



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, December 2, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 2, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, one of our responsibilities in this Congress is to protect the men and women from Iraq and Afghanistan who put their lives on the line to assist the United States.

Thousands of Afghans and Iraqis who helped us as guides, as interpreters, must not be left to the tender mercies of al Qaeda, the Taliban, and others with long memories who seek to punish those who helped us.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal had a front-page story about an Iraqi fam-

ily that is caught in the bureaucratic pipeline for the families seeking safety after years of service and now facing intense threats against them.

There was a recent HBO feature by comedian John Oliver on his program, "Last Week Tonight," that, in graphic, satirical, somewhat profane terms, captured the essence of the bureaucratic nightmare faced by thousands in Iraq and Afghanistan. They and their family members are at risk of being assaulted, kidnapped, tortured, raped, or killed simply because they were there helping Americans.

We are seeing some progress. I deeply appreciate the tireless efforts of Chairman BUCK McKEON, Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, and their staff, the work on the National Defense Authorization Act, which will help us uphold commitments to our Afghan allies.

However, all of us in Congress have a responsibility, and there is an opportunity for all of us to step up and help this desperate situation. Over the last 7 years, it has been a battle to have America honor its obligations by effectively implementing this Special Immigrant Visa program authorized by Congress to help those who helped us to escape.

We are seeing the results of many on this floor who encourage the State Department to more aggressively implement this Special Immigration Visa program. The Afghan program went from an embarrassing 32 visas for all of 2012 to an average of 400 each month this year. This is due to enhanced oversight and pressure and cooperation from Congress. The program is now functioning at a level that almost allows us to keep our promises to our allies.

One thing we all can do is to join me and my colleague, ADAM KINZINGER, who has been a tireless champion for justice for these Afghan and Iraqi nationals, in directing a letter to our friends on the Appropriations Committee asking that they, like last year, authorize urgently needed Afghan SIVs in the end-of-the-year appropriations package that we will soon have here on the floor.

We have stepped up before, but we need to avoid this Special Immigrant Visa roulette so that these people are not in limbo, or, worse, resigned to the hell inflicted on them by the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Even with the leadership of the Armed Services Committee, we will still fall short of upholding our commitments for a need as great as 9,000 visas for Afghanistan alone. That is why our appropriators must help shoulder the responsibility, and they need to hear from us, every Member of Congress.

It is our moral obligation to take action to protect, not just those people, but the security interests of the United States. It is not just their innocent lives that are at stake. Think about the trust that is going to be necessary when we need help in the future from foreign nationals for our soldiers, our diplomats, and our aid workers.

Let's sign the letter. Let's all detail someone on every staff to pay attention to this issue. Add our voices. It is being done by the Armed Services Committee. Help the Appropriations Committee in this next critical step.

It should not be left to a comedian like John Oliver, God bless him, to carry this banner alone. Sign the letter, speak out, take up the cause.

We must not fail those who are at risk only because they believed our promises and they helped Americans in some of the most difficult circumstances we have ever asked our soldiers, diplomats, and aid workers to face.

This is a failure we can avoid, and we can end this Congress on a positive note that can make everybody feel better as we approach the holiday season.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. David Gray, Bradley Hills Presbyterian Church, Bethesda, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, Your love is never ending. In these hallowed Halls, Your sovereign spirit comes to us, calms us, calls us, and infuses us with Your grace.

Give us strength this day to look outside ourselves for the opportunities which come from connection and collaboration. Give us faith to bring our best selves and to seek Your will. Give us confidence that solutions can be found and problems solved.

Grant us gratitude for the trust placed in us, for the privilege of living in this free land, and for Your presence here with us. Allow us to rest in and rely on Your hope-filled spirit.

Loving God, we ask Your blessing upon this body and all who gather here. Help us to receive Your assurance, Your encouragement, Your wisdom, and Your inspiration for the tasks to which we have been called. We pray this day.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. DAVID GRAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to welcome my good friend Pastor David Gray as our guest chaplain today.

Born in Dayton, Ohio, Pastor Gray grew up active in the Presbyterian church and has gone on to lead a distinguished life of service.

Holding both a law degree and a doctorate of ministry, Pastor Gray is a former public servant, having served as a staffer in the Senate and a true spiritual leader that has helped numerous individuals and families grow in their relationship with God.

Currently, Pastor Gray serves as the head pastor at Bradley Hills Church and resides in Bethesda, Maryland, with his wife, Bridget, and their four children.

On behalf of the United States Congress and the people of his hometown in my district of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, I want to thank Pastor Gray for his commitment to his faith and for opening the House today with his prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CALIFORNIA ABORTION MANDATE

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we have seen this administration casually ignore the law when it comes to immigration, EPA regs, and ObamaCare. Now, we are going to see whether they ignore the law when it comes to forcing churches in California to pay for abortion.

For many years now, Congress has included language in the appropriations bills that prohibits States from forcing health insurance plans to cover elective abortion: the Weldon amendment, named for my good friend and former colleague, Dr. Dave Weldon of Florida.

Now, the State of California has issued a bureaucratic edict that every health insurance plan in California regulated by the State must pay for the procedure, and this includes even plans purchased by churches, religious schools, and charities.

HHS must not hesitate to protect the right of Americans to prevent their health care dollars from going to something they find to be profoundly immoral. The agency is required to inform the State of California of this violation and remind them that they risk the loss of Federal funds.

There doesn't need to be any delay from HHS. This is exactly why the Weldon amendment was created.

FUNDING FOR ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE RESEARCH

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of funding for Alzheimer's disease research.

Alzheimer's is a particularly devastating disease both for the patients and their families. Families watch their loved ones effectively disappear before their eyes. There are currently more than 5 million Americans suffering from this disease, with one American being diagnosed every 67 seconds.

We must take preventive actions to address the growing population of Alzheimer's patients in this country. In the fiscal year 2015 appropriations process, I urge my colleagues to support increased funding for this research. This research will help find ways to prevent, treat, and even slow the progression of the disease, helping to ease the burden on patients, caregivers, and the Medicare system.

Congress must continue its commitment to fight against Alzheimer's by providing this crucial funding.

ECONOMY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, many North Carolina families know all too well of the struggle to find a job and pay the bills. Some are facing these challenges right now, and we all have family members, neighbors, or friends who are facing hard choices to make ends meet. Back home, I am often asked what Congress is doing to help people back to work and restore opportunity for everyone.

For the last 2 years, the House has passed numerous pieces of legislation to encourage job growth and strengthen America's standing in the global economy. We have also passed bills that would decrease energy costs, that would allow workers to have more flexibility in order to spend time with their families, and that would increase transparency in how tax dollars are spent.

While Congress cannot create prosperity, we can work to ensure entrepreneurs and employers aren't crushed under red tape. The 114th Congress is a fresh opportunity to help put more Americans back to work and to improve our economy. I look forward to working with the new majority in the Senate to accomplish those goals.

CONGRESS HAS YET TO TAKE UP THE BIG QUESTIONS FACING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, here we are just a few days short of the end of

the 113th Congress, and this Congress has yet to take up the big questions facing the American people.

We are 10 days away from a budget deadline, and there is still talk among some on the other side of using the sanctity of the budget—the economy of this country—as a tool to fight against actions taken by this President that the Congress, itself, is unwilling to take up.

Rather than taking up unemployment insurance, for example, despite the fact that we have seen a significant reduction in unemployment across the country—in my home State, unemployment is still above 7 percent—we haven't taken that up.

Instead of taking up the jobs program, like our Make It In America agenda, which would reenergize our manufacturing sector, we have set that aside and haven't taken it up.

Instead of taking up the very subject that has driven some to threaten to shut down government—comprehensive immigration reform—we haven't even seen a bill come to the floor of the House—not the Senate bill, not another bill—that even the Republicans, themselves, could put together.

While we talk a good game about being willing to take on these big questions, when it comes time to put something on the floor for us to legislate, to vote on, we see no action at all.

UNESCO

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, when UNESCO admitted a nonexistent State of Palestine to its membership, it did so knowing U.S. law prohibits funding to any entity at the U.N. that grants the PLO the same status as other member states.

The members of UNESCO also knew that admitting the so-called Palestine would have a negative impact on the future of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process; yet they enthusiastically welcomed Abu Mazen at UNESCO.

The only explanation for UNESCO's willingness to allow these consequences to pass is that its members view the delegitimizing of Israel as its mission. They view helping Abu Mazen to unilaterally establish the de facto recognition for a Palestinian state as a worthy means to an end.

We must not only block any attempt by the administration to restore funding to this entity which clearly has an agenda opposite to America's interests, but we must also work to block Abu Mazen's attempts at the U.N. to bypass his obligations to Israel by continuing his unilateral statehood scheme.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOHN KREBS

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise today to honor the life of former Congressman John Krebs. John was a close friend and a mentor.

As a young immigrant to the United States from Tel Aviv, John was able to live the American Dream and much more. He serves as an inspiration for all of those who knew him.

John served in the United States House of Representatives from 1975 to 1979. One of his proudest legislative accomplishments was incorporating the Mineral King Valley into the Sequoia National Park.

In 2009, President Obama recognized John for his efforts, and he signed legislation establishing the John Krebs Wilderness area which covers 40,000 acres within Mineral King Valley.

Mr. Krebs was a community leader and was active in the Democratic Party, playing key roles in both local and statewide campaigns throughout California.

John will be greatly missed by his wife, Hanna; by his son, Daniel, and his wife, Susan; by his daughter, Karen, and her husband, John; and by his grandchildren, Elizabeth, Caroline, Jack, Clay, and Peter.

John's strong values, work ethic, and compassion for others were evident to all who knew him and were fortunate to work with him. It is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to honor the life of former Congressman John Krebs, my good friend.

IN MEMORY OF EDWIN TUBBS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, the community of Coudersport, Potter County, Pennsylvania, will honor Private Edwin Franklin Tubbs, an American hero who sacrificed his life in defense of our Nation during the Vietnam war.

Private Tubbs was deployed to Vietnam on December 4, 1968. Just 5 weeks later, on January 12, 1969, he was fatally wounded as he set down his rifle to assist a friend who was injured on the battlefield.

With the dedication of the Private Edwin Tubbs Memorial at the West Chestnut Street Bridge, followed by one more dedication later this year, Potter County will have memorialized all nine of the county's Vietnam war casualties with specifically named bridges.

On behalf of this community, I offer my thoughts and prayers as we reflect

on the unique life and selfless service of Private Tubbs. While there is nothing that can be done or said to eliminate the sense of loss felt by family members and friends, today's dedication is one small token of appreciation for this hero's honored service to our country.

ASSURING A NEW ERA BETWEEN CITIZENS AND POLICE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, a new generation of young people of every race is demonstrating nonviolently to make sure that the larger meaning of the Michael Brown tragedy is not lost.

His death has become much more than a moment of anguish. Michael Brown has crystallized the painful experience that had found no outlet until now: the routine stops of Black men by police in the streets of our country because of the color of their skin.

The body-mounted cameras, announced by the President yesterday, are a good and practical beginning. Let's hope that local communities will use this tragedy to assure a new era of genuine collaboration that citizens need with the police who serve and protect them.

□ 1215

NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to speak about one of our greatest national security challenges: the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran.

I am deeply troubled by the Obama administration's recent 7-month extension of nuclear negotiations with Iran. The extension means that Iran will continue to have access to \$700 million a month in sanctions relief.

Every day that we continue these talks is another day given to Iran to develop a nuclear weapon. A nuclear-armed Iran would start a new arms race in the Middle East and pose an intolerable threat to the national security of the United States and our allies, especially Israel.

The House has passed H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act, which would increase sanctions on the Iranian regime. Now it is time for the United States Senate to do its part and pass legislation that would impose additional sanctions on Iran.

HANDS UP; DON'T SHOOT

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, November 30, we had a seminal moment occur in the history of our country. When those football players came out and held their hands up, they were speaking to the masses; and they were using these words, "Hands up; don't shoot," in this symbolism.

I believe so strongly in what they have done that I will have flags flown over the Capitol of the United States of America in honor of each of those players, and I will pay for the flags with my personal U.S. dollars.

I also want to mention something that happened this morning on the Morning Joe show. The question was posed: "What is wrong with these people? Don't they know that this is a lie?" meaning what happened in Ferguson in terms of the hands up; don't shoot.

I want to tell you what is wrong with these people. These people refuse to accept an invidious whitewash. I will say more about this tomorrow when I will have 5 minutes around 10 a.m. or sometime shortly thereafter, because I want the American people to know that there are some people who are willing to take a stand.

WE MUST ACT NOW TO INCREASE SANCTIONS ON IRAN

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the administration's recent decision to extend talks with Iran into 2015. Iran is simply stalling and buying time, time that we and our closest ally in the region, Israel, do not have.

Many months ago, when sanctions were starting to have an impact on Iran, the administration relaxed them. All we have to show for these weakened sanctions is months of stalled talks.

It is long overdue to increase the pressure on Iran. I call for new and immediate sanctions with the teeth to force Iran to give up its nuclear ambitions. Without new pressures, Iran won't see any reason to change its current course. Congress must act now in increasing sanctions to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

DELIVERING RESULTS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a reporter asked me to comment on whether Speaker BOEHNER will be able to make his mark in the next Congress, with the largest House majority for his party since 1929. My

thoughts: stand and deliver. If the Speaker wants to work, there is nothing stopping him. Democrats stand ready to work with him to tackle many of the challenges facing American families.

In many ways, our economy has shown incredible resilience of late. GDP and job growth are up, but, unfortunately, many still don't feel like things are getting any better. It is long past time that we come together and enact policies that will help hard-working families instead of pandering to special interests.

This election saw the worst voter turnout in 72 years because Americans didn't think we could get anything done for them. Let's show that we can. I hope we will use the remaining weeks in this Congress to show that we are capable of delivering results to the American people.

ACHIEVING BETTER LIFE EXPERIENCE ACT

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Achieving Better Life Experience Act, commonly known as the ABLE Act.

In our Nation, we believe that everyone should have the opportunity to realize their dreams, that each American should be able to have the tools and capabilities to build a bright future. Yet millions of families in our country struggle with the challenges of raising children with special needs like autism and Down syndrome.

The ABLE Act doesn't put more burdens on the government or grow bureaucratic Federal programs; rather, it provides families with the opportunity to invest their own earnings in the care for their disabled children, like education, transportation, and other tools that help prepare their children for a future of independent living, without having to be taxed on those savings. These flexible savings tools will help families maintain greater financial security as they strive to raise their children to contribute to society in productive ways.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in the House to stand up for these families, like Rachel Mast and her family in Kansas, to ensure that we do everything to fight for their future, too.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE ACT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, after 9/11, this Congress came together, and we came together to put our economy back on

track. We passed TRIA, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act.

Now TRIA is set to expire in just 4 weeks, and we desperately need a long-term reauthorization of this important economic tool that has brought stability to businesses and to our economy. We cannot kick the can down the road again by pushing a short-term extension of TRIA.

In fact, just last night, 45 Republicans signed a letter opposing a short-term extension of TRIA. All of the Democrats already oppose an extension of a short-term reauthorization of TRIA. This united position should take the issue off the table.

While some Members have insisted that the House can't waive the CutGo rule to pass TRIA, I think it is important to note that the House has waived it 18 times; and we traditionally waive it for emergency spending, which is what TRIA is: spending in the wake of a terrorist attack.

Please come together and pass a long-term reauthorization for our economic growth.

POLICE TRAINING

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of Trayvon Martin's tragic death, the Nation waits. Young people wait. I could give a long litany. But certainly Michael Brown has galvanized us from north to south, from east to west.

I stand with the young men, among many others, of the St. Louis Rams and the young people that I have seen taking to the streets nonviolently, peacefully. Today I rise to thank them and to applaud them as Americans deserving of honor and respect. But they wait. So I believe that it is important that we work with those who are assigned and in uniform to protect and serve.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have stood alongside law enforcement, but now it is important that we realize that the system is not cracked but broken. There must be a complete overhaul of the training of local police in the nooks and crannies of America. There must be a reform of the system which provides the funding to local jurisdictions simply by traffic stops and foot citations. That is what geared Officer Wilson in the wrong direction. And finally, Mr. Speaker, there must be training to protect officers but to know when to use deadly force.

Deadly force was not warranted; it was not required in the life and the loss of Michael Brown. There must be solutions, Mr. Speaker, for those young people that are out in the streets protesting. We cannot have a lopsided justice system.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 2, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,

The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 2, 2014 at 11:03 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2203.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PEST MANAGEMENT RECORDS
MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5714) to permit commercial applicators of pesticides to create, retain, submit, and convey pesticide application-related records, reports, data, and other information in electronic form.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pest Management Records Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. USE OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS BY COMMERCIAL APPLICATORS OF PESTICIDES TO COMPLY WITH RECORD-KEEPING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 1491 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 1361-1) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) ELECTRONIC RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTING.—Notwithstanding any contrary provision of Federal, State, or local law, commercial applicators of pesticides, including commercial applicators of restricted use pesticides, may create, retain, submit, and convey a pesticide application-related record, report, data, or other information in electronic form in order to satisfy any requirement for such creation, retention, submission, or conveyance, respectively, under any Federal, State, or local law."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 5714.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) for being here to help with this bill today. I also want to thank my good friend and colleague from Oregon, Representative KURT SCHRADER, for his leadership on this important piece of legislation.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5714, the Pest Management Records Modernization Act.

Under the current law, the United States Department of Agriculture requires businesses that apply pesticides to maintain and provide access to records on their use, including the product name, amount, approximate date of application, and the location of application of each pesticide used.

While most States allow pesticide applicator businesses to convey information electronically to customers as a way to comply with consumer information requirements, a few States still require that the information be provided in paper or hard copy format. The challenge posed to the industry is not the longstanding consumer information requirements themselves but, rather, the very limited transmission options in certain States.

Today, businesses in virtually all sectors of the economy are going paperless as a way to save costs, increase efficiencies, and, yes, fulfill the range of local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements in a timely and proficient manner. Unfortunately, the transition to a paperless office for many pest management and other pesticide applicator businesses is more difficult than anticipated because of the decades-old State consumer information requirements that mandate transmission of such documents be via paper or hard copy. These requirements are especially disruptive for paperless companies that operate in multiple States, some of which permit electronic conveyance of the required information and others that don't.

The USDA permits records to be retained and conveyed electronically for restricted use pesticide applications. Unfortunately, the overwhelming ma-

jority of treatments performed by pest management professionals are general use pesticides.

The Pest Management Records Modernization Act is a commonsense change to existing law that will allow commercial applicators of pesticides to create, retain, and submit pesticide application-related records, reports, and other information in electronic form.

As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 5714, the Pest Management Records Modernization Act.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his remarks and for clearly stating this commonsense piece of legislation and for his support of it.

I, too, would like to thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER). He is the author of this piece of legislation. Something we have come to expect from Mr. SCHRADER is a commonsense, bipartisan piece of legislation.

□ 1230

H.R. 5714, the Pest Management Records Modernization Act, is pro-small business and pro-consumer. It improves the ability of pest management companies to communicate important information with their customers related to the products they use.

As you heard from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, most States require pest management and other applicator companies to provide customers with information related to pest treatments, either automatically or upon request. Most of the requirements are implemented and enforced by State departments of agriculture, which are the State pesticide regulatory agency in 40 States. The required information is typically information directly from the pesticide label. The overwhelming majority of treatments performed by pest management professionals involve general use pesticides.

Right now about 45 States permit electronic conveyance of this information directly to consumers. In fact, in the last 2 years, the States of California, Georgia, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Arizona have recognized the need to update their respective laws related to disclosure and passed legislation or taken administrative actions permitting electronic conveyance of pesticide application information.

Like businesses in countless sectors of the economy, professional pest management and other pest applicator businesses are going paperless as a way to save costs and increase efficiencies. Going paperless allows businesses to back up and better safeguard data and

records in case of a fire, flood, or other disasters. It also makes it easier to prove compliance with various record-keeping, reporting, and related requirements, plus it has the added advantage of being greener and more environmentally sound.

Unfortunately, the transition to a paperless office for many pest management and other pesticide applicator businesses is more difficult than anticipated because of antiquated State consumer information requirements from the 1970s and '80s that mandated transmission of such documents be via hard copies or paper and do not permit electronic conveyance. These requirements are especially disruptive for companies that have made the transition to paperless that operate in multiple States, some of which permit electronic conveyance and others that don't.

It is important to note H.R. 5714 does not put any new mandates on small businesses but, rather, provides them the ability to electronically convey information in the handful of States that have not yet addressed this in a changing e-commerce environment.

As I have said previously, and as my friend from Pennsylvania stated, H.R. 5714 is commonsense, it is bipartisan, it is pro-consumer, and it is pro-small business. It deserves our support, and I encourage everyone to make its swift passage possible.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his remarks and encourage my colleagues to support passage of this important piece of legislation. I have no further comments or speakers on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I also yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5714.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NO SOCIAL SECURITY FOR NAZIS ACT

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5739) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5739

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Social Security for Nazis Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress enacted social security legislation to provide earned benefits for workers and their families, should they retire, become disabled, or die.

(2) Congress never intended for participants in Nazi persecution to be allowed to enter the United States or to reap the benefits of United States residency or citizenship, including participation in the Nation's Social Security program.

SEC. 3. TERMINATION OF BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(n)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(n)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection—

"(A) an individual against whom a final order of removal has been issued under section 237(a)(4)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on grounds of participation in Nazi persecution shall be considered to have been removed under such section as of the date on which such order became final;

"(B) an individual with respect to whom an order admitting the individual to citizenship has been revoked and set aside under section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act in any case in which the revocation and setting aside is based on conduct described in section 212(a)(3)(E)(i) of such Act (relating to participation in Nazi persecution), concealment of a material fact about such conduct, or willful misrepresentation about such conduct shall be considered to have been removed as described in paragraph (1) as of the date of such revocation and setting aside; and

"(C) an individual who pursuant to a settlement agreement with the Attorney General has admitted to conduct described in section 212(a)(3)(E)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (relating to participation in Nazi persecution) and who pursuant to such settlement agreement has lost status as a national of the United States by a renunciation under section 349(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered to have been removed as described in paragraph (1) as of the date of such renunciation."

(b) OTHER BENEFITS.—Section 202(n) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 402(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4) In the case of any individual described in paragraph (3) whose monthly benefits are terminated under paragraph (1)—

"(A) no benefits otherwise available under section 202 based on the wages and self-employment income of any other individual shall be paid to such individual for any month after such termination; and

"(B) no supplemental security income benefits under title XVI shall be paid to such individual for any such month, including supplementary payments pursuant to an agreement for Federal administration under section 1616(a) and payments pursuant to an agreement entered into under section 212(b) of Public Law 93-66".

SEC. 4. NOTIFICATIONS.

Section 202(n)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(n)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) In the case of the removal of any individual under any of the paragraphs of

section 237(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (other than under paragraph (1)(C) of such section) or under section 212(a)(6)(A) of such Act, the revocation and setting aside of citizenship of any individual under section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act in any case in which the revocation and setting aside is based on conduct described in section 212(a)(3)(E)(i) of such Act (relating to participation in Nazi persecution), or the renunciation of nationality by any individual under section 349(a)(5) of such Act pursuant to a settlement agreement with the Attorney General where the individual has admitted to conduct described in section 212(a)(3)(E)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (relating to participation in Nazi persecution) occurring after the date of the enactment of the No Social Security for Nazis Act, the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Commissioner of Social Security of such removal, revocation and setting aside, or renunciation of nationality not later than 7 days after such removal, revocation and setting aside, or renunciation of nationality (or, in the case of any such removal, revocation and setting aside, of renunciation of nationality that has occurred prior to the date of the enactment of the No Social Security for Nazis Act, not later than 7 days after such date of enactment).

"(B)(i) Not later than 30 days after the enactment of the No Social Security for Nazis Act, the Attorney General shall certify to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate that the Commissioner of Social Security has been notified of each removal, revocation and setting aside, or renunciation of nationality described in subparagraph (A).

"(ii) Not later than 30 days after each notification with respect to an individual under subparagraph (A), the Commissioner of Social Security shall certify to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate that such individual's benefits were terminated under this subsection."

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to benefits paid for any month beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise as chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security—the committee of jurisdiction over Social Security benefits—in support of the No

Social Security for Nazis Act, legislation I introduced along with Ranking Member XAVIER BECERRA.

The world must never forget the 6 million Jews and other innocents murdered in the Holocaust. America has worked hard to prevent Nazis from entering the country and reaping the benefits of U.S. citizenship, including Social Security. Social Security is an earned benefit. Hardworking Americans pay a portion of their wages for promises of future benefits. However, it is a benefit that was never intended for those who participated in the horrific acts of the Holocaust.

Under the Social Security Act, Social Security benefits are terminated when individuals are deported due to participating in Nazi persecutions. Some individuals whom the Department of Justice identified as Nazi persecutors were denaturalized or voluntarily renounced their citizenship and left the country to avoid formal deportation proceedings. However, due to a loophole, certain Nazi persecutors have continued to receive Social Security benefits. Today we will put an end to this loophole.

The bill amends the law to stop benefit payments to those denaturalized due to participation in Nazi persecutions or who voluntarily renounced their citizenship as part of a settlement with the Attorney General related to participating in Nazi persecution.

The bill also makes sure that these individuals do not receive spousal benefits due to a marriage to a Social Security beneficiary.

Lastly, the bill requires the Attorney General to certify to the Ways and Means Committee and Finance Committee that Social Security has been notified of all those whose benefits should be terminated due to participation in Nazi persecutions. It also requires the Commissioner of Social Security to certify that benefits were terminated.

This legislation is currently cosponsored by over 47 Members of the Congress. Also, letters of support have been received from some of the following organizations: The Association of Mature American Citizens, B'nai B'rith International, Jewish Federations of North America, J Street, National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, Republican Jewish Coalition, Strengthen Social Security Coalition, and the Zionist Organization of America.

Mr. Speaker, I insert these letters in the RECORD as well.

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,
GLOBAL JEWISH ADVOCACY,
Washington, DC, November 24, 2014.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON AND RANKING MEMBER BECERRA, I write on behalf of AJC, the global Jewish advocacy organization, to urge your support of legislation to deny federal benefits to individuals who participated in Nazi persecution. There are two House

measures that seek to accomplish this: the Nazi Social Security Benefits Termination Act of 2014, introduced by Representatives Carolyn Maloney, Leonard Lance, and Jason Chaffetz, and the No Social Security for Nazis Act, introduced by Representatives Sam Johnson and Xavier Becerra.

For many years, Nazi extermination camp personnel and others who found refuge in the United States after World War II—individuals who perpetrated some of the worst crimes known to humanity, including the execution of millions of innocent civilians—have received various benefits, including Social Security payments, from the United States government. While the number of Nazi recipients of Social Security payments may not be large, the continuance of this practice is an intolerable insult to those, living and dead, who suffered at the hands of the Nazis, is an affront to American taxpayers, and contradicts our nation's core values.

The Nazi Social Security Benefits Termination Act will deny receipt of federal benefits to those who were accused of taking part in Nazi criminal acts and were either stripped of their citizenship or voluntarily renounced it. The No Social Security for Nazis Act amends the Social Security Act to cease payments to those stripped of U.S. citizenship as a result of participation in Nazi activities, and those who voluntarily renounced citizenship due to such participation.

The United States should not be lending material support to individuals whose crimes were so egregious that a new word had to be coined to describe them: genocide. On behalf of AJC, I urge you to support legislation to deny federal benefits to individuals who participated in Nazi persecution.

Thank you for considering our views on this important matter.

Respectfully,

JASON ISAACSON.

ASSOCIATION OF
MATURE AMERICAN CITIZENS,
November 20, 2014.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. XAVIER BECERRA,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES JOHNSON AND BECERRA AND SENATORS HATCH AND WYDEN, on behalf of the 1.2 million members of AMAC, the Association of Mature American Citizens, I am writing in strong support of the "No Social Security for Nazis Act." This critical bipartisan, bicameral bill is needed to address a loophole in the law that has enabled Holocaust perpetrators to wrongly collect Social Security benefits at the expense of American taxpayers and seniors.

The World must never forget the atrocities committed by the Nazis or the millions of innocent Jews that were callously murdered during the Holocaust. For that reason, Congress has a responsibility to ensure that war criminals no longer benefit from U.S. government programs. Therefore, the "No Social Security for Nazis Act" justly amends the Social Security Act and puts an end to Nazis receiving Social Security payouts.

On a broader scale, AMAC believes it is imperative for Congress to continue to protect

Social Security for rightful beneficiaries. Mature Americans and seniors overwhelmingly depend on Social Security to help supplement their retirement income; yet, according to the Trustees of Social Security, the program remains at risk of becoming insolvent by 2030. Clearly, Social Security cannot sustain its current fiscal path without comprehensive reform. AMAC strongly urges Congress to take immediate action to save Social Security and to guarantee its existence for future generations of hard-working Americans.

Although Social Security as a whole is in need of real legislative attention, AMAC is proud to see Congress working together on this particular issue to right a terrible wrong. Thanks to your concern for this significant matter, AMAC is pleased to support the "No Social Security for Nazis Act."

Sincerely,

DAN WEBER,
President and Founder of AMAC.

B'NAI B'RITH INTERNATIONAL,
November 24, 2014.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Washington, DC.
Hon. XAVIER BECERRA,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON AND RANKING MEMBER BECERRA: On behalf of B'nai B'rith International's hundreds of thousands of members and supporters, we write to express our support for your bill, H.R. 5739, the "No Social Security for Nazis Act." This bill, which amends the Social Security Act, will end Social Security payments to Nazi perpetrators who denaturalized and left the country many years ago as a result of their Nazi pasts. This important change in the law will treat this subgroup of Nazis in the same way as deported Nazis—who are already barred from receiving Social Security benefits.

We appreciate the deliberation and care that has gone into this process, and the many members of both houses of Congress who have worked in recent weeks to address this issue. The "No Social Security for Nazis Act" will accomplish our shared goal of ending the payments while amending the Social Security statute directly, thereby ensuring that the many facets of social security benefit access are treated properly.

Although Social Security is an earned benefit for American workers, this change would apply only to individuals who misrepresented their pasts when entering this country and applying for citizenship. Nazi perpetrators should not be allowed to continue to benefit from the lies they told long ago. Those who have so defiled the most basic of social contracts should not be allowed to receive these benefits any longer. We believe this step is necessary and appropriate, and encourage both houses of Congress to take up these bills expeditiously. We thank you for your leadership on this matter and urge each Member of Congress to join you in quickly enacting this legislation.

Sincerely,

ALLAN J. JACOBS,
President.
DANIEL S. MARIASCHIN,
Executive Vice President.

THE JEWISH FEDERATIONS®
OF NORTH AMERICA,
November 24, 2014.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Chairman;
Hon. XAVIER BECERRA,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and
Means Social Security Subcommittee, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON AND RANKING
MEMBER BECERRA: We write to express our
support for your leadership in introducing
H.R. 5739, legislation that would terminate
Social Security benefits for Nazi persecutors
who receive such benefits because of a loop-
hole in current law.

The Jewish Federations of North America
("JFNA") is the national organization that
represents 153 Jewish Federations, and 300
independent network communities that are
the umbrella fundraising organization as
well as the central planning and coordi-
nating body for an extensive network of Jew-
ish health, education, and social service
agencies. The JFNA system raises and allo-
cates funds for almost one thousand affil-
iated agencies that provide needed services to
almost one million individuals throughout
the country. As an organization that has
been a tireless advocate to secure and pro-
vide needed support for the over 100,000 Holo-
caust survivors in the U.S. JFNA applauds
your efforts to end benefits for war criminals
that persecuted millions of innocents during
the Holocaust.

It is encouraging that so many of your col-
leagues have joined in your effort to close
this egregious loophole in current law. We
will urge all of our partners in the Jewish
community to work with you to ensure that
H.R. 5739 is enacted during this legislative
session.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. DAROFF,
Senior Vice President for Public Policy and
Director of the Washington Office.

J STREET.

J Street applauds the introduction of the
No Social Security for Nazis Act (H.R. 5739),
led by Chairman Sam Johnson (R-TX-3) and
Ranking Member Xavier Becerra (D-CA-34),
which would change the Social Security Act
to prevent those who participated in Nazi
persecution from receiving social security
benefits. We commend the strong bipartisan
support for the bill and urge its swift passage
by Congress.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE
SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE,
Washington, DC, November 20, 2014.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: On behalf of the
millions of members and supporters of the
National Committee to Preserve Social Secu-
rity and Medicare, I am writing to express
our support of your bill, H.R. 5739, the "No
Social Security for Nazis Act."

This bill amends the Social Security Act
to close a loophole that allows some Nazis
who gained U.S. citizenship through fraud
and deception to continue receiving Social
Security benefits even though they have
been stripped of their citizenship and have
been removed from our country. While the
individuals who will be affected by this bill
worked and contributed to Social Security,
they gained the right to do so by lying on
their applications for citizenship about the
nature of their roles in the Nazi holocaust
during World War II.

These war criminals should not be allowed
to continue to reap the fruits of their dishon-
esty, and on behalf of all of our members, we
commend you for your leadership in bringing
this travesty to an end. We urge all Members
of Congress to join you in enacting this im-
portant legislation.

Sincerely,

MAX RICHTMAN,
President and CEO.

REPUBLICAN JEWISH COALITION,
Washington, DC, November 24, 2014.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Social Secu-
rity, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I'm writing to
thank you for introducing H.R. 5732, the No
Social Security for Nazis Act, and to encour-
age you and your colleagues on the House
Ways and Means committee to press for en-
actment of legislation to close this newly
discovered loophole in current law this year.

As you've noted, during prior Congresses,
action had been taken to cancel Social Secu-
rity benefits for individuals determined to
have participated in Nazi war crimes. In
light of recent news reports detailing how a
number of individuals in this category have
maneuvered to maintain their access to ben-
efits, it is clear that a fix is needed.

H.R. 5732 ensures that Nazi war criminals
who voluntarily renounced their citizenship
and left the country prior to an impending
deportation action cannot retain Social Secu-
rity benefits they would otherwise have
lost and blocks such individuals' access to
spousal benefits.

We are encouraged by the breadth of bipar-
tisan support for remedial legislation tar-
geting this loophole. On behalf of the Repub-
lican Jewish Coalition's 40,000 members, I sa-
lute you for your leadership in quickly mov-
ing to solve the problem that has recently
come to light.

Sincerely,

NOAH SILVERMAN,
Congressional Affairs Director,
Republican Jewish Coalition.

STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY,
Washington, DC.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
House of Representatives,
Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP, RANKING MEMBER
LEVIN, CHAIRMAN JOHNSON, AND RANKING
MEMBER BECERRA: The Strengthen Social Secu-
rity Coalition, which is comprised of over
350 national and statewide organizations in-
cluding women's, labor, veterans, aging, and
civil rights groups appreciate your timely
introduction of the No Social Security for
Nazis Act (H.R. 5739).

It is under unfortunate extraordinary cir-
cumstances that a group of individuals in-
volved in Nazi persecutions have been receiv-
ing Social Security benefits. These war
criminals should never have been allowed to
enter the United States and should never
have received Social Security benefits. The
bipartisan legislation that has been intro-
duced presents a solution for this extraor-
dinary circumstance and respects the hard
work and contribution of Americans who
have earned their benefits. Thank you for de-
fending the Social Security benefits that
have been earned by the American people.

Sincerely,

ERIC KINGSON,
Coalition Co-Chair.
NANCY ALTMAN,
Coalition Co-Chair.

ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, November 20, 2014.

Hon. SAM JOHNSON,
Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee
Chairman, Longworth House Office Build-
ing, Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: The Zionist Orga-
nization of America (ZOA), the oldest and
one of the largest pro-Israel organizations in
the United States, strongly supports H.R.
5739, the No Social Security for Nazis Act. It
is a travesty that through the loophole of
passive enforcement, deported aliens who
have been found to have lied about their war-
time activities continue to receive Social Secu-
rity from the U.S. government. We ap-
plaud the bi-partisan group of Congressmen
and their Senate counterparts who are seek-
ing to close this loophole during the Novem-
ber and December congressional sessions be-
fore Congress adjourns for the year.

The process to identify those who partici-
pated in the World War II persecution of
Jews was legally rigorous, but ultimately
failed to achieve all of its objectives as long
as the Nazis who fraudulently entered our
country following the war continue to ben-
efit during their advanced years from the
fraud they committed against our country.
This legislation will repair this defect. The
ZOA urges its adoption in both houses of
Congress and the swift signing into law of
the prohibition of Social Security Payments
to those found to be part of the Nazi atrocity
machinery.

The ZOA commends Members of Congress
of both parties who support this legislation.

MORTON KLEIN,
National President,
Zionist Organization of America.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. For
many years a loophole has allowed
those who perpetrated horrific crimes
against humanity to receive benefits
paid by the United States Government.
While the number of Nazi recipients of
Social Security benefits may be few
now, allowing payments to continue is
an inexcusable insult to those who suf-
fered at the hands of the Nazis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of
the House to vote "yes" and pass the
No Social Security to Nazis Act today
so the Senate can take action soon and
that the President can sign it into law
without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of
my time.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield
myself such time as I may consume.

Let me begin, Mr. Speaker, by thank-
ing my colleague, but, more impor-
tantly, my dear friend, Mr. SAM JOHN-
SON from Texas, for the work that he
did to move so quickly working with
his able staff to try to make sure we
had a bill come before us. I also want
to make sure that I salute the staff on
this side of the aisle for the work they
did in partnership to make sure that
we could quickly put a bill on the floor
of this House that could address what
all of us agree is a glaring omission.

And so I am pleased to stand here to
say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a bill
that not only will take care of those
dollars that Americans contributed to
Social Security on a daily basis as they
go to work and pay into the system,

but it also will protect the dollars that so many Americans now rely on to receive their benefits.

Today, Mr. Speaker, 160 million Americans work and pay into Social Security. They know that because they do that their families will be protected if they happen to die or if they happen to become disabled or if they decide to retire. Now, for most of the 58 million Americans who are already retired or currently receiving Social Security benefits of some sort, that Social Security benefit is the most important source of income for them.

One of the greatest privileges we have as Americans living here in the U.S. is the opportunity to work and earn this Social Security protection for ourselves and for our families.

We recently learned, as Mr. JOHNSON has mentioned, that Nazi war criminals and collaborators slipped through a loophole in our laws and began receiving Social Security benefits. The record is clear: Congress never intended for the perpetrators of the Holocaust—the systematic, bureaucratic, state-sponsored murder of more than 6 million Jews and millions of other innocents—to be allowed to enter the U.S., let alone to participate in Social Security. It has been our longstanding policy that when Nazi persecutors who came under false pretenses are discovered that they be deported and stripped of all their privileges of U.S. citizenship and residency, including, of course, Social Security.

I am pleased to be here today because today what we are saying is we are ready to act. This legislation will tightly close the loophole that allows some individuals to use and retain Social Security benefits even after their Holocaust crimes have been proven and their citizenship has been revoked. As the chairman has mentioned, and as we are trying to make clear today, it is critically important that we make everyone aware that when you work for Social Security, you have earned it, and only then will you get it. So when someone comes in, uses a loophole, tries to take advantage, and then believes that they can get away with it, we want to be able to act quickly and make it clear that it will never happen again. We want those safeguards to be in place for everyone who has been working hard and paying into Social Security for years and years. They are the ones that own it, not people who have defrauded our government.

Like past Congresses, we believe that we must act quickly because the issue of the Holocaust is not unresolved in our minds. We know what we must do to anyone who perpetrated those heinous acts. We must act as quickly as we can. And so, Mr. Speaker, I say with a great deal of pride and friendship that I stand with the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee today, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, to urge my col-

leagues to join us in closing this loophole now before Social Security has to pay another dime to a Nazi war criminal.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you, Mr. BECERRA. I appreciate your remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, for many today, the heinous acts of the Nazi party in the World War II era are a story relegated to the history books and museums. But the fact is some of these war criminals are still alive, and they are even getting a monthly check from Uncle Sam.

An Associated Press investigation found that dozens of Nazi suspects have collected Social Security benefits due to a loophole in our laws. And the cost to the taxpayers has reportedly reached into the millions.

Seniors in my district already have concerns about the future of Social Security. The last thing that they want to see is their government using scarce taxpayer dollars for this purpose. That is why I was proud to cosponsor Congressman SAM JOHNSON's No Social Security for Nazis Act, legislation to cut off benefits to anyone stripped of their U.S. citizenship related to their participation in Nazi crimes.

No act of Congress could ever make right the atrocities of the Holocaust or bring justice to its 6 million victims. But ending the flow of the payments to those human rights violators would sure be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his good work on this issue and this bipartisan measure and look forward to voting in support.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, we are expecting another speaker, but I reserve the balance of my time and let the gentleman from Texas proceed if he has another speaker.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

□ 1245

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of H.R. 5739, the No Social Security for Nazis Act, which will correct an injustice of two generations and right a terrible wrong in the name of the lives that were lost as a result of the Holocaust.

To think Nazis are receiving Social Security benefits derived from tax receipts of the American people is sickening and morally wrong. Today, Congress will move to put an end to it.

This effort was originally championed in the 1990s by my predecessor from the district I have the honor of serving, the late Congressman Bob

Franks, and I am proud to continue his effort and see this legislation pass on the floor of the House today.

The United States, including my home State of New Jersey, stands in solidarity with the Jewish people, the State of Israel, and the decades-long struggle for peace in the world following the Nazi atrocities.

This action is yet another step in demonstrating that our resolve for justice is unyielding and our commitment to pursue what is right continues even 70 years after World War II.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY of New York City, for her leadership on this issue and for asking me to cosponsor the original bill that she had initiated. I also thank Congressman SAM JOHNSON and the Ways and Means Committee for taking up this effort.

The world can never forget the hate and intolerance of the 1930s and 1940s that claimed the lives of millions of people of the Jewish faith and forever scarred the face of mankind. Let this effort be another chapter in the healing that has brought vigor to the pursuit of justice, attention and care to all human suffering and the work toward a world of greater understanding and peace.

When given the chance to put an end to an egregious practice, we must act. I urge passage today of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who has been very active on this issue.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank my friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle, LEONARD LANCE, for coming to New York, for working in meetings, and for advancing this issue before the Social Security Administration and also the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, for decades, former Nazis complicit in war crimes have been given monthly Social Security benefit checks due to a loophole in the law. It is an outrage that began at the end of World War II, when thousands of Nazis fled to the United States.

Many lied about their past, so that they could become American citizens, take jobs, and try to just blend in, but most were eventually identified and deported, and some were tried for their crimes; however, dozens were never formally deported. If a former Nazi left the U.S. on his own before a final order of removal was issued, the law allowed him to keep receiving his Social Security benefits.

As the author of the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act of 1998, which opened up all of the files of the CIA on the Nazis and what they were doing in the United States and in Europe, I have been working on this issue for decades.

In 1991, I cowrote a bill to close this loophole by creating a new legal process to terminate benefits. Earlier this

year, I wrote the Social Security Administration, seeking more information on former Nazis who continue to receive Social Security benefits. They will be issuing a report to me and others on exactly how much money is involved.

After an investigative report by the Associated Press revealed new details of Nazis receiving Social Security benefits, I wrote to the IG of the Justice Department and have had meetings with them and the Social Security Administration to investigate exactly how this all occurred.

I also worked with my colleagues, Republican Congressmen LEONARD LANCE of New Jersey and JASON CHAFFETZ of Utah, to craft the Nazi Benefits Termination Act of 2014. It was supported by editorials across this Nation. We received a total of 19 editorials in support of our bill.

In the interest of time, I will just put in the RECORD roughly five of them because I think it is important that across this Nation, from the South, the West, the East, the North, all of them have come out strongly in support of not spending one taxpayer dime to support Nazis.

The Ways and Means Committee took on this same effort. Our bills are similar, and either would be sufficient to address the problem. Both would affirmatively declare individuals who have been denaturalized or renounced citizenship on the grounds of participation in Nazi persecution ineligible for Social Security benefits.

I urge my colleagues to end this outrage, close this loophole, and send a message that when we say we will never forget, we mean we will never forget and that we will stop this terrible abuse of taxpayer money going to Social Security benefits for Nazis.

I commend all of my colleagues who have worked on this important issue.

[From mydailynews.com]

NO SSNS FOR THE SS

A search for some small measure of justice will go on as long as Nazi war criminals remain alive and unpunished. Never mind that almost seven decades have passed since they participated in the Holocaust. Never mind that they are well up in years, perhaps approaching 100.

The outrage is that some of the guilty are living out their last days with the help of Social Security payments sent out by Uncle Sam.

After World War II, former SS death camp guards and others made their way to America in the hope of leaving their crimes behind. Rather than fight to boot the group, the government made odious deals: If they left the country, they would keep their Social Security benefits.

As reported by the Associated Press, troops who worked in the camps, a rocket scientist accused of using slave labor to do his research, a Polish Nazi collaborator who facilitated the murder of thousands of Jews and others fled and kept their cash.

At least four are still alive—and collecting. Rep. Carolyn Maloney said she will draft legislation to strip benefits from Nazis.

Better late than never.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Oct. 22, 2014]

SHAMEFUL SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR EXPELLED NAZIS

Jakob Denzinger gets about \$1,500 a month in Social Security payments, but the 90-year-old retiree isn't a typical senior citizen.

He's a former Auschwitz guard and one-time Ohio businessman who is now living comfortably overseas on U.S. Social Security benefits. His monthly check is nearly twice the take-home pay of an average worker in Croatia, where he lives. This for a man who patrolled one of the Nazi regime's most infamous death camps. It is an outrageous affront; Congress should no longer tolerate it.

An Associated Press investigation published over the weekend found that the U.S. Justice Department secretly used the promise of continued retirement payments to persuade dozens of Nazi suspects in the U.S. to leave. If they agreed to go quietly, or fled before deportation, as Denzinger did in 1989, they could retain their benefits. In return, the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations avoided messy deportation hearings and increased the number of former Nazis it expelled.

Just how many Nazis cashed in isn't known. However, it's stomach-turning to know that Nazi war criminals are receiving retirement benefits, just like your father or grandfather who fought to end the Nazi reign of terror. No accountability. Just a quiet retirement with a steady stream of government checks for Hitler's henchmen.

Americans deserve answers. The AP traces the program to 1979 and says at least 38 of 66 suspected Nazis removed from the country since then kept receiving their retirement benefits. By March 1999, the AP reports, 28 suspected Nazi criminals living overseas had amassed \$1.5 million in Social Security benefits. That's probably just the tip of the iceberg, but Social Security and Justice Department officials aren't talking.

We acknowledge that there is scant appetite in Europe or the United States to bring these aging men to trial. However, neither is there good reason for the U.S. to continue subsidizing their golden years. The deaths of millions should never be forgotten or bought off. With anti-Semitism again on the rise in Europe, sweeping these cases under the rug is the wrong way to signal to the world that we will never forget Nazi atrocities.

Congress turned its back on previous measures to stop payments to keep from offending diplomatic sensibilities or slowing down the Justice Department's expulsion efforts. It's time for this insult to end. A White House spokesman says the president, rightly, wants the benefits stopped, and Rep. Carolyn Maloney, D-N.Y., has called for an inquiry into the actions of Justice Department and Social Security officials; she also plans to introduce legislation to halt the payments.

It is unconscionable to reward those accused of such horrific crimes. Congress should act now to strip them of their benefits.

[From registerguard.com]

The headline on The Associated Press story read like something one would see on the front page of a tabloid newspaper at a supermarket checkout stand: "Nazis who left U.S. still paid Social Security." The difference is, the story apparently is true.

The AP reported Sunday that since 1979 "dozens of suspected Nazi war criminals and

SS guards collected millions of dollars in Social Security benefits after being forced out of the United States." The report said at least four of the 38 known beneficiaries are still alive, including a former concentration camp guard who left Arizona and returned to Germany in 2007, just before being stripped of his U.S. citizenship, and a former guard at Auschwitz who fled Ohio in 1989, after learning "denaturalization" proceedings were under way against him, and settled in Croatia.

State Department officials said the Justice Department used the continuation of Social Security benefits as a carrot to get the Germans to voluntarily give up their U.S. citizenship, and to avoid lengthy deportation hearings. A spokesman for the Justice Department denied that Social Security payments were thus used.

At the time the Justice Department had a Nazi-hunting unit, the Office of Special Investigations, that was dedicated to expelling as many former Nazis as possible, preferably to countries where they would be prosecuted for war crimes, although only 10 were.

The AP said the payments were made possible by a "loophole" in the law but provided no specifics. The Social Security Administration denied an AP request for the number of suspects who received payments and the amounts they received, saying it doesn't track Nazi cases.

On Monday, Rep. Carol Maloney, D-NY, sent letters to the inspectors general of the Justice Department and the Social Security Administration demanding that the Obama administration investigate the payments, which she called a "gross misuse of taxpayer dollars." But the son of the former Auschwitz guard, Jakob Denzinger, told The AP his father had earned the benefit payments and deserves to continue receiving them.

Did the former Nazi guards who simply carried out orders, however immoral or heinous, absolve themselves by becoming upstanding, law-abiding, tax-paying U.S. citizens during the 70 years since World War II ended? Some will say yes but many others would argue their crimes can never be forgiven. For most Americans, knowing that taxpayer-funded retirement benefits are being given to people who surrendered their U.S. citizenship, and who played a direct role in the worst human-caused catastrophe in history, isn't going to sit right. And it shouldn't.

It sounds as if Maloney, who's a high-ranking member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, is bent on closing whatever "loophole" has allowed the Social Security payments to continue to be sent overseas. The millions that have already been paid are gone and not likely to be recoverable but the thousands not yet paid could still be withheld. It shouldn't take an act of Congress to scotch such a grievous insult to American taxpayers—but apparently it will.

[From the Sun Sentinel, Nov. 30, 2014]

NAZI CRIMINALS GETTING BENEFITS? YES, IT'S TRUE

Congress has finally found something its members can agree on.

It's important, it's bipartisan and it's hellacious enough to make you wonder how such a practice could have been allowed to continue, with the blessing of the U.S. government, no less.

But now, a group of lawmakers—including Florida Democratic Sen. Bill Nelson—has introduced legislation that would strip suspected Nazi war criminals of the Social Security benefits they've been receiving for

having agreed to leave this country and live overseas.

You read that right

Hard as it is to believe, an investigation by the Associated Press found that dozens of Nazi suspects who made their way to the U.S. have been receiving retirement benefits with taxpayer money. And if they agreed to leave the country quietly, or before a deportation action, the Justice Department said they could keep these benefits. That way, the government could avoid ugly deportation hearings and increase the number of former Nazis expelled.

Outrageous? You bet.

And it's been going on for years, with your money.

The AP traced the program to 1979, and said at least 38 of 66 suspected Nazis removed from the country since that time kept receiving retirement benefits. By March 1999, the report said 28 suspected Nazi criminals living overseas had amassed \$1.5 million in Social Security benefits. The number is certainly much larger by now.

Now comes the Nazi Social Security Benefits Termination Act, in response to the revelations. Nelson is one of the sponsors of the Senate version. The legislation would end benefits for Nazi suspects who have lost American citizenship. Congress is hoping to get the legislation finalized during the current lame-duck session.

"Our bill will eliminate the loophole that has allowed Nazi war criminals to collect Social Security benefits," said Rep. Carolyn Maloney, D-N.Y. She also has called for an inquiry into the actions of Justice Department and Social Security officials.

Remember, we're talking about Nazi war criminals here, people involved in the horrific death camps where millions died.

As an example, Jakob Denzinger, 90, has been getting about \$1,500 a month in Social Security payments. He is a former Auschwitz guard and a one-time Ohio businessman. According to the AP, some other recipients of Social Security participated in the liquidation of the Warsaw Ghetto, oversaw the use of slave labor and helped with the round-up and killing of thousands of Jews.

It defies all sensibilities to learn that these payments have been going on for decades. Now that they've come to light, President Obama says he wants them, stopped. The proposed legislation would do just that.

"This legislation is long overdue," said Abraham Foxman, national director of the Anti-Defamation League, "and we are pleased that lawmakers in Congress are taking this seriously."

A serious investigation also is needed into how this happened to begin with.

[From the Pueblo Chieftain, Oct. 23, 2014]

CLOSING AN ABHORRENT LOOPHOLE

FOR ONCE, we actually do agree with the White House and the Congress.

But it's hard to find fault when the president's spokesman says it's past time to cut off Social Security benefits for former Nazis who are living and aging overseas. Or with Congressional plans to solve the problem.

"Our position is we don't believe these individuals should be getting these benefits," White House Spokesman Eric Schultz said Monday.

That's a bit of an understatement. Rather, we find it astounding these suspected murderers and thugs got benefits—much less the millions of taxpayer dollars reported by the Associated Press—in the first place.

As a bit of background, the AP reported last week that dozens of suspected Nazis

have collected benefits after being driven out of the United States. Though their World War II actions led to their departure, they were never convicted of war crimes.

While the exact number of beneficiaries—or the total taxpayer-underwritten benefit they received—has not been released, the list included SS troops who guarded Nazi concentration camps, a rocket scientist accused of using slave labor to advance his research in the Third Reich and a Nazi collaborator who allegedly engineered the arrest and execution of thousands of Jews in Poland, according to the Associated Press.

They fled their home countries after the war and set up residency here.

A legal loophole gave the Justice Department leverage to persuade the Nazi suspects to leave the U.S. If they did, or if they simply fled prior to deportation, they could keep their Social Security benefit, the AP reported.

And in this rare instance, Washington's response has been both swift and appropriate. Rep. Carolyn Maloney of New York—a ranking member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee—called on the Obama administration to investigate the payments. The Democrat called them a "gross misuse of taxpayer dollars."

And yesterday, Sens. Charles Schumer, D-NY, and Bob Casey, D-PA, announced plans to introduce legislation to close the loophole that allowed for the payments. A joint press release issued by the pair reflects that the bill would also provide direction to federal immigration judges adjudicating cases involving a suspected Nazi persecutors.

New York's Rep. Maloney plans on carrying that bill in the U.S. House.

At least four of these suspected criminals are still living comfortably on the taxpayer dole. They are doing so via a social service safety net that is now financially failing.

That is a totally unacceptable and abhorrent misuse of our funds. We are pleased to see Congress is acting to fix the problem, even if—given the ages of the surviving recipients—it is too late to result in substantial savings.

We strongly encourage each member of Colorado's congressional delegation to support the legislation. Be bold. Take a stance for the taxpayers, the citizens in need, the survivors and the millions who perished at the hands of these suspected criminals and their contemporaries.

Pass this law and close the loophole.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I think it is important to close on a particular note. I don't think it gets lost on the chairman or me that, when we sit as the chairman and ranking member on the Social Security Subcommittee, we have a major responsibility, and that is to make sure that what people expect when they allow a good chunk of money to come out of their paycheck, it is going to be used for what they believe, and that is for Social Security benefits for those who have earned them.

When something like this comes along and you find out that someone found out a way to circumvent the laws and the process and take advantage of getting dollars out of America that have been put in for the purpose of providing security to those who retire or become disabled or who die, it really

makes you want to act, but when you realize that, on top of that, the folks who are gaming the system are folks who should never have been in this country in the first place because they committed heinous crimes and were perpetrators of some of the worst evils we have seen in our history, then it makes you want to work doubly fast.

At a time when we deal with major issues and oftentimes have challenges in reaching agreement, the American people should watch for a second because, in this case, we are coming together to say that we understand the purpose of Social Security.

It is important to extend a thank you to the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee for making sure that, before we ended this year and before we ended this session, we had an opportunity to put our vote on the floor saying, "No, if you don't earn your benefits, you won't get them, and if you shouldn't have been here in the first place, then you certainly shouldn't get Social Security as well."

It is important to get this done, and we hope the Senate will act quickly. Hopefully, before too long, the President will have an opportunity to sign this, and forever, we will be able to say that we know that no perpetrator of the Holocaust will ever have an opportunity to steal Social Security from those who worked hard to earn it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, and thanking the staff on both sides of the aisle for the work they have done so diligently and to my friend and chairman, Mr. JOHNSON, I say thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Mr. BECERRA.

It takes two to tango, and fortunately, we have a compatible interest on this committee. I thank Ranking Member XAVIER BECERRA and his staff for working with us on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to vote "yes" and pass the No Social Security for Nazis Act today, so the Senate can take action soon and that the President can sign it into law without delay.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5739.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 2040, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5050, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3572, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

BLACKFOOT RIVER LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2040) to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—414

Adams	Capito	Davis, Rodney
Amash	Capps	DeFazio
Amodei	Cárdenas	DeGette
Bachmann	Carney	Delaney
Bachus	Carson (IN)	DeLauro
Barber	Carter	DelBene
Barletta	Cartwright	Denham
Barr	Castor (FL)	Dent
Barrow (GA)	Castro (TX)	DeSantis
Barton	Chabot	DesJarlais
Beatty	Chaffetz	Deutch
Becerra	Chu	Diaz-Balart
Benishkek	Cicilline	Dingell
Bentivolio	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Bera (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Duffy
Bilirakis	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver	Edwards
Bishop (UT)	Clyburn	Ellison
Black	Coble	Ellmers
Blackburn	Coffman	Engel
Blumenauer	Cohen	Enyart
Bonamici	Cole	Eshoo
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Esty
Brady (PA)	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Farr
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Fattah
Brat	Conyers	Fincher
Bridenstine	Cook	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (AL)	Cooper	Fleischmann
Brooks (IN)	Costa	Fleming
Broun (GA)	Cotton	Flores
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Forbes
Brownley (CA)	Cramer	Fortenberry
Buchanan	Crawford	Foster
Bucshon	Crenshaw	Fox
Burgess	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Bustos	Cuellar	Franks (AZ)
Butterfield	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Byrne	Cummings	Fudge
Calvert	Daines	Gabbard
Camp	Davis (CA)	Gallego
Campbell	Davis, Danny	Garamendi

Garcia	Lujan Grisham	Ros-Lehtinen
Gardner	(NM)	Roskam
Gerlach	Luján, Ben Ray	Ross
Gibbs	(NM)	Rothfus
Gibson	Lummis	Roybal-Allard
Gingrey (GA)	Lynch	Royce
Gohmert	Maffei	Ruiz
Goodlatte	Maloney,	Runyan
Gosar	Carolyn	Ruppersberger
Gowdy	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)
Granger	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Graves (GA)	Marino	Salmon
Graves (MO)	Massie	Sánchez, Linda
Grayson	Matsui	T.
Green, Al	McAllister	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Gene	McCarthy (CA)	Sanford
Griffin (AR)	McCaul	Sarbanes
Griffith (VA)	McCollum	Scalise
Grijalva	McDermott	Schakowsky
Grimm	McGovern	Schiff
Guthrie	McHenry	Schneider
Gutiérrez	McIntyre	Schock
Hahn	McKeon	Schwartz
Hanabusa	McKinley	Schweikert
Hanna	McMorris	Scott (VA)
Harper	Rodgers	Scott, Austin
Harris	McNerney	Scott, David
Hartzler	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Serrano
Hastings (WA)	Meeke	Sessions
Heck (NV)	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Heck (WA)	Messer	Shea-Porter
Hensarling	Mica	Sherman
Herrera Beutler	Michaud	Shimkus
Higgins	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Himes	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Sinema
Holding	Moore	Sires
Holt	Moran	Slaughter
Honda	Mullin	Smith (MO)
Horsford	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hudson	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)
Huelskamp	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Huffman	Napolitano	Neal
Huizenga (MI)	Neal	Southerland
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Speier
Hunter	Noem	Stewart
Israel	Nolan	Stivers
Issa	Norcross	Stockman
Jackson Lee	Nugent	Stutzman
Jeffries	Nunes	Swalwell (CA)
Jenkins	Nunnelee	Takano
Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke	Terry
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Jolly	Pallone	Thornberry
Jones	Pascrell	Tiberi
Jordan	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney
Joyce	Paulsen	Tipton
Kaptur	Payne	Titus
Keating	Pearce	Tonko
Kelly (IL)	Pelosi	Tsongas
Kelly (PA)	Perry	Turner
Kennedy	Peters (CA)	Upton
Kildee	Peters (MI)	Valadao
Kilmer	Peterson	Petri
Kind	Pingree (ME)	Van Hollen
King (IA)	Pittenger	Vargas
King (NY)	Pitts	Veasey
Kinzinger (IL)	Pocan	Vela
Kirkpatrick	Poe (TX)	Velázquez
Kline	Polis	Visclosky
Kuster	Pompeo	Wagner
Labrador	Posey	Walberg
Lamalfa	Price (GA)	Walden
Lamborn	Price (NC)	Walorski
Lance	Quigley	Walz
Langevin	Rahall	Wasserman
Lankford	Rangel	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Reed	Waters
Larson (CT)	Reichert	Waxman
Latham	Renacci	Weber (TX)
Latta	Ribble	Webster (FL)
Lee (CA)	Rice (SC)	Welch
Levin	Richmond	Wenstrup
Lewis	Rigell	Westmoreland
LoBiondo	Roby	Whitfield
Loebach	Roe (TN)	Williams
Lofgren	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (FL)
Long	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Lowenthal	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Lowe	Rokita	Wolf
Lucas	Rooney	Womack

Woodall	Yoder	Young (AK)
Yarmuth	Yoho	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—20

Aderholt	Hall	Miller, Gary
Bass	Hurt	Negrete McLeod
Capuano	Kingston	Perlmutter
Cassidy	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)
Doyle	Matheson	Rush
Duckworth	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader
Garrett	McClintock	

□ 1324

Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Ms. McCOLLUM changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 534, a recorded vote on S. 2040. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 534, I was unable to vote due to a doctor's appointment. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

MAY 31, 1918 ACT REPEAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5050) to repeal the Act of May 31, 1918, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

YEAS—418

Adams	Brooks (AL)	Clay
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cleaver
Amodei	Broun (GA)	Clyburn
Bachmann	Brown (FL)	Coble
Bachus	Brownley (CA)	Coffman
Barber	Buchanan	Cohen
Barletta	Bucshon	Cole
Barr	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Bustos	Collins (NY)
Barton	Butterfield	Conaway
Bass	Byrne	Connolly
Beatty	Calvert	Conyers
Becerra	Camp	Cook
Benishkek	Campbell	Cooper
Bentivolio	Capito	Costa
Bera (CA)	Capps	Cotton
Bilirakis	Cárdenas	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Cramer
Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)	Crawford
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Crenshaw
Black	Cartwright	Crowley
Blackburn	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Culberson
Bonamici	Chabot	Cummings
Boustany	Chaffetz	Daines
Brady (PA)	Chu	Davis (CA)
Brady (TX)	Cicilline	Davis, Danny
Brat	Clark (MA)	Davis, Rodney
Bridenstine	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio
	Clawson (FL)	DeGette

Delaney	Johnson, E. B.	Olson	Thompson (CA)	Vela	Westmoreland	Clyburn	Heck (NV)	Meadows
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Owens	Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Whitfield	Coble	Heck (WA)	Meehan
DelBene	Jolly	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)	Visclosky	Williams	Coffman	Hensarling	Meeks
Denham	Jones	Pallone	Thornberry	Wagner	Wilson (FL)	Cohen	Herrera Beutler	Meng
Dent	Jordan	Pascarell	Tiberi	Walberg	Wilson (SC)	Cole	Higgins	Messer
DeSantis	Joyce	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney	Walden	Wittman	Collins (GA)	Himes	Mica
DesJarlais	Kaptur	Paulsen	Tipton	Walorski	Wolf	Collins (NY)	Hinojosa	Michaud
Deutch	Keating	Payne	Titus	Walz	Womack	Conaway	Holding	Miller (FL)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (IL)	Pearce	Tonko	Wasserman	Woodall	Connolly	Holt	Miller (MI)
Dingell	Kelly (PA)	Pelosi	Tsongas	Schultz	Yarmuth	Conyers	Honda	Miller, George
Doggett	Kennedy	Perry	Turner	Waters	Yoder	Cook	Horsford	Moore
Duffy	Kildee	Peters (CA)	Upton	Waxman	Yoho	Cooper	Hoyer	Moran
Duncan (SC)	Kilmer	Peters (MI)	Valadao	Weber (TX)	Young (AK)	Costa	Hudson	Mullin
Duncan (TN)	Kind	Peterson	Van Hollen	Webster (FL)	Young (IN)	Cotton	Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)
Edwards	King (IA)	Petri	Vargas	Welch		Courtney	Huffman	Murphy (PA)
Ellison	King (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Veasey	Wenstrup		Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Nadler
Ellmers	Kinzing (IL)	Pittenger				Crawford	Hultgren	Napolitano
Engel	Kirkpatrick	Pitts				Crenshaw	Hunter	Neal
Enyart	Kline	Pocan	Aderholt	Hall	Negrete McLeod	Crowley	Hurt	Neugebauer
Eshoo	Kuster	Poe (TX)	Capuano	Kingston	Perlmutter	Cuellar	Israel	Noem
Esty	Labrador	Polis	Cassidy	Matheson	Rush	Cummings	Issa	Nolan
Farenthold	LaMalfa	Pompeo	Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader	Daines	Jackson Lee	Norcross
Farr	Lamborn	Posey	Duckworth	McClintock		Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Nugent
Fattah	Lance	Price (GA)	Garrett	Miller, Gary		Davis, Danny	Jenkins	Nunes
Fincher	Langevin	Price (NC)				Davis, Rodney	Johnson (GA)	Nunnelee
Fitzpatrick	Lankford	Quigley				DeFazio	Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke
Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)	Rahall				DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Olson
Fleming	Larson (CT)	Rangel				Delaney	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Flores	Reed	Richmond				DeLauro	Jolly	Palazzo
Forbes	Latta	Reichert				DelBene	Jones	Pallone
Fortenberry	Lee (CA)	Renacci				Denham	Jordan	Pascarell
Foster	Levin	Ribble				Dent	Joyce	Pastor (AZ)
Fox	Lewis	Rice (SC)				DeSantis	Kaptur	Paulsen
Frankel (FL)	Lipinski	Richmond				DesJarlais	Keating	Payne
Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo	Rigell				Deutch	Kelly (IL)	Pearce
Frelinghuysen	Loeb	Roby				Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Pelosi
Fudge	Lofgren	Roe (TN)				Dingell	Kennedy	Perry
Gabbard	Long	Rogers (AL)				Doggett	Kildee	Peters (CA)
Galleo	Lowenthal	Rogers (KY)				Duffy	Kilmer	Peters (MI)
Garamendi	Lowe	Rogers (MI)				Duncan (SC)	Kind	Peterson
Garcia	Lucas	Rohrabacher				Duncan (TN)	King (IA)	Petri
Gardner	Luetkemeyer	Rokita				Edwards	King (NY)	Pingree (ME)
Gerlach	Lujan Grisham	Rooney				Ellison	Kingston	Pittenger
Gibbs	(NM)	Ros-Lehtinen				Ellmers	Kinzing (IL)	Pitts
Gibson	Lujan, Ben Ray	Roskam				Engel	Kirkpatrick	Pocan
Gingrey (GA)	(NM)	Ross				Enyart	Kline	Polis
Gohmert	Lummis	Rothfus				Eshoo	Kuster	Pompeo
Goodlatte	Lynch	Roybal-Allard				Esty	Labrador	Posey
Gosar	Maffei	Royce				Farenthold	LaMalfa	Price (GA)
Gowdy	Maloney,	Ruiz				Farr	Lamborn	Price (NC)
Granger	Carolyn	Runyan				Fattah	Lance	Quigley
Graves (GA)	Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger				Fincher	Langevin	Rahall
Graves (MO)	Marchant	Ryan (OH)				Fitzpatrick	Lankford	Rangel
Grayson	Marino	Ryan (WI)				Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)	Reed
Green, Al	Massie	Salmon				Fleming	Latham	Reichert
Green, Gene	Matsui	Sánchez, Linda				Forbes	Latta	Ribble
Griffin (AR)	McAllister	T.				Fortenberry	Lee (CA)	Rice (SC)
Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)	Sanford				Foster	Levin	Richmond
Grijalva	McCaul	Sarbanes				Fox	Lewis	Rigell
Grimm	McCollum	Scalise				Frankel (FL)	Lipinski	Roby
Guthrie	McDermott	Schakowsky				Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo	Roe (TN)
Gutiérrez	McGovern	Schiff				Frelinghuysen	Loeb	Rogers (AL)
Hahn	McHenry	Schneider				Fudge	Lofgren	Rogers (KY)
Hanabusa	McIntyre	Schock				Gabbard	Long	Rogers (MI)
Hanna	McKeon	Schwartz				Galleo	Lowenthal	Rohrabacher
Harper	McKinley	Schweikert				Garamendi	Lowe	Rokita
Harris	McMorris	Scott (VA)				Garcia	Lucas	Rooney
Hartzler	Rodgers	Scott, Austin				Gardner	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Scott, David				Gerlach	Lujan Grisham	Roskam
Hastings (WA)	Meadows	Sensenbrenner				Gibbs	(NM)	Ross
Heck (NV)	Meehan	Sessions				Gibson	Lujan, Ben Ray	Rothfus
Heck (WA)	Meeks	Sewell (AL)				Gingrey (GA)	(NM)	Roybal-Allard
Hensarling	Meng	Shea-Porter				Gohmert	Lummis	Royce
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Sherman				Goodlatte	Lynch	Ruiz
Higgins	Mica	Shimkus				Gosar	Maffei	Runyan
Himes	Michaud	Shuster				Gowdy	Maloney,	Ruppersberger
Hinojosa	Miller (FL)	Simpson				Granger	Carolyn	Ryan (OH)
Holding	Miller (MI)	Sinema				Graves (GA)	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (WI)
Holt	Miller, George	Sires				Graves (MO)	Marchant	Salmon
Honda	Moore	Slaughter				Grayson	Marino	Sánchez, Linda
Horsford	Moran	Smith (MO)				Green, Al	Matsui	T.
Hoyer	Mullin	Smith (NE)				Green, Gene	McAllister	Sanford
Hudson	Mulvaney	Smith (NJ)				Griffin (AR)	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes
Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)	Smith (TX)				Grijalva	McCaul	Scalise
Huffman	Murphy (PA)	Smith (WA)				Grimm	McCollum	Schakowsky
Huizenga (MI)	Nadler	Southerland				Guthrie	McDermott	Schiff
Hultgren	Napolitano	Speier				Gutiérrez	McGovern	Schneider
Hunter	Neal	Stewart				Hahn	McHenry	Schock
Hurt	Neugebauer	Stivers				Hanabusa	McIntyre	Schwartz
Israel	Noem	Stockman				Hanna	McKeon	Schweikert
Issa	Nolan	Stutzman				Harper	McKinley	Scott (VA)
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)				Harris	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Jeffries	Nugent	Takano				Hartzler	Rodgers	Scott, David
Jenkins	Nunes	Terry				Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (GA)	Nunnelee					Hastings (WA)		
Johnson (OH)	O'Rourke							

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1333

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 535 I was unable to vote due to a doctor's appointment. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

JOHN H. CHAFEE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM BOUNDARIES REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3572) to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in North Carolina, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 7, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—410

Adams	Black	Camp
Amash	Bonamici	Campbell
Amodei	Boustany	Capito
Bachmann	Brady (PA)	Capps
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Cárdenas
Barber	Braley (IA)	Carney
Barletta	Brat	Carson (IN)
Barr	Bridenstine	Carter
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (AL)	Cartwright
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Castor (FL)
Bass	Brown (GA)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Chabot
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Chaffetz
Benish	Buchanan	Chu
Bentivolio	Buchon	Cicilline
Berra (CA)	Burgess	Clark (MA)
Bilirakis	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Clawson (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Byrne	Clay
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Cleaver

Serrano	Terry	Walorski
Sessions	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Shea-Porter	Thompson (PA)	Schultz
Sherman	Thornberry	Waters
Shimkus	Tiberi	Waxman
Shuster	Tierney	Webster (FL)
Simpson	Tipton	Welch
Sinema	Titus	Wenstrup
Sires	Tonko	Westmoreland
Slaughter	Tsongas	Whitfield
Smith (MO)	Turner	Wilson (FL)
Smith (NE)	Upton	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Valadao	Wittman
Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Wolf
Smith (WA)	Vargas	Womack
Southerland	Veasey	Woodall
Speier	Vela	Yarmuth
Stewart	Velázquez	Yoder
Stivers	Visclosky	Yoho
Stutzman	Wagner	Young (AK)
Swalwell (CA)	Walberg	Young (IN)
Takano	Walden	

NAYS—7

Blackburn	Poe (TX)	Williams
Griffith (VA)	Stockman	
Mulvaney	Weber (TX)	

NOT VOTING—17

Aderholt	Duckworth	Miller, Gary
Blumenauer	Garrett	Negrete McLeod
Capuano	Hall	Perlmutter
Cassidy	Matheson	Rush
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader
Doyle	McClintock	

□ 1340

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 536 I was unable to vote due to a doctor's appointment. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

□ 1345

SBIC ADVISERS RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4200) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4200

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "SBIC Advisers Relief Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND VENTURE CAPITAL FUNDS.

Section 203(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "No investment adviser" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No investment adviser"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) ADVISERS OF SBICS.—For purposes of this subsection, a venture capital fund includes an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940)."

SEC. 3. ADVISERS OF SBICS AND PRIVATE FUNDS.

Section 203(m) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) ADVISERS OF SBICS.—For purposes of this subsection, the assets under management of a private fund that is an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (b)(7) (other than an entity that has elected to be regulated or is regulated as a business development company pursuant to section 54 of the Investment Company Act of 1940) shall be excluded from the limit set forth in paragraph (1)."

SEC. 4. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

Section 203A(b)(1) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-3a(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) that is not registered under section 203 because that person is exempt from registration as provided in subsection (b)(7) of such section, or is a supervised person of such person."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 4200, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The legislation we consider today is a bipartisan, noncontroversial, and commonsense change that will ultimately allow for greater small business capital formation and job creation.

H.R. 4200, the SBIC Advisers Relief Act, streamlines reporting requirements for advisers to small business investment companies, or SBICs. These are advisers to investment funds who make long-term investments in U.S. small businesses and who have to the tune of more than \$63 billion since 1958.

Under current law and for more than 55 years, SBICs have been regulated and closely supervised by the Small Business Administration. The existing regulatory regime surrounding SBICs

includes an in-depth examination of management, strong investment rules, operational requirements, record-keeping, examination and reporting mandates, and conflict of interest rules. These entities and the management of these entities are anything but unregulated.

The need for exemptions for SBICs and their advisers has been well-recognized by Congress. Congress' intent by including some of these exemptions in previous legislation was to reduce the regulatory burdens facing smaller funds and SBICs. This bill fixes some unintended consequences that have arisen and need to be addressed.

The SBIC Advisers Relief Act does so by doing three things: number one, it allows advisers who jointly advise SBICs and venture funds to be exempt from registration, combining two separate exemptions that already exist; number two, it excludes SBIC assets from the SEC's assets under management threshold calculation; number three, it allows SBIC funds with less than \$90 million in assets under management to be regulated solely by the SBA, as they are today.

The Financial Services Committee has thoroughly examined the bipartisan legislation in both a legislative hearing and a markup. H.R. 4200 garnered praise from members on both sides of the aisle and from witnesses who testified on the bill in an April hearing. This noncontroversial legislation passed the committee by a vote of 56-0 in May.

It is also important to note that the legislation includes suggestions made by the SEC. Most importantly, this legislation includes sensible provisions that prevent redundant regulatory mandates and allow for a greater investment in America's small businesses.

I want to thank Congresswoman MALONEY for her help on this bill, and I ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill, as has been indicated, is a bipartisan bill. We support the bill. I have no requests for time; therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4200.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AND SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5471) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5471

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(h)(7)(D)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under subparagraph (A) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the hedge or mitigation of such commercial risk is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism must be utilized.”.

(2) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 AMENDMENT.—Section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c-3(g)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An affiliate of a person that qualifies for an exception under paragraph (1) (including affiliate entities predominantly engaged in providing financing for the purchase of the merchandise or manufactured goods of the person) may qualify for the exception only if the affiliate enters into the security-based swap to hedge or mitigate the commercial risk of the person or other affiliate of the person that is not a financial entity, provided that if the hedge or mitigation such commercial risk is addressed by entering into a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, an appropriate credit support measure or other mechanism must be utilized.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CREDIT SUPPORT MEASURE REQUIREMENT.—The requirements in section 2(h)(7)(D)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act and section 3C(g)(4)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended by subsection (a), requiring that a credit support measure or other mechanism be utilized if the transfer of commercial risk referred to in such sections is addressed by entering into a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant or a security-based swap with a security-based swap dealer or major security-based swap participant, as appropriate, shall not apply with respect to swaps or security-based swaps, as appropriate, entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 5471, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Hundreds of American businesses, large and small—from manufacturers, to utilities, to agricultural businesses, to airlines—use derivatives every day to manage their business risks and to reduce their exposure to price fluctuations.

Without derivatives, businesses and their customers would face increased prices for the goods and services these businesses provide. The derivatives these businesses use are not risky. They played no role in the financial crisis. Nevertheless, they were targeted in the Dodd-Frank Act, which increased their price and decreased their availability.

Since the beginning of the 112th Congress in 2011, the Financial Services Committee and the Agriculture Committee have worked together to clarify that title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act should not burden Main Street businesses with a costly compliance regime that would stifle growth and job creation.

These efforts have produced bipartisan bills, including many sponsored by Democrats, that have passed the House with large majorities. The bill under consideration is yet another.

H.R. 5471 is sponsored by my Democratic colleague on the Financial Services Committee, Representative GWEN MOORE, and is cosponsored by another colleague, Representative STEVE STIVERS. The bill amends the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Commodity Exchange Act, and it extends the Dodd-Frank Act, title VII, clearing exemption to nonfinancial entities that use a central treasury unit to reduce risk and net the hedging needs of affiliated businesses.

Mr. Speaker, that may sound technical, but the bill is a commonsense measure to give regulatory certainty to Main Street businesses in Missouri and beyond. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 5471.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I join my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, in urging my colleagues to support H.R. 5471; however, before I get into why we should support the bill, I need to thank all of my partners in this effort.

As has been mentioned, Mr. STIVERS has been fantastic throughout this entire process. I knew going into this that I had a great Republican partner. I can't say enough about Representative STIVERS, but time will not allow me to do it.

I had another great bipartisan partner in Representative GIBSON on the Agriculture Committee. Of course, it is always a joy to work with a good friend and colleague on the Ag Committee, Representative MARCIA FUDGE.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5471 is a true “end users” bill. The bill is targeted as it applies to centralized treasury centers, or CTUs, of nonfinancial end user companies.

The CTU model enables an end user corporation to efficiently centralize hedging risks for the entire consolidated corporate group, and it is, in fact, a corporate best practice. It permits companies to more efficiently hedge commercial business risk, which was always the intent of Dodd-Frank.

The CFTC agrees with the underlying policy of the bill as they have provided no-action relief on this point; however, H.R. 5471 is still needed because, as a practical matter, no-action relief is no substitute for statutory fixes as it creates legal uncertainty when deciding how to organize your global business structure.

Corporate boards may be hesitant to approve a decision, as they are required to do, that violates the law based only on an assurance that CFTC staff will not recommend enforcement. H.R. 5471 fixes the quirky result of treating companies that use a CTU model differently than companies that do not accomplish the same result.

The bill also solves another far more technical issue with the no-action relief that relates to CTUs issuing swaps as a principal, as opposed to as an agent.

There is simply no good reason to not address these issues. In fact, CTUs are considered a corporate best practice. I can offer you, Mr. Speaker, an example of one company in my district, MillerCoors. They summarized it best in written testimony before the House Financial Services Committee:

Though it may be tempting to view all derivatives as risky financial products that were central to the credit crisis, we must remember that these are important tools upon which thousands of companies depend to manage risks in the real economy.

Just remember that we all have companies in our districts that use swaps legitimately to mitigate risk. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

I would like to thank my colleagues from the House Agriculture Committee, Mr. GIBSON and Ms. FUDGE, for their continued leadership on this issue; also, I would like to thank Ms. MOORE and Mr. STIVERS for working with my committee to introduce this compromise language as a stand-alone bill for the House's consideration.

Almost identical language was included in the Agriculture Committee's CFTC reauthorization bill, H.R. 4413. I am proud to say that we moved that legislation through the Ag Committee by a voice vote and then passed it here on the House floor with overwhelming bipartisan support this summer. I am hopeful that this bill can receive the same strong bipartisan support.

H.R. 5471 will provide American businesses the certainty they need to continue managing their risk in the most efficient manner possible. Today, businesses all over America rely on the ability to centralize their hedging activities to reduce their counterparty credit risk, to lower costs, and to simplify their financial dealings.

It is important to remember that these transactions between affiliated corporate entities pose no systemic risk, and they should not be regulated as if they do. These transactions are used to reduce an individual firm's risk by consolidating a hedging portfolio spread across a corporate group.

By doing this, firms can find savings with offsetting positions between affiliates and can reduce the need for the group to seek hedges in the wider market.

H.R. 5471 will prevent the redundant regulation of these harmless interaffiliate transactions that would tie up the working capital companies with no added protections for the market or benefits for the consumers. I strongly support this bipartisan, commonsense legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, the ranking member of the committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank Congresswoman MOORE, as well as Congresswoman FUDGE, for their efforts to craft the text of this bill which represents a dramatic improvement from a similar bill that was considered in the Financial Services Committee 18 months ago.

At that time, Commodity Futures Trading Commission—that is, the CFTC—Chairman Gary Gensler warned that providing such a broad interaffiliate exemption from the requirement to clear derivatives could harm its efforts to regulate the market.

Since that time, however, the authors of this legislation have signifi-

cantly tailored the language, incorporating several technical edits provided by the CFTC, and the measure now only extends the interaffiliate exemption to instances when the commercial risk of an exempt end user is being hedged or mitigated.

Last week, the CFTC provided the same tailored relief that this bill would provide. I submit for the RECORD the CFTC's no-action letter.

U.S. COMMODITY FUTURES
TRADING COMMISSION,
Washington, DC, November 26, 2014.

Re No-Action Relief from the Clearing Requirement for Swaps Entered into by Eligible Treasury Affiliates

The purpose of this letter is to amend the no-action relief previously granted by the Division of Clearing and Risk ("Division") of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("Commission") under No-Action Letter 13-22 to address certain challenges faced by treasury affiliates in undertaking hedging activities on behalf of non-financial affiliates within a corporate group. Those challenges pertained to certain conditions in the prior relief. The Division in this letter is altering some of those conditions to enable additional market participants to avail themselves of the treasury affiliate relief originally set forth in No-Action Letter 13-22.

TREASURY AFFILIATE EXEMPTION FROM CLEARING

On June 4, 2013, the Division granted no-action relief from the clearing requirement under section 2(h)(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act ("CEA") and part 50 of the Commission's regulations, for swaps entered into by certain affiliates acting on behalf of non-financial affiliates within a corporate group for the purpose of hedging or mitigating commercial risk (hereinafter referred to as "treasury affiliates").

No-Action Letter 13-22 was issued based on the Division's understanding that treasury affiliates were undertaking hedging activities on behalf of non-financial affiliates that were eligible to elect the end-user exception from clearing, but were themselves ineligible to elect the exception. As discussed further below, because treasury affiliates can act in a wider capacity as treasury centers that provide financial services for all or most of the affiliates within a corporate group, including daily cash management, debt administration, and risk hedging and mitigation, treasury affiliates met the definition of "financial entity" under section 2(h)(7)(C)(i)(VIII) of the CEA and thus could not elect the end-user exception. As a result, the Division granted treasury affiliates relief to continue entering into non-cleared swaps on behalf of the non-financial affiliates, subject to specific conditions and requirements.

The Division has since learned that there are treasury affiliates precluded from electing the relief in No-Action Letter 13-22 because they do not meet certain conditions contained in the letter. As discussed below, based on input from market participants, the Division is hereby issuing this letter to amend some of the conditions and requirements contained in No-Action Letter 13-22 to allow additional treasury affiliates to rely on the relief from clearing.

APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Under section 2(h)(1)(A) of the CEA, it is unlawful for any person to engage in a swap unless that person submits such swap for clearing to a derivatives clearing organization ("DCO") that is registered under the

CEA or exempt from registration if the swap is required to be cleared. On November 29, 2012, the Commission adopted its first clearing requirement determination, requiring that swaps meeting certain specifications within four classes of interest rate swaps and two classes of credit default swaps be cleared.

Pursuant to section 2(h)(7) of the CEA and §50.50 of the Commission's regulations, a counterparty to a swap that is subject to the clearing requirement may elect the end-user exception from required clearing provided that such counterparty is not a financial entity, as defined in section 2(h)(7)(C) of the CEA, and otherwise meets the requirements of §50.50 of the Commission's regulations. Thus, the end-user exception from required clearing may be elected for swaps that are entered into between two non-financial entities, or between a non-financial entity and a financial entity, for swaps that hedge or mitigate commercial risk.

As noted above, the Division granted relief from required clearing for treasury affiliates of non-financial companies that fall within the definition of "financial entity" under section 2(h)(7)(C)(i)(VIII) of the CEA when acting on behalf of affiliates that otherwise would be eligible to elect the end-user exception from required clearing." As such, No-Action Letter 13-22 effectively allowed treasury affiliates, subject to certain additional requirements and conditions, to take advantage of the end-user exception from clearing that its non-financial affiliates in the corporate group would otherwise have been eligible to elect had they entered into the transactions directly.

SUMMARY OF RELIEF

Since the Division issued No-Action Letter 13-22, market participants have highlighted several requirements and conditions that make use of the relief granted thereunder impractical for many treasury affiliates. As discussed below, the Division is therefore amending the following requirements and conditions.

i. The requirement that the ultimate parent of a treasury affiliate identify all wholly- and majority-owned affiliates and ensure a majority qualify for the end-user exception.

Market participants have expressed concerns about the second condition for eligible treasury affiliate status in No-Action Letter 13-22. The second condition requires that the ultimate parent of a treasury affiliate identify all wholly- and majority-owned affiliates within the corporate group and ensure that a majority qualify for the end-user exception.

Market participants have noted the ratio of the absolute number of financial entities to nonfinancial entities does not necessarily provide meaning-fill information about the corporate family as a whole, and adds ongoing surveillance responsibilities and expenses for the corporate family. The Division agrees and has removed the requirement accordingly in the revised relief set forth herein.

ii. The requirement that the treasury affiliate is not itself or is not affiliated with a systemically important nonbank financial company.

Market participants have also expressed concerns about the fourth condition for eligible treasury affiliate status in No-Action Letter 13-22. The fourth condition prohibits the treasury affiliate from being, or being affiliated with, a nonbank financial company that has been designated as systemically important by the Financial Stability Oversight

Council. As explained above, section 2(h)(7)(D) of the CEA permits affiliates acting as an agent and on behalf of entities eligible for the end-user exception to elect the end-user exception themselves, unless the affiliate is one of seven enumerated types of entities listed in section 2(h)(7)(D)(ii). Among others, these prohibited entities include swap dealers, commodity pools, and bank holding companies with over \$50 billion in consolidated assets.

Market participants have pointed out that the fourth condition for eligible treasury affiliate status provides a list of entities that generally tracks the list in section 2(h)(7)(D)(ii), except for the addition of systemically important nonbank financial companies. The Division believes that additional restrictions relating to systemically important nonbank financial companies are appropriate. As a result, the Division is maintaining the requirement that the treasury affiliate itself cannot be a systemically important nonbank financial company. However, the Division also recognizes that certain corporate families with significant non-financial operations are precluded from using the existing relief because of the affiliation with a systemically important nonbank financial company, regardless of the degree to which the operations of the financial and non-financial entities are conducted separately.

The Division believes restricting the treasury affiliate from (i) entering into transactions with, or on behalf of, a systemically important nonbank financial company and (ii) providing any services, financial or otherwise, to such a designated entity, provides sufficient protection from the risks of systemically important affiliate, while allowing the treasury affiliate to provide the necessary support to its related operating entities. The Division is amending the conditions relating to systemically important nonbank financial companies accordingly.

iii. The requirement that treasury affiliates act only on behalf of certain types of related affiliates.

Market participants have indicated that the definition of "related affiliates" under No-Action Letter 13-22 unnecessarily excludes certain entities that perform a cash pooling function for a corporate family that includes a financial entity. The definition of related affiliate currently includes either: (i) a non-financial entity that is, or is directly or indirectly wholly- or majority-owned by, the ultimate parent; or (ii) a person that is another eligible treasury affiliate for an entity described in (i).

Market participants claim that the limitation is unnecessary, highlighting that the third General Condition to the Swap Activity already precludes an eligible treasury affiliate from entering into swaps with, and on behalf of, its financial affiliates. The Division agrees the definition is problematic because the collection and disbursement of cash within the corporate family is a core function of a treasury affiliate. Given the existing restrictions on swap activity by the eligible treasury affiliate with or on behalf of a financial affiliate, the Division has amended the related affiliate definition to allow entities that provide financial services on behalf of a financial entity to nonetheless qualify as an eligible treasury affiliate.

iv. The requirement that treasury affiliates transfer the risk of related affiliates through the use of swaps.

Market participants have expressed concern with the first General Condition to Swap Activity in No-Action Letter 13-22. The condition requires the eligible treasury affil-

iate enter into the exempted swap for the sole purpose of hedging or mitigating the commercial risk of one or more related affiliates that was transferred to the eligible treasury affiliate by operation of one or more swaps with such related affiliates.

According to market participants, there are a number of ways for commercial risk to be transferred between affiliates, and that the risk that a treasury affiliate may have been seeking to hedge or mitigate would not necessarily be transferred from the operating affiliate to the treasury affiliate by way of a swap transaction as required by No-Action Letter 13-22. The method by which the risk is transferred can be dependent on the type of risk being hedged. For example, it may be more common for foreign exchange risk to be transferred between affiliates through the use of book-entry transfers, as opposed to interest rate risk, where the use of back-to-back swaps may be more prevalent. The Division agrees that this limitation is unnecessarily strict and is revising the condition accordingly. However, as the transfer of risk from the related affiliate to the treasury affiliate will no longer be evinced by back-to-back swaps, the Division will require that the treasury affiliate be able to identify the related affiliate or affiliates on whose behalf the swap was entered into by the treasury affiliate.

v. The requirement that treasury affiliates do not enter into swaps other than for hedging or mitigating the commercial risk of one or more related affiliates.

Market participants have questioned whether an eligible treasury affiliate would lose its status if the entity entered into hedging transactions that were mitigating a commercial risk of the treasury affiliate itself. The second General Condition to the Swap Activity states that the eligible treasury affiliate cannot enter into swaps with related affiliates or unaffiliated counterparties other than for the purposes of hedging or mitigating the commercial risk of one or more related affiliates.

The Division agrees that a treasury affiliate should not lose its status as an eligible treasury affiliate simply because it entered into a hedging transaction on its own behalf. The Division is therefore amending the language in the second condition to allow an eligible treasury affiliate to enter into its own hedging transactions. However, the Division notes that such transactions entered into by the eligible treasury affiliate on its own behalf would not be "exempted swaps" as defined below, and may be required to be cleared if subject to the Commission's clearing requirement and no other exception or exemption to clearing applied. Further, the Division notes that treasury affiliates entering into any speculative transaction, on its own behalf or otherwise, would not be consistent with this condition.

vi. The requirement that related affiliates entering into swaps with the treasury affiliate, or the treasury affiliate itself, may not enter into swaps with or on behalf of any affiliate that is a financial entity.

Market participants have expressed confusion as to whether a related affiliate can enter into transactions with multiple eligible treasury affiliates under the third General Condition to the Swap Activity in No-Action Letter 13-22. The third condition states that neither any related affiliate that enters into swaps with the eligible treasury affiliate nor the eligible treasury affiliate, may enter into swaps with or on behalf of any affiliate that is a financial entity (a "financial affiliate"), or otherwise assumes,

nets, combines, or consolidates the risk of swaps entered into by any financial affiliate.

Ms. WATERS. After conversations with CFTC Chairman Massad and following this action by the regulator, I felt comfortable having H.R. 5471 be considered under a suspension of the House rules.

Now, I have heard from several companies that, while the CFTC's actions are welcome, they still need the legal certainty that only H.R. 5471 could provide.

On the other side, of course, I have heard concerns that if we pass this bill we may be binding the CFTC's hands to deal with a problem that could arise in the future.

I believe that people on both sides of this issue are working in good faith and want to help rebuild our economy. Again, I applaud Congresswoman MOORE's efforts to improve this bill.

□ 1400

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), who is the lead cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me time.

I also would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for all her work on this bill. She has been dedicated and engaged and hard-working and willing to compromise to move this effort forward to help a lot of Main Street businesses that are in my district, her district, and that dot the map of America.

I also want to thank Ms. FUDGE and Mr. GIBSON for their collaborative efforts and their work through the Agriculture Committee on this bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the culmination of over 2½ years' work. In 2012, Ms. MOORE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GIBSON, and I joined together to introduce legislation that clarified rules under the Dodd-Frank Act with regard to margin clearing and reporting requirements of interaffiliate transactions. What that means is a lot of Main Street businesses in various industries, from agriculture to consumer products, that work across international boundaries use this central treasury unit structure to offset competing or offsetting risks, and that way they can decide what their total aggregate risk is and then make it much more affordable for a corporation.

Unfortunately, under the Dodd-Frank Act and the way the rules were interpreted by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, these companies were being charged double or triple the cost by imposing these central clearing unit ways of managing risk. It just didn't make sense, and it actually cost them more money. These companies did not add systemic risk, and that is what the rules on swaps were all about is to make sure we reduce systemic

risk. These companies are using these swaps to offset risk to their company and their operating risks, and so this is a commonsense piece of legislation. In fact, Barney Frank, the author of the Dodd-Frank legislation, spoke in favor of this when he was the ranking member in the last Congress.

Unfortunately, there was no activity on the bill in the last Congress, and over the last 2 years both the Securities and Exchange Commission and the CFTC have worked with us—with Ms. MOORE and me—on these rules. They have done a pretty good job in that regard, but there is more to be done because their rules left out the folks that use these centralized treasury units as a specific business model. Just last month, in fact, the CFTC published a no-action letter that Ms. MOORE referred to; but a no-action letter means that it is still part of the law, we are just not going to enforce the law.

What we need to do is fix the law. It is really common sense. So this bill that Ms. MOORE introduced fixes the law for that centralized treasury unit way of doing business. It makes sense. It does not add any risk to the system, and it allows these companies that are all over America to manage their risk in a smarter way without being charged two or three times as much and without risking that they are violating the law, even though it is not going to be enforced.

So I applaud the gentlelady from Wisconsin for changing the law, fixing the law, and making it work for a lot of small, medium, and even large businesses across America so they can use their cash to hire Americans in this tough time, and hire more Americans and not waste it on unneeded cost that does not provide any safety to anyone.

I want to thank the gentlelady from Wisconsin as well as the gentleman from New York and the gentlelady from Ohio for all their work, and I was proud to be a small part of this.

I would urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and the others for their work on this legislation.

H.R. 5471 provides further clarity to those using the derivatives market to hedge against risk and builds upon language in H.R. 4413, legislation approved by the House last summer to reauthorize the CFTC. The bill before us today makes it clear that if an affiliate of a company already exempted from clearing engages in a swap with a swap dealer or major swap participant in order to hedge or mitigate commercial risk, those swaps would also be exempt from the clearing requirement as long as

they use an appropriate credit support measure.

While it is my understanding that the CFTC would prefer to address this issue through agency action, I also believe that they are supportive of this language. Because H.R. 5471 improves the work already done by the House, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever the gentlewoman from Wisconsin is ready.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to place the second half of the CFTC letter into the RECORD.

No-Action Letter 13-22 contemplated the use of multiple eligible treasury affiliates within a corporate family, but the Division agrees with market participants that the third condition does not accurately reflect this. The Division is accordingly amending the third condition to clarify that the restriction on related affiliates and eligible treasury affiliates from entering into swap transactions with financial entity affiliates does not preclude the circumstance where the financial entity affiliate is an eligible treasury affiliate.

vii. The requirement for the payment obligations of the treasury affiliate to be guaranteed.

Market participants expressed concern with respect to the fifth General Condition to the Swap Activity in No-Action Letter 13-22. The fifth condition states that the payment obligations of the eligible treasury affiliate on the exempted swap must be guaranteed by: (i) its non-financial parent; (ii) an entity that wholly-owns or is wholly-owned by its non-financial parent; or (iii) the related affiliates for which the swap hedges or mitigates commercial risk.

Market participants have explained that corporate parents and structures may avail themselves of other types of support arrangements, such as keepwell agreements, letters of credit, or revolving credit facilities for example, which would not satisfy the requirements of No-Action Letter 13-22. As a result, the Division is removing the condition to accommodate the additional support arrangements that may exist with regard to the eligible treasury affiliate's payment obligations.

DIVISION NO-ACTION POSITION

The Division recognizes the benefits that arise from the use of treasury affiliates within corporate groups and has determined to provide the following no-action relief; described below.

For purposes of this no-action letter only, the following definitions shall apply:

Eligible treasury affiliate means a person that meets each of the following qualifications:

(i) The person is (A) directly, wholly-owned by a non-financial entity or another eligible treasury affiliate (its "non-financial parent"), and (B) is not indirectly majority-owned by a financial entity, as defined in section 2(h)(7)(C)(i) of the CEA;

(ii) The person's ultimate parent is not a financial entity as defined in section 2(h)(7)(C)(i) of the CEA;

(iii) The person is a financial entity as defined in section 2(h)(7)(C)(i)(VIII) of the CEA solely as a result of acting as principal to swaps with, or on behalf of, one or more of its related affiliates, or providing other services that are financial in nature to such related affiliates;

(iv) The person is not, and is not affiliated with, any of the following:

(A) a swap dealer;
(B) a major swap participant;
(C) a security-based swap dealer; or
(D) a major security-based swap participant.

(v) The person is not any of the following:

(A) a private fund as defined in section 202(a) of the Investment Advisors Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. §80-b-2(a));

(B) a commodity pool;

(C) an employee benefit plan as defined in paragraphs (3) and (32) of section 3 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. §1002);

(D) a bank holding company;

(E) an insured depository institution;

(F) a farm credit system institution;

(G) a credit union;

(H) a nonbank financial company that has been designated as systemically important by the Financial Stability Oversight Council; or

(I) an entity engaged in the business of insurance and subject to capital requirements established by an insurance governmental authority of a State, a territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, a country other than the United States, or a political subdivision of a country other than the United States that is engaged in the supervision of insurance companies under insurance law.

(vi) The person does not provide any services, financial or otherwise, to any affiliate that is a nonbank financial company that has been designated as systemically important by the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

Non-financial entity means a person that is not a financial entity as defined in section 2(h)(7)(C)(i) of the CEA.

Related affiliate means with respect to an eligible treasury affiliate:

(i) A non-financial entity that is, or is directly or indirectly wholly- or majority-owned by, the ultimate parent; or

(ii) A person that is another eligible treasury affiliate.

The Division will not recommend that the Commission commence an enforcement action against an eligible treasury affiliate for its failure to comply with the requirements under section 2(h)(1)(A) of the CEA and part 50 of the Commission's regulations to clear a swap with an unaffiliated counterparty or another eligible treasury affiliate (the "exempted swap") that is subject to required clearing pursuant to §50.4 of the Commission's regulations, subject to the following conditions:

GENERAL CONDITIONS TO THE SWAP ACTIVITY

(i) The eligible treasury affiliate enters into the exempted swap for the sole purpose of hedging or mitigating the commercial risk of one or more related affiliates that was transferred to the eligible treasury affiliate;

(ii) The eligible treasury affiliate does not enter into swaps with its related affiliates or unaffiliated counterparties other than for the purpose of hedging or mitigating its own commercial risk or the commercial risk of one or more related affiliates;

(iii) Neither any related affiliate that enters into swaps with the eligible treasury affiliate nor the eligible treasury affiliate, enters into swaps with or on behalf of any affiliate that is a financial entity ("financial affiliate"), or otherwise assumes, nets, combines, or consolidates the risk of swaps entered into by any financial affiliate, except in the case of financial affiliates that qualify as eligible treasury affiliates under this letter; and

(iv) Each swap entered into by the eligible treasury affiliate is subject to a centralized risk management program that is reasonably designed (A) to monitor and manage the risks associated with the swap, and (B) to identify the related affiliate or affiliates on whose behalf each exempted swap has been entered into by the eligible treasury affiliate.

REPORTING CONDITIONS

With respect to each swap that an eligible treasury affiliate ("electing counterparty") elects not to clear in reliance on the relief provided in this letter, the reporting counterparty, as determined in accordance with §45.8 of the Commission's regulations, shall provide or cause to be provided the following information to a registered swap data repository or, if no registered swap data repository is available to receive the information from the reporting counterparty, to the Commission, in the form and manner specified by the Commission:

(i) Notice of the election of the relief and confirmation that the electing counterparty satisfies the General Conditions to the Swap Activity of this no-action relief specified above;

(ii) How the electing counterparty generally meets its financial obligations associated with entering into non-cleared swaps by identifying one or more of the following categories, as applicable:

- (A) A written credit support agreement;
- (B) Pledged or segregated assets (including posting or receiving margin pursuant to a credit support agreement or otherwise);
- (C) A written guarantee from another party;
- (D) The electing counterparty's available financial resources; or
- (E) Means other than those described in (A)–(D); and

(iii) If the electing counterparty is an entity that is an issuer of securities registered under section 12 of, or is required to file reports under section 15(d) of, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934:

- (A) The relevant SEC Central Index Key number for such counterparty; and
- (B) Acknowledgment that an appropriate committee of the board of directors (or equivalent body) of the electing counterparty has reviewed and approved the decision to enter into swaps that are exempt from the requirements of section 2(h)(1), and if applicable, section 2(h)(8) of the CEA.

(iv) If there is more than one electing counterparty to a swap, the information specified in the Reporting Conditions of this no-action relief specified above shall be provided with respect to each of the electing counterparties.

(v) An entity that qualifies for the relief provided in this no-action letter may report the information listed in paragraphs (ii) and (iii) above, annually in anticipation of electing the relief for one or more swaps. Any such reporting under this paragraph will be effective for purposes of paragraphs (ii) and (iii) above for 365 days following the date of such reporting. During the 365-day period, the entity shall amend the report as necessary to reflect any material changes to the information reported.

(vi) Each reporting counterparty shall have a reasonable basis to believe that the electing counterparty meets the General Conditions to the Swap Activity for the no-action relief specified above.

This no-action letter, and the positions taken herein, represent the view of the Division only, and do not necessarily represent the position or view of the Commission or of

any other office or division of the Commission. The relief issued by this letter does not excuse the affected persons from compliance with any other applicable requirements contained in the CEA or in the Commission's regulations issued thereunder. Further, this letter, and the relief contained herein, is based upon the information available to the Division. Any different or changed material facts or circumstances might render this letter void. As with all no-action letters, the Division retains the authority to, in its discretion, further condition, modify, suspend, terminate or otherwise restrict the terms of the no-action relief provided herein. This letter supersedes No-Action Letter 13-22.

Sincerely,

PHYLLIS DIETZ,
Acting Director.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Again, I just want to thank everyone who was involved in this process. This is something that is going to protect thousands of jobs across our country. People often criticize us for not doing things in a bipartisan manner, but I think this is exemplary of what we can do when we really work at it, even though it has taken a couple of years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5471.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION D STUDY ACT

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3240) to instruct the Comptroller General of the United States to study the impact of Regulation D, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3240

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regulation D Study Act".

SEC. 2. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a comprehensive study on the impact on depository institutions, consumers, and monetary policy of the requirement that depository institutions maintain reserves in accordance with subsections (b) and (c) of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461) and Regulation D (12 C.F.R. 204).

(b) MATTERS TO BE STUDIED.—In conducting the study under this section, the Comptroller General shall include the following:

(1) An historic review of how the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

has used reserve requirements to conduct United States monetary policy, including information on how and when the Board of Governors has changed the required reserve ratio.

(2) The impact of the maintenance of reserves on depository institutions, including the operational requirements and associated costs.

(3) The impact on consumers in managing their accounts, including the costs and benefits of the reserving system.

(4) Alternatives the Board of Governors may have to the maintenance of reserves to effect monetary policy.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under this section, the Comptroller General shall consult with credit unions and community banks.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) the results of the study conducted pursuant to this section; and

(2) any recommendations based on such study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 3240, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3240, the Regulation D Study Act, introduced by my friend from North Carolina (Mr. PITTEMBERG), a colleague on the Financial Services Committee. This is a simple but important bill that directs the GAO to study the impact that the Federal Reserve's Regulation D minimum reserve requirements have on depository institutions, consumers, and monetary policy.

Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act gives the Federal Reserve authority to impose reserve requirements on the deposits of member institutions. These requirements are set forth in what is commonly referred to as Reg D.

Regulation D reserve requirements are calculated as a percentage of the amount of funds a financial institution's members hold in transaction accounts. A transaction account is typically an account from which the depositor or account holder is permitted to make unlimited transfers or withdrawals, such as a checking account. Because balances in those accounts can change quickly, the Federal Reserve requires institutions to reserve funds

for those accounts as a stabilizing tool for the money supply. Regulation D limits the number of transfers and withdrawals from nontransaction accounts to six per month.

As legislators, it is important that we periodically review the impact of regulations on those whom we have the honor to represent. The Regulation D Study Act does just that, and I am pleased to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I strongly, strongly support Representative PITTENGER's Reg D Study Act. Again, as my colleague from Missouri has indicated, this is a technical bill, but it is extremely important.

Commentators have argued that the maintenance of these reserves imposes opportunity costs on depository institutions, namely, by requiring them to hold funds in abeyance that could otherwise be lent out, and I think that it is worth GAO studying the issue and reporting back to Congress.

I just want to make a point, Mr. Speaker, and to stress this: reserve requirements are separate and distinct from capital requirements, liquidity, and leverage rules, which protect the safety and soundness of the financial system. This bill does not take away those important protections.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3240, the Regulation D Study Act.

This bill is simple. It directs the Government Accountability Office, GAO, to study the regulatory impact on depository institutions, consumers, and monetary policy.

Current regulations limit common online and automated transfers and withdrawals from nontransaction accounts, such as savings accounts, to only six transfers per month. The regulators who created this rule never envisioned online banking and modern banking technology, and because only some transactions are subject to the six-per-month restriction and others are without limit, this rule is very confusing to consumers.

Today, many families use online banking tools to actively manage their finances with unnecessary restrictions from these outdated rules. Regulation D requirements force financial institutions to focus on compliance concerns rather than spending more time with consumers to meet their financial needs.

This is commonsense legislation that is not only good for financial institutions, but for American families as well. The issue of allowing only six transfers per month for certain bank

accounts hasn't been reviewed in several decades. With new technological advancements and online banking, we owe it to our hardworking American families to revisit this regulation.

H.R. 3240 enjoys support from the Credit Union National Association and the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, whose financial institutions serve millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD a letter of support from the president of the Credit Union National Association, which serves 100 million members across the country.

CREDIT UNION
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, December 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the Credit Union National Association (CUNA), I am writing in support of H.R. 3240, bipartisan legislation scheduled for consideration this week by the House of Representatives. CUNA is the largest credit union advocacy organization in the United States, representing America's state and federally chartered credit unions and their 100 million members.

H.R. 3240, sponsored by Representatives Robert Pittenger (R-NC) and Carolyn Maloney (D-NY), directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to study the impact of the Federal Reserve Board's monetary reserve requirements, implemented through Regulation D, on depository institutions, consumers and monetary policy. The House Financial Services Committee favorably reported this bill to the House on July 20, 2014 by voice vote.

Regulation D impacts credit union members by limiting the number of automatic withdrawals from a member's savings account to six transactions per month. The impact of this limit is to unnecessarily cause credit union members to overdraft their checking accounts when a debit draws the checking account balance below zero and the member has already had six automatic transfers during the month. When this happens, members who may have the funds in a savings account to cover the debit are hit with nonsufficient fund fees (NSF) from their financial institution and, when a check is involved, a returned check fee from the merchant. This is not a result of an overdraft protection program—this happens because of a regulatory cap on automatic transfers. It is difficult for credit union members affected by the cap to understand that this is out of the control of the credit union when the funds to cover the debit are sifting in their account at the credit union.

We believe the cap should be increased or eliminated, but we understand that one of the reasons the regulation is in place is because the Federal Reserve Board is authorized to use it as a tool to conduct monetary policy. As a first step toward a possible change in this cap, the legislation directs the GAO to study the issue. This effort will make more information available for Congress to determine whether an increase in or the elimination of this cap would substantially affect the Federal Reserve Board's ability to conduct monetary policy.

Specifically, H.R. 3240 directs the GAO to examine and report within one year of enact-

ment on the following topics: an historic overview of how the Federal Reserve Board has used reserve requirements to conduct monetary policy; the impact of the maintenance of reserves on depository institutions, including the operations requirements and associated costs; the impact on consumers in managing their accounts, including the costs and benefits of the reserving system; and, alternatives to required reserves the Federal Reserve Board may have to effect monetary policy. The bill also directs the GAO to consult with credit unions and community banks.

According to former Federal Reserve Board Chairman Ben Bernanke, "... reserve balances far exceed the level of reserve requirements and the level of reserve requirements thus plays only a minor role in the daily implementation of monetary policy." A GAO study will allow an objective assessment of whether the rarely changed monetary reserves imposed on depository institutions and consumers are necessary in order for the Federal Reserve Board to implement monetary policy in the 21st century. CUNA strongly supports this bill.

On behalf of America's credit unions and their 100 million members, thank you for scheduling H.R. 3240 for consideration. We look forward to working with you and members of the House of Representatives to swiftly enact this legislation.

Sincerely,

JIM NUSSLE,
President & CEO.

Mr. PITTENGER. As technology advances, we need to make sure Federal regulations keep pace. Former Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke has said that account "reserve balances far exceed the level of reserve requirements, and the level of reserve requirements thus plays only a minor role in the daily implementation of monetary policy."

We can continue to protect the financial system while allowing families more flexibility to use online banking tools.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support, and I would like to thank my colleague from New York, Congresswoman MALONEY, who serves on the Financial Services Committee, for joining me in introducing H.R. 3240.

A GAO study will allow an objective assessment of whether the rarely changed monetary reserves imposed on depository institutions and consumers are necessary in order for the Federal Reserve to implement monetary policy in the 21st century.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely delighted to yield such time as she might consume to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the Democratic cosponsor of this bill, who is the ranking member of the Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3240. I am pleased to have worked on this bill with my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER). I would also like to take this opportunity to compliment his work on attempting to end terrorism, cracking

down on terrorism financing in our country.

The purpose of this particular bill is to study the current monthly limits, under Regulation D, on the number of automatic withdrawals from a consumer's savings account.

□ 1415

Currently Regulation D limits the number of automatic withdrawals from a consumer's account to six per month. This means that if a consumer has already hit his limit on automatic withdrawals for the month and then overdrafts his or her checking account, the bank won't transfer money from his savings account to cover the overdraft, and this results in an unnecessary overdraft fee.

As two recent studies by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau have noted, overdraft fees disproportionately harm those of us who can least afford it. Unsophisticated consumers are most hit by them. So if there is a regulation that is causing unnecessary overdraft fees, we should study whether that regulation is necessary. That is what our commonsense bill does. It asks the GAO to study the limitation in Regulation D to determine if it is, in fact, useful or harmful.

This bill is supported by many stakeholders in financial services: the Credit Union National Association, the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, and the American Bankers Association.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill, and I appreciate the help of my colleague.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3240.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4329) to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4329

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2014”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. References.

TITLE I—BLOCK GRANTS AND GRANT REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 101. Block grants.

Sec. 102. Recommendations regarding exceptions to annual Indian housing plan requirement.

Sec. 103. Environmental review.

Sec. 104. Deadline for action on request for approval regarding exceeding TDC maximum cost for project.

TITLE II—AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Sec. 201. National objectives and eligible families.

Sec. 202. Program requirements.

Sec. 203. Homeownership or lease-to-own low-income requirement and income targeting.

Sec. 204. Lease requirements and tenant selection.

Sec. 205. Tribal coordination of agency funding.

TITLE III—ALLOCATION OF GRANT AMOUNTS

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 302. Effect of undisbursed block grant amounts on annual allocations.

TITLE IV—AUDITS AND REPORTS

Sec. 401. Review and audit by Secretary.

Sec. 402. Reports to Congress.

TITLE V—OTHER HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

Sec. 501. HUD—Veterans Affairs supportive housing program for Native American veterans.

Sec. 502. Loan guarantees for Indian housing.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 601. Lands Title Report Commission.

Sec. 602. Limitation on use of funds for Cherokee Nation.

Sec. 603. Leasehold interest in trust or restricted lands for housing purposes.

Sec. 604. Clerical amendment.

TITLE VII—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

Sec. 701. Demonstration program.

Sec. 702. Clerical amendments.

TITLE VIII—HOUSING FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

Sec. 801. Reauthorization of Native Hawaiian Homeownership Act.

Sec. 802. Reauthorization of loan guarantees for Native Hawaiian housing.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Native

American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.).

TITLE I—BLOCK GRANTS AND GRANT REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 101. BLOCK GRANTS.

Section 101 (25 U.S.C. 4111) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding after the period at the end the following: “The Secretary shall act upon a waiver request submitted under this subsection by a recipient within 60 days after receipt of such request.”; and

(2) in subsection (k), by striking “1” and inserting “an”.

SEC. 102. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING EXCEPTIONS TO ANNUAL INDIAN HOUSING PLAN REQUIREMENT.

Not later than the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and after consultation with Indian tribes, tribally designated housing entities, and other interested parties, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to the Congress recommendations for standards and procedures for waiver of, or alternative requirements (which may include multi-year housing plans) for, the requirement under section 102(a) of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4112(a)) for annual submission of one-year housing plans for an Indian tribe. Such recommendations shall include a description of any legislative and regulatory changes necessary to implement such recommendations.

SEC. 103. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.

Section 105 (25 U.S.C. 4115) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by adding after and below paragraph (4) the following:

“The Secretary shall act upon a waiver request submitted under this subsection by a recipient within 60 days after receipt of such request.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) CONSOLIDATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS.—If a recipient is using one or more sources of Federal funds in addition to grant amounts under this Act in carrying out a project that qualifies as an affordable housing activity under section 202, such other sources of Federal funds do not exceed 49 percent of the total cost of the project, and the recipient's tribe has assumed all of the responsibilities for environmental review, decisionmaking, and action pursuant to this section, the tribe's compliance with the review requirements under this section and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with regard to such project shall be deemed to fully comply with and discharge any applicable environmental review requirements that might apply to Federal agencies with respect to the use of such additional Federal funding sources for that project.”.

SEC. 104. DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON REQUEST FOR APPROVAL REGARDING EXCEEDING TDC MAXIMUM COST FOR PROJECT.

(a) APPROVAL.—Section 103 (25 U.S.C. 4113) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON REQUEST TO EXCEED TDC MAXIMUM.—A request for approval by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to exceed by more than 10 percent the total development cost maximum cost for a project shall be approved or

denied during the 60-day period that begins on the date that the Secretary receives the request.”.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—Section 4 (25 U.S.C. 4103) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (22) as paragraph (23); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following new paragraph:

“(22) **TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST.**—The term ‘total development cost’ means, with respect to a housing project, the sum of all costs for the project, including all undertakings necessary for administration, planning, site acquisition, demolition, construction or equipment and financing (including payment of carrying charges), and for otherwise carrying out the development of the project, excluding off-site water and sewer. The total development cost amounts shall be based on a moderately designed house and determined by averaging the current construction costs as listed in not less than two nationally recognized residential construction cost indices.”.

TITLE II—AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACTIVITIES

SEC. 201. NATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND ELIGIBLE FAMILIES.

The second paragraph (6) of section 201(b) (25 U.S.C. 4131(b)(6); relating to exemption) is amended—

(1) by striking “1964 and” and inserting “1964.”; and

(2) by inserting after “1968” the following: “, and section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968”.

SEC. 202. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

Section 203(a) (25 U.S.C. 4133(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **APPLICATION OF TRIBAL POLICIES.**—Paragraph (2) shall not apply if the recipient has a written policy governing rents and homebuyer payments charged for dwelling units and such policy includes a provision governing maximum rents or homebuyer payments.”;

SEC. 203. HOMEOWNERSHIP OR LEASE-TO-OWN LOW-INCOME REQUIREMENT AND INCOME TARGETING.

Section 205 (25 U.S.C. 4135) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, in the case of rental housing that is made available to a current rental family for conversion to a homebuyer or a lease-purchase unit, that the current rental family can purchase through a contract of sale, lease-purchase agreement, or any other sales agreement, is made available for purchase only by the current rental family, if the rental family was a low-income family at the time of their initial occupancy of such unit; and”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding after the period at the end the following: “The provisions of such paragraph regarding binding commitments for the remaining useful life of the property shall not apply to improvements of privately owned homes if the cost of such improvements do not exceed 10 percent of the maximum total development cost for such home.”.

SEC. 204. LEASE REQUIREMENTS AND TENANT SELECTION.

Section 207 (25 U.S.C. 4137) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **NOTICE OF TERMINATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the owner or manager of rental housing that is assisted in part with amounts provided under this Act and in part with one or more other sources of Federal funds shall only utilize leases that require a notice period for the termination of the lease pursuant to subsection (a)(3).”.

SEC. 205. TRIBAL COORDINATION OF AGENCY FUNDING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle A of title II (25 U.S.C. 4131 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 211. TRIBAL COORDINATION OF AGENCY FUNDING.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a recipient authorized to receive funding under this Act may, in its discretion, use funding from the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health and Human Services for construction of sanitation facilities for housing construction and renovation projects that are funded in part by funds provided under this Act.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 210 the following new item:

“Sec. 211. Tribal coordination of agency funding.”.

TITLE III—ALLOCATION OF GRANT AMOUNTS

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The first sentence of section 108 (25 U.S.C. 4117) is amended by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013” and inserting “\$650,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

SEC. 302. EFFECT OF UNDISBURSED BLOCK GRANT AMOUNTS ON ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title III (25 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 303. EFFECT OF UNDISBURSED GRANT AMOUNTS ON ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS.

“(a) **NOTIFICATION OF OBLIGATED, UNDISBURSED GRANT AMOUNTS.**—Subject to subsection (d) of this section, if as of January 1 of 2015 or any year thereafter a recipient’s total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department’s line of credit control system is greater than three times the formula allocation such recipient would otherwise receive under this Act for the fiscal year during which such January 1 occurs, the Secretary shall—

“(1) before January 31 of such year, notify the Indian tribe allocated the grant amounts and any tribally designated housing entity for the tribe of the undisbursed funds; and

“(2) require the recipient for the tribe to, not later than 30 days after the Secretary provides notification pursuant to paragraph (1)—

“(A) notify the Secretary in writing of the reasons why the recipient has not requested the disbursement of such amounts; and

“(B) demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the recipient has the capacity to spend Federal funds in an effective manner, which demonstration may include evidence of the timely expenditure of amounts previously distributed under this Act to the recipient.

“(b) **ALLOCATION AMOUNT.**—Notwithstanding sections 301 and 302, the allocation

for such fiscal year for a recipient described in subsection (a) shall be the amount initially calculated according to the formula minus the difference between the recipient’s total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department’s line of credit control system on such January 1 and three times the initial formula amount for such fiscal year.

“(c) **REALLOCATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any grant amounts not allocated to a recipient pursuant to subsection (b) shall be allocated under the need component of the formula proportionately amount all other Indian tribes not subject to such an adjustment.

“(d) **INAPPLICABILITY.**—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to an Indian tribe with respect to any fiscal year for which the amount allocated for the tribe for block grants under this Act is less than \$5,000,000.

“(e) **EFFECTIVENESS.**—This section shall not require the issuance of any regulation to take effect and shall not be construed to confer hearing rights under this or any other section of this Act.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 302 the following new item:

“Sec. 303. Effect of undisbursed grant amounts on annual allocations.”.

TITLE IV—AUDITS AND REPORTS

SEC. 401. REVIEW AND AUDIT BY SECRETARY.

Section 405(c) (25 U.S.C. 4165(c)) is amended, by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **ISSUANCE OF FINAL REPORT.**—The Secretary shall issue a final report within 60 days after receiving comments under paragraph (1) from a recipient.”.

SEC. 402. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 407 (25 U.S.C. 4167) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Congress” and inserting “Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and to any subcommittees of such committees having jurisdiction with respect to Native American and Alaska Native affairs.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY TO RECIPIENTS.**—Each report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made publicly available to recipients.”.

TITLE V—OTHER HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

SEC. 501. HUD-VETERANS AFFAIRS SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROGRAM FOR NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS.

Paragraph (19) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS.**—

“(i) **AUTHORITY.**—Of the funds made available for rental assistance under this subsection for fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall set aside 5 percent for a supported housing and rental assistance program modeled on the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program, to be administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs, for the benefit of homeless Native American veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness.

“(ii) **RECIPIENTS.**—Such rental assistance shall be made available to recipients eligible

to receive block grants under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.).

“(iii) FUNDING CRITERIA.—Funds shall be awarded based on need, administrative capacity, and any other funding criteria established by the Secretary in a notice published in the Federal Register, after consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, by a date sufficient to provide for implementation of the program under this subparagraph in accordance with clause (i).

“(iv) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Such funds shall be administered by block grant recipients in accordance with program requirements under Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 in lieu of program requirements under this Act.

“(v) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this subparagraph, but only upon a finding by the Secretary that such waiver or alternative requirement is necessary to promote administrative efficiency, eliminate delay, consolidate or eliminate duplicative or ineffective requirements or criteria, or otherwise provide for the effective delivery and administration of such supportive housing assistance to Native American veterans.

“(vi) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly consult with block grant recipients and any other appropriate tribal organizations to—

“(I) ensure that block grant recipients administering funds made available under the program under this subparagraph are able to effectively coordinate with providers of supportive services provided in connection with such program; and

“(II) ensure the effective delivery of supportive services to Native American veterans that are homeless or at risk of homelessness eligible to receive assistance under this subparagraph.

Consultation pursuant to this clause shall be completed by a date sufficient to provide for implementation of the program under this subparagraph in accordance with clause (i).

“(vii) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall establish the requirements and criteria for the supported housing and rental assistance program under this subparagraph by notice published in the Federal Register, but shall provide Indian tribes and tribally designated housing agencies an opportunity for comment and consultation before publication of a final notice pursuant to this clause.”

SEC. 502. LOAN GUARANTEES FOR INDIAN HOUSING.

Section 184(i)(5) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z–13a(i)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after the period at the end of the first sentence the following: “There are authorized to be appropriated for such costs \$12,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “2014 through 2018”; and

(B) by striking “such amount as may be provided in appropriation Acts for” and inserting “\$976,000,000 for each”.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. LANDS TITLE REPORT COMMISSION.

Section 501 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4043 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Subject to sums being provided in advance in appropriations Acts, there” and inserting “There”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1) by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2014”.

SEC. 602. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CHEROKEE NATION.

Section 801 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–411) is amended by striking “Temporary Order and Temporary Injunction issued on May 14, 2007, by the District Court of the Cherokee Nation” and inserting “Order issued September 21, 2011, by the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia”.

SEC. 603. LEASEHOLD INTEREST IN TRUST OR RESTRICTED LANDS FOR HOUSING PURPOSES.

Section 702 (25 U.S.C. 4211) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “, whether enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this section” after “law”; and

(2) by striking “50 years” each place such term appears and inserting “99 years”.

SEC. 604. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by striking the item relating to section 206 (treatment of funds).

TITLE VII—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

SEC. 701. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Add at the end of the Act the following new title:

“TITLE IX—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

“SEC. 901. AUTHORITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other authority provided in this Act for the construction, development, maintenance, and operation of housing for Indian families, the Secretary shall provide the participating tribes having final plans approved pursuant to section 905 with the authority to exercise the activities provided under this title and such plan for the acquisition and development of housing to meet the needs of tribal members.

“(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF NAHASDA PROVISIONS.—Except as specifically provided otherwise in this title, titles I through IV, VI, and VII shall not apply to a participating tribe’s use of funds during any period that the tribe is participating in the demonstration program under this title.

“(c) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN NAHASDA PROVISIONS.—The following provisions of titles I through VIII shall apply to the demonstration program under this title and amounts made available under the demonstration program under this title:

“(1) Subsections (d) and (e) of section 101 (relating to tax exemption).

“(2) Section 101(j) (relating to Federal supply sources).

“(3) Section 101(k) (relating to tribal preference in employment and contracting).

“(4) Section 104 (relating to treatment of program income and labor standards).

“(5) Section 105 (relating to environmental review).

“(6) Section 201(b) (relating to eligible families), except as otherwise provided in this title.

“(7) Section 203(g) (relating to a de minimis exemption for procurement of goods and services).

“(8) Section 702 (relating to 99-year leasehold interests in trust or restricted lands for housing purposes).

“SEC. 902. PARTICIPATING TRIBES.

“(a) REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE.—To be eligible to participate in the demonstration program under this title, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary a notice of intention to participate during the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, in such form and such manner as the Secretary shall provide.

“(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—Upon approval under section 905 of the final plan of an Indian tribe for participation in the demonstration program under this title, the Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the participating tribe that provides such tribe with the authority to carry out activities under the demonstration program.

“(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not approve more than 20 Indian tribes for participation in the demonstration program under this title.

“SEC. 903. REQUEST FOR QUOTES AND SELECTION OF INVESTOR PARTNER.

“(a) REQUEST FOR QUOTES.—Not later than the expiration of the 180-day period beginning upon notification to the Secretary by an Indian tribe of intention to participate in the demonstration program under this title, the Indian tribe shall—

“(1) obtain assistance from a qualified entity in assessing the housing needs, including the affordable housing needs, of the tribe; and

“(2) release a request for quotations from entities interested in partnering with the tribe in designing and carrying out housing activities sufficient to meet the tribe’s housing needs as identified pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(b) SELECTION OF INVESTOR PARTNER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, an Indian tribe requesting to participate in the demonstration program under this title shall—

“(A) select an investor partner from among the entities that have responded to the tribe’s request for quotations; and

“(B) together with such investor partner, establish and submit to the Secretary a final plan that meets the requirements under section 904.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may extend the period under paragraph (1) for any tribe that—

“(A) has not received any satisfactory quotation in response to its request released pursuant to subsection (a)(2); or

“(B) has any other satisfactory reason, as determined by the Secretary, for failure to select an investor partner.

“SEC. 904. FINAL PLAN.

“A final plan under this section shall—

“(1) be developed by the participating tribe and the investor partner for the tribe selected pursuant to section 903(b)(1)(A);

“(2) identify the qualified entity that assisted the tribe in assessing the housing needs of the tribe;

“(3) set forth a detailed description of such projected housing needs, including affordable housing needs, of the tribe, which shall include—

“(A) a description of such need over the ensuing 24 months and thereafter until the expiration of the ensuing 5-year period or until the affordable housing need is met, whichever occurs sooner; and

“(B) the same information that would be required under section 102 to be included in

an Indian housing plan for the tribe, as such requirements may be modified by the Secretary to take consideration of the requirements of the demonstration program under this title;

“(4) provide for specific housing activities sufficient to meet the tribe’s housing needs, including affordable housing needs, as identified pursuant to paragraph (3) within the periods referred to such paragraph, which shall include—

“(A) development of affordable housing (as such term is defined in section 4 of this Act (25 U.S.C. 4103));

“(B) development of conventional homes for rental, lease-to-own, or sale, which may be combined with affordable housing developed pursuant to subparagraph (A);

“(C) development of housing infrastructure, including housing infrastructure sufficient to serve affordable housing developed under the plan; and

“(D) investments by the investor partner for the tribe, the participating tribe, members of the participating tribe, and financial institutions and other outside investors necessary to provide financing for the development of housing under the plan and for mortgages for tribal members purchasing such housing;

“(5) provide that the participating tribe will agree to provide long-term leases to tribal members sufficient for lease-to-own arrangements for, and sale of, the housing developed pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(6) provide that the participating tribe—

“(A) will be liable for delinquencies under mortgage agreements for housing developed under the plan that are financed under the plan and entered into by tribal members; and

“(B) shall, upon foreclosure under such mortgages, take possession of such housing and have the responsibility for making such housing available to other tribal members;

“(7) provide for sufficient protections, in the determination of the Secretary, to ensure that the tribe and the Federal Government are not liable for the acts of the investor partner or of any contractors;

“(8) provide that the participating tribe shall have sole final approval of design and location of housing developed under the plan;

“(9) set forth specific deadlines and schedules for activities to be undertaken under the plan and set forth the responsibilities of the participating tribe and the investor partner;

“(10) set forth specific terms and conditions of return on investment by the investor partner and other investors under the plan, and provide that the participating tribe shall pledge grant amounts allocated for the tribe pursuant to title III for such return on investment;

“(11) set forth the terms of a cooperative agreement on the operation and management of the current assistance housing stock and current housing stock for the tribe assisted under the preceding titles of this Act;

“(12) set forth any plans for sale of affordable housing of the participating tribe under section 907 and, if included, plans sufficient to meet the requirements of section 907 regarding meeting future affordable housing needs of the tribe;

“(13) set forth terms for enforcement of the plan, including an agreement regarding jurisdiction of any actions under or to enforce the plan, including a waiver of immunity; and

“(14) include such other information as the participating tribe and investor partner consider appropriate.

“SEC. 905. HUD REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning upon a submission by an Indian tribe of a final plan under section 904 to the Secretary, the Secretary shall—

“(1) review the plan and the process by which the tribe solicited requests for quotations from investors and selected the investor partner; and

“(2)(A) approve the plan, unless the Secretary determines that—

“(i) the assessment of the tribe’s housing needs by the qualified entity, or as set forth in the plan pursuant to section 904(3), is inaccurate or insufficient;

“(ii) the process established by the tribe to solicit requests for quotations and select an investor partner was insufficient or negligent; or

“(iii) the plan is insufficient to meet the housing needs of the tribe, as identified in the plan pursuant to section 904(3);

“(B) approve the plan, on the condition that the participating tribe and the investor make such revisions to the plan as the Secretary may specify as appropriate to meet the needs of the tribe for affordable housing; or

“(C) disapprove the plan, only if the Secretary determines that the plan fails to meet the minimal housing standards and requirements set forth in this Act and the Secretary notifies the tribe of the elements requiring the disapproval.

“(b) ACTION UPON DISAPPROVAL.—

“(1) RE-SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of any disapproval of a final plan of an Indian tribe pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall allow the tribe a period of 180 days from notification to the tribe of such disapproval to re-submit a revised plan for approval.

“(2) LIMITATION.—If the final plan for an Indian tribe is disapproved twice and resubmitted twice pursuant to the authority under paragraph (1) and, upon such second re-submission of the plan the Secretary disapproves the plan, the tribe may not re-submit the plan again and shall be ineligible to participate in the demonstration program under this title.

“(c) TRIBE AUTHORITY OF HOUSING DESIGN AND LOCATION.—The Secretary may not disapprove a final plan under section 904, or condition approval of such a plan, based on the design or location of any housing to be developed or assisted under the plan.

“(d) FAILURE TO NOTIFY.—If the Secretary does not notify a participating tribe submitting a final plan of approval, conditional approval, or disapproval of the plan before the expiration of the period referred to in paragraph (1), the plan shall be considered as approved for all purposes of this title.

“SEC. 906. TREATMENT OF NAHASDA ALLOCATION.

“Amounts otherwise allocated for a participating tribe under title III of this Act (25 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) shall not be made available to the tribe under titles I through VIII, but shall only be available for the tribe, upon request by the tribe and approval by the Secretary, for the following purposes:

“(1) RETURN ON INVESTMENT.—Such amounts as are pledged by a participating tribe pursuant to section 904(10) for return on the investment made by the investor partner or other investors may be used by the Secretary to ensure such full return on investment.

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Secretary may provide to a participating tribe, upon the request of a tribe, not more than 10

percent of any annual allocation made under title III for the tribe during such period for administrative costs of the tribe in completing the processes to carry out sections 903 and 904.

“(3) HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS.—A participating tribe may use such amounts for housing infrastructure costs associated with providing affordable housing for the tribe under the final plan.

“(4) MAINTENANCE; TENANT SERVICES.—A participating tribe may use such amounts for maintenance of affordable housing for the tribe and for housing services, housing management services, and crime prevention and safety activities described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively, of section 202.

“SEC. 907. REUSE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a participating tribe may, in accordance with the provisions of the final plan of the tribe approved pursuant to section 905, resell any affordable housing developed with assistance made available under this Act for use other than as affordable housing, but only if the tribe provides such assurances as the Secretary determines are appropriate to ensure that—

“(1) the tribe is meeting its need for affordable housing;

“(2) will provide affordable housing in the future sufficient to meet future affordable housing needs; and

“(3) will use any proceeds only to meet such future affordable housing needs or as provided in section 906.

“SEC. 908. REPORTS, AUDITS, AND COMPLIANCE.

“(a) ANNUAL REPORTS BY TRIBE.—Each participating tribe shall submit a report to the Secretary annually regarding the progress of the tribe in complying with, and meeting the deadlines and schedules set forth under the approved final plan for the tribe. Such reports shall contain such information as the Secretary shall require.

“(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress annually describing the activities and progress of the demonstration program under this title, which shall—

“(1) summarize the information in the reports submitted by participating tribes pursuant to subsection (a);

“(2) identify the number of tribes that have selected an investor partner pursuant to a request for quotations;

“(3) include, for each tribe applying for participating in the demonstration program whose final plan was disapproved under section 905(a)(2)(C), a detailed description and explanation of the reasons for disapproval and all actions taken by the tribe to eliminate the reasons for disapproval, and identify whether the tribe has re-submitted a final plan;

“(4) identify, by participating tribe, any amounts requested and approved for use under section 906; and

“(5) identify any participating tribes that have terminated participation in the demonstration program and the circumstances of such terminations.

“(c) AUDITS.—The Secretary shall provide for audits among participating tribes to ensure that the final plans for such tribes are being implemented and complied with. Such audits shall include on-site visits with participating tribes and requests for documentation appropriate to ensure such compliance.

“SEC. 909. TERMINATION OF TRIBAL PARTICIPATION.

“(a) TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION.—A participating tribe may terminate participation in the demonstration program under

this title at any time, subject to this section.

“(b) EFFECT ON EXISTING OBLIGATIONS.—

“(1) NO AUTOMATIC TERMINATION.—Termination by a participating tribe in the demonstration program under this section shall not terminate any obligations of the tribe under agreements entered into under the demonstration program with the investor partner for the tribe or any other investors or contractors.

“(2) AUTHORITY TO MUTUALLY TERMINATE AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this title may be construed to prevent a tribe that terminates participation in the demonstration program under this section and any party with which the tribe has entered into an agreement from mutually agreeing to terminate such agreement.

“(c) RECEIPT OF REMAINING GRANT AMOUNTS.—The Secretary shall provide for grants to be made in accordance with, and subject to the requirements of, this Act for any amounts remaining after use pursuant to section 906 from the allocation under title III for a participating tribe that terminates participation in the demonstration program.

“(d) COSTS AND OBLIGATIONS.—The Secretary shall not be liable for any obligations or costs incurred by an Indian tribe during its participation in the demonstration program under this title.

“SEC. 910. FINAL REPORT.

“Not later than the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary shall submit a final report to the Congress regarding the effectiveness of the demonstration program, which shall include—

“(1) an assessment of the success, under the demonstration program, of participating tribes in meeting their housing needs, including affordable housing needs, on tribal land;

“(2) recommendations for any improvements in the demonstration program; and

“(3) a determination of whether the demonstration should be expanded into a permanent program available for Indian tribes to opt into at any time and, if so, recommendations for such expansion, including any legislative actions necessary to expand the program.

“SEC. 911. DEFINITIONS.

“For purposes of this title, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) **AFFORDABLE HOUSING.—**The term ‘affordable housing’ has the meaning given such term in section 4 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

“(2) **HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE.—**The term ‘housing infrastructure’ means basic facilities, services, systems, and installations necessary or appropriate for the functioning of a housing community, including facilities, services, systems, and installations for water, sewage, power, communications, and transportation.

“(3) **LONG-TERM LEASE.—**The term ‘long-term lease’ means an agreement between a participating tribe and a tribal member that authorizes the tribal member to occupy a specific plot of tribal lands for 50 or more years and to request renewal of the agreement at least once.

“(4) **PARTICIPATING TRIBES.—**The term ‘participating tribe’ means an Indian tribe for which a final plan under section 904 for participation in the demonstration program under this title has been approved by the Secretary under section 905.

“SEC. 912. NOTICE.

“The Secretary shall establish any requirements and criteria as may be necessary to carry out the demonstration program under

this title by notice published in the Federal Register.”.

SEC. 702. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 705 the following:

“TITLE VIII—HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

“Sec. 801. Definitions.

“Sec. 802. Block grants for affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 803. Housing plan.

“Sec. 804. Review of plans.

“Sec. 805. Treatment of program income and labor standards.

“Sec. 806. Environmental review.

“Sec. 807. Regulations.

“Sec. 808. Effective date.

“Sec. 809. Affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 810. Eligible affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 811. Program requirements.

“Sec. 812. Types of investments.

“Sec. 813. Low-income requirement and income targeting.

“Sec. 814. Lease requirements and tenant selection.

“Sec. 815. Repayment.

“Sec. 816. Annual allocation.

“Sec. 817. Allocation formula.

“Sec. 818. Remedies for noncompliance.

“Sec. 819. Monitoring of compliance.

“Sec. 820. Performance reports.

“Sec. 821. Review and audit by Secretary.

“Sec. 822. General Accounting Office audits.

“Sec. 823. Reports to Congress.

“Sec. 824. Authorization of appropriations.

“TITLE IX—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

“Sec. 901. Authority.

“Sec. 902. Participating tribes.

“Sec. 903. Request for quotes and selection of investor partner.

“Sec. 904. Final plan.

“Sec. 905. HUD review and approval of plan.

“Sec. 906. Treatment of NAHASDA allocation.

“Sec. 907. Resale of affordable housing.

“Sec. 908. Reports, audits, and compliance.

“Sec. 909. Termination of tribal participation.

“Sec. 910. Final report.

“Sec. 911. Definitions.

“Sec. 912. Notice.”.

TITLE VIII—HOUSING FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

SEC. 801. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOMEOWNERSHIP ACT.

Section 824 (25 U.S.C. 4243) is amended by striking “such sums as may be necessary” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.”.

SEC. 802. REAUTHORIZATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING.

Section 184A(j)(5) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z–13b(j)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after the period at the end of the first sentence the following: “There are authorized to be appropriated for such costs \$386,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “for each of fiscal years” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 with an aggregate outstanding principal amount not exceeding \$41,504,000 for each such fiscal year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 4329, as amended, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act was first signed into law in 1996. This 5-year authorization bill was conceptualized not to simply be another Federal subsidy for Native Americans but rather a bridge to assist millions in creating a better living condition, create housing opportunities, and find prosperity for tribal members.

My family’s story is exactly this one: when I was born, Dad and Mom had to move the chickens out of the shack that we moved into. That building still has a dirt floor in it today and wires in the windows. I have seen housing conditions similar to this still in New Mexico. I understand that my family made its way up the prosperity ladder starting, first, with owning our own home and, second, with then finding other ways to achieve asset acquisitions, and the same thing can happen for Native Americans.

In the last 10 years, NAHASDA, as it is known, has become a driving force for positive change and improvement on tribal lands. Through increased access to safe and affordable housing and lease-to-own programs aimed at providing rural tribes with a means for self-growth, the program has provided flexibility and independence to tribal members nationwide.

This year we are not only reauthorizing this critical bill that provides much-needed housing; we are also attempting to continue NAHASDA’s tradition of transforming housing programs. We are doing so by capturing and enhancing market efficiencies and the effectiveness of streamlined processes to continue building prosperity, something that has been elusive on tribal lands for too long.

I would like to thank all of those who have assisted in the development and promotion of this legislation, Congressman DON YOUNG, Congressman TOM COLE, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, Congressman DENNY HECK, and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, who made great suggestions during the

markup of this bill. Along with their staffs, they have worked tirelessly to make the reauthorization of this act possible and a truly bipartisan effort that achieves many of the reforms requested by Native American tribes nationwide.

Working together, we were able to reduce the burden on tribes and expand the opportunities in Native American housing. These reforms will result in more efficient use of taxpayer money and provide approval of projects with greater speed, allowing tribes to focus money and resources on development and innovation instead of spending inordinate amounts of time and money on administrative requirements. Ultimately, this will provide more families with homes.

Mr. Speaker, I commend HUD for truly embracing the need for more modernized programs with more accountability, transparency, and increased self-determination among Native Americans. Their willingness to engage with our offices, my counterparts working on this issue, and the committee has allowed us to create a more united product. Some Native Americans, upon reading the bill, have declared these changes and ideas will become transformational if they are adopted into law. Transformational is what we all came here to do.

H.R. 4329 includes a number of reforms, updates, and additions to the originating legislation, which are widely supported across Native American tribes. Since passage out of the Financial Services Committee, our office has received countless letters of support for passage of the bill.

In discussions with tribal housing councils and tribal leaders, there was great frustration with HUD for continued delays, and in extreme cases, failure to respond altogether. This legislation includes a compromise way forward to address this shortcoming. It sets a requirement that HUD shall respond to tribes within a 60-day period, ensuring timely responsiveness, but it does this without jeopardizing HUD's oversight responsibility.

This reauthorization has a special provision that provides tribal businesses with greater opportunities for employment on tribal housing projects. The bill provides tribes with the flexibility to create independent maximum rent requirements dictated by the needs of their communities and with the flexibility to commingle Indian Health Service funds with NAHASDA money to construct sanitation facilities and greater infrastructure around housing developments.

Working with the administration, my legislation includes language to recoup unexpended funds within the program. The agreement that was reached is more accommodating to tribal needs than the original request, allowing more room for tribes to work through

their balances while meeting the need for efficiencies in the system.

Finally, we have included a new demonstration project in the bill designed to attract greater private financing and more developers to invest private money in housing projects on tribal lands. This program envisions the same privatization projects that occurred on military land and succeeded in providing great numbers of new houses for military individuals in a very short period of time. The objective here is to put more Native Americans in homes and work through the backlog of housing needs in ways unseen before on Native lands.

NAHASDA was designed to promote development and increase flexibility so that tribes may meet the unique challenges they face and provide the self-determination tribes deserve. The legislation before you today expands upon these principles and represents an opportunity for greater prosperity for a cross-section of our society that in many parts of the Nation is truly in need of assistance.

Finally, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Majority Leader MCCARTHY and their staff for their willingness to address this issue and working with me to bring it up to date.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this day is a culmination of a lot of time, a lot of work, and a lot of conversations back and forth, but, again, it is the best work that we have been able to produce in a bipartisan manner. It is not perfect, but I do want to thank all of our partners in this process. Representatives COLE, HANABUSA, HECK, KILDEE, PEARCE, and YOUNG have really been just outstanding partners. I really want to thank Ranking Member WATERS. She has been supportive, constructive, and, not to mention, exceedingly patient.

I also want to thank the Native American community. The National Congress of American Indians, the National American Indian Housing Council, and many individual tribes from across the country have provided their expertise, their comments, their education, and their energy every single step of the way. My very first meeting in the 112th Congress was with one of my Wisconsin tribes, and I assured them that I would keep fighting to get NAHASDA to the floor, this reauthorization that honors the unique needs and sovereignty of the Nations of the First People, and H.R. 4329 keeps that promise.

It is a model for how Congress can work. Of course, again, there is not 100 percent agreement on every provision. I am waiting for the perfect bill. But we cannot let the perfect stand in the way of the possible. We must do what is the best for our tribal communities at this time.

NAHASDA provides tribal governments the ability to provide safe and affordable housing to tribal communities consistent with their status as sovereign. And it is no small task. Some of the poorest and most remote communities in this country are Native American. In fact, the three poorest communities in the United States are Native American.

Improvements that this bill accomplishes include expediting certain Federal approvals, providing rental assistance for Native American veterans, and providing that all Native people are eligible for NAHASDA. Expediting approval ends costly administrative duplication and delays, which is important due to unique timing and building challenges on reservations.

I am hopeful that when I yield time to another one of my colleagues, Mr. HECK, that he will expand on the provisions that we are proud of in this bill regarding Native American veterans. We are going to have several speakers, Mr. Speaker, who are going to comment on how we, after much back and forth, have included all Native people in this bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), who has devoted not just time this year but decades of helping Native Americans.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4329, the NAHASDA reauthorization act of 2014. Over the last 2 years, I have had the privilege of working with a bipartisan group of my colleagues on this crucial legislation. I would like to first start by thanking and commending Mr. PEARCE for his leadership in sponsoring this bill. This bill wouldn't have been possible without the efforts of Mr. COLE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DENNY HECK, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. KILDEE, and all the others. I also would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING for his dedication in moving this bill through the committee and for his statesmanship in resolving the difficult issues.

I would be remiss without thanking Alex on my staff, who has done great work on this legislation for the good of the First Americans.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge the many tribes and organizations that contributed to this legislation. These include the National American Indian Housing Council, which has developed a foundation for the legislation, and the Cook Inlet Housing Authority, which has been a tireless advocate in my State.

As my colleagues note, NAHASDA continues to be a successful and well-liked program throughout Indian Country. NAHASDA exemplifies the spirit of self-determination by allowing Native communities to create their own

innovative housing assistance programs in ways that best serve their members. This bill upholds the success of NAHASDA and includes improvements to the programs that empower Native communities to better confront their housing challenges.

□ 1430

Furthermore, the bill responsibly streamlines administration of the programs so that both tribes and HUD will spend less time navigating red tape and more time advancing housing that makes a difference for native people.

As we pass this bill, the Senate must act quickly to take up the legislation before the end of this Congress. I call on our colleagues in the Senate to recognize the bipartisan nature of the bill and listen to the voices on this side of the aisle in support of Indian Country. It is my hope that the legislation will be signed into law before the end of the year.

As I said, I urge and I thank those for passage of this bill, H.R. 4329.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY), a member on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her hard work on the legislation.

I rise in support of reauthorizing the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act. Communities are built upon access to safe, quality, affordable housing, but for many of America's great tribal nations, bureaucratic red tape has restricted tribes' abilities to make the most of scarce Federal housing dollars.

While Native Americans face some of the worst housing and economic conditions in the country, this is simply unacceptable. Giving control of housing grants to tribal nations just makes sense.

In addition to providing housing, the Miccosukee Indian Tribe of Florida preserves tradition, fights to protect the Florida Everglades, and works to develop the Tamiami Trail Reservation, using the flexibility NAHASDA provides to grow native-owned construction and building material businesses.

I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), chairman and ranking member of the committee, and the tribal leaders for their work on this important bipartisan legislation that provides much-needed reform to keep our Nation's promise to tribal nations and strengthen their communities. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. There are many different Native American groups across the country who have sent letters of support, including

the National American Indian Housing Council, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Southwest Tribal Housing Alliance, Nevada and California Indian housing authorities, and the Northwest Indian Housing Association.

In New Mexico, the Acoma Pueblo, Laguna Pueblo, Mescalero Apache, Jicarilla Apache, Santa Clara Pueblo, the Northern Pueblo, Santo Domingo Pueblo, and the Navajo Nation offers its support. Indian tribes all across the country are lending their support.

I did note that I had overlooked the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) on the other side of the aisle. His office was also greatly involved and instrumental in this bill, and I would like to recognize those efforts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am so happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who came here in his running shoes and really came here because of his relationship to his uncle who is one of our former retired colleagues, Mr. Kildee of Michigan, and the younger Mr. KILDEE has been a tremendous asset in terms of putting this bill together.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for her great work on this legislation and her kind words, as well as Ranking Member WATERS, and to Mr. PEARCE who has pursued this legislation relentlessly, Mr. YOUNG, and others, I think this is a fine moment for us. It is an exercise in bipartisanship which we don't see enough of around here.

This is important legislation that has taken too long for Congress to bring to the floor. I think we all agree that it is long overdue. Our responsibilities, our trust relationships to the tribes has to be adhered to.

I will say no bill is perfect, and I do support this legislation with some concerns primarily around, as I voiced in committee, the demonstration project that is included in this bill which is, by some, viewed as a step toward privatization of the NAHASDA program.

I know most don't feel that way, but some feel it might lead to that. Tribes already have the ability to contract with nonprofit or for-profit private developers in building and rehabilitating tribal housing.

This particular program, the demonstration program, is not included in the National American Indian Housing Council's NAHASDA recommendations, and I think it is important that we listen to Indian Country and those in the tribal communities because the very name of this bill has to do with self-determination, and I think it is important that we adhere to the interests of those sovereign tribes that will be administering this program.

There are other provisions that will be exempt from the NAHASDA requirements if in fact the privatization effort

goes forward, so I would just be cautioning those tribal organizations and housing authorities that will be implementing under this law to take care to examine those relationships that they might enter into before pursuing the pilot program.

I will finish by saying that it is important that this legislation move forward. No bill is perfect. This is a very good step forward. I commend leaders on both sides of the aisle for bringing this to the floor, and I look forward to it becoming law very soon.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate the observations by the gentleman. We had time to discuss after the hearing and after the markup, and at that time, it was pointed out that the pilot project is completely voluntary, easy to opt into and easy to opt out of.

It is not our intent to trap or entrap anyone, but instead open a door if they desire to go through it. I think there will be tribes that can go in and build all of houses that they need in a very short period of time. That is what we are looking for, but again, I take his observations very seriously, and we have looked for flaws in the program that might be hooks or have unintended consequences.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA), who is not a member of the committee but weighed in heavily on the final draft that is before us today.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin not only for yielding, but for her hard work and advocacy for native people.

I rise in support of this important piece of legislation for all of our native people, and I want to thank the chair and the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee for moving the bill forward.

Our native people, all native people, the Native Hawaiians included, have a very strong tie to the land. In Hawaii, it is called the *aina*. The need to have homeownership and to be tied to the land equates to the preservation of the culture and of the people.

In Hawaii, we continue to have beneficiaries of a Federal law called the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, which Congress did pass, who are still waiting to get on the land—still waiting. This reauthorization will bring us closer to fulfilling the intent and the purpose of that act.

I appreciate the bipartisan efforts which have gone into this bill, and I would like to point out that title VIII, the portion that is relevant to the Native Hawaiians, expired in 2005.

It is almost 10 years later, and it is only through the bipartisan efforts of this committee and those like my good friend from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and

Mr. COLE from Oklahoma, who have managed to push this forward with all of our strong advocates on the committee as well.

I ask that all Members of this body join me in supporting H.R. 4329 for all the native people because it is how we define and how we treat our native people that makes us a better Nation and a great Nation.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, again, recognizing the gentlelady from Hawaii, we had an opportunity to visit on the floor multiple times, and I recognize her inputs and just again would salute her for her support of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), who is one of many people who participated in getting this bill to where it is today.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise proudly in support of H.R. 4329, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization of 2014. In the 18 years since its enactment, this legislation has strengthened indigenous self-determination by empowering native nations to empower their low-income families and households by assisting with their affordable housing needs.

The State of Hawaii's Department of Hawaiian Home Lands uses these funds to manage a trust that Congress established for the rehabilitation of the Native Hawaiian people. Over 1,400 low-income families in Hawaii have benefited from these services, and in many cases, homeownership would not have been possible given the \$640,000 median price of a single-family home on the island of Oahu.

I would like to give one quick example of the Nakihei family on the island of Molokai. Brent and Amber Nakihei could not have afforded to remain in the neighborhood where Brent grew up, but they partnered with the Molokai Habitat for Humanity and Hawaiian Homes to build a new three-bedroom, one-bath house in 2007.

They invested 700 hours of work towards construction of that house, and their four children will now learn the responsibility of homeownership from a young age and have a safe home to grow up in. Passage of this legislation will continue to have a tremendous impact by enabling other families like the Nakihei family.

Nationwide passage of this legislation also would represent an important step to removing roadblocks to economic success in native communities and would reaffirm the House's longstanding commitment to tribal sovereignty and self-determination.

I thank my colleagues, Chairman HENSARLING, Ranking Member WATERS, and Representative MOORE for their outstanding leadership in allowing this legislation to move forward, as well as longtime advocate Representative

YOUNG, Congresswoman HANABUSA, and DAN KILDEE who worked very hard on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4329.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, who has really put a lot of time into this bill.

As the ranking member, she serves on all of the subcommittees, but she has been particularly passionate about her stewardship over this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide an important and long overdue reauthorization of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act, or NAHASDA.

Through NAHASDA, the Federal Government provides housing assistance to Native Americans and Native Hawaiians, two groups that not only experience some of the poorest housing conditions in the Nation, but also face unique barriers to housing due to the legal status of tribal lands.

Through block grants and loan guarantees, NAHASDA ensures Federal assistance is tailored to address their needs while respecting their right to self-determination. I am encouraged that my Republican colleagues have finally agreed to include a provision to reauthorize Native Hawaiian programs.

As a supporter of the reauthorization of NAHASDA, I did not object to the bill before us today moving forward under suspension; however, this is one of those times, while you understand very well why reauthorization is necessary, I must go on record to continue to support a fight and a struggle that I have been involved in with some of my colleagues for many years.

The bill will do nothing to protect the Cherokee Freedmen—descendants of former African American slaves of the Cherokee—who are facing possible expulsion by the Cherokee Nation.

The ancestors of the Freedmen marched with the Cherokee on the Trail of Tears; yet, today, their tragic history continues as the Freedmen face ongoing discrimination from the tribe that they call their own.

□ 1445

For the past several years, under the leadership of former Members, including former Congresswoman Carolyn Kilpatrick and former Congressman Mel Watt, the Congressional Black Caucus has stood up for the rights of the Cherokee Freedmen.

I attempted to deal with this issue by way of an amendment, but the Republicans again refused to offer protections for the Cherokee Freedmen in this legislation. During the committee markup, my amendment was rejected, which would have made NAHASDA

funding to the Cherokee contingent on full recognition of the Freedmen as citizens of the Cherokee Nation. It causes me great pain to not be able to support the continued silence on this issue.

Furthermore, there is one other issue that I have to be concerned about. This bill would seriously undercut the central goal of providing affordable housing for low-income Native Americans. It would waive a low-standing tenet of affordable housing known as the "Brooke rule," which states that the maximum rent paid by assisted households must be no more than 30 percent of their income. I have to be concerned about this because this is a rule that is throughout HUD. I do not wish to be part of opening up that door and then having to face that later on as we deal with public housing and assisted housing. This bill strips away this basic safeguard, making low-income Native Americans vulnerable to unlimited increases in rent without any kind of hardship exemptions in place.

Lastly, this bill includes a new demonstration program that moves toward increased privatization and deregulation of tribal housing activities. I remain very concerned that this program could have negative impacts on low-income Native American households in participating tribes.

I would like to sincerely thank Ms. MOORE, Mr. HECK, and Mr. KILDEE for their efforts to reach a bipartisan agreement on this bill. I would like to thank Ms. HANABUSA and Ms. GABBARD for the work that they are doing. I won't support the reauthorization in its current form for all the reasons I have stated, but I thank all of those who have worked so hard to try and deal with the need for assistance for both the Hawaiians and the Native Americans in housing.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Mexico has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me thank again all of the partners in getting this legislation to the floor.

I do want to make mention of someone who is not a part of this debate, the gentlewoman from Minnesota, Representative BETTY MCCOLLUM, who is the cochair of the Native American Caucus. She wanted to make sure that she weighed in during this discussion about the extraordinary need to deal with Native American housing.

So many of us believe that Native Americans often are involved in gaming and that they are wealthy and rich, but as the ranking member mentioned, they are subjected to some of the poorest housing conditions in our country.

Although we are reauthorizing NAHASDA, none of us should be fooled at all that this will in any way deal with the tremendous need for affordable housing within Native American communities.

I, again, am very, very empathetic with the issues, particularly that the ranking member has raised, and I am really hopeful that many of these issues, particularly the issue of the Cherokee Freedmen, will be dealt with. It seems promising to me because of some of the decisions that have been made in courts so far.

We do seem to have a Cherokee chairman who is more open, it would seem, to providing membership and retaining membership of the Cherokee Freedmen.

I, again, am happy that the Native Hawaiians are in this bill. I think that as we move forward, we should be ever mindful to make sure that nothing that we have done here will preempt the Native Americans' sovereignty or sovereignty status.

Again, I want to thank all of my partners.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), who is a tireless advocate for Native Americans and Native American housing.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I rise to support the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determined Reauthorization Act of 2014.

I want to begin by thanking my friend Mr. PEARCE. Nobody has worked harder on this legislation and, frankly, cared more and done more to make sure that a part of our population that historically has not done well, to say the least, has the opportunity to not only receive some benefits that are appropriately and rightfully theirs, but to take more control over their own destiny and their own housing. I think this legislation does just that.

I want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle. I see my good friend from Wisconsin over there who, we worked together on VAWA. I know what her commitment is on Native American issues, and I appreciate that very, very much.

This legislation provides Native American tribes with much greater efficiencies when deploying NAHASDA funding. We all know government, however well intentioned, quite often is a pretty clumsy and pretty bureaucratic instrument. Consolidating the environmental review requirements, requiring the HUD Secretary to study and recommend to Congress standards to streamline the construction of Indian housing, recommendations for HUD to establish alternative reporting requirements for tribes, these are all good things that will speed the development of housing and allow tribes to deploy their funds more efficiently.

There is also legislation in here to deal with taxpayer protections and tribal accountability to make sure the HUD Secretary has the authority to recoup unexpended funds that are held for too long; it strengthens tribal flexibility and sovereignty; and, finally, it allows tribes to pursue alternative funding sources by encouraging private investment, something that is desperately needed.

I know, and happened to come in the last part of the debate, there was some discussion about the Cherokee Freedmen issue. That is an issue I know a fair amount about since the tribe is located in my home State of Oklahoma. I want to agree with Ms. MOORE that we do have a chief, Chief Baker, who is extremely concerned about this issue and is trying to work it through.

The bill itself, the language, is really just an update from what we did in 2008. We are trying to allow the courts and the tribe to solve the issue. I think they genuinely have made progress that the people here that have had legitimate concerns about this issue can be proud of. I think they will continue to do that. But there is no substantive change in what my friend Mr. PEARCE has brought forward and what existing law was in this area.

I just want to end once more by thanking my friend Mr. PEARCE. Frankly, this bill would not have been on this floor without his diligent work. I certainly want to thank Mr. HENSARLING for working with my friend Mr. PEARCE, and I want to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle who also have focused a great deal of attention and concern on this issue to try and make sure that the first Americans aren't the last Americans in almost every category. So, again, I thank my friends, and I look forward to the passage of this legislation.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and, again, appreciate his leadership.

As you have heard, there is no shortage of debate on the bill, but there is also no shortage of people coming together and saying let's pass this bill.

I listened with interest to the ranking member. The points that she made today were made during the markup, and, again, I appreciate and respect that and have not set those concerns off on the side. It was absolutely essential that we move the bill forward in order to get this passed in this session, so I appreciate all of the support from our partners across the aisle.

This support that you are hearing from Native Americans across the country from people in this Chamber is no coincidence. It comes from hard work, and that hard work has come from both sides of the aisle, but especially from Ms. MOORE, Mr. HECK, Mr. KILDEE, and, again, Ms. WATERS. So

thank you all for that dedicated effort. On our side, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COLE, and Mr. HENSARLING have been just vital in getting this kind of pulled together in a fashion that we could bring it here today on suspension.

For the past 2 years, my office and I have worked with countless tribal leaders and housing associations nationwide; we have worked with other Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle; we have worked with HUD and the administration—all for one end result, and that is to create greater prosperity for Native Americans. It is that simple.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 4329 because it does so much to accomplish this goal. For generations, prosperity and growth have evaded many Native American communities. NAHASDA is not designed as an entitlement but, rather, as a tool of empowerment and growth. To date, each reauthorization has built upon the past to make alterations and updates designed to provide greater autonomy and prosperity on tribal lands. H.R. 4329 is no exception.

I ask that you join me today in reauthorizing this commonsense yet transformative legislation, which will help millions realize the dream of prosperity. Vote "yes" and help break a perpetual cycle of poverty through self-determination and independence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4329, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE EFFICIENCY ACT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2790) to authorize private nonprofit organizations to administer permanent housing rental assistance provided through the Continuum of Care Program under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2790

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Housing Assistance Efficiency Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO ADMINISTER RENTAL ASSISTANCE.

Subsection (g) of section 423 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42

U.S.C. 11383(g)) is amended by inserting “private nonprofit organization,” after “unit of general local government.”.

SEC. 3. REALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

Paragraph (1) of section 414(d) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11373(d)(1)) is amended by striking “twice” and inserting “once”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 2790, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Housing Assistance Efficiency Act was introduced by SCOTT PETERS in July of 2013 as a technical correction to the 2009 HEARTH Act amendments to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. Changes include restoring nonprofit organizations' ability to administer rental assistance programs, as well as alter the way in which HUD reallocates funds.

Originally enacted in 1987 as the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, this legislation created a number of new programs to assist homeless Americans' needs, including food, shelter, health care, and education.

Since 1987, it has twice been reauthorized. In 2000, it came to be known as the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, with updates including the creation of the HUD Homeless Assistance Grants, the Department of Labor Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program, and others. In 2009, the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing, the HEARTH Act, amended McKinney-Vento Homeless to combine the Shelter Plus Care and the Supportive Housing Programs into a single, competitive program.

Supported by HUD and the administration, the bill before us today will correct unintended consequences created by the HEARTH Act by allowing existing nonprofits that operate CoC programs for leased housing to homeless families and individuals to continue to manage their McKinney-Vento grants as rental assistance.

It restores nonprofit participation and maximum community flexibility by delegating authority to these institutions to administer rental assistance. It allows Innovation of Promising

Practices. Providing nonprofits with administration of rental assistance will allow these groups to implement new housing practices, which would better assist the communities they are in. It reduces administrative work by allowing reallocation to occur once a year instead of semiannually.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I really rise to congratulate and thank the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) for championing this bill and bringing to our attention a real tremendous cost savings in this HUD program with H.R. 2790, and really providing, using the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to provide services to the homeless rather than just additional legal fees, operating costs, additional insurance issues, establishing new internal controls and tracking systems. This is really innovative in terms of how it maximizes the McKinney-Vento moneys. The bill does not include more money, Mr. Speaker. It just allows us to use the small “c” that we have more effectively.

I yield as much time as he might consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS), the author of H.R. 2790.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, many laws are intended to ensure efficiency in Federal agencies but often have unintended consequences, preventing agencies from serving the public and costing taxpayer money. Currently, the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Continuum of Care Program spends too much time fulfilling administrative obligations instead of helping individuals and families transition out of homelessness and putting them on a path to independent living.

Twice a fiscal year, HUD has to reallocate emergency solutions grant program funds that are unused, returned, or otherwise become available in the program, but because almost no funds are unused or become available under the program, the reallocation of funds takes a lot of time and unwarranted human capital to complete.

It is administratively more efficient to reallocate funds only once a year. This frees up HUD employees to provide more human resources toward providing better service to constituents, and we shouldn't saddle HUD with more administrative work that isn't helping anyone.

In addition to mandatory fund allocations, HUD also faces a mountain of paperwork when it comes to administering rental assistance. Prior to 2009, private nonprofits could administer rental assistance through HUD's Continuum of Care. The HEARTH Act, however, obfuscated rental assistance laws, and private nonprofits were left

off the list of entities allowed to administer rental assistance.

Currently, only States, units of general local government, or public housing agencies can dispense housing assistance despite nonprofits' substantial experience and their ability to reach vulnerable populations. Private nonprofits can still execute other homelessness programs, but they have to go through public housing agencies or another layer of bureaucracy to get rental assistance to their clients or the landlord. This creates more bureaucratic burdens when individuals and families really need the help quickly to stay in their homes.

H.R. 2790, the Housing Assistance Efficiency Act, would remedy both these problems, would make HUD a more efficient agency and get homelessness assistance to those that need it more quickly. This is important in particular to San Diego. We have the third largest homeless population, and it is widely supported in my district and across the country.

I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

In their statement supporting this legislation, the San Diego Housing Federation said this bill removes barriers to helping get important resources to those who need it the most, and that is what it is all about.

So I urge my colleagues to help pass this legislation to take substantive action to improve government efficiency and help fight chronic homelessness in our country.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would again like to thank the gentleman for his hard work in this area and for bringing this bill forward.

We have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2790.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD WAR I AMERICAN VETERANS CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2366) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2366

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “World War I American Veterans Centennial Commemorative Coin Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The year 2018 is the 100th anniversary of the signing of the armistice with Germany ending World War I battlefield hostilities.

(2) On the 6th of April 1917, the United States of America entered World War I by declaring war against Germany.

(3) Two million American soldiers served overseas during World War I.

(4) More than four million men and women from the United States served in uniform during World War I.

(5) The events of 1914 through 1918 shaped the world and the lives of millions of people for decades.

(6) Over 9 million soldiers worldwide lost their lives between 1914 and 1918.

(7) The centennial of America’s involvement in World War I offers an opportunity for people in the United States to commemorate the commitment of their predecessors.

(8) Frank Buckles, the last American veteran from World War I died on February 27, 2011.

(9) He was our last direct American link to the “war to end all wars”.

(10) While other great conflicts, including the Civil War, World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War, have all been memorialized on United States commemorative coins, there currently exists no coin to honor the brave veterans of World War I.

(11) The 112th Congress established the World War I Centennial Commission to plan, develop, and execute programs, projects, and activities to commemorate the centennial of World War I.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to—

(1) commemorate the centennial of America’s involvement in World War I; and

(2) honor the over 4 million men and women from the United States who served during World War I.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) **\$1 SILVER COINS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 \$1 coins in commemoration of the centennial of America’s involvement in World War I, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 26.73 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches (38.1 millimeters); and

(3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(b) **LEGAL TENDER.**—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) **DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the centennial of America’s involvement in World War I.

(2) **DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.**—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year “2018”; and

(C) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(b) **SELECTION.**—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be selected by the Secretary based on the winning design from a juried, compensated design competition described under subsection (c).

(c) **DESIGN COMPETITION.**—The Secretary shall hold a competition and provide compensation for its winner to design the obverse and reverse of the coins minted under this Act. The competition shall be held in the following manner:

(1) The competition shall be judged by an expert jury chaired by the Secretary and consisting of 3 members from the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee who shall be elected by such Committee and 3 members from the Commission of Fine Arts who shall be elected by such Commission.

(2) The Secretary shall determine compensation for the winning design, which shall be not less than \$5,000.

(3) The Secretary may not accept a design for the competition unless a plaster model accompanies the design.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) **QUALITY OF COINS.**—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) **MINT FACILITY.**—Only one facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) **PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.**—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the calendar year beginning on January 1, 2018.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) **SALE PRICE.**—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins;

(2) the surcharge provided in section 7 with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) **BULK SALES.**—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) **PREPAID ORDERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) **DISCOUNT.**—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge of \$10 per coin.

(b) **DISTRIBUTION.**—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be paid by the Secretary to the United States Foundation for the Commemoration of the World Wars, to assist the World War I Centennial Commission in commemorating the centenary of World War I.

(c) **AUDITS.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall have the right to examine such books, records, documents, and other data of the United States Foundation for the Commemoration of the World Wars as may be related to the expenditures of amounts paid under subsection (b).

(d) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of com-

memorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code. The Secretary may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 2366, as amended, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a few short weeks ago, the world marked the 96th anniversary of the signing of the peace accords between the Allied Forces and Germany that ended what, at the time, was called the Great War. Sadly, it was only the first of what we now call World Wars because it was followed only two short decades later by the beginning of what became known as World War II.

That anniversary, which America today calls Veterans Day, was, for years, called Armistice Day, and it is still called that across Europe. Four years from now, November 11, 2018, will mark the signing of that armistice. It will be 100 years since the end of that ugly, bloody war that ushered in aerial warfare, chemical weapons, tanks, and a host of other horrors.

Mr. Speaker, in the ensuing century we have not managed to move past war, and it is well that we remember its costs. For that reason, I rise in strong support of this legislation before us, H.R. 2366, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) along with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

The World War I American Veterans Centennial Commemorative Coin Act calls for the Treasury Secretary to

mint and make available for sale no more than 350,000 silver coins in recognition of the centenary of the end of that war.

The veterans of the Great War are long gone, the last having died nearly 4 years ago. It is well that we remember, though, that nearly 4 million Americans, men and women, served in uniform during the First World War. Half of them served overseas, and some even volunteered to fight for other Allied armies even before the U.S. entered the war in April of 1917.

Of those 4 million veterans, even those who are not students of military history know some of the names, such as General John Joseph Pershing, known as "Black Jack" Pershing, who led the American Expeditionary Forces in that war and became the only general of the armies promoted to that rank while he was alive.

Sergeant Alvin York was perhaps the best known and most decorated soldier, winning a Medal of Honor for leading an attack on a nest of enemy machine guns at the height of the Meuse-Argonne battles in France, capturing 32 of them and 132 enemies while killing 28.

James Norman Hall, an Iowa youngster, went to France before the U.S. entered the war to fly with the American-staffed Lafayette Escadrille of the French Air Corps, and later drifted to the South Seas where he cowrote the "Mutiny on the Bounty" trilogy.

Mr. Speaker, the coins authorized by this legislation would be sold at a price that would recoup all costs to taxpayers. The sale price would include a surcharge that, after requirements for raising private matching funds are met, would support the work of the World War I Centennial Commission established by the 111th Congress to plan and execute activities marking the centennial of the war.

This legislation currently has 302 cosponsors, and a companion bill introduced by Senator BLUNT has 72.

Mr. Speaker, while not celebrating this or any other war, I urge Members to soberly reflect on the horrors and tragedy of this first global conflict and to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2366, the World War I American Veterans Centennial Commemorative Coin Act, introduced by Representative DOUG LAMBORN of Colorado's Fifth Congressional District, and seek its immediate passage.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, this summer marked the 100th anniversary of the start of World War I. The United States formally joined the war in April of 1917. During that time, more than 4.7 million Americans served, and of those brave men and women, more than 116,000 soldiers made the ultimate sacrifice.

While other great conflicts, including the Civil War, World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war, have all been memorialized on United States commemorative coins, there currently exists no coin to honor the brave veterans of World War I. This bill would honor their service by directing the Secretary of the Treasury to, number one, hold a competition to design the coins and, number two, mint and issue \$1 silver coins in commemoration of the centennial of America's involvement in World War I.

The sale of the coins will assist the World War I Centennial Commission in raising funds that will be utilized in commemorating U.S. involvement in the Great War and educating a new generation of Americans about the role the United States assumed in that war.

I am also pleased to report that the passage of this bill entails no net cost to taxpayers.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in passing this commonsense, bipartisan bill without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague from the State of New Mexico for his leadership.

I rise in support of H.R. 2366, which I introduced with the help of my colleague, Representative EMANUEL CLEAVER, which would require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

The year 2018 will be the 100th anniversary of the signing of the armistice with Germany, marking the end of battlefield hostilities in World War I. During the war, more than 4 million men and women from the United States served in uniform, and more than 100,000 gave their lives.

To honor their service and sacrifices, Congress created the World War I Centennial Commission in 2013 and tasked them with planning and executing activities to commemorate the centennial of World War I through the use of private donations and coin sales.

By requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins to commemorate this centennial, this bill would allow us to honor the memory, service, and sacrifices of the brave veterans of World War I, while also providing the means to pay tribute to the end of World War I battlefield hostilities.

Other great conflicts, including the Civil War, World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war, have all been memorialized on United States commemorative coins, but no such honor has been extended to the brave veterans of World War I. This year, 2014, as has been said, is the 100th anni-

versary of the start of World War I, making it a very fitting tribute that we pass the measure for this year.

It is my pleasure to offer H.R. 2366. I am grateful for the opportunity to work with both Representative EMANUEL CLEAVER and Senator ROY BLUNT on this important bill. Together, we have gathered 300 cosponsors in the House for this patriotic bill. It will not cost the U.S. Treasury anything, as has been said, but, on a voluntary basis, will actually raise money.

It is no coincidence that Representatives and Senators from the State of Missouri are helping on this effort. There is a wonderful memorial to World War I in Kansas City, Missouri, with an adjoining museum that is a world-class museum. For those who haven't had the opportunity to visit that museum and learn about this chapter in our Nation's history, I would strongly urge them to do so.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING and the Financial Services Committee for their support of this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the brave veterans of World War I by supporting this bill.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE.

□ 1515

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, it was called the "War to End All Wars." It began 100 years ago, and after 3 years, World War I was a bloody stalemate.

Then the American doughboys entered the bloody trenches of Europe, and the tenacious teenagers went over there to a land they had never seen fighting for people they did not know. But soon after, the war turned in the favor of the Allies, and the war was over.

Allied victory was declared in 1918. Millions and millions of people throughout the world had died. 116,000 Americans died. Many more thousands died when they came back to America from the Spanish flu that they got while they were overseas.

The last surviving World War I veteran was Frank Buckles. This is a photograph of him shortly before his death. I got to know Frank Buckles before he died at the age of 110. Like I said, he was the last surviving World War I veteran from America.

He lied to get into the United States Army. He was probably 15. He convinced some Army recruiter that he was 21, and they signed him up. He served in World War I.

After World War I was over with, World War II started, and he found himself in the Philippines. He was captured by the Japanese and put in a prisoner-of-war camp until World War II was over.

But he came to the United States Capitol and met with many Members of

the House and Senate for the sole purpose of making sure that those doughboys he fought with and who died were remembered by the United States Congress. His dying wish was that those he served with would be honored by the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The proceeds from the sale of the coins will be used for the World War I Commission to help commemorate the sacrifices of those warriors. I was privileged to be appointed as an original member of the World War I Commission and still serve on the World War I Foundation.

I want to thank Congressman CLEAVER from Missouri for all the work he has done to remember those doughboys, not only in this specific bill of getting this coin act passed but the original commission that he worked on to make sure that we, as an American Nation, remembered them.

I appreciate the work that the gentleman does in Kansas City with the first-class memorial that we have to honor those World War I veterans.

Mr. Speaker, all those that served, every one of them that served in World War I, they are all gone. There are none left. Frank Buckles was the last one.

But the United States World War I Commission will make sure we Americans remember and honor them, for the worst casualty of war is to be forgotten.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

First of all, thanks to Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. LAMBORN for bringing this bill to the floor today. Thanks for your dedicated work on that.

Thanks to Mr. POE. Around here we just simply know him as "Judge," but thanks for his poignant comments.

As a Vietnam veteran returning to the United States in the 1973 era, I found a Nation that was disrespectful to young men and women who had served, myself included. I took my uniform off and put it in a closet, never to pull it out until I ran for Congress and people began to ask why I didn't tell about the military story.

That is a condition and a mindset that no matter how you are registered, no matter what culture you are in, what race, what religion, we must never let this happen again. We must be willing to sacrifice for those who have sacrificed for us and those who have been willing to make the sacrifice.

My grandfather was in World War I. As I was approaching my time to go to Vietnam, he visited with me about being in the Argonne Forest and about being gassed there. It left him with a lung condition and frailty throughout the rest of his life. But he never was sorry for serving, never was sorry for those things that had happened to him.

It is young men and women who are willing to do anything for others' freedom that we are honoring here today. And again, I would urge all to support this legislation. It is a noble concept and a noble tradition of remembering those who have served this country in the military.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2366, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DISCLOSURE MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4569) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4569

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. SUMMARY PAGE FOR FORM 10-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue regulations to permit issuers to submit a summary page on form 10-K (17 C.F.R. 249.310), but only if each item on such summary page includes a cross-reference (by electronic link or otherwise) to the material contained in form 10-K to which such item relates.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENT OF REGULATION S-K.

Not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall take all such actions to revise regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.)—

(1) to further scale or eliminate requirements of regulation S-K, in order to reduce the burden on emerging growth companies, accelerated filers, smaller reporting companies, and other smaller issuers, while still providing all material information to investors;

(2) to eliminate provisions of regulation S-K, required for all issuers, that are duplicative, overlapping, outdated, or unnecessary; and

(3) for which the Commission determines that no further study under section 4 is nec-

essary to determine the efficacy of such revisions to regulation S-K.

SEC. 4. STUDY ON MODERNIZATION AND SIMPLIFICATION OF REGULATION S-K.

(a) STUDY.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall carry out a study of the requirements contained in regulation S-K (17 C.F.R. 229.10 et seq.). Such study shall—

(1) determine how best to modernize and simplify such requirements in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on issuers while still providing all material information;

(2) emphasize a company by company approach that allows relevant and material information to be disseminated to investors without boilerplate language or static requirements while preserving completeness and comparability of information across registrants; and

(3) evaluate methods of information delivery and presentation and explore methods for discouraging repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Commission shall consult with the Investor Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing—

(1) all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a);

(2) specific and detailed recommendations on modernizing and simplifying the requirements in regulation S-K in a manner that reduces the costs and burdens on companies while still providing all material information; and

(3) specific and detailed recommendations on ways to improve the readability and navigability of disclosure documents and to discourage repetition and the disclosure of immaterial information.

(d) RULEMAKING.—Not later than the end of the 360-day period beginning on the date that the report is issued to the Congress under subsection (c), the Commission shall issue a proposed rule to implement the recommendations of the report issued under subsection (c).

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Revisions made to regulation S-K by the Commission under section 3 shall not be construed as satisfying the rulemaking requirements under this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 4569, as amended, that is currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise now in support of H.R. 4569, which is the Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act of 2014. Having access to the U.S. capital markets and the broad investor base that comes with it is vital—literally vital—for U.S. companies to be able to grow their businesses and create jobs in this country.

Over time, as our securities laws have continued to grow and evolve, the number of new SEC rules and regulations that have been weighing down on public companies continue now to multiply, and it is becoming more and more difficult and costly for small businesses to succeed and eventually go public.

Many of the disclosure rules that have been added over time are both duplicative and are no longer needed due to many technological advancements that we are all familiar with. And yet the SEC has taken little action to review these unnecessary and outdated regulations and to make appropriate changes to help U.S. companies and also investors.

So we have H.R. 4569 before us, and it seeks to do what? It removes some of the outdated and unnecessary red tape and allows for the small companies and investors to benefit from a more streamlined and efficient public disclosure regime.

Specifically, the legislation would direct the SEC to simplify the public company disclosure regime for issuers and investors by permitting the issuers to submit a summary page of annual reports on Form 10-Ks with cross references to the contents of the report. It is that simple.

Because the typical 10-K filed by issuers is hundreds of pages long and written in legalese, investors do find it difficult to locate and to digest the truly important information about the company in the report. So permitting issuers to submit a summary page would enable companies to concisely disclose pertinent information to investors without exposing them to liability.

This summary page would also enable investors to more easily access the most relevant information about that company.

This legislation would also direct the SEC to revise Regulation S-K—"Reg S-K," it is called—to better scale disclosure rules for emerging growth companies and smaller issuers, and to eliminate other duplicative, outdated, or unnecessary Reg S-K disclosure rules for all issuers.

In testimony before the Capital Markets Subcommittee, one witness stated: "The burdens imposed by existing regulation, primarily Reg S-K and Reg S-X, effectively deny small companies access to the public market and make investors less willing to invest."

He added: "This bill, H.R. 4569, is very constructive, and the Commission

is likely to be receptive to it. It might well launch a process that would substantially reduce unneeded impediments to smaller firms being able to access the public capital markets."

Additionally, another commenter testified:

Over the course of time, proxies have become voluminous, some required disclosures have become obsolete, and the delivery of information has changed, though the legal mandated forms of disclosure have not.

This situation has commonly been referred to as "disclosure overload" and it is apparent that investors are not being given information in a decision-useful manner and, in some cases, they are simply overwhelmed with non-relevant information.

Even SEC Chair Mary Jo White has, on several occasions, stated that a review of our current disclosure system is a top priority for the Commission this year. So this bill would help augment the SEC's effort by requiring the Commission to, first, eliminate wholly unnecessary or outdated disclosure requirements and to allow issuers to include a summary of material in the form 10-K.

So this legislation builds on section 108 of the Jumpstart Our Business Startups bill—you remember that, the JOBS Act—which directed the SEC to study Reg S-K in order to simplify and modernize disclosure rules. The SEC completed the study in December of 2013. Unfortunately, the study proposed few substantive reform measures. Instead, it recommended further study of Reg S-K disclosure rules.

Let me conclude with this. Given our continued economic difficulties, I believe we need to stop studying and start taking action. Simplifying and streamlining disclosure requirements will enable companies to divert fewer resources to compliance, freeing up additional capital to create American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of Mr. GARRETT's bill, H.R. 4569, which was favorably reported from the House Financial Services Committee, and championed by my friend from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

I would like to associate myself with the long and extended explanation by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and just to say, Mr. Speaker, that, in short, this bill will make disclosures that public companies make more streamlined, manageable, and user friendly.

I really appreciate the participation of my good friend, Representative MALONEY, who really worked hard to make sure that this legislation was balanced and it included language to emphasize that we needed to reduce burdens on companies, but we need to preserve investment protection.

So, given the changes that Mrs. MALONEY made with the Maloney amendment, I strongly support the legislation, would urge all my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for her assistance in this matter.

Also, you made reference to Mrs. MALONEY from New York for her work as well. She is not on the floor right now, but I certainly do appreciate her efforts with the legislation and in full committee and in subcommittee as well in order to move forward on this piece of legislation before the House, H.R. 4569.

And to your comment about perhaps I should have taken the substance of the bill to heart, I did streamline the 10 pages down to four pages to make it not duplicative, unnecessary, and outdated information.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his hard work on this bill. I did want to come to the floor and support it because it is one of the areas where we did work together in a positive way.

I would like to also take this opportunity to congratulate him on being reappointed as chairman of the Capital Markets Committee on which I serve. And I look forward to working with you in the next Congress.

When the Financial Services Committee marked up the JOBS Act in 2012, Mr. GARRETT included an amendment requiring the SEC to conduct a study on how to modernize and simplify the disclosure process for emerging growth companies.

The SEC published that study last December, and while the study failed to make any specific recommendations on how to streamline the disclosure process, it did provide, I thought, a very fascinating history of all the different efforts to simplify registration and disclosure processes, especially for smaller companies, which is a concern for many Members of this Congress who want to relieve the regulatory burden on particularly smaller companies.

□ 1530

For example, here are some of the studies that they did: the SEC's 1969 Disclosure Policy Study; the 1977 Advisory Committee on Corporate Disclosure; the simplified Form S-18 for small companies in 1979; a new simplified Form S-B in 1992; the 1996 Task Force on Disclosure Simplification; the 2005 Advisory Committee on Smaller Public Companies; the Advisory Committee on Improvements to Financial Reporting in 2007; and, most recently, the Advisory Committee on Small and Emerging Companies.

What this history demonstrates is that the process of scaling and streamlining the reporting requirements for smaller companies is something that we all need to focus on in order to keep pace with the ever-evolving marketplace, and it is one that historically

has been revisited every 7 to 10 years. It requires strong oversight by the SEC and also by Congress.

I believe that now is an excellent time for the SEC to revisit the disclosure requirements for smaller companies and to figure out how to best modernize these requirements. This bill directs the SEC to build on its 2013 study by making immediate improvements to reg S-K in the short term and then by making specific and detailed recommendations on how to simplify and modernize reg S-K in the long term.

We were able to work in a bipartisan manner on this bill to clarify that any revisions the SEC makes should reduce burdens on small businesses, while also ensuring that investors still have access to all important information.

This bill will ensure that the SEC properly tailors its regulations to the needs of small businesses and doesn't get caught up in a one-size-fits-all reaction. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman for her efforts.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Disclosure Modernization and Simplification Act of 2014.

For far too long, our economy has remained weak, and small businesses and wage earners have suffered greatly. Part of the reason they have suffered is from too many regulations and from an increase in red tape from Federal Government agencies, which has hindered growth and kept businesses from expanding. They also present big challenges for startup companies that are looking to gain solid footing in this shaky economy.

If we are going to move this country in the right direction, we need to make it easier and not harder for Americans to do business. The least we can do in Washington is to make sure Federal regulators do not force business managers to report the same information over and over. That is what this act is all about.

This legislation, along with others we will consider today, will help remove the Federal Government from the backs of small business owners and make it easier for all Americans to succeed.

It will revise regulations to include startup companies, to eliminate redundant and duplicative provisions, and to discourage the disclosure of immaterial information, among other simplifications. Now is the time to remove these roadblocks on the pathway to success.

The American people are looking for us to ease some of these painful economic burdens, and today, we have an opportunity to support legislation that will have a positive impact on our

economy, that which limits the challenges on small business owners and job creators.

Let's work together in this Chamber and pass this series of bills in a bipartisan fashion. Let's show our constituents that we are serious about recharging our economic engine by pursuing commonsense regulatory reforms.

I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING, Representative GARRETT, Representative HURT, and the rest of the members of the Financial Services Committee, who worked hard on this issue. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. GARRETT. I appreciate the gentleman's coming to the floor. More importantly, I appreciate the gentleman's efforts and hard work on this legislation in committee. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4569, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5739, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3240, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2366, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NO SOCIAL SECURITY FOR NAZIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5739) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—420

Adams	Denham	Johnson, E. B.
Amash	Dent	Johnson, Sam
Amodei	DeSantis	Jolly
Bachmann	DesJarlais	Jones
Bachus	Deutch	Jordan
Barber	Diaz-Balart	Joyce
Barletta	Dingell	Kaptur
Barr	Doggett	Keating
Barrow (GA)	Duffy	Kelly (IL)
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Bass	Duncan (TN)	Kennedy
Beatty	Edwards	Kildee
Becerra	Ellison	Kilmer
Benishek	Ellmers	Kind
Bentivolio	Engel	King (IA)
Bera (CA)	Enyart	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Kingston
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Kinzinger (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Farenthold	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Farr	Kline
Black	Fattah	Kuster
Blackburn	Fincher	Labrador
Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Bonamici	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Boustany	Fleming	Lance
Brady (PA)	Flores	Langevin
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Lankford
Braley (IA)	Fortenberry	Larsen (WA)
Brat	Foster	Larson (CT)
Bridenstine	Foxo	Latham
Brooks (AL)	Frankel (FL)	Latta
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Lee (CA)
Broun (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Levin
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Lewis
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Buchanan	Galleo	LoBiondo
Bucshon	Garamendi	Loebach
Burgess	Garcia	Lofgren
Bustos	Gardner	Long
Butterfield	Garrett	Lowe
Byrne	Gerlach	Lucas
Calvert	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Camp	Gibson	Lujan Grisham
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	(NM)
Capito	Gohmert	Lujan, Ben Ray
Capps	Goodlatte	(NM)
Cárdenas	Gosar	Lummis
Carney	Gowdy	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Granger	Maffei
Carter	Graves (GA)	Maloney,
Cartwright	Graves (MO)	Carolyn
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Marchant
Chabot	Green, Gene	Marino
Chaffetz	Griffin (AR)	Massie
Chu	Griffith (VA)	Matheson
Cicilline	Grijalva	Matsui
Clark (MA)	Grimm	McAllister
Clarke (NY)	Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)
Clawson (FL)	Gutiérrez	McCauley
Clay	Hahn	McClintock
Cleaver	Hanabusa	McCollum
Clyburn	Hanna	McDermott
Coble	Harper	McGovern
Coffman	Harris	McHenry
Cohen	Hartzer	McIntyre
Cole	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Collins (GA)	Hastings (WA)	McKinley
Collins (NY)	Heck (NV)	McMorris
Conaway	Heck (WA)	Rodgers
Connolly	Hensarling	McNerney
Conyers	Herrera Beutler	Meadows
Cook	Higgins	Meehan
Cooper	Himes	Meeks
Costa	Hinojosa	Meng
Cotton	Holding	Messer
Courtney	Honda	Mica
Cramer	Horsford	Michaud
Crawford	Hoyer	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Hudson	Miller (MI)
Crowley	Huelskamp	Miller, George
Cuellar	Huffman	Moore
Culberson	Huizenga (MI)	Moran
Cummings	Hultgren	Mullin
Daines	Hunter	Mulvaney
Davis (CA)	Hurt	Murphy (FL)
Davis, Danny	Israel	Murphy (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Nadler
DeFazio	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
DeGette	Jeffries	Neal
Delaney	Jenkins	Neugebauer
DeLauro	Johnson (GA)	Noem
DelBene	Johnson (OH)	Nolan

Norcross	Ross	Swalwell (CA)	[Roll No. 538]	Nolan	Roskam	Swalwell (CA)
Nugent	Rothfus	Takano	YEAS—422	Norcross	Ross	Takano
Nunes	Roybal-Allard	Terry		Nugent	Rothfus	Terry
Nunnelee	Royce	Thompson (CA)	Adams	Nunes	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)	Amash	Nunnelee	Royce	Thompson (MS)
Olson	Runyan	Thompson (PA)	Amodei	O'Rourke	Ruiz	Thompson (PA)
Owens	Ruppersberger	Thornberry	Bachmann	Olson	Runyan	Thornberry
Palazzo	Rush	Tiberi	Bachus	Owens	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Pallone	Ryan (OH)	Tierney	Barber	Palazzo	Rush	Tierney
Pascrell	Ryan (WI)	Tipton	Barletta	Pallone	Ryan (OH)	Tipton
Pastor (AZ)	Salmon	Titus	Barr	Pascrell	Ryan (WI)	Titus
Paulsen	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko	Barrow (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Salmon	Tonko
Payne	T.	Tsongas	Barton	Paulsen	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas
Pearce	Sanchez, Loretta	Turner	Bass	Payne	T.	Turner
Pelosi	Sanford	Upton	Beatty	Pearce	Sanchez, Loretta	Upton
Perry	Sarbanes	Valadao	Becerra	Pelosi	Sanford	Valadao
Peters (CA)	Scalise	Van Hollen	Benisek	Perry	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Peters (MI)	Schakowsky	Vargas	Bentivolio	Peters (CA)	Scalise	Vargas
Peterson	Schiff	Veasey	Bera (CA)	Peters (MI)	Schakowsky	Veasey
Petri	Schneider	Vela	Bilirakis	Peterson	Schiff	Vela
Pingree (ME)	Schock	Velázquez	Bishop (GA)	Petri	Schneider	Velázquez
Pittenger	Schwartz	Visclosky	Bishop (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Schock	Visclosky
Pitts	Schweikert	Wagner	Bishop (UT)	Pittenger	Schwartz	Wagner
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Walberg	Black	Pitts	Schweikert	Walberg
Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Walden	Blackburn	Pocan	Scott (VA)	Walden
Polis	Scott, David	Walorski	Blumenauer	Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Pompeo	Sensenbrenner	Walz	Bonamici	Polis	Scott, David	Walz
Posey	Serrano	Wasserman	Boustany	Pompeo	Sensenbrenner	Wasserman
Price (GA)	Sessions	Schultz	Brady (PA)	Posey	Serrano	Schultz
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Waters	Brady (TX)	Price (GA)	Sessions	Waters
Quigley	Shea-Porter	Waxman	Brady (IA)	Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Waxman
Rahall	Sherman	Weber (TX)	Brat	Quigley	Shea-Porter	Weber (TX)
Rangel	Shimkus	Webster (FL)	Bridenstine	Rahall	Sherman	Webster (FL)
Reed	Shuster	Welch	Brooks (AL)	Rangel	Shimkus	Welch
Reichert	Simpson	Wenstrup	Brooks (IN)	Reed	Shuster	Wenstrup
Renacci	Sinema	Westmoreland	Broun (GA)	Reichert	Simpson	Westmoreland
Ribble	Sires	Whitfield	Brown (FL)	Renacci	Sinema	Whitfield
Rice (SC)	Slaughter	Williams	Brownley (CA)	Ribble	Sires	Williams
Richmond	Smith (MO)	Wilson (FL)	Buchanan	Rice (SC)	Slaughter	Wilson (FL)
Rigell	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)	Bucshon	Richmond	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Roby	Smith (NJ)	Wittman	Burgess	Rigell	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Roe (TN)	Smith (TX)	Wolf	Bustos	Roby	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rogers (AL)	Smith (WA)	Womack	Butterfield	Roe (TN)	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Southerland	Woodall	Byrne	Rogers (AL)	Smith (WA)	Womack
Rohrabacher	Speier	Yarmuth	Calvert	Rogers (KY)	Southerland	Woodall
Rokita	Stewart	Yoder	Camp	Rohrabacher	Speier	Yarmuth
Rooney	Stivers	Yoho	Campbell	Rokita	Stewart	Yoder
Ros-Lehtinen	Stockman	Young (AK)	Capito	Rooney	Stivers	Yoho
Roskam	Stutzman	Young (IN)	Capps	Ros-Lehtinen	Stockman	Young (AK)
			Cárdenas		Stutzman	Young (IN)
			Carney			

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt	Hall	Negrete McLeod
Capuano	Holt	Perlmutter
Cassidy	Lowenthal	Rogers (MI)
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader
Duckworth	Miller, Gary	

□ 1603

Mr. MCNERNEY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION D STUDY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3240) to instruct the Comptroller General of the United States to study the impact of Regulation D, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

Adams	Denham	Johnson (OH)
Amash	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Amodei	DeSantis	Johnson, Sam
Bachmann	DesJarlais	Jolly
Bachus	Deutch	Jones
Barber	Diaz-Balart	Jordan
Barletta	Dingell	Joyce
Barr	Doggett	Kaptur
Barrow (GA)	Duffy	Keating
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (IL)
Bass	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)
Beatty	Edwards	Kennedy
Becerra	Ellison	Kildee
Benisek	Ellmers	Kilmer
Bentivolio	Engel	Kind
Bera (CA)	Enyart	King (IA)
Bilirakis	Eshoo	King (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Kingston
Bishop (NY)	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Farr	Kirkpatrick
Black	Fattah	Kline
Blackburn	Fincher	Kuster
Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bonamici	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Boustany	Fleming	Lamborn
Brady (PA)	Lance	Lance
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Langevin
Braley (IA)	Fortenberry	Lankford
Brat	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Bridenstine	Fox	Larson (CT)
Brooks (AL)	Frankel (FL)	Latham
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Broun (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Lee (CA)
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Levin
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Lewis
Buchanan	Gallego	Lipinski
Bucshon	Garamendi	LoBiondo
Burgess	Garcia	Loeb
Bustos	Gardner	Loeb
Butterfield	Garrett	Lofgren
Byrne	Gerlach	Long
Calvert	Gibbs	Lowenthal
Camp	Gibson	Lowey
Campbell	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Capito	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Capps	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham
Cárdenas	Gosar	(NM)
Carney	Gowdy	Luján, Ben Ray
Carson (IN)	Granger	(NM)
Carter	Graves (GA)	Lummis
Cartwright	Graves (MO)	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Maffei
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Maloney,
Chabot	Green, Gene	Carolyn
Chaffetz	Griffin (AR)	Maloney, Sean
Chu	Griffith (VA)	Marchant
Cicilline	Grijalva	Marino
Clark (MA)	Grimm	Massie
Clarke (NY)	Guthrie	Matheson
Clawson (FL)	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Clay	Hahn	McAllister
Cleaver	Hanabusa	McCarthy (CA)
Clyburn	Hanna	McCauley
Coble	Harper	McClintock
Coffman	Harris	McCollum
Cohen	Hartzler	McGovern
Cole	Hastings (FL)	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Collins (NY)	Heck (NV)	McKeon
Conaway	Heck (WA)	McKinley
Connolly	Hensarling	McMorris
Conyers	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers
Cook	Higgins	McNerney
Cooper	Himes	Meadows
Costa	Hinojosa	Meehan
Cotton	Holding	Meeks
Courtney	Holt	Meng
Cramer	Honda	Messer
Crawford	Horsford	Mica
Crenshaw	Hoyer	Michaud
Crowley	Hudson	Miller (FL)
Cuellar	Huelskamp	Miller (MI)
Culberson	Huffman	Miller, George
Cummings	Huizenga (MI)	Moore
Daines	Hultgren	Moran
Davis (CA)	Hunter	Mullin
Davis, Danny	Hurt	Mulvaney
Davis, Rodney	Israel	Murphy (FL)
DeFazio	Issa	Murphy (PA)
DeGette	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Delaney	Jeffries	Napolitano
DeLauro	Jenkins	Neal
DelBene	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer
		Noem

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Duckworth	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Hall	Negrete McLeod
Cassidy	McCarthy (NY)	Perlmutter
Doyle	McDermott	Schrader

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1610

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD WAR I AMERICAN VETERANS CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2366) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 3, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

YEAS—418

Adams	DeGette	Huizenga (MI)
Amodei	Delaney	Hultgren
Bachmann	DeLauro	Hunter
Bachus	DelBene	Hurt
Barber	Denham	Israel
Barletta	Dent	Issa
Barr	DeSantis	Jefferson Lee
Barrow (GA)	DesJarlais	Jeffries
Barton	Deutch	Jenkins
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)
Beatty	Dingell	Johnson (OH)
Becerra	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Benishek	Duffy	Johnson, Sam
Bentivolio	Duncan (SC)	Jolly
Bera (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Jones
Bilirakis	Edwards	Jordan
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Joyce
Bishop (NY)	Ellmers	Kaptur
Bishop (UT)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Black	Enyart	Kelly (PA)
Blackburn	Eshoo	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Esty	Kildee
Bonamici	Farenthold	Kilmer
Boustany	Farr	Kind
Brady (PA)	Fattah	King (IA)
Brady (TX)	Fincher	King (NY)
Braley (IA)	Fitzpatrick	Kingston
Brat	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Bridenstine	Fleming	Kirkpatrick
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Kline
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Kuster
Brown (FL)	Fortenberry	Labrador
Brownley (CA)	Foster	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Fox	Lamborn
Bucshon	Frankel (FL)	Lance
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Langevin
Bustos	Frelinghuysen	Lankford
Butterfield	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Byrne	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Calvert	Gallego	Latham
Camp	Garamendi	Latta
Campbell	Garcia	Lee (CA)
Capito	Gardner	Levin
Capps	Garrett	Lewis
Cárdenas	Gerlach	Lipinski
Carney	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Carson (IN)	Gibson	Loeb
Carter	Gingrey (GA)	Lofgren
Cartwright	Gohmert	Long
Castor (FL)	Goodlatte	Lowenthal
Castro (TX)	Gosar	Lowe
Chabot	Gowdy	Lucas
Chaffetz	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Chu	Graves (GA)	Lujan Grisham
Cicilline	Graves (MO)	(NM)
Clark (MA)	Grayson	Lujan, Ben Ray
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	(NM)
Clawson (FL)	Green, Gene	Lummis
Clay	Griffin (AR)	Lynch
Cleaver	Griffith (VA)	Maffei
Clyburn	Grijalva	Maloney,
Coble	Grimm	Carolyn
Coffman	Guthrie	Maloney, Sean
Cohen	Gutiérrez	Marchant
Cole	Hahn	Marino
Collins (GA)	Hanabusa	Matheson
Collins (NY)	Hanna	Matsui
Conaway	Harper	McAllister
Connolly	Harris	McCarthy (CA)
Conyers	Hartzler	McCaul
Cook	Hastings (FL)	McClintock
Cooper	Hastings (WA)	McCollum
Costa	Heck (NV)	McDermott
Cotton	Heck (WA)	McGovern
Courtney	Hensarling	McHenry
Cramer	Herrera Beutler	McIntyre
Crawford	Higgins	McKeon
Crenshaw	Himes	McKinley
Crowley	Hinojosa	McMorris
Cuellar	Holding	Rodgers
Culberson	Holt	McNerney
Cummings	Honda	Meadows
Daines	Horsford	Meehan
Davis (CA)	Hoyer	Meeks
Davis, Danny	Hudson	Meng
Davis, Rodney	Huelskamp	Messer
DeFazio	Huffman	Mica

Michaud	Roe (TN)	Stewart
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Stivers
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Stockman
Moore	Rogers (MI)	Stutzman
Moran	Rohrabacher	Swalwell (CA)
Mullin	Rokita	Takano
Mulvaney	Rooney	Terry
Murphy (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (PA)	Roskam	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Ross	Thompson (PA)
Napolitano	Rothfus	Thornberry
Neal	Roybal-Allard	Tiberi
Neugebauer	Royce	Tierney
Noem	Ruiz	Tipton
Nolan	Runyan	Titus
Norcross	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Nugent	Rush	Tsongas
Nunes	Ryan (OH)	Turner
Nunnelee	Ryan (WI)	Upton
O'Rourke	Salmon	Valadao
Olson	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Owens	T.	Vargas
Palazzo	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Pallone	Sanford	Vela
Pascarell	Sarbanes	Velázquez
Pastor (AZ)	Scalise	Visclosky
Paulsen	Schakowsky	Wagner
Payne	Schiff	Walberg
Pearce	Schneider	Walden
Pelosi	Schock	Walorski
Perry	Schwartz	Walz
Peters (CA)	Schweikert	Wasserman
Peters (MI)	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Peterson	Scott, Austin	Waters
Petri	Scott, David	Waxman
Pingree (ME)	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Pittenger	Serrano	Webster (FL)
Pitts	Sessions	Welch
Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Wenstrup
Poe (TX)	Shea-Porter	Westmoreland
Polis	Sherman	Whitfield
Pompeo	Shinkus	Williams
Posey	Shuster	Wilson (FL)
Price (GA)	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Price (NC)	Sinema	Wittman
Quigley	Sires	Wolf
Rahall	Slaughter	Womack
Rangel	Smith (MO)	Woodall
Reed	Smith (NE)	Yarmuth
Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Renacci	Smith (TX)	Yoho
Ribble	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Rice (SC)	Southerland	Young (IN)
Richmond	Speier	
Rigell		

NAYS—3

NOT VOTING—13

Amash	Broun (GA)	Massie
Aderholt	Hall	Negrete McLeod
Capuano	Keating	Perlmutter
Cassidy	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader
Doyle	Miller, Gary	
Duckworth	Miller, George	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1617

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5771, TAX INCREASE PREVENTION ACT OF 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 647, ACHIEVING A BETTER LIFE EXPERIENCE ACT OF 2014

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 113-643) on the resolution (H. Res. 766) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SUPPORT ABLE ACT OF 2014

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the House to pass the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2014, also known as the ABLE Act.

The ABLE Act would help ease the strain on those with physical and mental disabilities by allowing the creation of tax-free savings accounts. These savings accounts would work a lot like the popular 529 college savings plans.

The accounts could be used to pay for life expenses such as education, housing, and transportation. In other words, this bill levels the playing field for those with disabilities who cannot make use of tax-free college savings plans by giving families an alternative tax-free account that they can use.

It is also important to note that the bill doesn't take away any other benefits that those with disabilities might be entitled to; rather, it would serve as a supplement, giving these families the flexibility to achieve a better life.

This bill has a tremendous amount of bipartisan support. The ABLE Act is an opportunity for this Congress to show that we can work together to make a real difference in the lives of American families.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about empowering those with disabilities and their families, and I urge that the House and Senate pass the ABLE Act, so that the President can sign it into law before the end of the year.

IMPERIAL EDICT FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, he said, "I'm the President. I'm not king. I can't do these things by myself."

That was President Obama in 2010. That was then; this is now. The lawless administration continues to ignore Congress in order to go it alone and implement his own authoritarian agenda.

The latest illegal kingly edict is that he will disregard immigration law, orally change the rules, grant legal status, and give work permits to millions of foreign undocumented nationals.

These actions show the administration is more interested in jobs for illegal foreign nationals in America than Americans in America. That is why Congresswoman BLACK and I have introduced the Separation of Powers Act.

This legislation would prohibit the use of funds for granting deferred action, green cards, work permits, or other immigration relief to people not lawfully present in the U.S.

Most importantly, it would allow Congress to exercise its check on the out-of-control White House that treats the Constitution as a mere suggestion instead of the law. The President says he is not the emperor of the United States, but his actions show otherwise. America doesn't need a king; otherwise, we would have kept King George.

And that is just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

WORLD AIDS DAY

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked World AIDS Day and more than 30 years since the first discovery of AIDS in the United States.

As the cofounder of the HIV/AIDS caucus, I am proud to say that we have made great strides in combating the AIDS epidemic here in our own country and throughout the world. Contracting HIV is no longer the death sentence that it once was, but much more remains to be done.

A recent report by UNAIDS found that we have 5 years to break the epidemic for good or risk it rebounding out of control. We cannot allow the gains we have made in fighting for an AIDS-free generation to be lost, and we can eradicate AIDS if we devote proper resources to the fight both here and abroad.

We must reduce the stigma surrounding the disease by strengthening educational and outreach activities to help prevent millions of new HIV cases worldwide. We must also provide the science-based comprehensive sex education that has proven to reduce the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, and we must repeal laws that promote discrimination and hate.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to take bold action to create a world that is free from HIV and AIDS. I urge my colleagues to join me in working to achieve an AIDS-free generation.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS BY PRESIDENT OBAMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, well, it has been quite an interesting couple of days coming back from Thanksgiving, and this morning, there was an interesting conference, what to do about a President who, for a number of years, a couple dozen of times or so, has made very clear he is not a king, he is not an emperor, he would rather not have to deal with Congress, Congress is a messy thing to deal with, but he can't just do what he wants regarding immigration without following the Constitution and that means, under the Constitution, article I, section 8, Congress has sole authority when it comes to issues like naturalization and immigration.

Prior Congresses have passed laws and made it clear what it takes to become a United States citizen. Now, those laws need fixing. There is no question about that, and despite all of the rhetoric, our friends on the other side of the aisle, when they controlled the majority in the House, majority in the Senate, with President Obama in the White House, chose to absolutely do nothing about correcting immigration problems, securing the border—not even amnesty. Why? Because they know, they see the polls, and the polls make very clear that the American public did not want any type of amnesty.

The President knew were he and the Democrats in the House and Senate, when they had the majority during their 2 years, to have done something like an amnesty bill like the bill the President passed without going through Congress, then they would have surely lost the majority, and the President would definitely not have been reelected in 2012.

□ 1630

And they did not think it was worth risking the majority over an amnesty when the vast majority of Americans did not want it. Why? Because the vast majority of Americans have to comply with the law, and fortunately those same vast number of Americans think everybody else should as well.

Now, we still see emails saying, you know, if we could ever get Congress under Social Security, Congress living under the same laws as everybody else did, then a lot of our problems will be fixed, and that forgets the fact that actually Members of Congress have been paying into Social Security for years.

No Member of Congress has a benefit that every other Federal employee doesn't already have. One of the promises that Republicans made, that they

said they would do if they got the majority in November of 1994, is to make sure that Republicans have and Democrats in Congress have to live under the same laws everybody else does.

Now, I was told when I was prevented from continuing to cook ribs that my friends across the aisle, Democrats, and Republicans love—everybody that is not a vegetarian tells me they loved my ribs; and my dear friend LOUISE SLAUGHTER had told me that her late husband, before he passed, as a vegetarian had even eaten two ribs of mine she brought home. So my ribs were a big hit with everybody but the Architect of the Capitol. He told me I couldn't continue to cook because of a violation of the fire code, and that was something Republicans actually changed to make sure that we in Congress had to live under the same laws everybody else does. So we do.

We are supposed to live under the laws everybody else does, but then it comes to amnesty, and some here in the minority think it is just fine for a President to legislate since they are not able to do that while they are in the minority. Didn't do it when they were in the majority. The President didn't do it before his reelection in 2012.

So it is a bit of a conundrum when the President of the United States asserts, as an alleged former constitutional professor, apparently an instructor, all these years he cannot do anything about the immigration problem because the Constitution doesn't allow it. Then, immediately before the grand jury acted in Missouri, the President acts, knowing what was about to happen in Missouri, Ferguson, and knowing Thanksgiving was coming up and a lot of people would take their eye off of what was happening with regard to amnesty, and then the President speaks a new law into existence.

The law is very clear: if you are not legally in the United States, you can't legally hold a job. The President changed that law with a pronouncement and a stroke of his pen, but that is not a legal law.

So we have got to stand up for the Constitution. For a President to avoid taking such action before an election because he knew it would cost him a second term, it would cost his party dramatically in the Senate and House, then to wait and do it immediately after the election and right before Thanksgiving when he thinks people will lose interest, well, Americans are not losing interest. They are still concerned.

Now that the President has taken this unconstitutional action, America is looking at Republicans: You said you were against it. You ran and we elected you to the majority in the House and Senate, and you were saying you would not abide such an unconstitutional action. So what are you going to do about it?

Well, one of the things being proposed is my dear friend TED YOHO—sometimes people say “dear friend” around this body and they say it a bit tongue in cheek, but that is not true of TED YOHO. He is a great American, and I am very, very proud he is my friend. But in H.R. 5759, titled, Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act, my friend Congressman YOHO has a bill that declares that the President does not have the authority to exempt categories of persons unlawfully present in the United States from removal. Any executive action seeking to exempt these categories of person is a violation of the law and has no legal effect.

The bill goes on to make clear this is a permanent solution that will apply to executive actions that attempt to circumvent the law. Further, this does not affect any appropriation, so it does not risk any government funding or shutdown issues.

It is a constitutional separation of powers issue. So any reform or change to the law must come from congressional legislation, not executive fiat, and basically makes clear an executive fix of the law is unconstitutional, temporary, and establishes a dangerous precedent that could be abused by Presidents of both parties for any area of the law they disagree with.

So that is a great first step, but the problem is, if we do not eliminate the funding for the President's unconstitutional action, then it may be carried out anyway. There is some talk about extending funding to next March. Well, by March people will already have been provided work permits that the law says may not legally have work permits, and it is not likely anything would be done at that point to stop it. Now is the time to stop unconstitutional action.

As the President keeps saying, Congress didn't do anything. It shows that he is getting terrible advice. We had a knock-down, drag-out session the last week of July in this Chamber, and two floors below this Chamber, in the House office buildings, we were fighting it out because, as the President has said, dealing with Congress can be messy.

That is the way the Founders intended it. They wanted it to be difficult to pass laws. And Jefferson, thinking it would be a good idea—though he wasn't there at the Constitutional Convention, so he didn't get this in. It would be a good idea if laws had to be on file for a year before they could even be brought up for a vote. Things done in haste in this body or the Senate are not a good idea.

Yet we must do something to stop the unconstitutional action. The President wants a border bill. We passed one in the House. Somebody needs to advise President Obama's advisers that we passed a good bill. It was not a good

bill on Thursday, but by Friday at 10 p.m. or so when we passed it, it was a good bill. Still had more to do. There is much more we can and should do. There is a lot of reforms that must be done, but until the border is secure, then we are just going to have to keep reforming immigration, reforming immigration, giving amnesty, giving amnesty, until the country is not the country people wanted to come to.

How ironic that people have to leave countries—they believe—because there is graft, corruption, violence, because the rule of law is not enforced fairly across the board, and they want to come to America because, with all the down economy, over 92 million people having given up hope of finding a job, not even looking anymore, this is still one of the greatest economies in the world because we still pretty much try to enforce the law across the board.

So people come from countries where the rule of law is not observed, not enforced fairly across the board—too many friends or people with particular interests of the leaders, they get special privileges, they get exempted from the law. So they come here where we are not supposed to do that, and once here, say, “Look, now that we are here, having come illegally, we want you, United States, to just forget about the law, ignore your Constitution, ignore the laws on immigration, and just waive them and forget about them,” when, in so doing, we would become like the country they felt they had to leave because we don't enforce the law fairly across the board anymore.

The old saying, capital is a coward, talking about money to be invested, it is a coward. It goes to areas where it feels safest, where the laws will be most fairly applied so that there is something that can be counted on, that laws mean things.

So we have had a lot of investment in the United States of people from China, from Russia, Africa, South America. People around the world have been willing to invest in the United States because we have been a country where capital could be comfortable.

But when mass amnesty is applied, which will ultimately throw however many people are given illegal work permits to work legally, you are going to throw that many million people out of jobs. You will depress the working wage rate.

Mr. Speaker, it can't be overemphasized that what happened since this President has been in office or in power is what we normally say about monarchs, but what has happened for the first time in American history never happened under any prior President.

But this President's policies, as he talked about the fat cats on Wall Street, though he received more donations from them than Republicans did; as he bad-mouthed the oil companies, but he had friends that were doing fa-

vors for him; as he bad-mouthed capital cronyism as capital cronyism was exactly what was occurring in this country and from this administration, actually for the first time in our history, 95 percent of all income in America went to the top 1 percent of income earners. It has never happened before.

I know—I know—this administration, everybody in it talks about the fat cats and going after the rich, and yet, amazingly, as they talk about going after the rich, it is as if there is a wink and a nod: We are going to talk bad about you, call you fat cats, but you are going to get richer than you have ever been. Just don't forget us when it comes to political contributions. Oh, yeah, we will trash the Koch Brothers, but they can't hold a candle to the fat-cat Democratic contributors.

But when you try to get your head around 95 percent of the income going to the top 1 percent in America, it is extraordinary. The President himself acknowledged, September a year ago, that this was happening on his watch.

□ 1645

Again, people can talk about the middle class getting bigger and wages being suppressed. Their solution is to bring in 5 million new workers willing to work a lot cheaper, without health insurance, to compete with Americans that need a little more in order to live and that need health insurance.

And the solution is to bring in 5 million people more? Do you really want to see minority unemployment go even higher than its current skyrocketing position?

That is not fair to Americans. Our oath is to this country and the people in it, and the way we do that is by defending the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. It is time the poor and the middle class in America were helped by having a better wage, by not continuing to leave the borders open, by not winking and nodding and unconstitutionally allowing 5 million people to work illegally but with the stamp of approval from the White House. It is time to stop it before we lose the Constitution altogether.

Here is an article from Steven Camarota and Karen Ziegler. The headline, “Immigrant Families Benefit Significantly from ObamaCare,” and the subheadline, “Immigrant Families Accounted for 42 Percent of Medicaid Growth Since 2011.”

The article says:

A key part of the Affordable Care Act is Medicaid expansion for those with low incomes. A new analysis of government data by the Center for Immigration Studies shows that immigrants and their U.S.-born children, under age 18, have been among the primary beneficiaries of Medicaid growth. The data show that immigrants and their children accounted for 42 percent of the growth in Medicaid enrollment from 2011 to 2013. Immigrants benefited more from Medicaid expansion than natives because a much larger share of immigrants are poor and uninsured.

It seems almost certain that immigrants and their children will continue to benefit disproportionately from ObamaCare, as they remain much more likely than natives to be uninsured or poor. The available evidence indicates that Medicaid growth associated with immigrants is largely among those legally in the country.

Nonetheless, immigrants, this points out:

The number of immigrants and their U.S.-born children on Medicaid grew twice as fast as the number of natives and their children on Medicaid from 2011 to 2013.

Immigrants and their children accounted for 42 percent of Medicaid enrollment growth from 2011 to 2013, even though they accounted for only 17 percent of the Nation's total population and 23 percent of overall U.S. population growth in the same time period.

About two-thirds of the growth in Medicaid associated with immigrants was among immigrants themselves, rather than U.S.-born children of immigrants.

It is an interesting issue because when my friend STEVE KING and I were in England in recent years, we were told there that the law is very clear. They know that their country would fail if they just say everybody that comes in is immediately entitled to every Federal subsidy the British Government offers, so they have a requirement in England that you are not entitled to any benefit, we were told, until you have paid into the British system for at least 5 years.

Well, that kind of makes sense, and having just been over there and had a chance to address members from the House of Commons and House of Lords, having spoken at Cambridge and Oxford, they are trying to save their country over there, but there was a great deal of welfare that is hurting the system and their economics. Even so, they have a law that says you can't even get these kind of benefits until you have paid into their system for 5 years.

Why isn't there something like that in the President's new law that he spoke into being? Perhaps that ought to be the first reform that both Houses take up. You can't receive any kind of benefit from the U.S. Government unless you have paid into the U.S. Government for at least 5 years, and that does not include getting more money back year after year than you pay in.

An article yesterday indicated one woman in Virginia had been largely using people that were illegally in the country to file for child tax credits so they can get back \$4,000, \$7,000, \$1,500 more than they paid in, and it was a scam.

If one woman in Virginia can be accountable for \$7,000 in child tax credits being paid out more than people paid in, how many people are there across the United States that are doing that same thing, while we have workers across the country, like in my district, that have said that because ObamaCare changed the definition of part-time

work, it forced them into a situation of having to work two part-time jobs, not having health insurance anymore, and just struggling just to survive, just to live; yet when it comes to people that have not paid a dime into the system, all of a sudden, we are just going to bend over backwards and violate the Constitution for them.

There is an article in Breitbart today from Tony Lee that said:

One in three illegal immigrants over the age of 25 in America do not even have a high school education, according to a New Migration Policy Institute report.

The Migration Policy Institute estimates there are 8.512 million illegal immigrant adults 25 years of age or older. The study found that while 49 percent of illegal immigrants 25 years or older have at least a high school diploma or a GED, 17 percent have some high school education, while 33 percent do not have any high school education.

Of course, we have got people of all races, national origins, and both genders trying to get into this country. They have been trying for years and years to do so legally. They could fill needed specialized positions to help our economy grow; yet they can't get a visa. They are not about to get amnesty. We have got things completely backwards.

We know, of course, when the President talks about amnesty and legal status—along with other people here in Washington—our border patrolmen make clear over and over that that increases the number of people coming across our border.

Thank God Texas has stepped up. The State of Texas has been paying tremendous amounts of money to have additional people on the border. At night, you can see their profile—DPS troopers, Texas Rangers, game wardens—where they can call people in speedboats that Texas has paid for to rush up and try to catch the coyotes bringing people across illegally.

The coyotes don't want to be caught. The people do. They want to turn themselves in as quick as they can. The coyotes don't want to be caught, so they are not going to come across if they think they are going to get caught before they can get across with their raft.

One of the other things that ought to scare law enforcement dramatically is the fact that I have heard a number of people say, as they were questioned by our border patrolmen out in the middle of the night, and they are asked—it's not on the standard questions, but they have been asked many times by our border patrolmen, "How much did you have to pay the gangs or the drug cartels to bring you across?" Sometimes, it is \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, or \$8,000.

Sometimes, a followup question is asked, "Where did you get that kind of money in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, or wherever you came from?" Often, the answer was, "Well, some of the friends or family in the

U.S. sent money. We have been trying to collect money in our home country."

Every now and then, you get a response that scares me and is probably at the bottom of many of the people's payments to come and be brought in illegally by drug cartels and gangs. They have confided, "They are going to let us work some of the rest of it off."

Well, what does that mean? It means when Health and Human Services picks people up and transmits them across the country—with scabies, as we have seen happen, and whatever disease they may bring in—as some have pointed out, that means every State is a border State, thanks to Health and Human Services shipping them around the country.

As they build up their numbers in different cities around the country and they owe the drug cartels that are ruthless, unscrupulous, and don't mind torturing and killing, we hear more and more about Mexican drug cartel activities around the country and our cities, how horrendous it is that the United States Department of Homeland Security and the United States Department of Health and Human Services being complicit in helping ship agents for the drug cartels and gangs around the country that can be intimidated and reminded, "Remember, you still owe us \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, and here's how you will work it off."

Is it sex trade? Is it drugs that are poisoning more of our American teenagers and young adults with the Mexican drugs being brought in?

If the drug cartels are getting promises from people coming into the United States illegally that they will work off the rest of the money, then you can bet the drug cartels are going to see that they do.

I have been told by border patrolmen that you don't cross the U.S. border without some drug cartel, some gang, some organized crime being in charge of the area of the border where you crossed, and you dare not cross across Mexico into the United States without the permission of whatever organized criminal group is in charge. They say they will come after them.

We are bringing in agents of drug cartels and shipping them around the country where they can work for the drug cartels. It is what they have said there on the border. "Yeah, they are going to let me work this off."

Well, in talking to the border patrolmen there in the middle of the night down on the border, they tell you some interesting things. As I have been told by the border patrolmen, "You know what the drug cartels call us Federal agents here in the U.S.? They borrow from a commercial on television and say, 'We're the logistics.'"

The United States Federal employees are the drug cartels' logistics. All they have to do is get their agents that are

going to work for the drug cartels into the United States, and then the United States Government ships them around the country for the drug cartels.

All they have to do is say, "This is where I've got somebody—a family member, a loved one—and that's where I need to go," and we ship them free of charge. The U.S. Government makes it free of charge at least to the immigrant coming in illegally.

Of course, there is no free lunch, as Phil Gramm used to repeatedly say. Somebody is paying for it, and to a limited extent, it is American taxpayers. To another extent, it is our children and grandchildren who are incurring the debts that will be paid with income they have never even figured out what job they will be deriving the income from. It is immoral.

□ 1700

Here is an article from Politico saying, the DHS chief, short-term funding a very bad idea. So it turns out Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson warned Tuesday that a short-term funding measure for his agency will be "a very bad idea," telling Congress such a bill would hold up everything from hiring Secret Service agents to paying for border security.

Well, we still have people that are saying, though, you know, in a CR and an omnibus, we really can't put restrictions on the Federal Government in there. And yet, here is a report regarding the last omnibus highlights where there were 17 different restrictions on agencies' use of fees in the last fiscal year.

This was done with the help of the Congressional Research Service that reviewed the previous spending omnibus. And Senator JEFF SESSIONS, dear friend, great guy, he has been able to identify 17 separate restrictions.

One was a restriction in section 543 on the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services that said, notwithstanding section 1356(n), title VIII, U.S. Code, of the funds deposited into the immigration examinations fee account, \$7,500,000 may be allocated by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services fiscal year 2014 for the purpose of providing an immigrant integration grants program.

There is one for the Department of Agriculture, Department of Justice, Transportation Security Administration, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Security and Exchange Commission, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation Enforcement, Copyright Office, Export-Import Bank of the United States.

So we know it can be done. It has been done. The restrictions have been made in past omnibuses, even just last year. So we can do that, and we should do that.

If we don't do that, then the President's unconstitutional act is going to

be a harbinger of terrible things to come. Once you no longer have a Constitution that means anything, then Presidents can pretty much do as they wish.

That is what happens in Third World countries. That is why we have lasted over 200 years, because the Constitution meant something. It took a civil war to make the Constitution more enforcing of what it said. It took someone like Dr. King giving his life to ensure civil rights for everyone, as the Constitution guaranteed.

But once we have moved into this post-constitutional era, where the Constitution no longer is enforced, it is just a document, then there is no skeleton on which to hang muscle and the might that makes a strong country, and we become, figuratively speaking, a blob of a nation without structure that can't defend itself adequately, that has drug cartel agents throughout the country, that continues to have people sending wives in to have children in the United States free of charge and leaving to go back home with, actually, a U.S. passport as an American citizen.

I think that is how Anwar al-Awlaki, whom the President was so concerned about he blew him up with a drone strike—he was an American citizen. His parents came over from Yemen on visas, and he was born here, but taken back, grew up learning to hate America.

The deputy leader of Hamas, Mousa Abu Marzook, his wife came to the U.S., had a child that, no doubt, is being taught to hate America.

Palestinian Islamic jihad leader Sami Al-Arian, his wife came to the United States, had a child, American citizen.

Abdul Rahman al-Amoudi, who is doing 23 years in prison for supporting terrorism, financing terrorism, his wife had a child here in the United States, an American citizen.

Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the 9/11 mastermind, even has confessed to that in his own written pleadings and said, if our act of terror created terror in your heart, then praise be to Allah. Basically, in his six-page pleading, he said, you had it coming.

I think there is possibly a chance he would raise a child to hate America.

And then the Muslim Brother President of Egypt, Mohamed Morsi, his wife came to America. Irony of ironies, he thought he was being very clever to have an American citizen daughter, yet the Egyptian people didn't think it was so clever. They didn't like the idea.

When he became such an unconstitutional actor as a President that he could no longer be tolerated, he allowed to be left in office, 20 million Egyptians were reported in the streets of Egypt demanding his removal, followed by another demonstration of 30 million to 33 million Egyptians, mod-

erate Muslims, Christians, Jews, secularists, out in the streets demanding, we don't want a radical Islamist in control of our country, Egypt.

Amazing. Such a huge event in the realm of human history in Egypt. God bless the Egyptians. We need to pray for them, we need to help them.

But not this administration. This administration says, oh, so you ousted the Muslim Brother, part of the organization that wants to bring down America, and you ousted him?

Well, if you don't put him back in power we are not going to send you the Apache helicopters you are using to keep the Suez Canal open. We are not going to send you what you need to deweaponize the Sinai that Morsi saw weaponized.

No, we are going to hold back any weapons that will help you clean up the radicalization in Egypt and Sinai that Morsi oversaw, which is why some of the moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East and North Africa continue to ask, why do you keep helping your enemies?

Do you not understand that the Muslim Brothers are your enemy?

Do you not understand that the Muslim Brothers want the United States as part of a caliphate?

Well, the Department of Homeland Security and this administration and mainstream media belittled me for the last couple of years or so as I continued to point out that they had an adviser on their top Homeland Security Advisory Council who had used his classification that Janet Napolitano gave him in an inappropriate way; that he had spoken—he was listed as a speaker paying tribute to the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of vision; that he defended the Holy Land Foundation principals who were convicted of supporting terrorism; failed to properly file the tax forms that would allow his foundation to remain a 501(c)(3). Didn't file them. And yet, he is a top adviser.

Well, even the Obama administration had to finally let him go and, yes, go ahead and accept the resignation when he tweeted out that the international caliphate is inevitable so we need to get used to it. Even the Obama administration had to let him go after that. So he has resigned. He is no longer a top member advising this administration.

But it is time for Americans to wake up. Ignoring the Constitution is not helpful. After over two-dozen statements by this President that he doesn't have the power to, in effect, do what he just now did right before Thanksgiving, demands congressional action. We must stand up and defund the illegal activity of this President.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important to note that our Republican leaders got duped in July of 2011. I tried to warn. I told people back then, told our whole conference, this supercommittee

will not be allowed to reach an agreement by the Democrats.

I was assured, oh, sure they will because it cuts a whole bunch of money from Medicaid and an automatic sequestration if the supercommittee doesn't reach an agreement. So the hundreds of billions, the gutting of our military will never happen because the supercommittee will reach an agreement because they don't want the cuts to Medicare.

Well, it seemed very clear to me, and as I told my Republican friends, no, they are going to prevent the supercommittee from reaching agreement if we pass this bill because they want the cuts to Medicare because they cut over \$700 billion of Medicare funding in ObamaCare without a single Republican vote.

So the only way, in 2012, they will be able to run commercials saying, we love our rich friends more than we love seniors, is if they prevent the supercommittee from reaching an agreement.

The cuts to Medicare are only a fraction of what ObamaCare did but, nonetheless, cuts to Medicare will happen.

And the President has never cared much for the military anyway, and this allows him, basically, to gut our military to pre-World War II levels. So it is a win, win, win all the way around for the administration if we pass that bill creating a supercommittee.

Well, we did, and the President got the military gutted, Defense Department gutted. The sequestration happened.

And now I am concerned, if we say, all right, we are not going to fund Homeland Security unless you agree, you sign a bill that defunds your illegal activity in providing amnesty to 5 million people, I think we need to be careful about that, Mr. Speaker, because it just may be that the President would like to blame Republicans and say, you know what? Well, I would like to have Border Patrol securing the border, but the Republicans cut off the funding, and so, gee, there is no Border Patrol on the border. It is all the Republicans' fault because they wouldn't fund it.

I think we need to be rather careful about saying we are going to bank on not funding Homeland Security, only fund them for a short time, and then threaten the President, if you don't sign off on a bill defunding your illegal activity, then Homeland Security won't be funded.

As one of my Republican friends pointed out, kind of like the old adage, if you are going to take a hostage, you need to take somebody that the other side doesn't want to see killed. And there is some concern that if we take hostage, figuratively speaking, the Homeland Security Department in order to defund the illegal activity of this President's amnesty, it just may be that the President, figuratively

again speaking, will say, go ahead, take out your hostage; completely defund Homeland Security. That is okay with me.

□ 1715

No, that is not the way you negotiate.

If we are going to stop the President's unconstitutional amnesty, it is going to require funding everything that needs funding, but to go after something the President really wants but doesn't need. Good grief. When we are spending the trillions of dollars we are, we can certainly afford, for example, to do away with the czars, to do away with the, say, public transportation to golf outings.

We can save millions of dollars just on that alone. This is what you do in negotiation. For those of us who have negotiated multimillion-dollar deals and multimillion-dollar settlements, that is what you do. You have to find something that is very important to the other side, but that is really not necessary, so that the other side, when you are negotiating, knows you mean business. I don't think Homeland Security is the place to threaten.

We have got to defund the illegal activity, or of those who fought to defend the Constitution, who picked up the Stars and Stripes in representing our Nation—our constitutional Republic—and carried it as fellow soldiers were killed and who advanced freedom here in America, their blood will be on our hands because we wouldn't even stand for the Constitution when there were no bullets being fired. We have got to stand up for America and for our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ALZHEIMER'S

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIDENSTINE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I want to spend some time with my colleagues discussing something that we actually can do for every American family, something that the Congress of the United States can take action on soon, like this week, when we pass our appropriations bill or, perhaps, next week if we fail to get the job done this week.

We can help every American family tomorrow, the next day, and on into the years out ahead if we take action. The subject matter of tonight is about an issue that affects every American family wherever you are out there—my own family, your family, the families of my staff, perhaps even the families of those who are working with us tonight.

This is an illness. This is an illness that has become the most expensive and will soon become the most pervasive illness in America. It is Alzheimer's. It is dementia associated with Alzheimer's. It is a devastating illness.

It is one that robs individuals of their mental abilities. It robs them of their memories of their families, of their work, of their lives. It confuses and muddles their thoughts, and eventually, it will destroy that individual, so tonight, we talk about Alzheimer's.

Is there anyone out there, any family, any individual, who hasn't seen this illness? I think we all have.

Let's get into it in some detail. A little later, as my colleagues join us, we will continue the discussion and talk about what we can do—your Representatives. There are 535 of us—435 here in the House of Representatives from every part of this Nation and from every walk of life and from every community, and there are the 100 Senators from every State. Let's use some of these charts to see if we can get a better fix on what we are actually facing here in America.

Let's see. Alzheimer's is the most expensive disease in America. One in five Medicare dollars is currently spent on people with Alzheimer's, 20 percent of every Medicare dollar. In fact, the total cost of Alzheimer's today—this year, 2014—is over \$215 billion—a quarter of a trillion dollars. More and more of that money will come from Medicare as the baby boom population begins to move into its more senior years.

This illness is not just found in seniors. We are also learning about the early onset of Alzheimer's, men and women in their thirties and forties—early Alzheimer's. Of course, it extends on, mostly in the more senior population, 60–65 and above.

This is an illness that is also associated with genetics. If you have Alzheimer's in your family, there is a higher probability that you will have Alzheimer's yourself, but it is also an illness that is associated with brain damage that can occur from concussions.

I think we have all heard about the National Football League players who have suffered with one form of dementia or another and who have died early because of it. We also know that traumatic brain injuries are the most common injuries found among our troops who have returned from Afghanistan and Iraq.

Alzheimer's, it is there. It is very expensive.

What can we look forward to in the future? Let's see. This is Medicare and Medicaid—the Federal Government expenditures—not the family expenditures, not the expenditures by health insurance companies. This is just the Federal Government.

Today, it is about \$122 billion. By the end of this decade, it will be \$195 billion. As this wave of baby boomers

passes through our demography and through our society, we expect, by the year 2050, that the Federal Government will be spending over \$880 billion—\$120 billion short of \$1 trillion—on this illness, and this may be just two-thirds of the total cost. Well over \$1.2 trillion will be spent in about 35 years on this illness.

Do you want to bust the budget? Do you want to see the deficits of America soar almost uncontrollably? Then look to Alzheimer's and dementia and the effect that they will have on the Federal budget deficit. Pay attention to these numbers because these numbers are the story of the American Federal budget and of the personal budgets of families across this Nation—Alzheimer's and dementia, \$880 billion of Medicare and Medicaid money by 2050.

There is another way of looking at it. It is a different graph but the same story. The already high cost of Alzheimer's will skyrocket as the baby boom moves through the population. There it is: the same numbers, the same graph, the same extraordinary challenge facing America.

I should also mention that this is not just an American issue; this is an issue for every advanced economy in the world. If you are able to avoid the childhood illnesses—the illnesses that kill so many in the developing world—then those economies that have advanced to the more developed economies face the exact same population surge and costs associated with Alzheimer's and dementia.

What can we do about it? We can actually do a lot. I suspect, if you are looking at this on your TV screens or are here in the audience, you really only see the green line. This speaks of the treatment for Alzheimer's: today, \$250 billion by Federal and local and private.

On this one over here is research, treatment versus research. It is the old adage: You spend it now or spend a lot more later. A penny saved is a penny earned.

What does research amount to? I have to pull this up close—oh, here it is. We are spending \$122 billion to \$150 billion or so of Federal and State money. What are we spending on research? \$566 million. Billions? Millions? What does research amount to? It actually works. Research actually will solve problems, medical research.

How long have we been at polio? I remember growing up around the issues of polio. It was very common in our communities, then some money was spent on research and a polio vaccine. You don't see polio in our communities anymore.

The research worked with the development of the Salk vaccine, followed by other vaccines to treat polio. It is essentially wiped out in America. It only exists in a few very isolated places in the world. If we were to spend the

money on a vaccination in those areas, we would see polio disappear from our world. The same thing happened with smallpox.

I want to show you something more of today. Let's look at the research budgets for those programs that are active today: investments in health research at the National Institutes of Health, 2014 cancer research, \$5.4 billion on cancer research.

Enough? Probably not. We probably could and should spend more on cancer research. Should we do so, I would suspect that we would see even more success in treating cancer in its earliest stages.

HIV/AIDS, nearly \$3 billion on HIV/AIDS—have we solved the problem? No, but we have certainly figured out how people can live with HIV/AIDS, and we are probably going to see a vaccine sometime in the near future. This is what we are currently spending—nearly \$3 billion—on HIV/AIDS.

Cardiovascular issues—stroke, heart attacks, other kinds of cardiovascular illnesses—just around \$2 billion or slightly more is spent on that.

The most expensive, the most prevalent of all of the illnesses is Alzheimer's, \$566 million. It's not billions—not \$2 billion, not \$3 billion, not \$5.5 billion—but \$566 million.

What is the result of all of this? What does it mean when you spend this kind of money on research? It really means something very good happens, that something really, really good happens when you spend money on research. With polio research and a polio vaccine, polio is no longer found in the United States.

Let's look at these major illnesses. What does it mean? What does it mean when we spend money on cancer research? Let's take a look here at deaths from major diseases and the change in the number of deaths from 2000 to 2012: breast cancer down 2 percent, prostate cancer down 8 percent.

What happens when you spend \$5.5 billion a year on cancer research? Cancer deaths fall—success. On heart disease—cardiovascular illnesses—we spend about \$2 billion a year, and we see heart disease dropping by some 16 percent. That is deaths from heart disease dropping by 16 percent and stroke dropping by 28 percent.

□ 1730

So what is the use of research? Well, if you want to live, it is a pretty good thing to spend money on, particularly if you are thinking about getting cancer or any of the cardiovascular illnesses: heart disease, stroke, heart attacks and the like.

HIV/AIDS, do you remember that number? HIV/AIDS, nearly \$3 billion was spent on HIV/AIDS, and deaths from HIV/AIDS are down 42 percent in the United States.

So what does it mean when you spend money on research? It means really

good things for Americans, and around the world a similar result. You spend that money on the research dealing with these major illnesses, and you will see the death rates drop all across this Nation.

HIV/AIDS is down by 42 percent, spending \$3 billion a year; cardiovascular, \$2 billion a year.

And this purple line over here, what happens when you spend \$566 million a year on research for Alzheimer's? Alzheimer's deaths from 2000 to 2010 were up, increased by 68 percent. There is a story here. There is a lesson here. There is something that 535 of your Representatives, the American people's Representatives, should be paying attention to; and that is, if we want to deal with the most devastating, the most expensive, and, increasingly, the most common illness in America—the one that always will lead to death, the one for which there is no cure presently, the one for which there is not the kind of support needed for those people that suffer from Alzheimer's—then and we had better start talking about solutions. Research is a part of it.

How much do we think could be spent this year in the appropriation bills that are now coming before us? What if we were to add \$200 million, about a 40 percent increase? What would it mean? It means that we will probably, over the next couple of years, begin to see profound knowledge about the human brain, about how it functions, about the diseases of the human brain, and about how we can attack Alzheimer's.

I don't expect it to be done in 2 years, but I know that out there, in the mind institutions at the University of California-San Francisco, University of California-Davis, down at UCLA and in other research institutions around this Nation, we are learning how the brain functions. We are learning about the diseases of the brain. And if we were to invest this year an additional \$200 million, we would see a flourishing of knowledge. And maybe, maybe in one of those research institutes, they would find the key to solving the Alzheimer's puzzle. And if they were to do so, we would see a profound reversal in these numbers; and this blue dramatic increase of 68 percent more deaths from Alzheimer's over the last decade, we would see that reverse, and hopefully we would see it go down.

I would like to continue our discussion here with my colleagues. I have noticed that my colleague from California, JACKIE SPEIER, representing the Peninsula, has arrived.

I think your district comes very close to that great research institution, the University of California-San Francisco. I am not sure if it is in your district, but I know it is on the border of your district, if not in your district.

Ms. SPEIER, if you would join us to talk about this issue, I know it has

been on your mind and in your heart. You have been a leader in California and back here in Washington on this issue. So thank you so very much for joining us in our discussion about the most prevalent and the most expensive of all diseases in America.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman from California.

You are right. For more than 25 years, I have actually represented UCSF in the State legislature and then here in Congress, except as a result of reapportionment in the last 2 years. So I no longer technically represent the institution.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, I get to represent the University of California-Davis, and it is in my district, although the hospital and the research center are not. So I guess we share the same sadness.

Ms. SPEIER. Yes, and the same real joy in knowing that there is extraordinary research going on at both of those institutions.

I thank the gentleman for drawing such laser focus on the issue of Alzheimer's disease and why it is, in fact, the number one most prevalent disease in this country.

I brought down this Alzheimer's Association sash that many of us wore when our constituents came into town, pleading with us to do more about Alzheimer's research. Many of us took pictures with them and said, yes, we are very supportive, but it is really time for us to put our money where our mouth is. It is not good enough to wear a purple sash and say that you are supportive of Alzheimer's research when, in fact, what we are spending in terms of Alzheimer's research is so much less than it is with every other disease.

As you were pointing out with your chart—I have a very similar chart as well—we are spending \$566 million a year on Alzheimer's disease. Good. There is no question about it. But it is not good enough. It is not good enough in comparison to what we are spending on cardiovascular disease, on HIV/AIDS, or on cancer—\$5 billion, \$5.5 billion on cancer research.

But let's talk about the big elephant in the room. I mean, we already know that we are not spending nearly as much money on Alzheimer's research as we are on other conditions and we need to pump that up, but let's talk about the elephant in the room. The elephant in the room is not the Republican elephant. It is the elephant on the issue of Alzheimer's.

Why is it so important for you and me and every American to be concerned about Alzheimer's research? Because it is going to choke us financially in a very short period of time. We are now spending about \$214 billion a year on the cost of health care. Now, that is \$150 billion in costs for Medicare, and then another \$37 billion in costs for Medicaid.

So it is costing us a lot of money today, but the real choker is how much it is going to cost us in 2050. In 2050, it is going to cost us over \$1.2 trillion. So we owe it to our families, we owe it to our constituents; we owe it to the American people, we owe it to the Medicare system and the Medicaid system to find a cure or find a way to early detection and then to slow the process of this particular disease.

Now, in my county, we have about 15,000 people living with Alzheimer's right now and more than 45,000 caregivers. Nationally, in 2012, 15.5 million caregivers provided an estimated 17 billion hours of unpaid care, valued at \$220 billion, which brings me to my next point, and it is about women.

This issue is a women's health issue. Now, it is true that women—60 percent of Alzheimer's and dementia caregivers are women. They are often unpaid in providing those services. But nationally, a woman in her sixties has an estimated lifetime risk for developing Alzheimer's of something like 1 in 6. For breast cancer, what we have been so focused on, it is 1 in 11.

Here is the most stunning figure of all. Two-thirds of the 5 million seniors with Alzheimer's disease in this country are women. Two-thirds are women. So this is, indeed, a women's health issue and one that we have to take very seriously.

So with that, Mr. GARAMENDI, I know you have other participants in this, and I thank you for yielding.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. SPEIER. I really appreciate you bringing the women's issue to this.

The last 3 years of my mother-in-law's life were spent in our home as she went through the process of Alzheimer's. And it is, indeed, a women's issue. Two-thirds, as you say, are women. And we experienced that. Fortunately, for us, it worked out very well for us and our family.

But we are not unique, and while our experience was sad but good in some ways, that is not always the case. This is a huge, huge burden. Not only are the women the ones who suffer, but the women are often the ones who care for those who have it.

So I thank you so much.

I notice my friends from the east coast have joined us. We often do an east-west thing here. My two friends are debating who is going to go first.

Mr. FATTAH, why don't you go first, and we will go from there.

Mr. FATTAH. Thank you. I appreciate that.

We were together just recently in your district at the Staglin Scientific Symposium, focusing on some of the challenges related to diseases and disorders of the human brain. This issue that you raise on the floor tonight is the most dominant challenge that we face in terms of a degenerative brain disease.

It is not by accident that Prime Minister David Cameron, when leading the G7, said that dementia was the world's global challenge. It is not by accident that here in our own country we have created, through the great work of Members like yourselves and others, a major focus now on Alzheimer's as one of the brand-name dementias that has affected millions of Americans and will affect millions going forward.

I have led an effort in the appropriations process focusing on the human brain, both mapping the brain and challenging and chasing cures and treatments for diseases. This neuroscience initiative, Fattah Neuroscience Initiative, has been focused on the fact that these 600-plus diseases of the brain affect over 50 million Americans; but there is none more costly than Alzheimer's, none that are affecting more families than Alzheimer's. And it is so important.

We just had an incident the other day of a very prominent restaurant owner here in Washington who was said to have gone missing in New York City because she is suffering from this disease.

I was happy to be at the launch of the Give To Cure effort, which is an effort to build support so that the "valley of death," as it is called, in terms of major research that needs to go forward to clinical trials, working with my good friend Rafi Gidron from the Israel Brain Technologies and so many others.

This morning I met with the new president of Cal Tech and talked about the efforts there at a great university in your State, and they received well over 10 percent of the initial awards in the BRAIN Initiative from NIH because of the leading research. I have been—and some of the people think I may have some designs on retiring to California. I have spent some time there now with Stanley Prusiner, who is a Nobel laureate in neurology. He was the first one working with people like Virginia Lee and John Trojanowski to begin to really understand the early formation of this disease and how it affects people.

I want to talk just for a minute about how this affects families—and then I will yield—not about the science of it. There are significant scientific hurdles, with over 100 billion neurons, tens of trillions of connections. We do not now know how the brains of human beings work, but we don't have a good understanding yet of how the brains of much smaller insects or animals actually function. This is a great scientific challenge. I think it is the most important frontier for all of science to focus on, and that is why I am so dedicated to it.

When it comes to families—and I heard you speak about your own—this is something that has a tremendous impact. And dementia is something

that, as people are healthier, their bodies are healthier, their brains are degenerating. We are going to face more and more of this.

We had a former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, talk about, if we could just reverse for a few years the onset of Alzheimer's, it could save our country trillions of dollars. But put the dollars aside. What this is really about is valuing families and understanding that as much as science is something that we all take a great interest in, that what should focus us is to make sure that our scientific endeavors are focused on how to improve the life chances of the people who we represent.

□ 1745

So the World Health Organization says there are a billion people worldwide, NIH says 50-plus million Americans suffering from brain illnesses. We know that you have your finger on the pulse, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for conducting this Special Order.

I know that so many members want to participate, I am going to now yield back my time, but you can count on us as we go forward to continue to work with you and to work with the pharmaceutical industry and to work with our academic enterprises, and we are going to have even more success going forward not just in finding treatment but we have to put as our goal finding a cure. So thank you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much, Mr. FATTAH, and thank you for your role on the Appropriations Committee trying to move the money into this research so that we can address this. You mentioned the Staglins out in California and their project, which is the One Mind project, our former colleague Mr. Kennedy involved in that project, trying to pull together the research from around the world and here in the United States specifically, so that there is a sharing of knowledge back and forth from these various research centers, so that the synergy would come from the knowledge that may exist at Cal Tech or New York, which we will undoubtedly hear about in a few moments, or in your country out in Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. If the gentleman would yield for just a second.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Sure.

Mr. FATTAH. I met just a few days ago with Henry Markram with the European Human Brain Project, where the EU has put now a billion-and-a-half euros on the table to help with the mapping of the brain. One of the things that we talked about and what is clear is that we have to bring these global efforts together and connect them. This is not about one researcher somewhere discovering the solution to this. This is going to take a combined effort, and we have to have a certain urgency about it, and we have to demand that it be done now. Thank you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, thank you so very, very much. I am going to turn to my colleague from our normal East-West dialogue here that we have done so many days, so many times over the last few years.

Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much for joining us once again as we talk this time about—we usually talk about jobs and the economy and how we can build it, but this time we are talking about Alzheimer's, so please.

Mr. TONKO. Well, thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for leading us in a very important discussion during this Special Order. There is no denying that all of us, Members of the House and beyond, if you are to ask individuals out there across this country if Alzheimer's or dementia issues have impacted their family, the immediate response is absolutely.

I think all of us have been touched by those devastating impacts, those outcomes that befell our loved ones, and the ripple effect onto that circle of family and friends. It is devastating. You in a sense lose that individual, and it is a very painful process certainly for those individuals living with Alzheimer's and dementia, and for their immediate families and loved ones and caregivers who watch as they painfully travel the journey with those individuals. So I think for us to take that human element, that impact and that dynamic, and put it into working order, we would be well served to acknowledge that Alzheimer's is the most expensive disease in America. It is driving bankruptcy if it goes unaddressed. And when one in every five Medicare dollars is spent on a person with Alzheimer's or dementia, the warning signals should be out there for sounder budgeting, to put our focus on a cure, on research, on developing those opportunities that will bend the cost curve, so to speak, that will enable us to address with dignity and common sense and economic sustainability the issues of Alzheimer's and dementia.

The impact upon our culture is so much so the economic drain is at about \$214 billion in 2014. That is an immense economic toll that is placed upon budgets, be they Medicare, Medicaid, local budgets, or not-for-profits that make it their goal to best serve individuals, especially in their elderly years, and to be able to assist in that effort by advancing the efforts of the study of the brain that have been initiated by this President, by President Obama and his administration, is a very, very worthy investment.

It will tell us much about several diseases out there and allow us to again approach an issue with dignity and facts at our fingertips that will then provide for the best prioritization of how to respond to those issues.

Now, much has been said about research here tonight, and rightfully so.

It is very critical that we, you know, grow the investment on research. I have participated in our annual town halls that are called for in the National Alzheimer's Project Act, and that National Alzheimer's Project Act requires that we gather together to understand how well the services are coming together, what the needs are, and how we plan appropriately for ongoing budgets.

There you receive, all of us, the very disturbing testimony that reaches us, impacts our thinking, and certainly speaks to our hearts and souls about what we need to do, painful journeys that individuals have made. I can vividly recall a high school friend mentioning that her husband no longer knew her name but knew her voice. These are painful bits of testimony to absorb, and they motivate us. They ought to motivate us and challenge us to move more quickly in this effort to fund research and find a cure and find better treatments.

The efforts that I think are important here that follow the National Alzheimer's Project Act is to put together a more clinical response, and I think the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, which I have cosponsored, allows for H.R. 4351 to respond to the Alzheimer's planning in a way that clinicians and those directly involved in the service delivery system to the Alzheimer's community, they will advise what those budgeted amounts should look like in an annual effort from here to the threshold year of 2025. That is an absolute essential.

I applaud our efforts here in the House with Representative GUTHRIE and others—as I said, I am a cosponsor—looking to make certain that we have a much more accountable, logistic, well-planned, and professional-driven estimate that will move us forward with each and every budget year to respond to this crisis in America, and it indeed is at crisis proportion.

So Representative GARAMENDI, these are efforts that I think need to be made. The commitment that starts with the human element, the compassion that needs to be expressed on behalf of the people of this country via this House, via Congress, both Houses speaking to a legitimate request that authorizes the investment in research, that puts together a plan that is run by clinicians that advise the United States Government as to how to best respond, what those levels, those thresholds should be from now to the benchmark year of 2025, and to make certain that we do it all within our professional capacity in harnessing the resources that are required.

We grow, we cultivate an intellectual capacity in this country of which we are very proud, and one that should serve us abundantly well, and it is important to have our hearts and souls measure that opportunity, to put together the best blueprint for addressing

this crisis. Let's move forward with a sound, resounding commitment of support to these individuals and their caregivers.

You know, when we look at the statistics out there, one in nine over the age of 65 is impacted by Alzheimer's, one in three in age category 85-plus. And guess what? That is the fastest-growing age demographic in our country. So in order to plan and plan well for the onslaught of baby boomers who will enter into these given demographics, we need to make commitments, and we need to again bend that cost curve by investing now in research, preventative therapies, and certainly study of the brain, efforts that are promoted by the President and the administration to make certain that we can move forward effectively and compassionately and allow for the best choices to be made.

So I thank you for leading us in this very important discussion, Representative GARAMENDI, and I am convinced that with the facts at our fingertips and with the elements of compassion and dignity that should respond to the Alzheimer's community, we can get these important measures achieved.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much for your bringing to us the information about actions that have already been taken. The Alzheimer's plan that you discussed lays out a process by which the National Institutes of Health will develop a program of research, bring it directly to Congress so that we can then analyze it and hopefully fund that research. It is the pragmatic way of dealing with it. As you said, it is based upon a studied step-by-step process to get to the solution of Alzheimer's.

There is also other legislation. Our former colleague, now Senator MARKEY, put together a bill that is called the HOPE Act, and that is one that would require that Medicare take specific account of Alzheimer's, and that in the Medicare program, there be a method for Medicare to fund early diagnosis of Alzheimer's and then the early treatment. As was said by one of our colleagues earlier, a delay of a couple of years or 3 or 4 years in the onset of serious Alzheimer's is extraordinarily beneficial to the individual and to the family, and, in a larger context, to the budget of the individual family, their insurance company, as well as the Federal government through Medicare and Medicaid.

So that program also speaks to the caregiving that is necessary and Medicare picking this up. It is clearly going to be the illness that will bust the bank unless we can get ahead of it, and that is where the research comes into focus and into play. We can do this.

There is another angle to this. I was going to take this up with Mr. FATTAH when he was here. He was talking about other agencies and other govern-

ments that are involved in dealing with this. About a month ago I had the opportunity to spend about an hour with the new Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Mr. McDonald, and we were talking about the various challenges that the Department of Veterans Affairs has dealing with all of the veterans, and it wasn't long before the conversation turned to traumatic brain injury and PTSD, post-traumatic stress syndrome, both of which are illnesses or problems of the human brain.

We were discussing how the Department of Veterans Affairs is dealing with this. It turns out that they also have a research budget, and we know that he was unaware of some of the research that was going on both at the NIH and what Mr. FATTAH talked about, the One Mind program that our former colleague Mr. Kennedy is involved in in pulling together the research that is available around the world, bringing that research together so that the synthesis of it could be a much more rapid solution to the problems that Mr. McDonald faces in the Veterans Administration dealing with post-traumatic stress illnesses as well as traumatic brain injury.

So all of these things come together, and in dealing with it, ultimately we carry a heavy burden of responsibility here in Congress.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. You talked too about the caregivers, and it is theorized that nearly 60 percent of those caregivers who respond to Alzheimer's patients and those living with dementia are impacted with tremendous emotional stress, and they rate that as high or very high. And then of that 60 percent of caregivers, literally one-third is suffering from some order of depression. So the impacts here continue to sprawl and cause greater expenditure for those who are doing their good deed, responding to the needs of loved ones or friends or the patient population out there, and then they are impacted by this order of depression.

□ 1800

It is assumed that has added additional cost to the system of our health care drain, and that is at \$9.3 billion. That estimate goes over the year of 2013, so it is very easy to begin to do the calculus here on the cost of status quo, of not responding in deep measure or in wise capacity, so as to put together the sort of research that we require and the respite relief programs that are essential.

Having talked to a number of caregivers during my tenure here, now closing out my third term, but before that in the State Assembly of New York, I would routinely hear from folks who would deal with these situations, these family issues in ways that they never imagined would be possible.

I know of some spouses that indicated to me that, while they stayed

home full time being the caregiver, they eventually sought employment and used every bit of that salary that came from that new employment to go toward the cost of caregivers. Now, they did that in order to save a relationship.

It was a tremendous emotional drain on their relationship because it is not easy serving as a caregiver. Individuals have told me, as spouses, that they have gone out and sought full-time employment and again passed over that salary to the respite person.

That is the sort of painful pressure under which individuals and couples—families—are living. It is a very difficult assignment many have chosen to keep their loved one at home.

There are issues of safety, economic duress, and certainly our system has to respond to that, so the sooner we set our sights on a cure, on funding that is adequate and effective for research purposes and for developing the responsiveness of the medical teams out there, via perhaps pharmaceutical assistance and development there, the better our economic situation will be in regard to these struggles.

Here is a chance for Congress to respond in very magnanimous terms that will allow us to state cumulatively that we get it, that we are there in order of compassion, that we understand it is about a dignity factor, it is about quality of life, and it is about providing hope to situations that may be rendered hopeless.

Isn't that the best element of work that we can do here to bridge that order of hope to those who have been so stressed and who have been given a walk in life, a journey that is powerfully painful?

I just appreciate the fact that we are utilizing these opportunities, such as this Special Order, to bring to the attention of those concerned with these issues to a laser-sharp focus and to allow for people to speak out there as the general public in support of measures that can be taken, of budget appropriations that can be secured, of opportunities that come in securing the resources essential to go forward and offer the fullest response that we can.

Again, health care situations are driven by this. There are huge costs if we don't respond to the needs of individuals living with Alzheimer's, and then there is that ripple effect that is happening all too frequently for the caregiver community that is also worn thin because of this assignment, because of this mission that they embrace.

It is honorable that they do these things, but we also have to work the system here on the Hill in Washington, to respond to them with a degree of reverence and common sense and fully acknowledge that there are efforts that can be made here that bend that cost curve and speak to the situations at hand in the most effective manner.

Representative GARAMENDI, I thank you for bringing us together on this evening of thoughtfulness here concerning dementia and Alzheimer's as a particular stress.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. TONKO, for joining us in this Special Order hour. Working with you has always been a pleasure. I think this subject is one that you and I and our colleagues will want to take up as the days go forward.

In the spring, the 2015 Alzheimer's Day will occur once again here in Washington, DC. There will be thousands of people coming to Congress, knocking on our doors, grabbing our lapels, and asking us to pay attention to this illness.

I want to review some of the costs, and then basically wrap this up. You talked about home care. There are articles that appeared recently in The Sacramento Bee about elderly people taking care of each other, a wife taking care of her husband in their 50th year of marriage with severe Alzheimer's, the love that is so apparent, but also the difficulty of an elderly person taking care of another elderly person.

We can address that. That is what the HOPE legislation is all about, bringing Medicare into this.

The research thing that we talked about earlier, I am going to put up very, very quickly a couple of charts. This one, what is going to happen to the Federal budget if we do not address Alzheimer's, it is \$122 billion today; in 35 years or 40 years, we are going to look at over \$800 billion, and that doesn't include the private sector. It is going to be \$1.2 trillion spent on this, so we are going to bust the budget. If you are a deficit hawk, you should be paying attention to this.

What do we need to address it? Well, we certainly need care for the caregivers. We have talked about that. We also need research. The plan that was in the earlier legislation laying out the Alzheimer's plan called for an additional \$200 million this year on top of the \$566 million that we are currently spending.

Keep in mind that, for cancer, it is nearly \$5.5 billion; for HIV/AIDS, nearly \$3 billion; and cardiovascular illnesses, just about \$2 billion annually spent in research at the National Institutes of Health.

They are very good, it is very important, and not a nickel should be taken away from that, but we should add \$200 million this year as we complete the appropriation process right now.

People ask, "Where can we find the money?" Well, let's see. We just said we are going to spend \$5.6 billion in Syria and Iraq—new money. I know that my work on the Armed Services Committee—I am on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. We are talking about more than \$12 billion over the next 6–7 years rebuilding a nuclear

bomb that nobody knows what to do with.

Maybe there are choices that we can make. Would America be better off with a new nuclear weapon or rebuilt nuclear weapon, spending \$12 billion or so on that, or maybe spending it on Alzheimer's research?

Our work is about choices, Mr. TONKO. How are we going to allocate the resources of this Nation? My suggestion is we go where every family in America will be affected, every family, either directly as my family has been directly impacted by this. My mother-in-law lived with us the last 3 years of her life, dying at the age of 92; yes, we were affected.

We know the genetic issues. My grandchildren are looking out there and saying, "This is a genetic thing, Papa. What about me?" So that worry carries through our family, and I suspect it carries through every family in America, either directly or indirectly.

Let's make a choice. Let's make a choice to attack with research, with care, with funding the most expensive, most common, most deadly illness in America and in other developed countries: dementia and Alzheimer's.

We can do it. This is not an impossible task. This is simply a task of focusing like a laser on this issue, and when we do, we will find the same success that we have seen with heart, cancer, and HIV/AIDS—not cured, not stopped, but a very significant drop in the deaths associated with those illnesses.

Mr. TONKO, I have completed my statements tonight. I think you have another comment.

Mr. TONKO. I would just like to attach my comments to those you have just closed your statement by.

This bankruptcy that is driven by certain catastrophic situations with health care costs are impacting far too many families, and this order of work here in the Congress is about prioritizations. We have spent trillions on war, and we have really diminished the investment in domestic programming, including health care.

We come up with all sorts of efforts called sequestration, which is a hidden attack on investments in our domestic agenda. We have to be cautious about how we are guiding those priorities that we are establishing in our budgeting here in Washington, but if we were to prioritize based on where the public demands are, let me suggest, in closing, that I have gone to the Alzheimer's walk in my district for the past several years, and every year, the same statement is made: "This is the largest crowd ever assembled."

It keeps growing. It tells me the consciousness of this country, that we want something done for this dreadful disease, doing something that will cure individuals who are walking and living with Alzheimer's and dementia.

The people have asked for this by their participation in local fundraising events. Is that the way that we respond to a crisis, by hoping we have good weather on the walk day, that we reach our intended goal that given year, as people are strapped with expenses of caregiving and medications?

There is a better way to complement that, to lead the effort here in Washington with the research, with the cure that can be found, with the advancements in the pharmaceutical industry to be able to extend life and enhance life and the quality of life. That is what I think is so powerful about the opportunity we have here.

I believe we can be those agents of hope. I do believe firmly that the priority here is to address this crisis that is devastating our American families and our economy. Let's go forward and be those agents of hope. Let's provide for a better tomorrow, and let's show people that there is a compassion that accompanies the efforts here in Washington.

Representative GARAMENDI, thank you for bringing us together on an important discussion that needs to be followed up with resources and public policy and certainly prioritization that brings us to the threshold of responsiveness that is so needed and so deserved and is so correct.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you very much, Mr. TONKO, for joining us tonight. I also thank my colleagues, Mr. FATTAH from Pennsylvania and Ms. SPEIER from California, for joining us on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5069. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1000. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY of California) for today on account of a family illness.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family medical issues.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 3, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8124. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Financial Market Utilities [Regulation HH; Docket No.: R-1477] (RIN: 7100-AE09) received November 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8125. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Credit Union Ownership of Fixed Assets (RIN: 3133-AE05) received November 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8126. A letter from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8127. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8128. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8129. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's Fiscal Year 2014 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on House Administration.

8130. A letter from the Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter regarding a new trade agreement in the World Trade Organization aimed at eliminating tariffs on a wide range of environmental goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8131. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified Transportation Fringe (Rev. Rul. 2014-32) received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8132. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Treatment of Certain Amounts Paid to Section 170(c) Organizations under Certain Employer Leave-Based Donation Programs to Aid Victims of the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) Outbreak in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone [Notice 2014-68] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8133. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service,

transmitting the Service's final rule — Salvage Discount Factors and Payment Patterns for 2014 (Rev. Proc. 2014-60) received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3240. A bill to instruct the Comptroller General of the United States to study the impact of Regulation D, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4200. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies (Rept. 113-641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4569. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 766. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-643). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Joint Economic Committee. Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 2014 Economic Report of the President (Rept. 113-644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 5779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for elementary and secondary private school tuition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 5780. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the integrity

of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 5781. A bill to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 5782. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, to provide additional assistance to Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H. Res. 767. A resolution expressing support for designation of December 3, 2014, as the "National Day of 3D Printing"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HAHN:

H. Res. 768. A resolution recognizing that Monsignor Diomartich through his passion of spreading the word of God, has inspired and guided the residents of Los Angeles and has brought unity and pride to the Croatian community; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. Res. 769. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the healthcare, energy, telecommunications, and other sectors of the United States economy should continue their sector-specific efforts to protect critical infrastructure, to prevent information security breaches, and to prevent cybersecurity breaches; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 5779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

Section 8.

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 5780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 5781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 5782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1 Sec. 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 411: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1150: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1351: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1518: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2426: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2529: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2780: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2790: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2989: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 3116: Mr. STUTZMAN and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 3369: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 3424: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 3426: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 3465: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3505: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3708: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 3833: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3899: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3902: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 4158: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 4215: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 4351: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 4361: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4663: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4664: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4717: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 4748: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 4885: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4920: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 4969: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5136: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5241: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 5364: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 5478: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 5491: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 5504: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 5505: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 5557: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 5563: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5589: Mr. WALZ, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 5620: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 5644: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 5646: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 5650: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5655: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 5658: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 5675: Mr. JOYCE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 5696: Mr. WALZ and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 5697: Mr. KEATING, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 5706: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 5735: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 5739: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 5759: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 5765: Mr. COLE and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 5768: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. JENKINS.

H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H. Res. 190: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 622: Mr. GIBBS.

H. Res. 757: Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Res. 761: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 5771, the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The provisions in H.R. 5771 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 5771, the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

SENATE—Tuesday, December 2, 2014

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, our shelter in turbulent times, as voices throughout the Nation cry out for equal protection under the law, use our lawmakers to ensure that justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

Thank You for not leaving or forsaking us, for You continue to be our ever-present help in trouble. We are Your people and the sheep of Your pasture.

Shepherd of Love, continue to provide for our every need from the rich bounties of Your grace. In a special way bless the lawmakers who will take the oath of office today.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume executive session. There will be four rollcall votes at 10:30 a.m. on the confirmation of the Mamet and Bell nominations and cloture on the Coloretti and Adler nominations.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

There will be a series of three votes at 4 p.m. on confirmation of the Coloretti and Adler nominations and cloture on the Burrows nomination.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificates of election to fill the unexpired terms for the States of Hawaii and South Carolina. The certificates, the Chair is advised, are in the form suggested by the Senate. If there be no objection, the reading of the certificates will be waived, and they will be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR UNEXPIRED TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November, 2014, Brian Schatz was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Hawaii a Senator for the unexpired term ending at noon on the 3rd day of January, 2017, to fill the vacancy in the representation from said State in the Senate of the United States caused by the death of Daniel K. Inouye.

Witness: His excellency our governor Neil Abercrombie, and our seal hereto affixed at Honolulu this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 2014.

By the Governor:

NEIL ABERCROMBIE,
Governor.
SCOTT T. NAGO,
Chief Election Officer.

[State Seal Affixed]

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR UNEXPIRED TERM

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the fourth day of November A.D. 2014, Tim Scott was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina a Senator for the unexpired term ending at noon on the third day of January, 2017, to fill the vacancy in the representation from said State in the Senate of the United States caused by the resignation of Jim DeMint.

Witness: Her Excellency our governor Nikki R. Haley and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, South Carolina, this twenty-fourth day of November in the year of our Lord 2014.

NIKKI R. HALEY,
Governor.
MARK HAMMOND,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senators-elect will now present themselves at the desk, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

Mr. SCHATZ and Mr. SCOTT, escorted by Mr. BEGICH and Mr. GRAHAM, respec-

tively, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Vice President; and they severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations, Senators.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the Senate on the pending nominations before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF NOAH BRYSON MAMET TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC

NOMINATION OF COLLEEN BRADLEY BELL TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO HUNGARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Noah Bryson Mamet, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Argentine Republic; and Colleen Bradley Bell, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

BELL NOMINATION

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I don't usually object to the appointments and nominations by the administration to various ambassadorial positions around the world. I also understand there are numbers of political supporters, financial supporters, and that this is characteristic of Republican and Democratic administrations alike. It has never disturbed me when I have observed nominees to a Caribbean country or maybe to London or Paris or Berlin being rewarded for support both financial and otherwise. But now we are at a point where, according to the Washington Post, modern Presidents have generally followed a 70-30 rule on ambassadorial appointments—where 70 percent are career foreign service and 30 percent are political appointees. President Obama has defied this historic bipartisan political practice, and in his second term a shocking 53 percent of ambassadorial nominees have been political. This brings his 2-term average to 37—far more than any administration in the past. What is very interesting is that some of these nominees are in very sensitive positions around the world. The nomination of Ms. Colleen Bell is probably the most egregious example of that.

Hungary is a close ally—in many respects—but there is no doubt that since taking office in 2010 the Hungarian Prime Minister, Mr. Viktor Orban, has centralized power, has faced scrutiny due to actions that critics charge are inconsistent with democratic principles and practices. His government has reduced the independence of Hungary's courts, pushed through controversial changes to the constitution, and placed acute restrictions on non-governmental organizations. In other words, this is a very important country. This is a very important country where bad things are going on.

Ms. Bell's experiences have been largely relegated to producing the television soap opera "The Bold and the Beautiful." Now, I am sure television viewing is important in Hungary, but the fact is this nominee is totally unqualified for this position in this country.

Now, if it were, as I say, some Caribbean country or some other, I would understand that. But here we are in a relationship with a country where, according to Bloomberg News, "Orban says he seeks to end liberal democracy in Hungary. Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban said he wants to abandon liberal democracy in favor of an 'illiberal state,' citing Russia and Turkey as examples."

By the way, we have an excellent DCM there in Hungary who has been doing a great job.

Ms. Bell has two qualifications. One is she is a producer of a television soap opera. She has no experience in foreign policy or national security, no famili-

arity with the language, country, or the region, has never been there, and lacks meaningful knowledge of history or economics. Her only significant qualification is that she bundled, as the word is used, \$800,000 to President Obama in the last election, and as part of the California delegation to the 2012 Democratic convention, she bundled more than \$2.1 million for President Obama's reelection effort.

I want to repeat again that I understand there are awards for political support and it has grown with "bundling." But when we send a person who doesn't know the language—has never been to the country, has no familiarity in foreign policy or national security—to a nation of this importance, then, my friends, we are making a serious mistake.

The Hungarian Prime Minister is distancing himself from the values shared by most European Union nations. Orban said civil society organizers receiving funding from abroad needed to be "monitored," as he considered those to be agents of foreign powers. We are talking about the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, Freedom House, and others.

He said:

We're not dealing with civil society members but paid political activists who are trying to help foreign interests here.

Amazing. Orban, who has fueled employment with public works projects, said he wants to replace welfare societies with a welfare state. But the main problem is that Mr. Orban is cozying up to Vladimir Putin. He has now entered into a nuclear deal, and he is practicing the same kinds of anti-democratic practices as what seems to be his role model—Vladimir Putin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to Mr. REID from the 15 former presidents of the American Foreign Service Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 6, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR REID, Among the nominees for ambassadorships currently under consideration by the Senate, three have generated considerable public controversy: George Tsunis (Norway), Colleen Bell (Hungary), and Noah Mamet (Argentina). The nominations of Mr. Tsunis and Ms. Bell have been forwarded to the full Senate by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

As former presidents of the American Foreign Service Association, the professional association and trade union of career members of the Foreign Service, we urge you to oppose granting Senate consent to these three candidates. Although we have no reason to doubt that the nominees are conscientious and worthy Americans, the fact that they appear to have been chosen on the basis of their service in raising money for electoral campaigns, with minimal demonstrated qualifications for their posts, has subjected them to widespread public ridicule, not only

in the U.S. but also abroad. As a result, their effectiveness as U.S. representatives in their host countries would be severely impaired from the start. Their nominations also convey a disrespectful message, that relations with the host country are not significant enough to demand a chief of mission with relevant expertise.

These three nominations represent a continuation of an increasingly unsavory and unwise practice by both parties. In the words of President Theodore Roosevelt, "The spoils or patronage theory is that public office is primarily designed for partisan plunder." Sadly it has persisted, even after President Nixon's acknowledged rewarding of ambassadorial nominations to major campaign donors was exposed. Recognizing that the practice was inconsistent with democratic principles, the U.S. Congress in the Foreign Service Act of 1980 set the following guidelines:

SEC. 304. APPOINTMENT OF CHIEFS OF MISSION.—

(a)(1) An individual appointed or assigned to be a chief of mission should possess clearly demonstrated competence to perform the duties of a chief of mission, including, to the maximum extent practicable, a useful knowledge of the principal language or dialect of the country in which the individual is to serve, and knowledge and understanding of the history, the culture, the economic and political institutions, and the interests of that country and its people.

(2) Given the qualifications specified in paragraph (1), positions as chief of mission should normally be accorded to career members of the Service, though circumstances will warrant appointments from time to time of qualified individuals who are not career members of the Service.

(3) Contributions to political campaigns should not be a factor in the appointment of an individual as a chief of mission.

(4) The President shall provide the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, with each nomination for an appointment as a chief of mission, a report on the demonstrated competence of that nominee to perform the duties of the position in which he or she is to serve.

(b)(1) In order to assist the President in selecting qualified candidates for appointment or assignment as chiefs of mission, the Secretary of State shall from time to time furnish the President with the names of career members of the Service who are qualified to serve as chiefs of mission, together with pertinent information about such members.

(2) Each individual nominated by the President to be a chief of mission, ambassador at large, or minister shall, at the time of nomination, file with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report of contributions made by such individual and by members of his or her immediate family during the period beginning on the first day of the fourth calendar year preceding the calendar year of the nomination and ending on the date of the nomination. The report shall be verified by the oath of the nominee, taken before any individual authorized to administer oaths. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall have each such report printed in the Congressional Record. As used in this paragraph, the term "contribution" has the same meaning given such term by section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(8)), and the term "immediate family" means the spouse of the nominee, and any child, parent, grandparent, brother, or sister of the nominee and the spouses of any of them.

During his 2008 election campaign, President Obama recognized the appropriateness of these guidelines, and promised to respect them. The time for the Senate to begin enforcing its own guidelines set forth in law for U.S. diplomatic chiefs of mission is now. The nation cannot afford otherwise.

Sincerely,

Fifteen former presidents of the American Foreign Service Association—Marshall Adair, Thomas Boyatt, Kenneth Bleakley, Theodore Eliot, Franklyn A Harris, William Harrop, Dennis Hays, J. Anthony Holmes, Lars Hyde, Susan Johnson, Alphonse La Porta, John Limbert, John Naland, Lannon Walker, Theodore Wilkinson.

Mr. MCCAIN. They say:

As former presidents of the American Foreign Service Association, the professional association and trade union career members of the Foreign Service, we urge you to oppose granting Senate consent to these three candidates . . .

They mention George Tsunis to Norway, Colleen Bell to Hungary, and Noah Mamet to Argentina. I think we should pay attention to these former distinguished members of the diplomatic corps.

I urge my colleagues for once to vote against a totally unsuitable nominee to be Ambassador to a very critical country in a struggle that is going to go on for a long time, as Colonel Vladimir Putin tries to extend the reach of Russia and restore the old Russian Empire. We will be sending a message by this appointment that it really isn't that important. I urge my colleagues to cast a "no" vote.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MAMET NOMINATION

The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Noah Bryson Mamet, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Argentine Republic?

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN),

the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 293 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Harkin	Pryor
Begich	Heitkamp	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Levin	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Hagan	Nelson	

NAYS—43

Alexander	Flake	McConnell
Ayotte	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	King	Vitter
Cruz	Kirk	Wicker
Enzi	Lee	
Fischer	McCain	

NOT VOTING—7

Brown	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Coburn	Murkowski	
Cochran	Roberts	

The nomination was confirmed.

BELL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Bell nomination.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. We are about to vote on a totally unqualified individual to be Ambassador to a nation which is very important to our national security interests. Her qualifications are as the producer of the television soap opera "The Bold and the Beautiful." She contributed \$800,000 to Obama in the last election and bundled more than \$2.1 million for President Obama's reelection effort.

I am not against political appointees. I understand how the game is played, but here we are, a nation that is on the verge of ceding its sovereignty to a neofacist dictator—getting in bed with Vladimir Putin—and we are going to send the producer of "The Bold and the Beautiful" as our Ambassador.

I urge my colleagues to put a stop to this foolishness. I urge a "no" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, one would think this is the first time any

President ever nominated someone who is a political appointee. That is ridiculous. Just because somebody is a producer of a very popular show doesn't disqualify them. It is ridiculous. I could point out people who had the support of the Senator from Arizona who perhaps didn't work at all.

So let's be clear. This nominee is an intelligent woman. She knows how to be successful. She will do a good job. I think she will do very well in this position because I know her well. She knows how to make friends. She is not angry.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Colleen Bradley Bell, of California, to be Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 294 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Harkin	Pryor
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Boxer	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Levin	Tester
Carper	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Casey	Markey	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCaskill	Walsh
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hagan	Nelson	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Corker	Hatch
Ayotte	Cornyn	Heller
Barrasso	Crapo	Hoeven
Blunt	Cruz	Inhofe
Boozman	Enzi	Isakson
Burr	Fischer	Johanns
Chambliss	Flake	Johnson (WI)
Coats	Graham	King
Collins	Grassley	Kirk

Lee
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Paul

Portman
Risch
Rubio
Scott
Sessions

Shelby
Thune
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

[Rollcall Vote No. 295 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Ayotte
Baldwin
Begich
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coats
Collins
Coons
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Flake
Franken

Gillibrand
Hagan
Harkin
Hatch
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Johnson (SD)
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Levin
Manchin
Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy

Murray
Nelson
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Walsh
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

Coburn
Cochran

Landrieu
Murkowski

Roberts
Rockefeller

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the cloture vote on the Coloretti nomination.

Who yields time?

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the ending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Harry Reid, Tim Johnson, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Department of Housing and Urban Development, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 34, as follows:

Alexander
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo
Cruz
Enzi
Fischer

NAYS—34

Grassley
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)
Kirk
Lee
McCain
McConnell
Moran

Paul
Portman
Risch
Rubio
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Thune
Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—7

Coburn
Cochran
Graham

Landrieu
Murkowski
Roberts

Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 34.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF NANI A. COLORETTI TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With respect to the nominations confirmed under the previous order, the motions to reconsider have been made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to the cloture vote on the Adler nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robert S. Adler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Harry Reid, John D. Rockefeller IV, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Tom Udall, Mazie Hirono, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert S. Adler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 296 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin
Begich
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand
Hagan

Harkin
Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Johnson (SD)
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson

Pryor
Reed
Reid
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Walsh
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—40

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo

Cruz
Enzi
Fischer
Flake
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)

Kirk
Lee
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Paul
Portman
Risch
Rubio
Scott

Sessions
Shelby

Thune
Toomey

Vitter
Wicker

NOT VOTING—8

Coburn
Cochran
Graham

Landrieu
Levin
Murkowski

Roberts
Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. ADLER TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert S. Adler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 4 p.m. will be equally divided in its usual form.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are postcloture on the Adler nomination.

OBAMACARE

Mr. THUNE. Very good.

Madam President, I wish to speak today about some of what is happening here with the agenda and where we might be headed. I think it is important to point out that the Democrats here, after this election, seem to be in disarray. We have fractures emerging on the left and the right.

Senate Democrats and the President are blaming each other for the Democrats' devastating election loss. The President is threatening a veto on a bipartisan tax extenders package that was negotiated by the House Ways and Means Committee chairman and the Senate Democratic leader.

The senior Senator from New York told an audience last week that passing ObamaCare was a mistake. To quote the Senator:

But unfortunately, Democrats blew the opportunity the American people gave them.

We took their mandate and put all of our focus on the wrong problem—health-care reform.

... it wasn't the change we were hired to make.

I could not agree more, but it is quite an admission from the third-ranking Democrat in the Senate.

Back in 2009, Republicans tried to tell Democrats we should focus on the economy and that any health care reform should be targeted at helping those struggling to afford health care rather than upsetting our entire system, but Democrats refused to listen. Now it appears at least some of them are wishing they had.

The President tried to sell the health care law as a benefit for the middle

class. At a 2010 tele-town hall, he told his listeners that "once this reform is fully in effect, middle-class families are going to pay less for their health care."

Unfortunately, as far too many Americans have found, the President's health care law has actually forced them to pay more. I have lost count of the number of letters I have gotten from constituents in South Dakota telling me how much their health insurance has gone up since the so-called Affordable Care Act passed.

One constituent emailed me in November to tell me:

Please do something about the Affordable Care Act. Health insurance is no longer affordable. In March our family health insurance policy went up \$150.00/month. Now [we've] received notice [of] another \$112.00 increase effective January 1, 2015, for a total monthly premium of \$857.00. This is more than our mortgage and we cannot afford it!!

Let me just repeat part of that last line. "This is more than our mortgage." How are middle-class families supposed to afford what amounts to a second mortgage payment each month? The answer of course is they can't.

The President can talk all he wants about the supposed benefits of his health care law, but the fact is ObamaCare has made life worse for this South Dakota family and it has made things worse for millions of families across the United States.

Since ObamaCare was signed into law, family health insurance premiums have risen by about \$3,000. That is a strain on any family budget just by itself, but it is even worse when we realize that the average family's income has dropped by nearly \$3,000 over the course of the Obama Presidency.

On top of this, ObamaCare has forced millions of Americans off health insurance plans they had and they liked. Frequently, they have been forced to pay more for their new plans while getting less.

Thanks to ObamaCare, Americans have lost access to doctors they liked and trusted, they have lost access to convenient hospitals and they have lost access to medications and that is just the damage ObamaCare is doing to Americans' health care. That is not to mention the damage it is doing to the economy at large.

As the Senator from New York made clear in his comments, he thinks the Democratic Party erred in passing ObamaCare because what Americans wanted was not health care legislation but jobs legislation, and he is right. But Democrats went ahead with ObamaCare anyway, and not only has it not helped the economy, as the President said it would, it is actually hurting the economy.

Take one small part of ObamaCare, the tax on lifesaving medical devices such as pacemakers and insulin pumps. This tax has already been responsible for putting thousands of Americans out

of work, and it is on track to eliminate thousands more jobs if it isn't repealed.

Then there is the ObamaCare 30-hour workweek rule, which is eliminating hours and reducing wages for thousands of American workers, and the numerous ObamaCare regulations that are making it difficult for small businesses to hire new workers.

As Democrats are now realizing, ObamaCare was a big mistake. What Democrats should have done, as the senior Senator from New York admits, was focus on creating jobs and opportunities for middle-class families.

The recent Gallup poll listing the overall health of the economy as Americans' top economic concern was just the latest poll in which Americans have listed jobs and the economy among their main worries. Yet Democrats have spent years ignoring the need for jobs and focusing on their own political priorities.

As the senior Senator from New York said:

When Democrats focused on health care, the average middle class person thought, "the Democrats aren't paying enough attention to me."

That average middle-class person is right.

In a few short weeks Republicans will take over the Senate, and we will be running things very differently.

Our first priority will be passing legislation to create jobs and opportunities for American workers. A significant part of that will be working to undo the damage ObamaCare has done to the economy. We will work to repeal the medical device tax and restore the 40-hour workweek. I hope Democrats will join us. I have a feeling many of them will.

As we have seen, opposition to these damaging ObamaCare provisions is not limited to Republicans. Democrats have joined us before to attempt to address these issues, and I look forward to working with these same Democrats and others in the new Congress.

As for the President, I hope he will finally admit his law is hurting Americans and join us in undoing the damage. Unfortunately, his actions so far have not demonstrated much openness to cooperation or any sign that he understands the American people are calling for a new era in Washington.

Democrats have spent the past several years focusing on the priorities of the far leftwing of their party instead of the American people's priorities—the economy and jobs. That is what the American people have been saying over and over they want their elected leaders to be focused on.

I hope the new Congress will mark the start of a new era in which Democrats join Republicans to help create jobs and opportunities for Americans and remove obstacles to success. The American people have waited a long time for relief. It is time for Congress to give it to them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

ECONOMIC AGENDA FOR AMERICA

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, it seems to me the American people at this particular moment in our history must make a very fundamental decision, and that decision is do we continue the status quo—which includes a 40-year decline of our middle class and a huge and growing gap between the very rich and everyone else—or do we fight for a bold and meaningful economic agenda that creates jobs, raises wages, protects our environment, and provides health care for every American?

The question of our time is whether we are prepared to take on the enormous economic and political power of the billionaire class or do we continue to slide into economic and political oligarchy?

That is the question which the American people must answer. I hope and expect they are prepared to answer with a resounding yes and a desire to move this country in a very different direction.

The long-term deterioration of the middle class, accelerated by the Wall Street crash of 2008, has not been a pretty picture. Today we have more wealth and income inequality than any other major country on Earth, with the top 1 percent owning more wealth than the bottom 90 percent, with one family, the Walton family of Walmart, owning more wealth itself than the bottom 40 percent.

Today in the United States we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth, and we are the only major country on this planet that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right.

The United States once led the world in terms of the percentage of our people who graduated college, and that in a global economy is an enormously important issue. We can't create jobs unless we have a well-educated workforce. We were once in first place in terms of percentage of our people who graduated college. Today we are in 12th place.

I think, as most Americans understand, we once were the envy of the world in terms of the quality of our infrastructure—our roads, bridges, waste water plants, water system, rail—but today, as all Americans know, our physical infrastructure is literally collapsing before our eyes.

Real unemployment today is not 5.8 percent. That is official unemployment. When we include those people who have given up looking for work and those people who are working part time when they want to work full time, real unemployment is 11.5 percent, youth unemployment is 18.6 percent, and African-American youth unemployment is over 30 percent.

Today millions of Americans are working longer hours for lower wages. When we try to understand why the American people are angry, it is important to understand that, in inflation adjusted for dollars, the median male worker—that male worker right in the middle of the economy—earned \$783 less last year than he made 41 years ago, despite all of the increases in productivity. The median woman worker made \$1,300 less last year than she earned in 2007. Since 1999, the median middle-class family has seen its income go down by almost \$5,000 after adjusting for inflation, now earning less than it did 25 years ago.

Why are the American people angry? That is why: a huge increase in productivity, all of the global economy, and yet the median family income in America is \$5,000 less than it was in 1999.

It seems clear to me that the American people must demand that Congress and the White House start protecting the interests of working families and not just wealthy campaign contributors. We need Federal legislation to put millions of our unemployed workers back to work, to raise wages, and make certain that all Americans have the health care and education they need for healthy and productive lives.

In other words, we must have a vision for the future, which talks about what this Nation can become in terms of jobs, in terms of income, in terms of education, and in terms of health care.

Let me very briefly describe some of the major initiatives that I intend to fight for in the new Congress. There are 12 major initiatives which, if enacted, will transform the middle class of this country.

No. 1, we need a major investment to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure—our roads, bridges, water systems, waste water plants, airports, railroads, schools, et cetera.

It has been estimated that the cost of the Bush-Cheney war in Iraq, a war we should never have gotten into in the first place, will end up costing us some \$3 trillion. If we invested \$1 trillion in rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, we could create 13 million decent-paying jobs and make this country more efficient and more productive. We need to invest in infrastructure, not in war.

No. 2, the United States must lead the world in reversing climate change and making certain this planet is habitable for our children and grandchildren.

We must transform our energy system away from fossil fuels and into energy efficiency and sustainable energies. When we do that—make our transportation system energy efficient, make our homes more energy efficient, move to wind, solar, geothermal biomass—we can also create a significant number of good-paying jobs.

No. 3, we need to develop new economic models to increase job creation

and productivity. Instead of giving huge tax breaks to corporations which ship our jobs to China and other low-wage countries, we need to provide assistance to workers who want to purchase their own businesses by establishing worker-owned cooperatives.

Study after study shows that when workers have an ownership stake in the businesses in which they work, productivity goes up, absenteeism goes down, and employees are much more satisfied with their jobs.

No. 4, union workers who are able to collectively bargain for higher wages and benefits earn substantially more than nonunion workers.

Today, corporate opposition to union organizing makes it extremely difficult for workers to join a union. We need legislation which makes it clear that when a majority of workers sign cards in support of a union, they can form that union.

No. 5, the current Federal minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour is a starvation wage. We need to raise the minimum wage to a living wage. No one in this country who works 40 hours a week should live in poverty.

No. 6, women workers today earn 78 percent of what their male counterparts earn. We need pay equity in this country—equal pay for equal work.

No. 7, since 2001 we have lost more than 60,000 factories in this country and more than 4.9 million decent-paying manufacturing jobs. We once led the world in terms of our manufacturing capability. Yet in State after State, we have seen significant losses in manufacturing jobs. When people walk into a store, it is harder and harder for them to purchase products made in the United States of America.

The time is now for us to end our disastrous trade policies—NAFTA, CAFTA, Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—because these policies simply enable corporate America to shut down plants in this country and move to China and other low-wage countries.

We need to end the race to the bottom and to develop trade policies which protect the interests of American workers and not just multinational corporations. American companies should start investing in this country and not simply in China and other low-wage countries.

No. 8, in today's highly competitive global economy, millions of Americans are unable to afford the higher education they need in order to get good-paying jobs. About 40 or 50 years ago we had a situation in this country where some of the great public universities of our Nation—the University of California, City University of New York, and State colleges all over America were virtually tuition free, and anybody could go to those schools regardless of the income of their families.

Today, for many, many families and young people the cost of higher education is simply unaffordable. Either students choose not to go to college because they can't afford it or they come out of school deeply in debt—a debt fastened on their shoulders for decades.

Quality education in America—from child care to higher education—must be affordable for all. Without a high-quality and affordable educational system, we will be unable to compete globally in the international economy and our standard of living will continue to decline. We have to invest in education. The idea that we are laying off teachers is completely absurd.

No. 9, the function of banking—the banking system—is to facilitate the flow of capital into a productive and job-creating economy. That is what banking is supposed to be. People save, people put money in banks, and that money goes out into the economy so that people can buy homes and create businesses.

Financial institutions cannot be an island unto themselves, standing as huge profit centers outside of the real productive economy. In other words, banking must be a means to an end by improving society, creating jobs, providing people with decent housing, and not simply a means by which financial institutions make more and more profit.

Today, six huge Wall Street financial institutions have assets equivalent to 61 percent of our gross domestic product. There is close to \$10 trillion in 6 financial institutions. These institutions underwrite more than one-half of the mortgages in this country and more than two-thirds of the credit cards. The greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior of major Wall Street firms plunged this country into the worst financial crisis since the 1930s, and every day when we open up our newspapers, we see another major banking scandal.

The truth of the matter is that these financial institutions on Wall Street are too powerful to be reformed. They have too much money, too much wealth, too many lobbyists, and make too much in campaign contributions. Our goal must be to break them up. They have too much power and too much wealth. They must be broken up so that our financial institutions begin to serve the needs of the American people and not simply the CEOs and the stockholders of Wall Street firms.

No. 10, the United States must join the rest of the industrialized world and recognize that health care is a right of all and not a privilege. I think many Americans don't know that we are the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right. Yet, within this dysfunctional health care system, we have 40 million people who have no health insurance, more people who are underinsured, millions of people with high

premiums and high deductibles, and at the end of all of that, we end up spending almost twice as much per capita on health care as do the people of any other major country on Earth.

The time is now for us to declare that health care is a right of all people and not a privilege. We need to pass a Medicare-for-all, single-payer system.

No. 11, millions of senior citizens in this country live in poverty, and we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth.

I hear a lot of discussion on the part of my Republican colleagues—and some Democrats—that we should be cutting Social Security. Well, I strongly disagree. In my view, we must strengthen and expand Social Security—not cut it. That is terribly important, especially at a time when more and more seniors are slipping into poverty. We have millions of seniors who are trying to survive on \$12,000, \$13,000 and \$14,000 a year. They have to decide every single day whether they should buy the medicine they need, heat their homes adequately or buy the food they need. We should not be cutting these programs; we should be expanding these programs.

No. 12—and the last point I will make as part of an agenda that rebuilds America and rebuilds our middle class—at a time of massive wealth and income inequality, we need a progressive tax system in this country which is based on ability to pay. It is not acceptable that every single year we have major, profitable corporations which pay nothing in Federal income taxes. It is not acceptable that we have corporate CEOs in this country who make millions of dollars every year and enjoy an effective tax rate which is lower than that of their secretaries. That is grotesquely unfair, and it must be changed.

Further, we have to address the disgrace that every single year our country loses over \$100 billion in revenue because corporations and the wealthy stash their money in offshore tax havens all over the world. The time is long overdue for real tax reform which says to the wealthy and large, profitable corporations that they have to begin paying their fair share of taxes.

I will conclude by getting back to the point I made in the beginning of my remarks, and that is that we are in a pivotal moment in American history. The very, very rich are becoming richer, the middle class is disappearing, and today we have more people living in poverty than at almost any other time in American history. With the wealth of the billionaire class, they are exercising their power politically because Citizens United—a disastrous Supreme Court decision—has given them the power to buy elections and control, to a significant degree, our political process.

We, as a nation, have to ultimately make a decision about whether we are

going to continue the process where the middle class continues to decline and the very, very richest people become richer or whether we are prepared—and this is not easy stuff—to stand together to take on the billionaire class and their greed and to say: Enough is enough. This country does not just belong to the top 1 percent or the top one-tenth of 1 percent. It belongs to all of us.

I hope very much that the American people make the right choice, because if they do, we can bring about a transformation of this country so the government begins to work for all of the people and not just the billionaires who are on top.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:42 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. ADLER TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I will take just about a minute. I know we are waiting for others to come. I have heard some of the discussion on the floor and in the hallways about Thanksgiving. On Thursday, when I sat down with my family over Thanksgiving dinner, I thought about our history and how my grandparents came to Vermont from Italy, my great-grandparents from Ireland, and my wife's family from the Province of Quebec in Canada. We, similar to most Americans, are a family of immigrants. It is that rich melting-pot history that makes our country so special, so strong. Thanksgiving is a good time to celebrate and honor that strength.

Far too many immigrant families today, however, live in fear—fear of being torn apart, of losing a mother or father or sister or brother, to deportation. Bringing peace to those families is one of the things that most motivated me last year during the long debate on immigration reform. Both Democrats and Republicans in this Chamber praised the fair and thorough process that we had in the Judiciary Committee on the immigration bill.

We had 6 hearings featuring 42 witnesses. We debated bipartisan legislation a total of 37 hours over a 3-week period. We considered 212 amendments, and we adopted 136 of them—all but 3 on a bipartisan basis. The full Senate

then debated the bill and approved it by an overwhelming bipartisan majority.

But that effort was not good enough for Republican leaders in the House. They would not even allow a vote on the bill. Today, they are batting zero when it comes to addressing the broken immigration system.

They now complain that the President is acting alone, but he is not. The American people support immigration reform. That is why President Obama acted. His actions are legal, but they are only a temporary fix. Congress must still act. The Republican House leadership has chosen to hold hearings attacking the President's actions, rather than simply stepping up and allowing a vote on a bill to solve the problem. Time is running out and they are wasting it on political antics. I hope that they use the remainder of this month to take up and vote on the comprehensive bill we sent them more than a year and a half ago.

I applaud the President's action to keep families together. That is why next week, the Senate Judiciary Committee will again turn to the issue of family unity. I have asked Astrid Silva, whose remarkable story President Obama began to tell last week, to come and share the rest of her story and what the President's actions will mean to her family. The fact is we have done the work for an immigration bill. Why won't the Republicans at least vote—vote yes or vote no. We did, and I applaud those Republicans and Democrats in the Senate who stood and voted. Let the House act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

COLORETTI NOMINATION

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam President, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the nomination of Ms. Nani Coloretti to be Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The HUD Deputy Secretary is a critical component of the agency's management team, overseeing HUD's programs that provide affordable rental housing, community and economic development opportunities, and an opportunity for creditworthy families to achieve the dream of home ownership. I believe Ms. Coloretti has the skills and experience necessary to take on this role. The full Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee also approved Ms. Coloretti's nomination for the position on April 29, 2014, by voice vote.

Ms. Coloretti is currently the Assistant Secretary for Management at the U.S. Department of the Treasury. During her tenure at Treasury, Ms. Coloretti helped create a new Treasury Operations Excellence Team, which has applied lean principles developed in the private sector to improve performance

at Treasury. This work encompassed dozens of process improvement outcomes, saving the Department money and staff time while engendering a culture of continual improvement.

Prior to joining the Treasury Department, Ms. Coloretti held positions in the San Francisco mayor's office, including budget director; the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families; the U.S. Office of Management and Budget; and the private sector. She is also a recipient of the National Public Service Award, the Public Policy and International Affairs Achievement Award, and the Federal 100 Award.

In all, Ms. Coloretti would bring over 20 years of experience in budget and program analysis, as well as more than 15 years of management experience, to the position of Deputy Secretary of the Department of HUD.

At a time when millions of American families struggle to find affordable rental housing, the market continues to lock many creditworthy potential borrowers out of homeownership, and HUD's State and local partners work to provide greater opportunities with limited resources, it is critical that HUD and the programs it oversees are run efficiently and effectively. As HUD's Deputy Secretary, Ms. Coloretti would be a valuable addition to Secretary Castro's management team. I urge my fellow Senators to support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

CHESAPEAKE BAY ACCOUNTABILITY AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2013

FEDERAL DUCK STAMP ACT OF 2014

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, in a moment I am going to be asking a unanimous consent request on some legislation that combines some work I have been doing and work the ranking member of the EPW Committee, my friend, the Senator from Alaska, has been doing. I want to make a brief statement first and then I am going to turn the floor over to the Senator from Louisiana.

I start by thanking Chairman BOXER and Ranking Member VITTER for working with me on this important legislation. I also thank the bipartisan Virginia delegation on both sides of the Capitol, especially my friend Congressman ROB WITTMAN. He and I have worked on this initiative now for more than 4 years.

As we all know, the Chesapeake Bay, while located around Virginia and Maryland and Delaware, is actually a national treasure. It is the centerpiece of the culture and economy of many

coastal communities in Virginia and in several neighboring States.

Restoring the health of the Chesapeake Bay must be a national priority. Virginia and five other States, the District of Columbia, 10 Federal agencies, and more than 1,000 local governments have spent decades on this shared priority.

We have joined together over the years in a shared commitment to the Bay. We have worked across jurisdictional lines, across the political aisle, across every level of government in partnership with the private sector and with nonprofit groups such as the Chesapeake Bay Foundation.

This important bipartisan legislation that we are going to be moving on shortly ensures that we maintain a Federal commitment to the partnership to restore the Chesapeake Bay. It also makes sure that during these challenging fiscal times every dollar spent on improving the health of the Bay produces real results.

The Chesapeake Bay accountability bill requires the U.S. Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget. That means we will actually track where and how Federal and State restoration dollars are being spent throughout the entire Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

This will allow us to track costs and match them to results. It means more accountability and it means more transparency to our combined efforts to restore this national treasure.

This bipartisan legislation is an important step forward in ensuring that the Chesapeake Bay restoration and preservation efforts remain effective, accountable, responsible, and transparent. In a moment I am going to urge all my colleagues to join us in approving it.

At this moment, I yield the floor to the ranking member, the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I am truly honored to join my colleagues on the floor, Senators WARNER and BEGICH. I am pleased to support Senator WARNER's bill that he just described and also a second bill Senator BEGICH and I have been working very diligently on that will be part of the unanimous consent request. That is H.R. 5069, the Federal Duck Stamp Act of 2014. This bipartisan legislation is a real victory for sportsmen and for conservation. It is a straightforward bill that updates the fee paid by duck hunters for a duck stamp for the first time since 1991, and that is a big win for the hunters, it is a big win for conservation because the cost of the duck stamp goes directly toward conservation of waterfowl habitat. In fact, 98 cents on every \$1 generated goes directly to purchase or lease wetland habitat for ducks, and where you have more habitat, you have more ducks and you have

a healthier environment. It is as simple as that.

I am very pleased to say our work on this bill is exactly how this place and American democracy is supposed to work. I first heard about this real need from duck hunters, from sportsmen who live with this and breathe this every day. I am an occasional hunter, but these folks absolutely live it and breathe it every day and understand the critical need.

I immediately got very involved. I reached out to allies such as Senator BEGICH, who had a great interest in it. I met with the House sponsor, Representative JOHN FLEMING, also from Louisiana. We met with the House Natural Resources chairman, DOC HASTINGS. We got a strong version of the bill that passed through the House recently and that now comes to the Senate. Today, by this consent, we will pass that House bill through the Senate and send it to the President.

As I said, that is the way the process is supposed to work, and this is a real win for hunters, for conservation, for the environment.

I thank my colleague and partner on this, Senator BEGICH, and yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I thank my colleague, Senator VITTER, for this incredible work. For several years we have been focused on this piece of legislation for two reasons; one, not only is it important for the hunters, the duck hunters, but a provision in there is also important for subsistence users in my State of Alaska.

This is an important bill. As has been mentioned, 98 cents of every \$1 that goes into a duck stamp goes back into habitat protection for hunters currently and into the future.

Along with that, since 1934, almost \$1 billion—three-quarters of a billion dollars—has been spent in protecting wetland habitat, again for the purpose of ensuring that we have this habitat protected not only for hunters but in my case for subsistence users.

I agree with Senator VITTER, this is the kind of legislation we want to see done, where Democrats and Republicans, the House and the Senate, are working together. My colleague, Congressman YOUNG, a Republican on the House side from Alaska, worked on his side of the equation, working with other House Members, to figure out how to move a bill. We had a Senate version over here we were working on. At the end of the day, it is not about whose name is on the bill; it is about getting the job done.

Here we have a piece of legislation that will finally correct the pricing on duck stamps to ensure that we keep up with inflation, to ensure that the continued preservation of wetlands is done for our hunters and our sportsmen. But

on top of that, for my State of Alaska, this recognizes the needs of subsistence hunters. Millions of acres in Alaska are set aside as refuge and others are in protected status. Our subsistence users live off the land—not for extra gain for their household, but literally for food for the winter in order to survive. So this allows a waiver to be put into place that will have minimal impact on the duck stamp program, but will ensure that subsistence users—people who live off the land in Alaska—can continue to do that without the threat of a Federal agency fining them or even dealing with them in some way because they didn't have the stamp. This allows them to go for a waiver and ensure they will be able to do their subsistence hunting they have been doing for generations before the government came along and locked up their land they have been hunting. And we will make sure this happens not only now but into the future.

Again, I wish to thank Senator VITTER for his work and his efforts not only in this body but on the other side of the Capitol, working with House Members to make sure we could all work together and do this by unanimous consent. Along with them, Senator BOXER and the EPW staff did an incredible job. It is an honor to be here today.

The last thing I will say to Senator WARNER is this: My son just had an opportunity to go to the bay. He did an incredible field study there with some of his staff. It was a great experience. He was able to go into the mud. I am not sure what that is exactly, but he was able to go chest deep, and then he decided not to do that, but to be there to help people. But it was an incredible experience, to experience that bay, which is a national treasure. So having that bill at the same time as this other one is not only good for Senator WARNER's community but good for this whole country. And for folks from my State who come to visit this community, it is another opportunity for them to see a national treasure. So it is an honor to have two pieces of legislation that will pass by unanimous consent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for his comments and I will be happy to take the Senator and his whole family out to the bay again. I thank the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Alaska for working together. That is the way this is supposed to work. There are duck hunters in Virginia as well and they firmly support this legislation. I appreciate also the special considerations that need to be addressed in terms of the State of Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent that the EPW Committee be discharged from

further consideration of S. 1000, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration and the consideration of H.R. 5069, which is at the desk, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills, en bloc.

Mr. WARNER. I further ask unanimous consent that the Warner substitute amendment to S. 1000, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bills, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and passed en bloc; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3965) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) CHESAPEAKE BAY STATE.—The term "Chesapeake Bay State" or "State" means any of—

(A) the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, and New York;

(B) the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania; and

(C) the District of Columbia.

(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term "Chesapeake Bay watershed" means all tributaries, backwaters, and side channels, including watersheds, draining into the Chesapeake Bay.

(4) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—The term "Chesapeake Executive Council" has the meaning given the term by section 117(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267(a)).

(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE.—The term "chief executive" means, in the case of a State or Commonwealth, the Governor of the State or Commonwealth and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) FEDERAL RESTORATION ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Federal restoration activity" means a Federal program or project carried out under Federal authority in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act with the express intent to directly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that provide financial and technical assistance to promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(B) CATEGORIZATION.—Federal restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(i) Physical restoration.

(ii) Planning.

(iii) Feasibility studies.

(iv) Scientific research.

(v) Monitoring.

(vi) Education.

(vii) Infrastructure development.

(8) STATE RESTORATION ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “State restoration activity” means any State program or project carried out under State authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(B) CATEGORIZATION.—State restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(i) Physical restoration.

(ii) Planning.

(iii) Feasibility studies.

(iv) Scientific research.

(v) Monitoring.

(vi) Education.

(vii) Infrastructure development.

SEC. 3. CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSCUT BUDGET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the chief executive of each Chesapeake Bay State, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, shall submit to Congress a financial report containing—

(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays, as applicable—

(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year;

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C); and

(E) a section that identifies and evaluates, based on need and appropriateness, specific opportunities to consolidate similar programs and activities within the budget and recommendations to Congress for legislative action to streamline, consolidate, or eliminate similar programs and activities within the budget;

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by each Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds that were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including—

(A) the project description;

(B) the current status of the project;

(C) the Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, program, or responsible agency;

(D) the authorization level for appropriations;

(E) the project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) a list of coordinating entities;

(I) a description of the funding history for the project;

(J) cost sharing; and

(K) alignment with the existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement, Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities, and Annual Action Plan required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 (33 U.S.C. 1267 note; relating to Chesapeake Bay protection and restoration).

(b) MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.—In describing restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a), the Director shall only include—

(1) for the first 3 years that the report is required, descriptions of—

(A) Federal restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$300,000; and

(B) State restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$300,000; and

(2) for every year thereafter, descriptions of—

(A) Federal restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$100,000; and

(B) State restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$100,000.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than September 30 of each year.

(d) REPORT.—Copies of the report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on—

(1) restoration activities; and

(2) any related topics that are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission of nominees by the Chesapeake Executive Council, the Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council with the consultation of the scientific community.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—The Chesapeake Executive Council may nominate for consideration as Independent Evaluator a science-based institution of higher education.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall only select as Independent Evaluator a nominee that the Administrator determines demonstrates excellence in marine science, policy evaluation, or other studies relating to complex environmental restoration activities.

(c) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of appointment and once every 2 years thereafter, the Independent Evaluator

shall submit to Congress a report describing the findings and recommendations of reviews conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act.

The bill (S. 1000), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill (H.R. 5069) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VITTER. Did that unanimous consent agreement cover both bills?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. ADLER TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION—Continued

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in any quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX EXTENDERS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I wish to spend a few minutes today to discuss the ongoing saga of the 2014 tax extenders package.

Getting this legislation passed through the Senate has been quite an ordeal from the outset. As my colleagues will recall, the Finance Committee reported its tax extenders package in April and a few weeks later progress stalled on the Senate floor when the Senate majority leadership refused to allow votes on any amendments.

After that time—which was in mid-May—the tax extenders sat somewhat in limbo, although both sides acknowledged the desire to get something passed during the lameduck session, if not before.

The Finance Committee extenders package, if my colleagues remember, extended 55 expired or expiring tax provisions for 2 years without making any of them permanent.

The House took a different approach which was to make certain important tax provisions, such as the R&D tax credit, for example, permanent, bringing more certainty to American businesses, families, and individuals.

Over the past several weeks, negotiations have been ongoing in the hopes of producing a bill that combined the Senate Finance Committee's package with the approach taken by the House.

I am generally hesitant to publicly comment about what happens behind closed doors in negotiations; but, on the other hand, much of what happened next has already been printed in the media. That being the case, I don't feel too awkward discussing the recent turn of events that has brought us to where we are now with the tax extenders.

Last week, before the Thanksgiving holiday, the Speaker's office and the Senate majority leader's office were very close to reaching a deal on a tax extenders package—one that would have included all of the provisions from the EXPIRE Act, which is the Senate Finance Committee-reported tax extenders bill, as well as a number of permanent tax extender provisions.

This emerging deal would have been a reasonable compromise between Republicans and Democrats and between the House and Senate approaches to this matter. It was not the legislation I would have written, but as a compromise taking place in a Congress that is, for the time being, still divided, it was likely the best both parties could hope for.

As I said, we were on the cusp of a deal last week, and then something strange happened. On Tuesday, the White House caught wind of the potential deal—even though the terms had not yet been finalized—and issued a veto threat. How often does that happen? How often does the President issue a veto threat on potential deals still under negotiation? How often do we find that extraordinary threat ratified by people who are involved in the negotiations? As I said, this was not a Republican wish list being negotiated. House Republicans were willing to make a number of tough concessions in order to get a deal across the finish line.

For example, the deal would have made permanent the American opportunity tax credit—a provision that first came into law in the Democrats' partisan 2009 stimulus bill and has been a high priority item for Democrats. It would have also made the State and local sales tax deduction—which is a high priority for a number of congressional Democrats—permanent. And it would have rolled over the tax extenders that expired during 2013—including many that most Republicans do not support—for another 2 years.

These were major concessions and, to its credit, the House was willing to make them in the interests of a bipartisan agreement.

More importantly, the deal was supported by the Senate majority leader who, the last time I checked, was a Democrat. Yet the deal wasn't good enough for the President and for the more liberal Members of the Senate, or should I say the Senate Democratic Caucus. Apparently they weren't willing to take yes for an answer. Instead of compromising even a little bit, President Obama issued his veto threat and has been rallying Democratic Senators against the proposed deal, or at least that is what I have been told. As a result, it appears unlikely that a deal on the tax extenders package will be reached in this Congress. Instead, the most likely scenario appears to be that the Congress will pass a 1-year referendum of tax extenders that have already expired.

Short of not passing anything at all, this is surely the worst of all possible worlds. Rather than the certainty that would come with making some of the more prominent individual tax extenders permanent, families, individuals, and businesses will have to once again put long-term plans on hold in hopes that Congress can get its act together the next time around.

This is bad news for middle-class families. This is bad news for individuals. This is bad news for job creators. And this is bad news for those of us hoping the government will improve the way it does business any time in the near future.

We all know the makeup of the next Congress will be different than it is now. I don't mean to be too presumptuous, but I think it is safe to say the President and his liberal allies are unlikely to get a better tax deal in the next Congress than the one the Senate Democratic leadership had been negotiating up until the last week. I commend the Senate Democratic leadership for its work on that matter. I commend the House leadership and congratulate them for doing the same thing.

Do any of my Democratic colleagues who came out against the proposed deal really think their prospects are likely to improve next year? I have to ask because, quite frankly, this recent turn of events is mind-boggling to me.

In the end, I think the only conclusion that makes sense is that this line of attack—the President's veto threat—and liberal opposition to the potential extenders deal is more about politics than about policy. It is about the President's strategy of following an electoral rebuke of his policies by tacking even further to the left. And it is about congressional Democrats' efforts to pander to their liberal base at the expense of good government.

I hope I am wrong about this, but as I said, there is not another logical explanation that I have heard. I hope the White House and its Senate allies will prove me wrong and come to the table

with an offer that reflects a genuine compromise with the House.

I think the events of this past week have demonstrated divisions in the Democratic Party, and that those divisions are causing real problems. Once again, we had the Senate majority leader in the room and ready to make a deal, only to be undercut by the President and his liberal allies in the Senate. I find that very unfortunate. I commend the Democratic majority leader for trying.

Of course, at the end of the day, I suppose none of us should be surprised at what has happened. After all, President Obama is not particularly known for being business friendly or placing his focus on job creation, which is sorely needed in this country. Whether it is crippling environmental regulations—which we are now seeing come to the forefront in dramatic terms—or whether it is labor policy or health care, the President has demonstrated that he is all too willing to put his political ideology above the needs of our economy.

Make no mistake, the proposed tax extenders deal—the one the President scuttled with his veto threat—was all about job creation. It would have made the research and development tax credit, small business expensing, and other provisions permanent, giving certainty to the business community, paving the way for more investment, and paving the way for more jobs in our society.

The President's latest gambit on the tax extenders is just a series in a long line of instances where politics has trumped job creation. Still, as one who has been willing to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I can't help but be disappointed.

But make no mistake, things are about to change around here and we will have an opportunity to right this ship. I just hope we will have a lot of Democrats who are willing to help us. We need to focus on an agenda that will actually grow our economy. We need to focus on an agenda that will actually create jobs. And we need to focus on an agenda that will empower the American people. That is going to be the focus of this new Congress.

Once again, the President and his allies here in the Senate missed a big opportunity to address some of their party's priorities with the tax extenders legislation. It is difficult to imagine that they will have another bite at the same apple in the next Congress. Absent a deal, we are now left with only one option: a 1-year extension that will likely be passed by the House this week. Once again, a 1-year extension is not a great deal for families, individuals, and businesses, but it is far better than letting these provisions lapse entirely. Indeed, if we do nothing, we run into a series of problems, including a delayed filing season, which means millions of delayed refunds for Americans who count on them. In addition,

doing nothing would essentially amount to a tax hike on millions of people and businesses.

Consequently, I plan to vote in favor of the 1-year extension, unless, of course, my colleagues on the other side finally come to their senses and allow a better deal to be had.

I don't understand this kind of leadership in this country. I don't understand why the President does some of these things. I don't understand why the left just can't take an offering to them that was much better than what we are going to get. The majority leader knew it.

Republicans have been tough on the majority leader. I have been here for years. I care for him. I think it is a tough group of people to manage, just as they are on our side as well. It is a tough job. Frankly, I think the deal he worked out should have been followed. It would have given the President much of what he wanted initially, anyway. It would have brought us together one more time, and it would have been a wonderful thing.

It would have made the end of the year—the work we are doing—much more satisfying and acceptable. It would have been a good prelude to next year of our working together—something that this body needs really badly.

I want to commend the distinguished majority leader, Senator REID, for the work he tried to do. I want to congratulate him. I want to congratulate the Speaker of the House for being willing to work on this.

I think it is unfortunate we are at this point in these negotiations, where we are going to have a 1-year extension. It is not going to be anywhere near where we had negotiated with the majority leader and had negotiated with the House. There are parts of the negotiated bill that I wish I could have changed. But, we had come a long way.

I want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee. I don't think he had much confidence at first that we would put our original extenders bill through the committee. At least he didn't express it to me.

I said: Let's do it, and we did. Even with the parts that I wish weren't in there and the parts he wished weren't in there, it was a classic bipartisan compromise by two sides who feel very, very deeply about all these issues—each and every one of them.

I think the work that Senator REID, the distinguished majority leader, and the Speaker had done was not only a step in the right direction but it would have been something most all of us would have been quite pleased with. I commend them for their work.

I am disappointed with where we are. I hope we can solve these problems in the future. I will be working as hard as I can to bring about bipartisan efforts in that regard.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EPA REGULATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Last Wednesday Americans all across the country were preparing for Thanksgiving. They were traveling. Many of them were going to visit friends and family and places around their communities, their State or the country.

What did the Obama administration do when it thought nobody was actually paying attention? It snuck out a huge new regulation that imposes job-crushing environmental restrictions.

Politico ran an article on it later that day. The headline was: "The most expensive regulation ever. Obama rolls out a major EPA rule."

Why would the President do that? Why would he put out a major rule from the Environmental Protection Agency, affecting millions of Americans, and do it right before a holiday?

If these regulations were such a good idea, we would think the administration—as the administration claims it is a good idea—would put it out in a way that people would be paying attention.

I want to know why the administration did this in a way to hide the regulations from the American people. President Obama didn't say a word about it that day. Instead, he pardoned a turkey. The turkey got a better deal than the American people did last week. They are the ones who are going to be paying for the President's expensive and destructive regulation.

Here is what is happening. The Environmental Protection Agency has proposed a new rule that would dramatically slash the limits of ground-level ozone. The rule runs 626 pages. Then we add on the appendix—over 500 additional pages.

Here is what the Wall Street Journal had to say about the new rule. They had an editorial on it Friday with this headline: "Highway to the Danger Ozone." It says: "Like so many other such rules, this one twists decades-old air pollution laws to restructure the U.S. energy industry and gradually ban fossil-fuel-fired power."

We have fossil fuel-fired power gradually being banned as this administration tries to restructure the U.S. energy industry.

It says: "Coal is the first target." The article also adds: "But natural gas is next."

The current limit on ozone is 75 parts per billion. The Environmental Protection Agency wants to cut that number down to as little as 70, 65, even 60 parts per billion.

The Agency estimates that the new rule could cost nearly \$17 billion every

year—\$17 billion a year in costs. Most of the country would fail to meet Washington's tough new standards if they were in place today. As much as 95 percent of the country would be unable to comply with the new regulations if they go down to 60 parts per billion.

States, counties, and cities would have to curb their energy production and limit manufacturing. That will mean far less economic growth and fewer people working. It will raise the cost of everyday living, and it will destroy middle-class jobs. There is no question about it.

This rule will undermine energy reliability. It will stall manufacturing investment, and it will smother economic opportunity for middle-class families.

It costs too much, and there is very little benefit. It doesn't matter to the extreme environmentalist wing of the Democratic Party who support it.

The Obama administration is once again turning a deaf ear to Americans—the people who want Washington to focus on jobs. That is what we saw in the election earlier this month. The people of this country want the administration to focus on jobs.

The administration claims its tough new rule will lead to new health benefits. What about the health damage done to people who lose their jobs because of the rule?

In March 2012 the Committee on Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Clear Air and Nuclear Safety issued a report titled "Red Tape Making Americans Sick." It is a new report on the health impacts of high unemployment.

According to the testimony and scientific research that was reviewed by the subcommittee, unemployment caused by excessive regulation—such as the new ozone rule—increases the likelihood of hospital visits, illnesses, and premature deaths. That raises health care costs. It hurts the health of children and the well-being of families. The Obama administration doesn't want to hear it and certainly doesn't want to talk about it.

Bipartisan majorities in Congress have rejected the President's energy policies. Senate Democrats wouldn't even bring up his cap and trade plan for a vote in this body.

What does the President do? Does he learn the lesson that the American people don't want his enormously expensive, job-crushing policies?

Does he listen to the voters in the most recent elections—people who sent a clear message they weren't happy with the direction the country is headed? No, not President Obama—he goes ahead and does it anyway.

People are concerned about jobs. They are concerned about the economy. The President is focused, though, on making it tougher for the private

sector to create jobs and tougher for the economy to grow. He purposely is going around the American people and their representatives in Congress and taking this drastic step on his own. Why? Because he knows even Democrats in Congress do not support him.

So what are the Democrats who control the Senate right now going to do about it? If history is any indication, they are not going to do anything. Democrats in Congress are going to just roll over and accept another destructive policy by President Obama. That is what they did with the health care law—a terrible law. Democrats in Congress pushed it through anyway because President Obama told them to do it. NANCY PELOSI was the Speaker of the House at the time. She said: First you have to pass the bill before you get to find out what is in it. Well, now even Democrats are admitting it was a bad idea as they are learning more and more what is in this bill for which they voted. The senior Senator from New York said the other day that the health care law “wasn’t the change we were hired to make.” He said, with the economy in bad shape, it was a focus on “the wrong problem.” That is from a Senator who voted for the health care law. Well, today the Senator is right when he says it was a focus on the wrong problem.

With this new ozone regulation, the President is still focused on the wrong problem. He should still be looking for ways to grow America’s economy, not ways to tie it up with more redtape.

President Obama has made the wrong choice time and time again, adding more regulations, more rules, more bureaucracy. He continues to push extreme policies he knows the American people reject. The President is using unelected and unaccountable czars to go around Congress and the public. His latest Executive action shows his Presidency is failing and floundering.

President Obama is not even waiting to try to work with a Republican Congress or when Republicans take the majority in January. He is acting on his own right now. Well, in January Republicans in Congress will listen to Americans and focus on the priorities of the American people. We will hold the Obama administration accountable for its destructive overreach. We will listen to people who are struggling under Obama’s redtape and suffering because of it. We will do everything possible to stop this legislation and help Americans have better job opportunities in the future.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the President’s Executive order on immigration. I have been listening to my colleagues, both here and on the other side of the Capitol, and I rise in amazement. It is almost incredulous that our Republican friends are against the President taking the same action Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush took to defer deportation to solve a critical problem that we all know exists in the country—a problem that impacts millions. When President Obama exercises the same Executive authority—the same—they are on the air, on television, on talk shows, on Twitter, fear-mongering, calling it illegal, calling it amnesty, a constitutional crisis. Where was all of that when Presidents Reagan and Bush did it?

They hold hearings in the House titled “Open Border: The Impact of Presidential Amnesty on Border Security,” which is a little ridiculous because we have more border security under this administration than we have had in the history of the United States. As a matter of fact, we spend more on border enforcement and immigration enforcement than we do in all of the other Federal law enforcement entities combined—combined.

The Republicans threaten to sue the government or even shut it down. The irony of that is laughable because a shutdown over conducting background checks and collecting taxes from undocumented immigrants would only cost current taxpayers billions of dollars.

Certainly it would cost them billions of dollars if it is anything like the last shutdown that Republicans forced. So double standard? Absolutely. It is the very definition of “double standard.”

On immigration reform, our Republican friends—particularly on the other side of the Capitol—have become the poster children for double standards. On the one hand, they know the political ramifications of the demographic reality. On the other, they refuse to catch up with history and fix our broken immigration system. They are sailing against the headwinds of history, and now they want to prevent the President from pulling them to shore, saving them from their own immobility, their own inaction. They are also sailing against the headwinds of what the American people want. In poll after poll we have seen that the American people want to fix our broken immigration system, and that which the Senate passed—and I was honored to be one of the Group of 8 who put it together 1½ years ago—and passed with an overwhelming bipartisan vote, still has the highest rating among the American people. It has been sitting in the House of Representatives for the last 1½ years.

A new Gallup poll shows that the President’s approval rating among all voters has not gone down since the Executive action announcement was made, as some predicted it would, but, rather, it has increased 5 percentage points among all voters since early November. In my view, any action—Executive or otherwise—is movement in the right direction and it is what America expects of its leaders.

Americans are expecting someone to act, someone to tackle the difficult issues, and immigration, particularly for our House colleagues, seems to be a very difficult issue they can’t tackle. It is not difficult for me, and it is not really difficult for most Americans who believe in the power of common sense, not for those who believe in the need to secure our borders, to secure the country, to promote economic opportunity, and preserve our history as a nation of immigrants and that core value of family values.

I cannot recall anyone coming to this floor and praising inaction, praising the President for not having done enough on a matter of consequence, but that is exactly what our Republican colleagues are doing, once again standing squarely on the wrong side of history—in fact, on the wrong side of their own history—invoking the double standard and claiming what is right for their party’s Presidents is wrong for this President. History, however, is a funny thing. You can choose to ignore it, but eventually it catches up with you, and it has finally caught up with my Republican colleagues.

I repeat what I have said all along: The antidote to Executive action is passing immigration reform. Let’s be clear. Regardless of how big or how bold the President’s announcement may be, a permanent legislative solution continues to be our ultimate objective. Administrative relief will not grant anyone legal status or citizenship, but it will clear the way for many to come out of the shadows, register with the government, pass a criminal background check, get a work permit, and pay taxes as the rest of us do.

Because of the President’s Executive action, the nature of who is eligible is really people who have U.S. citizen families here. It will prevent needless deportations and give a chance at a better life to those who want nothing more than to keep their families together. We are talking about millions of hard-working people who—right now many are exploited, creating downward pressure on the salaries and wages of all Americans by virtue of that exploitation. We have an opportunity to change that. I would rather know who is here to pursue the American dream versus who is here to do us harm, but I can’t know that unless I get people to come forward and go through a criminal background check.

If our Republican colleagues are so concerned about getting immigration

policy right, if they are so concerned about the President overstepping his authority, which is the same authority Republican Presidents have used, they can exert their own authority and push our bipartisan bill over the finish line with one vote—one vote in the House of Representatives.

The President himself has said he acted because there is a cost to waiting—a cost measured in the thousands of parents of U.S. citizen children who are deported, husband and wives who are separated from their U.S. citizen spouses, and the economic consequences.

I know there are some who suggest: Let's wait until the next Congress. Let's wait and see. Give them a little time. If not, we will act.

This is the same Republican Party—particularly in the House of Representatives—that blocked immigration reform in 2006, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2014 despite a strong bipartisan bill here. So if they wish, they can join us at the negotiating table with their own proposals and their own solutions because doing nothing and maintaining the status quo is no longer an option. That is precisely why they didn't want the President to follow through on what he told them. He waited on Executive action. He gave them advance notice. He said: I want you to act, but if you don't act, eventually I will have to act.

Now let's look at what my Republican friends find so objectionable. To put it simply, the administration is creating a new deferred action for parental accountability, a program that provides deferred action on a case-by-case basis to undocumented parents of U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents—those who were present in the United States on November 20 of this year, those who have continuously lived in the United States for 5 years, since January 2010, and are not an enforcement priority—and also is expanding the program that already exists for DREAMers by expanding the age content.

This isn't amnesty because amnesty means you did something wrong and you are forgiven and get whatever you want. Amnesty means you get something for nothing. First of all, these people have no pathway to becoming a permanent resident or citizen under the President's Executive order. Secondly, their only opportunity is not to be deported, assuming they can pass a background check and pay their taxes.

As a result of the President's order, more people will go to the southern border to protect it, more people will pay taxes who may not be paying them now, more families will stay reunited, and more people who are in the shadows will come forward and go through a criminal background check. I would like to know who those people are, and I would like to make sure they don't have a criminal background. More

criminals and felons will be deported because now it will be a priority to deport those individuals. What is wrong with that set of circumstances?

So this is temporary relief as the Congress hopefully comes together on a more permanent basis.

In my State of New Jersey, approximately 137,000 parents of U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents will benefit from the new action. About 67,000 will benefit from the new program on children. That is an estimated 204,000 people in New Jersey who can come out of the shadows and contribute to the community and the economy. These are moms and dads, good people, hard-working people who can register with the government, pass a background check, get a work permit, pay taxes, take care of their families, and no longer fear deportation.

The fact is, because of the President's Executive action, more felons will be deported, more resources will go to our border, more families will stay together, and more people will pay taxes. These are all good things.

The Council of Economic Advisers has found that over the next decade the range of Executive actions announced by the President will increase our gross domestic product by up to 0.9 percent, it will reduce the Federal deficit by \$25 billion through increased economic growth, and it will raise the average wages for U.S. workers by 0.3 percent.

The Executive action the President has taken and the Republicans have criticized will increase the productivity of our workforce. How? By allowing those—from undocumented immigrants to spouses of highly skilled H-1B visa holders—to be part of the formal economy and match the skills they have with the skills needed by entrepreneurial startups that they often create.

By the way, that is a fraction of the economic benefits of what we did here on a bipartisan basis that has been sitting in the House of Representatives for the last 1½ years. The Senate bill we passed, according to the Congressional Budget Office—the nonpartisan scoring division of everything we do here—will increase the gross domestic product of the United States by over 3 percent in 2023—less than 9 years—and 5.4 percent in 2033, which is an increase of roughly \$700 billion in 2023 and \$1.4 trillion in 2033. It will reduce the Federal deficit by \$197 billion over the next decade and another \$700 billion between 2024 and 2033. That is almost \$1 trillion in deficit spending which can be lifted from the backs of the next generation of Americans by giving 11 million people a pathway to citizenship. What do we ever do that we pass that grows the economy, reduces the deficit, and creates more jobs for all Americans? Very little. The immigration bill which the Senate passed and which has been pending in the House does all of that in addition to securing our border.

So let's be clear. The President's Executive actions are only temporary steps. Only Congress can finish the job. Deferred action is an act of prosecutorial discretion, but it is not a path to citizenship or a permanent solution. The fact is that we have waited and waited. In the absence of any Republican action in the House on immigration reform, the President has used the power he has available, which other Presidents have used as well. If the Republicans are concerned about an Executive action, they should use their own power to pass immigration reform—either the Senate bill or their own vision of what comprehensive reform is.

For those who question the legality of this, I would simply say there are three letters—one before the Executive action and two after—from law professors and former general counsels of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and chief counsels of USCIS. They say the President has the authority. He is on sound legal footing.

So we are tired of waiting for Republicans to say yes to something—yes to taking action that is in the interest of millions in this country who expect leadership, expect action, expect progress, expect cooperation, not confrontation and obstruction. Millions of families are tired of waiting. The Nation is tired of waiting for Republicans to catch up with history—in this case, with the lessons of their own history.

Let's invite our Republican friends to invoke the memory of Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush and for once commend this President for following their lead in this, doing what is right by the Nation and doing what is right by our taxpayers, doing what is right for our security and doing what is right by our families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote originally scheduled for today at 4 p.m. be delayed until 4:10 p.m., and that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on cloture on Calendar No. 1069, Burrows, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on Calendar No. 1067, Lopez; further, that if cloture is invoked on either of these nominations, that at 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning, Wednesday, December 3, 2014, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further,

that following these votes, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 1036, Hale; 1037, Kearney; and 1038, Pappert; further, if cloture is invoked on any of these nominations, that at 3 p.m. tomorrow, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote and all rollcall votes after the first vote in the sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, with respect to the nominations in this agreement, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF NANI A. COLORETTI TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Coloretti nomination.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to express my support for the consideration of the nomination of Nani Coloretti to be the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD.

Ms. Coloretti has a distinguished history of public service; she currently is the Assistant Secretary for Management at the U.S. Department of Treasury, a position she has served in since 2012. Prior to joining the U.S. Treasury, Ms. Coloretti assisted setting up operations at the newly created Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, serving as the Acting Chief Operating Officer. Additionally, from 1999 to 2005, Ms. Coloretti served as director of policy, planning and budget for the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and their Families, as well as budget director to San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom, where she managed the implementation of San Francisco's \$6.2 billion annual budget.

Ms. Coloretti received a B.A. in economics and communications from the University of Pennsylvania and a master's in public policy from the Goldman School of Public Policy at the Univer-

sity of California at Berkeley. In 2012, Ms. Coloretti was awarded the National Public Service Award by the American Society for Public Administration and the National Academy of Public Administration.

I believe that Ms. Coloretti brings a wealth of experience and knowledge to the position of Deputy Secretary, and I look forward to voting for her confirmation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Nani A. Coloretti, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Department of Housing and Urban Development?

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce the Senator from Louisiana (Mrs. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 297 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Alexander	Hagan	Murray
Ayotte	Harkin	Nelson
Baldwin	Hatch	Portman
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Heller	Reid
Booker	Hirono	Rockefeller
Boxer	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Isakson	Schatz
Cantwell	Johanns	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	King	Tester
Coats	Klobuchar	Toomey
Collins	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Coons	Levin	Udall (NM)
Corker	Manchin	Walsh
Donnelly	Markley	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wicker
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	

NAYS—28

Barrasso	Enzi	McCain
Blunt	Fischer	McConnell
Boozman	Graham	Moran
Burr	Grassley	Paul
Chambliss	Inhofe	Risch
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Roberts
Crapo	Kirk	
Cruz	Lee	

Rubio	Sessions	Thune
Scott	Shelby	Vitter

NOT VOTING—4

Coburn	Landrieu
Cochran	McCaskill

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. ADLER TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Adler nomination.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert S. Adler, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 298 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Pryor
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rockefeller
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Levin	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markley	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Hagan	Nelson	

NAYS—44

Alexander	Enzi	Kirk
Ayotte	Fischer	Lee
Barrasso	Flake	McCain
Blunt	Graham	McConnell
Boozman	Grassley	Moran
Burr	Hatch	Murkowski
Chambliss	Heller	Paul
Coats	Hoeven	Portman
Collins	Inhofe	Risch
Corker	Isakson	Roberts
Cornyn	Johanns	Rubio
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Cruz	King	

Sessions Thune Vitter
Shelby Toomey Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Coburn Cochran Landrieu

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote to invoke cloture on the Burrows nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 299 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Cardin	Gillibrand
Ayotte	Carper	Hagan
Baldwin	Casey	Harkin
Bennet	Collins	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Coons	Heitkamp
Booker	Donnelly	Hirono
Boxer	Durbin	Johnson (SD)
Brown	Feinstein	Kaine
Cantwell	Franken	King

Klobuchar	Murphy	Shaheen
Leahy	Murray	Stabenow
Levin	Nelson	Tester
Manchin	Pryor	Udall (CO)
Markey	Reed	Udall (NM)
McCaskill	Reid	Walsh
Menendez	Rockefeller	Warner
Merkley	Sanders	Warren
Mikulski	Schatz	Whitehouse
Murkowski	Schumer	Wyden

NAYS—39

Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johanns	Sessions
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cruz	Kirk	Thune
Enzi	Lee	Toomey
Fischer	McCain	Vitter
Flake	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Begich Cochran
Coburn Landrieu

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 39.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF CHARLOTTE A. BURROWS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on cloture on the Lopez nomination.

Mr. CARDIN. I yield back all remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time has been yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of P. David Lopez, of Arizona, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination

of P. David Lopez, of Arizona, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 300 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Walsh
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—43

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johanns	Shelby
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	
Fischer	Moran	

NOT VOTING—3

Coburn Cochran Landrieu

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF P. DAVID LOPEZ TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of P. David Lopez, of Arizona, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, with respect to the votes to confirm the Coloretti and Adler nominations, the motions to reconsider are considered made and

laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Texas.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last week, before the Thanksgiving holiday, our colleague from across the aisle, the senior Senator from New York, gave a very significant speech at the National Press Club. Senator SCHUMER is not just a senior Senator from New York; he is an important Member of the Democratic leadership here in the Senate.

While giving the speech about the midterm elections, he said what many Members on this side of the aisle have been saying for the last 4 years, and that is that the Democratic party, by making the passage of ObamaCare their top priority after they won the election of 2008, "blew the opportunity the American people gave them." He said they did so by focusing "on the wrong problem."

What I think he meant and went on to say is that they should have focused on the lack of jobs and the wage stagnation for hardworking, middleclass families in America.

As he pointed out, that broader group of the middle class represented a much larger segment of the electorate than just a small percentage of the electorate represented by the uninsured. I would add, parenthetically, that we know that even the best laid plans with the Affordable Care Act has proven to be a terrible failure.

Today the Wall Street Journal reported that between 2007 and 2013 health insurance premiums for an average middleclass American family have gone up by 24 percent. As we know, when the President said if you like your doctor, you can keep him, that proved not to be true. When he said the family of four would see their premiums go down by \$2,500, that ended up not to be true either.

Two weeks ago, despite the overwhelming rejection the President's policies received at the polls, the President then decided to circumvent Congress and take Executive action on immigration, far exceeding any arguable authority that I believe most lawyers would think he has. Certainly, while we recognize it is within the President's discretion to prioritize the people against whom enforcement action will be taken, there is no legal authorization for doing other things he purports to have the authority to do, such as issuing work permits.

Then there is this. Just when it seemed that the Senate was beginning to work on avoiding a retroactive tax increase for millions of Americans, the President threatened to veto an important tax relief package, which, as I said, had bipartisan support, including the support of the majority leader, Senator REID, and Senator SCHUMER,

the senior Senator from New York. He did so because it did not include every single provision he thought it should include.

If we have not learned before, we should now know that if you insist on absolute perfection—in other words, you want everything you want, and the alternative is nothing—then most of the time you are going to get nothing. That is what taxpayers are getting when it comes to aborting this retroactive tax provision in the so-called tax extenders bill.

To again quote our good friend from New York, by threatening to veto this job-creating tax relief, it appears that the President has once again focused on the wrong problem and is certainly going about this in a nonproductive and unconstructive way. It is unfortunate because the President seems to be positively allergic to good-faith negotiations and genuine compromise. Again, if your attitude is "my way or the highway," you are going to get the highway all the time because that is not how our democratic institutions work. The only way things work is for us to find common ground and to compromise. Yet the President's attitude seems, unfortunately, out of touch. He seems more interested in getting his way by any means necessary—hence, the Executive action on immigration.

We increasingly know that actions are dividing the country and hurting hard-working Texans and American families across the Nation—and not just by not contributing to the solution but by being a positive obstacle to bipartisan resolutions of so many of these problems. I realize the President must think that it is much easier to issue Executive orders and threaten to veto legislation from the White House, but it was not helping to solve problems we were sent here by our constituents to solve.

There is no real reason preventing us from getting to the tax relief I mentioned earlier that the President said he would veto. For years House and Senate Republicans—often with significant bipartisan support—have focused on making progrowth provisions of the Tax Code permanent, such as the research and development tax credit, accelerated depreciation, for example, and the section 179 provision.

To show how counterproductive it is for us to do these on a short-term basis or to try to jam them through a lame-duck session, I had a farmer from Texas come and see me. He said: I am prepared to spend and invest \$200,000 on my farm if I know this tax provision is going to be the law. If it is not, I won't. To me, that is just another example of how what we do here—or what we don't do here—has a negative impact on our economy and on investment in job creation.

While I know the bipartisan package proposed last week was not perfect, it

certainly would have moved us in the right direction. It would have provided some certainty—indeed permanency—for some tax provisions and would have provided some temporary relief on others. Perhaps most importantly, it would have sent a signal to our constituents that we got the message that was delivered to us on November 4, and that we are going to commit ourselves anew to try to work together to provide certainty and protect millions of Americans from tax hikes that are just right around the corner and work on other constructive proposals to help solve problems that affect the middle class.

Unfortunately, the President has persisted in his attitude of refusing to negotiate with Congress, resulting in another missed opportunity, and ultimately another short-term fix that will provide no long-term certainty to taxpayers struggling in the Obama economy.

Come January, there will be a new majority in the Senate that will make the priorities of the American people the priorities of Congress. As for President Obama, we can only hope he will somehow have an epiphany and decide to work with us to unite the country rather than continue to divide the country with more Executive actions and his harmful "take it or leave it" approach to governing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I was not intending to come down here. I was getting ready to leave to see my 12-year-old son who just got home from school and make sure that he has dinner and do all the things that a parent would do, but I heard a speech earlier today—and I just heard another one—and it is like revisionist history. It is amazing to me to hear them talk about information that they claim is information—and really when you listen carefully, it is really more of the same.

I agree with my colleague who was just here that people want something different as the new Congress comes in. I will not be here, as the Presiding Officer knows, but that does not mean I will not be a participant in my community and also making comments when I hear things. But what I heard was they are going to finally get to economic development and improve the economy.

The two Members who spoke today whom I heard were here when I came to the Senate in 2009, and a few years later the Presiding Officer came to the Senate. People may have forgotten where this economy was in 2009. The stock market was in dismal shape. I believe it was around 6,500 or 6,800—somewhere in that range. Unemployment was at 10 percent, and the pundits and economists all said it was growing. Approximately 700,000 jobs were lost per month. Two of the three largest U.S.

automobile companies were basically on their back and about to go bankrupt. New housing starts didn't exist, and prices of homes across the country were crashing. Consumer confidence was at the lowest point I have ever seen in I don't know how many years. The deficit was—annually—about \$1.4 trillion.

I know what happens these days—because I have experienced it for the last several years—is news by the minute. What happens today in this moment of time are these one-liners and I can tell they are very synchronized today. They said that the economy was bad, and is still bad, and the bright spot is around the corner.

Actually, you have to look at where we are today, 6 years later. The stock market is at 17,000-plus. What does that mean? It means that people who have retirement accounts, such as 401(k)s or 529s—putting money aside for their kids' education—have had their value come back.

For my home State, which receives a benefit called the permanent fund check—we invest in the stock market with oil revenues we put aside constitutionally, and it is put in the permanent fund and a check is issued once a year. Guess what? This year the check is double from what it was last year. Why is that? Because it works on a 5-year average. Going backwards—I took the year 2009 off; it was a very bad year—what happened to the permanent fund check? It doubled this year in Alaska, which meant that people got that money in their pocket and spent it on the economy and helped to grow the economy.

Where is unemployment today? It is at 5.8 percent nationally—a 50-percent drop. GM, Ford, and Chrysler have added 500,000 jobs since mid-2009.

I know that today was like revisionist history. Amnesia has set into some people over there. They want to recreate the news because the good news is hard to talk about because it is reality.

Now, there is still a challenge. The Presiding Officer has talked about this a great deal, and that is that people are still working harder and longer because the incomes have not gone up enough. They have not seen it come down to them yet, but they have seen it in certain elements. Housing prices are up. In the one single largest investment an individual makes in a lifetime—their housing prices are back up.

Gasoline prices—I have no idea if my colleagues fill up their cars with gas. I do. I know what it costs to fill up my tank, and it costs less now. The average price across the country now is about \$2.77. In my State, it is about \$3.35. But we were up to \$5 in the urban areas—but not anymore.

I saw the statistic today, and I wrote it down. I think I have this right. The price of oil has gone down and so has

the price of gasoline. What does that save consumers every day? It saves consumers \$630 million a day in current prices. It means that consumers are benefiting from that.

When you look at job growth—I believe we are in our 55th straight month of private-sector job growth. Again, we don't have it fully trickling down to the wages yet, but first we have to right the economy. I know the voters have made a decision. Before I came in, the economy was a disaster. Before the Presiding Officer came in, the economy was barely recovering. But I will not sit here and listen to revisionist history.

As a matter of fact, the consumer confidence level is the highest this month since 2007. That means consumers are finally feeling it a little bit. There is still more to go. But to pretend that nothing has happened over the last 6 years—I can't use the words on the floor here because it would be disrespectful—is just not true. It has changed. We still have more work to do.

As a matter of fact, the tax extender bill—the items they didn't want to support permanently would have brought it to every single family that is still struggling. But I know there are tax provisions they want for the NASCAR owners, the horseracing owners. I get that. Those are their issues. I understand that. But we have to be realistic.

Also, the deficit. Think about this. When I came to the Senate in 2009, the annual deficit in this country was \$1.4 trillion. Today, it is \$480 billion. It has dropped by \$1 trillion per year. Now do we want it to be zero? Yes. Do we want to have a surplus so we can start paying off the debt? Absolutely. But we have to get recovery first—get some treatment, which is what we have been doing—and then reinvest in the future. That means infrastructure, education, and objectives that matter to everyday Americans and everyday Alaskans.

I sit here and listen to these comments. Today it happened a little bit before 12:30 p.m., before our caucus break, because we usually break at 12:30 p.m. and I was going to go home. I turned on—my mistake. I turned on the station and I heard the commentary and I thought, Jacob is going to have to wait a little bit for dinner and I am going to come to the floor, because it is amazing to me. Exports—businesses we create in this country we ship out, up 37 percent over the last several years. I will give an example of a company in Alaska. When I was campaigning, I ran into this company in Fairbanks. They had their manufacturing plant in China. Do my colleagues know where they have it now? It is in Fairbanks, AK. They moved it from China to Fairbanks. I told them they should put a 4-by-8 sign out there and say, We take jobs from China and bring them home. They are all good

jobs. As a matter of fact, they are union jobs. So when people talk about how unions are destroying the country—they actually brought jobs back that are union jobs, paying good wages, good benefits, and took it from China and brought it to Fairbanks, AK. It is unbelievable what they do. They do business not only in Alaska, but in Hawaii and other places.

I listened over and over again today, and I want to make sure people—also I should mention housing prices are up, new housing starts are up, which is important for the construction industry. It creates jobs and makes sure we have competition so prices are stabilized over time. Retail sales are strong. I have no idea if my colleague who spoke earlier has ever been in business. He talked about the 179 depreciation. I have actually used it because I have been in small business. I have no idea if he understands how it works, but for small businesses, it is a big deal. It is why Democrats have supported that time and time again.

As a matter of fact, we had it in the minimum wage bill we brought to the floor, the 179 extension, which they voted against, they did not support—raising the minimum wage, bringing people out of poverty and, by the way, helping small businesses expand and invest so they can grow more. As someone who used the 179 more than once—as a matter of fact, my wife has small businesses and is now expanding and investing and is using the 179 depreciation. I hear what they are saying, but I don't know if they understand how it is used. When we had the minimum wage bill, coupled with 179, it seemed to make a lot of sense, but they didn't like that, either.

So I wanted to come to the floor because I think it is important that we, No. 1, don't take things out of context. They mentioned Senator SCHUMER's speech several times. They should read the whole speech, because I think they selected verbiage. I don't agree 100 percent with his comments, but I agree with the concept. We actually did two things. We worked on health care and we worked on the economy. I see people sometimes when they eat their food, they eat one piece at a time—their carrots first, and then their potato, and then their steak. We actually did a little bit of everything. We dealt with health care, because it was crushing the economy, but we dealt with the economy overall. We had to take votes on a regular basis that the other side would never do, because we bet on America. And the result is 6 years later, here we are. The economy is better. It is stronger. It needs more work, there is no question about it. We need to get the deficit to zero and get a surplus, and knock the debt down. That was driven up not just by this administration but by past administrations as well. They forgot about the two wars

they didn't pay for. The extender bill is not paid for. We didn't hear one word about how that tax extender bill is not going to be paid for. It is going to be another part of the debt. But 4 or 5 months ago—my colleagues may remember this—we were on the floor debating veterans care, and all they said is how are we going to pay for it. Well, the veterans paid, but we had to find a way. But here we are going to give more corporate tax relief without paying for it—except actually we do pay for it. Everyday Americans will pay for it with their taxes, and the debt, and interest on the debt. So we have to be clear about that.

I think about where we were, what we did, and where we are. It is significantly different than 6 years ago. It is better. I agree there is more work to be done to make sure we get more of the revenue stream and opportunities in the hands of individuals—hard-working Alaskans, hard-working folks from Massachusetts, and hard-working folks across this country. That is our next obligation. But to come to the floor and say the economy is a disaster is irresponsible. It is not correct. The numbers tell us differently. Actually, even the conservative Forbes, Wall Street Journal, and all of these other magazines and newspapers that I read are now talking about how the economy is moving because we have had this consecutive pattern which really tells how the economy is improving. That is important.

The last thing I will say from a purely Alaska perspective is not only are exports important to us because we do a lot of business overseas—we have seen exports increase. Our unemployment in Anchorage, for example, the city I am from, is 4.9 percent—a pretty good economy. Our fisheries industry, which I know the Presiding Officer and I share—78,000 jobs are connected to that—a \$5 billion, almost \$6 billion industry. Our tourism industry is up, with 2 million overall visitors to our State, again, generating income. There is more activity happening around the country than ever before, and my State is seeing it every single day.

But to come to the floor and continue to be naysayers and talk about how bad things are is really not responsible. We have done a great job. Can we do better? Absolutely. That is what we strive for every single day. And I hope—and I say this to the Presiding Officer because I will not be here after January—that they don't take the position where they are mad at immigration so now they are not going to do these economic development issues, or they are mad at something else and they take it out on some other program. We are going to have—the Presiding Officer will have differences with her colleagues, on immigration, maybe, on health care, on the economy, but we have to find common

ground. The economy is a constant issue, and where investments should happen if we really want to have an impact down the road is investing in infrastructure, education, relieving—as the Presiding Officer has tried to do—relieving debt from students and families. There is now a \$1.4 trillion debt, I think, on families for student loans. It is outrageous. We should be lowering those rates.

Also, as tax reform issues come up, which they will next year, I hope the Senate and the House look at objectives such as making a big impact for individual families, lowering the rates for individual families, hard-working families, if we want to put cash in their pockets, if we want to change the dynamics, give them more of their money back, not the top 1 percent or even the top 10 percent, but I am talking about the folks we see every day—I see every day—out there working hard. We need to make sure they can start putting money aside for college education for their kids, putting money aside for retirement, spending more in the economy, because maybe that car that is 15 years old isn't running so well anymore. That is what I hope we do. Individual relief is more important than corporate relief or the top 1 percent.

On top of that, when we talk about corporate tax relief, never forget who really is driving the economy. It is the small business owners, including the limited liability corporations, the subchapter S corporations, the sole proprietor individuals. They all get taxed by individual rates. We will hear about corporate rate relief, which is important to be competitive, but that is for the big guys. But the guys we see every day—when we go to the cleaners, a sole proprietor; go to a restaurant, sole proprietor, maybe it is an LLC—they are not going to see that benefit unless we lower the rates for them. That is what we should be doing if we want to make a difference for them. Because they will use the 179 depreciation. The 179 has a limit. The big boys use it a little bit, but the limit is really designed for small businesses to reinvest. But if their tax rates are still too high, they won't be able to take advantage of that as much as they can. We want them to take advantage.

I didn't mean to take time here at the end of the evening. I know lots of times people want to get out. But, honestly, I couldn't sit there and listen to the revisionist history that continues to go on. The elections are over. I know now it is called the Obama economy. That is a new phrase. It is really collectively all of our economy, because we participated in trying to save it. They have objected to it for the last 6 years, so by their objection, they get to be a part of not having the result that maybe they wanted, but the result is the economy is much better. We need to do more work to make sure it gets

into the hands of the individual out there. I know that is a priority to the Presiding Officer. But if I continue to hear it, I will continue to come to the floor and speak, because people can't get away with just saying over and over again that they are stating the facts, because the facts are very clear as I just stated. The stock market has gone up. Unemployment has dropped. Housing is up. Housing starts are up. The two largest automobile companies, all three of them now, over a half a million new jobs. Fifty-five consecutive months of growth. That is all good news and we should be proud of it. The Presiding Officer should be proud of it and the Senate should be proud of it. But there is no room for revisionist history when we talk about the fact of where we were 6 years ago and where we are today.

I appreciate the time and yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I am here for my 81st "Time To Wake Up" speech and to ask this body to wake up to the effects of climate change and to say this: Acting on this issue will accelerate economic growth, spur innovation, and create jobs.

We have settled any real argument about the leading cause of climate change. It is carbon pollution. Measurements in the atmosphere and oceans reveal dramatic, even unprecedented changes in the climate.

Our scientists know carbon pollution heats up the climate and acidifies the ocean. That is beyond debate. They know this is already a problem for Americans and the world.

We had wonderful testimony from a NASA scientist today in the Environment and Public Works Committee who talked about what they actually see when they look down from the satellites.

They take measurements. They are not hypothesizing. They actually measure these things. The scientists know that continued, unchecked emissions of carbon dioxide will push the climate and the oceans into dangerous uncharted new territory.

In the face of overwhelming evidence of climate change, some of our Republican colleagues—just a few—are beginning to move beyond denial of basic measurements and basic classroom science and beginning to talk about the costs of action. That is progress. When he was asked recently about climate change, the junior Senator from South

Dakota acknowledged there are a number of factors that contribute to that, including human activity. The question is, he went on to say, what are we going to do about it and at what cost?

Across the building, over on the House side, Congressman PAUL RYAN of Wisconsin has also been talking about the costs of action. In his most recent campaign for reelection, he said that when it comes to action to reduce carbon emissions, "the benefits don't outweigh the costs."

Let's talk about that. When we get past the denial, which with a few of our colleagues it seems we have—not all, maybe not even many, but a few—and we talk about balancing costs and benefits, if we look at the whole ledger, there is no doubt about it that the balance favors action.

Climate change carries enormous costs to our economy and to our way of life. Acting now can accelerate economic growth and create new jobs. The costs of climate change are huge. We even hear this from our own advisers at the Government Accountability Office. In its 2013 high-risk list, our Government Accountability Office said that climate change poses a significant risk to the U.S. Government and to our Nation's budget. Why? The Federal Government owns and operates infrastructure and property that is vulnerable to the effects of climate change. The Federal Government provides aid and disaster response when State agencies are overwhelmed. The Federal Government is an insurer of property and crops vulnerable to climate disruption. These are major line items in the Federal budget.

Our Treasury Secretary, Jack Lew, recently explained:

If the fiscal burden from climate change continues to rise, it will create budgetary pressures that will force hard trade-offs, larger deficits or higher taxes, and these tradeoffs would make it more challenging to invest in growth.

One example—just one. Last month, in the GAO report on what climate change means for private and Federal insurance for crops and for floods, it warned of increased hurricane-related losses to the Federal program. They estimated between a 14- and 47-percent increase by 2040 and a 50- to 110-percent increase over the next century due to climate change. Remember, when you are doubling a number like that, you are starting with a pretty big baseline.

Superstorm Sandy wrought \$66 billion in damage in 2012. If we are constantly replacing damaged roads and bridges, always adapting farming and fishing practices to suit never-seen-before conditions, and frequently paying out big disaster relief and flood insurance claims, that will hit the Federal pocketbook hard.

We do not even have to look to the costs of the future to justify reducing carbon pollution today. Increasingly,

green energy makes economic sense for utilities, for business, and for consumers. Since 2008, prices for solar photovoltaic have dropped 80 percent—80 percent. Austin Energy in Texas recently signed a power purchase agreement for a 150-megawatt solar plant at 5 cents per kilowatt hour—less expensive than comparable offers for natural gas at 7 cents, coal at 10 cents, or nuclear power at 13 cents. The story is similar for wind power. Since 2009, the cost of wind power has decreased by 64 percent. At the lowest end of the price range nationally, unsubsidized wind power prices are just below 4 cents per kilowatt hour. This compares favorably to new coal generation, priced between 6 and 7 cents per kilowatt hour at the lowest end.

The World Resources Institute has just done a brief report called "Seeing is Believing: Status of Renewable Energy in the United States." It is headlined "Wind & solar are cheaper than coal & gas in a growing number of markets." It lists sales in Utah, Colorado, Texas, Georgia, and Minnesota—not States that have a lot in common except that renewables are beginning to outcompete fossil fuels in those States.

Similarly, the New York Times just last week in its business section highlighted this shift in an article: "Solar and Wind Energy Start to Win on Price vs. Conventional Fuels."

I ask unanimous consent that the World Resources Institute report and the New York Times story be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Green energy jobs—they are out there. They are helping communities. Indeed, they are helping communities recover from the great recession. Let me use a Rhode Island example—TPI Composites. TPI has a development and manufacturing facility in Warren, RI. It is also one of our leading manufacturers of wind turbine blades. They make them in Iowa. When the Maytag plant closed in Newton IA, leaving as many as 4,000 workers jobless, wind jobs helped the town get back on its feet. In 10 years TPI has manufactured more than 10,000 wind turbine blades.

In Iowa, MidAmerican Energy pays farmers thousands of dollars each year to site their turbines on their farms. The farmers love it. They can farm right up to about 25 feet around the base of the turbine. There is a little gravel road for the maintenance trucks, but they can farm right up to that. They get paid for having the turbines on their farms. So it is a win-win that has helped Iowa generate more than one-quarter of its electricity from wind.

They are investing more. They have been reducing emissions and moving the State's economy forward—step by step reducing emissions and moving the economy forward. More and more companies, in their own planning, are

seeing the economic benefits from cleaning up their supply chains and reducing carbon pollution from their operations. They see green investments increasing profits. "Too many people say it's this or that," Apple CEO Tim Cook explained earlier this year. "We've found that if you set the bar high, then it's possible to do both."

Outside these walls here in Congress, where the deniers rule and polluter money reigns, State and local political leaders also see that reducing carbon pollution and growing the economy go hand in hand. Almost 10 years ago, the Presiding officer's State and my State and others—bipartisan—nine northeastern Governors came together and formed the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, called RGGI, which caps carbon emissions and sells permits to powerplants to emit greenhouse gasses. Since the program started, RGGI States that have cut emissions from the power sector have cut them by 40 percent.

Here is the blue line. That is the emission chart from 2005 through 2012. Well, if cutting emissions was bad for the economy, you would think that the State GDP would have followed downward in that curve, but, in fact, you see that the regional economy across these States actually grew by 7 percent—grew by 7 percent. Bear in mind, this is 2008, the great recession.

Here we are now. So you would think that during this period the GDP numbers would have taken a pounding. The underlying numbers are actually better than this once you adjust for the recession.

Early estimates show that in its first decade, RGGI will have saved New England families and businesses in the participating States nearly \$1.3 billion on their electric bills. It will have added \$1.6 billion into local economies. Along the way, those RGGI States will have added 16,000 job years. Additional investments are coming online because it is such a successful program. So those benefits also grow. Rhode Island has put over 90 percent of the money generated through the RGGI auctions into energy efficiency improvements, helping residents save money on their utility bills and making small businesses more competitive. This success led Tom Wolf, the Governor-elect of Pennsylvania—a coal mining and natural gas State—to campaign for office successfully on joining RGGI.

RGGI shows that improving the environment boosts the economy. Look north to Canada. British Columbia has a revenue-neutral carbon fee that has reduced the use of polluting fossil fuels by 16 percent. What has happened to the economy? The BC economy has not missed a step. The carbon fee revenue has been used to lower personal and corporate rate income taxes. British Columbia now has the lowest personal tax rate in Canada.

If our Republican colleagues would like to lower our American corporate and individual taxes, then I have a revenue-neutral carbon fee bill I am happy to discuss with them. Evidence from Rhode Island to British Columbia shows that action on carbon pollution spurs innovation, creates jobs, and economically boosts families and businesses.

Today I discussed this larger report, again from the World Resources Institute, which is a group that has, for instance, executives from Alcoa and Caterpillar on its board. This is not some fringe group; it is a very responsible organization with significant corporate and international leadership.

Here is the lead sentence:

A growing body of evidence shows that economic growth is not in conflict with efforts to reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses.

It continues:

Policies are often necessary to unlock these opportunities, however, because market barriers hamper investment in what are otherwise beneficial activities.

That is what we are about here. Unlock those opportunities for our economy. On the downside—here is the first chapter heading: “Delaying action will have significant economic impacts.”

Climate change itself constitutes a significant risk to the nation’s economy.

The downside is on doing nothing, according to this report. The upside is on changing our policies to seize those opportunities. Why are we here fighting about this? Well, again, to quote the report:

The persistence of pollution externalities—“Pollution externalities” means when the cost of your product—you can ship off to somebody else and make them have to take care of it.

The persistence of pollution externalities gives an unfair advantage to polluting activities. Externalities occur when a product or activity affects people in ways that are not fully captured in its price, such as the full health effects of air pollution not being factored into the cost of electricity generation. Thus, society rather than the company pays the cost.

Why are we in this fight? Because there are a lot of companies that folks on the other side are supporting and representing here that have been the winners in that fight. They have had those polluting externalities work in their favor. They have enjoying that unfair advantage. They do not want to give it up. But as the report continues, the well-designed policies can overcome those market barriers and direct investment into beneficial technologies and practices. New policies can enhance the transition to a low-carbon economy while delivering net economic benefits and, in many cases, direct savings for consumers and businesses. So that is pretty good news.

Equally important, taking action helps to reduce the worst effects of cli-

mate change—what is coming at us. Do not just take my word for it. Many conservative economists, writers, and officials see the benefits of market-based climate action. “A tax on carbon,” wrote Hudson Institute economist Irwin Stelzer, “need not swell the government’s coffers—if we pursue a second, long-held conservative objective: Reducing the tax on work.

He continues:

It would be a relatively simple matter to arrange a dollar-for-dollar, simultaneous reduction in payroll taxes. . . . Anyone interested in jobs, jobs, jobs should find this an attractive proposition, with growth-minded conservatives leading the applause.

That is the economics of it unless you are shilling for the folks who have had the unfair advantage and want to keep it, but that is not market based, that is not economics, that is just taking care of special interests.

A recent joint report from economists at the Brookings Institution and the conservative American Enterprise Institute described human-induced greenhouse gas emissions as a textbook example of a negative externality. The report proposed—guess what—a revenue-neutral carbon fee program as the efficient and elegant approach to managing carbon pollution.

According to the report’s authors:

Taxing something we do not want (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions) rather than something we want more of (e.g., productive labor and investment) could help lower the economy-wide cost of the program and may even have economic benefits in addition to its environmental benefits.

Today, in the Environment and Public Works Committee, I had a conversation with a Heritage Foundation witness in which I read to the witness a very similar quote from the economist Arthur Laffer, Reagan’s economist, saying: A carbon fee—where you tax the product in the ground and relieve taxes on work and effort by people—is a net win for the economy.

I asked the witness what he thought about that, and he couldn’t dispute it. In fact, he considers himself to be something of an acolyte of Arthur Laffer’s, so there is actually a lot of economic support for it.

I will conclude by saying, if the topic is now not going to be denial but it is going to be the cost and benefits of climate action, I am ready to have that conversation all day long. Let’s just make sure it is the whole conversation, not just the half of the conversation that looks at what losing their subsidy means for the big oil companies, the big coal companies, the Koch brothers and the rest of the polluters.

A lot of my colleagues only look at one side of the ledger, how this affects the fossil fuel lobby. If we look at the whole ledger, if we look at both sides, when we look at all the evidence, it tells us one thing; that is, that the costs of climate change are already here. They are showing up in our lives

in innumerable ways that carry real economic costs and carry real costs in terms of quality of life and our identity as a country, and in fact they may overwhelm us by century’s end. Looking at all the evidence shows us that significant reductions in carbon pollution will actually support jobs and increase economic growth.

Finally, a revenue-neutral carbon fee would spur innovative business models and technological development in the United States. If we lose this race to clean up our carbon mess, one of the collateral injuries we will sustain is that we will not have developed a robust clean energy economy and we will find ourselves buying products from the Chinese, the Indians, the Europeans, and others.

We need to put our industry to the test. They will rise to it. They always have. We can trust them. We can count on them, but giving them a pass does not serve their interests or ours. This will drive market forces to decrease our emissions and grow our economy.

We have the tools to do something big. It has been proven in British Columbia. It has been proven with RGGI. All of the economists across the economic spectrum seem to agree the time is right to put a national price on carbon.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the World Resources Institute]

SEEING IS BELIEVING: STATUS OF RENEWABLE ENERGY IN THE UNITED STATES

WIND & SOLAR ARE CHEAPER THAN COAL & GAS IN A GROWING NUMBER OF MARKETS

For each region, the average wind power purchase agreement (PPA) is cheaper than new coal plants, new coal and natural gas plants, and new coal and natural gas plants, even without federal tax incentives. Wind PPA data is unavailable in the Southeast region.

WELL DESIGNED POLICIES & TECHNOLOGICAL IMPROVEMENTS CAN CONTINUE THESE TRENDS

Prices for solar PV systems have dropped 80 percent since 2008; analysts expect a continued decline in the coming years.

New, taller wind turbines with longer blades are able to capture more energy and can open the U.S. up to new areas of wind development.

Long-term regulatory certainty is needed through a price on carbon (like a carbon tax or cap-and-trade), or greenhouse gas standards for existing power plants.

Additional important policy signals include: States and utilities should ensure that renewable energy providers have access to long-term contracts, which could reduce the average electricity costs of wind and solar projects by 10-15 percent. Major corporations are already taking advantage of electricity price savings from these long-term contracts, and are asking for access in more states through the Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers’ Principles.

Congress should address the design flaw of renewable tax incentives so that more of the value of the credit flows to project developers (as opposed to third party investors) without increasing the cost to taxpayers, for

example by making the tax incentive “re-fundable”.

Renewable projects can face high financing costs, so financial regulators and lending institutions should work together to develop new investment models that lower these costs.

Bringing more renewables online can be challenging because the supply varies. States and utilities should update regulations and business models to promote a flexible power grid that uses more storage, distributed generation, and demand response.

Federal spending on research and development in the power sector has fallen 77 percent since 1980, while the power industry itself spends only .05 percent of its earnings on R&D (compared to 11 percent for the pharmaceutical industry and 8 percent for computers and electronics). Congress should therefore increase federal funding for research, development and commercialization of low-carbon and energy-saving technologies, especially for those that could generate baseload electricity like geothermal and concentrating solar power.

In the absence of other tools to provide long-term regulatory certainty, EPA has used its existing legal authority under the Clean Air Act to propose greenhouse gas standards for existing power plants. EPA should finalize these standards.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 23, 2014]

SOLAR AND WIND ENERGY START TO WIN ON PRICE VS. CONVENTIONAL FUELS

(By Diane Cardwell)

For the solar and wind industries in the United States, it has been a long-held dream: to produce energy at a cost equal to conventional sources like coal and natural gas.

That day appears to be dawning.

The cost of providing electricity from wind and solar power plants has plummeted over the last five years, so much so that in some markets renewable generation is now cheaper than coal or natural gas.

Utility executives say the trend has accelerated this year, with several companies signing contracts, known as power purchase agreements, for solar or wind at prices below that of natural gas, especially in the Great Plains and Southwest, where wind and sunlight are abundant.

Those prices were made possible by generous subsidies that could soon diminish or expire, but recent analyses show that even without those subsidies, alternative energies can often compete with traditional sources.

In Texas, Austin Energy signed a deal this spring for 20 years of output from a solar farm at less than 5 cents a kilowatt-hour. In September, the Grand River Dam Authority in Oklahoma announced its approval of a new agreement to buy power from a new wind farm expected to be completed next year. Grand River estimated the deal would save its customers roughly \$50 million from the project.

And, also in Oklahoma, American Electric Power ended up tripling the amount of wind power it had originally sought after seeing how low the bids came in last year.

“Wind was on sale—it was a Blue Light Special,” said Jay Godfrey, managing director of renewable energy for the company. He noted that Oklahoma, unlike many states, did not require utilities to buy power from renewable sources.

“We were doing it because it made sense for our ratepayers,” he said.

According to a study by the investment banking firm Lazard, the cost of utility-scale solar energy is as low as 5.6 cents a kilowatt-

hour, and wind is as low as 1.4 cents. In comparison, natural gas comes at 6.1 cents a kilowatt-hour on the low end and coal at 6.6 cents. Without subsidies, the firm’s analysis shows, solar costs about 7.2 cents a kilowatt-hour at the low end, with wind at 3.7 cents.

“It is really quite notable, when compared to where we were just five years ago, to see the decline in the cost of these technologies,” said Jonathan Mir, a managing director at Lazard, which has been comparing the economics of power generation technologies since 2008.

Mr. Mir noted there were hidden costs that needed to be taken into account for both renewable energy and fossil fuels. Solar and wind farms, for example, produce power intermittently—when the sun is shining or the wind is blowing—and that requires utilities to have power available on call from other sources that can respond to fluctuations in demand. Alternately, conventional power sources produce pollution, like carbon emissions, which face increasing restrictions and costs.

But in a straight comparison of the costs of generating power, Mr. Mir said that the amount solar and wind developers needed to earn from each kilowatt-hour they sell from new projects was often “essentially competitive with what would otherwise be had from newly constructed conventional generation.”

Experts and executives caution that the low prices do not mean wind and solar farms can replace conventional power plants anytime soon.

“You can’t dispatch it when you want to,” said Khalil Shalabi, vice president for energy market operations and resource planning at Austin Energy, which is why the utility, like others, still sees value in combined-cycle gas plants, even though they may cost more. Nonetheless, he said, executives were surprised to see how far solar prices had fallen. “Renewables had two issues: One, they were too expensive, and they weren’t dispatchable. They’re not too expensive anymore.”

According to the Solar Energy Industries Association, the main trade group, the price of electricity sold to utilities under long-term contracts from large-scale solar projects has fallen by more than 70 percent since 2008, especially in the Southwest.

The average upfront price to install standard utility-scale projects dropped by more than a third since 2009, with higher levels of production.

The price drop extends to homeowners and small businesses as well: last year, the prices for residential and commercial projects fell by roughly 12 to 15 percent from the year before.

The wind industry largely tells the same story, with prices dropping by more than half in recent years. Emily Williams, manager of industry data and analytics at the American Wind Energy Association, a trade group, said that in 2013 utilities signed “a record number of power purchase agreements and what ended up being historically low prices.”

Especially in the interior region of the country, from North Dakota down to Texas, where wind energy is particularly robust, utilities were able to lock in long contracts at 2.1 cents a kilowatt-hour, on average, she said. That is down from prices closer to 5 cents five years ago.

“We’re finding that in certain regions with certain wind projects that these are competing or coming in below the cost of even existing generation sources,” she said.

Both industries have managed to bring down costs through a combination of new

technologies and approaches to financing and operations. Still, the industries are not ready to give up on their government supports just yet.

Already, solar executives are looking to extend a 30 percent federal tax credit that is set to fall to 10 percent at the end of 2016. Wind professionals are seeking renewal of a production tax credit that Congress has allowed to lapse and then reinstated several times over the last few decades.

Senator Ron Wyden, the Oregon Democrat, who for now leads the Finance Committee, held a hearing in September over the issue, hoping to push a process to make the tax treatment of all energy forms more consistent.

“Congress has developed a familiar pattern of passing temporary extensions of those incentives, shaking hands and heading home,” he said at the hearing. “But short-term extensions cannot put renewables on the same footing as the other energy sources in America’s competitive marketplace.”

Where that effort will go now is anybody’s guess, though, with Republicans in control of both houses starting in January.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order be modified so the votes originally scheduled for 3 p.m. tomorrow now occur at 5:30 p.m. and that the time following the 10 a.m. cloture votes and 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the vote on cloture on Calendar No. 555, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on the nomination of Calendar No. 660; that if cloture is invoked on either nomination, the time under cloture run consecutively in the order in which cloture was invoked, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING JEFF E. CAUDILL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Jeff E. Caudill—a veteran and tireless public servant who passed away last month at the age of 84.

Jeff was born in a log cabin in Viper, KY, on January 20, 1930. In order to help support himself and his family, he began work in the coal mines with his father and brothers at the age of 14.

Without a formal education past the seventh grade, Jeff decided to join the U.S. Army, where he proudly served his country for 22 years throughout both the Korean and Vietnam wars.

After his retirement from the military, Jeff moved back to Kentucky where he continued his service to the community in other ways. Throughout London, KY, he is known as “Santa Jeff.” Jeff was afforded this nickname in part because his white beard gave him the ability to play the part during the Christmas season, but also because he could be counted on to serve his community in all seasons.

Jeff was known to organize clothing and food drives, make hospital visits to the sick and elderly, and captain the Honor Guard at military funerals. Whatever he could do to better the lives of others, you could count on Jeff to deliver.

Jeff Caudill’s life of service to his country, community, and family set a shining example for us all to follow. Therefore, I ask that my U.S. Senate colleagues join me in honoring this exemplary citizen.

The London-area publication the Sentinel-Echo recently published an article detailing the life of Mr. Caudill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sentinel-Echo, Nov. 17, 2014]

REMEMBERING JEFF

(By Nita Johnson)

One of the founding members of the Laurel-London Optimist Club and “Santa Jeff” died suddenly at his home Friday morning.

Jeff Caudill, best known for his efforts in founding the local Optimist Club and for his many years of portraying Santa Claus in the annual Christmas parade, had ongoing health problems. In recent years, he had suffered two strokes and a heart attack as well as kidney failure. His wife Shirley said Caudill had breakfast Friday morning and was planning his usual daily activities when he had “a massive heart attack” that ended his life.

Caudill, 84, was instrumental in establishing the Laurel-London Optimist Club. For many years, he hosted a Halloween party at his home, giving away bicycles and cooking for children of all ages—the predecessor of the current Optimist Club Halloween party held each year. He served as president of the local organization several

times including twice as the Honor Club and again as vice president. He served as Lt. Governor for the Kentucky-West Virginia region and was named Optimist of the Year both locally and throughout the district. He was presented with a Lifetime Achievement Award in 2008 for his years of dedicated service to the Optimist Club.

Caudill was also known throughout the community as “Santa Jeff”, posing with children at Walmart for yearly Christmas pictures. He was hand-picked by former London-Laurel County Chamber of Commerce executive director Randy Smith to portray Santa Claus in the Christmas parade—a job that Caudill thrived on each year. One year, however, Caudill was hospitalized and was on life support and could not fulfill his Santa duties.

“The day of the parade, he had big tears running down his face,” his wife said. “That’s the only Christmas parade he ever missed, once even putting on his Santa suit 10 days after having surgery.”

In fact, Caudill had just had his Santa suit dry cleaned in preparation for this year’s Christmas parade. His bag was already half-full of candy canes that he always gave out to children.

“He was one of 16 children. They didn’t have Christmas,” Shirley said. “He didn’t get candy or clothes or toys. That’s why he worked so hard to make sure other children had a Christmas.”

Caudill spent 22 years in the U.S. Army, 14 of which were overseas. He served in Korea in 1947 before going to Japan a year later. He was wounded during a battle but continued to serve his country, moving his family to various military posts across the world. After discharge, Caudill was considered 100 percent disabled, but he continued to honor military heroes through the Disabled American Veterans organization where he served on the Color Guard and participated in military funeral tributes.

Funeral arrangements for Jeff Caudill were pending at London Funeral Home at press time Friday. Burial will be held at Camp Nelson in Jessamine County. The family asks that in lieu of flowers, donations be made to the Jeff Caudill Optimist Scholarship fund to assist local students in their college costs.

REMEMBERING SALVATORE FERRARA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Chicago lost its Candy Man on Thanksgiving Day. Salvatore Ferrara II passed away in Oak Brook, IL. He was the third generation of the Ferrara family who has given us memories, cavities, and the treats that lit up kids for generations.

Simply listing their iconic candies takes you back in time: Original Boston Baked Beans at the Saturday movies, Red Hots after a sandlot game, Lemonheads at the swimming pool, and Atomic Fireballs on a dare. A handful of Ferrara candy was like a handful of happiness.

Ferrara Pan Candy Company was started in 1908 in Chicago by Mr. Ferrara’s grandfather, the original Salvatore Ferraro. Its first candy was confetti, the candy-coated almonds served at Italian weddings, symbolizing good luck. Nello Ferrara followed his dad into the business.

It was Nello who invented the company’s lip-puckering Lemonhead candies. Little Sal was born with forceps, giving him a temporarily misshapen head—“like a lemon,” his dad said. And candy history was made.

Nello Salvatore’s military service in Japan after World War II provided the inspiration for another company classic—Atomic Fireballs.

Sal II joined the family business in the mid seventies. Over the next 40 years, the company would grow from 35 to more than 500 workers, and annual revenues soared from \$3.5 million to \$300 million. It also acquired another iconic candy: Gummy Bears.

Sal Ferrara died of esophageal cancer. His family said he hadn’t smoked since 1981. His doctor reportedly linked his cancer to acid reflux disease. He was too young—just 63 years old.

I want to offer my condolences to Mr. Ferrara’s friends and family, especially his wife Andrea, his children Alana, Lauren, Nello II, and Erik, and his three grandchildren.

I join kids and former kids all over America in thanking Sal Ferrara and his family for so many sweet treats and happy memories.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING DAVID GADIS

• Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today, I applaud David L. Gadis, a lifelong Hoosier, for his induction into the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame and for his civic leadership in the Indianapolis community.

Established in 1962, the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame is dedicated to recognizing Indiana’s basketball legends and inspiring the future of basketball in our State. Individuals are eligible for nomination 26 years after playing high school basketball, and all nominees are evaluated by a statewide board of directors. In recognition of his contributions to Indiana basketball, David Gadis was inducted into the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame earlier this year.

Born and raised in northwest Indianapolis, David played in his first competitive basketball league at the age of 7 at Municipal Gardens, where he went on to win several AAU-level State championships and a few national runner-up titles. While attending Pike High School, David broke 15 school records, averaged 25 points per game during his senior year, and scored 1,368 career points. David received a number of awards, including being named team MVP, Conference Player of the Year, a Street & Smith Magazine All-American, and a 1980 Indiana All Star. His success at Pike High School earned David a spot on the Southern Methodist University basketball team in Dallas, TX. As a senior and team captain in 1984, David led his team in a

successful 25 and 8 season, earning a place in the NCAA Basketball Championship. More recently, David was a member of the 2005 Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame Silver Anniversary Team.

David's commitment to excellence extends beyond the court. After graduating from Southern Methodist University with a degree in marketing communication, David became vice president of shared services for the Indianapolis Water Company, now Veolia Water Indianapolis, VWI. Today, David serves as executive vice president of sales, marketing and government affairs for Veolia Water North America.

David has dedicated himself to positively impacting communities by creating valuable relationships between public and private utility firms, in order to ensure there are reliable and efficient utilities for Hoosiers and our Nation. With David's leadership, VWI received the United States Conference of Mayors' 2006 Public/Private Partnership Award, as well as the mayor of Indianapolis' Celebration of Diversity Award and the Indiana Minority Supplier Development Council's Circle of Excellence Award a total of three times.

David has served on the boards of the Indianapolis Urban League, Fifth Third Bank, Central Indiana Corporate Partnership, Indianapolis Sports Corporation, Indiana Business Diversity Council, Greater Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, the Indiana Chamber of Commerce, the local Big Ten Basketball Tournament Committee, Indianapolis Downtown Incorporated, and is a member of the American Water Works Association.

David is a tireless advocate for Hoosiers and everyone he advises. Whether he is inspiring us with his skills on the basketball court or developing better municipal infrastructure, David has demonstrated his devotion to civic engagement, diversity, and making Indiana an even better place to live. I want to thank David Gadis for his commitment to the city of Indianapolis and its surrounding communities and congratulate him once again on his induction into the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame and for all of his outstanding achievements.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2455. An act to provide for the sale or transfer of certain Federal lands in Nevada, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3410. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to secure critical infrastructure against electromagnetic pulses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3438. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize use of

grants under the Urban Area Security Initiative and the State Homeland Security Grant Program to work in conjunction with a Department of Energy national laboratory.

H.R. 4924. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of certain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 5421. An act to amend title 11 of the United States Code in order to facilitate the resolution of an insolvent financial institution in bankruptcy.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3410. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to secure critical infrastructure against electromagnetic pulses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5421. An act to amend title 11 of the United States Code in order to facilitate the resolution of an insolvent financial institution in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2970. A bill to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1618. A bill to enhance the Office of Personnel Management background check system for the granting, denial, or revocation of security clearances or access to classified information of employees and contractors of the Federal Government (Rept. No. 113-283).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Virginia Tyler Lodge, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2019.

*Ronald Anderson Walter, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2019.

*Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commis-

sion for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2018.

By Mr. HARKIN for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2019.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2967. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or coercing States to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other specific academic standards, instructional content, curricula, assessments, or programs of instruction; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 2968. A bill to include community partners and intermediaries in the planning and delivery of education and related programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2969. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain items under the control of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the descendants of General Omar Bradley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 2970. A bill to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; read the first time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 772

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 864

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reauthorize technical assistance to small public water systems, and for other purposes.

S. 995

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 995, a bill to authorize the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish the National Desert

Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1029

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1029, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents.

S. 1332

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 1332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 1407

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1407, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education, and for other purposes.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

S. 2693

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2693, a bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2714

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2714, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

S. 2723

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2723, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit.

S. 2738

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2738, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces, to establish an advisory board on exposure to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

S. 2785

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2785, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to microcystins in drinking water.

S. 2828

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2828, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, to provide additional assistance to Ukraine, and for other purposes.

S. 2839

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2839, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

S. 2843

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2843, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide certain members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are victims of sex-related offenses with access to a special victims' counsel.

S. 2944

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2944, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

S. 2949

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2949, a bill to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information.

S. 2964

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were

added as cosponsors of S. 2964, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 2966

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2966, a bill to improve the understanding and coordination of critical care health services.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 578, a resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the world's poorest countries have access to vaccines and immunization through Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3965. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1000, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes.

SA 3966. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2828, to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, to provide additional assistance to Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3967. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3968. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3969. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3970. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3965. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1000, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **CHESAPEAKE BAY STATE.**—The term “Chesapeake Bay State” or “State” means any of—

(A) the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, and New York;

(B) the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania; and

(C) the District of Columbia.

(3) **CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.**—The term “Chesapeake Bay watershed” means all tributaries, backwaters, and side channels, including watersheds, draining into the Chesapeake Bay.

(4) **CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.**—The term “Chesapeake Executive Council” has the meaning given the term by section 117(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267(a)).

(5) **CHIEF EXECUTIVE.**—The term “chief executive” means, in the case of a State or Commonwealth, the Governor of the State or Commonwealth and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) **FEDERAL RESTORATION ACTIVITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “Federal restoration activity” means a Federal program or project carried out under Federal authority in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act with the express intent to directly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that provide financial and technical assistance to promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(B) **CATEGORIZATION.**—Federal restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(i) Physical restoration.

(ii) Planning.

(iii) Feasibility studies.

(iv) Scientific research.

(v) Monitoring.

(vi) Education.

(vii) Infrastructure development.

(8) **STATE RESTORATION ACTIVITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “State restoration activity” means any State program or project carried out under State authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(B) **CATEGORIZATION.**—State restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(i) Physical restoration.

(ii) Planning.

(iii) Feasibility studies.

(iv) Scientific research.

(v) Monitoring.

(vi) Education.

(vii) Infrastructure development.

SEC. 3. CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSCUT BUDGET.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the chief executive of each Chesapeake Bay State, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, shall submit to Congress a financial report containing—

(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays, as applicable—

(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year;

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C); and

(E) a section that identifies and evaluates, based on need and appropriateness, specific opportunities to consolidate similar programs and activities within the budget and recommendations to Congress for legislative action to streamline, consolidate, or eliminate similar programs and activities within the budget;

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by each Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds that were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including—

(A) the project description;

(B) the current status of the project;

(C) the Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, program, or responsible agency;

(D) the authorization level for appropriations;

(E) the project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) a list of coordinating entities;

(I) a description of the funding history for the project;

(J) cost sharing; and

(K) alignment with the existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement, Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities, and Annual Action Plan required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 (33 U.S.C. 1267 note; relating to Chesapeake Bay protection and restoration).

(b) **MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.**—In describing restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a), the Director shall only include—

(1) for the first 3 years that the report is required, descriptions of—

(A) Federal restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$300,000; and

(B) State restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$300,000; and

(2) for every year thereafter, descriptions of—

(A) Federal restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$100,000; and

(B) State restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$100,000.

(c) **DEADLINE.**—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than September 30 of each year.

(d) **REPORT.**—Copies of the report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on—

(1) restoration activities; and

(2) any related topics that are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) **APPOINTMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission of nominees by the Chesapeake Executive Council, the Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council with the consultation of the scientific community.

(2) **NOMINATIONS.**—The Chesapeake Executive Council may nominate for consideration as Independent Evaluator a science-based institution of higher education.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Administrator shall only select as Independent Evaluator a nominee that the Administrator determines demonstrates excellence in marine science, policy evaluation, or other studies relating to complex environmental restoration activities.

(c) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of appointment and once every 2 years thereafter, the Independent Evaluator shall submit to Congress a report describing the findings and recommendations of reviews conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act.

SA 3966. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2828, to impose sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, to provide additional assistance to Ukraine, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Statement of policy regarding Ukraine.

Sec. 4. Sanctions relating to the defense and energy sectors of the Russian Federation.

Sec. 5. Sanctions on Russian and other foreign financial institutions.

- Sec. 6. Major non-NATO ally status for Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova.
- Sec. 7. Increased military assistance for the Government of Ukraine.
- Sec. 8. Expanded nonmilitary assistance for Ukraine.
- Sec. 9. Expanded broadcasting in countries of the former Soviet Union.
- Sec. 10. Support for Russian democracy and civil society organizations.
- Sec. 11. Report on non-compliance by the Russian Federation of its obligations under the INF Treaty.
- Sec. 12. Rule of construction.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACCOUNT; CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms “account”, “correspondent account”, and “payable-through account” have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(3) DEFENSE ARTICLE; DEFENSE SERVICE; TRAINING.—The terms “defense article”, “defense service”, and “training” have the meanings given those terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(4) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” means a financial institution specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (M), or (Y) of section 5312(a)(2) of title 31, United States Code.

(5) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “foreign financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 561.308 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

(6) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means any individual or entity that is not a United States citizen, a permanent resident alien, or an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States.

(7) KNOWINGLY.—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(8) RUSSIAN PERSON.—The term “Russian person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of the Russian Federation; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the Russian Federation.

(9) SPECIAL RUSSIAN CRUDE OIL PROJECT.—The term “special Russian crude oil project” means a project intended to extract crude oil from—

(A) the exclusive economic zone of the Russian Federation in waters more than 500 feet deep;

(B) Russian Arctic offshore locations; or

(C) shale formations located in the Russian Federation.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING UKRAINE.

It is the policy of the United States to further assist the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereignty and territorial integrity to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. That policy

shall be carried into effect, among other things, through a comprehensive effort, in coordination with allies and partners of the United States where appropriate, that includes economic sanctions, diplomacy, assistance for the people of Ukraine, and the provision of military capabilities to the Government of Ukraine that will enhance the ability of that Government to defend itself and to restore its sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of unlawful actions by the Government of the Russian Federation.

SEC. 4. SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE DEFENSE AND ENERGY SECTORS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) SANCTIONS RELATING TO THE DEFENSE SECTOR.—

(1) ROSOBORONEXPORT.—Except as provided in subsection (d), not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose 3 or more of the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to Rosoboronexport.

(2) RUSSIAN PRODUCERS, TRANSFERORS, OR BROKERS OF DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Except as provided in subsection (d), on and after the date that is 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose 3 or more of the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to a foreign person the President determines—

(A) is an entity—

(i) owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation or owned or controlled by nationals of the Russian Federation; and

(ii) that—

(I) knowingly manufactures or sells defense articles transferred into Syria or into the territory of a specified country without the consent of the internationally recognized government of that country;

(II) transfers defense articles into Syria or into the territory of a specified country without the consent of the internationally recognized government of that country; or

(III) brokers or otherwise assists in the transfer of defense articles into Syria or into the territory of a specified country without the consent of the internationally recognized government of that country; or

(B) knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, assists, sponsors, or provides financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, an entity described in subparagraph (A) with respect to an activity described in clause (ii) of that subparagraph.

(3) SPECIFIED COUNTRY DEFINED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, the term “specified country” means—

(i) Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova; and

(ii) any other country designated by the President as a country of significant concern for purposes of this subsection, such as Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the Central Asia republics.

(B) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing not later than 15 days before—

(i) designating a country as a country of significant concern under subparagraph (A)(ii); or

(ii) terminating a designation under that subparagraph, including the termination of any such designation pursuant to subsection (h).

(b) SANCTIONS RELATED TO THE ENERGY SECTOR.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIAL RUSSIAN CRUDE OIL PROJECTS.—Except as provided in subsection (d), on and after the date that is 45 days after the date of the enactment of this

Act, the President shall impose 3 or more of the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person knowingly makes a significant investment in a special Russian crude oil project.

(2) AUTHORIZATION FOR EXTENSION OF LICENSING LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN EQUIPMENT.—The President, through the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce or the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury, as appropriate, may impose additional licensing requirements for or other restrictions on the export or reexport of items for use in the energy sector of the Russian Federation, including equipment used for tertiary oil recovery.

(3) CONTINGENT SANCTION RELATING TO GAZPROM.—If the President determines that Gazprom is withholding significant natural gas supplies from member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or further withholds significant natural gas supplies from countries such as Ukraine, Georgia, or Moldova, the President shall, not later than 45 days after making that determination, impose the sanction described in subsection (c)(7) and at least one additional sanction described in subsection (c) with respect to Gazprom.

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions the President may impose with respect to a foreign person under subsection (a) or (b) are the following:

(1) EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ASSISTANCE.—The President may direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States not to approve the issuance of any guarantee, insurance, extension of credit, or participation in the extension of credit in connection with the export of any goods or services to the foreign person.

(2) PROCUREMENT SANCTION.—The President may prohibit the head of any executive agency (as defined in section 133 of title 41, United States Code) from entering into any contract for the procurement of any goods or services from the foreign person.

(3) ARMS EXPORT PROHIBITION.—The President may prohibit the exportation or provision by sale, lease or loan, grant, or other means, directly or indirectly, of any defense article or defense service to the foreign person and the issuance of any license or other approval to the foreign person under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778).

(4) DUAL-USE EXPORT PROHIBITION.—The President may prohibit the issuance of any license and suspend any license for the transfer to the foreign person of any item the export of which is controlled under the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 et seq.) (as in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)) or the Export Administration Regulations under subchapter C of chapter VII of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(5) PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any person from—

(A) acquiring, holding, withholding, using, transferring, withdrawing, transporting, or exporting any property that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and with respect to which the foreign person has any interest;

(B) dealing in or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to such property; or

(C) conducting any transaction involving such property.

(6) **BANKING TRANSACTIONS.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the foreign person.

(7) **PROHIBITION ON INVESTMENT IN EQUITY OR DEBT OF SANCTIONED PERSON.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any United States person from transacting in, providing financing for, or otherwise dealing in—

(A) debt—

(i) of longer than 30 days' maturity of a foreign person with respect to which sanctions are imposed under subsection (a) or of longer than 90 days' maturity of a foreign person with respect to which sanctions are imposed under subsection (b); and

(ii) issued on or after the date on which such sanctions are imposed with respect to the foreign person; or

(B) equity of the foreign person issued on or after that date.

(8) **EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.**—In the case of a foreign person who is an individual, the President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States, the foreign person, subject to regulatory exceptions to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(9) **SANCTIONS ON PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.**—In the case of a foreign person that is an entity, the President may impose on the principal executive officer or officers of the foreign person, or on individuals performing similar functions and with similar authorities as such officer or officers, any of the sanctions described in this subsection applicable to individuals.

(d) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(1) **IMPORTATION OF GOODS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under subsection (c)(5) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) **GOOD DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(2) **ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS.**—The President shall not be required to apply or maintain the sanctions under subsection (a) or (b)—

(A) in the case of procurement of defense articles or defense services under existing contracts, subcontracts, or other business agreements, including ancillary or incidental contracts for goods, or for services or funding (including necessary financial services) associated with such goods, as necessary to give effect to such contracts, subcontracts, or other business agreements, and the exercise of options for production quantities to satisfy requirements essential to the national security of the United States—

(i) if the President determines in writing that—

(I) the foreign person to which the sanctions would otherwise be applied is a sole

source supplier of the defense articles or services;

(II) the defense articles or services are essential;

(III) alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available; and

(IV) the national interests of the United States would be adversely affected by the application or maintenance of such sanctions; or

(ii) if the President determines in writing that—

(I) such articles or services are essential to the national security under defense co-production agreements; and

(II) the national interests of the United States would be adversely affected by the application or maintenance of such sanctions;

(B) in the case of procurement, to eligible products, as defined in section 308(4) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2518(4)), of any foreign country or instrumentality designated under section 301(b)(1) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2511(b)(1));

(C) to products, technology, or services provided under contracts, subcontracts, or other business agreements (including ancillary or incidental contracts for goods, or for services or funding (including necessary financial services) associated with such goods, as necessary to give effect to such contracts, subcontracts, or other business agreements) entered into before the date on which the President publishes in the Federal Register the name of the foreign person with respect to which the sanctions are to be imposed;

(D) to—

(i) spare parts that are essential to United States products or production;

(ii) component parts, but not finished products, essential to United States products or production; or

(iii) routine servicing and maintenance of United States products, to the extent that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available;

(E) to information and technology essential to United States products or production; or

(F) to food, medicine, medical devices, or agricultural commodities (as those terms are defined in section 101 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8511)).

(e) **NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (a) or (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President—

(A) determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(2) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by paragraph (1)(B) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(f) **TRANSACTION-SPECIFIC NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (a) or (b) with respect to a specific transaction if the President—

(A) determines that the transaction is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the determination and the specific reasons for the determination that a waiver with respect to the transaction is necessary and appropriate.

(2) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by paragraph (1)(B) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(g) **IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.**—

(1) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, or conspires to violate, or causes a violation of, subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or an order or regulation prescribed under either such subsection, to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

(h) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section, and sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the Government of the Russian Federation has ceased ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, supporting, or financing, significant acts intended to undermine the peace, security, stability, sovereignty, or territorial integrity of Ukraine, including through an agreement between the appropriate parties.

(2) **APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA.**—The termination date under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to the provisions of subsection (a) relating to the transfer of defense articles into Syria or sanctions imposed pursuant to such provisions.

SEC. 5. SANCTIONS ON RUSSIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) **FACILITATION OF CERTAIN DEFENSE- AND ENERGY-RELATED TRANSACTIONS.**—The President may impose the sanction described in subsection (c) with respect to a foreign financial institution that the President determines knowingly engages, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, in significant transactions involving activities described in subparagraph (A)(ii) or (B) of section 4(a)(2) or paragraph (1) or (3) of section 4(b) for persons with respect to which sanctions are imposed under section 4.

(b) **FACILITATION OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS ON BEHALF OF SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NATIONALS.**—The President may impose the sanction described in subsection (c) with respect to a foreign financial institution if the President determines that the foreign financial institution has, on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, knowingly facilitated a significant financial transaction on behalf of any Russian person included on the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury, pursuant to—

(1) this Act;

(2) Executive Order 13660 (79 Fed. Reg. 13,493), 13661 (79 Fed. Reg. 15,535), or 13662 (79 Fed. Reg. 16,169); or

(3) any other executive order addressing the crisis in Ukraine.

(c) **SANCTION DESCRIBED.**—The sanction described in this subsection is, with respect to a foreign financial institution, a prohibition

on the opening, and a prohibition or the imposition of strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by the foreign financial institution.

(d) **NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.**—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a foreign financial institution if the President—

(1) determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(e) **IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.**—

(1) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, or conspires to violate, or causes a violation of, subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or an order or regulation prescribed under either such subsection, to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—This section, and sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees the certification described in section 4(h).

SEC. 6. MAJOR NON-NATO ALLY STATUS FOR UKRAINE, GEORGIA, AND MOLDOVA.

Section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321k) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **ADDITIONAL DESIGNATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the date of the enactment of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014, Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova are each designated as a major non-NATO ally for purposes of this Act and the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.).

“(2) **NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION.**—The President shall notify Congress in accordance with subsection (a)(2) before terminating the designation of a country specified in paragraph (1).”

SEC. 7. INCREASED MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President is authorized to provide defense articles, defense services, and training to the Government of Ukraine for the purpose of countering offensive weapons and reestablishing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, including anti-tank and anti-armor weapons, crew weapons and ammunition, counter-artillery radars to identify and target artillery batteries, fire control, range finder, and optical and guidance and control equipment, tactical troop-operated surveillance drones, and secure command and communications equipment, pursuant to the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), and other relevant provisions of law.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a report de-

tailoring the anticipated defense articles, defense services, and training to be provided pursuant to this section and a timeline for the provision of such defense articles, defense services, and training, to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2015, \$125,000,000 for fiscal year 2016, and \$125,000,000 for fiscal year 2017 to carry out activities under this section.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available for obligation and expenditure through the end of fiscal year 2018.

(d) **AUTHORITY FOR THE USE OF FUNDS.**—The funds made available pursuant to subsection (c) for provision of defense articles, defense services, and training may be used to procure such articles, services, and training from the United States Government or other appropriate sources.

(e) **PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Government of Ukraine should take all appropriate steps to protect civilians.

SEC. 8. EXPANDED NONMILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR UKRAINE.

(a) **ASSISTANCE TO INTERNALLY DISPLACED PEOPLE IN UKRAINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a plan, including actions by the United States Government, other governments, and international organizations, to meet the need for protection of and assistance for internally displaced persons in Ukraine, to—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan required by paragraph (1) should include, as appropriate, activities in support of—

(A) helping to establish a functional and adequately resourced central registration system in Ukraine that can ensure coordination of efforts to provide assistance to internally displaced persons in different regions;

(B) encouraging adoption of legislation in Ukraine that protects internally displaced persons from discrimination based on their status and provides simplified procedures for obtaining the new residency registration or other official documentation that is a prerequisite to receiving appropriate social payments under the laws of Ukraine, such as pensions and disability, child, and unemployment benefits; and

(C) helping to ensure that information is available to internally displaced persons about—

(i) government agencies and independent groups that can provide assistance to such persons in various regions; and

(ii) evacuation assistance available to persons seeking to flee armed conflict areas.

(3) **ASSISTANCE THROUGH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—The President shall instruct

the United States permanent representative or executive director, as the case may be, to the relevant United Nations voluntary agencies, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, and other appropriate international organizations, to use the voice and vote of the United States to support appropriate assistance for internally displaced persons in Ukraine.

(b) **ASSISTANCE TO THE DEFENSE SECTOR OF UKRAINE.**—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense should assist entities in the defense sector of Ukraine to reorient exports away from customers in the Russian Federation and to find appropriate alternative markets for those entities in the defense sector of Ukraine that have already significantly reduced exports to and cooperation with entities in the defense sector of the Russian Federation.

(c) **ASSISTANCE TO ADDRESS THE ENERGY CRISIS IN UKRAINE.**—

(1) **EMERGENCY ENERGY ASSISTANCE.**—

(A) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, in collaboration with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall work with officials of the Government of Ukraine to develop a short-term emergency energy assistance plan designed to help Ukraine address the potentially severe short-term heating fuel and electricity shortages facing Ukraine in 2014 and 2015.

(B) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan required by subparagraph (A) should include strategies to address heating fuel and electricity shortages in Ukraine, including, as appropriate—

(i) the acquisition of short-term, emergency fuel supplies;

(ii) the repair or replacement of infrastructure that could impede the transmission of electricity or transportation of fuel;

(iii) the prioritization of the transportation of fuel supplies to the areas where such supplies are needed most;

(iv) streamlining emergency communications throughout national, regional, and local governments to manage the potential energy crisis resulting from heating fuel and electricity shortages;

(v) forming a crisis management team within the Government of Ukraine to specifically address the potential crisis, including ensuring coordination of the team's efforts with the efforts of outside governmental and nongovernmental entities providing assistance to address the potential crisis; and

(vi) developing a public outreach strategy to facilitate preparation by the population and communication with the population in the event of a crisis.

(C) **ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development are authorized to provide assistance in support of, and to invest in short-term solutions for, enabling Ukraine to secure the energy safety of the people of Ukraine during 2014 and 2015, including through—

(i) procurement and transport of emergency fuel supplies, including reverse pipeline flows from Europe;

(ii) provision of technical assistance for crisis planning, crisis response, and public outreach;

(iii) repair of infrastructure to enable the transport of fuel supplies;

(iv) repair of power generating or power transmission equipment or facilities;

(v) procurement and installation of compressors or other appropriate equipment to enhance short-term natural gas production;

(vi) procurement of mobile electricity generation units;

(vii) conversion of natural gas heating facilities to run on other fuels, including alternative energy sources; and

(viii) provision of emergency weatherization and winterization materials and supplies.

(2) REDUCTION OF UKRAINE'S RELIANCE ON ENERGY IMPORTS.—

(A) **PLANS REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of State, in collaboration with the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall work with officials of the Government of Ukraine to develop medium- and long-term plans to increase energy production and efficiency to increase energy security by helping Ukraine reduce its dependence on natural gas imported from the Russian Federation.

(B) **ELEMENTS.**—The medium- and long-term plans required by subparagraph (A) should include strategies, as appropriate, to—

(i) improve corporate governance and unbundling of state-owned oil and gas sector firms;

(ii) increase production from natural gas fields and from other sources, including renewable energy;

(iii) license new oil and gas blocks transparently and competitively;

(iv) modernize oil and gas upstream infrastructure; and

(v) improve energy efficiency.

(C) **PRIORITIZATION.**—The Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the Secretary of Energy should, during fiscal years 2015 through 2018, work with other donors, including multilateral agencies and nongovernmental organizations, to prioritize, to the extent practicable and as appropriate, the provision of assistance from such donors to help Ukraine to improve energy efficiency, increase energy supplies produced in Ukraine, and reduce reliance on energy imports from the Russian Federation, including natural gas.

(D) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 in the aggregate for fiscal years 2016 through 2018 to carry out activities under this paragraph.

(3) **SUPPORT FROM THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.**—The Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall—

(A) prioritize, to the extent practicable, support for investments to help increase energy efficiency, develop domestic oil and natural gas reserves, improve and repair electricity infrastructure, and develop renewable and other sources of energy in Ukraine; and

(B) implement procedures for expedited review and, as appropriate, approval, of applications by eligible investors (as defined in section 238 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2198)) for loans, loan guarantees, and insurance for such investments.

(4) **SUPPORT BY THE WORLD BANK GROUP AND THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.**—The President shall, to the extent practicable and as appropriate, direct the United States Executive Directors of the World Bank Group and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to encourage the World Bank Group and the European Bank for Reconstruction

and Development and other international financial institutions—

(A) to invest in, and increase their efforts to promote investment in, projects to improve energy efficiency, improve and repair electricity infrastructure, develop domestic oil and natural gas reserves, and develop renewable and other sources of energy in Ukraine; and

(B) to stimulate private investment in such projects.

(d) ASSISTANCE TO CIVIL SOCIETY IN UKRAINE.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall, directly or through nongovernmental or international organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the National Endowment for Democracy, and related organizations—

(A) strengthen the organizational and operational capacity of democratic civil society in Ukraine;

(B) support the efforts of independent media outlets to broadcast, distribute, and share information in all regions of Ukraine;

(C) counter corruption and improve transparency and accountability of institutions that are part of the Government of Ukraine; and

(D) provide support for democratic organizing and election monitoring in Ukraine.

(2) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a strategy to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(3) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2016 to carry out this subsection.

(4) **TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS.**—Any assistance provided pursuant to this subsection shall be conducted in as transparent of a manner as possible, consistent with the nature and goals of this subsection. The President shall provide a briefing on the activities funded by this subsection at the request of the committees specified in paragraph (2).

SEC. 9. EXPANDED BROADCASTING IN COUNTRIES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors shall submit to Congress a plan, including a cost estimate, for immediately and substantially increasing, and maintaining through fiscal year 2017, the quantity of Russian-language broadcasting into the countries of the former Soviet Union funded by the United States in order to counter Russian Federation propaganda.

(b) **PRIORITIZATION OF BROADCASTING INTO UKRAINE, GEORGIA, AND MOLDOVA.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall prioritize broadcasting into Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty.

(c) **ADDITIONAL PRIORITIES.**—In developing the plan required by subsection (a), the Chairman shall consider—

(1) near-term increases in Russian-language broadcasting for countries of the former Soviet Union (other than the countries specified in subsection (b)), including Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and

(2) increases in broadcasting in other critical languages, including Ukrainian and Romanian languages.

(d) **BROADCASTING DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “broadcasting” means the distribution of media content via radio broadcasting, television broadcasting, and Internet-based platforms, among other platforms.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Broadcasting Board of Governors \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018 to carry out activities under this section.

(2) **SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall supplement and not supplant other amounts made available for activities described in this section.

SEC. 10. SUPPORT FOR RUSSIAN DEMOCRACY AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall, directly or through nongovernmental or international organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the National Endowment for Democracy, and related organizations—

(1) improve democratic governance, transparency, accountability, rule of law, and anti-corruption efforts in the Russian Federation;

(2) strengthen democratic institutions and political and civil society organizations in the Russian Federation;

(3) expand uncensored Internet access in the Russian Federation; and

(4) expand free and unfettered access to independent media of all kinds in the Russian Federation, including through increasing United States Government-supported broadcasting activities, and assist with the protection of journalists and civil society activists who have been targeted for free speech activities.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018 to carry out the activities set forth in subsection (a).

(c) **STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a strategy to carry out the activities set forth in subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(d) **TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS.**—Any assistance provided pursuant to this section shall be conducted in as transparent of a manner as possible, consistent with the nature and goals of this section. The President shall provide a briefing on the activities funded by this section at the request of the committees specified in subsection (c).

SEC. 11. REPORT ON NON-COMPLIANCE BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION OF ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE INF TREATY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly referred to as the “Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty” or “INF Treaty”).

(2) This behavior poses a threat to the United States, its deployed forces, and its allies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should hold the Russian Federation accountable for being in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty; and

(2) the President should demand the Russian Federation completely and verifiably eliminate the military systems that constitute the violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the committees specified in subsection (d) a report that includes the following elements:

(A) A description of the status of the President's efforts, in cooperation with United States allies, to hold the Russian Federation accountable for being in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty and obtain the complete and verifiable elimination of its military systems that constitute the violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(B) The President's assessment as to whether it remains in the national security interests of the United States to remain a party to the INF Treaty, and other related treaties and agreements, while the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(C) Notification of any deployment by the Russian Federation of a ground launched ballistic or cruise missile system with a range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers.

(D) A plan developed by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), to verify that the Russian Federation has fully and completely dismantled any ground launched cruise missiles or ballistic missiles with a range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers, including details on facilities that inspectors need access to, people inspectors need to talk with, how often inspectors need the accesses for, and how much the verification regime would cost.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(d) COMMITTEES SPECIFIED.—The committees specified in this subsection are—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 12. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed as an authorization for the use of military force.

SA 3967. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

SEC. 535. REQUIREMENT TO USE HUMAN-BASED METHODS FOR CERTAIN MEDICAL TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2017. Requirement to use human-based methods for certain medical training

“(a) COMBAT TRAUMA INJURIES.—(1) Not later than October 1, 2017, the Secretary of Defense shall develop, test, and validate human-based training methods for the purpose of training members of the armed forces in the treatment of combat trauma injuries with the goal of replacing live animal-based training methods.

“(2) Not later than October 1, 2019, the Secretary—

“(A) shall only use human-based training methods for the purpose of training members of the armed forces in the treatment of combat trauma injuries; and

“(B) may not use animals for such purpose.

“(b) EXCEPTION FOR PARTICULAR COMMANDS AND TRAINING METHODS.—(1) The Secretary may exempt a particular command, particular training method, or both, from the requirement for human-based training methods under subsection (a)(2) if the Secretary determines that human-based training methods will not provide an educationally equivalent or superior substitute for live animal-based training methods for such command or training method, as the case may be.

“(2) Any exemption under this subsection shall be for such period, not more than one year, as the Secretary shall specify in granting the exemption. Any exemption may be renewed (subject to the preceding sentence).

“(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—(1) Not later than October 1, 2016, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the development and implementation of human-based training methods and replacement of live-animal based training methods for the purpose of training members of the armed forces in the treatment of combat trauma injuries under this section.

“(2) Each report under this subsection on or after October 1, 2019, shall include a description of any exemption under subsection (b) that is in force as the time of such report, and a current justification for such exemption.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘combat trauma injuries’ means severe injuries likely to occur during combat, including—

“(A) hemorrhage;

“(B) tension pneumothorax;

“(C) amputation resulting from blast injury;

“(D) compromises to the airway; and

“(E) other injuries.

“(2) The term ‘human-based training methods’ means, with respect to training individuals in medical treatment, the use of systems and devices that do not use animals, including—

“(A) simulators;

“(B) partial task trainers;

“(C) moulage;

“(D) simulated combat environments;

“(E) human cadavers; and

“(F) rotations in civilian and military trauma centers.

“(3) The term ‘partial task trainers’ means training aids that allow individuals to learn or practice specific medical procedures.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 101 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2017. Requirement to use human-based methods for certain medical training.”.

SA 3968. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN TIME SPENT RECEIVING MEDICAL CARE FROM SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AS ACTIVE DUTY FOR PURPOSES OF ELIGIBILITY FOR POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3301(1)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting “12301(h),” after “12301(g),”.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply as if such amendment were enacted immediately after the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-252).

SA 3969. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. CONSIDERATION BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF RESOURCES DISPOSED OF FOR LESS THAN FAIR MARKET VALUE BY INDIVIDUALS APPLYING FOR PENSION.

(a) VETERANS.—Section 1522 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) If a veteran otherwise eligible for payment of pension under section 1513 or 1521 of this title or the spouse of such veteran disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue the payment of pension to such veteran under section 1513 or 1521 of this title, as the case may be, for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).

“(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the veteran or, if the veteran has a spouse, the corpus of the estates of the veteran and of the veteran's spouse, that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the veteran or spouse had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the veteran's maintenance.

“(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate of the veteran or, if the veteran has a spouse, the corpus of the estates of the veteran and of the veteran's spouse, that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the veteran's maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the veteran applies for pension under section 1513 or 1521 of this title or, if later, the date on which the veteran (or the spouse of the veteran) disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this subparagraph is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this subparagraph shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of covered resources so disposed of by the veteran (or the spouse of the veteran) on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the veteran's maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of monthly pension that is payable to a veteran under section 1513 or 1521 of this title, including the maximum amount of increased pension payable under such sections on account of family members, but not including any amount of pension payable under such sections because a veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance or is permanently housebound,

rounded down, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) If a veteran otherwise eligible for payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child, the spouse of the veteran, or the child disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue payment of such increased pension for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).

“(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the child that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the veteran, the spouse of the veteran, or the child had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the child's maintenance.

“(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with

regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate of the child that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the child's maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the veteran applies for payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child or, if later, the date on which the veteran, the spouse of the veteran, or the child disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this subparagraph is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this subparagraph shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of the covered resources so disposed of by the veteran, the spouse of the veteran, or the child on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the child's maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of increased monthly pension that is payable to a veteran under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child, rounded down, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c)(1)(A) The Secretary shall not deny or discontinue payment of pension under section 1513 or 1521 of this title or payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child by reason of the application of subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2) of this section to the disposal of resources by an individual—

“(i) if—

“(I) a satisfactory showing is made to the Secretary (in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary) that all resources disposed of for less than fair market value have been returned to the individual who disposed of the resources; or

“(II) the Secretary determines, under procedures established by the Secretary in accordance with subparagraph (B), that the denial or discontinuance of payment would work an undue hardship; or

“(ii) to the extent that any portion of the resources disposed of for less than fair market value have been returned to the individual who disposed of the resources.

“(B) Undue hardship would be worked by the denial or discontinuance of payment for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(II) if the denial or discontinuance of payment would deprive the individual during the period of denial or discontinuance—

“(i) of medical care such that the individual's life or health would be endangered;

“(ii) of necessary food or clothing, or other necessities of life; or

“(iii) on such other basis as the Secretary shall specify in the procedures required by subparagraph (A)(i)(II).

“(C) If payment of pension or increased pension that would otherwise be denied or

discontinued by reason of the application of subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2) is denied or discontinued only in part by reason of the return of resources as described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the period of the denial or discontinuance as determined pursuant to subparagraph (E) of subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2), as applicable, shall be recalculated to take into account such return of resources.

“(2) At the time a veteran applies for pension under section 1513 or 1521 of this title or increased pension under subsection (c), (d), (e), or (f) of section 1521 of this title on account of a child, and at such other times as the Secretary considers appropriate, the Secretary shall—

“(A) inform such veteran of the provisions of subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) providing for a period of ineligibility for payment of pension under such sections for individuals who make certain dispositions of resources for less than fair market value, including the exception for hardship from such period of ineligibility;

“(B) obtain from such veteran information which may be used in determining whether or not a period of ineligibility for such payments would be required by reason of such subsections; and

“(C) provide such veteran a timely process for determining whether or not the exception for hardship shall apply to such veteran.”.

(b) SURVIVING SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—Section 1543 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2)(A) If a surviving spouse otherwise eligible for payment of pension under section 1541 of this title disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue the payment of pension to such surviving spouse under section 1541 of this title for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).

“(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the surviving spouse that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the surviving spouse had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the surviving spouse's maintenance.

“(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate of the surviving spouse that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the surviving spouse's maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the surviving spouse applies for pension under section 1541 of this title or, if later, the date on which the surviving spouse disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this subparagraph is the first day of the first month in or

after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this subparagraph shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of the covered resources so disposed of by the surviving spouse on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the surviving spouse’s maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of monthly pension that is payable to a surviving spouse under section 1541 of this title, including the maximum amount of increased pension payable under such section on account of a child, but not including any amount of pension payable under such section because a surviving spouse is in need of regular aid and attendance or is permanently housebound,

rounded down, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) If a surviving spouse otherwise eligible for payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child or the child disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue payment of such increased pension for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).

“(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the child that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the surviving spouse or the child had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the child’s maintenance.

“(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate of the child that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the child’s maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the surviving spouse applies for payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child or, if later, the date on which the surviving spouse (or the child) disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this subparagraph is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this clause shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of the covered resources so disposed of by the surviving spouse (or the

child) on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the child’s maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of increased monthly pension that is payable to a surviving spouse under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child,

rounded down, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2)(A) If a child otherwise eligible for payment of pension under section 1542 of this title or any person with whom such child is residing who is legally responsible for such child’s support disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i), the Secretary shall deny or discontinue the payment of pension to such child under section 1542 of this title for months during the period beginning on the date described in subparagraph (D) and equal to the number of months calculated as provided in subparagraph (E).

“(B)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, a covered resource is any resource that was a part of the corpus of the estate of the child or the corpus of the estate of any person with whom such child is residing who is legally responsible for such child’s support that the Secretary considers that under all the circumstances, if the child or person had not disposed of such resource, it would be reasonable that the resource (or some portion of the resource) be consumed for the child’s maintenance.

“(ii) For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary may consider, in accordance with regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, a transfer of an asset (including a transfer of an asset to an annuity, trust, or other financial instrument or investment) a disposal of a covered resource for less than fair market value if such transfer reduces the amount in the corpus of the estate described in clause (i) that the Secretary considers, under all the circumstances, would be reasonable to be consumed for the child’s maintenance.

“(C)(i) The look-back date described in this clause is a date that is 36 months before the date described in clause (ii).

“(ii) The date described in this clause is the date on which the child applies for pension under section 1542 of this title or, if later, the date on which the child (or person described in subparagraph (B)) disposes of covered resources for less than fair market value.

“(D) The date described in this clause is the first day of the first month in or after which covered resources were disposed of for less than fair market value and which does not occur in any other period of ineligibility under this paragraph.

“(E) The number of months calculated under this clause shall be equal to—

“(i) the total, cumulative uncompensated value of the portion of the covered resources so disposed of by the child (or person described in subparagraph (B)) on or after the look-back date described in subparagraph (C)(i) that the Secretary determines would reasonably have been consumed for the child’s maintenance; divided by

“(ii) the maximum amount of monthly pension that is payable to a child under section 1542 of this title,

rounded down, in the case of any fraction, to the nearest whole number, but shall not in any case exceed 36 months.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c)(1)(A) The Secretary shall not deny or discontinue payment of pension under section 1541 or 1542 of this title or payment of increased pension under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child by reason of the application of subsection (a)(2), (a)(4), or (b)(2) of this section to the disposal of resources by an individual—

“(i) if—

“(I) a satisfactory showing is made to the Secretary (in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary) that all resources disposed of for less than fair market value have been returned to the individual who disposed of the resources; or

“(II) the Secretary determines, under procedures established by the Secretary in accordance with subparagraph (B), that the denial or discontinuance of payment would work an undue hardship; or

“(ii) to the extent that any portion of the resources disposed of for less than fair market value have been returned to the individual who disposed of the resources.

“(B) Undue hardship would be worked by the denial or discontinuance of payment for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i)(II) if the denial or discontinuance of payment would deprive the individual during the period of denial or discontinuance—

“(i) of medical care such that the individual’s life or health would be endangered;

“(ii) of necessary food or clothing, or other necessities of life; or

“(iii) on such other basis as the Secretary shall specify in the procedures required by subparagraph (A)(i)(II).

“(C) If payment of pension or increased pension that would otherwise be denied or discontinued by reason of the application of subsection (a)(2), (a)(4), or (b)(2) is denied or discontinued only in part by reason of the return of resources as described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the period of the denial or discontinuance as determined pursuant to subparagraph (E) of subsection (a)(2), (a)(4), or (b)(2), as applicable, shall be recalculated to take into account such return of resources.

“(2) At the time a surviving spouse or child applies for pension under section 1541 or 1542 of this title or increased pension under subsection (c), (d), or (e) of section 1541 of this title on account of a child, and at such other times as the Secretary considers appropriate, the Secretary shall—

“(A) inform such surviving spouse or child of the provisions of subsections (a)(2), (a)(4), and (b)(2), as applicable, providing for a period of ineligibility for payment of pension or increased pension under such sections for individuals who make certain dispositions of resources for less than fair market value, including the exception for hardship from such period of ineligibility;

“(B) obtain from such surviving spouse or child information which may be used in determining whether or not a period of ineligibility for such payments would be required by reason of such subsections; and

“(C) provide such surviving spouse or child a timely process for determining whether or not the exception for hardship shall apply to such surviving spouse or child.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a)(2), (b)(2), and (c) of section 1522 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and subsections (a)(2), (a)(4), (b)(2), and (c) of section 1543 of such title, as added by

subsection (b), shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to payments of pension and increased pension applied for after such date and to payments of pension and increased pension for which eligibility is redetermined after such date, except that no reduction in pension shall be made under such subsections because of any disposal of covered resources made before such date.

(d) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 900 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each year thereafter through 2018, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the administration of subsections (a)(2), (b)(2), and (c) of section 1522 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and subsections (a)(2), (a)(4), (b)(2), and (c) of section 1543 of such title, as added by subsection (b), during the most recent 12-month period.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following, for the period covered by the report:

(A) The number of individuals who applied for pension under chapter 15 of such title.

(B) The number of individuals who received pension under such chapter.

(C) The number of individuals with respect to whom the Secretary denied or discontinued payment of pension under the subsections referred to in paragraph (1).

(D) A description of any trends identified by the Secretary regarding pension payments that have occurred as a result of the amendments made by this section.

(E) Such other information as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Select Committee on Aging of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 3970. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1087. PROHIBITION ON CLOSURE OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD FACILITIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—The Coast Guard may not—

(1) close a Coast Guard air facility that was in operation on November 30, 2014;

(2) retire an aviation asset from an air facility described in paragraph (1); or

(3) transfer an aviation asset from an air facility described in paragraph (1), except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) EMERGENCY TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(3), the Coast Guard may temporarily relocate an aviation asset for not more than 30 days in the event of an emergency, after providing notice of the pending temporary relocation to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

(c) SUNSET.—This section is repealed effective January 1, 2016.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 2, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 2, 2014, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, “Addressing Domestic Violence in Professional Sports.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 2, 2014, at 2:15 p.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 2, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 2, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 2, 2014, at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND WILDLIFE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sub-

committee on Water and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 2, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “Innovation and the Utilities of the Future: How Local Water Treatment Facilities are Leading the Way to Better Manage Wastewater and Water Supplies.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDING EBOLA TO THE FDA PRIORITY REVIEW VOUCHER PROGRAM ACT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 602, S. 2917.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2917) to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2917) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2917

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Adding Ebola to the FDA Priority Review Voucher Program Act”.

SEC. 2. PRIORITY REVIEW TO ENCOURAGE TREATMENTS FOR TROPICAL DISEASES.

Section 524 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360n) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (Q) as subparagraph (R);

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (P) the following:

“(Q) Filoviruses.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (R), as so redesignated, by striking “regulation by” and inserting “order of”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding “There is no limit on the number of times a priority review voucher may be transferred before such voucher is used.” after the period at the end; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “365 days” and inserting “90 days”.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2970

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that S. 2970 is due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2970) to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

BILL WILLIAMS RIVER WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4924, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4924) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of certain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water

rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4924) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, December 3, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume executive session and consideration of the Burrows nomination, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, there will be five rollcall

votes at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning on the confirmation of the Burrows and Lopez nominations and cloture on the Hale, Kearney, and Pappert nominations. Another series of votes, as many as six, will occur at 5:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:09 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, December 3, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 2, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

COLLEEN BRADLEY BELL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO HUNGARY.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

NANI A. COLORETTI, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

NOAH BRYSON MAMET, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

ROBERT S. ADLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF SEVEN YEARS FROM OCTOBER 27, 2014.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING DELORES "DEE" PIPINO

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Delores M. "Dee" Pipino, 83, who passed away on October 17, 2014 surrounded by her loving family.

Dee devoted her life to her family. Her children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren were her favorite topic of conversation and were her greatest source of pride and joy. As a lifelong resident of Poland, Ohio, Dee was an active part of her community as a longtime member of the Holy Family Parish and Fonderlac Country Club. Aside from being dedicated to her home and her family, she was an excellent cook and baker, a great sewing and interior design student, all while remaining an avid reader. Dee's three year battle with cancer was exhausting, but she faced it with a resilient courage and strength that will remain an inspiration to all who knew her.

Preceded in death by her loving parents and husband, Donald; four sisters, Anne, Mary, Clara, and Janet; and her brother, Anthony. She will be deeply missed and her memory cherished by her children Mary, Chris, Sam, and Joe; grandchildren Eddie, Deloran and Donielle, Candace and Donald, Sammy, Grayson; great-grandchildren Luca and Dane. Although no longer with us Dee's loving memory will be cherished by all who knew her. We miss her.

RECOGNIZING DEGRAFF MEMORIAL HOSPITAL AS THE 2014 BUSINESS OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize DeGraff Memorial Hospital as the 2014 Chamber of Commerce of the Tonawandas Business of the Year. This award is especially relevant this year, as DeGraff Memorial is celebrating 100 years of service and care to Western New York.

DeGraff Memorial Hospital is a Kaleida Health Facility that has served the Tonawandas and the Northtowns since 1914. A major employer in North Tonawanda, the hospital has 70 inpatient beds to provide necessary services.

DeGraff's versatility in health services is known throughout the region. The hospital is equipped to provide medical, surgical, and diagnostic services to both inpatients and outpatients. In addition, long term residential care

is offered through a Skilled Nursing Facility, and special rehabilitation units are available for patients that require extensive recovery through acute and subacute care.

The progressive mission of DeGraff Memorial places the community at the center. Each day, those employed by the hospital work to advance the health of the community and provide exceptional quality services to those in need, paired with a commitment to education and research that is accessible to all. The values of the hospital are accountability, patient-centered, integrity, and excellence.

The hospital has received national recognition as a Nurses Improving Care for Healthsystem Elders Hospital for their excellence in providing sensitive and exemplary care for those over 65 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to recognize DeGraff Memorial Hospital as the 2014 Business of the Year for the Chamber of Commerce of the Tonawandas. I commend the hard work of those employed by the hospital and their dedication to the health of our community.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR. JAMES T. CECIL

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Mr. James T. Cecil of Lexington, Kentucky, for his distinguished military service during World War II. Mr. Cecil served our nation in uniform from August 26, 1942 to September 15, 1945.

At the age of 19 years old, Mr. Cecil was one of 70 young men from Central Kentucky who voluntarily enlisted as a private in the Marine Corps with what was known as the Lexington Platoon. Today, Mr. Cecil is the only surviving member of the original Lexington Platoon.

During the United States' campaign to achieve victory over the Axis Powers, Mr. Cecil entered the war by joining some of the bloodiest battles of the Pacific and continued to fight until the Empire of Japan signed the Japanese Instrument of Surrender on board the USS *Missouri* on September 2, 1954.

Mr. Cecil was a member of the first wave of U.S. forces that stormed the islands of Saipan and Tarakan. He was delayed entering the battles on the island of Okinawa for one day due to a Japanese kamikaze plane striking the naval ship he was aboard and causing him and his fellow service members to abandon ship. Astonishingly, after floating in the shark infested waters for about 45 minutes, Mr. Cecil was rescued by a nearby U.S. naval vessel.

On June 20, 1944, during fierce combat on the islands of Saipan, Mr. Cecil received

shrapnel wounds throughout his body caused by an enemy's exploding artillery ordinance. Because of a severe concussion that left him unconscious, Mr. Cecil was believed by his comrades to be dead. Miraculously, Mr. Cecil recovered and courageously returned to the battlefield, fighting until the Marines took control of the islands.

When asked how he was able to make it through the dangers and challenges of war, Mr. Cecil said, "I took it one day at a time, and I did what I was supposed to do." Today, he can still vividly recall his experience, and is often reminded of his involvements by gazing at a portrait of a Japanese officer whom he killed in combat. However, it was Mr. Cecil's discovery of a map in the officer's pocket which outlined many of the enemy's artillery positions that earned him a battlefield promotion from private to corporal. Mr. Cecil also earned a Purple Heart due to the injuries he sustained during battle.

Mr. Cecil's bravery and that of his fellow men and women in uniform secured our freedoms for future generations. He is truly an outstanding American, a protector of freedom, and an inspiration to us all.

TRIBUTE TO ADVERTISING INNOVATOR JOE PHILPORT, PH.D.

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to offer a tribute to a leader in advertising research and innovation—Joe Philport, Ph.D.—who plans to retire at the end of this year.

I have a special appreciation for advertising, based on my professional background. After earning an MBA from Wharton, I started an advertising business in Atlanta, Georgia, representing major corporations and other clients.

Therefore, I know the importance of ratings when buying and selling media for advertising. All parties benefit from the availability of a trusted currency to measure audience.

Dr. Philport led the development of a modernized method to measure audiences for out of home advertising.

In 2002, he became chief executive officer of the Traffic Audit Bureau (TAB). In those days, out of home media was measured by traffic counts, or how many people were likely to pass by a billboard or a bus shelter.

By early 2010, guided by Dr. Philport's leadership, TAB introduced a new ratings system that measures audiences that actually see out of home ads.

The modernized TAB Out of Home Ratings provides detailed information about audiences, including age, gender, and ethnicity.

This sort of information is important to those buying media, the customers. Mr. Speaker, I

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

have been a longtime billboard customer, so these types of improvements in audience measurement are important to me personally.

The ability to collect and analyze vast amounts of data offers benefits in the efficiency of communicating messages. We all know the need to balance the use of data with respect for privacy. As a former advertising executive and as a buyer of advertising, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Dr. Joe Philport for his contributions to the advertising industry and to wish him well in retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. PENNY
LUKENBILL'S SERVICE TO MAR-
SHALL COUNTY, INDIANA

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Mrs. Penny Lukenbill, for her service and dedication to Marshall County and the State of Indiana for the past 15 years.

A resident of Plymouth, Indiana, Penny and her husband Kenneth have been married for 39 years. In 1981 they welcomed their son Adam who is now an attorney and partner in his father's law firm Lukenbill and Lukenbill. Eager to continue her own education, Mrs. Lukenbill received her bachelor's degree in psychology from Indiana University South Bend in 1995, where she graduated cum laude.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lukenbill has displayed a constant commitment to serving Hoosiers of Marshall County. In 1999 she was elected to serve as the county treasurer, and held that position until 2007, when she was elected as the Marshall County Auditor. In addition to her duties as auditor, she served as president of both the Association of Indiana Counties and the Indiana County Treasurers Association. Mrs. Lukenbill's dedication to her community is evident from her past membership on the Plymouth Public Library Board of Trustees, Plymouth Park Board, and the Plymouth Industrial Development Corporation Board. During Mrs. Lukenbill's distinguished career in public service, she has received multiple awards and recognitions. In 2012, she received Outstanding County Auditor from the Indiana Association of County Commissioners and in 2004, she was awarded the Plymouth Chamber of Commerce Public Servant of the Year.

These awards are just a small reminder of how much Mrs. Lukenbill's service has meant to the citizens of Marshall County. Her exemplary dedication to the community is seen in her service as an elder at the First Presbyterian Church of Plymouth and in leading past Lions Sight mission trips to Mexico.

On behalf of Indiana's Second Congressional District, I am honored to recognize Penny Lukenbill's service and her unprecedented community involvement throughout Marshall County.

RECOGNIZING THE ZONTA CLUB
OF THE TONAWANDAS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Zonta Club of the Tonawandas as the Chamber of Commerce of the Tonawandas honors the club for their outstanding community service at their 2014 Awards Dinner.

The Zonta Club of the Tonawandas was formed on April 15th, 1931, by founding officers Mrs. Helen Annis, Miss Althea Wilson, Miss Emma Barnard, Mrs. Lillian Dickson, Mrs. Benjamin Rand. Their Charter Members were Pauline VanVorhees, Marian Strum, Margaret McNeerney, Catherine Rowley Lautz, Clara Collins, Grace Eaton, Rena Hilton, and Edna Sutton.

The mission of the Zonta Club is a worldwide network of executives and professionals working together to advance the status of women worldwide through service and advocacy.

The Zonta Club of the Tonawandas focuses on scholarship awards to college bound students and providing financial assistance to local outreach organizations. Annual scholarships have been awarded to Tonawanda and North Tonawanda High School graduates. Local aid organizations that have benefitted from the generosity of the Zonta Club include Inner Faith Food Pantry, Meals on Wheels, Salvation Army and YWCA Carrel House.

In partnership with the YWCA of the Tonawandas, the Zonta Club has developed ZAP, a computer education and training program for women. ZAP teaches basic keyboarding, Microsoft Word, and Microsoft Excel skills, which helps participants build independence and self-worth.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the Zonta Club of the Tonawandas for their excellent community service work. I wish them the best in all their future endeavors and commend their honorable mission.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD S. GOLD-
STEIN ON HIS INDUCTION INTO
THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING
HALL OF FAME

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Richard Goldstein on his induction into the Affordable Housing Hall of Fame. Affordable Housing Finance magazine created the Hall of Fame in 2006, honoring those who shape, develop and preserve affordable housing by advocacy, drafting policy and legislation, and building projects. Rick Goldstein has earned and richly deserves his place in the Hall of Fame.

Rick earned his undergraduate degree from the State University of New York at Buffalo

and his Juris Doctor from Boston College School of Law and he is a partner in the law firm of Nixon Peabody LLP. He has worked tirelessly to preserve the low-income tax credit since its enactment in 1986, and is a national authority on the program. One of Rick's partners wrote, "This is a significant tribute recognizing Rick's leadership and experience counseling syndicators, investors, developers and others on complex transactions and policy involving the low-income housing tax credit."

Rick Goldstein's stellar legal career has been dedicated to preserving the low-income housing tax credit and advising clients on how the tax credit will impact their businesses. He is a trusted advisor to many Members of Congress who rely on him to assist in their legislative efforts on affordable housing. Rick is keenly aware of the need for more affordable housing in our nation and has said, "Sometimes Congress gets the Tax Code right," referring to the Affordable Housing Credit. He attributes the bipartisan support of the program to the fact that the tax credit truly goes to those it purports to benefit, not investors or developers of affordable rental housing, but the actual tenants of these housing developments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in saluting and congratulating Rick Goldstein as he receives this great honor. Thousands of families and individuals live in affordable, decent housing across our country today because of his work. Rick Goldstein has strengthened communities and our country through his extraordinary work and it is an honor to pay tribute to a great man, a prized professional and a valued friend.

RECOGNIZING COACH KEN SPARKS
OF CARSON-NEWMAN UNIVERSITY

HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks today to recognize Coach Ken Sparks of the Carson-Newman's Eagles football program on becoming number 6 on the NCAA's all-time career wins list with 324 victories. As a member of this distinguished group, Coach Sparks has helped set the bar for athletic excellence in our corner of East Tennessee. This recognition stands as a testament to his hard work and dedication.

Over his 35 year career at Carson-Newman, Coach Sparks has led the Eagles to five NAIA championships and 24 playoff appearances. Personally, he has attained many awards including the 12-time SAC Coach of the Year, the 2002 Division II Coach of the Year, and was inducted into the Tennessee Sports Hall of Fame.

In addition to his successes on the field, Coach Sparks has also devoted his career to the development of his players within the community. Serving as mentor to countless young athletes, he has instilled the values of hard work and perseverance into those playing for him. Coach Sparks has served as an inspiration to our community and has impacted the lives of those around him.

I thank Coach Sparks for his service to Carson-Newman University and our community.

**TRIBUTE TO HER EXCELLENCY
DEBORAH-MAE LOVELL, AMBASSADOR OF ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA**

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to join me as I rise to pay tribute to H.E. Deborah-Mae Lovell, Antigua and Barbuda's Ambassador to the United States of America and Antigua and Barbuda's Permanent Representative to the Organization of American States (OAS) who distinguished herself in strengthening the bonds of friendship between Antigua and Barbuda and our country as well as by her work through the OAS in promoting peace and goodwill in our hemisphere. Ambassador Lovell will enter into retirement on December 1, 2014 having served her country for over thirty-one years, ten of which were spent in the roles of Ambassador and Permanent Representative in Washington D.C.

As Ambassador to the United States of America, Ambassador Lovell built bridges of understanding at both the executive and legislative branches where she consistently engaged officials on the imperative of implementing mutually beneficial policies. Beyond this, she earned the trust of the fourteen member independent countries of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) to lead discussions with members of the legislative branch on issues ranging from energy through security and immigration to trade. Always active in promoting the rights of the underserved and the underrepresented, Ambassador Lovell was a passionate advocate for youth, afro-descents and women at the OAS. Propelled by the belief that young people are our investment in the future, she identified youth empowerment as the theme when she chaired the Permanent Council of the OAS. Her initiative was complemented by the thirty-four Foreign Ministers and Representatives of the highest policy making body of the OAS, the General Assembly, (the Thirty-Eighth Regular Session) who crafted a declaration, Youth and Democratic Values, that committed the hemisphere to strengthening the political, social and economic participation of youth in the democratic process.

During Ambassador Lovell's tenure, Antigua and Barbuda spearheaded the adoption of two landmark Conventions at the OAS that would help to eliminate racism and intolerance. These were the Inter-American Convention against Racism, Racial Discrimination and Related Forms of Intolerance and the Inter-American Convention on All Forms of Discrimination and Intolerance. Furthermore, on the question of women's rights, Ambassador Lovell has championed women entrepreneurship and has worked against domestic violence.

Ambassador Lovell is an ardent believer in international cooperation and by forming part-

nerships with friendly countries; she has laid the groundwork in establishing a modern address system for her country that would lead to the better provision of government services such as the distribution of utilities. In 2010, Ambassador Lovell was bestowed a knighthood, the highest honor of Antigua and Barbuda for her services rendered in the field of diplomacy and carries the title Dame Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of the Nation. Ambassador Lovell has received commendations by the State of Maryland, the City of Baltimore, the Maryland House of Delegates, the Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Club and the Consulate General of Antigua and Barbuda. Under Ambassador Lovell's leadership, the Embassy of Antigua and Barbuda had been selected as one of the top ten embassies in Washington D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I know my fellow members of the House of Representatives agree that Ambassador Lovell deserves to be recognized for a job well done and for her many years of service to the people of Antigua and Barbuda, the United States of America and the Organization of American States.

**IN RECOGNITION OF N.E. REED ON
HIS RETIREMENT AS EDMONSON
COUNTY JUDGE-EXECUTIVE**

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of N.E. Reed. After serving more than 20 years as the Edmonson County Judge-Executive, N.E. will retire at the end of the year.

Prior to taking elected office in 1994, N.E. taught at Kyrock Elementary School, was an employee at Cutler Hammer and worked in the dairy industry doing quality assurance.

Throughout each of these jobs, N.E. has always been a fixture in the Edmonson County community. His list of accomplishments is long; from purchasing buildings to serve as the home of key local offices, to rebuilding others, N.E. has left his mark on Edmonson County. During his time as Chair of the Regional Development Board, N.E. expanded the county's buildings—all while leaving Edmonson County debt free. Basketball courts, playgrounds and walking trails are among the many additions he made by investing in local parks for the community.

Mammoth Cave, which covers a large part of Edmonson County, didn't become what it is today overnight. N.E. ensured that families who sold land to create the park were protected and that the land would be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

N.E.'s commitment and selflessness is clear to everyone in Edmonson County. But it is even more evident that by putting the people first, he has established a strong community that will benefit the entire region for years to come.

I am grateful for all of N.E.'s hard work and dedication to the people of Edmonson County.

I wish him well on his retirement and look forward to continuing to work with him in the community.

**HONORING "RAMBLIN' LOU"
SCHRIVER AS HE RECEIVES THE
2014 LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT
AWARD**

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Lou Schriver as he receives the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Chamber of Commerce of the Tonawandas. Known as Ramblin' Lou, the Tonawanda native's distinguished career in broadcasting is worthy of praise.

Born and raised on Young Street in Tonawanda, New York, Ramblin' Lou worked at his father's riding academy during his childhood. While he has earned national recognitions, he has always remained close to his roots, doing all he can to promote the Tonawandas.

In 1947, Ramblin' Lou started a "Twin Cities" radio show on 1440AM in Niagara Falls, New York to honor merchants in the Tonawandas. He has performed many assemblies at Tonawanda High School to benefit various charitable causes and community members. Annually, Lou and Charlie Fleischman organized an annual benefit show for the "Twin Cities" for over 25 years. Since the introduction of Canal Fest in 1983, the Ramblin' Lou Family Band has performed at the iconic Tonawanda festival.

A lifetime member of Musicians' Local #209/106 of Tonawanda, Lou served as the president and general manager of WXRL Radio.

Ramblin' Lou is the recipient of many local and national honors. In 1978, he was inducted into the Walkway of Stars in the Country Music Hall of Fame in Nashville, Tennessee. Other honors include the induction into the Buffalo Music Hall of Fame in 1996; the Distinguished Broadcaster Award from the Buffalo Broadcaster Pioneers in May 1998; the Tonawanda High School Distinguished Alumni Award in May 2002; serving as Grand Marshall for the Canal Fest Parade in July 2007; and election into the New York State Country Music Hall of Fame in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the life and career of Ramblin' Lou Schriver. His broadcast excellence and promotion of his hometown are honorable, and I wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

**HONORING RETIREMENT OF
POLICE OFFICER JOHN M. POPPE**

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Police Officer George M. Poppe as he retires after more than 24 years of law enforcement service.

Officer Poppe began his law enforcement career in 1990 as a Police Officer with the City of Albany. On November 3, 1997, he was hired as a Police Officer with the Fairfield Police Department. Officer Poppe served the community in various capacities that included Patrol, Violent Crime Suppression, and Major Crimes Investigation. Some of his most significant contributions to the Police Department have been the special assignments he held including Special Activity and Felony Enforcement (SAFE Team), Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT Team), K-9 Handler, Firearms Instructor, and Field Training Officer.

Officer Poppe has received numerous commendations from citizens and coworkers, and he was awarded two Lifesaving Medals, the first in 2000 and the second in 2001, for his heroic intervention, exemplary performance and dedication to duty during two critical and life-threatening incidents.

Officer Poppe has been a valued employee and his commitment to the community was evidenced on a daily basis. He is a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired for his hard work, dedication, and positive work ethic.

IN MEMORY OF THOMAS "TOMMY"
THOMPSON

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart today to honor an amazing life, and a legendary career. On November 6th, America lost one of the great innovators in medical technology and a dear friend of mine, Thomas "Tommy" Thompson. While Tommy Thompson may not be a household name, there is not one household in America who has not been touched by his life's work.

Tommy was a dynamic medical device innovator whose passion in life was to improve the human condition. And in this pursuit he was immensely successful. But Tommy wasn't content with his own successes, he wanted to make sure that the countless doctors, engineers and other innovators in this field also had an environment where they could develop medical breakthroughs. Tommy was the type of leader who didn't just point out problems, he tirelessly fought to fix them. In 1992, he joined with a group of innovators to establish the Medical Device Manufacturers Association to give the innovative and entrepreneurial sector of the industry a strong and independent voice in the nation's capital. What started as a handful of medical technology companies has grown to nearly 300 members across the United States. Under Tommy's leadership, the association helped drive countless policies and regulations that improved patient care and innovation. For the past few years, Tommy discussed the devastating impact the medical device tax was having on innovators trying to develop the cures of tomorrow. Tommy was also a tireless advocate to ensure patients and physicians had access to the technologies they needed, and worked to remove barriers and roadblocks so that they could obtain the

best care possible. There is no question that medical technology innovators today are standing on the shoulders of Tommy and all the passion and hard work he dedicated towards improving the innovation ecosystem. To honor Tommy, I will continue to work to repeal this tax.

Tommy's passion also extended to helping organizations and individuals in his home state of Texas. He devoted countless hours to many of his favorite organizations there including the Fairhill School, the Foundation for Lovejoy Schools, and Phi Kappa Sigma at The University of Texas.

Our thoughts and prayers go out to his wife Betty and all his family and loved ones at this difficult time. We have all lost a great man whose love of improving patient care was second only to that for his family.

At one time or another everyone wonders what kind of legacy our lives might produce, and what it is that future generations may say about our brief time here on Earth. Tommy never said it—he was too humble and too magnanimous—but I will: Tommy Thompson was a legend and a leader in the medical device industry, allowing patients around the world to live longer, healthier lives. He gave so much of his time, treasure and talents, never expecting anything in return. Whether helping a local school or giving time to mentor an engineer just starting in the field, Tommy cared about people and improving this world. That is his legacy. That is what he will always be known for. That is a legacy anyone would be proud of, and we will be forever grateful for all that Tommy did on behalf of patients and innovators.

Thomas "Tommy" Thompson led a life dedicated to that old-fashioned notion that if you're focused on helping others, you truly can change the world. Tommy did change the world, and we are all better off thanks to his selfless passion and generosity.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. MIKE
MCCALL ON HIS RETIREMENT AS
PRESIDENT OF THE KENTUCKY
COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL
COLLEGE SYSTEM

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Mike McCall. After more than 15 years serving as the President of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS), Dr. McCall will retire in January 2015.

KCTCS, a network of 16 colleges located throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky, currently educates more than 92,000 students. Kentucky's Second District is fortunate to be the home of three of those campuses—Owensboro Community and Technical College, Southcentral Kentucky Community and Technical College and Elizabethtown Community and Technical College.

During Dr. McCall's tenure, KCTCS has grown to be the largest provider of post-secondary education in the Commonwealth.

Today, KCTCS represents nearly 50 percent of all undergraduate college students, serving more than 5,000 businesses and training more than 52,000 employees on an annual basis.

Dr. McCall has been the recipient of numerous awards and honors, but it is Kentucky that is the real winner. Dr. McCall's career dedicated to better serving community and technical colleges has been one that will create a lasting impact on the Commonwealth. I wish Dr. McCall well during this new phase of his life and know that KCTCS will continue to grow and prosper.

HONORING MARK E. SALTARELLI
AS THE 2014 CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Mark E. Saltarelli as he is recognized as Citizen of the Year by the Chamber of Commerce of the Tonawandas. Mr. Saltarelli is a practicing attorney and former acting City Court Judge, whose dedication to public service and the law is commendable.

A graduate of the University of Buffalo and Syracuse Law School, Mr. Saltarelli practices at Saltarelli and Associates, P.C., in the city of Tonawanda. He is a trusted attorney whose sound legal advice has helped many in the community for decades.

In addition to his legal work, Mr. Saltarelli has leadership roles in many non-profit organizations, including the Knights of Columbus, the Tonawanda Club, the Kiwanis Club of the Tonawandas, the Riviera Theatre, Gateway Harbor, Inc., and Buffalo's Franciscan Center. Mr. Saltarelli is involved heavily in the St. Francis of Assisi Parish Council and their school board. While the school is in danger of closing, Mr. Saltarelli has joined with many in the community in an attempt to keep the school open.

A family man, Mr. Saltarelli enjoys spending time with his wife Marcia and their two children, Rachel and Mark Thomas.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to recognize the accomplishments of Mark Saltarelli, the Chamber of Commerce of the Tonawandas Citizen of the Year. I congratulate Mr. Saltarelli on this honor and wish him continued success in all his future endeavors.

CELEBRATING STEP AFRIKA! ON
ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating Step Afrika! on its 20th anniversary, which will be celebrated on December 4, 2014.

Founded two decades ago, Step Afrika! was originally created as a cultural exchange program with the Soweto Dance Theatre of Johannesburg, South Africa, and has grown to

become an internationally recognized dance company.

Stepping is a uniquely American art form that originated on the campuses of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Step Afrika! is the first professional company dedicated to the art of stepping. Step Afrika! promotes an appreciation for stepping through performances and arts education programs in the District of Columbia, across the rest of the United States and around the world.

Step Afrika! specializes in the use of stepping as an educational tool for young students. Step Afrika! brings stepping and its associated values of teamwork, commitment and discipline to students in classrooms, non-traditional dance venues and performing arts venues. Step Afrika! introduced stepping to the Kennedy Center's Teaching Artist program in 1998, and served as the first step group for the Washington Performing Arts' Concerts in Schools program. In 2005, Step Afrika! earned its first DC Mayor's Arts Award for Outstanding Contribution to Education, in acknowledgement for its expanding role in arts education. Step Afrika! brings stepping to more than 20,000 students each year.

Step Afrika! is also globally renowned. The organization serves as an official Cultural Ambassador for the U.S. State Department. It has represented the United States and countries around the world including South Sudan. Step Afrika! has also provided moral, welfare, and recreation programs for service members overseas in Bahrain and Djibouti.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Step Afrika!, its Founder and Executive Director, C. Brian Williams, and the Chair of Step Afrika!'s Board of Directors, Jacqueline N. Francis, M.D. on 20 years of service to the District of Columbia and the rest of the United States.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF OPINION EDITORIAL ON CANNED TUNA MADE BY CHILD LABOR

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, the following opinion editorial on canned tuna made by child labor.

[From The Hill, Jan. 8, 2014]

TUNA FIRMS SPAR OVER SCHOOL LUNCH
ACCESS

(By Kevin Bogardus)

The world's largest tuna companies are making a splash in Washington with a fight over rules that keep some catches out of school lunches.

StarKist and Tri Marine are clashing with Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea over the Agriculture Department's strict Buy American standards for where tuna is cleaned, canned and shipped.

Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea lose under the rules. Both companies have facilities that process tuna in the United States, but their product is also cleaned overseas. Under the USDA standards, their tuna cannot be served in schools, denying them access to a lucrative market.

StarKist, on the other hand, has a major operation in the U.S. territory of American Samoa. Tri Marine is building up a new facility in the territory as well.

The two factions are sparring over language in the House agricultural appropriations bill that would require the USDA to issue a report on how the department could revise its Buy American standards, including "the option for less than 100 percent of the value of the tuna product be United States produced."

The language could be slipped into the omnibus spending bill that lawmakers aim to release sometimes this week. If it becomes law, that report could clear the way for Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea to begin selling to schools.

Millions of dollars in government sales are at stake, including for American Samoa, where tuna is a linchpin of the island economy.

The fight over the provision has become bitter, with both sides hurling charges of child labor and inhumane working conditions at the other.

"I suspect most members don't have the facts yet on where Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea source their tuna. And if they would be informed, they would not be supportive of this language," said Jim Bonham, chairman of the government affairs practice at Manatt, Phelps & Phillips.

Bonham lobbies for Tri Marine, founded in Singapore, and StarKist, which is headquartered in Pittsburgh but owned by Korea's Dongwon Industries. StarKist's tuna qualifies for the USDA's school nutrition program because it's processed in American Samoa, and Tri-Marine's catch should as well once its plant is up and running.

But their competitors want in on the action.

"For years, we have been trying to revise these standards. So instead of 100 percent U.S. content, we would revise it down to 80 percent," said Jeff Pike, CEO of Pike Associates, which lobbies for Bumble Bee. "We are buying fish from U.S. boats. We are working with U.S. fishermen. We have a U.S. factory and we are the only U.S.-owned major brand."

Tuna purchases by the U.S. government represent a significant chunk of change. The USDA's purchases of canned and pouched tuna have equaled around \$20 million per year over the past decade.

The provision under scrutiny could upend that market, critics argue.

"The parameters of the study are so narrow, we know what the outcome will be. It asks them [the USDA] to come up with multiple options to erode the Buy American standards," Bonham said.

Bumble Bee's advocate contends that changing the standards would simply bring competition to American Samoa's tuna industry.

"There is a lot of sympathy for American Samoa. I'm convinced, even with the change, the government will still buy tuna from American Samoa," Pike said. "Tuna is high in protein. Tuna is low in fat. What is your objection to putting competition into the school lunch program so kids can eat more tuna fish?"

American Samoa has consolidated lobbying forces to protect its golden industry. Last summer, StarKist, Tri Marine, the Chamber of Commerce of American Samoa and others formed the Stronger Economy for American Samoa Coalition.

The group has worked to promote American Samoa, including highlighting a Pitts-

burgh Post-Gazette op-ed by Pittsburgh Steeler Troy Polamalu that discussed the "economic distress" in the territory.

Mark McCullough, a coalition spokesman, said loosening the Buy American standards would hurt American Samoa.

"Congress needs to be partnering with the islands' public and private industry leaders on a new economic development plan, not costing more Americans their jobs by weakening what it means to buy America," McCullough said.

Del. Eni Faleomavaega (D), American Samoa's delegate on Capitol Hill, has sought to substitute the report language with his own measures that would target Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea. One proposal would have USDA study whether child labor was used to process tuna bought by the government.

Faleomavaega's aides have given a PowerPoint presentation, obtained by The Hill, that cites human rights reports that blast Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea for using Thai facilities, where workers allegedly suffer terrible conditions while cleaning tuna.

"It is disgraceful to suggest that poor kids in Asia should be forced to provide tuna sandwiches for America's school lunch program. Bumble Beeware! It is time for America to know the truth about Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea," Faleomavaega said in a statement to The Hill.

In opposition to the language, Faleomavaega has sent letters to select members of the House and Senate Agriculture panels, Appropriations agriculture subcommittees and to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.). The delegate has also asked for help from House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), according to his office.

"I suspect most consumers don't want to buy child labor tuna. . . . Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea are kicking a hornet's nest here," Bonham said.

StarKist's critics said the company has used the Thai plants as well, but its supporters say the company has made sure not to sell any foreign-processed tuna to the U.S. government.

StarKist has had to contend with a Food and Drug Administration "warning letter" for poor workplace conditions in 2011. That halted its tuna sales to the USDA, but backers of the company say the issue has since been resolved.

Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea also have their supporters in Congress. Rep. Linda Sánchez (D-Calif.) introduced legislation last year that would loosen the Buy American standards for tuna.

"It simply provides more flexibility to the Department of Agriculture's canned tuna purchasing program. The Tuna Competition Act is designed to bolster domestic industry," said Mattie Muñoz, a Sánchez spokeswoman.

Bumble Bee has a tuna canning plant in Santa Fe Springs, Calif.—based in Sanchez's district—that employs more than 300 workers.

"Congresswoman Sanchez is always happy to fight for job creators in the 38th District. However, it is important to note that this bill will help US tuna producers nationally," Munoz said.

[From The Hill, Jan. 14, 2014]

BOYCOTT CANNED TUNA MADE BY CHILD LABOR
(By Rep. Eni Faleomavaega (D-American Samoa))

As an Asia-Pacific American and former chairman and current ranking member of

the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, I hope that Congress and consumers will boycott efforts by Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea to introduce canned tuna made by child labor into America's school lunch program.

Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea are disqualified from providing canned tuna to the Department of Agriculture's school lunch program because both companies clean their tuna in factories in Thailand, which use child, trafficked, and other forced and exploited labor. The Environmental Justice Foundation says "the processing industry in Thailand does not just have a problem with human rights abuses, but is built on it." This brutal business practice is a gross violation of the Department of Agriculture's Buy America program and is simply un-American.

USDA provisions exist to ensure that federal dollars are spent on products that are available and produced 100 percent in the United States. Buy America provisions also exist to ensure the highest quality goods are being purchased by the U.S. government, and they are being manufactured in a manner consistent with American policies as related to child labor, working conditions and wages.

StarKist, which operates in the U.S. Territory of American Samoa, complies with Buy America provisions. At StarKist Samoa, our workers fully manufacture canned tuna from the whole fish through to the final, labeled product. On occasion, if enough whole fish is not available, StarKist has in the past used frozen loins to supplement the whole fish. However, in compliance with USDA regulations, StarKist uses segregated lines to make sure only whole fish processed 100 percent in the U.S. is used for the school lunch program.

Despite misinformation put forward by Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea, American Samoa's workers are local citizens and legal residents from the neighboring country of Samoa. StarKist abides by U.S. labor and environmental laws, and pays workers in accordance with federal minimum wage standards as determined by the U.S. Congress, unlike tuna factories in Thailand where Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea clean their fish.

In response to proponents who say there is no competition in America's school lunch program, Tri Marine is making a \$50 million investment in American Samoa. Tri Marine intends to use the same business model as StarKist by cleaning the whole fish through to the final, labeled product.

And as for those trying to take advantage of a temporary interruption of canned tuna to America's school lunch program due to a warning letter StarKist received from the Food and Drug Administration in 2011 about deviations from the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point and Low Acid Food requirements, the suspension has been lifted and had nothing to do with the debate at hand.

Furthermore, Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea have come under fire from the FDA due to problems with seams on their can lids not meeting safety standards. In 2013, both Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea issued a nationwide recall of their canned tuna products because their faulty seals could make the tuna vulnerable to spoilage and contamination, which could sicken consumers. Tragically, in 2012, a tuna worker was cooked to death at Bumble Bee's plant in California, and the company was fined and cited for egregious safety violations.

Once you unveil the truth, it is crystal clear that proponents of changing the Buy America requirements for canned tuna in our school lunch program are the same proponents who believe poor children should sweep floors in exchange for their lunch. It is bad enough that child labor and human rights abuses exist. But it is disgraceful to suggest that poor kids in Asia or anywhere else should be forced to provide tuna sandwiches for America's school lunch program.

[From The Hill, Jan. 28, 2014]

THE BUZZ ON BUMBLE BEE

(By Del. Eni Faleomavaega (D-American Samoa))

Bumble Bee has been lobbying Capitol Hill since 2007 to introduce canned tuna made by child labor to America's schoolchildren and troops under the guise of creating competition, reducing prices for government agencies and increasing the presence of a healthy school lunch option for our children. Chicken of the Sea (COS) joined the effort in 2009. Both companies clean their tuna in low-wage countries like Thailand where human rights abuses, including the use of child labor, are rampant in the processing industry.

Chicken of the Sea is owned by Thai Union, which is under investigation for employing 14- to 17-year-old migrants. Bumble Bee's supplier in Thailand is Sea Value, and Unicord is part of the Sea Value group, which is also under heavy criticism for the same human rights and child labor violations. Bumble Bee owns a 10 percent share in Sea Value.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) knows about human trafficking in the canned tuna industry and said no to the guise. However, with the support of Rep. Jack Kingston (R-Ga.), Bumble Bee and COS succeeded in getting language inserted in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014, which now requires the USDA to submit a report within 60 days regarding potential ways that would allow a revision of the Master Solicitation for Commodity Procurements for the purchase of canned tuna.

This is just a disingenuous way of requesting that the USDA weaken the USDA's 100 percent Buy America provisions and permit canned tuna made by child labor into America's school lunch program. In response, I called for a boycott on Jan. 14. And on Jan. 15, Rep. Kingston, who is my friend, clarified his intent regarding Buy America provisions. As reported by The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Kingston stated, "I think the concern is, what can you do to not necessarily go into the Buy American provision, but are there alternatives?"

On Jan. 16, Chris Lischewski—CEO of Bumble Bee—perhaps troubled that he may be losing Kingston's support, buzzed all about how Bumble Bee uses companies in Thailand to clean some of its tuna (The Hill's Congress blog: "Sorry, Charlie, but that's a fishy story") and how he "knows" those companies don't violate child labor standards because they sign a statement saying they don't. Every schoolchild in America knows you can't rely on an offender to tell the truth about whether or not they have offended.

According to the Environmental Justice Foundation, Thailand's processing workforce is "90 percent migrant and a large proportion is unregistered and trafficked." As acknowledged by Thailand, its government cannot account for the well-being of its migrant workers.

The U.S. Department of Labor reported in 2012 that "the Government [of Thailand]

lacks current nationwide data on child labor . . . and children continue to be engaged in the worst forms of child labor, including in hazardous activities in . . . seafood processing."

And so, while Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee opt to continue the un-American practice of having their canned tuna made by child labor in Thailand, StarKist chooses to clean its tuna in American Samoa. And yes, unlike Lischewski, every schoolchild in America also knows that American Samoa is part of the United States.

Canned tuna supplied by StarKist for America's school lunch program is 100 percent made in the USA. On the rare occasion that StarKist uses frozen loins, it maintains a separate, segregated line in accordance with USDA guidelines to assure no frozen loins or foreign-cleaned fish is used in America's school lunch program.

StarKist, a U.S. corporation and a subsidiary of the Dongwon Group of South Korea, abides by all U.S. labor and environmental laws.

As for monopolies, according to a Government Accountability Office report, since 2006, companies like Bumble Bee that use child labor to make their canned tuna operate at a \$7.5 million per year advantage and climb over companies like StarKist that make their canned tuna in the USA.

Regarding safety standards, in 2013, both Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee issued a nationwide recall of their canned tuna products because their faulty seals could make the tuna vulnerable to spoilage and contamination, which could sicken consumers. Tragically, in 2012, a tuna worker was cooked to death at Bumble Bee's plant in California, and the company was fined and cited for egregious safety violations.

And so, while Bumble Bee's slogan may be Eat, Live and BeeWell, I believe consumers should consider a new label for a company so intent on selling tuna made by child labor to America's school children and troops: Bumble Bee Ware.

[For Immediate Release, Mar. 16, 2014]

BUMBLE BEEWARE, WHY AMERICA'S SCHOOL KIDS SHOULD JUST SAY NO TO TUNA SANDWICHES MADE BY CHILD LABOR

The WSJ opines about how fish is brain food and ought to be served up in school cafeterias. I would agree except for the whale of a tale the WSJ has penned up about Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea.

The WSJ reports that the FDA found StarKist's American Samoa processing operation wasn't up to health standards, and that's why we have no tuna in school cafeterias. Only last year, Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee issued a nationwide recall of their canned tuna due to spoilage and contamination. In 2012, an employee was cooked to death at Bumble Bee's plant in California.

Bumble Bee has little regard for its workers much less kids here or abroad, and neither does Chicken of the Sea. Both companies use child labor in Thailand to clean their tuna. Asian kids and other exploited workers are paid approximately \$0.75 cents an hour to manually cut off the head, fins, and tail, and scrape off the skin. After the hard work is done, Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea ship the clean tuna back to the U.S. where about 200 workers in California and 200 in Georgia are paid to \$12 to \$18 an hour to put it in a can.

By hook or crook both companies then claim they're American as apple pie and ought to be able to provide canned tuna for the USDA's 100% Buy America school lunch

program. Thankfully, reputable human rights organizations, including FinnWatch, and renowned human rights activists like Andy Hall, who is known to Nobel Peace Prize winner and Congressional Gold Medal recipient Aung San Suu Kyi, have documented the fraud.

Chicken of the Sea is owned by Thai Union, the world's largest tuna exporter. Bumble Bee is supplied by and has interest in the Sea-Value owned Unicord factory in Thailand. FinnWatch found that both factories in Thailand employed 14- to 17-year old migrants. More than half of those interviewed reported workplace abuses including physical and verbal harassment, dangerous working conditions, high employment registration fees, and confiscation of passports.

When your work papers and passports are confiscated, you become a slave to your employer. This is why the U.S. State Department's 2013 Trafficking in Persons (TIP) report underscores that "the risk of labor trafficking among Burmese migrant workers in the seafood industry in [Thailand]" is high; "57 percent of those surveyed experienced conditions of forced labor."

The AFL-CIO has filed a petition with the U.S. Trade Representative asking that the trade preferences for Thailand be suspended or terminated because the government in that country has failed to take meaningful steps to address worker and human rights abuses in a number of sectors, including seafood processing, or fish cleaning. Wal-Mart should also call for a boycott and take canned tuna made by Bumble Bee and Chicken of the Sea off their shelves.

Most of all, the USDA shouldn't feed canned tuna made by child labor to America's school kids. Neither should Congress. It would be un-American to do so.

StarKist, a subsidiary of a Korean company, is headquartered in Pennsylvania, USA and cleans its tuna in the U.S. Territory of American Samoa where our sons and daughters have served in record numbers in every U.S. military engagement from World War II to present. Our enlistment rates per capita are one of the highest in any State or Territory.

Yes, StarKist employs our cousins from the neighboring island of Samoa, but we don't employ children, and we don't pay workers \$0.75 cents and less per hour. Our employees are legal residents, paid in accordance with federal minimum wage laws and our canneries abide by all U.S. laws and regulations. That's why canned tuna made in American Samoa qualifies for the USDA's 100% Buy America school lunch program.

Once upon a time, Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee also qualified. For more than 50 years, Chicken of the Sea operated in American Samoa and Bumble Bee in Puerto Rico. In 2009, Chicken of the Sea closed its operations, outsourced more than 2,000 jobs to its parent company in Thailand, and set up a skeletal crew in Georgia USA. In 2012, Bumble Bee left Puerto Rico, also outsourced American jobs to Thailand, and now keeps a small crew in California. By choice, neither company qualifies anymore to sell canned tuna to America's school kids because by choice their tuna is no longer 100% Made in the USA.

And that's why Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee are having a tuna meltdown.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 1, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on #532 and #533.

IN RECOGNITION OF EL CATAÑO "LA CASITA" COMMUNITY GARDEN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize El Cataño, affectionately known as "La Casita" Community Garden, which celebration took place on Saturday, June 7th in celebration of the 2014 National Puerto Rican Day Parade. In 1994, Jose and his sister Esther Reyes decided to look for an empty lot to start a community garden. The garden would be named after the Town of Cataño, which is located across from the bay of San Juan, Puerto Rico. The lot was a rat infested dumping ground for garbage, needles and crack vials, before Jose and Esther took on the challenge and collected over 200 signatures throughout the immediate neighborhood to acquire the lot in support of a community garden. Support grew from community organizations and businesses, which enabled Jose and Esther to acquire the lot and to clean it. In 1995, La Casita de Cataño Community Garden was born.

Traditionally, there is a Puerto Rican Day Festival held each Saturday before the parade—New York City's third largest—along Third Avenue in East Harlem, with community members transforming the El Cataño Community Garden into a celebration of Puerto Rican food and music. The presiding Mayor of Cataño often joins local residents in the festivities at the garden, where a past mayoral plaque commends the successful work of its founder Jose Reyes—who established the garden 20 years ago—in organizing tournaments between the El Cataño Community Garden's own baseball team and teams in Puerto Rico.

La Casita stood up to the Giuliani's Administration efforts to close the garden in favor of market rate and commercial development. In 2008, under the leadership of the late City Councilman Philip Reed, El Cataño Community Garden was saved. Councilman Reed enlisted the New York Restoration Project (NYRP) to restore this 2,500-square-foot site in partnership with Denali Construction. Re-envisioned by acclaimed landscape designer Billie Cohen, the space—Cohen's tenth garden design for NYRP—features an intricate pattern of bluestone tiles in front and pavers arranged in concentric circles in the back of the garden. Additional highlights include planting beds for perennials such as roses and rhododendron. El Cataño's new design is well-suited to the garden's primary use as a community gath-

ering space and frequent site of birthday parties, christenings and baby showers, as well as children's activities and educational workshops. In addition, local senior citizens use the garden to play cards and dominoes and, each year, NYRP partners with garden members to host a family-friendly domino tournament. This garden is situated in an area starved for open green space within blocks of 10 schools and in close proximity to five New York City Housing Authority properties. The densely populated neighborhood's residents are primarily of Hispanic, Latino and African-American descent.

The Board of Directors of the El Cataño Community Garden remain in constant contact with their counterparts in their hometown of Cataño, Puerto Rico. Every June and through the assistance of Carmen "Puruca" Ruiz they are honored to receive the Honorable José A. Rosario Meléndez, Mayor of Cataño during their annual National Puerto Rican Day weekend of activities at La Casita Community Garden.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me and the New York Congressional Delegation in paying tribute to Jose and Esther Reyes as they continue to maintain and keep the culture of Puerto Rico alive at "La Casita de Cataño".

HISTORICAL RECORD OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY GRANT FUNDING IN AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information about National Emergency Grant funding in American Samoa.

[Press Release, Oct. 20, 2009]

FALEOMAVAEGA THANKS U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FOR RELEASING OVER \$24 MILLION TO ASSIST CLEAN-UP AND RECOVERY EFFORTS IN AMERICAN SAMOA

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that the U.S. Department of Labor has released over \$24 million in National Emergency Grant Funds to assist clean-up and recovery efforts in American Samoa.

"I want to personally thank my good friend and former colleague, U.S. Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis, for releasing more than \$24 million in National Emergency Grant funds to help American Samoa rebuild," Faleomavaega said. "The people of American Samoa are deeply appreciative of the support we are receiving from the federal government in the aftermath of the earthquake and tsunami that struck our islands on September 29, and I thank the Obama Administration, the U.S. Congress, FEMA, Secretary Solis, and all others for standing with us as we begin the long and difficult process of rebuilding our homes and lives."

"I also want to thank Senator Inouye and Senator Akaka for their unwavering support. Earlier today, we released a joint statement applauding Secretary Solis' decision to release more than \$24 million in aid and, during these trying times, I want to thank both Senators for their heartfelt words and condolences."

"With the outpouring of prayers being offered in our behalf, I have every confidence that American Samoa will rebuild but we will never be the same without the ones we have lost. This is why I continue to convey my condolences to the families and friends who have lost loved ones, and pledge to do all I can as we work to recover."

The full text of the U.S. Department of Labor's notification, which was sent to Faleomavaega, Senator Inouye, Senator Akaka, and to members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC), of which Faleomavaega serves as Vice-Chair, is included below:

NOTIFICATION

DEAR FALEOMAVAEGA/ INOUE/ AKAKA
STAFF AND CAPAC, Attached is a release announcing a \$24,857,608 National Emergency Grant award from the U.S. Department of Labor to assist clean-up and recovery efforts in the wake of a tsunami that struck American Samoa on Sept. 29.

This grant is for clean-up and recovery from a natural disaster. National Emergency Grants are part of the secretary of labor's discretionary fund and are awarded based on a state's ability to meet specific guidelines.

[Press Release, Oct. 20, 2009]

\$25 MILLION GRANT FOR AMERICAN SAMOA CLEAN-UP AND RECOVERY

U.S. Senators Daniel K. Akaka and Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii) and Delegate Eni Faleomavaega (D-American Samoa) today applauded a \$24,857,608 federal grant to assist clean-up and recovery efforts in American Samoa following last month's destructive tsunami. The U.S. Department of Labor awarded the funds to American Samoa's Department of Human Resources to create more temporary jobs to assist in recovery efforts.

"I attended a memorial service in Washington this past weekend and was reminded of the tremendous toll this tsunami took: Entire villages destroyed, children and grandparents lost, livelihoods ruined," Senator Akaka said. "This grant will help American Samoa create temporary on-island jobs so residents can begin rebuilding their homes and infrastructure, surveying environmental damage, and repairing damaged industries."

"Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with those affected by the earthquakes and tsunami in American Samoa. The trauma suffered by the people dealing with the devastation and tragic loss of life is difficult to comprehend. These funds will help rebuild and restore the property that was destroyed and damaged and hopefully restore some semblance of the lifestyle that was lost," said Senator Inouye.

Delegate Faleomavaega said: "I want to personally thank my good friend and former colleague, U.S. Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis, for releasing more than \$24 million in National Emergency Grant funds to assist clean-up and recovery efforts in American Samoa. The people of American Samoa are deeply appreciative of the support we are receiving from the federal government since the earthquake and tsunami struck our islands on September 29 and, once more, I thank the Obama Administration, the U.S. Congress, FEMA, Secretary Solis and all others for standing with American Samoa as we begin the long and difficult process of rebuilding."

"Our hearts go out to the victims and survivors of the recent tsunami in American Samoa," said Secretary of Labor Hilda L. Solis. "Today's grant will support ongoing

recovery efforts and help American Samoans put their lives back together."

Of the \$24,857,608 announced today, \$8,285,870 will be released initially. Additional funding up to the amount approved will be made available as the territory demonstrates a continued need for assistance, according to the Department of Labor.

On September 29, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) declared all islands in the United States territory of American Samoa eligible for FEMA's Public Assistance Program. As a senior member of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Senator Akaka has been briefed by FEMA officials on initial recovery efforts to send food, water, cots, medical supplies, and working vehicles from the FEMA Pacific Area Office warehouse in Honolulu to American Samoa. Senator Akaka worked to establish and maintain this office beginning in 1991 in order to protect isolated Pacific island communities.

For more information on National Emergency Grants, visit <http://www.doleta.gov/NEG>.

[Press Release, Apr. 21, 2010]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR NOTIFIES FALEOMAVAEGA THAT OVER \$16 MILLION WILL BE RELEASED TO ASG FOR ABOUT 2,200 TEMPORARY WORKERS TO CONTINUE CLEAN- UP AND RECOVERY EFFORTS

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) notified him this evening that it will release \$16,571,738 to ASG for about 2,200 temporary workers to continue clean-up and recovery efforts in the wake of the tsunami that struck American Samoa on September 29, 2009.

On October 19, 2009 a National Emergency Grant (NEG) was approved for up to \$24,857,608, with \$8,285,870 released initially. This incremental and final NEG award will bring total NEG funds awarded for clean-up and recovery efforts to \$24,857,608.

"I want to again thank my good friend and former colleague, U.S. Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis, for releasing more than \$24 million in NEG funds to help create about 2,200 temporary jobs in American Samoa," Faleomavaega said. "I first contacted Secretary Solis in May of 2009 regarding NEG funds in response to Chicken of the Sea's announced closure and, on May 7, 2009, I provided Governor Togiola with the contact information necessary to request assistance for our workers, noting that any request put forward must originate with the Governor."

"While that effort was underway between ASG and DOL, American Samoa was struck by a tsunami on September 29, 2009. In response to the tsunami, DOL immediately and preemptively reached out to ASG and assisted ASG in preparing and processing a disaster national emergency grant application. On October 19, 2009, ASG was then awarded over \$24 million to create about 2,200 temporary jobs for clean-up and recovery efforts."

"Discussions continue about how this grant might be more fully expanded, if necessary. For now, the American Samoa Department of Human Resources is responsible for the administration of the grant and ASG, in consultation with the DOL, determines who qualifies for temporary work."

"Again, I thank DOL for its swift response in providing temporary work for the people of American Samoa. The DOL can be assured that the people of American Samoa are appreciative of the support the federal government is providing them, especially as we

work together to rebuild and retool," Faleomavaega concluded.

[Press Release, June 28, 2012]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AWARDS \$500,000 IN SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL EMERGENCY GRANT FUNDING TO AMERICAN SAMOA DE- PARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Congressman Faleomavaega today announced that the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) this week awarded approximately \$500,000 in supplemental National Emergency Grant (NEG) funding to the American Samoa Department of Human Resources.

According to DOL, the funding will provide for the continuation of workforce development services to workers who held temporary jobs to assist with the clean-up and recovery efforts following the earthquake and tsunami and subsequent flooding that struck American Samoa in 2009.

The initial NEG award of \$24,857,608 was approved on October 19, 2009, with \$8,285,870 released initially and a second increment of \$16,571,738 was approved and released on April 21, 2010. The supplemental funding of \$500,000 announced this week will bring the total NEG funds awarded for this project to \$25,357,608. With the supplemental funding, the project's period of performance is also extended for two quarters, so that all participants have more time to finish their full complement of reemployment services.

"I want again to thank my good friend and former colleague, U.S. Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis, for releasing more than \$25 million over the past three years in National Emergency Grant funds for American Samoa," Faleomavaega stated.

"Immediately following the devastating earthquake and tsunami that struck our islands on September 29, 2009, the Department of Labor notified my office as well as the offices of Senator Inouye, Senator Akaka, and the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, informing us of the outpouring of millions of dollars of federal funding to help American Samoa with clean-up and recovery efforts. The funding also provided for needed jobs to employ American Samoans and help with our local economy," Faleomavaega added.

"I also want to thank and acknowledge the great work by our local leaders in the American Samoa Department of Human Resources, including Department Director Evelyn Langford and NEG Program Manager Tuimavave Tauapa'i Laupola, for the tremendous job they've done in managing this program as well as their tireless efforts in addressing the multifaceted needs of the Territory in the aftermath of the devastating 2009 tsunami. I have every confidence that this funding will continue to help our Territory rebuild," Congressman Faleomavaega concluded.

HONORING CLYDE HAWES

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Clyde Hawes from New Madrid, Missouri for his exceptional years of service as Presiding Commissioner of New Madrid County.

Mr. Hawes has set a wonderful example of public service and dedication to bettering our

community. This month he will be retiring after serving as Presiding Commissioner for 36 years. Before that Mr. Hawes also served as Assessor of New Madrid County for 20 years while owning and operating his family farm. Mr. Hawes has spoken at several public events sharing his knowledge about business, agriculture, and civic matters.

Apart from his work as commissioner, Mr. Hawes is a Sunday school teacher at his church. As a devoted family man, Clyde sets a precedent for others to follow by committing to a balancing work and family.

For his years of service and all the work he has done to strengthen our community, it is my pleasure to recognize the achievements of Clyde Hawes and congratulate him on his retirement before the House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING DR. ROBERT
HEINEMAN

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects to a long time leader in higher education in my district. Dr. Robert Heineman has taught at Alfred University, my alma mater, since 1971, and was one of my professors of political science. He has shaped the thought of generations of Alfred University students and encouraged them to get involved in their communities and, specifically, to get involved in the political process.

Dr. Heineman holds a BA from Bradley University and both a MA and a Ph.D from American University. He has taught at Eastern Washington State College, Bradley University and Alfred University. He is a two time recipient of Alfred University's Excellence in Teaching Award and is the author of many book chapters and articles on the American Political System.

His activities extend beyond the classroom and into the Alfred community. Dr. Heineman served as an elected member of the Allegany County Legislature, Village of Alfred Board and as Village Justice in the Village of Alfred. He is the current chair of the advisory board of the Allegany County Youth Court. He has worked extensively to make the communities of Alfred and Allegany County better places to live.

Dr. Heineman has been married to his wife Alice for over 55 years and they have raised three children Phillip, Karen and Cheryl.

Our system of representative democracy cannot endure without each new generation of citizens being educated to appreciate its underlying philosophy and precepts. A community cannot flourish without engaged citizens of all ages participating in civic life. Dr. Robert Heineman has dedicated his life to the work of encouraging young people to love and respect the political process handed down to us by the founders and, more importantly encouraged them to not just watch from the sidelines but get in the game and be part of our democracy. It is a privilege as one of Dr. Heineman's former students to be able to praise him as a member of the House of Representatives.

IN RECOGNITION OF NAOMI
PATRIDGE

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Naomi Patridge who is leaving the Half Moon Bay City Council after serving a remarkable career of leadership spanning almost two decades.

Naomi and her husband, Howard, have lived in Half Moon Bay for nearly 45 years. Naomi is the Energizer Bunny of Half Moon Bay. For example, prior to serving on the council, she served for 14 years on the city's Parks and Recreation Commission. She has also served on the board of the Half Moon Bay Beautification Committee, the organizer of the annual Art and Pumpkin Festival. Half Moon Bay is a thriving, seaside community that annually hosts tens of thousands of visitors on one weekend in October when the pumpkins come to market and the tourists from around the country come to this charming town. The festival is a major fundraising event for civic improvements. Naomi has been at the heart of the festival for many years.

When the girls of Half Moon Bay think of softball, they think of Naomi Patridge. She has spent decades with the Half Moon Bay Girls Softball League and was instrumental in creating a permanent field as a home for generations of young ball players. Some may mourn the recent passing of Candlestick Park in San Francisco, but in Half Moon Bay the citizens celebrate the field that Naomi spent decades to secure. Her focus is on healthy living, and it is evident in the energy she poured into teams that always had good sportsmanship and fun as the center of their purposes.

Naomi has also been instrumental in creating a coastside bike trail that bears her name. Half Moon Bay is filled with bicyclists who travel for both pleasure and work. Naomi was concerned about the workers who had to peddle in the early morning hours and who were not safe. She was equally concerned about tourists who might get into trouble riding along the coastal highway. While she joined with others to create this wonderful amenity, it was her advocacy before local funding agencies that helped to secure much of the money for a trail that ultimately bore her name.

Mr. Speaker, as fun as it may be to bicycle along the coast or on Main Street in Half Moon Bay, Highway 92 can be a real headache for coastside residents. Naomi Patridge pushed relentlessly for a coastal road that fit in with local sensibilities about growth and development while also helping to relieve the frazzled nerves of residents.

When one thinks of Naomi, one also thinks of the quiet, dedicated employee of the school district. One thinks of the quiet, dedicated advocate and volunteer for seniors. One thinks of the vocal advocate for Half Moon Bay's library, and of the woman behind the table dishing out a heaping plate of hot food at the annual Farm Day luncheon. One also thinks of the advocate for housing the elderly and lower income farm worker residents of Half Moon Bay.

However, when thinking of Naomi, one must inevitably also think of the cool city councilmember evaluating a tough decision, and then casting a tough vote. There were times in the city's history when its finances were in order and times, particularly after recessions or a court judgment, that the city's finances were in deep distress. Naomi took the heat for difficult decisions during all of these budget hearings. When improving, fixing or supplementing basic public infrastructure was the concern, Naomi was a well-reasoned voice.

In fact, Naomi has been a voice of moderation and common sense for so many decades that one might also call her a civic thermometer. If it gets too hot in the debate, Naomi acts to cool things down. If the community isn't concerned enough about needed services or improvements, Naomi switches on to heat things up a bit, and to stir up questions and dialogue. Always moderate, Naomi can be counted on to keep the civic area of Half Moon Bay as comfortable as possible despite the inevitable challenges that occur in local democratic governance.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call Naomi a dear friend and colleague. I dare say there has not been a more constructive leader in Half Moon Bay than Naomi Patridge. While we will miss her service to us all, we will have her example of thoughtful citizenship to inspire us for years to come.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF
FALEOMAVAEGA'S EFFORTS TO
ESTABLISH A NATIONAL GUARD
PRESENCE IN AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information about efforts to establish a National Guard presence in American Samoa.

[Press Release, Sept. 28, 2005]

FALEOMAVAEGA REQUESTS EXPEDITED ASSISTANCE IN ESTABLISHING A HAWAII NATIONAL GUARD PRESENCE IN AMERICAN SAMOA

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that as a follow up to his discussions with Major General Robert Lee, Adjutant General for the State of Hawaii, he is requesting expedited assistance in establishing a Hawaii National Guard presence in American Samoa.

General Lee and I have been discussing how best to establish a National Guard Unit in American Samoa, Congressman Faleomavaega said. We have agreed that the best way is to establish a branch of the Hawaii National Guard in American Samoa. Governor Linda Lingle of the State of Hawaii supports our efforts as does Governor Togiola.

At this time, General Lee and I have agreed that it is in the best interest of American Samoa that our Guard unit should be a weapons of mass destruction and civil support team which will respond to terrorist threats and natural disasters. Our team will be locally recruited in American Samoa and will be based in the Territory.

The only remaining issue is that we must encourage the National Guard Bureau to expedite our request. The Bureau has been

working on this request for more than a year and, for this reason, I have written to General Lee and asked for his assistance. General Lee is the Commander of all National Guard Units for the State of Hawaii and our branch would be under his Command.

Once our request is approved, ASG will need to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the State of Hawaii. Governor Linda Lingle and Governor Togiola stand ready to sign this MOU and I am hopeful that with our latest efforts this will be in the very near future.

As always, I thank General Lee for his continued support for the people and troops of American Samoa. General Lee is to be commended for his dedication, commitment and leadership. I also thank Governor Lingle for without her support we could not move forward in establishing a branch of the Hawaii National Guard in American Samoa. I also thank Governor Togiola and, above all, I thank our military men and women for their service to our country, the Congressman concluded.

[Press Release, Nov. 16, 2005]

FALEOMAVAEGA AND MAJOR GENERAL ROBERT LEE MET TO DISCUSS THEIR ONGOING EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL GUARD UNIT IN AMERICAN SAMOA

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he met with Major General Robert Lee, Adjutant General for the State of Hawaii, to discuss their ongoing efforts to establish a National Guard Unit in American Samoa. The meeting was held in the Congressmen's Washington office.

As a follow-up to our efforts to establish a National Guard unit in American Samoa, Major General Lee and I met again to discuss the progress we are making, Congressman Faleomavaega said. Senator Inouye has been supportive of our work for a number of years now and I am pleased that based on our discussions Major General Lee has forwarded my most recent correspondence and also a new Memorandum to Lieutenant General Stephen Blum, Chief, National Guard Bureau.

Dated October 26, 2005, Major General Lee's Memorandum requests allowances for Hawaii to support a National Guard Unit in American Samoa. The Memorandum states: American Samoa continues to express great concern about the lack of local response capability. The CSTs (Civil Support Teams) currently within the region would be hard pressed to support an incident in American Samoa without substantially degrading its own abilities to respond to and sustain operations in support of a local incident. The additional team would be in lieu of creating and stationing a CST, or portion thereof, in American Samoa.

The team will be stationed in Hawaii with the HIARNG responsible for recruiting to fill the additional positions. Soldiers will be sought from Hawaii and American Samoa. The additional team will operate and train under the command and control of the 93d CST. The primary training location will be Hawaii, with training in American Samoa also being a necessity in order to provide for advance planning and coordination with proper offices and agencies local to American Samoa.

We are pleased that Governor Togiola of American Samoa and Governor Lingle of Hawaii have joined in to support our efforts and that both are ready to enter into an agreement regarding the stationing, training, and employment of the Civil Support Team. At this time, General Lee and I are hopeful that

General Blum will act to expedite our most recent request especially since this matter has been pending for some time.

Once again, Major General Lee has noted that the Hawaii National Guard stands ready to support its neighbors in the Pacific and, in turn, we thank the State of Hawaii for standing with us. At this time and on behalf of the people of American Samoa, I thank General Lee for his continued support. As a people, we are deeply appreciative of the service he renders in support of our troops and we commend him for his dedication, commitment and leadership, the Congressman concluded.

[Press Release, Mar. 13, 2009]

FALEOMAVAEGA PUSHES AIR NATIONAL GUARD FOR AMERICAN SAMOA

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he is pushing to establish a Hawaii Air National Guard unit in American Samoa. On January 28, 2009, Faleomavaega wrote to Senator Inouye and also met with the Senator on January 29. On March 12, 2009, he sent a letter to General Craig R. McKinley, Chief of the National Guard Bureau. A complete text of the letter, which was copied to Senator Daniel K. Inouye, follows:

Dear General McKinley:

I am writing as a follow-up to discussions I have had with U.S. Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Major General Robert Lee who is The Adjutant General (TAG) for the State of Hawaii, and also Major General Darryl D.M. Wong, Commander of Hawaii Air National Guard, regarding the establishment of a Hawaii Air National Guard unit in Pago Pago, American Samoa.

Major General Lee and Major General Wong have informed me that you are aware of this request, and that our efforts look promising. I thank you for your support which is critical to our success, and I am hopeful that you will join me in sending a joint letter to Governor Togiola Tulafono so that we may expedite this process.

As you may know, American Samoa has a per capita enlistment rate in the U.S. military which is higher than any State or U.S. Territory. Our sons and daughters have served in record numbers in every U.S. military engagement from WWII to present operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have stood by the United States in good times and bad, and I believe this relationship would only be strengthened by establishing a detachment of the Hawaii Air National Guard in American Samoa.

Faleomavaega concluded his letter by stating, "I am hopeful to work with you on this important initiative, and I congratulate you on being the first four-star General in National Guard history."

[Press Release, June 11, 2014]

CONGRESSMAN FALEOMAVAEGA MEETS WITH GENERAL WOJTECKI TO DISCUSS NATIONAL GUARD FEASIBILITY STUDY

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he met with Brigadier General Timothy Wojtecki, Vice-Director of Force Structure, Resources and Assessment for the National Guard Bureau (NGB) to discuss the feasibility study now underway for a National Guard unit in American Samoa. Colonel Mike Mellor, Branch Chief of the Force Capabilities and Requirements Analysis Division, and Master Sergeant (MSG) Bryan Rotherham, Joint Programs Legislative Liaison, also attended the meeting held in the Congressman's Washington, DC office.

"I want to personally thank BG Wojtecki for the update he provided me regarding the feasibility study on establishing National Guard units in American Samoa and CNMI," Faleomavaega said. "In 2013, the House and Senate agreed to my request to include language in the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) authorizing a feasibility study and I am pleased that the Department of Defense (DOD) and the National Guard Bureau have formed the study team and are now conducting an assessment."

"BG Wojtecki works under the command of General Grass of the National Guard Bureau, and the NGB is coordinating with the DOD as this study moves forward. With the United States pivoting towards the Asia Pacific, I have asked the DOD and NGB to consider foremost the strategic importance of both American Samoa and CNMI, especially since our military men and women serve our nation in record numbers. BG Wojtecki agreed that this would be a top consideration."

"Other areas that are being reviewed are force structure, demographics, what units would be best suited and if a National Guard unit can be sustained in American Samoa since the local government would have to participate in cost-sharing. Also, there are many legal matters which must be addressed, including the need for lawyers to assess how National Guard legalities would fit with local law but I am confident we can resolve any issues that might be of concern."

"One issue that BG Wojtecki and I agreed on, which Governor Lolo also supports, is that due to legal issues American Samoa may not be able to have a guard unit function under the Hawaii National Guard because, unlike the Reserve, different rules govern the National Guard."

"And so, if the study team recommends a guard unit for American Samoa and should the DOD agree, our next step would be to include funding in the National Defense Authorization Act for 2016, and after that we could still be looking at three years out before we transition into a fully functioning National Guard. If we succeed, then the Governor would select an Adjutant General but a Colonel would also be appointed who would work directly with General Grass of the National Guard Bureau. The Colonel would oversee all U.S. fiscal funding, property, and equipment and would report directly to the National Guard Bureau."

"In hopes that we can one day make this a reality, I also suggested, and the Brigadier General Wojtecki agrees, that we should consider having a National Guard unit co-share the Reserve building, and the study team would review this option as a cost-savings to strengthen our case for establishing a National Guard presence in American Samoa."

"BG Wojtecki also informed me that the timeline for the study to be completed could be as early as September or as late as November or December of this year, given that the NGB needs to coordinate with DOD, USAR, and other federal agencies to make sure the study team has the most accurate information possible upon which to base its recommendation. BG Wojtecki and I firmly believe the NGB and DOD must receive input from Command Sergeant Major Iuniasolua Savusa, who was once a candidate for CSM of the Army."

"In fact, they said that the study requires his input since he is the Director of Homeland Security in American Samoa. To alleviate any concern about his time commitment, I was assured in today's meeting that the time commitment on CSM Savusa's part

would be minimal making it possible for him to devote all of his time and attention to his job as Director of Homeland Security while also contributing his unparalleled expertise to this historic study."

"I very much look forward to working closely with Governor Lolo to make sure that the study put forward by the team is as strong as possible in hopes that the recommendation from the NGB and the DOD will be for the establishment of a National Guard unit in American Samoa. With the support and the prayers of the people of American Samoa, it is my intent to work hand in hand with Governor Lolo and our local leaders until we accomplish our goal," Faleomavaega concluded.

[Press Release, Dec. 11, 2013]

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR 2014

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for 2014 contains a provision requiring the Department of Defense (DOD) to do a feasibility study on establishing National Guard units in American Samoa and the CNMI. The House is expected to vote later this week.

In the case of American Samoa, Faleomavaega has worked on this issue since 2004 with the late Senator Daniel K. Inouye and 2005 with Major General Robert Lee, former General of the 9th Regional Support Command.

As previously stated, "While I am pleased that the U.S. Congress supported efforts to construct a new \$20 million U.S. Army Reserve Center in American Samoa, I am hopeful that the Congress will now give serious consideration to the establishment of a National Guard unit in the Territory as I believe that it is in our national interest for the United States to increase its military presence in American Samoa," Faleomavaega said.

"During WWII, the naval station in American Samoa served as a critical refueling point for U.S. troops. With increasing tensions in the Asia Pacific region, now more than ever the U.S. needs to reconsider its relationship with U.S. insular areas in the Pacific."

After many discussions and delays in Congress, in May 2013, the Congressman provided testimony before the House Committee on Armed Services where he urged the Committee to finally include language for a feasibility study for a National Guard in American Samoa. The Committee decided to include CNMI as well because it does not have a National Guard unit.

In June 2013, Congresswoman Bordallo offered an amendment at Faleomavaega's request and the amendment was passed. The language is now included in the final bill to be considered.

A feasibility study is the first step for the establishment of a National Guard unit in American Samoa, and the conferees to the NDAA agreed to include language authorizing the study. The House is now expected to vote on the NDAA as early as tomorrow.

JORDAN'S MIXED SIGNALS HARM REGIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY

HON. MATT SALMON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention an incident that oc-

curred on November 16, 2014 in which two American rabbis and three Israeli citizens were brutally murdered in a West Jerusalem synagogue by two cousins associated with the Har Nof terrorist group.

While I appreciate the role Jordan, her government, and her people play in fighting terrorism and promoting regional stability, I am deeply disappointed at the Jordanian government's response to this sickening, ruthless act of terrorism and murder.

While the Prime Minister's office officially condemned the action and its extremist ideology, these admonishments are rendered moot when they are followed by a letter of condolence from Jordanian Prime Minister Abdullah Ensour to the terrorists' family. Additionally, the Jordanian parliament not only condoned but celebrated the murders by holding a minute of silence on the parliament floor to memorialize the perpetrators. Such mixed signals from the Jordanian government are unconscionable and counterproductive to ongoing efforts toward regional stabilization and peace.

Praising those who commit acts of terrorism promotes the culture of political violence that continually shocks the neighborhoods of East and West Jerusalem, further derailing an already strained reconciliation process at each turn. Such official endorsements send the wrong message to Jordanian citizens and Muslims worldwide, especially youth who are faced each day with the decision to turn to violence or toward peace.

The U.S. Congress must encourage the Jordanian government to stand in condemnation of such acts of violence.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. GERALDINE "JEWEL" BLUE

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a wonderful Chicagoan, Geraldine Blue, who passed from this world on November 22, 2014.

Affectionately known as "Jewel" to her friends and family, she was born in Little Rock, Arkansas on March 8, 1940 to Blanche and Willie Johnson, Sr. Jewel's passion for music and dance started early. As a young child and teenager, Jewel competed in multiple talent competitions with her sisters and cousins. Indeed, the multiple invitations to perform locally that they received serve as testimony to the skill she and her family possessed. Her family used to say that Jewel would "sing her way to heaven and dance right out of her shoes". This description makes me smile because it captures her zeal for music and life. As a young woman, Jewel decided to move to Chicago where she met the love of her life, L.C. Blue, with whom she celebrated 30 years of marriage. Her friends emphasize her devotion to her family and commitment to ensuring their well-being. Jewel was a wonderful stay-at-home mother to four lovely children, Norris Timothy, Regina Pierre, Vonda Yvette and Levelle Christopher. Her

nurturing nature and talent with children led her husband to encourage her to start a home day care. Her 30 years of service to her Chicago community as a local child care provider gave hundreds of children and families the strong foundation and support needed to thrive in life.

Jewel's enthusiasm for life and dedication to others also showed in her work with the church. She served God via multiple ministries; she used her glorious voice in the music ministry and her passion for helping others as a member of the Adult Usher Board, Junior Missionary Board, and Altar Workers. I understand that her church family appreciated the unconditional love she gave to so many without judgment or shame. She was genuine and loving. What a beautiful combination.

Jewel was preceded in death by: her husband L.C. Blue; son Norris Timothy; parents Blanche and Willie Johnson, Sr.; and siblings Credale Johnson, Emma Jean Brown, Robert Johnson, Sr., and Willie Johnson, Jr. Jewel leaves many family members and loved ones to cherish her lasting memories, including: her children Regina Pierre, Vonda Yvette, and Levelle Christopher; her sisters Rosetta Williams, Lula Phillips, and Mary Walton (Raymond); her grandchildren Monique D. Johnson-Smith (Rodney), Chanel E. Moore, Jarrett L. Moore, Brandon D. Brazziel, Maya A. Moore; her great-grandchild Myles X. Smith; and her 38th Street Church family. We are grateful to Geraldine "Jewel" Blue for her tremendous contribution to so many in Chicago and our nation; her nurture and love strengthened individuals and communities.

ST. PAUL UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM L. ENYART

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating St. Paul United Church of Christ on its 175th anniversary.

From humble beginnings in 1839, St. Paul's has seen an incredible cross section of American history in the Midwest. Born from Belleville's German immigrants, the church first held services at the local court house, while awaiting a physical structure to be built.

St. Paul's provides worship and community appeal to the Belleville area and beyond. What makes St. Paul's exceptional is its mission to serve those who need it most.

Through Christmas and Thanksgiving charitable programs, the Franklin Community Neighborhood Association, Tuesday Community Dinner, afterschool programs, a food pantry, and much more, the church reaches out to every age group and background in the community.

A shining star of St. Paul's Church is the love and care that developed and grew St. Paul's Home into the senior community it is today. For over 85 years, St. Paul's Home has faithfully provided respite care, memory care, assisted living services, and skilled nursing to the elderly in Belleville and surrounding communities. And today, the church can proudly boast its new additions coming soon.

St. Paul's is proud to call the Illinois metro east home, and Belleville is proud to call St. Paul's one of its own.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating St. Paul's United Church of Christ on 175 years in the Belleville community.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE HILLARY CLINTON'S AUTHORIZATION OF EMERGENCY RELIEF SUPPLIES TO SAMOA IN RESPONSE TO DEVASTATING TSUNAMI

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information about former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's authorization of emergency relief supplies to Samoa in response to the devastating tsunami of September 29, 2009.

[Press Release, Oct. 10, 2009]

SECRETARY CLINTON GETS IT DONE; EMERGENCY RELIEF SUPPLIES TO BE AIRLIFTED FROM GREATER LOS ANGELES AREA TO SAMOA IN RESPONSE TO DEVASTATING TSUNAMI

Chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, Congressman Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, and Congresswoman Laura Richardson (D-CA), announced today that the U.S. Department of State called them this morning to inform them that Secretary Clinton has authorized the use of funds from the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) to get emergency relief supplies airlifted from the greater Los Angeles area to Samoa in response to the devastating tsunami that struck Apia on September 29.

In his capacity as Chairman of the Asia Pacific Subcommittee which has broad jurisdiction for U.S. foreign policy affecting the region, including Samoa, Chairman Faleomavaega personally spoke to Secretary Clinton on Oct 1 and, in letters dated Oct 4 and Oct 5, followed up with her regarding the specific need to airlift emergency supplies to Apia, which were gathered by the Samoan communities and congregations in the greater Los Angeles area.

The Samoan communities in the greater Los Angeles directly contacted Faleomavaega for assistance because many of their families and relatives live in his district of American Samoa or Samoa. Congresswoman Laura Richardson has worked closely with Faleomavaega throughout this process given that she represents part of the greater Los Angeles area, and the Samoan communities living in that area are her constituents.

"I want to personally thank Secretary Clinton for her untiring efforts in getting these relief supplies airlifted," Chairman Faleomavaega said. "Since the tsunami struck, Secretary Clinton has spared no effort in coming to our aid, and even called upon the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) to quickly move these supplies from the West Coast to Samoa. Last evening, Congresswoman Richardson and I learned that DOD had agreed to move the supplies but that due to legalities of moving privately-do-

nated goods, the process would take too long."

"In a previous conference call yesterday, anticipating that DOD might be unable to quickly move these supplies, we requested the State Department to fund a commercial flight through the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance should we encounter any problems with DOD," Faleomavaega and Rep. Richardson said. "Last night, upon learning that the DOD process would take too long and in consideration of our request for a more immediate airlift, Secretary Clinton assessed the options while en route to Europe, and this morning the State Department informed us that Secretary Clinton has agreed to fund the flight with OFDA funds."

"The agreement is that this will be a one-time airlift, and our Samoan communities should make future donations in cash, rather than in commodities. We will not be able to airlift frozen goods, and our offices will work closely with the communities to gather the supplies to a central location for the airlift. Also, the airlift provided by the U.S. Department of State can only be authorized to land in Samoa. While we were also hopeful to get supplies in to American Samoa, all matters relating to American Samoa are decided between the Governor and FEMA, according to federal law."

"I know from my meeting earlier this week with Prime Minister Tuilaepa Sailele Malielegaoi that he is thankful to the Samoan congregations and communities in the greater Los Angeles area who responded from the heart by collecting critical supplies that will now be airlifted to those in need," Faleomavaega said. "For this reason, I want to thank the Prime Minister for agreeing to accept this gift, and I also want to thank Reverend Liiki Tiatia, Reverend John Mailo, Reverend Misipouena Tagaloa, and High Chief Loa Pele Faletofo for all the good work they have done. Reverend Tiatia and Reverend Mailo will be taking a flight to Samoa to make the presentation to the Government of Samoa on behalf of our Samoan community on the West Coast and also on behalf of Congresswoman Richardson and myself."

"I especially want to thank Congresswoman Richardson for working around the clock in support of our Samoan communities living in her district, and in Samoa and American Samoa," Faleomavaega continued. "Congresswoman Richardson has stood by us every step of the way and has left no stone unturned in getting this done. She has been staunch and solid in her dedication to us, and has earned her rightful place in our hearts. It is my honor to welcome Congresswoman Richardson into our Pacific Island family."

"With so many people in need of basic supplies in Samoa, it has been a privilege to work with Chairman Faleomavaega to assist the people of my district in making sure the items they have collected will soon be in the hands of their families and friends," Congresswoman Richardson said. "This feat is only possible because of the dedication of Chairman Faleomavaega and Secretary Clinton. Over 60 local organizations in the 37th district of California, including church groups, non-profit organizations and caring others collected over 100,000 pounds of essential items to send to victims of the tragedy that recently occurred. The lives of thousands of Samoans will be immediately and directly improved by the actions taken by Secretary Clinton, Chairman Faleomavaega and all of us who answered the call to help. I am proud to be a part of this exceptional team."

"It is clear that change has come and that Secretary Clinton is restoring America's stature once again, especially in a part of the world that the U.S. has too long neglected. We thank Secretary Clinton for her leadership and commitment, and for standing with the people of Samoa when they need her most, and we continue to extend our deepest condolences to the families and friends of those who are suffering so much," Faleomavaega and Rep. Richardson concluded.

DR. KENNETH H. COOPER

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that Dr. Kenneth H. Cooper will be inducted into the National Football Foundation's Leadership Hall of Fame on January 8th, 2015.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF BLACK VETERANS AND NATIONAL COMMANDER BRIGADIER GENERAL (RET.) ROBERT A. COCROFT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the National Organization of Black Veterans (NABVETS) and its visionary and founder, Brigadier General (Ret.) Robert A. Cocroft for his distinguished service as National Commander. This year, under the leadership of President and Chief Executive Officer Wendy McClinton, Black Veterans for Social Justice, Inc. hosted the National Organization of Black Veterans National Conference and Convention in New York City, which took place from August 14th to August 17th, 2014. The theme for the 2014 Convention was "Transitioning to the Next Level: Fighting for Your Focus". This theme was very apropos, because the conference honored Brigadier General (Ret.) Robert A. Cocroft who retired as National Commander.

The National Association for Black Veterans, Inc. (NABVETS) is a membership service organization with the charge to address issues concerning Black and other minority veterans. NABVETS has served as a leader to address the unmet concerns of minority and low-income veterans through direct services, empowerment training and collaborative partnerships; and in the service design to address the "holistic" issues of homelessness among veterans. Since inception, NABVETS has provided direct services to 65,000 veterans and on behalf of 240,000 veterans—primarily of the Vietnam and post-Vietnam era.

Robert A. Cocroft served with the Army in Korea during the Vietnam War and had an active career in the Army Reserve. He served as the Deputy Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Veterans Affairs, President of the National Association for Black Veterans, and

President and CEO of the Center for Veterans Issues (Milwaukee, Wisconsin).

Robert A. Cocroft was born in Conway, Mississippi, Nov. 16, 1946 and was raised in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He entered military service via the draft in 1966, while as a student at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, where he studied and played football.

During his illustrious military career and service, he was once offered a position in military intelligence, but declined because he believed that as a Black officer he would be used to spy on student demonstrators such as the Black Panther Party. He describes going to Panama for jungle training and becoming anemic due to taking required anti-malaria drug Primaquine, which reacted with his G6PD deficiency. Sent to Korea, he mentions assignment to headquarter Special Troops and processing military personnel with the 8th Army and touches on racial tension, infiltrators along the Demilitarized Zone, attitudes towards Republic of Korea soldiers, and estimates of military strength.

After return to Wisconsin, he joined the 84th Division of the Reserve, while also working and going to school full time. He graduated from the Army War College, climbing the chain of command to Assistant Division Commander for Operations with the 98th Division. Cocroft examines the problem with minorities getting administrative discharges and then having great difficulty getting veteran benefits, and the unfairness of this compared to the amnesty offered to draft dodgers, who were mostly white. He reports that now the segregation problems are not racial, but gender-based, and he addresses the issues of fraternization and different standards for women. Cocroft emphasizes that the American people need to decide what they want from their military. He retired at the rank of Brigadier General.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me and a very grateful Nation in paying tribute and salute to Brigadier General (Ret.) Robert A. Cocroft.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARION BARRY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Marion Barry, former Mayor of Washington, D.C., civil rights activist, community organizer, and Mississippi native.

Born in Itta Bena, MS, on March 6, 1936, into a family of sharecroppers, Marion Barry immediately developed a work ethic that would be on display throughout his entire life. Even as a child growing up in the Mississippi Delta and later in Memphis, TN, he would work jobs as a paperboy, a waiter, and a bag boy at a grocery store to help his family in which he was the third of 10 children.

Mr. Barry was always a great student and graduated with a degree in chemistry from Lemoyne-Owen College in Memphis and later received a master's degree in organic chem-

istry from Fisk University in Nashville, TN. While a graduate student at Fisk, Mr. Barry began what would be a long, storied life in public service and civil rights and helped found the campus's chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and, subsequently, helped to form and became the first National Chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

As Chairman of SNCC, Mr. Barry led protests against racial segregation and discrimination, played a central role in many voter registration efforts, worked for the recognition of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party and, despite the imminent danger involved, participated in the Freedom Rides organized by the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), during the spring and summer of 1961, to help African-Americans in the South register to vote.

In 1965, Mr. Barry came to D.C. to manage the local SNCC office. His advocacy for the people of Washington, D.C., started that year and would continue for nearly five decades. At the time Mr. Barry arrived in Washington, D.C., the city, though more than fifty percent Black, had few Black people in the ranks of the city's leadership and was being held under the thumb of often all-white congressional committees whose members' segregationist policies worked to prevent the black community from growing and thriving.

In response to these conditions, Mr. Barry organized a "Free D.C. Movement" to advocate for D.C. Home Rule. Additionally, he often spoke against the policies and regulations put in place by the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

In 1967, Mr. Barry resigned from his leadership position in the D.C., SNCC office and organized Pride, Inc.—a program that provided job training to uplift unemployed black men in Washington, D.C., and put them in a better position to be contributing members of the community. This program helped to build and develop a generation of Black men who may have otherwise been lost.

Mr. Barry began his life in electoral politics in 1971, when he was elected to the Washington, D.C., school board. He would go on to serve as president of the board from 1972 to 1974. Mr. Barry would then go on to run for and be elected to an at-large seat on the D.C. City Council. Mr. Barry immediately became a leader on the council and helped to make real changes in the city including, getting a pay raise for the police department and defeating a gross-receipts tax on all city businesses.

On March 9, 1977, Mr. Barry's personal will and courage were on display as he survived a gunshot wound he received when radical terrorists took siege of the City Council building during a hostage crisis. This event would only add to the reverence that was building for the man and his leadership abilities.

In 1978, Mr. Barry was elected as the Mayor of Washington, D.C.—a post he would hold for 16 years between 1979 and 1999. Like me, Mr. Barry was one of the nearly 250 black mayors elected in the years following Martin Luther King Jr.'s assassination and he became one of the many black elected leaders who rose from the struggles of the civil rights era.

As mayor of Washington, D.C., Marion Barry was a powerhouse. He helped to create a local government that had barely existed before his arrival at City Hall. He was an advocate for diversity and inclusivity in City government hiring and appointed new and talented black leaders who, ultimately, proved the viability of self-governance by Black leaders in D.C.

Mr. Barry instituted budget reforms that had not previously existed and was able to get the city's financial books in order. Additionally, Mr. Barry worked to build up downtown Washington, D.C., and turn it into a thriving business center that would eventually include the Verizon Center—home to the Washington Wizards and Washington Capitals. Moreover, Mr. Barry would raise the national and international profile of Washington, D.C., through his charismatic leadership and effective results.

Though he moved the city forward and became an ally to the business community, the upper middle class and the professional working class alike, Marion Barry never forgot where he came from and the people who he was elected to serve. During his mayoralty, Mr. Barry continued to be a champion for the poor and downtrodden. He would often say that he could "walk with kings but not lose the common touch." He helped steer millions of dollars into job training, employment, senior citizen, and social welfare programs. He also hired thousands of blue-collar workers into his administration to perform many of the jobs that helped build a thriving metropolis.

Marion Barry was often referred to as "Mayor for Life" due in part to the unyielding support he received from his constituents. This support would often be tested in his political life. But even in the face of controversy that prevented him from seeking mayoral office in 1990 and eventually cost him his freedom, the people of D.C. trusted the leadership of Mr. Barry enough to re-elect him as D.C.'s Mayor in 1994 and subsequently to several more terms as a City Council member.

Despite any of Mr. Barry's personal struggles and downfalls, he always kept one thing front and center in his mind—the well being and progression of the people of his beloved Washington, D.C., and the continued advancement of the black community. Until his dying day, Marion Barry carried the flag for his city.

Marion Barry is a great example of what can happen when the system tries to choose our heroes for us and the people push back.

While the media and various individuals worked as hard as they could to break him down and turn their collective backs on him, the people—the ones who should be the most important to an elected official—always welcomed him with open arms and received him even more warmly at the ballot box. This speaks volumes about the kind of man and the kind of leader Marion Barry was in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mayor Marion Barry, an undaunted activist, a community leader, a devoted public servant, and an unforgettable personality in American politics.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY ON PAS-
SAGE OF FALEOMAVAEGA BILL
TO PROVIDE ASG AUTHORITY TO
ISSUE BONDS EXEMPT FROM
STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information about the passage of a bill to provide the American Samoa Government the authority to issue bonds exempt from state and local taxation.

[Press Release, Nov. 5, 2003]

HOUSE PASSES FALEOMAVAEGA BILL TO PRO-
VIDE ASG AUTHORITY TO ISSUE BONDS EX-
EMPT FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION

Congressman Faleomavaega announced that on November 4, 2003 the U.S. House of Representatives unanimously passed H.R. 982, a bill he introduced to provide the American Samoa Government with the authority to issue bonds exempt from state and federal taxation.

I would like to thank Chairman Pombo and Ranking Member Rahall of the Resources Committee and Chairman Sensenbrenner and Ranking Member Conyers of the Judiciary Committee for their continued support regarding the needs of American Samoa and for their efforts to bring H.R. 982 to the Floor, Congressman Faleomavaega said. H.R. 982 would amend the U.S. Code to allow interest earned from American Samoa bonds to be exempt from both state and local taxation.

Under the U.S. Code, Congress has expressly provided for the exemption of state and local taxes for bonds issued by Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands. While American Samoa can issue bonds similar to the other territories, the interest earned from American Samoa bonds is subject to taxation by the several States, Washington, DC and the other territories. H.R. 982 would provide parity to American Samoa.

H.R. 982 will also make American Samoa bonds more attractive to investors and could save the American Samoa Government between \$20,000 and \$50,000 a year in interest costs on municipal bonds it may issue, the Congressman said. The American Samoa Power Authority has indicated that it would like to sell bonds to purchase new diesel generator sets to accommodate our growing population. This legislation would lower the interest costs of the prospective sales and will also enable the government to address deficiencies in its current infrastructure.

This legislation is identical to H.R. 1448 which I introduced in the 107th Congress. H.R. 1448 was adopted by the Judiciary and Resources Committees and was finally agreed to by voice vote on the House Floor on September 24, 2002. Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to consider this legislation before the 107th Congress adjourned.

However, the Judiciary and Resources Committees once again supported American Samoa's interests by unanimously passing H.R. 982 in the 108th Congress and I am thankful that my friends, both Republican and Democrat, also voted in favor of H.R. 982 when this matter was brought to the Floor for consideration. This legislation is beneficial and critical to the needs of American

Samoa and in due time will help us build and strengthen our local economy.

At this time, I also want to thank Governor Togiola for his support and I look forward to working with my friends in the U.S. Senate to make sure that this legislation is passed before the 108th Congress adjourns next year, the Congressman concluded.

[Press Release, Sept. 30, 2004]

SENATE PASSES FALEOMAVAEGA'S BILL TO
DEVELOP AMERICAN SAMOA'S ECONOMY BY
PROVIDING ASG WITH AUTHORITY TO ISSUE
BONDS EXEMPT FROM TAXATION

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that on Wednesday September 29, 2004 the Senate passed H.R. 982, a bill he introduced to help develop American Samoas economy by providing the American Samoa Government with the authority to issue bonds exempt from state and federal taxation.

Bonds encourage economic investment in the Territory and H.R. 982 will make American Samoa bonds more attractive to investors and will immediately save the American Samoa Government between \$20,000 and \$50,000 a year in interest costs on municipal bonds it may issue, the Congressman said.

Not long ago, the American Samoa Power Authority said that it would like to sell bonds to purchase new diesel generator sets to accommodate our growing population. This legislation would lower the interest costs of the prospective sales and will also enable the government to address deficiencies in its current infrastructure.

This legislation is identical to H.R. 1448 which I introduced in the 107th Congress. H.R. 1448 was adopted by the Judiciary and Resources Committees and was finally agreed to by voice vote on the House Floor on September 24, 2002. Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to consider this legislation before the 107th Congress came to a close.

However, the Judiciary and Resources Committees once again supported American Samoa's interests by unanimously passing H.R. 982 in the 108th Congress and I am thankful that my friends, both Republican and Democrat, also voted in favor of H.R. 982 when this matter was brought to the House Floor for consideration. This legislation is beneficial and critical to the needs of American Samoa and in due time will help us build and strengthen our local economy.

At this time, I thank my friends, especially Senator Harry Reid, Assistant Democratic Leader of the U.S. Senate who responded to my letter dated September 20, 2004 in which I requested his support in bringing H.R. 982 to the Senate floor for passage. The Senate Finance Committee favorably reported the bill on July 20, 2004 and placed it on the Senate Calendar for consideration and vote. As Assistant Democratic Leader, I am thankful that Senator Reid was able to hotline this bill.

I also appreciate the support of Senator Charles Grassley, Chairman of the Committee on Finance, and Ranking Member Max Baucus for supporting the bill. This bill is good news for American Samoa and, again, will encourage more investment in the Territory. Now that this bill has passed both the House and Senate, H.R. 982 now awaits the President's signature which I am confident will be forthcoming, the Congressman concluded.

TRIBUTE TO KENNY HALE

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a notable Hoosier, Mr. Kenny Hale, for his retirement from public service, most recently as President of the Morgan County Council. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to our community, state, and country.

Kenny was first elected to the Morgan County Council in 1999, and assumed a leadership role immediately. He served as the council's Vice President for his first six years on the body and has served as President for the past ten years. He also served as the county's plan director, 911 coordinator, floodplain administrator, county purchasing agent of land acquisition, and heavy equipment operator. In addition to serving the people of Morgan County, Kenny is an ASE and Moog Certified Technician, and a Certified Welder.

Kenny's leadership was critical in the county's coordinated response to several unforgettable disasters over the years, including the devastating F-3 tornado in 2002 and the massive floods of 2008. His generosity and expertise even extended outside of the county to fellow Hoosiers following the disastrous 2010 tornado that claimed lives in Henryville, Indiana.

Kenny has been recognized by his community and peers over the past several years. The Morgan County Sheriff's Department awarded him for coordinating the Jefferson Township Crime Watch program. He has been recognized by the Association of Indiana Counties as Outstanding County Councilman in 2004, and other organizations for his leadership, achievement and community service.

Kenny has been a dedicated public servant and I wish him well during his well-deserved retirement from public service, though I suspect we will see his continued leadership in the community for years to come. Thank you, Kenny, for your service and leadership.

COMMENDING KRISHNA
BHADRIRAJU

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Krishna Bhadriraju for appreciating the value of life at the young age of four and working to save the life of an injured bird.

Krishna documented his care of a blue jay that he rescued and nursed back to health. The story of healing and the care an individual can provide for another species resonated so strongly that his teachers encouraged him to put pen to paper. The result, produced at age six, is his book, "Krishna Saves a Bird." His compassion and dedication to helping an animal in trouble at such a young age has become an inspirational opportunity to show

other children the value of helping others and tapping your creative skills.

I commend Krishna Bhadriraju for using his experience to inspire action in others. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, I again congratulate Krishna on the completion of "Krishna Saves a Bird." We are grateful for his work to promote kindness and compassion.

HONORING GOLDEN LIVING CENTER

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Golden LivingCenter in St. James as the 2014 recipient of the Gold-Excellence in Quality National Quality Award. Golden LivingCenter is the only long term care center that has received this prestigious award from the National Quality Award program for three consecutive years.

Since 1964, as a role model for providing skilled nursing and post-acute care, Golden LivingCenter has been dedicated to improving the lives of their patients and residents. Their employees have continuously been committed to provide exceptional care for the residents of the communities they serve.

For the years of service and commitment to helping others, it is my pleasure to recognize Golden LivingCenter in St. James before the United States House of Representatives.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF CITIZEN- SHIP ISSUE IN AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, the following information about the citizenship issue in American Samoa.

[Press Release, June 11, 2008]

WASHINGTON, D.C.—FALEOMAVAEGA RESPONDS TO GOVERNOR TOGIOLA'S COMMENTS ABOUT CITIZENSHIP LEGISLATION

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he is clarifying the intent of H.R. 6191, a bill he introduced to make it easier for U.S. nationals living in American Samoa to become U.S. citizens, if they so choose.

"Recently, the Governor has publicly expressed that he strongly opposes the legislation and, while I respect his right to oppose, I disagree with his position," Faleomavaega said. "Also, given that the Governor has made statements that are not factual, I believe it is important to clear up the misinformation he has relayed to the newspapers and radio."

"First, Governor Togiola states that H.R. 6191 will force U.S. citizenship on U.S. nationals. This is not true. H.R. 6191 is about choice, not force, and only applies to those U.S. nationals living in American Samoa

who choose to become U.S. citizens if they wish to apply."

"Secondly, the Governor states that this legislation is contrary to the findings of the Future Political Status Study Commission which recommended that American Samoa not seek U.S. citizenship for its people at this time. Again, this is false. H.R. 6191 does not make citizenship automatic for American Samoa's people. H.R. 6191, which my staff hand-delivered to Governor Togiola's office on June 7, 2008, states that the intent of this legislation is to allow nationals to become citizens by more expeditious means. In other words, it speeds up the process. It does not make citizenship automatic."

"For those nationals who choose to become citizens, H.R. 6191 speeds up the process by doing away with certain requirements and treating nationals like nationals rather than foreigners. As the law now stands, in order for a national to become a citizen, our people must follow the same procedures as aliens, or foreigners, and this is not right since nationals owe permanent allegiance to the United States."

"For nationals living in American Samoa, it is not right that our people are currently required to pass an English proficiency and civics exam given that American Samoa's education system is patterned after that of public schools in the U.S."

"Also, our people should not be required, as they now are, to move to the mainland to pass the residency requirement. Our people already live in a U.S. Territory and should not be subjected to the financial hardship and burdens of moving to California or Hawaii or elsewhere just to establish residency. While the Governor may believe that our people should be treated like foreigners and forced to move and take exams, I do not and this is where we disagree."

"I believe the provisions of physical residency and exams should be waived, and this is what H.R. 6191 does. H.R. 6191 waives the requirements of physical residency but keeps in place all other provisions of section 316 as to good moral character, etc. H.R. 6191 also makes sure that U.S. nationals are required to file an application, complete an interview, be fingerprinted, take an oath and meet all other requirements as expressed in the Immigration and Nationality Act."

"Regarding the Governor's concerns about H.R. 6191 opening up the floodgate to foreigners, I am pleased that after all these years the Governor has finally agreed to stop the flow of foreigners entering the territory if H.R. 6191 is passed. If H.R. 6191 accomplishes nothing else, it has been well worth the effort because ASG should have closed the floodgate years ago. ASG's weak immigration and corporate laws, which allow for sponsorship of foreigners, like Daewoosa, who set up shop and send their money back home, have brought embarrassment to our Territory and jeopardized our communal lands and customs. If ASG does not clean up its mess and establish fair laws for fair business, our people will lose everything."

"Regarding the Governor's point that he believes H.R. 6191 will lead to our people being drafted in the U.S. military, I would respectfully suggest that he review H.R. 6191. H.R. 6191 does not make anyone subject to the draft."

"Finally, like the Governor, I welcome input, and I introduced this legislation based on the input of the people. Many of our people have requested my assistance because, like me, they believe U.S. nationals who choose to become citizens should be able to do so without being treated like foreigners in

the process. This is why I introduced H.R. 6191, and stand by it, and intend to open it up for nationals living in the U.S. as well," Faleomavaega concluded.

[Press Release, July 12, 2012]

WASHINGTON, D.C.—FALEOMAVAEGA OPPOSES THE RECENTLY FILED LAWSUIT TO FORCE CITIZENSHIP ON EVERY PERSON BORN IN AMERICAN SAMOA

Congressman Faleomavaega today announced his continued strong opposition to the efforts to use the judicial system to force citizenship upon every person who is born in American Samoa.

On July 10, 2012, a lawsuit was filed by Murad Hussain of Arnold & Porter LLP, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Mr. Hussain represents several plaintiffs born in American Samoa, and the Samoan Federation of America located in Carson, California. The plaintiffs in the lawsuit are seeking a declaratory judgment from the court that the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution should apply to American Samoa. The plaintiffs are also seeking an injunction to prevent the U.S. Department of State from imprinting Endorsement Code 09 on passports of persons born in American Samoa noting that the "Bearer is a U.S. National and Not a U.S. Citizen. A copy of the complaint or lawsuit can be found at this link: <http://www.house.gov/faleomavaega/pdfs/1-main.pdf>.

"I respect the rights of the plaintiffs, who were born in American Samoa, to file their lawsuit. I also appreciate the frustration of the Samoan Federation of America that struggles to meet the needs of Samoans who are U.S. nationals who cannot vote in national elections and are precluded from certain jobs that requires U.S. citizenship. However, I believe the choice of becoming a U.S. citizen belongs to the people of American Samoa, and not by judicial legislation," Faleomavaega said.

"I have sent letters to the leadership of the Fono, both the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House, that summarizes the lawsuit that was filed this week in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. In the letters I further reiterated my opposition to the lawsuit which if successful will force citizenship upon everyone born in American Samoa," Faleomavaega added.

"The future of our territory is being threatened by outside forces and we must unite in our opposition to this lawsuit. I firmly believe the future of American Samoa should be decided by the people living in the territory, not by a court 7,000 miles away," Faleomavaega concluded.

The full text of the Congressman's letter to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House follows:

I am writing to bring to your attention a lawsuit that was filed this week in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on behalf of several persons born in American Samoa. The plaintiffs in the lawsuit are seeking a declaratory judgment from the court that the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution should apply to American Samoa. The plaintiffs are also seeking an injunction to prevent the U.S. Department of State from imprinting Endorsement Code 09 on passports of persons born in American Samoa noting that the "Bearer is a U.S. National and Not a U.S. Citizen".

The lawsuit, filed against the United States of America, the U.S. Department of

State, the Secretary of State and the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs, could have significant ramifications on American Samoa's political relationship with the U.S. government. If the court rules in favor of the plaintiffs and the Citizenship Clause is applied to American Samoa, this will set the precedent for other provisions of the U.S. Constitution to be applied in the Territory. This is a cause for concern as the courts may invalidate any of our local laws that protect our Matai system and communal lands.

For years, I have warned the people of American Samoa of the dangers of outside forces determining the future of our territory. The lawsuit filed this week is the manifestation of our greatest fear, that citizenship will be forced upon us and we could lose our Matai system and communal lands. For example, in *King v. Andrus*, 452 F. Supp. 11 (D.D.C. 1977), a federal court applied the jury system to the American Samoa judiciary system against our will.

This week a federal court is again asked to decide an issue critical to American Samoa, whether American Samoans should be considered U.S. citizens. We must ask ourselves do we want a court to decide whether we become citizens or do we want to decide our own destiny.

I respect the right of the plaintiffs to file this lawsuit. However, I believe the issue of citizenship should be decided by the people currently living in American Samoa and who plan on remaining in American Samoa. Since any potential negative consequences of citizenship being granted to all persons born in American Samoa will affect persons living in American Samoa not those living in the United States. For those living in the United States, there are existing pathways to citizenship that allow them to become U.S. Citizens. There is also a fee waiver available for some individuals who are not able to pay filing fee for the naturalization application.

I have enclosed a copy of the complaint. My hope is for a thorough review by the Fono on this important issue. I will also make the complaint available for download on my website at <http://www.house.gov/faleomavaega/pdfs/1-main.pdf>.

[Press Release, August 12, 2014]

FALEOMAVAEGA COMMENDS U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE'S BRIEF IN *TUAAU V. UNITED STATES*

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman Faleomavaega today issued the following statement offering his support for the U.S. Department of State's recently filed brief against the plaintiffs in the citizenship case formally known as *Tuaua v. United States*, a case in which five individuals want the U.S. Government to grant automatic citizenship to anyone born in American Samoa.

"On behalf of the people of American Samoa, I submitted a legal brief to the court in 2012 asserting that U.S. citizenship by birthright should only be decided by the will of the people and granted through legislation passed by the U.S. Congress," Faleomavaega said.

"I now commend the State Department for emphasizing that only Congress has the authority to grant U.S. citizenship to American Samoa, a position which I have publicly expressed for years. As I have stated on and off the record, I am not against birthright citizenship for American Samoans; however, there is a process in place. Every U.S. territory that currently possesses birthright citizenship obtained it through an 'organic act' passed by the U.S. Congress. Each organic act was supported by the will of the people in

each respective territory. American Samoa must also go through this process if our people decide that birthright citizenship is in their best interest."

"We cannot allow our political status with the United States to be decided by five individuals or by a court thousands of miles away. If our people decide that they want to be granted automatic citizenship by birthright, I will work with Congress and our local leaders, as provided by governing law and years of legal precedent, to pass such legislation. Until then, I will continue to keep the people updated as this case moves through the court," Faleomavaega concluded.

THE NO SOCIAL SECURITY FOR NAZIS ACT

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the rare occasions where the name of the bill speaks for itself.

The No Social Security for Nazis Act is designed to close a loophole that has allowed some Nazi persecutors and their collaborators in the Holocaust to receive Social Security benefits. By leaving the country before they were officially deported, these people were able to keep their Social Security benefits. It is unbearable that those responsible for the deaths of millions during the Holocaust continue to receive Social Security benefits due to this loophole.

This legislation stops benefit payments to Nazi persecutors and ensures that these individuals do not receive spousal benefits from marrying a Social Security beneficiary or through other channels. Congress never intended for Nazi war criminals and collaborators to be able to receive Social Security benefits. This bipartisan legislation reaffirms that intent.

Social Security is an earned benefit, and it is our job in Congress to preserve and protect it. We must stop these inappropriate payments now, and that is exactly what this legislation does. I thank Representatives JOHNSON and BECERRA and the work of Representatives CAROLYN MALONEY, JASON CHAFFETZ and LEONARD LANCE, and all others for their leadership on this legislation.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,005,549,328,561.45. We've added \$7,378,672,279,648.37 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.3 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

FUNDING FOR ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to appropriate an additional \$200 million to the National Institutes of Health for research on Alzheimer's disease.

More than five million Americans currently have Alzheimer's disease. Today, someone develops Alzheimer's every 67 seconds and by 2050, it will be every 33 seconds.

Alzheimer's is the most expensive disease in America. Unless action is taken, the cost of Alzheimer's will total \$1.2 trillion in 2050, and Medicare and Medicaid spending on Alzheimer's will increase 500 percent.

My mother-in-law battled this disease, so I appreciate how devastating it can be to patients and their loved ones.

The bipartisan National Alzheimer's Project Act (NAPA) was passed by Congress unanimously.

NAPA called for the creation of a National Alzheimer's Plan, which has resulted in some notable accomplishments. However, scientists and researchers must have the necessary funds to carry out the blueprint set forth in the Plan.

Congress provided an additional \$100 million in Alzheimer's research for fiscal year 2014, yet we continue to underinvest.

To address a disease of this magnitude, we must further our commitment by increasing funding for Alzheimer's research by \$200 million in fiscal year 2015.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF POLITICAL STATUS ISSUE IN AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, the following information on the political status of American Samoa.

[Press Release, Oct. 2, 2006]

FALEOMAVAEGA TESTIFIES BEFORE POLITICAL STATUS COMMISSION

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he testified before the American Samoa Political Status Commission in a hearing held on Saturday, September 29, 2006 at BYU-Hawaii in Laie, Hawaii.

I believe the work of this commission is critical for American Samoa's political future, Faleomavaega said. I am honored to provide input as the commissioners deliberate our political status options.

In my opinion, before we get too far ahead of ourselves in examining our political options we need to look inward to resolve some lingering ambiguities regarding our current territorial status. Currently, American Samoa's political relationship with the United States is governed by the two Treaties or Deeds of Cession signed in 1900 (Tutuila) and

1904 (Manua). These documents provide no clear protections for our culture, no clear guidance for our relationship with the United States, and no expression of political unity between our own islands.

To me, it makes sense that we should address these issues first before we can develop a roadmap for our future. Otherwise, unresolved questions will always remain regarding our internal (Tutuila and Manua) and external (with the United States) political relationships.

One source of ambiguity in these documents is that, in a Samoan context, this was understood to be a treaty of cession, rather than a deed of cession. In the Samoan version of these documents, our chiefs used the term *feagaiga*, which means treaty, but in the English version, the word treaty is never mentioned. To our Samoan chiefs this treaty relationship meant that Samoans would maintain a measure of autonomy the terms of the agreement allowed the U.S. the right to use the land and the harbor, in exchange for providing protection against hostile nations. Viewed as a deed, however, this agreement would have meant that the chiefs were giving over the land as well as their sovereignty over the land. The problem inherent in this ambiguity is that a deed of cession offers our people something less than the sovereign status that a treaty would provide, and in fact the term deed implies ownership of property rather than a sense of the rights and privileges of a sovereign people.

Another source of ambiguity related to these two treaties/deeds is that they were negotiated separately between the United States and each of the island groups. Because these two instruments were two separate acts, by themselves they did not unite American Samoa into one political entity. Therefore, the fact remains that to this day, there is no officially declared political union between the island groups of Tutuila and Manua, only separate understandings with the United States.

Furthermore, despite what others may have said was the understanding in the past, these treaties do not provide for the protection of the basic rights of American Samoan people. While these two treaties have proven instrumental in providing stability to the people of American Samoa for the past 106 years, the deeds do not cover many of the most basic issues of concern for our people, such as citizenship, immigration, international trade and commerce, national security, marine and communal property rights, or membership in international organizations, to name a few. Rather than being instruments that express some vague obligation on the part of the United States to protect our culture, I see these two treaties as asserting United States sovereignty over our lands and our lives.

While the Deeds of Cession still stand as the basis upon which American Samoa can claim a political relationship with the United States, there is still some confusion even within the United States government as to the effect of these two treaties. A review of the U.S. Department of State listing of U.S. treaties in force makes no mention of any treaty existing between the United States and the island groups of Tutuila and Manua.

Also, as a current conflict in federal law illustrates, the U.S. Congress has its own problems in defining the U.S. relationship with American Samoa. The U.S. Congress approved these documents under the 1929 Ratification Act (48 U.S.C. 1661). Section 1661 states as follows:

Until Congress shall provide for the government of such islands, all civil, judicial, and military powers shall be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct; and the President shall have power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned. (emphasis added)

Congress did not ratify the 1900 and 1904 Deeds until 1929, and then delegated its constitutional authority to administer the territory to the President, who transferred the administration of American Samoa to the Secretary of the Navy, primarily because the U.S. wished to establish a naval station in Pago Pago Bay.

In 1951, President Truman transferred the administration of American Samoa to the Secretary of the Interior. The transfer of all administrative, judicial, and military authority from the Congress to the President has not been amended since 1929. Notwithstanding this 1929 law delegating authority over the territory to the President, in 1984 Congress passed a bill, signed into law by the President (Pub. L. 98-213, codified at 48 U.S.C. 1662a), that now requires congressional approval of any amendment to the territory's constitution. In view of this new law, several questions and problems are now being raised. First, why does American Samoa now require Congressional approval of any amendments to its territorial constitution when Congress never expressly approved the territorial constitution to begin with? Second, there are several provisions in our territorial constitution that would raise serious constitutional issues that Congress has not yet addressed. In fact, it is questionable if Congress would approve such provisions in light of the U.S. Constitution. Unfortunately, Congress has never fully examined the contradictions between these two statutes.

The question here is whether the territorial constitution should be subject to congressional or presidential authority. If the authority is congressional, the 1929 law should be amended to rescind the authority delegated to the President; if the authority is presidential, the 1984 law should be rescinded and the approval of changes to our constitution should be returned to the complete authority of the President via the Secretary of the Interior. In either case, we have to face the fact that our present constitution and our current measure of sovereignty are nothing more than an extension of the presidential power of the Secretary of the Interior.

As we discuss our possible options in our quest for a greater measure of self-government, where are we now in our relationship with the United States? American Samoa is described as an unorganized and unincorporated territory of the United States. American Samoa is considered unorganized because since 1929 Congress has not officially organized a government for the separate island kingdoms of Tutuila and Manua under one organic act. Our territory is unincorporated because, according to Supreme Court decisions regarding the constitutional rights of insular territories, Congress has never intended to incorporate American Samoa into the Union.

From 1900 to 1951, the U.S., through the Department of the Navy, appointed military officers to govern the affairs of the islands. According to the 1921 Codification of the Regulations and Orders of the Government of American Samoa, on May 1, 1900 Commander Benjamin Tilley, the first naval com-

mandant of Tutuila and Manua, declared that the Governor, for the time being, of American Samoa is the head of the Government. For fifty-one years, this self-made regulation governed American Samoa's course with one appointed Naval Governor after another acting as the maker of all laws and appointments with little regard for the will of the people. During this period of martial law there were no elected leaders.

With the transfer of power in 1951 to the Department of the Interior, American Samoa experienced little more than a transition from military to civilian rule. Civilian-appointed governors still had full authority over island affairs. In the 1960s a territorial constitution was drafted and there began to be some involvement from the Samoan Legislature. One unintended consequence of the law passed in 1984 requiring Congressional approval of amendments to the American Samoa constitution is that, whereas between 1960 and 1984 our local leaders had extensive practice at constitution-writing, after the law was passed this practice ceased. To date, the final steps toward some measure of self-government were taken when in 1977 the first Governor was elected by popular vote and in 1980 when American Samoa elected its first Delegate to the U.S. Congress.

Given this background and history of our political relationship with the United States, Faleomavaega offered the following recommendations. First, Tutuila and Manua must officially declare a union as one political entity or governing body, thereby sanctioning its authority to deal with the United States as we negotiate our future status. This would address one of the major shortcomings of the separately negotiated Deeds of Cession.

Second, I would recommend that a national convention be called to deliberate the specific provisions of the 1900 and 1904 Deeds of Cession. As I mentioned, these Deeds do not provide any real protection for our communal lands and culture as our forefathers intended. I believe we need to formulate a statement of principles underlining our desire to either amend certain provisions of the two deeds or establish an entirely new agreement with the United States. The provisions of any such agreement should define our political relationship with the United States, whether it is a covenant status like the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, free association status like the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and the Marshall Islands, commonwealth status like Puerto Rico, or even an Organic Act such as the one governing Guam's relationship with the United States.

Third, once we have defined what American Samoa's relationship should be with the United States under the terms of an agreement that is agreeable to both sides, the leadership of Samoa should then call a constitutional convention and organize a government based upon the terms and conditions outlined in the agreement, not the U.S. Constitution. Moreover, I believe this must be done as soon as possible the longer this uncertainty surrounding these two Deeds remains, the further we drift from our forefathers' treaty intentions and risk the erosion of our culture, of becoming less Samoan and more American or, in other words, Americans of Samoan ancestry. As it stands, we cannot claim loyalty to the United States and at the same time refuse to apply federal standards that are incompatible with our local traditions and land-tenure system.

To summarize, Faleomavaega said, what I asked of the esteemed members of the Political Status Study Commission is that, before

they become too deeply involved in examining all possible future options, they focus first on clarifying the original sources of authority underpinning our current political relationship with the United States, the two Deeds of Cession, as a foundation for a unified approach to determining our political future.

The full text of the Treaties/Deeds of Cession, in English and Samoan, as well as the 1929 and 1983 laws discussed in the Congressman's statement are available on Congressman Faleomavaega's website at www.house.gov/faleomavaega/historical.shtml

[Press Release, May 24, 2007]

**FUTURE POLITICAL STATUS STUDY COMMISSION
REPORT NOW AVAILABLE ONLINE**

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that a copy of the Future Political Status Study Commission Report is now available online for the public and particularly members of the Samoan community all around the world to read.

"Many people in our Samoan community, especially those residing outside of American Samoa, have contacted my office to request copies of or to find out how to obtain a copy of the Future Political Status Study Commission Report," Faleomavaega said. "So, I am pleased to inform everyone that a copy of the report is now available online on my website and on the American Samoa Governor's website for anyone to read."

"I want to congratulate and thank The Honorable Tufele Li'amatua—Chairman, The Honorable Tu'alo Fruean—Vice Chairman, High Talking Chief Fofu Sunia—Executive Director, and all the Commissioners and staff of the Future Political Status Study Commission for the tremendous work they did in completing this report."

"Now that we have the report, everyone concerned should take time to thoroughly review the Commission's recommendations, especially our Fono and the Administration. As I have stated before, I believe the next logical step in this important process is for the Fono to conduct hearings to discuss the different recommendations made by the Commission. Only after such a careful review and discussion I feel we should proceed to the next steps or implementation," Faleomavaega concluded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on December 1, 2014, I missed two recorded votes on the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call 532 and YEA on Roll Call 533.

**RECOGNIZING THE TWENTY-FIFTH
ANNIVERSARY OF HOPE**

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Hispanas Organized for

Political Equality, or HOPE, on the celebration of its twenty-fifth anniversary. On December 4, 2014, HOPE will celebrate a quarter-century of success in championing the full participation of Latinas in America's democracy and economy. HOPE's efforts have benefited not just Latinas, but men and women of all backgrounds throughout our nation.

A cross-section of Latinas from business, political, and social backgrounds came together to found HOPE in 1989, the same year the first Latina was elected to Congress. Since that time, HOPE has been a valuable partner to Latinas who have pushed political limits, broken barriers, and defined what it means to be a leader. HOPE has directly served more than 50,000 Latinas throughout the state of California, as well as millions more through advocacy efforts. HOPE's achievements include:

The HOPE Leadership Institute (HLI), California's only statewide leadership program specifically designed to train Latina leaders in vital leadership and advocacy skills. More than ninety percent of HLI alumnae have attained leadership positions in their careers or communities, and thirty percent have gone on to serve on a local or statewide commission.

The HOPE Youth Leadership Program (HYLP), which has prepared hundreds of low-income Latina high school students for college, and trained them in civic participation. Eighty-seven percent of HYLP participants have enrolled in college after graduation.

HOPE's Latina Action Day and Latina History Day, which inspire and empower over 1,300 attendees each year to succeed and take responsibility to ensure the prosperity of their communities.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I salute HOPE, its Board, and its supporters. They have played a vital role in inspiring, empowering, and supporting so many of California's leaders over the last twenty-five years. California, and the entire United States, are stronger for their leadership. I wish HOPE continued success as it continues its mission to ensure political and economic parity for Latinas.

**CONGRATULATING CASSIDY
NUSSMAN FOR HONORABLE MENTION
SELECTION**

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cassidy Nussman for being named an honorable mention selection on the Under Armour Girls High School All-America Team by the American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA). Nussman is a senior at Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. This award recognizes Nussman's outstanding athletic achievements.

She is among an elite group of high school athletes, joining a list of 150 high school All-American honorable mentions. After this season, Nussman will go on to compete at the highest level of intercollegiate athletics at Northwestern University.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Cassidy Nussman for being selected as an honorable mention on the Under Armour Girls High School All-America Team. We look forward to her continued success both on and off the court.

**HISTORICAL RECORD OF U.S.
TREASURY \$20.4 MILLION STIMULUS
PAYOUT TO QUALIFYING
RESIDENTS IN AMERICAN SAMOA**

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information about the U.S. Treasury's \$20.4 million stimulus payout to qualifying residents in American Samoa.

[Press Release, Apr. 28, 2008]

**U.S. TREASURY SENDING \$20.4 MILLION TO
ASG TO PAY OUT ECONOMIC STIMULUS PAY-
MENTS TO QUALIFYING RESIDENTS**

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that the American Samoa Government will receive \$20.4 million from the U.S. Department of Treasury to be paid out to qualifying residents as part of the Economic Stimulus Package that was signed into law to jumpstart the economy.

Faleomavaega and Congresswoman Madeleine Bordallo urged the Leadership of the House and Senate to include the Territories in the stimulus package and make child tax credits and tax rebates available to qualifying residents. The Members were successful in their efforts and, prior to the bill being signed into law, in a letter dated January 29, 2008, Faleomavaega informed Governor Togiola and the Fono that, for American Samoa, the U.S. Treasury would send a check of an estimated amount and ASG must have a plan approved promptly to disburse the money quickly.

In a joint letter dated February 15, 2008 to Secretary Henry M. Paulson of the Department of Treasury, Faleomavaega along with Congresswoman Madeleine Bordallo, Congresswoman Donna Christensen, and Resident Commissioner Luis Fortuno also urged the Secretary to implement an arrangement that will provide for the funds to be transferred in advance of the actual payouts of the rebates.

"Today, Secretary Paulson has honored our request and I thank him for informing my office that he has accepted ASG's plan for distributing stimulus payments to residents of American Samoa, and that ASG will receive a check for \$20.4 million in order to payout tax rebates and child tax credits to those who qualify," Faleomavaega said. "This payment is in accordance of the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 that was signed by the President on February 13, 2008."

"The stimulus package was easily passed by both the House and Senate and I, again, thank Chairman Charles Rangel of the House Committee on Ways and Means and Chairman Max Baucus of the Senate Finance Committee for supporting our request to include the territories in the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008."

"I also commend Governor Togiola and our local Tax Office for acting quickly and submitting a plan that has been approved by the

U.S. Treasury. I am especially pleased that the people of American Samoa will benefit from these rebates which will help bolster our local economy," Faleomavaega concluded.

The full text of Secretary Paulson's letter of April 28 informing Governor Togiola of the approval of ASG's Distribution Plan was forwarded to Faleomavaega's office by the U.S. Department of Treasury and follows:

Dear Governor Tulafono:

Thank you for your letter of April 23, 2008, submitting the Distribution Plan for the Recovery Rebates (the Plan) in American Samoa. The Economic Stimulus Act of 2008, P.L. 110-185 (the Act), requires that I approve American Samoa's plan for distributing stimulus payments to residents of American Samoa. The Act also requires that once such a plan is approved, the Treasury Department make a payment to American Samoa in an amount estimated as being equal to the aggregate benefits that would have been provided to residents of American Samoa by reason of the amendments made to the Internal Revenue Code by section 101(c) of the Act if a "mirror code" tax system had been in effect in American Samoa.

In accordance with the Act, I approve the Plan, a copy of which is enclosed. Also, we have estimated the aggregate benefits that would have been provided to residents of American Samoa by reason of section 101(c) of the Act if a mirror code tax system had been in effect in American Samoa at \$20.4 million. A payment in this amount will be made by the Treasury Department to American Samoa to fund the prompt distribution of stimulus payments to residents of American Samoa pursuant to the Plan.

Sincerely,

Henry M. Paulson, Jr.

RECOGNIZING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF DR. JERI PHEIFER

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable public service of Dr. Jeri Pheifer as she retires from her position as Superintendent of the Everman Independent School District.

Dr. Pheifer was appointed Superintendent of Schools in 2004, after serving the Venus and Albany Independent School Districts. Under her tenure with Everman Schools, the district has thrived and provided quality education for the thousands of children who attend class each day. Most notably, under Dr. Pheifer's leadership the Everman Joe C. Bean High School Graduation Class of 2013 achieved a one hundred percent graduation rate. Her tireless work to improve and strengthen Everman schools has not gone unnoticed. Earlier this year Dr. Pheifer worked with Tarrant County College to open its newest Early College High School. Partnerships like these work to provide students, who likely would not otherwise consider attending college, an opportunity to earn a high school diploma and an associate's degree at the same time.

Over the past 35 years, Dr. Pheifer has worked tirelessly in the field of education. She has served as a teacher and administrator for public and private schools, serving students

from pre-Kindergarten through the university level. These positions exemplify Dr. Pheifer's dedication to not only the community she currently serves, but to the State of Texas and its citizens. Dr. Pheifer received her Bachelor of Arts and Master of Education degrees from Abilene Christian University and her Doctor of Education degree from Texas Tech University.

It is an honor to recognize Dr. Pheifer on the occasion of her retirement from over three decades of contributions to Texas communities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to please join me in recognizing Dr. Jeri Pheifer's dedicated service to the Everman Independent School District and the State of Texas.

IN RECOGNITION OF ALLAN ALIFANO

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Allan Alifano, a retiring member of the Half Moon Bay City Council. Allan Alifano has served the people of Half Moon Bay with distinction through eight years on the city's planning commission and since 2009 on the city council.

Councilman Alifano has also served his community through countless meetings of the Local Agency Formation Commission and as a member of the local wastewater treatment board. While on the board during our period of intense drought, he supported recycling water from the treatment plant to meet local landscaping and golf course requirements.

During his time on the council, Half Moon Bay underwent tremendous challenges including the historic recession and consequent reductions in sales tax receipts, as well as a legal judgment involving land use decisions. The combined impact of these events placed the city's finances in great peril. Councilman Alifano was committed to seeing his community pull through despite the odds. Ultimately, Half Moon Bay emerged with essential services intact and a renewed commitment to community betterment.

Councilman Alifano is the proud owner of Alifano Technologies in Half Moon Bay. Among many offerings, it specializes in computer support, complex IT design and customer service through the provision of needed supplies. The company is a prominent business on Main Street, a location that demonstrates the commitment of Councilman Alifano and his family to Half Moon Bay's historic business district. Alifano Technologies is also philanthropic, with the proceeds of e-waste recycling going towards the Boys and Girls Club of the Coastsides.

Mr. Speaker, serving on a city council is a challenging form of public service. Neighbors may have your phone number or buttonhole you in the store. You are privy to the most optimistic projections about the future of your town, and to some of the biggest challenges to continued prosperity. Allan Alifano handled his responsibilities with aplomb, enthusiasm and decisiveness. Half Moon Bay is a better

community because he offered his services on behalf of its future. Please join me in congratulating Allan Alifano on his service to the outstanding community of Half Moon Bay as he returns to private life in a city that was guided by his hopes for its future and by his service to all.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF HAR- LEM'S TUSKEGEE AIRMAN JO- SEPH HERMAN SPOONER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Tuskegee Airman Joseph Herman Spooner, a life-long resident of the Village of Harlem. As noted by the family: On September 11th, 2014, America surrendered a living legend to the annals of Black American history. Inextricably intertwined to the importance of this day "September 11th" in American history, a Tuskegee Airman at 94 years old, has passed over.

September 11 reminds all of us every year that 'freedom is not free' and the strength of our nation depends on men and women, such as Joe Spooner, a decorated World War II original member of the 99th Fighter Squadron/332 Fighter Group stationed out of Tuskegee, Alabama.

Joseph Spooner was born on October 30th, 1919 to Joseph and Georgianna Spooner. Joseph was hilarious and loved to play jokes on people. He was high spirited and the life of the party. He had 6 children and three generations of grandchildren. He attended PS 179 Elementary School, PS 165 Robert E. Simon, and graduated from Dewitt Clinton High School in which he excelled in academics and athletics. He loved to play and watch sports. In his early years, he played Semi-Pro Basketball on a team called the Columbians.

At the time he was drafted Joseph Spooner was a freshman at The City College of New York. Having played with the likes of Negro Basketball League legend John Issacs and "Pop" Gates of the original Harlem Globetrotters he made his family proud qualifying to pursue a college education during such a racially charged and segregated time period. America in the 1940's, was unforgiving for people of color, it was an impossible dream come true, yet a dream deferred. Joseph Spooner left college, abandoning a basketball scholarship to serve his country.

Joe enlisted into service in 1942, and in 1943 this Black American hero was commissioned for duty with the Tuskegee Airmen. On April 1943, the 99th Fighter Squadron in their P-47 Thunderbolt fighters went into combat bound for North Africa, where it would join the 33rd Fighter Group and its commander, Colonel William W. Mommyer. Given little guidance from battle-experienced pilots, the 99th's first combat mission was to attack the small strategic volcanic island of Pantelleria in the Mediterranean Sea to clear the sea lanes for the Allied invasion of Sicily in July 1943. The air assault on the island began on 30 May 1943. The 99th flew its first combat mission on June

2, 1943. The surrender of the garrison of 11,121 Italians and 78 Germans due to air attack was the first of its kind.

The 99th moved on to Sicily and received a Distinguished Unit Citation for its performance in combat led by Col. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., Commander of the Tuskegee Airmen 332nd Fighter Group. Though subject to racial discrimination, both at home and abroad, the 996 pilots and more than 15,000 ground personnel who served with the all-black units would be credited with some 15,500 combat sorties and earn over 150 Distinguished Flying Crosses for their achievements. With over 200 combat missions the Tuskegee Airmen did not lose a single bomber. They did everything in their power to protect and shield the bombers.

As American history has now recognized the heroism and amazing exploits and air battles that took place in the skies over Europe by the 99th Fighter Squadron/332 Fighter Group, Joe as Armorer may have had the most important role by which he was responsible for loading the fighter planes with ammunition. In 2006, I introduced legislation to honor the Tuskegee Airmen with the Congressional Gold Medal. In March of 2007, Tuskegee Airman Joseph Herman Spooner received the Congressional Gold Medal of Honor from President George W. Bush.

Great men, like our beloved Tuskegee Airman Joseph Herman Spooner are temporary gifts we have in this world, but their accomplishments and achievements are far remembered and forever lasting. Mr. Speaker, I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Tuskegee Airman Joseph Herman Spooner.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF SENATE AND HOUSE HEARINGS ON FALEOMAVAEGA'S BILL TO PROTECT VOTING RIGHTS OF AMERICAN SAMOA'S ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE MEMBERS AND OVERSEAS VOTERS

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information on Senate and House hearings on a bill to protect the voting rights of American Samoa's active duty service members and overseas voters.

[Press Release, July 14, 2004]

SENATE HOLDS HEARING ON FALEOMAVAEGA BILL TO PROTECT VOTING RIGHTS OF ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE MEMBERS AND OVERSEAS VOTERS

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests held a hearing on H.R. 2010, a bill he introduced to protect the voting rights of active duty service members and overseas voters whose home of residence is American Samoa.

At this time, I want to thank Chairman Larry Craig and Ranking Member Ron Wyden for holding this hearing and for entering the full text of my statement into the

record, Congressman Faleomavaega said. I also want to thank Senator Daniel Akaka who is a senior member of both the Energy Committee and the Subcommittee on Public Lands. Senator Akaka was instrumental in getting this hearing held and I thank him for his support and kind words.

At today's hearing, Senator Akaka said, "H.R. 2010 was introduced by my good friend, Eni Faleomavaega, a senior member of the House who couldn't testify himself because of the centennial celebration for the islands of Manua. On this occasion, I'd like to send the people of American Samoa our best wishes as they celebrate the 100th anniversary since the stars and stripes were first raised by their traditional chiefs."

Senator Akaka continued by saying, "I do not have a question, Mr. Chairman, but a comment as someone who is very familiar with the challenges of transportation and communications out in the Pacific. This bill would resolve a long-standing problem in electing the Delegate from American Samoa: How to conduct a run-off election in just 14 days in a territory with a very large number of absentee voters and only two regular flights from the U.S. each week? This bill would provide for election of the Delegate by a plurality vote. Or, if the local government wants, by a majority vote following a primary election. It would resolve a long-standing problem."

Chairman Craig thanked Senator Akaka for his opening comments and I also thank Senator Akaka for being at today's hearing. Although I was invited to testify before the Senate Subcommittee, I thought it was equally important to attend Flag Day celebrations being held in American Samoa to recognize Manua's 100 year relationship with the United States, Congressman Faleomavaega said. This celebration is an historic event and I am pleased to be with the people on this important occasion and, again, I am pleased that Chairman Craig recognized the importance of Flag Day and included my written testimony in the Committee records.

I am also pleased to welcome the MV Sili to Manua. It is most fitting for our new vessel to arrive from Louisiana just in time to commemorate Manua's history and to honor our traditional leaders and chiefs, past and present. The arrival of this vessel has been more than a year in the making and I am grateful to our friends in the House and Senate who supported our efforts to set aside funding for this vessel.

When Republicans in the Senate wanted to cut funding for the Territories from the Tax Act of 2003, Democratic Senator Benjamin Nelson from Nebraska fought hard to help us keep our funding in place. Later, Republican Chairman Bill Thomas of the House Ways and Means Committee sent me a letter saying that he was pleased he could assist me in this effort.

Because we were successful in including the Territories, American Samoa received more than \$10 million from the Tax Act of 2003 and I am grateful that Senator John Breaux of Louisiana and Ranking Member Charles Rangel of the House Committee on Ways and Means stood with me in establishing Congressional intent on how these funds should be spent, Congressman Faleomavaega said.

I am also pleased that Governor Togiola stood with me and agreed that \$5 million should be set aside for the purchase of a new vessel for Manua. I am also thankful that Senator Breaux put us in touch with one of the best shipyards in the world located in

Louisiana and then personally made sure that American Samoa was receiving one of the best vessels Louisiana had to offer at a cost of \$4 million. I consider Senator Breaux a good friend and I can say with certainty that he is also a friend of American Samoa.

This year, we have much to be thankful for including this historic legislation which is moving through Congress to protect the voting rights of our active duty service members and our college students and other overseas voters. H.R. 2010 is a bipartisan bill which is supported by Republican Chairman Richard Pombo and Ranking Democratic Member Nick Rahall of the House Committee on Resources, Faleomavaega said.

On May 5, 2004, the House Committee on Resources passed this bill by unanimous consent. On June 14, 2004, a Republican controlled House passed H.R. 2010 without objection. I am pleased that the Senate is now considering H.R. 2010 and I would like to note for the record that on October 29, 2003 the House Committee on Resources also held a hearing on this bill. On behalf of the U.S. Department of the Interior, Mr. David Cohen, the Assistant Secretary for Insular Affairs, was invited to testify but declined citing that this was a local issue.

Locally, H.R. 2010 is supported by the Governor of American Samoa, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and 85% of those surveyed in American Samoa agree that overseas voters and active duty service members should have the right to vote in federal elections held in the Territory, Faleomavaega said.

Given that Assistant Secretary Cohen accepted today's invitation to testify before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, I am pleased that his testimony was supportive. Two weeks ago, when the Senate first informed me that H.R. 2010 would be considered today, I called Mr. Cohen to discuss the bill and determine where the Department of Interior stood on the issue. Assistant Secretary Cohen and I came to an understanding prior to the hearing and I thank him for his support.

While the Assistant Secretary focused his comments on the will of the people, when asked by Chairman Craig how he believed the will of the people should be determined, Mr. Cohen said he believed the Committee should rely on the statements which I included in the Record. As I have said on many occasions, this matter has been before the people and the local leaders of American Samoa for the past six years.

Since 1998, I have written to our Governors, past and present. I have written and testified before our local Legislature and I have also included copies of my testimony, my letters, and local responses in the House and Senate Committee records. These enclosures now on file with the Committees are more than 70 pages in length. Included in the record is Governor Togiola's support of H.R. 2010.

Once more, I want to commend Governor Togiola for supporting this bill as we have always agreed that our military men and women should have the right to vote especially when they contribute almost a million dollars per year in taxes to our local government. I also thank the President of the American Samoa Senate, the Honorable Lutu Tenari S. Fuimaono, and Speaker Matagi Ray McMoore for their support, Faleomavaega said.

H.R. 2010 is an historic bill. It is a bill that immediately restores the voting rights of our overseas voters and active duty military members. It is also a bill that makes clear in

no uncertain terms that the American Samoa Legislature is vested with the authority it needs to establish primary elections for the office of the Delegate, if it so chooses.

H.R. 2010 also protects American Samoa's future in the U.S. Congress. Without H.R. 2010, future Delegates could miss out on key committee assignments as a result of delayed outcomes and run-off elections. Like Governor Togiola, I do not believe American Samoa's future should be weakened or disadvantaged and this is one more reason I appreciate his support of H.R. 2010.

Given the importance and urgency of this bill, I thank the members of the House Resources Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, who unanimously voted in favor of this bill. H.R. 2010 is the right thing to do and, as a Vietnam veteran, I will not rest until we fully guarantee that our active duty service members have the right to vote in federal elections held in American Samoa.

To alleviate any concerns that I will personally benefit from this legislation, I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute for purposes of changing the effective date of this bill from January 2004 to January 2006. This amendment was unanimously supported at mark-up by the House Resources Committee and, as such, any change in law will not go into effect until the 2006 election cycle, Faleomavaega said.

As I have repeatedly stated, H.R. 2010 in no way affects how the American Samoa Government chooses to elect its local leaders and, having made every change requested of me by our local leaders and after years of good-faith efforts on my part, I believe the time has come to do right by our overseas voters and men and women in the military. Our sons and daughters have fought and died to preserve our freedoms and I will do everything I can to protect their right to vote.

Again, I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests for holding this historic hearing on H.R. 2010 and I am hopeful that they will support its successful passage. In a dramatic moment before the hearing came to a close, Senator Akaka said, "As a person from the Pacific, I want to make a final comment about H.R. 2010."

Chairman Craig granted the Senators request and Senator Akaka said, "As you know, Mr. Cohen, H.R. 2010 will resolve a long standing problem made worse by the current conflict in the Middle East where many American Samoans are now serving. Those Americans are fighting for democracy and I speak out in support of this bill. Mr. Chairman, I believe we should act quickly to pass this bill so that those men and women will have the opportunity to vote to help select their representative to the U.S. House of Representatives."

Like Senator Akaka, I also believe the Senate should act on this bill and I thank my dear friend Senator Akaka for standing with the people of American Samoa on this important issue. I also thank our men and women from American Samoa who are serving on active duty at a time when our nation is at war. I wish them the very best and I pray for their safe return, the Congressman concluded.

[Press Release, Oct. 31, 2003]

RESOURCES COMMITTEE HOLDS HEARING ON ELECTION BILL, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR TESTIFIES

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that on Wednesday October 29, 2003 the House Committee on Resources held a hearing on H.R. 2010, a bill he introduced to pro-

tect the voting rights of military men and women whose home of record is American Samoa.

Governor Togiola asked the Lieutenant Governor to testify in support of the bill and I am pleased by the outcome, Congressman Faleomavaega. At this time, we are in full agreement that H.R. 2010 is the right thing to do. Like 85% of those surveyed in American Samoa, we believe that our active duty service members should be afforded the same rights and privileges as every other man and woman serving in the U.S. Armed Forces. Our service members and college students deserve the right to vote and we believe it is our duty to protect their rights.

I am also pleased that Senator Fuimaono, President of the Senate, has also agreed to support our efforts. On October 27, 2003, he sent me a letter stating his full support for H.R. 2010 and wishing Chairman Pombo the best of luck in moving the bill forward.

In a statement submitted to the Committee, Governor Togiola stated that although I had previously expressed misgivings about the bill, after further review, I have come to support the measure for the following reasons: 1) The bill in its current form provides that when American Samoa devises a system for primary elections for election of our Congressman, the U.S. Congress will amend the section to restore the election of the Congressman by majority vote. 2) Currently there is no other way to maximize the participation of American Samoan residents serving in the U.S. Armed Forces and those attending college, as well as their families, to fully participate in the election of our Congressional Delegate.

As I have said before, H.R. 2010 is a good compromise and includes the suggestions of our local leaders. H.R. 2010 provides for both plurality and majority voting. It also clearly authorizes the Fono to establish primary elections, if it so chooses, Congressman Faleomavaega said.

I am pleased that the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and the President of the Senate are now fully supportive of this bill. I thank them for their support and I also thank Chairman Pombo and Ranking Member Nick Rahall of the House Resources Committee for holding a hearing on this bill.

Finally, I want to thank our college students and our men and women serving in the U.S. Armed Forces. We are living in difficult times and we must work together to make a difference for generations to come, the Congressman concluded.

HONORING MRS. DEBORAH MOORE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Unsung Hero in Cleveland, Mississippi.

Deborah Moore is the Associate Vice President of Community Relations at Delta Health Alliance. Mrs. Moore is assigned to the Indianola Promise Community where she provides administrative oversight and technical assistance to the community and organizations. Mrs. Moore worked one year as Project Manager IV at Delta Health Alliance before being promoted to Assistant Vice President and then to Associate Vice President.

Mrs. Moore is a retiree from the state of Mississippi where she served 27 years in

community and economic development. She spent the last 12 years of her career before coming to Delta Health Alliance at Delta State University's Center for Community and Economic Development in Cleveland, MS where she served as AmeriCorps director for two programs and then as director of the Center for Community and Economic Development the last five years. In her role as director of the Center for Community and Economic Development she assisted grass-root communities by empowering individuals, strengthening relationships and developing projects and programs to strengthen communities. Moore has extensive work with proposal writing having secured grants in excess of \$15,000,000.00.

Mrs. Moore is a member of several nonprofit boards, the Mississippi Center for Nonprofits, Cleveland Youth Council and Friends of the Environment. She currently serves as chair of the board for the Delta Fresh Foods Initiative. Moore serves in an advisory capacity for the Breast Education-Early Detection Project and the School-based Asthma Management Project at Delta State University. She also serves on the advisory board of the Excel By 5 program in Cleveland, MS and is a member of the Excel By 5 Coalition in Indianola, MS.

Mrs. Moore works tirelessly in assisting the elderly by running errands and doing other tasks they may desire; mentoring youth in diverse subject areas, so they can become an asset to society and work faithful with her husband's ministry to enhance congregants both spiritually and naturally.

Mrs. Moore is a native of Cleveland, MS. She is a graduate of Delta State University with a B.B.A. degree and a M.B.A. degree. She has a certification as an Economic Development Finance Professional from the National Development Council (NDC) and received her PhD from the University of Southern Mississippi in Human Capital Development.

Mrs. Moore is married to Dr. Billy Moore and they are the proud parents of two daughters, A'ndrea and Alicia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Deborah Moore, an amazing Unsung Hero, for her dedication and service to mankind.

CONGRATULATING MEMORIAL HERMANN LIFE FLIGHT

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Memorial Hermann Life Flight for being named the 2014 EMS Air Medical Service of the Year by the Texas Department of State Health Services. This award recognizes Memorial Hermann Texas Trauma Institute's commitment to excellence in providing emergency care to critically ill and injured patients.

Life Flight, Houston's only hospital-based air medical service, operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week and performs more than 3,000 life-saving missions each year. Since Memorial Hermann began its air medical program, it has completed more than 140,000

missions. Life Flight continually adds new in-flight medical innovations into its quick transport system to provide better care for the fast-growing Houston community.

Thanks to the Memorial Hermann Texas Trauma Institute for their tireless work in ensuring our community's health and safety. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Memorial Hermann for being honored with the 2014 EMS Air Medical Service of the Year Award.

HISTORICAL RECORD ON PASSAGE OF FALEOMAVAEGA'S BILL TO PROTECT VOTING RIGHTS OF AMERICAN SAMOA'S ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE MEMBERS AND OVERSEAS VOTERS

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA
OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information on the passage of a bill to protect the voting rights of American Samoa's active duty service members and overseas voters.

[Press Release, Oct. 11, 2004]

SENATE PASSES FALEOMAVAEGA'S BILL TO PROTECT VOTING RIGHTS OF AMERICAN SAMOA'S ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE MEMBERS; PRESIDENT BUSH EXPECTED TO SIGN BILL INTO LAW WITHIN 30 DAYS

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that on Wednesday September 15, 2004 the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources passed, by unanimous consent, H.R. 2010, a bill he introduced to allow military and overseas voters to participate in federal elections held in American Samoa. On the evening of Sunday October 10, 2004, the United States Senate also unanimously passed H.R. 2010 and the bill has now been sent to President George W. Bush who is expected to sign Faleomavaega's bill into law within the next thirty days.

First and foremost, I want to thank American Samoa's military men and women who are proudly serving our country at a time when our nation is at war, the Congressman said. American Samoa's sons and daughters have fought and died for the right to vote and, as a Vietnam Veteran, I promised I would do everything I could to make sure our military men and women could fully participate in federal elections held in American Samoa.

This is why I introduced H.R. 2010 and why I am thankful that this bill has enjoyed the full support of Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate. For the record, it should be noted that not one Republican or Democrat in the House or Senate objected to H.R. 2010 and I am thankful to my colleagues for their support.

No matter what is said, Congress is not about who is in the Majority. Congress is about seniority, friendship, and influence. It takes both Republicans and Democrats to get the job done and it also takes the support of our local leaders, Faleomavaega said. This is why I commend Governor Togiola, the late Senate President Lutu T. Fuimaono, and Speaker McMoore who also stood in support of H.R. 2010.

I also commend the people of American Samoa, the Congressman continued. Of those

surveyed, more than 85% agreed that our active duty military members deserve the right to vote and, as a result of your support and prayers, H.R. 2010 has now passed the House and Senate and has been sent to the President of the United States who is also expected to fully support this bill. Once signed, H.R. 2010 will become effective in 2006. Again, H.R. 2010 is an historic bill. It is a bill that restores the voting rights of our college students and active duty military members and makes clear in no uncertain terms that the American Samoa Legislature is vested with the authority it needs to establish primary elections for the office of the Delegate, if it so chooses.

While my opponents continue to call this a plurality bill, nothing could be further from the truth, Faleomavaega said. Those who understand this bill know that this bill includes both plurality and majority voting. If, for example, the American Samoa Legislature establishes primary elections, the general election for the office of the Delegate will be by majority. If the American Samoa Legislature fails to establish primary elections, the general election for the office of the Delegate will be by plurality. Either way, our military men and women and college students will have the right to vote for their Representative to the United States House of Representatives.

Also, H.R. 2010 in no way affects how the American Samoa Government chooses to elect its local leaders. Furthermore, this matter is not new to the people or the Legislature of American Samoa. The truth is this matter has been before the people and our local leaders for the past five years. Since 1998, I have written to our Governors, past and present. I have written and testified before our local Legislature and I have brought this matter to the attention of our people through press releases, newsletters, radio and tv programs. In 2001, I also conducted a Congressional survey and 85% of those surveyed agreed that American Samoans active duty service members should be afforded the same rights and privileges as every other American serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Having made every change requested of me by our local leaders and after years of good-faith efforts on my part, I am pleased that once the President signs H.R. 2010 into law our military men and women and college students will have the right to vote in federal elections held in American Samoa and will no longer be disenfranchised from the process as a result of Public Law 95-556 which was passed on October 31, 1978, Faleomavaega said. Federal, or PL 95-556, requires a runoff election to be held only 14 days after the general election. As Governor Togiola said, this creates a situation where it is virtually impossible for American Samoans Election Office to send out absentee ballots to the men and women in the military and expect to receive them back in time for those votes to be counted in a run-off election. In other words, this is an injustice that has been made worse by the current conflict in the Middle East where many American Samoans are now serving and fighting for democracy.

H.R. 2010 corrects the injustice and, for this reason, I am thankful that the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, Governor Togiola, the late Senate President Fuimaono, Speaker McMoore, and 85% of those surveyed in American Samoa agreed with me that some measure should be put in place to assure that the votes of our military men and women are counted in federal elections held in American Samoa,

Faleomavaega said. I am also thankful that Senator Akaka, a senior Member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, spoke out in support of H.R. 2010 and urged the Senate to act quickly to pass this bill so that American Samoans military men and women will have the opportunity to vote to help select their representative to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Simply put, H.R. 2010 is the right thing to do and, to alleviate any concerns that I will personally benefit from this legislation, I would like to reiterate that I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute for purposes of changing the effective date of this bill from January 2004 to January 2006. This amendment was unanimously supported at mark-up by the House Resources Committee and, as such, any change in law will not go into effect until the 2006 election cycle.

At this time, I thank Chairman Pete Domenici and Ranking Member Jeff Bingaman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources for supporting H.R. 2010. I also thank our Commander in Chief, President George W. Bush, who I am confident will soon sign H.R. 2010 into law. Above all, I thank our military men and women from American Samoa who are fighting for democracy so that you and I and future generations may live in peace. As a Vietnam veteran, I wish them the very best and, as always, I pray for their safe return, the Congressman concluded.

[Press Release, Oct. 30, 2004]

PRESIDENT BUSH SIGNS FALEOMAVAEGA'S BILL AND AGREES THAT AMERICAN SAMOA'S TROOPS SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that on the evening of October 30, 2004 President Bush signed into law H.R. 2010, a bill he introduced to restore the voting rights of American Samoa's troops and college students.

I made a promise that I would not rest until American Samoa's active duty military men and women and other overseas voters had the right to vote in federal elections held in our Territory, Congressman Faleomavaega said. And, today, I thank the President of the United States for signing my bill and supporting our troops.

American Samoa's military men and women have put their lives on the line time and time again and some have even given their lives for us to live in a free and democratic society. Now we have come together to thank them for their service by restoring their right to vote.

Governor Togiola, Lieutenant Governor Aitofele Sunia, the late and honorable President of the Senate, Lutu T. Fuimaono, and many other members of the Fono supported this historic legislation and I thank them for their support. More than 85% of those surveyed in American Samoa also agreed that our military men and women should have the right to vote and I thank you for your support, Faleomavaega said.

The U.S. House of Representatives and the United States Senate also unanimously supported H.R. 2010. In fact, not one Republican or Democrat in the House or Senate objected to my bill. This is because H.R. 2010 is the right thing to do.

H.R. 2010 includes both plurality and majority voting. If, for example, the American Samoa Legislature establishes primary elections, the general election for the office of the Delegate will be by majority. If the American Samoa Legislature fails to establish primary elections, the general election

for the office of the Delegate will be by plurality. Either way, our military men and women and college students will have the right to vote for their Representative to the United States House of Representatives, Faleomavaega said.

Also, H.R. 2010 in no way affects how the American Samoa Government chooses to elect its local leaders and this matter is not new to the people or the Legislature of American Samoa. The truth is this matter has been before the people and our local leaders for the past five years. Since 1998, I have written to our Governors, past and present. I have written and testified before our local Legislature and I have brought this matter to the attention of our people through press releases, newsletters, radio and tv programs. In 2001, I also conducted a Congressional survey and 85% of those surveyed agreed that American Samoa's active duty service members should be afforded the same rights and privileges as every other American serving in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Having made every change requested of me by our local leaders and after years of good-faith efforts on my part, I am pleased that H.R. 2010 has now been signed into law. As a result of the Presidents support, our military men and women and college students will now have the right to vote in federal elections held in American Samoa and they will no longer be disenfranchised from the process as a result of Public Law 95-556 which was passed on October 31, 1978.

Federal, or PL 95-556, requires a runoff election to be held only 14 days after the general election. As Governor Togiola said, this creates a situation where it is virtually impossible for American Samoa's Election Office to send out absentee ballots to the men and women in the military and expect to receive them back in time for those votes to be counted in a run-off election. In other words, this is an injustice that has been made worse by the current conflict in the Middle East where many American Samoans are now serving and fighting for democracy.

H.R. 2010 corrects the injustice and, for this reason, I am thankful that President Bush, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, many of our local leaders and the people of American Samoa agreed with me that some measure should be put in place to assure that the votes of our military men and women are counted in federal elections held in American Samoa.

Again, I thank Senator Akaka, Chairman Pete Domenici and Ranking Member Jeff Bingaman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources for supporting H.R. 2010. I also thank Chairman Richard Pombo and Ranking Member Nick Rahall of the House Committee on Resources for their support. Above all, I thank our military men and women from American Samoa who are fighting for democracy so that you and I and future generations may live in peace. As a Vietnam veteran, I wish them the very best and, as always, I pray for their safe return, the Congressman concluded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on November 11, 2014, on Roll Call #516 on the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 4194—Government Reports Elimination Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On November 12, 2014, on Roll Call #517 on H. Res. 748, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5682) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On November 13, 2014, on Roll Call #518 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 5682, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On November 13, 2014, on Roll Call #519 on H.R. 5682, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, December 3, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 3, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

NATIONAL OZONE POLLUTION STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, since the Clean Air Act was enacted into law more than 40 years ago, we have seen tremendous progress in cleaning up our air and in protecting thousands of communities around the country.

Unfortunately, many Americans are still living in communities where poor air quality puts them and their loved ones' health at risk. That is why I am proud to support the EPA's new standard for ground level ozone pollution.

Whether we work outdoors or simply want our children to be able to play outside, the EPA's recent national ozone pollution standards bring us one step closer to cleaner, healthier communities for everyone to enjoy. This proposal would lower the current standard of 75 parts per billion to a standard in the range of 65 to 70 parts per billion, while taking public comments on a level as low as 60.

Despite what many of my colleagues seem to believe, successful public health protection depends on the latest

scientific data, and as many Members have been so eager to point out, we are not scientists. All we can do is rely on the best data out there from experts in the field, and in this case the data is quite clear.

A significantly expanded body of scientific evidence, including more than 1,000 new studies since the last review of the standards, show that ozone can cause harmful effects to health and the environment. Health experts, epidemiologists, and numerous medical organizations have clearly stated that the existing EPA smog standard of 75 parts per billion is not adequate to protect public health, particularly for vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly, outdoor workers, and those with chronic medical conditions like asthma. In all, 147 million people in the U.S., almost half of the country, are breathing unhealthy air.

Earlier this year the American Lung Association's State of the Air 2014 ranked Chicago as the 14th most polluted city in the Nation for short-term particle pollution. The city also ranked 20th for most ozone-polluted and for year-round particle pollution. In fact, nearly half of all Americans live in counties where ozone or particle pollution levels make the air unhealthy to breathe.

Studies have linked breathing ozone to an increased risk of premature deaths and difficulty breathing, as well as other serious illnesses. In the U.S. today, one child in 10 already suffers from asthma, and ozone pollution only makes things worse.

When asked what steps need to be taken to reduce the air pollution, the American Lung Association said that Federal action, including the EPA setting strong, health-based standards to limit ozone pollution, is one of the most important action steps we can take.

When we update our national ozone pollution standards, we are not only cleaning up our air but also protecting those most at risk. These changes would have a lasting and positive impact on my home State of Illinois, where 1.2 million adults and 13 percent of children suffer from smog-related asthma, well above the national average.

President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "In any moment of decision, the best thing you can do is the right thing. The worst thing you can do is nothing." Knowing the tremendous impact ozone pollution has on our environment and community health, the

decision to do nothing is not a viable option.

Per usual, there are those here attacking this new proposal with claims of job loss and economic harm. According to science deniers and special interests, this proposal will cause the sky to fall. The facts, however, state otherwise.

Since 1970 we have cut harmful air pollution by almost 70 percent while the U.S. economy has more than tripled. An ozone standard in the proposed range of 65 to 70 parts per billion has public health benefits worth billions of dollars. Reducing ozone and particle pollution nationwide will avoid countless premature deaths and thousands of asthma-related emergency room visits, not to mention fewer missed school and work days.

The impact of ozone on agricultural workers is also important in its own right. A reduction in the ozone standard would translate into an annual cost savings of approximately \$1 billion in labor expenditure.

We have countless scientific studies that clearly display the negative health risks associated with unregulated ozone pollution. Nevertheless, critics continue to play a dangerous role in denouncing the science and the law EPA has used for more than 40 years.

The science cannot be ignored. Now is the time to protect the most vulnerable among us. Now is the time to fight for better air quality across the country. Now is the time for action to protect American health and the environment.

We cannot afford to wait. Clean air is essential to a healthy community and a strong economy.

GENIUS OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the genius of our Constitution can be found in the separation of powers that has preserved our freedom for 225 years.

The American Founders recognized that what had gone so terribly wrong in Europe was that the same organ of government that made the law also enforced that law and adjudicated it. All the powers were in the same hands. They wanted to protect their new Nation from such a fate.

So they divided the powers of government. Congress, and Congress alone,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

makes the law. "All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

You want many voices in that decisionmaking process. You want a great, big, messy debate. That is the Congress.

Once that decision is made, it needs to be carried out by a single will, a single branch, headed by one individual whom the Constitution commands to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." One person does not get to make the law in this Republic. The President is called upon to enforce the law.

Fundamentally, that means he does not get to pick and choose which laws he will enforce and which laws he will ignore. He does not get to pick and choose who must obey the law and who gets to live above the law. And he does not get to change laws or make laws by decree.

That is the difference between the American Republic that prides itself on being a nation of laws and not of men and the European despots of old who boasted that the law was in their mouths.

Mr. Speaker, last week the President asserted an entirely unconstitutional power to nullify existing immigration law by ordering the executive branch to simply ignore it. Further, he has ordered 34 million green cards to allow businesses to hire illegal immigrants, despite Federal law that explicitly forbids their employment.

Throughout our Nation's history, executives have tested the limits of their power, but this act crosses a very bright line. Fortunately, the American Founders anticipated that some day a President might attempt to subvert the Constitution in this manner, and they provided a variety of defenses available to both the legislative and the judicial branches.

The legislative branch has the power of the purse, but that power is temporarily constrained by the partisan division between the House and the Senate. Fortunately, the American people have acted to end that division in January.

But I fear that any confrontation between the executive and the legislative branches could ultimately end in stalemate. The third branch of government, the judiciary, must be brought into this process.

Since our earliest days, the Supreme Court has guarded our Nation from unconstitutional acts by both the legislative and executive branches, and that role is desperately needed now. I believe there is no substitute for Congress doing everything within its power to invoke judicial intervention.

I cannot believe that even the most devoted liberals on the bench can be comfortable with this brazen act of usurpation. Assuming the Court stands with the Constitution, the President would have no choice but to back down

or face a catastrophic public and congressional backlash.

Whether we choose to recognize it, this is a full-fledged constitutional crisis. If allowed to stand, this precedent renders meaningless the separation of powers and the checks and balances that comprise the fundamental architecture of our Constitution. If it stands, every future President, Republican and Democrat, will cite it as justification for lawmaking by decree.

The seizure of legislative authority by the executive is fatal to a republic such as ours. Indeed, it was Julius Caesar's usurpation of the Roman senate's legislative prerogatives that brought down the Roman republic and began four centuries of dictatorship. Once the rule of one man is established over the rule of law, it is a very difficult thing to stop.

Unlike every law that is passed under our Constitution, the Constitution itself has no penalties for those who break it. The reason is that the Constitution was written to be self-enforcing, but that only happens if the powers of government are evenly balanced. The Founders relied on each branch acting to keep those powers in balance. Now, in our time, that responsibility is ours.

ASSESSMENTS IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to discuss an important issue that we hear about when we talk with teachers, parents, students, and school administrators. In conversation after conversation, they have expressed concern about what seems like an endless stream of tests that, in many cases, do little, if anything, to improve learning or classroom instruction.

Of course, assessments play an important role in education, and high-quality assessments are valuable for informing meaningful instruction. Nonetheless, too much time is devoted to redundant, low-quality, or unnecessary tests.

In many cases, teachers administer tests, but the results aren't made available for months, and hardworking educators have little opportunity to design individualized support based on the results of those tests.

Furthermore, some of the tests are redundant. They take up time that could be used on meaningful instruction, use resources best spent elsewhere, and cause students undue stress. In other schools, too much time is dedicated to preparing for tests that are not well-aligned with State standards. Simply put, unnecessary assessments have hindered our progress as a global leader in education.

We know that the Federal Government mandates several tests each year,

and States and school districts often require even more tests. Does this all make sense? Do all of these tests improve instruction, improve public education?

Today, I rise to discuss legislation that I am working on to help States and local districts implement good, reliable assessments aligned to standards, and importantly, eliminate redundant, poor-quality assessments that take valuable time from teachers and students, time that could be used on meaningful instruction.

We don't need more tests. We need better tests. My bill will use an existing grant to provide States with funding to develop assessment systems that ensure the best use of students' test results and that align assessments with college and career-ready standards.

The transition to rigorous content standards is hard work, and my bill will support States as they implement high-quality assessments linked to those standards.

Working with local educational agencies, States will create assessment plans outlining how they will improve the quality of their tests, how they will use the assessment data, and how they will make the data more accessible to educators, students, and parents.

This legislation will also support States and local districts that want to lead the way on developing more sensible assessment systems. States will be able to volunteer to audit their assessment systems and use the results to design plans to eliminate unnecessary and redundant testing.

Many State school chiefs and district superintendents have recently made a commitment to this effort. My legislation will make available much-needed Federal support.

□ 1015

The focus in the classroom should be on the student. This bill will help States improve their assessments and make better use of the results, so they can draw valuable conclusions about students and give educators the data they need, so they can do what they do best: teach.

Ultimately, we must address the culture of testing that has created stress for students, parents, and teachers. This bill is a strong first step. It keeps control in the hands of the States and school districts, and it provides the funding to streamline assessment systems and make sure that the remaining assessments are high quality and useful.

My bill offers this support through an existing funding stream, and it will help put the focus back on our students. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

OPPOSITION TO UNESCO FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against a push by the administration and its allies here in Congress to ignore U.S. law—this time, to ignore the legal prohibition on using U.S. taxpayer dollars to fund UNESCO.

Frankly, it is an indictment against the administration and some of our colleagues that we have to go through this song and dance every year or whenever a funding measure is set to come to the floor; yet here we are again, as some in Congress want to help President Obama circumvent and undermine U.S. law and restore at least partial funding for UNESCO, so that that body can continue to push its anti-U.S./anti-Israel agenda.

Time and again, the President has taken unilateral action meant to get around congressional opposition and has openly stated that he will continue to do so.

Since 1990, U.S. law has prohibited any funding to the U.N. or to any U.N. agency that gives the PLO membership status and recognizes the nonexistent State of Palestine.

UNESCO was well aware of our laws when its members voted to include this so-called Palestine among its ranks, triggering the U.S. funding prohibition. President Obama knew this when we cut off UNESCO's funding in response because it is the law; however, since then, he has sought ways to undermine and circumvent this law to not only restore funding to UNESCO, but to also pay dues in arrears which now would amount to over \$300 million in U.S. taxpayer dollars.

This is the very same body that allows the likes of Cuba—the antithesis of freedom and the respect for human rights and the rule of law—on its executive board. When UNESCO admitted a nonexistent Palestine, it undermined the peace process and only emboldened Abu Mazen even further to move forward with his unilateral push for statehood at the U.N.

There cannot be a legitimate Palestinian state unless it comes about as the result of direct negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians. This unilateral scheme by Abu Mazen is a way for him to use that U.N. body to gain de facto statehood without having to first come to an agreement with Israel.

If President Obama and his enablers in Congress have their way and U.S. funding for UNESCO is restored, it will signal that the U.S. supports this unilateral push for statehood, and we will have sold out our closest friend and ally: the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

We must make it clear to the administration in no uncertain terms that Congress will not allow it to continue to circumvent and undermine congressional authority or the law and that we

will not allow it once again to fund UNESCO.

Giving the administration the authority it seeks to fund UNESCO would not only set a dangerous precedent by showing those with an anti-Israel agenda at the U.N. that the U.S. does not have the courage of its convictions or the fortitude to enforce our own laws, but it would also give the green light to the rest of the bodies at the U.N. to follow UNESCO's lead and also admit Palestine.

Abu Mazen has already signaled that he will seek further recognition at the U.N., and unless we make it absolutely certain to the entire U.N. system that admitting Palestine has very real and tangible negative consequences, the bodies at the U.N. will fall in line with this dangerous scheme, and that would cause irreparable harm to the peace process.

Instead of President Obama's looking for ways to spend hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars at an anti-U.S./anti-Israel body at the U.N., which is in violation of U.S. law, the President should perhaps instead focus on institutions at the U.N. that do work and that are effective.

This month, for example, the World Food Programme, WFP, was forced to suspend its assistance to millions of refugees who fled the crisis in Syria and went to Jordan, to Lebanon, to Iraq, to Turkey; as a result, millions could go hungry as they are set to face the harsh winter.

Our money would be better spent helping an institution we know works because it relies on voluntary contributions only, and we should be doing more to ensure that the WFP, the World Food Programme, can continue its good work to assist these millions of refugees around the world.

THIS CONGRESS MUST VOTE TO AUTHORIZE THE WARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great frustration and anger that this Congress—the 113th Congress—continues to ignore its constitutional responsibilities to debate and vote on whether to authorize the U.S. war against Islamic State forces in Iraq and Syria.

On July 25, this House voted 370–40 that, if the United States engages in sustained combat operations in Iraq, then the House would need to authorize such actions. Let me read exactly what this House approved by such an overwhelming, bipartisan majority:

The President shall not deploy or maintain United States Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without specific statutory authorization for such use enacted after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

That vote, supported by 180 Republicans and 190 Democrats, was taken nearly 4.5 months ago.

What has happened since then? On August 8, just 2 weeks after the House vote, the U.S. began bombing Islamic State forces in Iraq. We are now bombing Iraq to protect infrastructure, as part of coordinated military operations with Kurdish and Iraqi military forces, and to take back or to hold cities, towns, and other territory. We are flying dozens of bombing sorties nearly every day in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we have also escalated the number of U.S. troops in Iraq, ostensibly as trainers and advisers. On November 7, the President announced yet another escalation in the number of U.S. troops deployed to Iraq, sending roughly an additional 1,500 troops to the region for a “comprehensive training effort” for Iraq's army.

When they arrive, this will put the number of American troops in Iraq at around 3,000. The U.S. Central Command is also working on setting up new “expeditionary advise-and-assist operation centers” far outside the cities of Baghdad and Erbil.

What else has happened since July? We expanded the war to Syria. On September 17, this House voted to include in the short-term continuing resolution authority to arm and train certain Syrian rebel forces, ostensibly to provide ground troops inside Syria to fight Islamic State forces.

Five days later, the U.S. began bombing inside Syria. We have flown scores of bombing missions inside Syrian territory against the Islamic State and—and this should come as no surprise—other radical groups like the Khorasan Group.

This week, we are in military negotiations with Turkey to establish a safe zone—a no-fly zone—along the northern border of Syria that will cover territory inside of Syria and inside Turkey.

The President has asked for an additional \$5.6 billion from Congress to augment the Pentagon's overseas contingency operations account, the OCO. About \$3.4 billion of that would go to the operations against the Islamic State, and another \$1.6 billion would directly support the Iraqi training and equipping mission. I have no doubt that all or most of those funds will be included in the omnibus appropriations bill next week.

Mr. Speaker, if this doesn't add up to our forces being engaged in sustained military combat operations, then what in the world does? Many Members keep talking about prohibiting U.S. troops from having boots on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, we already have nearly 3,000 pairs of boots on the ground in Iraq, and I don't know how many people we have supporting and carrying out bombing missions because the Pentagon and the White House haven't told us.

Enough is enough. This House needs to draft, debate, and vote on whether to authorize this vast array of military operations known as Operation Inherent Resolve before we adjourn this year.

This war began under this Congress, the 113th Congress. It has escalated under the 113th Congress. It has expanded from Iraq to Syria and now to Turkey under the 113th Congress. It is the responsibility of the 113th Congress to authorize it or not. We need to take care of our business—real, serious, life-and-death business—before we walk out the door next week. We need to do our jobs.

No more excuses, no more whining about how the White House should send Congress a request. It is the institutional and constitutional duty of the Congress of the United States to decide matters of war and peace. It is time for the leadership of this House to step up to the plate and bring an authorization to the floor to be debated and voted on before we adjourn.

If not, then shame on this House and shame on the leadership for failing to carry out our most sacred duty to our uniformed men and women, their families, and the American people.

IN HONOR OF THE BRAVERY OF PRIVATE JOHN SIPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the bravery exhibited during the Civil War by Private John Sipe during the Battle of Fort Stedman.

In addition, I recognize and commend the tireless efforts by his great-grandson, Mr. Reuben Troutman, a constituent of Pennsylvania's Fourth District, who has advocated for over a decade for the consideration of his great-grandfather to receive the Medal of Honor.

On March 25, 1865, Private Sipe's selfless actions in the face of grave danger exhibited unparalleled bravery while fighting at the Battle of Fort Stedman with the 205th Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

After Confederate forces succeeded in capturing Fort Stedman, the 205th Regiment made a gallant charge to counter the rebel attack. Although still considered to be in training status at that time, these brave Pennsylvanians managed to force the opposition back into Fort Stedman, halting the Confederate onslaught.

During the intense hand-to-hand combat that occurred in retaking the fort, Private Sipe displayed extreme heroism when, without concern for his own safety, he fearlessly charged the rebel lines and captured the Confederate flag.

The commander of the IX Army Corps, Major General John G. Parke,

recommended to Army headquarters that Private Sipe be awarded the Medal of Honor for his valor and selflessness in capturing the enemy flag.

Mr. Speaker, I must explain that capturing this flag at the time was not like this game that you might have heard about of capturing the flag. At the time of the Civil War, just imagine the fire and the sound of cannonade, muskets, the screams of compatriots on either side of the line in trying to manage the battle.

It was the flag, it was the guidon, it was the standard, that showed the soldiers what action their unit was taking, and without it, it would render them impotent because there was no communication. There were no radios during the Civil War, so capturing the flag meant everything; not only was it symbolic, but it had a huge purpose in determining what that unit could, would, or would not do.

Although recommended to receive the award by the commanding general, according to the National Archives and Records Administration, Private Sipe, however, never received the Medal of Honor.

In a process that has spanned more than a decade, Private Sipe's only living relative—his great-grandson Reuben Troutman of Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania—has worked with our office and the office of my predecessors to ensure that Private Sipe was given fair consideration for the Medal of Honor for which he was recommended.

Unfortunately, the Department of Defense determined this year that a lack of existing evidence precludes the award of the Medal of Honor for Private Sipe's bravery and service. Private Sipe's heroism warrants recognition, nonetheless.

Additionally, Reuben Troutman has dedicated an extensive amount of time over many years in researching his great-grandfather's contribution at the Battle of Fort Stedman, and he has worked diligently and tirelessly to bring to light historical facts of Private Sipe's military record.

I commend Reuben for his attention to detail, persistence, tenacity, and zeal in seeking to honor his family heritage and for a valiant attempt at obtaining recognition for his great-grandfather's honorable and courageous service during the Civil War.

As a proud servicemember myself and as a combat veteran and on behalf of the millions of other uniformed personnel who have served after him, I thank not only Private Sipe, but also Mr. Troutman, for their selfless service and dedication to our Nation.

□ 1030

HUMAN DIGNITY FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in this season of reflection for many across the Nation, I will take a moment, first of all, to speak to my constituent Zeph to remind him that I have always supported the human dignity of all persons, and I will never fail to do so. I thank him for his warm embrace of those values and our commitment that we will continue to work together, which brings me to my concern of an ailing American who has continuously been held in Cuba.

I ask today on the floor of the House for the leadership of this government to continue to work diligently in the efforts to return Alan Gross to his family. I hope that we will join together, Republicans and Democrats, to work for his release and his return. I would note, Mr. Speaker, that I do not speak of the conditions of such, the reasons for such; just an American who is in failing health whom we need to work to bring home.

I think that is the kind of spirit of mercy that I would like to continue to speak of as we try to work our way through the understanding of the President's action on the executive order regarding immigration. It follows the directive of the Speaker of the House, who said:

A comprehensive approach to immigration reform is long overdue; and I am confident that the President, myself, and others can find the common ground to take care of this issue once and for all.

Spoken by Speaker BOEHNER in 2012.

Now, as we approach the new year, 2015, 3 years later, there has not been one vote on the floor of the House to bring mercy or relief to those who have been languishing in the shadows—not opening the borders, Mr. Speaker, but to really provide a framework for those who are here in the United States, almost as if there was a temporary pardon.

This is not, as the Judiciary Committee pounded over and over again yesterday, a change in the law. This is a work within the confines of the law under article II executive powers of the President and the language to take care. It is actually a recognition to frame, if you will, the interpretation that is given to laws of the land—might I say, civil laws as well. Because in a civil law, there is punishment; under immigration laws, you can be deported, a civil penalty.

So the President has said, in an executive order narrowly confined and reviewed by legal counsel and constitutional experts, supported by 136 scholars, that said that the President is within his rights to stop deportation of store owners and childcare workers and high-tech workers, and particularly the parents of children who are, in fact, citizen children of legal permanent residents.

It is important for the American people to understand, there is no illegality

here. There is no runaway Presidency here. There is an understanding that those who have status—not immigration status, not pathway to citizenship, but a temporary reprieve—almost like a pardon, yet it is more temporary, those children who have been deferred, all he did was to say that it should be 3 years and not 2 years. He has asked that the ICE officers be made, if you will, equal to other Federal law enforcement officers. I celebrate that. That is exciting.

Let me quickly say this, Mr. Speaker. I want to travel in the pathway of Reverend Dr. Sharon Stanley-Rea about immigration reform. Her words are, as I paraphrase them: We should choose our values for people over politics, community safety over partisan strategies, family unity and welcome over fear of foreigners, and humanitarian compassion for children and families above rhetoric and rancor.

Let me finally, Mr. Speaker, say that I want to, again, as I move to another topic, thank and compliment the protesters that were peaceful regarding the issue of Ferguson. I ask for people to understand these young people. I went out in Houston in the march and applauded them for the peacefulness of their protests. Now they are asking for us as legislators and policymakers to make a difference in their lives. I publicly say on the floor of the House they will not be forgotten.

I want AJ to know, who is an intern in my office from St. Louis, shot in gang fights, that he will not be forgotten. The work that he is doing will be remembered.

I ask the National Association of Chiefs of Police to join us in a discussion on how we best walk through these concerns. There are many legislative initiatives, but it has to be a combination of law enforcement, policymakers, civil rights leaders.

And to our police unions, let me say there are none of us that have not worked and stood alongside of you.

I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 5550, that I hope my colleagues will join me in making sure that funding is not used by local communities through their various traffic stops to fund their communities.

Let's make a difference on Ferguson, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the issue is no longer whether Congress and the President can agree on immigration policy. The question is: Does a President have the power to alter our Nation's laws without passing new statutes?

Throughout the history of this great country, since the time of our Found-

ing Fathers, the answer to this question has been "no." Yet President Obama struck a blow to the system of checks and balances that has been at the heart of our government and our Constitution for over 200 years.

The constitutionality of the President's actions are in question as the President has said time and time again that he does not have the constitutional authority to change our Nation's immigration laws on his own. From 2008 up to this August, at least 22 times the President has said that he couldn't ignore the laws on the books or create his own immigration laws.

In 2011, the President said: "America is a nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that. That's part of my job."

"We've got three branches of government. Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. And then the judiciary has to interpret the laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President."

Very well spoken, President Obama, the constitutional scholar that he is.

Mr. Speaker, this is the framework of our Nation's system of checks and balances. The Constitution is clear. It is clear that it is Congress' duty to write the laws, and it is the President's responsibility to enforce them.

While law enforcement agencies do have the inherent power to exercise prosecutorial discretion, the authority as to whether to enforce or not enforce the law against particular individuals, this power must be used judiciously and isn't an invitation to violate or ignore a law in its entirety. By granting amnesty to 5 million illegal immigrants, this administration has crossed the line from any justifiable use of its executive authority to a failure to faithfully execute the laws.

Mr. Speaker, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, whether you agree or disagree with the President's policy on illegal immigrants and immigration, you cannot agree with the President's actions. No one is vested with the power to be both President and legislator.

INJUSTICE ANYWHERE IS A THREAT TO JUSTICE EVERY- WHERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to the many persons who serve in law enforcement. They have difficult jobs, and they do their jobs well. I salute them.

I also salute the many persons who have been engaged in peaceful protests. What they have been attempting to do, I support. A peaceful protest is the best protest. Peaceful protests can make a difference in the lives of people. I know, because I stand here today because of peaceful protests.

I would like to continue what I started on yesterday, when I indicated that I would give a response today to a query that was made on Morning Joe. And I want my colleagues to know that I don't believe the query was made with malice aforethought. I think it was a genuine expression of concern. While intonations and expressions may connote otherwise to some, I believe that this is a question that should have been asked and that needs to be answered.

The question was: What is wrong with these people?—meaning three Members of Congress. What is wrong with these people that they would come to the well of the House of Representatives and they would hold their hands up? What is wrong with them?

Here is the answer, my dear brother: the same thing that was wrong with the Pilgrims and caused them to come to Plymouth Rock; the same thing that caused persons to throw tea into the Boston Harbor; the same thing that caused farmers to traverse the country on tractors and come to the United States Capitol to protest; the same thing that caused Rosa Parks to take a seat on a bus against the law; the same thing that caused Dr. King to march from Selma to Montgomery; the same thing that caused them to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge on what is known as Bloody Sunday.

What is wrong with these people? They refuse to accept injustice. I refuse to accept injustice. What happened in Ferguson was an injustice. I refuse to accept injustice. Injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere. Dr. King was right. Injustice in Ferguson is a threat to justice in Houston, a threat to justice in Boston. Injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere.

And so I will continue to hold my hands up. I will continue to support those who engage in peaceful protest. Because holding one's hands up is an indication that you don't have anything that will be harmful, an indication that you are willing to move freely and give an opinion about something that you believe to be important. I think that this will symbolize a movement that will metamorphose far beyond the initial reason for it being developed. I am absolutely convinced that this will not evaporate, this will not evaporate, that it is not going to go away. It is going to become part of the protest movement.

I also want to note that what happened with the Rams players was a seminal moment, and I want to legitimize what they did. I have already said

that I will have flags flown over the Capitol of the United States of America in each person's name.

Somebody is going to say, well, what about the people who may have committed a crime? Washington wasn't perfect, but we honored him. Jefferson wasn't perfect; we honor him. I am going to honor them for what they did at that seminal moment, just as I believe John Carlos and Tommie Smith should be honored for what they did when they held their hands up, indicating that they were protesting at the Olympics in '68.

So I, Mr. Speaker, am honored to have this opportunity today to indicate to the world, finally, that Dr. King was right when he said the truest measure of the person is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience, when everybody is patting you on the back, when everybody loves you, all your bills are paid, when things couldn't be better. The truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience. The truest measure of the person is where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy, when people are throwing the slings and arrows of life at you because you took a simple stand against injustice.

And it was injustice. I can explain it. I regret that I wasn't invited on the program to give my point of view. So I had to take to the floor of the House of Representatives to give what I would have given, if given the opportunity.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker.

THE 2015 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act this House will consider later this week.

I am very proud to represent Fort Hood, the largest military base in the world. On November 5, 2009, 5 years ago, our community suffered an unthinkable tragedy when a radicalized Islamic extremist named Nidal Hassan opened fire on Fort Hood and fatally shot 15 men and women and 1 unborn child.

□ 1045

More than 30 others were wounded that day. Hasan's radicalization was well known to the FBI and the DOD as early as 2005. Hasan plotted with the known terrorist Anwar al-Awlaki, and he expressed his radical views to his classmates. This administration dismissed these concerns in the name of political correctness.

Five years ago the President promised to take care of the victims of this shooting, but shortly thereafter, he turned his back on them and declared

the attack to be workplace violence. These victims and their families are still waiting for justice. Our communities have suffered long enough in the name of political correctness.

I am very proud that my colleagues in the House and Senator CORNYN and Senator CRUZ have not dropped the ball. We have stood for the Fort Hood community and the victims of this terrorist act even as the President failed to act. The House and Senate have agreed on this legislation that will allow these heroes to receive Purple Hearts and make them eligible for the benefits they deserve. The victims and their families will soon receive justice and closure. I am proud to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, ROGER WILLIAMS, my strong partner in this effort.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman JOHN CARTER, for his words, but, more importantly, for the many years of hard work he has put forth to care for the soldiers at Fort Hood.

Mr. Speaker, the 2009 terrorist attack at Fort Hood was an unthinkable tragedy. At that time it was the only story the news reported for days. Who was this murderer? Why did he do it? Could there be more like him? Are our other military installations at increased risk of this type of attack too? How did we not see this coming?

After the attacks on September 11 we asked these same questions. That is the difference between workplace violence and a terrorist attack. The Fort Hood shooter was not a disgruntled employee who took his anger out on his colleagues. He was a hate-filled, vengeful Islamic extremist who intentionally planned the horrendous terrorist attack and carried it out with no remorse.

Islamic extremists like him want us to fear them every single day. They want to hit us where it hurts—by taking innocent American lives and waging war on our military members. They have zero regard for human life—not even their own. That is why our response to terrorist attacks on American soil must be consistently tough, precise, and without hesitation.

At the memorial service honoring the lives of 13 Americans and one unborn, President Obama pledged to take care of those who were injured and the families of those killed. Yet 5 years later he has completely neglected them. Because President Obama designated the attack workplace violence, these men and women are not eligible to receive the benefits, treatment, and compensation that combat troops killed and injured in combat zones receive.

This negligence has caused many injured victims to have to pay their own out-of-pocket expenses for treatment, costing some hundreds of thousands of dollars. One victim was pulled off Ac-

tive Duty. Her paycheck went from \$1,400 a month to \$200 a month, and she lost her military health insurance. Others scrape by on disability payments but still have to pay the remainder of their medical bills from their own pocket. My friend Sergeant Alonso Lunsford was shot seven times but was turned away when he tried to check into an Army PTSD clinic due to the fact that he was not injured in combat.

This is not my definition of taking care of our Nation's heroes. However, the National Defense Authorization Act gives the Obama administration yet another opportunity to honor his pledge to provide for these men and women who were victims of terrorism.

This bicameral, bipartisan bill provides authorization for awarding the Purple Heart to members of the Armed Forces killed or wounded in a domestic attack inspired by a foreign terrorist organization. This is a commonsense solution that should have happened immediately following the attack at Fort Hood.

I want to thank Chairman MCKEON and again Congressman CARTER for their tireless work on behalf of their troops, and the many of my Texas colleagues who have joined the fight to restore justice. Just as we united as a country after these senseless attacks, let's once again unite as Americans to fight for the truth and honor of our fallen and demand justice for the victims of terrorism. In God we trust.

WAR POWERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by associating myself with the remarks of my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN.

It is difficult to fathom the daunting array of foreign policy challenges President Obama has had to weather since the start of his administration, challenges which are not the result of any misjudgment on his part.

Few modern leaders have had to contend with such an assortment of diverse global challenges, and the President deserves immense credit, which he rarely receives, for confronting them judiciously.

At nearly every turn, the 44th President has boldly promoted a global vision of peace and security defined by negotiation with allies and adversaries alike. The President's tenacious pursuit of a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear program is the hallmark of that doctrine. Moreover, he has held fast to these principles in the face of Republican and even some Democrat charges of weakness, arrogance, and treachery.

I admire the President and appreciate what an unenviable position he is

faced with in Iraq. However, like Mr. MCGOVERN, I am alarmed by the recent developments in what is becoming, in my mind, a full-fledged military campaign in Iraq. The situation in Iraq may be difficult, but that excuse does not merit the President's overreliance on war powers and the two outdated authorizations for use of force. When it comes to war and peace, the authority remains firmly with this body, the United States Congress.

Last month we heard that the White House planned to double the number of troops in Iraq, bringing the total to 3,000, despite the President's own promise not to put U.S. troops on the ground. On Monday another 250 paratroopers were called up from the 82nd Airborne for service in Iraq, and Congress is poised to give the President his \$5.6 billion request to combat ISIS with virtually no debate scheduled on this House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to implore the President to come to Congress and explain his strategy for this new campaign in Iraq. Even the last President, who was far less sensible, sought congressional authority. It is in President Obama's best interest to address not just those relevant committees apt to grant him the legal leeway the White House weakly asserts but all 435 Members who have congressional authority and constitutional authority to send our Nation's sons and daughters to war.

The President must tread carefully going forward, and not just because our recent military history in Iraq is poor but also because he now faces a Republican Congress. Those recklessly clamoring for greater military involvement against ISIS would like nothing more than to blame what could easily become a wider conflict, likely doomed to fail, squarely on the President's head. I trust this President, and I have faith that he will make the decisions in the best interest of the American people, as he understands them.

Let me be clear: it is in the American people's best interest for the President to ask the people's representatives—us in the House of Representatives—for a proper authorization for the use of military force. Then JOHN BOEHNER should lead the debate on such an authorization—a debate at great length and with complete transparency, not behind closed doors, not in committees, not somewhere in conference reports, but out here on the floor in front of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we have wandered down this road in Iraq before with a far less thoughtful President. What our goal was in Iraq is long since lost. Whatever President Bush said it was, it never turned out to be what we were there about. And here we are doing the same thing again, unfortunately. It is time we learned from our mistakes and that we, as Members of Congress, take re-

sponsibility for sending our people over there to die. There will be deaths, make no mistake about it. Generals have already said if we go over there a little bit, we are going to be there for the next 2 years. It is time for us to vote on this issue after a lengthy debate.

NANNY STATE LUNCHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal food police are whipping up their latest batch of distasteful government regulations. With a government fist around an iron spatula, the Federal Government has become the new Mr. Bumble from the book "Oliver Twist."

The food police have placed unhealthy and illogical regulations on menus for government school lunches across the fruited plain. This is just more unneeded, unnecessary, and unwarranted Federal Government invasion of what school kids eat. The Federal Government now is trying to raise America's children.

In an effort to control, dictate, and give children a nanny state society, school lunches have gotten watered down to a skimpy new low. After strict portion control and outlandish so-called nutrition standards, school lunches have become as exciting as detention. The food is unappealing and lacking in nutrition.

So what have students done? They have taken their frustrations to Twitter, taking photos of government-dictated school lunches. An Oklahoma school student tweeted a picture of a few chicken nuggets, a half an apple, and a piece of bread, complaining, "Thanks for the fulfilling lunch." More and more students are catching on, saying sarcastically, "I will be full for days," and "Thanks for the delicious lunch, sure was filling."

A parent eating lunch with their child at school was stunned after seeing the lunch portions. And here she took a photograph of the lunch. Here it is. And she said correctly, "This is sad." Here you have a little condiment package. Here you have a bun with a something in between, and then you have a half a fruit over on the other side. Isn't this a lovely lunch? If a parent had anything to do with this, the Federal Government would probably accuse them of child neglect.

There is a 350-calorie limit in place for entrees. So that means taking two packets of ketchup or mayonnaise would put the student over the allowed limit. Kids find themselves in an "Oliver Twist" situation with the workhouse headmaster, Mr. Bumble, and having to fearfully ask, "More please, sir?" And of course just like in the book, the answer is a loud "No."

Kids need the energy to learn, to pay attention, and to focus. That energy

comes from food. The cafeteria takeover by the Federal Government is leaving students—believe it or not—hungry.

How can we expect children operating on a lunch of no more than 350 calories to make it through the day? What about athletes and afterschool programs? Whether the student plays football or plays an instrument in the marching band, a dinky lunch just won't cut it.

Meghan Hellrood, a student at D.C. Everest High School in Wisconsin, is protesting the required "healthy" lunches by promising other students unlimited condiments that she herself will bring to school. Now, I wonder if the Federal Government will charge her with smuggling the forbidden condiments. Who knows?

Students all over the United States have started to speak out. Pictures of a lunch with two pieces of cauliflower, some ham, and a piece of cheese have surfaced, or three cherry tomatoes, skim milk, and some cheesy bread. This sounds more like the tasteless gruel Oliver Twist was served in the book "Oliver Twist."

Kids who buy their lunch but opt out of the side of fruits or vegetables are still charged for the whole meal, resulting in wasted food. There has been an 84 percent increase in wasted school lunches that are just thrown in the trash.

These regulations just aren't working. So what is next? Is the government going to force-feed kids who don't eat the government food lunches? The level of Federal Government intrusion is foolish, and it seems to be arrogant.

The time is now to protect schools from Mr. Bumble bureaucrats. Interestingly enough, some of the bureaucrats in Washington making the rules for government schools send their kids to private schools, which are not under the same absurd food regulations.

Mere calorie counting is not a viable healthy option. More physical activities in schools may be needed. In any event, it is the duty and responsibility of parents and local schools to decide what their kids eat in school, not the nanny, Mr. Bumble, and the bureaucrats in Washington.

Parents should raise their kids, not the Federal Government. Federal food police don't belong in a local school cafeteria.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1100

THE GAS TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, I introduced the first gas tax increase in over 20 years. I was

joined by a broad coalition in announcing the bill, supported by the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, building and construction industries and their unions, local governments, AAA and the truckers, environmentalists, transit, and cyclists. It was gratifying to have that broad base of support. One year later, the only thing that has changed is that the need, if anything, is greater and the path forward is even easier.

I just completed a press conference with my good friend TOM PETRI and with President Ronald Reagan. President Reagan, in 1982, in his Thanksgiving Day radio address, explained why we needed to raise the gas tax.

He said: "One of our greatest material blessings is the outstanding network of roads and highways that spreads across this great continent. Freedom of travel and the romance of the road are vital parts of our heritage, and they help make America great.

"We simply cannot allow this magnificent system to deteriorate beyond repair. The time has come to preserve what Americans spent so much time and effort to create, and that means a nationwide conservation effort in the best sense of the word.

"So I am asking Congress when it reconvenes next week to approve a new highway program that will enable us to complete construction of the interstate system and at the same time get on with the job of renovating existing highways. The program will not increase the Federal deficit or add to the taxes that you and I pay on April 15. It will be paid for by those of us who use the system, and it will cost the average car owner only about \$30 a year. That is less than the cost of a couple of shock absorbers.

"So what we are proposing is to add the equivalent of 5 cents a gallon to the existing highway user fee, the gas tax, which hasn't been increased in the last 23 years. The cost to the average motorist will be small, but the benefit to our transportation system will be immense. The program will stimulate 170,000 jobs, not make-work projects, but in real, worthwhile work in hard-hit construction industries, and an additional 150,000 jobs in related industries.

"Perhaps most important, we will be preserving for future generations of Americans a highway system that has long been the envy of the world and has truly made the average American driver king of the road.

"Thanks for listening, and until next time, God bless you."

That is a speech that could be given by any of us or by President Obama—and should be. Congress did return after that holiday, and President Reagan and Tip O'Neill more than doubled the gas tax. What has not changed is that we haven't raised the gas tax in 22 years. It costs the average family \$377 per year in damage to their cars.

If we increase the gas tax according to my proposal, H.R. 3636, it won't create 300,000 jobs; it will create 1.5 million family-wage jobs across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I understand people don't like the gas tax. I don't like the gas tax. I want to raise it, index it, and then abolish it and replace it with something that is sustainable. But in the meantime, raising the gas tax is the only viable approach, as verified by two Presidential commissions that reported to President Bush.

We have been asleep at the switch. It is time for us to step up. At a time of dramatically falling gas prices—23 cents on average in the last month, and they are projected to continue going down—now is the perfect time to step up, to raise the gas tax slowly over the next 3 years, rebuild and renew America, put family-wage jobs across the spectrum, and make our communities more livable, our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

All it takes is a little leadership and courage. Like Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did 32 years ago, I think we can do that now, and we should.

RANGER CHAPLAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on something very dear to my heart. The duty of a military chaplain is to help guide the hearts and minds of the soldiers that he serves with or she serves with, and that comes from a perspective of a background of their own faith, but also the respect of the faiths of others that they serve with, making sure that all feel a responsibility to not only do their job, their mission, but also to themselves, that they are being all that they can be in their own careers, in their own missions.

But just again, here we go again, as the old saying goes. Recently, in my district, an Army chaplain gave a suicide awareness and prevention brief as required by the Army and received a letter of concern in his official record. A letter of concern is a means to admonish a soldier's actions.

The chaplain did not infringe upon anyone's rights, did not receive any complaints from anyone being briefed that day; but after the chaplain's actions were reviewed, he was considered to have not violated any Army regulation or policy, yet his negative counseling remains, simply because at a time in which our society is dealing with soldiers and airmen who are struggling with depression and struggling with suicide rates, he had the audacity to share his own experience with depression and how his faith helped him.

What is a chaplain supposed to do except to share from his own heart in a way that is encouraging to others whether they have faith or no faith? I hope—no, I pray—this counseling record will reflect soon his innocence.

The Military Association of Atheists & Freethinkers decided to characterize the chaplain's briefing as evangelism in mental health training. The MAAF goes on to say that receiving Christian doctrine as a way to combat depression and suicidal thoughts would increase the amount of suicides in the military. This statement belittles the belief of soldiers who feel their faith may help them through difficult and troubling times.

Apparently, the MAAF feel only their systems of beliefs are worth propagating and any others are irrelevant, if not damaging, to a soldier's emotional health.

As a military chaplain, all I have to say to the MAAF is that if it protects and helps someone value life, keep their own life, then what they need to do is be reminded that they have an opinion, and so does everyone else.

It is time that they lived up to their own thoughts, that thoughts matter, and that what this chaplain did should be reversed. It should not reflect on his record. When you have someone actually in the game trying to help, it is not the time for little people on the outside to criticize. They need to get a new direction and a new focus, and this chaplain needs to be restored and this letter removed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4924. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of certain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2917. An act to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

SUPPORTING THE ABLE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, my intention this morning was to get up and

try to be eloquent when talking about the ABLE Act, Achieving a Better Life Experience, which we will vote on later today, but since yesterday, I have received four emails from parents in North Dakota whose words are far more eloquent than mine could ever be.

I will submit all of their words into the RECORD, but I want to share a few of the highlights from these important emails from my constituents.

Roxane Romanick writes:

How exciting that we are at this point where the dreams of the act passing may come true in the next days.

After writing a bit about the legislation itself, she writes this about her 15-year-old daughter, Elizabeth:

Due to her diagnosis of Down syndrome, she has the support of an individual education plan at school. The school will start working on a transition plan for her within a few months. Passage of the ABLE Act will mean that we can start a savings account for her in much the same way that we did for her brother.

Jamie Christensen writes:

Every parent of a child with special needs has a unique journey, but one thing is universal. We try to do the best we can to ensure a life well-lived for our child. Our unique journeys have another similarity—many of us agonize about the future.

She talks about their journey with their 7-year-old son, Grady, who has crystal blue eyes and a full head of hair. She writes:

Like many families, we want to care for our children equally, doing what we can to give them tools to help them reach their full potential. Shortly after Grady was born, I opened a 529 College SAVE account for Grady's big sister. It was then that I realized I had no idea how to plan for Grady's future. The ABLE Act is a huge step forward in easing this anxiety.

Aaron and Rachel Schuler from Bismarck, who I know very well, have a 4-year-old daughter, Ella. Actually, Ella will turn 4 years old on Christmas Eve. Ella has two siblings, Isaac and Clara. They talk about Ella with great hope. They write:

She will be a crazy teenager, graduate and go to college, work a full-time job and have a real, meaningful relationship. We believe this for her. That is what makes the ABLE Act so important to Ella and to people all over our great country. It will help her reach and fulfill the goals she desires.

How awesome.

And just while I have been sitting here in the Chamber, Marijo Schwengler of Fargo writes about their journey, about their 2-year-old son, David, one of four sons, who is diagnosed with Down syndrome. She writes:

I pray that seven weekly therapy appointments with an early intervention teacher, physical therapist, occupational therapist, and speech therapist will help him be the best that he can be. We dream big for David. Why shouldn't we?

Indeed, why shouldn't they? But she cites this fact:

David must remain "poor" in order to receive the services he needs. The ABLE Act

would mean that we could start saving for David's future today.

What an awesome promise that is.

My words would be inadequate, Mr. Speaker, but I submit these and the extended comments in these emails that I received in the last two days on behalf of Elizabeth and Grady and Ella and David and their peers, the thousands and thousands of families around our country who, in many respects, have a bias against them because they are disabled or have disabled children.

The ABLE Act that we will vote on this afternoon, Achieving a Better Life Experience Act, will go a long way toward leveling that playing field, improving their lives, and improving the lives of our entire country.

DESIGNER GENES,

A DOWN SYNDROME SUPPORT NETWORK,

December 2, 2014.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. CRAMER: Many thanks to you and everyone in your office for all of the work that you've done on the Achieving a Better Life Experience (ABLE) Act. How exciting that we are at this point where the dreams of the act passing may come true in the next days.

As you know, Designer Genes of North Dakota has been actively following the progress of the ABLE Act with many of our other Down syndrome association partners across the country. We believe that the opportunities that the ABLE Act affords to our individuals with Down syndrome will make a world of difference to their futures.

Last spring, my own daughter, Elizabeth, turned 15. Due to her diagnosis of Down syndrome, she has the support of an Individual Education Plan at school. Required by law, the school will start working on a transition plan for her within a few short months. Passage of the ABLE Act will mean that we can start a savings account for her in much the same way that we did for her brother. For too long we've treated individuals with significant disabilities with an institutional bias meaning that their need for support and care is based on old history of requiring institutionalization which included extreme poverty. Since birth, Elizabeth has had the opportunities afforded to her by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act and has been fully included in her community. These two laws establish support without impoverishment and help to equal the playing field for persons with disabilities. The ABLE Act will now do the same because it recognizes that needing support is inherent to persons with disabilities but does not require that they should live a life without realizing their hope and dreams.

Elizabeth is a go-getter. Every day she has a new dream and just yesterday she was googling recording equipment on the internet because she's decided she wants to own a recording studio. I have no idea where this dream has come from but it's very real. She's convinced she's moving out of the house when she's 18 and heading to college. I wish with all my might that the dream will come true for her (well maybe not the moving out of the house part). These dreams come because every day she walks, learns, and belongs beside her peers at Century High School, because someone fought for her right to do so.

Thank you for your work on this effort, Rep. Cramer!

ROXANE ROMANICK.

Every parent of a child with special needs has a unique journey, but one thing is universal. We try to do the best we can to ensure a life well-lived for our child. Our unique journeys have another similarity—many of us agonize about the future.

Our journey includes being blessed seven years ago with a beautiful baby boy with crystal blue eyes and a massive amount of blonde hair. His name is Grady and he has Down syndrome. Like many families, we want to care for our children equally, doing what we can to give them tools to help them reach their full potential. Shortly after Grady was born, I opened a 529 College SAVE account for Grady's big sister. It was then that I realized I had no idea how to plan for Grady's future.

After attending informational sessions, agonizing over it and meeting with a lawyer, we learned that we really had little to no options to help ensure a life well-lived for Grady. A few years later I lost my dad who was just 56, and my anxiety heightened. Just what would Grady's future look like if my husband and I died?

The ABLE Act is a huge step forward in easing this anxiety. It comes down to simple things, like making sure there is enough money for things like his over-the-counter allergy medicine and expensive lotion that are not covered by insurance, and assistive technology if communication continues to be a struggle for him into adulthood. And it means really big things, too, such as allowing us to dream about a future that could include college, work and independence. This dream just became more real because we now have a vehicle to save for supports such as education, housing, a job coach and transportation.

And specifically for Grady, it allows him some of the same rights and opportunities to work and save for his own future, just like the rest of his peers. Doing so will help him to reach his full potential, ensuring a life well-lived that all parents want for their children.

JAMIE CHRISTENSEN.

Our daughter Ella was born on Christmas Eve just about 4 years ago. Her birth was both shocking and confusing as she was born with Down Syndrome. Quickly we began to realize what a blessing she is through her smile, laugh, and genuine love for others. While we understand that Ella's life will carry certain hardships, we know that she is an absolute gift and bright light to this entire world. Our lives have been fully enriched by Ella and we plan to give her every opportunity to grow and chase her dreams. She will be a crazy teenager, graduate and go to college, work a full-time job, and have real meaningful relationship. We believe this for her.

That is what makes the ABLE Act so important to Ella and to people all over our great country. Our goal from the beginning is to provide every opportunity for Ella. The ABLE Act will help her to reach and fulfill the goals she desires to do. We must do everything we can to protect the benefits Ella and others with Down Syndrome will receive, while giving them every opportunity in life.

AARON SCHULER.

Last night at supper table, I told my family of 6, I am going to write a letter of support for the ABLE Act. They asked why so I

told them. Without even considering that David's disability may limit his workability, my 8 and 10 year olds replied, "Well mom, if David can't save his own money when he is older [he is 2 years old now], can't he just give us his money and then we can save it for him. And when he needs his money we can give it back to him?" Hmmm. . .

My name is Marijo Schwengler and I am mom of 4 wonderful boys ages 10, 8, 5, and 2. My youngest son David has Down syndrome. My husband and I were not expecting this diagnosis and we were not prepared. At first, we cried and mourned the loss of the dreams we had had for him. We did not understand what it means to have Down syndrome. We worried about how we would tell his older brothers. I worried about my older sons hating me because we have now burdened them with a 'special needs' brother. As scared as we were we promised to love David and give him the best of everything just like his older brothers.

In the days, weeks, months, following David's birth, we've learned he was just like our other boys; he just does things on his schedule. He plays, he wrestles, he cries, he knows what he likes and doesn't like. He loves books, balls, and super heroes. He knows over 30 sign language words. And just like my other children at his age, I do not know where his cognitive ability will be when he grows up. What I do know is all individuals with Down syndrome experience some kind of cognitive delay. I pray that 7 weekly therapy appointments with an early intervention teacher, physical therapist, occupational therapist and speech therapist will help him be the best that he can be. We dream BIG for David! Why shouldn't we?

My son is young and only time will tell what services and programs he may or may not need when he is an adult. But one message is clear: David must remain 'poor' in order to receive the services. Even if the services may not provide for all his needs adequately. We can't save for David in the same way we can for his brothers. We can't teach David to save his money. As child, I grew up in family that lived paycheck to paycheck, I promised myself to change that for my kids. I am in a position to do that but David's little extra chromosome prevents me from saving in a 529 for him or letting him have his own little savings account at the local bank.

The ABLE Act would mean that we could start saving for David's future today. We could teach David the importance of saving. We could make sure that David's brothers do not have to feel financially burdened by the cost of taking care of their littlest brother. The fear of my son's hating me because of David's Down syndrome was silly, his brothers love him to pieces and they would do anything for him. David and everyone with Down syndrome or any other special need deserves the right to save money for their future. Even my 8 and 10 year old boys get it! Please pass the ABLE Act.

MARIJO, JASON, JACOB,
ANDREW, SIMON AND
DAVID SCHWENGLER,
Fargo, ND.

CONGRATULATING ROBERT CASHELL ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the retirement

of a member of Nevada's public service varsity team, Reno mayor Bob Cashell. Bob was not a native of Nevada, but like most people in Nevada, he got there as quick as he could.

He has been there for a long time and has had various titles during his public service career: chairman of the board of regents of the university system, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Nevada, and finally—maybe finally—as the mayor of the city of Reno.

Bob is one of those folks who is blessed with vision that does not have many shades of gray. It is pretty black and white with the mayor when you talk to him, whether formally, informally, or whatever.

Words like "gosh" and "gee whiz" are not used in his vocabulary much. He possesses an incredible volume to his voice, uses it often, and is happy to share with you his thoughts.

Bob also has the support of an outstanding family: his wife and partner in life, Nancy, and his sons. His family has been key in terms of the fabric of the community of Truckee Meadows in northern Nevada for half a century or more.

In the resort hospitality industry, Bob was involved with properties, ownership-management—whatever—in Reno, Winnemucca, Carson City, and that little town where they do a little bit of the gaming business in the south known as Las Vegas. He was an outstanding participant in all of those.

A native of the Lone Star State, we were lucky to have Mayor Cashell come and make Nevada his home for all of his adult life and raise his family. Mr. Speaker, I thank Bob Cashell very much for his public service.

We appreciate it, and I look forward to hopefully being able to speak about him not here on the floor of the House of Representatives, but in a roast in the Truckee Meadows some time where I can pay him back for when he spoke at my roast upon my retirement from the legislature.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Eung Yul David Ryoo, Korean Central Presbyterian Church, Cen-

treville, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give our thanks-giving and praise to You, the triune God and the Creator of the universe, for offering salvation through Jesus Christ and guidance through the Holy Spirit.

We pray that humankind would be united in mutual brotherhood under Your love. We pray for Your blessing upon the United States of America, so that it would live according to Your Word as one Nation under God.

Bless the Members of the House of Representatives who have gathered here today. Etch within their hearts a fierce calling towards their motherland, within their heads the wisdom to complete their tasks with integrity, and within their lives the courage to sacrifice for the people of our country.

We pray that all here would experience the glorious joy of serving this country and its people with all that You have bestowed upon them.

We pray in the name of Jesus.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAYNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND EUNG YUL DAVID RYOO

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join you in welcoming our

pastor, Pastor Ryoo, from the Korean Central Presbyterian Church, located in Centreville, Virginia, and the 11th Congressional District, for today's invocation.

This church has been active in our community since it was founded 41 years ago in Vienna. Prior to my election to Congress, I served as chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, where I had the opportunity to collaborate with the congregation on the construction of its new sanctuary and on many of its activities throughout our community.

Within its many outreach ministries, the church founded a senior center 20 years ago, offering meals, recreation, skills training, and computerization for our senior population.

Under the direction of Heisung Lee, the center is now independently run and has been recognized by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Republic of Korea as an outstanding volunteer organization.

This and the many other activities of the congregation exemplify the tremendous contributions the Korean American community are making throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent one of the most vibrant Korean American communities in the United States and to continue our partnership here in Congress as cochair of the Korea Caucus.

I thank you, again, for joining us in welcoming Pastor Ryoo who, I think, really is emblematic of the success of the immigrant population in the United States. He represents our future.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ISRAEL

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to acknowledge the special relationship between the United States and Israel.

This year, we have witnessed yet another ugly chapter in the history of Israel's enduring fight to defend her sovereign borders and protect her people from terrorist attacks.

On August 1, Congress approved a measure to deliver an additional \$225 million in aid to Israel, with the aim of replenishing funds for the Iron Dome antimissile defense system in the midst of the conflict between Israel and Hamas.

It was absolutely the right thing to do because America's national security

interests are directly tied to developments in the Middle East and specifically to Israel's own security. Strategic cooperation between the U.S. and Israel is vital to the well-being of both countries.

The simple truth is, throughout history, Israel has made numerous concessions in the pursuit of peace while seeking only the right to exist. The country is a beacon of democracy in a sea of violence and hostility, and its ability to function and defend itself against terrorism is in no small part due to the support from the United States.

GAS TAX PRESS CONFERENCE

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, I introduced the first gas tax increase in 21 years. The only thing that has changed in that year is that the need is greater and the path forward is even easier. Everyone knows that America is falling apart and falling behind while gas prices have dropped dramatically.

I am joined this afternoon by Ronald Reagan who 32 years ago, on Thanksgiving, made a powerful radio address, explaining why he more than doubled the gas tax—actually, a user fee, he pointed out. The same speech could and should be made by President Obama tomorrow.

I urge you, my colleagues, to join me and Ronald Reagan in fixing the bankrupt highway trust fund, increasing the gas tax so we can rebuild and renew America and put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs all across this great land.

With the need getting worse and gas prices falling, there will never be a better time. All it takes is a little leadership and courage from the President and Congress.

THE ABLE ACT

(Ms. JENKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the ABLE Act.

I am a cosponsor of this bill because I believe that we need to make it easier for families with individuals with disabilities to save money for their care and to not be penalized for doing so. This legislation also makes an important improvement to 529 plans that will give parents more control over their children's savings.

It is rare for a bill to gain as much bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate as the ABLE Act has. This is because advocates for the ABLE Act have worked tirelessly over the

past several years to ensure that it crosses the finish line.

I am pleased that many of them are here today, and I congratulate them on their hard work.

HONORING ENI FALEOMAVAEGA

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor my colleague and friend, Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa.

ENI has served on Capitol Hill for nearly four decades, starting as a congressional staff member and eventually being elected to Congress for 13 straight terms.

Throughout his distinguished career, ENI has broken many barriers. He is the first Asian Pacific American ever to chair the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and he is the longest-serving Samoan Member of Congress. He is also a Vietnam war veteran; an author; a musician; and a devoted husband, father, and grandfather.

Over the years, I have had the privilege to work with ENI through the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and I have witnessed firsthand his unwavering commitment to the well-being of his constituents and to the broader Asian Pacific American community.

Thank you, ENI, for your lifetime of leadership and service. I wish you all the best.

IN TRIBUTE TO MARION RAMSEY

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the retirement of Marion Ramsey of Rogers, Arkansas, and the closing of her business, Marion's Donuts, that became part of my daily routine 35 years ago.

The "doughnut shop," as I affectionately called it, was my favorite place to catch up on the latest city news—oftentimes, just plain ole gossip—and hear about the aches and pains and the latest trials and tribulations of those who frequented the establishment over time.

I have taken my boys there since birth, and it was nostalgic for all three of them to join me last Sunday, her last day of business, for old times' sake.

The Bible tells us there is a season for everything. I am sad that the "season" has come and gone for Marion's Donuts because, while I will find another place for my morning coffee, I am not sure how I will fill the void on the friendships forged down through the years.

Enjoy your retirement, Marion. Your customers are grateful for our time together.

PEARL HARBOR DAY

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, December 7, is the 73rd anniversary of the attack on the American naval base at Pearl Harbor. That day, over 2,000 American soldiers and sailors lost their lives, and another 1,000 were wounded.

South Buffalo native, Army Corporal Earl Wickett, witnessed the horrors of that day; fought bravely for this Nation; and was fortunate to make it back, raise a family, and serve his community as a Buffalo firefighter. Sadly, Earl passed away this year, but his stories and the bravery of all of those who served that day must always be remembered.

On Sunday, West Seneca American Legion Post 735 will be among those recognizing Pearl Harbor Day and honoring the promise to never forget the sacrifices and service of those who were there on that day.

Today, I join them and others in paying tribute to all of those who faced the unthinkable at Pearl Harbor, to survivors, like Earl Wickett, and to the many who never made it back.

THE ABLE ACT

(Mr. FLEISCHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the ABLE Act, with over 380 cosponsors.

It is a wonderful piece of legislation that is going to help American families, and there is a key provision of this act which is going to fix a broken problem. I came to Congress to fix broken problems with commonsense solutions.

Earlier this year, this body, the Senate, and the President passed the water resources bill, which fundamentally fixed the problem of the inland waterway trust fund, but it was still underfunded.

I want to thank colleagues on both sides of this House for working with me—for working hard—to get an industry-supported user fee of 9 cents. What that will mean is that locks like the Chickamauga Lock in Chattanooga, which is near and dear to our district, and locks all over this country will now be able to be properly funded in the way in which they were intended.

Together, we can work hard to fix these problems. I urge the support of the ABLE Act, and I thank my colleagues for working hard to support this industry-supported user fee.

□ 1215

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, more than 18 months ago, the Senate passed a comprehensive and bipartisan immigration bill that would strengthen neighborhoods across the country, further secure our borders, inject certainty into our economy, boost our STEM and tech community, create jobs, protect employers, keep families together, our deficit would be reduced by nearly \$1 trillion, and fix our Nation's broken immigration system. That was 18 months ago.

More than a year ago, we introduced H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, which would have moved comprehensive immigration reform forward, a debate so far that has been dominated by partisan politics and obstruction.

All we are asking for is the chance to vote on the bill in this body, a simple up-or-down vote. That is all we ask. We are running out of time to act on immigration reform and pass legislation that an overwhelming majority of Americans have asked the House to approve for more than a year.

Again, I ask this body to put the interests of the country above those of party politics and give H.R. 15 the up-or-down vote it truly deserves.

MCKINNEY, NUMBER 1 SMALL CITY IN AMERICA

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Money magazine recently ranked America's best small cities. 781 cities were evaluated. The 35 top-scoring cities were visited by reporters. And wouldn't you know it, McKinney, Texas, was ranked number one as the best place in the United States to live.

It is worth noting that McKinney joined the list in 2008 and has steadily climbed each year. As Money magazine stated: "Underlying McKinney's homey southern charm is a thoroughly modern city. The area is a hotbed for growth-industry jobs."

McKinney certainly embodies its motto, "Unique by Nature." It is both a business-friendly and family-friendly place. And perhaps most significant, it places emphasis on both preserving history and ensuring a vibrant future.

I am proud to represent McKinney and the Third District of Texas. McKinney deserves this honor. It is my privilege to recognize their outstanding service to the community.

POLICE BODY CAMERAS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, hands up; don't shoot.

The recent events in Ferguson have brought to light many of the problems that still exist in our Nation: racial divides, mistrust of law enforcement, a judicial system that disproportionately incarcerates black men, and the unfortunate way that we view one another—not as Americans, but as us versus them.

I am encouraged by President Obama's initiative that will help purchase body cameras for police departments. This will increase accountability of law enforcement, and it will protect our officers by deterring wrongdoing.

I am proud that the two cities in my district, Newark and Jersey City, are taking the lead to acquire cameras for their police officers, because members of the community deserve to feel law enforcement is protecting them and not out to get them; and, in turn, our protectors deserve to be protected as well. This will be a step in the right direction.

TRIBUTE TO AIR FORCE CAPTAIN WILLIAM H. DUBOIS

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Air Force Captain William H. DuBois, whose life was tragically lost in support of Operation Inherent Resolve on December 1, 2014. Captain DuBois grew up in New Castle, Colorado.

On Monday, December 1, 2014, Captain DuBois took off from a U.S. coalition air base for a combat mission in Operation Inherent Resolve, when the F-16 he was flying began to experience mechanical problems. Captain DuBois attempted to return to the air base and was unable to eject before his plane crashed.

Captain DuBois was only 30 years old and was recently married to his wife, Ashley. The number of lives touched by this courageous young man are innumerable, and the love and memories he shared with his friends and family still linger today.

The death of Captain DuBois is an unfortunate reminder of the dangers our servicemen and -women face every day as they defend our country, as well as many sacrifices made to protect freedoms and our way of life.

Captain DuBois served his country with great distinction and honor, something that he always had dreamed of. He will be greatly missed by his family, friends, and his squadron.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Captain William H. DuBois. His dedication to our country and the way he selflessly lived his life serve as an inspiration to a grateful Nation as well as the State of Colorado.

PORT NEGOTIATIONS

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the hardworking men and women employed at our west coast ports who are responsible for two-thirds of our Nation's international trade. Their hard work supports 5 million jobs nationwide and is the lifeblood of our economy.

But they have been working for months without a contract and without knowing what the future holds for them. Contract negotiations are ongoing, and I encourage both sides to stay at the table. Failure to resolve their differences could be traumatic for our economy, and I sincerely hope that it will not come to that.

Many people are aware that we still have congestion issues at our ports. There are clearly underlying problems that must be addressed, but it is important to keep in mind that these issues will still exist even if a contract agreement is reached today.

Our ports drive our Nation's economy, and it is critical that we find solutions to the congestion issues at our ports and in our overall freight network.

NATIONAL MINERS DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the proud grandson of Oscar Thompson, a surface miner, to recognize National Miners Day, which is celebrated on December 6. On this day, we recognize the important role our Nation's miners continue to play across the Nation.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, my home State, the mining industry—the coal industry, in particular—is a vital contributor to the State's economy, with direct, indirect, and induced impacts that are responsible for family-sustaining jobs and billions in economic output. In 2011, Pennsylvania produced more than 67 million tons of coal from close to 500 mines, making it the fourth-largest producer of coal and the second-largest producer of electricity among all the States.

Today, coal is used to generate more electricity than any other resource in Pennsylvania, being responsible for 44 percent of the State's electricity generation.

On National Miners Day, we commemorate the work and sacrifice of miners, past and present, and recognize the contributions they make to our economy, the Nation's energy security, and our shared prosperity.

THE AMOS HOUSE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the work of Amos House and its mission to end hunger and homelessness in my home State of Rhode Island. Having just celebrated Thanksgiving, it is a good reminder of how important it is to remember those who are less fortunate and to give back to the communities we live in.

Led by Eileen Hayes, Amos House and its dedicated staff give back to Rhode Island every single day and provide life-giving services to those most in need. Since its founding in 1976, Amos House has grown from a small soup kitchen to a vibrant and essential multiservice center. This week I was proud to help break ground on a new project that will give Amos House a new home and help this wonderful organization further its important work.

Amos House serves hundreds of meals daily to the hungry, provides shelter for homeless men and women, substance abuse counseling, job training, and money management classes. I salute Amos House, Eileen, and her hardworking staff for the important contributions they make to those most in need in my home State of Rhode Island.

CELEBRATING FORMER REPRESENTATIVE RALPH REGULA'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. GIBBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th birthday of former Representative Ralph Regula.

Ralph Straus Regula was born in Beach City, Ohio, on December 3, 1924. Prior to his election to Congress, Mr. Regula served in the United States Navy; worked as a schoolteacher and a principal in Stark County schools; and served in the Ohio State House, Senate, and on the Ohio State Board of Education. In 1973, Mr. Regula was elected to Congress and served 18 consecutive terms, until his retirement in 2009.

During his tenure in Congress, Mr. Regula served as chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, where he worked across party lines to improve educational opportunities, workforce training programs, and health care. He was a passionate advocate for research and the advancement of science.

Congressman Regula billed himself a "regular" guy. He was the son of a dairy farmer and part of a high school graduating class of only 25, where he developed a strong work ethic and love of community. Ralph loved serving here because he cared about people and helping improve the quality of their

lives. In this House, he was a pragmatic leader willing to find solutions to tough problems.

I have personally known Ralph for over three decades and have many fond memories meeting with him both here and back in Ohio as my Congressman. Like many others, I have learned so much from Congressman Ralph Regula over the years. To that, I say thank you.

Today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the great life and career of Mr. Ralph Regula, wishing him a very happy 90th birthday.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Affordable Care Act. One year after implementing the health care exchanges, the number of uninsured in this country has decreased dramatically. North Carolina had one of the top five highest enrollments; and in my congressional district alone, the number of uninsured has declined by 14 percent, not to mention the incredible impact this legislation has had on the lives of working families.

Through the Affordable Care Act, 208,000 individuals in my congressional district now have access to health insurance. Young adults and college students can now stay on their parents' plans until age 26, which resulted in nearly 10,000 young adults retaining health insurance in my congressional district. Additionally, seniors in my district have received Medicare part D prescription drug discounts worth \$11.1 million, and being a woman is no longer considered a preexisting condition.

The Affordable Care Act has had a dramatic effect on unemployment, creating 9.6 million private sector jobs. My congressional district's unemployment rate is 13.9 percent. So, for me, this is not only about health, but jobs and our economy.

These tangible benefits cannot be ignored. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to end talks of repeal and, instead, work with Democrats to strengthen the law to provide even greater access to health insurance. States like North Carolina must reconsider their decision to reject the Medicaid expansion. This purely political decision has had real effects, leaving half a million North Carolinians uninsured. As legislators, we should make the lives of our constituents better; and, Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is making the lives of our citizens better.

So I urge folks in my congressional district and around the country to take advantage of the open enrollment period and get insured. There are 77 new

insurers offering coverage in 2015, and the deadline to sign up is February 15, 2015. Let's continue the progress that the Affordable Care Act has made and get more people covered.

AIR REFUELING GROUP RAINCROSS AWARD

(Mr. POMPEO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the 931st Air Refueling Group—McConnell Air Force Base's reserve unit—on receiving the Raincross Trophy, which recognizes it as the best unit in the 4th Air Force.

I have spent a lot of time with the fantastic airmen out of McConnell, and I am not surprised, but I am extremely pleased to see that they have been granted this outstanding award. It is only fitting that the 931st has been selected as the first reserve unit in the Air Force to fly and maintain America's new KC-46 tankers. McConnell-based tankers flew nearly half of all missions of Air Mobility Command's total KC-135 flying hours over the past year, and many of this unit's soldiers and airmen were deployed in support of operations all around the world.

This award is a wonderful recognition of the hard work of Colonel Mark Larson, Chief Master Sergeant Kathleen E. Lowman, and all the men and women of the 931st Air Refueling Group.

I know I speak for all Kansans in saying we are proud of the 931st and the entire McConnell family. November Kilo Alpha Whiskey Tango Golf.

NATIONAL 3-D PRINTING DAY

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my resolution to establish December 3 as National 3-D Printing Day. As an entrepreneur, myself, who built a manufacturing company from the ground up, I know firsthand how invaluable this technology is. Advances in 3-D printing are creating unprecedented opportunities for entrepreneurs and manufacturers to develop new products and bring their ideas to life.

When I think of the long hours that my brother and I spent in the machine shop building parts for our first prototype, parts that could now be built quickly and easily with 3-D printing, it makes me envious of today's startups.

From biotechnology to food production to advanced manufacturing, 3-D printing is creating endless opportunities for innovation. Additionally, 3-D printing technology is a great teaching tool for students. There is nothing like

the look of awe on students' faces as they watch a 3-D printer build something that they designed, something that started out as their idea that they can now hold in their hand. It is also a great way of teaching them the value of coordinate geometry.

So it is critical that we continue to develop this technology and recognize the importance in the modern economy and in inspiring the next generation to pursue careers in STEM and advanced manufacturing.

Again, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing December 3 as National 3-D Printing Day.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING TOM BERTRAND AS THE 2015 ILLINOIS SUPER- INTENDENT OF THE YEAR

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tom Bertrand as the 2015 Illinois Superintendent of the Year. For the last 13 years, Mr. Bertrand has served as superintendent of the Rochester Community Unit District in Rochester, Illinois. In his time with Rochester, he has served the school district as a teacher, coach, principal, and assistant superintendent before taking on his current role.

His dedication to the students and his many accomplishments in his time with the Rochester district make him a deserving recipient of this award. He has developed a nationally recognized anti-bullying program and has worked to improve the use of technology in the school district by both students and faculty.

I am proud to represent Mr. Bertrand and the Rochester school district. His commitment to his students is something to be recognized. I thank him for his service to the district and his dedication to public education.

Mr. Bertrand, congratulations on being named the 2015 Illinois Superintendent of the Year.

EXPANDING EDUCATION SUPPORT FOR VETERANS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, as a country, we have a responsibility to help our veterans transition back from active military duty by giving them the tools they need to succeed in civilian life.

Sadly, far too many of the men and women who have sacrificed so much on our behalf return home to find they must struggle to get housing, secure employment, and provide for them-

selves and their families. We can and must do better. That is why I am proud to partner with my Republican colleague, DAVID MCKINLEY, to introduce legislation that honors our commitment by providing resources to help veterans pursue higher education and gain the skills and training they need to succeed in STEM careers.

The ability to analyze, communicate, and motivate—honed during their military training—makes veterans ideal candidates in the fields related to science, technology, math, and engineering. With growth in the STEM fields for jobs that are expected to outpace other professions in the next two decades, this legislation will help to meet the demands for the high-skilled workforce that we need to be competitive in the global economy.

So I would urge my colleagues to join Mr. MCKINLEY and me in upholding our promise to our Nation's heroes and support the GI Bill STEM Extension Act of 2014.

SUPPORTING ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I am all too familiar with Alzheimer's, having lost my mom to complications from this dreadful disease nearly 4 years ago.

The Alzheimer's Association reports that over 5 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's, including nearly half a million in my home State of Florida.

Alzheimer's not only impacts seniors and their families, it is costing our Nation billions of dollars every year, with only a fraction of 1 percent of these costs spent on research toward better treatment options and potential cures. Our seniors, their loved ones, and their caregivers deserve better. American taxpayers deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to go to alz.org and learn more about Alzheimer's and how new research can help make a big difference in improving the lives of patients, their families, and America's budget.

ISRAEL

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about my concern for the safety and security of Israel, the Middle East, and the U.S.

Negotiations for Iran to end its pursuit of a nuclear weapon were recently extended without assurances that Iran would slow or abandon this program. This delay tactic also allows Iran to escape many economic sanctions. This

should be of grave concern to Americans who care about the regional security of the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the administration's goals and intent during these negotiations, but I urge that we continue to utilize all methods of influence throughout negotiations. We must fully use diplomacy, legal sanctions, and economic pressure to move toward a peaceful and secure situation in this critically important region to the world and our country.

THE THREAT OF A NUCLEAR IRAN

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express concern over the state of our negotiations with Iran and the threat of Iranian nuclear capability.

I am disappointed and extremely concerned with the extension of negotiations over Iran's nuclear program and the continued relaxing of economic sanctions against Tehran. Every day that we ease sanctions or fail to apply new ones is another day Iran races toward a nuclear weapons capability.

Iran currently has 10,000 operational centrifuges, each working hard toward a nuclear Iran. As the administration continues to cede ground in this area of negotiations, we must remember that Iran has threatened America and called for the total annihilation of our ally, Israel. The instability and unrest in this region would only be compounded should Iran achieve its goals.

Sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place, and these sanctions must be strengthened to convince them to stop their treacherous quest for nuclear weapons. I believe Congress must put renewed pressure on Iran. The Senate needs to pass the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act before going home. We cannot allow Iran to hold the world hostage with nuclear weapons. Now is the time to act.

NAHASDA

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, this body reauthorized the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, a true bipartisan effort and, more importantly, the right thing to do for all our Native people.

In it we reauthorized title 8, which addressed the Native people of my State, the Native Hawaiians. NAHASDA had expired for Native Hawaiians in 2005, and it has taken almost 10 years to make this right. Now they are authorized to the year 2019.

Home, land, or "Aina," as it is called in Hawaiian, is critical to all people, especially our Native people. This Con-

gress in 1921 passed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, and this reauthorization will bring us closer to meeting the dreams of those who are 50 percent blood quantum or more.

I thank my colleagues for the voice vote and ask them to join me in asking the Senate to pass this reauthorization for housing assistance for all Native people.

ISIL THREATENS AMERICAN MILITARY FAMILIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday both the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security issued warnings to American military personnel regarding possible attacks by ISIL here at home. Sadly, this comes after Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson incorrectly announced in New York on September 14, "At present we have no credible information that ISIS is planning to attack the homeland of the United States." The Secretary was wrong on the attacks, and equally, he has been wrong on the unconstitutional review of illegal aliens, which destroys jobs.

I appreciate yesterday national radio talk show host Kim Komando, the Digital Pro, who restated the FBI and DHS warnings of ISIS threats here in America to military families. She is a dedicated friend of the military.

The President should identify and stop the grotesque threats to conduct mass murder of American military families on U.S. soil.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President should take action to never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to the family of Captain William H. DuBois of Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina.

LONG-TERM TAX POLICIES

(Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, over the Thanksgiving holiday, I was able to spend time not only with my extended family but with the families of my district. And it struck me—not for the first time—how disconnected much of the conversation in Washington is from the concerns of typical families.

At the beginning of this week, we had an opportunity for a bipartisan agreement on making tax credits for working families permanent. But that has been derailed by cynical posturing.

In 2012, the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit helped lift 10.1 million people out of poverty. These programs work for working families.

But instead of voting on a broader bill today to help working families and businesses alike, we are kicking the can down the road once again. This is a process that benefits the status quo and holds the needs of working families hostage to another time when it is politically convenient—and it is no way to govern.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue working towards long-term tax policies that will help families who cannot afford to wait any longer for Congress to do right by them.

FISCAL INSANITY

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I am discouraged to stand here and to announce a milestone that we reached recently, a very discouraging milestone, and that was in the last few days we have now surpassed \$18 trillion in debt. If you want to know how much money that is, take every American taxpayer, from the young man who just got his first job to every mother and father who are struggling to take care of their families, and give them a bill for \$150,000. It is simply unsustainable.

If we continue down this current path, we will commit fiscal national suicide by our spending and our debt. Remember, a nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the security of its people, a nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the needy among them, and a nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the children in the next generation.

Now is the time to restore fiscal sanity. We must have the courage to reclaim the American Dream. Tax reform, entitlement reform, and a balanced budget—we must have the courage to make these a reality. But we can fix this. We must fix this. I hope we will have the courage to do this, even if it is hard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

HOWARD COBLE COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 5769) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5769

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is the following:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Authorized levels of military strength and training.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

Sec. 201. Commissioned officers.

Sec. 202. Commandant; appointment.

Sec. 203. Prevention and response workforces.

Sec. 204. Centers of expertise.

Sec. 205. Penalties.

Sec. 206. Agreements.

Sec. 207. Tuition assistance program coverage of textbooks and other educational materials.

Sec. 208. Coast Guard housing.

Sec. 209. Lease authority.

Sec. 210. Notification of certain determinations.

Sec. 211. Annual Board of Visitors.

Sec. 212. Flag officers.

Sec. 213. Repeal of limitation on medals of honor.

Sec. 214. Coast Guard family support and child care.

Sec. 215. Mission need statement.

Sec. 216. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request.

Sec. 217. Inventory of real property.

Sec. 218. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees.

Sec. 219. Active duty for emergency augmentation of regular forces.

Sec. 220. Acquisition workforce expedited hiring authority.

Sec. 221. Coast Guard administrative savings.

Sec. 222. Technical corrections to title 14.

Sec. 223. Multiyear procurement authority for Offshore Patrol Cutters.

Sec. 224. Maintaining Medium Endurance Cutter mission capability.

Sec. 225. Aviation capability in the Great Lakes region.

Sec. 226. Gaps in writings on Coast Guard history.

Sec. 227. Officer evaluation reports.

Sec. 228. Improved safety information for vessels.

Sec. 229. E-LORAN.

Sec. 230. Analysis of resource deficiencies with respect to maritime border security.

Sec. 231. Modernization of National Distress and Response System.

Sec. 232. Report reconciling maintenance and operational priorities on the Missouri River.

Sec. 233. Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy assessment.

TITLE III—SHIPPING AND NAVIGATION

Sec. 301. Repeal.

Sec. 302. Donation of historical property.

Sec. 303. Small shipyards.

Sec. 304. Drug testing reporting.

Sec. 305. Opportunities for sea service veterans.

Sec. 306. Clarification of high-risk waters.

Sec. 307. Technical corrections.

Sec. 308. Report.

Sec. 309. Fishing safety grant programs.

Sec. 310. Establishment of Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee.

Sec. 311. Travel and subsistence costs for prevention services.

Sec. 312. Prompt intergovernmental notice of marine casualties.

Sec. 313. Area Contingency Plans.

Sec. 314. International ice patrol reform.

Sec. 315. Offshore supply vessel third-party inspection.

Sec. 316. Watches.

Sec. 317. Coast Guard response plan requirements.

Sec. 318. Regional Citizens' Advisory Council.

Sec. 319. Uninspected passenger vessels in the United States Virgin Islands.

Sec. 320. Treatment of abandoned seafarers.

Sec. 321. Enforcement.

Sec. 322. Coast Guard regulations.

Sec. 323. Website.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Sec. 401. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 402. Award of reparations.

Sec. 403. Terms of Commissioners.

TITLE V—ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION

Sec. 501. Arctic maritime transportation.

Sec. 502. Arctic maritime domain awareness.

Sec. 503. IMO Polar Code negotiations.

Sec. 504. Forward operating facilities.

Sec. 505. Icebreakers.

Sec. 506. Icebreaking in polar regions.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 601. Distant water tuna fleet.

Sec. 602. Extension of moratorium.

Sec. 603. National maritime strategy.

Sec. 604. Waivers.

Sec. 605. Competition by United States flag vessels.

Sec. 606. Vessel requirements for notices of arrival and departure and automatic identification system.

Sec. 607. Conveyance of Coast Guard property in Rochester, New York.

Sec. 608. Conveyance of certain property in Gig Harbor, Washington.

Sec. 609. Vessel determination.

Sec. 610. Safe vessel operation in Thunder Bay.

Sec. 611. Parking facilities.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard as follows:

(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, \$6,981,036,000.

(2) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, \$1,546,448,000, to remain available until expended.

(3) For the Coast Guard Reserve program, including personnel and training costs, equipment, and services, \$140,016,000.

(4) For environmental compliance and restoration of Coast Guard vessels, aircraft, and facilities (other than parts and equipment associated with operation and maintenance),

\$16,701,000, to remain available until expended.

(5) To the Commandant of the Coast Guard for research, development, test, and evaluation of technologies, materials, and human factors directly related to improving the performance of the Coast Guard's mission with respect to search and rescue, aids to navigation, marine safety, marine environmental protection, enforcement of laws and treaties, ice operations, oceanographic research, and defense readiness, \$19,890,000.

(6) For alteration or removal of bridges over navigable waters of the United States constituting obstructions to navigation, and for personnel and administrative costs associated with the Alteration of Bridges Program, \$16,000,000.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND TRAINING.

(a) ACTIVE DUTY STRENGTH.—The Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active duty personnel of 43,000 for fiscal year 2015.

(b) MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS.—The Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads for fiscal year 2015 as follows:

(1) For recruit and special training, 2,500 student years.

(2) For flight training, 165 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions, 350 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition, 1,200 student years.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

SEC. 201. COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Section 42(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “7,200” and inserting “6,900”.

SEC. 202. COMMANDANT; APPOINTMENT.

Section 44 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: “The term of an appointment, and any reappointment, shall begin on June 1 of the appropriate year and end on May 31 of the appropriate year, except that, in the event of death, retirement, resignation, or reassignment, or when the needs of the Service demand, the Secretary may alter the date on which a term begins or ends if the alteration does not result in the term exceeding a period of 4 years.”.

SEC. 203. PREVENTION AND RESPONSE WORKFORCES.

Section 57 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2) by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) waterways operations manager shall have knowledge, skill, and practical experience with respect to marine transportation system management; or

“(5) port and facility safety and security specialist shall have knowledge, skill, and practical experience with respect to the safety, security, and environmental protection responsibilities associated with maritime ports and facilities.”;

(2) in subsection (c) by striking “or marine safety engineer” and inserting “marine safety engineer, waterways operations manager, or port and facility safety and security specialist”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(2) by striking “investigator or marine safety engineer.” and inserting “investigator, marine safety engineer, waterways operations manager, or port and facility safety and security specialist.”.

SEC. 204. CENTERS OF EXPERTISE.

Section 58(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) MISSIONS.—Any center established under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) promote, facilitate, and conduct—

“(A) education;

“(B) training; and

“(C) activities authorized under section 93(a)(4);

“(2) be a repository of information on operations, practices, and resources related to the mission for which the center was established; and

“(3) perform and support the mission for which the center was established.”.

SEC. 205. PENALTIES.

(a) AIDS TO NAVIGATION AND FALSE DISTRESS MESSAGES.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 83 by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$1,500”;

(2) in section 84 by striking “\$500” and inserting “\$1,500”;

(3) in section 85 by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$1,500”; and

(4) in section 88(c)(2) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”.

(b) UNAUTHORIZED USE OF WORDS “COAST GUARD”.—Section 639 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$1,000” and inserting “\$10,000”.

SEC. 206. AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 93(a)(4) of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “, investigate” and inserting “and investigate”; and

(2) by striking “, and cooperate and coordinate such activities with other Government agencies and with private agencies”.

(b) AUTHORITY.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 102. Agreements

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out section 93(a)(4), the Commandant may—

“(1) enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, and other agreements with—

“(A) Federal entities;

“(B) other public or private entities in the United States, including academic entities; and

“(C) foreign governments with the concurrence of the Secretary of State; and

“(2) impose on and collect from an entity subject to an agreement or contract under paragraph (1) a fee to assist with expenses incurred in carrying out such section.

“(b) DEPOSIT AND USE OF FEES.—Fees collected under this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts. The fees may be used, to the extent provided in advance in an appropriation law, only to carry out activities under section 93(a)(4).”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“102. Agreements.”.

SEC. 207. TUITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COVERAGE OF TEXTBOOKS AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS.

Section 93(a)(7) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and the textbooks, manuals, and other materials required as part of such training or course of instruction” after “correspondence courses”.

SEC. 208. COAST GUARD HOUSING.

(a) COMMANDANT; GENERAL POWERS.—Section 93(a)(13) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Treasury” and inserting “the fund established under section 687”.

(b) LIGHTHOUSE PROPERTY.—Section 672a(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Treasury” and inserting “the fund established under section 687”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 687(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Monies received under section 93(a)(13).

“(5) Amounts received under section 672a(b).”.

SEC. 209. LEASE AUTHORITY.

Section 93 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LEASING OF TIDELANDS AND SUBMERGED LANDS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—The Commandant may lease under subsection (a)(13) submerged lands and tidelands under the control of the Coast Guard without regard to the limitation under that subsection with respect to lease duration.

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Commandant may lease submerged lands and tidelands under paragraph (1) only if—

“(A) lease payments are—

“(i) received exclusively in the form of cash;

“(ii) equal to the fair market value of the use of the leased submerged lands or tidelands for the period during which such lands are leased, as determined by the Commandant; and

“(iii) deposited in the fund established under section 687; and

“(B) the lease does not provide authority to or commit the Coast Guard to use or support any improvements to such submerged lands or tidelands, or obtain goods or services from the lessee.”.

SEC. 210. NOTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 103. Notification of certain determinations

“(a) IN GENERAL.—At least 90 days prior to making a final determination that a waterway, or a portion thereof, is navigable for purposes of the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard, the Commandant shall provide notification regarding the proposed determination to—

“(1) the Governor of each State in which such waterway, or portion thereof, is located;

“(2) the public; and

“(3) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(b) CONTENT REQUIREMENT.—Each notification provided under subsection (a) to an entity specified in paragraph (3) of that subsection shall include—

“(1) an analysis of whether vessels operating on the waterway, or portion thereof, subject to the proposed determination are subject to inspection or similar regulation by State or local officials;

“(2) an analysis of whether operators of commercial vessels on such waterway, or portion thereof, are subject to licensing or similar regulation by State or local officials; and

“(3) an estimate of the annual costs that the Coast Guard may incur in conducting operations on such waterway, or portion thereof.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“103. Notification of certain determinations.”.

SEC. 211. ANNUAL BOARD OF VISITORS.

Section 194 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 194. Annual Board of Visitors

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy is established to review and make recommendations on the operation of the Academy.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The membership of the Board shall consist of the following:

“(A) The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, or the chairman’s designee.

“(B) The chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, or the chairman’s designee.

“(C) 3 Members of the Senate designated by the Vice President.

“(D) 4 Members of the House of Representatives designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

“(E) 6 individuals designated by the President.

“(2) LENGTH OF SERVICE.—

“(A) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—A Member of Congress designated under subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) as a member of the Board shall be designated as a member in the First Session of a Congress and serve for the duration of that Congress.

“(B) INDIVIDUALS DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT.—Each individual designated by the President under subparagraph (E) of paragraph (1) shall serve as a member of the Board for 3 years, except that any such member whose term of office has expired shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

“(3) DEATH OR RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.—If a member of the Board dies or resigns, a successor shall be designated for any unexpired portion of the term of the member by the official who designated the member.

“(c) ACADEMY VISITS.—

“(1) ANNUAL VISIT.—The Board shall visit the Academy annually to review the operation of the Academy.

“(2) ADDITIONAL VISITS.—With the approval of the Secretary, the Board or individual members of the Board may make other visits to the Academy in connection with the duties of the Board or to consult with the Superintendent of the Academy.

“(d) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The Board shall review, with respect to the Academy—

“(1) the state of morale and discipline;

“(2) the curriculum;

“(3) instruction;

“(4) physical equipment;

“(5) fiscal affairs; and

“(6) other matters relating to the Academy that the Board determines appropriate.

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of an annual visit of the Board under subsection (c)(1), the Board shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the actions of the Board during such visit and the recommendations of the Board pertaining to the Academy.

“(f) ADVISORS.—If approved by the Secretary, the Board may consult with advisors in carrying out this section.

“(g) REIMBURSEMENT.—Each member of the Board and each adviser consulted by the Board under subsection (f) shall be reimbursed, to the extent permitted by law, by

the Coast Guard for actual expenses incurred while engaged in duties as a member or adviser.”.

SEC. 212. FLAG OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 295 the following:

“§ 296. Flag officers

“During any period in which the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, section 1216(d) of title 10 does not apply with respect to flag officers of the Coast Guard.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 295 the following:

“296. Flag officers.”.

SEC. 213. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON MEDALS OF HONOR.

Section 494 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “medal of honor,” each place it appears.

SEC. 214. COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT AND CHILD CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after chapter 13 the following:

“CHAPTER 14—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT AND CHILD CARE

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“Sec.

“531. Work-life policies and programs.

“532. Surveys of Coast Guard families.

“SUBCHAPTER II—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT

“542. Education and training opportunities for Coast Guard spouses.

“543. Youth sponsorship initiatives.

“SUBCHAPTER III—COAST GUARD CHILD CARE

“551. Definitions.

“553. Child development center standards and inspections.

“554. Child development center employees.

“555. Parent partnerships with child development centers.

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“§ 531. Work-life policies and programs

“The Commandant is authorized—

“(1) to establish an office for the purpose of developing, promulgating, and coordinating policies, programs, and activities related to the families of Coast Guard members;

“(2) to implement and oversee policies, programs, and activities described in paragraph (1) as the Commandant considers necessary; and

“(3) to perform such other duties as the Commandant considers necessary.

“§ 532. Surveys of Coast Guard families

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The Commandant, in order to determine the effectiveness of Federal policies, programs, and activities related to the families of Coast Guard members, may survey—

“(1) any Coast Guard member;

“(2) any retired Coast Guard member;

“(3) the immediate family of any Coast Guard member or retired Coast Guard member; and

“(4) any survivor of a deceased Coast Guard member.

“(b) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—Participation in any survey conducted under subsection (a) shall be voluntary.

“(c) FEDERAL RECORDKEEPING.—Each person surveyed under subsection (a) shall be considered an employee of the United States for purposes of section 3502(3)(A)(i) of title 44.

“SUBCHAPTER II—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT

“§ 542. Education and training opportunities for Coast Guard spouses

“(a) TUITION ASSISTANCE.—The Commandant may provide, subject to the availability of appropriations, tuition assistance to an eligible spouse to facilitate the acquisition of—

“(1) education and training required for a degree or credential at an accredited college, university, or technical school in the United States that expands employment and portable career opportunities for the spouse; or

“(2) education prerequisites and a professional license or credential required, by a government or government-sanctioned licensing body, for an occupation that expands employment and portable career opportunities for the spouse.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) ELIGIBLE SPOUSE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible spouse’ means the spouse of a member of the Coast Guard who is serving on active duty and includes a spouse who receives transitional compensation under section 1059 of title 10.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘eligible spouse’ does not include a person who—

“(i) is married to, but legally separated from, a member of the Coast Guard under a court order or statute of any State or territorial possession of the United States; or

“(ii) is eligible for tuition assistance as a member of the Armed Forces.

“(2) PORTABLE CAREER.—The term ‘portable career’ includes an occupation that requires education, training, or both that results in a credential that is recognized by an industry, profession, or specific type of business.

“§ 543. Youth sponsorship initiatives

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant is authorized to establish, within any Coast Guard unit, an initiative to help integrate into new surroundings the dependent children of members of the Coast Guard who received permanent change of station orders.

“(b) DESCRIPTION OF INITIATIVE.—An initiative established under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) provide for the involvement of a dependent child of a member of the Coast Guard in the dependent child’s new Coast Guard community; and

“(2) primarily focus on preteen and teen-aged children.

“(c) AUTHORITY.—In carrying out an initiative under subsection (a), the Commandant may—

“(1) provide to a dependent child of a member of the Coast Guard information on youth programs and activities available in the dependent child’s new Coast Guard community; and

“(2) enter into agreements with nonprofit entities to provide youth programs and activities to such child.

“SUBCHAPTER III—COAST GUARD CHILD CARE

“§ 551. Definitions

“In this subchapter, the following definitions apply:

“(1) CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.—The term ‘child abuse and neglect’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note).

“(2) CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘child development center employee’ means a civilian employee of the Coast Guard who is employed to work in

a Coast Guard child development center without regard to whether the employee is paid from appropriated or nonappropriated funds.

“(3) COAST GUARD CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The term ‘Coast Guard child development center’ means a facility on Coast Guard property or on property under the jurisdiction of the commander of a Coast Guard unit at which child care services are provided for members of the Coast Guard.

“(4) COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITION.—The term ‘competitive service position’ means a position in the competitive service (as defined in section 2102 of title 5).

“(5) FAMILY HOME DAYCARE.—The term ‘family home daycare’ means home-based child care services provided for a member of the Coast Guard by an individual who—

“(A) is certified by the Commandant as qualified to provide home-based child care services; and

“(B) provides home-based child care services on a regular basis in exchange for monetary compensation.

“§ 553. Child development center standards and inspections

“(a) STANDARDS.—The Commandant shall require each Coast Guard child development center to meet standards that the Commandant considers appropriate to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the children and employees at the center.

“(b) INSPECTIONS.—The Commandant shall provide for regular and unannounced inspections of each Coast Guard child development center to ensure compliance with this section.

“(c) NATIONAL REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall maintain and publicize a means by which an individual can report, with respect to a Coast Guard child development center or a family home daycare—

“(A) any suspected violation of—

“(i) standards established under subsection (a); or

“(ii) any other applicable law or standard;

“(B) suspected child abuse or neglect; or

“(C) any other deficiency.

“(2) ANONYMOUS REPORTING.—The Commandant shall ensure that an individual making a report pursuant to paragraph (1) may do so anonymously if so desired by the individual.

“(3) PROCEDURES.—The Commandant shall establish procedures for investigating reports made pursuant to paragraph (1).

“§ 554. Child development center employees

“(a) TRAINING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall establish a training program for Coast Guard child development center employees and satisfactory completion of the training program shall be a condition of employment for each employee of a Coast Guard child development center.

“(2) TIMING FOR NEW HIRES.—The Commandant shall require each employee of a Coast Guard child development center to complete the training program established under paragraph (1) not later than 6 months after the date on which the employee is hired.

“(3) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—The training program established under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, instruction with respect to—

“(A) early childhood development;

“(B) activities and disciplinary techniques appropriate to children of different ages;

“(C) child abuse and neglect prevention and detection; and

“(D) cardiopulmonary resuscitation and other emergency medical procedures.

“(4) USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS.—The Commandant may use Department of Defense training programs, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for purposes of this subsection.

“(b) TRAINING AND CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS.—

“(1) SPECIALIST REQUIRED.—The Commandant shall require that at least 1 employee at each Coast Guard child development center be a specialist in training and curriculum development with appropriate credentials and experience.

“(2) DUTIES.—The duties of the specialist described in paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) special teaching activities;

“(B) daily oversight and instruction of other child care employees;

“(C) daily assistance in the preparation of lesson plans;

“(D) assisting with child abuse and neglect prevention and detection; and

“(E) advising the director of the center on the performance of the other child care employees.

“(3) COMPETITIVE SERVICE.—Each specialist described in paragraph (1) shall be an employee in a competitive service position.

“§ 555. Parent partnerships with child development centers

“(a) PARENT BOARDS.—

“(1) FORMATION.—The Commandant shall require that there be formed at each Coast Guard child development center a board of parents, to be composed of parents of children attending the center.

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—Each board of parents formed under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) meet periodically with the staff of the center at which the board is formed and the commander of the unit served by the center, for the purpose of discussing problems and concerns; and

“(B) be responsible, together with the staff of the center, for coordinating any parent participation initiative established under subsection (b).

“(3) FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to a board of parents formed under paragraph (1).

“(b) PARENT PARTICIPATION INITIATIVE.—The Commandant is authorized to establish a parent participation initiative at each Coast Guard child development center to encourage and facilitate parent participation in educational and related activities at the center.”

(b) TRANSFER OF PROVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REIMBURSEMENT FOR ADOPTION EXPENSES.—Section 514 of title 14, United States Code, is redesignated as section 541 and transferred to appear before section 542 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(B) CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES.—Section 515 of title 14, United States Code—

(i) is redesignated as section 552 and transferred to appear after section 551 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section; and

(ii) is amended—

(I) in subsection (b)(2)(B) by inserting “and whether a family is participating in an initiative established under section 555(b)” after “family income”; and

(II) by striking subsections (c) and (e); and

(III) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(C) DEPENDENT SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Section 657 of title 14, United States Code—

(i) is redesignated as section 544 and transferred to appear after section 543 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section; and

(ii) is amended in subsection (a) by striking “Except as otherwise” and all that follows through “the Secretary may” and inserting “The Secretary may”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) PART I.—The analysis for part I of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 13 the following:

“14. Coast Guard Family Support and Child Care 531”.

(B) CHAPTER 13.—The analysis for chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to section 514; and

(ii) by striking the item relating to section 515.

(C) CHAPTER 14.—The analysis for chapter 14 of title 14, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, is amended by inserting—

(i) before the item relating to section 542 the following:

“541. Reimbursement for adoption expenses.”;

(ii) after the item relating to section 551 the following:

“552. Child development services.”; and

(iii) after the item relating to section 543 the following:

“544. Dependent school children.”.

(D) CHAPTER 17.—The analysis for chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 657.

(c) COMMANDANT; GENERAL POWERS.—Section 93(a)(7) of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting “, and to eligible spouses as defined under section 542,” after “Coast Guard”.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the amount of funds appropriated for a fiscal year for operating expenses related to Coast Guard child development services should not be less than the amount of the child development center fee receipts estimated to be collected by the Coast Guard during that fiscal year.

(2) CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER FEE RECEIPTS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “child development center fee receipts” means fees paid by members of the Coast Guard for child care services provided at Coast Guard child development centers.

SEC. 215. MISSION NEED STATEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 569 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 569. Mission need statement

“(a) IN GENERAL.—On the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for fiscal year 2016 under section 1105 of title 31, on the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for fiscal year 2019 under such section, and every 4 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an integrated major acquisition mission need statement.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) INTEGRATED MAJOR ACQUISITION MISSION NEED STATEMENT.—The term ‘integrated

major acquisition mission need statement’ means a document that—

“(A) identifies current and projected gaps in Coast Guard mission capabilities using mission hour targets;

“(B) explains how each major acquisition program addresses gaps identified under subparagraph (A) if funded at the levels provided for such program in the most recently submitted capital investment plan; and

“(C) describes the missions the Coast Guard will not be able to achieve, by fiscal year, for each gap identified under subparagraph (A).

“(2) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term ‘major acquisition program’ has the meaning given that term in section 569a(e).

“(3) CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN.—The term ‘capital investment plan’ means the plan required under section 663(a)(1).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 15 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 569 and inserting the following:

“569. Mission need statement.”.

SEC. 216. TRANSMISSION OF ANNUAL COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION REQUEST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 662 the following:

“§ 662a. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a Coast Guard authorization request with respect to such fiscal year.

“(b) COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION REQUEST DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘Coast Guard authorization request’ means a proposal for legislation that, with respect to the Coast Guard for the relevant fiscal year—

“(1) recommends end strengths for personnel for that fiscal year, as described in section 661;

“(2) recommends authorizations of appropriations for that fiscal year, including with respect to matters described in section 662; and

“(3) addresses any other matter that the Secretary determines is appropriate for inclusion in a Coast Guard authorization bill.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 662 the following:

“662a. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request.”.

SEC. 217. INVENTORY OF REAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 679. Inventory of real property

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Commandant shall establish an inventory of all real property, including submerged lands, under the control of the Coast Guard, which shall include—

“(1) the size, the location, and any other appropriate description of each unit of such property;

“(2) an assessment of the physical condition of each unit of such property, excluding lands;

“(3) a determination of whether each unit of such property should be—

“(A) retained to fulfill a current or projected Coast Guard mission requirement; or
 “(B) subject to divestiture; and
 “(4) other information the Commandant considers appropriate.

“(b) INVENTORY MAINTENANCE.—The Commandant shall—

“(1) maintain the inventory required under subsection (a) on an ongoing basis; and

“(2) update information on each unit of real property included in such inventory not later than 30 days after any change relating to the control of such property.

“(c) RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 30, 2016, and every 5 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that includes—

“(1) a list of all real property under the control of the Coast Guard and the location of such property by property type;

“(2) recommendations for divestiture with respect to any units of such property; and

“(3) recommendations for consolidating any units of such property, including—

“(A) an estimate of the costs or savings associated with each recommended consolidation; and

“(B) a discussion of the impact that such consolidation would have on Coast Guard mission effectiveness.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“679. Inventory of real property.”.

SEC. 218. RETIRED SERVICE MEMBERS AND DEPENDENTS SERVING ON ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 680. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees

“A committee that—

“(1) advises or assists the Coast Guard with respect to a function that affects a member of the Coast Guard or a dependent of such a member; and

“(2) includes in its membership a retired Coast Guard member or a dependent of such a retired member; shall not be considered an advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) solely because of such membership.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 679 the following:

“680. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees.”.

SEC. 219. ACTIVE DUTY FOR EMERGENCY AUGMENTATION OF REGULAR FORCES.

Section 712(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “not more than 60 days in any 4-month period and”.

SEC. 220. ACQUISITION WORKFORCE EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY.

Section 404(b) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-281; 124 Stat. 2951) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 221. COAST GUARD ADMINISTRATIVE SAVINGS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF OUTDATED AND DUPLICATIVE REPORTS.—

(1) MARINE INDUSTRY TRAINING.—Section 59 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant” and inserting “The Commandant”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(2) OPERATIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Section 651 of title 14, United States Code, and the item relating to such section in the analysis for chapter 17 of such title, are repealed.

(3) DRUG INTERDICTION.—Section 103 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (14 U.S.C. 89 note), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents in section 2 of that Act, are repealed.

(4) NATIONAL DEFENSE.—Section 426 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (14 U.S.C. 2 note), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents in section 1(b) of that Act, are repealed.

(5) LIVING MARINE RESOURCES.—Section 4(b) of the Cruise Vessel Security and Safety Act of 2010 (16 U.S.C. 1828 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: “No report shall be required under this subsection, including that no report shall be required under section 224 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 or section 804 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006, for fiscal years beginning after fiscal year 2014.”.

(b) CONSOLIDATION AND REFORM OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) MARINE SAFETY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 2116(d)(2)(B) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(B) on the program’s mission performance in achieving numerical measurable goals established under subsection (b), including—

“(i) the number of civilian and military Coast Guard personnel assigned to marine safety positions; and

“(ii) an identification of marine safety positions that are understaffed to meet the workload required to accomplish each activity included in the strategy and plans under subsection (a); and”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 57 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(i) by striking subsection (e); and

(ii) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (e), (f), and (g) respectively.

(2) MINOR CONSTRUCTION.—Section 656(d)(2) of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget under section 1105 of title 31 each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing each project carried out under paragraph (1), in the most recently concluded fiscal year, for which the amount expended under such paragraph for such project was more than \$1,000,000. If no such project was carried out during a fiscal year, no report under this paragraph shall be required with respect to that fiscal year.”.

SEC. 222. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 14.
 Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in section 93(b)(1) by striking “Notwithstanding subsection (a)(14)” and inserting “Notwithstanding subsection (a)(13)”; and

(2) in section 197(b) by striking “of Homeland Security”.

SEC. 223. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR OFFSHORE PATROL CUTTERS.

In fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the department

in which the Coast Guard is operating may enter into, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, multiyear contracts for the procurement of Offshore Patrol Cutters and associated equipment.

SEC. 224. MAINTAINING MEDIUM ENDURANCE CUTTER MISSION CAPABILITY.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that includes—

(1) a schedule and plan for decommissioning, not later than September 30, 2029, each of the 210-foot, Reliance-Class Cutters operated by the Coast Guard on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) a schedule and plan for enhancing the maintenance or extending the service life of each of the 270-foot, Famous-Class Cutters operated by the Coast Guard on the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) to maintain the capability of the Coast Guard to carry out sea-going missions with respect to such Cutters at the level of capability existing on September 30, 2013; and

(B) for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the final Offshore Patrol Cutter is scheduled to be commissioned under paragraph (4);

(3) an identification of the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters capable of sea state 5 operations that, if 8 National Security Cutters are commissioned, are necessary to return the sea state 5 operating capability of the Coast Guard to the level of capability that existed prior to the decommissioning of the first High Endurance Cutter in fiscal year 2011;

(4) a schedule and plan for commissioning the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters identified under paragraph (3); and

(5) a schedule and plan for commissioning, not later than September 30, 2034, a number of Offshore Patrol Cutters not capable of sea state 5 operations that is equal to—

(A) 25; less

(B) the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 225. AVIATION CAPABILITY IN THE GREAT LAKES REGION.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may—

(1) request and accept through a direct military-to-military transfer under section 2571 of title 10, United States Code, such H-60 helicopters as may be necessary to establish a year-round operational capability in the Coast Guard’s Ninth District; and

(2) use funds provided under section 101 of this Act to convert such helicopters to Coast Guard MH-60T configuration.

SEC. 226. GAPS IN WRITINGS ON COAST GUARD HISTORY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on any gaps that exist in writings on the history of the Coast Guard. The report shall address, at a minimum, operations, broad topics, and biographies with respect to the Coast Guard.

SEC. 227. OFFICER EVALUATION REPORTS.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the

Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a written assessment of the Coast Guard's officer evaluation reporting system.

(b) **CONTENTS OF ASSESSMENT.**—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, an analysis of—

(1) the extent to which the Coast Guard's officer evaluation reports differ in length, form, and content from the officer fitness reports used by the Navy and other branches of the Armed Forces;

(2) the extent to which differences determined pursuant to paragraph (1) are the result of inherent differences between—

(A) the Coast Guard and the Navy; and

(B) the Coast Guard and other branches of the Armed Forces;

(3) the feasibility of more closely aligning and conforming the Coast Guard's officer evaluation reports with the officer fitness reports of the Navy and other branches of the Armed Forces; and

(4) the costs and benefits of the alignment and conformity described in paragraph (3), including with respect to—

(A) Coast Guard administrative efficiency;

(B) fairness and equity for Coast Guard officers; and

(C) carrying out the Coast Guard's statutory mission of defense readiness, including when operating as a service in the Navy.

SEC. 228. IMPROVED SAFETY INFORMATION FOR VESSELS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall establish a process that allows an operator of a marine exchange or other non-Federal vessel traffic information service to use the automatic identification system to transmit weather, ice, and other important navigation safety information to vessels.

SEC. 229. E-LORAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not carry out activities related to the dismantling or disposal of infrastructure that supported the former LORAN system until the later of—

(1) the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date on which the Secretary provides to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate notice of a determination by the Secretary that such infrastructure is not required to provide a positioning, navigation, and timing system to provide redundant capability in the event GPS signals are disrupted.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to activities necessary for the safety of human life.

(c) **AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, and other agreements with Federal entities and other public or private entities, including academic entities, to develop a positioning, navigation, and timing system, including an enhanced LORAN system, to provide redundant capability in the event GPS signals are disrupted.

SEC. 230. ANALYSIS OF RESOURCE DEFICIENCIES WITH RESPECT TO MARITIME BORDER SECURITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate

and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report describing any Coast Guard resource deficiencies related to—

(1) securing maritime borders with respect to the Great Lakes and the coastal areas of the Southeastern and Southwestern United States, including with respect to Florida, California, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands;

(2) patrolling and monitoring maritime approaches to the areas described in paragraph (1); and

(3) patrolling and monitoring relevant portions of the Western Hemisphere Drug Transit Zone.

(b) **SCOPE.**—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Commandant shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the Coast Guard's statutory missions with respect to migrant interdiction, drug interdiction, defense readiness, living marine resources, and ports, waterways, and coastal security;

(2) whether Coast Guard missions are being executed to meet national performance targets set under the National Drug Control Strategy;

(3) the number and types of cutters and other vessels required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(4) the number and types of aircraft, including unmanned aircraft, required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(5) the number of assets that require upgraded sensor and communications systems to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(6) the Deployable Specialized Forces required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions; and

(7) whether additional shoreside facilities are required to accommodate Coast Guard personnel and assets in support of Coast Guard missions.

SEC. 231. MODERNIZATION OF NATIONAL DISTRESS AND RESPONSE SYSTEM.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the implementation of the Rescue 21 project in Alaska and in Coast Guard sectors Upper Mississippi River, Lower Mississippi River, and Ohio River Valley.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) describe what improvements are being made to the distress response system in the areas specified in subsection (a), including information on which areas will receive digital selective calling and direction finding capability;

(2) describe the impediments to installing digital selective calling and direction finding capability in areas where such technology will not be installed;

(3) identify locations in the areas specified in subsection (a) where communication gaps will continue to present a risk to mariners after completion of the Rescue 21 project;

(4) include a list of all reported marine accidents, casualties, and fatalities occurring in the locations identified under paragraph (3) since 1990; and

(5) provide an estimate of the costs associated with installing the technology necessary to close communication gaps in the locations identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 232. REPORT RECONCILING MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONAL PRIORITIES ON THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that outlines a course of action to reconcile general maintenance priorities for cutters with operational priorities on the Missouri River.

SEC. 233. MARITIME SEARCH AND RESCUE ASSISTANCE POLICY ASSESSMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall assess the Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy as it relates to State and local responders.

(b) **SCOPE.**—The assessment under subsection (a) shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the extent to which Coast Guard search and rescue coordinators have entered into domestic search and rescue agreements with State and local responders under the National Search and Rescue Plan;

(2) whether the domestic search and rescue agreements include the Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy; and

(3) the extent to which Coast Guard sectors coordinate with 911 emergency centers, including ensuring the dissemination of appropriate maritime distress check-sheets.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit a report on the assessment under subsection (a) to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—SHIPPING AND NAVIGATION

SEC. 301. REPEAL.

Chapter 555 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by repealing section 55501;

(2) by redesignating section 55502 as section 55501; and

(3) in the analysis by striking the items relating to sections 55501 and 55502 and inserting the following:

“55501. United States Committee on the Marine Transportation System.”.

SEC. 302. DONATION OF HISTORICAL PROPERTY. Section 51103 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **DONATION FOR HISTORICAL PURPOSES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may convey the right, title, and interest of the United States Government in any property administered by the Maritime Administration, except real estate or vessels, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that such property is not needed by the Maritime Administration; and

“(B) the recipient—

“(i) is a nonprofit organization, a State, or a political subdivision of a State;

“(ii) agrees to hold the Government harmless for any claims arising from exposure to hazardous materials, including asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, or lead paint, after conveyance of the property;

“(iii) provides a description and explanation of the intended use of the property to the Secretary for approval;

“(iv) has provided to the Secretary proof, as determined by the Secretary, of resources sufficient to accomplish the intended use provided under clause (iii) and to maintain the property;

“(v) agrees that when the recipient no longer requires the property, the recipient shall—

“(I) return the property to the Secretary, at the recipient's expense and in the same condition as received except for ordinary wear and tear; or

“(II) subject to the approval of the Secretary, retain, sell, or otherwise dispose of the property in a manner consistent with applicable law; and

“(vi) agrees to any additional terms the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(2) REVERSION.—The Secretary shall include in any conveyance under this subsection terms under which all right, title, and interest conveyed by the Secretary shall revert to the Government if the Secretary determines the property has been used other than as approved by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(B)(iii).”

SEC. 303. SMALL SHIPYARDS.

Section 54101(i) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2009 through 2013” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

SEC. 304. DRUG TESTING REPORTING.

Section 7706 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “an applicant for employment by a Federal agency,” after “Federal agency,”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by—

(A) inserting “or an applicant for employment by a Federal agency” after “an employee”; and

(B) striking “the employee.” and inserting “the employee or the applicant.”

SEC. 305. OPPORTUNITIES FOR SEA SERVICE VETERANS.

(a) ENDORSEMENTS FOR VETERANS.—Section 7101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) The Secretary may issue a license under this section in a class under subsection (c) to an applicant that—

“(1) has at least 3 months of qualifying service on vessels of the uniformed services (as that term is defined in section 101(a) of title 10) of appropriate tonnage or horsepower within the 7-year period immediately preceding the date of application; and

“(2) satisfies all other requirements for such a license.”

(b) SEA SERVICE LETTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 427 the following:

“§ 428. Sea service letters

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide a sea service letter to a member or former member of the Coast Guard who—

“(1) accumulated sea service on a vessel of the armed forces (as such term is defined in section 101(a) of title 10); and

“(2) requests such letter.

“(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 30 days after receiving a request for a sea service letter from a member or former member of the Coast Guard under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide such letter to such member or former member if such member or former member satisfies the requirement under subsection (a)(1).”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 427 the following:

“428. Sea service letters.”

(c) CREDITING OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES SERVICE, TRAINING, AND QUALIFICATIONS.—

(1) MAXIMIZING CREDITABILITY.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in implementing United States merchant mariner license, certification, and document laws and the Inter-

national Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, shall maximize the extent to which United States Armed Forces service, training, and qualifications are creditable toward meeting the requirements of such laws and such Convention.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the steps taken to implement this subsection.

(d) MERCHANT MARINE POST-SERVICE CAREER OPPORTUNITIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall take steps to promote better awareness, on an ongoing basis, among Coast Guard personnel regarding post-service use of Coast Guard training, education, and practical experience in satisfaction of requirements for merchant mariner credentials under section 11.213 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 306. CLARIFICATION OF HIGH-RISK WATERS.

Section 55305(e) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “provide armed personnel aboard” and inserting “reimburse, subject to the availability of appropriations, the owners or operators of”; and

(B) by inserting “for the cost of providing armed personnel aboard such vessels” before “if”; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘high-risk waters’ means waters so designated by the Commandant of the Coast Guard in the maritime security directive issued by the Commandant and in effect on the date on which an applicable voyage begins, if the Secretary of Transportation—

“(A) determines that an act of piracy occurred in the 12-month period preceding the date the voyage begins; or

“(B) in such period, issued an advisory warning that an act of piracy is possible in such waters.”

SEC. 307. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) TITLE 46.—Section 2116(b)(1)(D) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 93(c)” and inserting “section 93(c) of title 14”.

(b) COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2006.—Section 304(a) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-241; 33 U.S.C. 1503 note) is amended by inserting “and from” before “the United States”.

(c) DEEPWATER PORT ACT OF 1974.—Section 4(i) of the Deepwater Port Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 1503(i)) is amended by inserting “or that will supply” after “be supplied with”.

SEC. 308. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the number of jobs, including vessel construction and vessel operating jobs, that would be created in the United States maritime industry each year in 2015 through 2025 if liquefied natural gas exported from the United States were required to be carried—

(1) before December 31, 2018, on vessels documented under the laws of the United States; and

(2) on and after such date, on vessels documented under the laws of the United States and constructed in the United States.

SEC. 309. FISHING SAFETY GRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) FISHING SAFETY TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4502(i)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2010 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

(b) FISHING SAFETY RESEARCH GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4502(j)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2010 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

SEC. 310. ESTABLISHMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 81 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 8108. Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as ‘the Committee’). The Committee—

“(1) shall act solely in an advisory capacity to the Secretary through the Commandant of the Coast Guard on matters relating to personnel in the United States merchant marine, including training, qualifications, certification, documentation, and fitness standards, and other matters as assigned by the Commandant;

“(2) shall review and comment on proposed Coast Guard regulations and policies relating to personnel in the United States merchant marine, including training, qualifications, certification, documentation, and fitness standards;

“(3) may be given special assignments by the Secretary and may conduct studies, inquiries, workshops, and fact finding in consultation with individuals and groups in the private sector and with State or local governments;

“(4) shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations reflecting its independent judgment to the Secretary;

“(5) shall meet not less than twice each year; and

“(6) may make available to Congress recommendations that the Committee makes to the Secretary.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of not more than 19 members who are appointed by and serve terms of a duration determined by the Secretary. Before filling a position on the Committee, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register soliciting nominations for membership on the Committee.

“(2) REQUIRED MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall appoint as members of the Committee—

“(A) 9 United States citizens with active licenses or certificates issued under chapter 71 or merchant mariner documents issued under chapter 73, including—

“(i) 3 deck officers who represent the viewpoint of merchant marine deck officers, of whom—

“(I) 2 shall be licensed for oceans any gross tons;

“(II) 1 shall be licensed for inland river route with a limited or unlimited tonnage;

“(III) 2 shall have a master's license or a master of towing vessels license;

“(IV) 1 shall have significant tanker experience; and

“(V) to the extent practicable—

“(aa) 1 shall represent the viewpoint of labor; and

“(bb) another shall represent a management perspective;

“(ii) 3 engineering officers who represent the viewpoint of merchant marine engineering officers, of whom—

“(I) 2 shall be licensed as chief engineer any horsepower;

“(II) 1 shall be licensed as either a limited chief engineer or a designated duty engineer; and

“(III) to the extent practicable—

“(aa) 1 shall represent a labor viewpoint; and

“(bb) another shall represent a management perspective;

“(iii) 2 unlicensed seamen, of whom—

“(I) 1 shall represent the viewpoint of able-bodied seamen; and

“(II) another shall represent the viewpoint of qualified members of the engine department; and

“(iv) 1 pilot who represents the viewpoint of merchant marine pilots;

“(B) 6 marine educators, including—

“(i) 3 marine educators who represent the viewpoint of maritime academies, including—

“(I) 2 who represent the viewpoint of State maritime academies and are jointly recommended by such State maritime academies; and

“(II) 1 who represents either the viewpoint of the State maritime academies or the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

“(ii) 3 marine educators who represent the viewpoint of other maritime training institutions, 1 of whom shall represent the viewpoint of the small vessel industry;

“(C) 2 individuals who represent the viewpoint of shipping companies employed in ship operation management; and

“(D) 2 members who are appointed from the general public.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Transportation in making an appointment under paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II).

“(c) CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The Secretary shall designate one member of the Committee as the Chairman and one member of the Committee as the Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or incapacity of the Chairman, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman.

“(d) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Committee may establish and disestablish subcommittees and working groups for any purpose consistent with this section, subject to conditions imposed by the Committee. Members of the Committee and additional persons drawn from the general public may be assigned to such subcommittees and working groups. Only Committee members may chair subcommittee or working groups.

“(e) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate on September 30, 2020.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“8108. Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee.”

SEC. 311. TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE COSTS FOR PREVENTION SERVICES.

(a) TITLE 46, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 2110 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b)(1) In addition to the collection of fees and charges established under subsection (a), in providing a service or thing of value under this subtitle the Secretary may accept in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence.

“(2) The value of in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence accepted under this paragraph may not exceed applicable per diem rates set forth in regulations prescribed under section 464 of title 37.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “subsections (a) and (b),” and inserting “subsection (a).”

(b) TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 664 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsections (e) through (g) as subsections (f) through (h), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e)(1) In addition to the collection of fees and charges established under this section, in the provision of a service or thing of value by the Coast Guard the Secretary may accept in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence.

“(2) The value of in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence accepted under this paragraph may not exceed applicable per diem rates set forth in regulations prescribed under section 464 of title 37.”

(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not accept in-kind transportation, travel, or subsistence under section 664(e) of title 14, United States Code, or section 2110(d)(4) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, until the Commandant of the Coast Guard—

(1) amends the Standards of Ethical Conduct for members and employees of the Coast Guard to include regulations governing the acceptance of in-kind reimbursements; and

(2) notifies the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the amendments made under paragraph (1).

SEC. 312. PROMPT INTERGOVERNMENTAL NOTICE OF MARINE CASUALTIES.

Section 6101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) NOTICE TO STATE AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—Not later than 24 hours after receiving a notice of a major marine casualty under this section, the Secretary shall notify each State or federally recognized Indian tribe that is, or may reasonably be expected to be, affected by such marine casualty.”;

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking “(1)”;

(B) by redesignating subsection (h)(2) as subsection (i) of section 6101, and in such subsection—

(i) by striking “paragraph,” and inserting “section,”; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as paragraphs (1) through (4); and

(3) by redesignating the last subsection as subsection (j).

SEC. 313. AREA CONTINGENCY PLANS.

Section 311(j)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “qualified personnel of Federal, State, and local agencies,” and inserting “qualified—

“(i) personnel of Federal, State, and local agencies; and

“(ii) members of federally recognized Indian tribes, where applicable.”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(A) by striking “and local” and inserting “, local, and tribal”; and

(B) by striking “wildlife,” and inserting “wildlife, including advance planning with

respect to the closing and reopening of fishing areas following a discharge.”;

(3) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “and local” and inserting “, local, and tribal”; and

(4) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking “and Federal, State, and local agencies” and inserting “, Federal, State, and local agencies, and tribal governments”;

(B) by redesignating clauses (vii) and (viii) as clauses (viii) and (ix), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

“(vii) include a framework for advance planning and decisionmaking with respect to the closing and reopening of fishing areas following a discharge, including protocols and standards for the closing and reopening of fishing areas.”

SEC. 314. INTERNATIONAL ICE PATROL REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 803 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 80301, by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PAYMENTS.—Payments received pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall be credited to the appropriation for operating expenses of the Coast Guard.”;

(2) in section 80302—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “An ice patrol vessel” and inserting “The ice patrol”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “An ice patrol vessel” and inserting “The ice patrol”;

(C) in the first sentence of subsection (d), by striking “vessels” and inserting “aircraft”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 80304. Limitation on ice patrol data

“Notwithstanding sections 80301 and 80302, data collected by an ice patrol conducted by the Coast Guard under this chapter may not be disseminated to a vessel unless such vessel is—

“(1) documented under the laws of the United States; or

“(2) documented under the laws of a foreign country that made the payment or contribution required under section 80301(b) for the year preceding the year in which the data is collected.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“80304. Limitation on ice patrol data.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on January 1, 2017.

SEC. 315. OFFSHORE SUPPLY VESSEL THIRD-PARTY INSPECTION.

Section 3316 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f)(1) Upon request of an owner or operator of an offshore supply vessel, the Secretary shall delegate the authorities set forth in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) with respect to such vessel to a classification society to which a delegation is authorized under that paragraph. A delegation by the Secretary under this subsection shall be used for any vessel inspection and examination function carried out by the Secretary, including the issuance of certificates of inspection and all other related documents.

“(2) If the Secretary determines that a certificate of inspection or related document issued under authority delegated under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to a vessel has reduced the operational safety of that vessel, the Secretary may terminate the certificate or document, respectively.

“(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014, and for each year of the subsequent 2-year period, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing—

“(A) the number of vessels for which a delegation was made under paragraph (1);

“(B) any savings in personnel and operational costs incurred by the Coast Guard that resulted from the delegations; and

“(C) based on measurable marine casualty and other data, any impacts of the delegations on the operational safety of vessels for which the delegations were made, and on the crew on those vessels.”.

SEC. 316. WATCHES.

Section 8104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders” and inserting “and oilers”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “(except the coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders)”.

SEC. 317. COAST GUARD RESPONSE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) VESSEL RESPONSE PLAN CONTENTS.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require that each vessel response plan prepared for a mobile offshore drilling unit includes information from the facility response plan prepared for the mobile offshore drilling unit regarding the planned response to a worst case discharge, and to a threat of such a discharge.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MOBILE OFFSHORE DRILLING UNIT.—The term “mobile offshore drilling unit” has the meaning given that term in section 1001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701).

(2) RESPONSE PLAN.—The term “response plan” means a response plan prepared under section 311(j) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)).

(3) WORST CASE DISCHARGE.—The term “worst case discharge” has the meaning given that term under section 311(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Coast Guard to review or approve a facility response plan for a mobile offshore drilling unit.

SEC. 318. REGIONAL CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL.

Section 5002(k)(3) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2732(k)(3)) is amended by striking “not more than \$1,000,000” and inserting “not less than \$1,400,000”.

SEC. 319. UNINSPECTED PASSENGER VESSELS IN THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b)(1) In applying this title with respect to an uninspected vessel of less than 24 meters overall in length that carries passengers to or from a port in the United States Virgin Islands, the Secretary shall substitute ‘12 passengers’ for ‘6 passengers’ each place it appears in section 2101(42) if the Secretary determines that the vessel complies with, as applicable to the vessel—

“(A) the Code of Practice for the Safety of Small Commercial Motor Vessels (commonly

referred to as the ‘Yellow Code’), as published by the U.K. Maritime and Coastguard Agency and in effect on January 1, 2014; or

“(B) the Code of Practice for the Safety of Small Commercial Sailing Vessels (commonly referred to as the ‘Blue Code’), as published by such agency and in effect on such date.

“(2) If the Secretary establishes standards to carry out this subsection—

“(A) such standards shall be identical to those established in the Codes of Practice referred to in paragraph (1); and

“(B) on any dates before the date on which such standards are in effect, the Codes of Practice referred to in paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the vessels referred to in paragraph (1).”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 4105(c) of title 46, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is amended by striking “Within twenty-four months of the date of enactment of this subsection, the” and inserting “The”.

SEC. 320. TREATMENT OF ABANDONED SEAFARERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 111 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1113. Treatment of abandoned seafarers

“(a) ABANDONED SEAFARERS FUND.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a separate account to be known as the Abandoned Seafarers Fund.

“(2) AUTHORIZED USES.—Amounts in the Fund may be appropriated to the Secretary for use—

“(A) to pay necessary support of a seafarer—

“(i) who—

“(I) was paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)), or for whom the Secretary has requested parole under such section; and

“(II) is involved in an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter that is related to the administration or enforcement of law by the Coast Guard; or

“(ii) who—

“(I) is physically present in the United States;

“(II) the Secretary determines was abandoned in the United States; and

“(III) has not applied for asylum under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

“(B) to reimburse a vessel owner or operator for the costs of necessary support of a seafarer who has been paroled into the United States to facilitate an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter that is related to the administration or enforcement of law by the Coast Guard, if—

“(i) the vessel owner or operator is not convicted of a criminal offense related to such matter; or

“(ii) the Secretary determines that reimbursement is appropriate.

“(3) CREDITING OF AMOUNTS TO FUND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), there shall be credited to the Fund the following:

“(i) Penalties deposited in the Fund under section 9 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1908).

“(ii) Amounts reimbursed or recovered under subsection (c).

“(B) LIMITATION.—Amounts may be credited to the Fund under subparagraph (A) only if the unobligated balance of the Fund is less than \$5,000,000.

“(4) REPORT REQUIRED.—On the date on which the President submits each budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that describes—

“(A) the amounts credited to the Fund under paragraph (2) for the preceding fiscal year; and

“(B) amounts in the Fund that were expended for the preceding fiscal year.

“(b) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to create a private right of action or any other right, benefit, or entitlement to necessary support for any person; or

“(2) to compel the Secretary to pay or reimburse the cost of necessary support.

“(c) REIMBURSEMENT; RECOVERY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel owner or operator shall reimburse the Fund an amount equal to the total amount paid from the Fund for necessary support of a seafarer, if—

“(A) the vessel owner or operator—

“(i) during the course of an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter under this Act that the Coast Guard referred to a United States attorney or the Attorney General, fails to provide necessary support of a seafarer who was paroled into the United States to facilitate the investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication; and

“(ii) subsequently is—

“(I) convicted of a criminal offense related to such matter; or

“(II) required to reimburse the Fund pursuant to a court order or negotiated settlement related to such matter; or

“(B) the vessel owner or operator abandons a seafarer in the United States, as determined by the Secretary based on substantial evidence.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If a vessel owner or operator fails to reimburse the Fund under paragraph (1) within 60 days after receiving a written, itemized description of reimbursable expenses and a demand for payment, the Secretary may—

“(A) proceed in rem against the vessel on which the seafarer served in the Federal district court for the district in which the vessel is found; and

“(B) withhold or revoke the clearance required under section 60105 for the vessel and any other vessel operated by the same operator (as that term is defined in section 2(9)(a) of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901(9)(a)) as the vessel on which the seafarer served.

“(3) OBTAINING CLEARANCE.—A vessel may obtain clearance from the Secretary after it is withheld or revoked under paragraph (2)(B) if the vessel owner or operator—

“(A) reimburses the Fund the amount required under paragraph (1); or

“(B) provides a bond, or other evidence of financial responsibility, sufficient to meet the amount required to be reimbursed under paragraph (1).

“(4) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall notify the vessel at least 72 hours before taking any action under paragraph (2)(B).

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ABANDONS; ABANDONED.—Each of the terms ‘abandons’ and ‘abandoned’ means—

“(A) a vessel owner’s or operator’s unilateral severance of ties with a seafarer; or

“(B) a vessel owner’s or operator’s failure to provide necessary support of a seafarer.

“(2) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the Abandoned Seafarers Fund established under this section.

“(3) NECESSARY SUPPORT.—The term ‘necessary support’ means normal wages and expenses the Secretary considers reasonable for lodging, subsistence, clothing, medical care (including hospitalization), repatriation, and any other support the Secretary considers to be appropriate.

“(4) SEAFARER.—The term ‘seafarer’ means an alien crew member who is employed or engaged in any capacity on board a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

“(5) VESSEL SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ‘vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States’ has the meaning given that term in section 70502(c), except that it does not include a vessel that is—

“(A) owned, or operated under a bareboat charter, by the United States, a State or political subdivision thereof, or a foreign nation; and

“(B) not engaged in commerce.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1113. Treatment of abandoned seafarers.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1908) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Any penalty collected under subsection (a) or (b) that is not paid under that subsection to the person giving information leading to the conviction or assessment of such penalties shall be deposited in the Abandoned Seafarers Fund established under section 1113 of title 46, United States Code.”.

SEC. 321. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 55305(d) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) Each department or agency that has responsibility for a program under this section shall administer that program consistent with this section and any regulations and guidance issued by the Secretary of Transportation concerning this section.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2)(A) The Secretary shall have exclusive authority for determining the applicability of this section to a program of a Federal department or agency.

“(B) The head of a Federal department or agency shall request the Secretary to determine the applicability of this section to a program of such department or agency if the department or agency is uncertain of such applicability. Not later than 30 days after receiving such a request, the Secretary shall make such determination.

“(C) Subparagraph (B) shall not be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary to make a determination regarding the applicability of this section to a program administered by a Federal department or agency.

“(D) A determination made by the Secretary under this paragraph regarding a program shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines that this section no longer applies to such program.”;

(3) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) shall conduct an annual review of the administration of programs subject to the

requirements of this section to determine compliance with the requirements of this section.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) On the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary shall make available on the Internet website of the Department of Transportation a report that—

“(A) lists the programs that were subject to determinations made by the Secretary under paragraph (2) in the preceding year; and

“(B) describes the results of the most recent annual review required by paragraph (3)(A), including identification of the departments and agencies that transported cargo in violation of this section and any action the Secretary took under paragraph (3) with respect to each violation.”.

(b) DEADLINE FOR FIRST REVIEW.—The Secretary of Transportation shall complete the first review required under the amendment made by subsection (a)(1)(C) by not later than December 31, 2015.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3511(c) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (46 U.S.C. 55305 note) is repealed.

SEC. 322. COAST GUARD REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an analysis of the Coast Guard’s proposed promulgation of safety and environmental management system requirements for vessels engaged in Outer Continental Shelf activities. The analysis shall include—

(1) a discussion of any new operational, management, design and construction, financial, and other mandates that would be imposed on vessel owners and operators;

(2) an estimate of all associated direct and indirect operational, management, personnel, training, vessel design and construction, record keeping, and other costs;

(3) an identification and justification of any of such proposed requirements that exceed those in international conventions applicable to the design, construction, operation, and management of vessels engaging in United States Outer Continental Shelf activities; and

(4) an identification of exemptions to the proposed requirements, that are based upon vessel classification, tonnage, offshore activity or function, alternative certifications, or any other appropriate criteria.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not issue proposed regulations relating to safety and environmental management system requirements for vessels on the United States Outer Continental Shelf for which noticed was published on September 10, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 55230) earlier than 6 months after the submittal of the analysis required by subsection (a).

SEC. 323. WEBSITE.

(a) REPORTS TO SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION; INCIDENTS AND DETAILS.—Section 3507(g)(3)(A) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (ii) by striking “the incident to an Internet based portal maintained by the Secretary” and inserting “each incident specified in clause (i) to the Internet website maintained by the Secretary of Transportation under paragraph (4)(A)”;

(2) in clause (iii) by striking “based portal maintained by the Secretary” and inserting “website maintained by the Secretary of Transportation under paragraph (4)(A)”.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF INCIDENT DATA ON INTERNET.—Section 3507(g)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) WEBSITE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall maintain a statistical compilation of all incidents on board a cruise vessel specified in paragraph (3)(A)(i) on an Internet website that provides a numerical accounting of the missing persons and alleged crimes reported under that paragraph without regard to the investigative status of the incident.

“(ii) UPDATES AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The compilation under clause (i) shall—

“(I) be updated not less frequently than quarterly;

“(II) be able to be sorted by cruise line;

“(III) identify each cruise line by name;

“(IV) identify each crime or alleged crime committed or allegedly committed by a passenger or crewmember; and

“(V) identify the number of individuals alleged overboard.

“(iii) USER-FRIENDLY FORMAT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall ensure that the compilation, data, and any other information provided on the Internet website maintained under this subparagraph are in a user-friendly format.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking “Secretary” and inserting “Secretary of Transportation”.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission \$24,700,000 for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 402. AWARD OF REPARATIONS.

Section 41305 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “, plus reasonable attorney fees”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ATTORNEY FEES.—In any action brought under section 41301, the prevailing party may be awarded reasonable attorney fees.”.

SEC. 403. TERMS OF COMMISSIONERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) TERMS.—The term of each Commissioner is 5 years. When the term of a Commissioner ends, the Commissioner may continue to serve until a successor is appointed and qualified, but for a period not to exceed one year. Except as provided in paragraph (3), no individual may serve more than 2 terms.”; and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (5), and inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) VACANCIES.—A vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. An individual appointed to fill a vacancy is appointed only for the unexpired term of the individual being succeeded. An individual appointed to fill a vacancy may serve 2 terms in addition to the remainder of the term for which the predecessor of that individual was appointed.

“(4) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—

“(A) LIMITATION ON RELATIONSHIPS WITH REGULATED ENTITIES.—A Commissioner may

not have a pecuniary interest in, hold an official relation to, or own stocks or bonds of any entity the Commission regulates under chapter 401 of this title.

“(B) LIMITATION ON OTHER ACTIVITIES.—A Commissioner may not engage in another business, vocation, or employment.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) does not apply with respect to a Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission appointed and confirmed by the Senate before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 501. ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION.

(a) ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 89 the following:

“§ 90. Arctic maritime transportation

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure safe and secure maritime shipping in the Arctic including the availability of aids to navigation, vessel escorts, spill response capability, and maritime search and rescue in the Arctic.

“(b) INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION AGREEMENTS.—To carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is encouraged to enter into negotiations through the International Maritime Organization to conclude and execute agreements to promote coordinated action among the United States, Russia, Canada, Iceland, Norway, and Denmark and other seafaring and Arctic nations to ensure, in the Arctic—

“(1) placement and maintenance of aids to navigation;

“(2) appropriate marine safety, tug, and salvage capabilities;

“(3) oil spill prevention and response capability;

“(4) maritime domain awareness, including long-range vessel tracking; and

“(5) search and rescue.

“(c) COORDINATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.—The Committee on the Maritime Transportation System established under section 55501 of title 46, United States Code, shall coordinate the establishment of domestic transportation policies in the Arctic necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

“(d) AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may, subject to the availability of appropriations, enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, or other agreements with, or make grants to, individuals and governments to carry out the purpose of this section or any agreements established under subsection (b).

“(e) ICEBREAKING.—The Secretary shall promote safe maritime navigation by means of icebreaking where necessary, feasible, and effective to carry out the purposes of this section.

“(f) ARCTIC DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘Arctic’ has the meaning given such term in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 89 the following:

“90. Arctic maritime transportation”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 307 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-281; 14 U.S.C. 92 note) is repealed.

SEC. 502. ARCTIC MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 154. Arctic maritime domain awareness

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall improve maritime domain awareness in the Arctic—

“(1) by promoting interagency cooperation and coordination;

“(2) by employing joint, interagency, and international capabilities; and

“(3) by facilitating the sharing of information, intelligence, and data related to the Arctic maritime domain between the Coast Guard and departments and agencies listed in subsection (b).

“(b) COORDINATION.—The Commandant shall seek to coordinate the collection, sharing, and use of information, intelligence, and data related to the Arctic maritime domain between the Coast Guard and the following:

“(1) The Department of Homeland Security.

“(2) The Department of Defense.

“(3) The Department of Transportation.

“(4) The Department of State.

“(5) The Department of the Interior.

“(6) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

“(7) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

“(8) The Environmental Protection Agency.

“(9) The National Science Foundation.

“(10) The Arctic Research Commission.

“(11) Any Federal agency or commission or State the Commandant determines is appropriate.

“(c) COOPERATION.—The Commandant and the head of a department or agency listed in subsection (b) may by agreement, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, share personnel, services, equipment, and facilities to carry out the requirements of this section.

“(d) 5-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than January 1, 2016 and every 5 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a 5-year strategic plan to guide interagency and international intergovernmental cooperation and coordination for the purpose of improving maritime domain awareness in the Arctic.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the term ‘Arctic’ has the meaning given that term in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 153 the following:

“154. Arctic maritime domain awareness.”.

SEC. 503. IMO POLAR CODE NEGOTIATIONS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and thereafter with the submission of the budget proposal submitted for each of fiscal years 2016, 2017, and 2018 under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a report on—

(1) the status of the negotiations at the International Maritime Organization regarding the establishment of a draft international code of safety for ships operating in polar waters, popularly known as the Polar Code, and any amendments proposed by such a code to be made to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea and the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships;

(2) the coming into effect of such a code and such amendments for nations that are parties to those conventions;

(3) impacts, for coastal communities located in the Arctic (as that term is defined in the section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111)) of such a code or such amendments, on—

(A) the costs of delivering fuel and freight; and

(B) the safety of maritime transportation; and

(4) actions the Secretary must take to implement the requirements of such a code and such amendments.

SEC. 504. FORWARD OPERATING FACILITIES.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may construct facilities in the Arctic (as that term is defined in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111)). The facilities shall—

(1) support aircraft maintenance, including exhaust ventilation, heat, an engine wash system, fuel, ground support services, and electrical power;

(2) provide shelter for both current helicopter assets and those projected to be located at Air Station Kodiak, Alaska, for at least 20 years; and

(3) include accommodations for personnel.

SEC. 505. ICEBREAKERS.

(a) COAST GUARD POLAR ICEBREAKERS.—Section 222 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-213; 126 Stat. 1560) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading by striking “; BRIDGING STRATEGY”; and

(B) by striking “Commandant of the Coast Guard” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “Commandant of the Coast Guard may decommission the Polar Sea.”;

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following:

“(3) RESULT OF NO DETERMINATION.—If in the analysis submitted under this section the Secretary does not make a determination under subsection (a)(5) regarding whether it is cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea, then—

“(A) the Commandant of the Coast Guard may decommission the Polar Sea; or

“(B) the Secretary may make such determination, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014, and take actions in accordance with this subsection as though such determination was made in the analysis previously submitted.”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) STRATEGIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the analysis required under subsection (a) is submitted, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate—

“(A) unless the Secretary makes a determination under this section that it is cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea, a bridging strategy for maintaining the Coast Guard’s polar icebreaking services until at least September 30, 2024;

“(B) a strategy to meet the Coast Guard’s Arctic ice operations needs through September 30, 2050; and

“(C) a strategy to meet the Coast Guard’s Antarctic ice operations needs through September 30, 2050.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—The strategies required under paragraph (1) shall include a business case analysis comparing the leasing and purchasing of icebreakers to maintain the needs and services described in that paragraph.”.

(b) CUTTER “POLAR SEA”.—Upon the submission of a service life extension plan in accordance with section 222(d)(1)(C) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-213; 126 Stat. 1560), the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may use funds authorized under section 101 of this Act to conduct a service life extension of 7 to 10 years for the Coast Guard Cutter Polar Sea (WAGB 11) in accordance with such plan.

(c) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not expend amounts appropriated for the Coast Guard for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2024, for—

(A) design activities related to a capability of a Polar-Class Icebreaker that is based solely on an operational requirement of another Federal department or agency, except for amounts appropriated for design activities for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2016; or

(B) long-lead-time materials, production, or post-delivery activities related to such a capability.

(2) OTHER AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available to the Secretary under an agreement with another Federal department or agency and expended on a capability of a Polar-Class Icebreaker that is based solely on an operational requirement of that or another Federal department or agency shall not be treated as amounts expended by the Secretary for purposes of the limitation established under paragraph (1).

SEC. 506. ICEBREAKING IN POLAR REGIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 86 the following:

“§ 87. Icebreaking in polar regions

“The President shall facilitate planning for the design, procurement, maintenance, deployment, and operation of icebreakers as needed to support the statutory missions of the Coast Guard in the polar regions by allocating all funds to support icebreaking operations in such regions, except for recurring incremental costs associated with specific projects, to the Coast Guard.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 86 the following:

“87. Icebreaking in polar regions.”.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. DISTANT WATER TUNA FLEET.

Section 421 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (46 U.S.C. 8103 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (c) and (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (f) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

SEC. 602. EXTENSION OF MORATORIUM.

Section 2(a) of Public Law 110-299 (33 U.S.C. 1342 note) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

SEC. 603. NATIONAL MARITIME STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of the department in

which the Coast Guard is operating, shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a national maritime strategy.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify—

(A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and

(B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and

(2) include recommendations to—

(A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;

(B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;

(C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;

(D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;

(E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 55601(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and

(F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

SEC. 604. WAIVERS.

(a) “JOHN CRAIG”.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8902 of title 46, United States Code, shall not apply to the vessel John Craig (United States official number D1110613) when such vessel is operating on the portion of the Kentucky River, Kentucky, located at approximately mile point 158, in Pool Number 9, between Lock and Dam Number 9 and Lock and Dam Number 10.

(2) APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall apply on and after the date on which the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating determines that a licensing requirement has been established under Kentucky State law that applies to an operator of the vessel John Craig.

(b) “F/V WESTERN CHALLENGER”.—Notwithstanding section 12132 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the F/V Western Challenger (IMO number 5388108).

SEC. 605. COMPETITION BY UNITED STATES FLAG VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an assessment of authorities under subtitle II of title 46, United States Code, that have been delegated to the Coast Guard and that impact the ability of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to effectively compete in international transportation markets.

(b) REVIEW OF DIFFERENCES WITH IMO STANDARDS.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall include a review of differences between United States laws, policies, regulations, and guidance governing the inspection of vessels documented under the laws of the United States and standards set by the International Maritime Organization governing the inspection of vessels.

(c) DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Commandant en-

ters into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences under subsection (a), the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the assessment required under such subsection.

SEC. 606. VESSEL REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICES OF ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE AND AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the status of the final rule that relates to the notice of proposed rulemaking titled “Vessel Requirements for Notices of Arrival and Departure, and Automatic Identification System” and published in the Federal Register on December 16, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 76295).

SEC. 607. CONVEYANCE OF COAST GUARD PROPERTY IN ROCHESTER, NEW YORK.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard is authorized to convey, at fair market value, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, consisting of approximately 0.2 acres, that is under the administrative control of the Coast Guard and located at 527 River Street in Rochester, New York.

(b) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—The City of Rochester, New York, shall have the right of first refusal with respect to the purchase, at fair market value, of the real property described in subsection (a).

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property described in subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Commandant.

(d) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The fair market value of the property described in subsection (a) shall—

(1) be determined by appraisal; and

(2) be subject to the approval of the Commandant.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The responsibility for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with a conveyance under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Commandant and the purchaser.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Commandant may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under subsection (a) as the Commandant considers appropriate and reasonable to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—Any proceeds from a conveyance under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the fund established under section 687 of title 14, United States Code.

SEC. 608. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) CITY.—The term “City” means the city of Gig Harbor, Washington.

(2) PROPERTY.—The term “Property” means the parcel of real property, together with any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 0.86 acres of fast lands commonly identified as tract 65 of lot 1 of section 8, township 21 north, range 2 east, Willamette Meridian, on the north side of the entrance of Gig Harbor, narrows of Puget Sound, Washington.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) CONVEYANCE.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating relinquishes the reservation of the Property for lighthouse purposes, at the request of the City and subject to the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall convey to the City all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Property, notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713).

(2) TERMS OF CONVEYANCE.—A conveyance made under paragraph (1) shall be made—

(A) subject to valid existing rights;

(B) at the fair market value as described in subsection (c); and

(C) subject to any other condition that the Secretary may consider appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) COSTS.—The City shall pay any transaction or administrative costs associated with a conveyance under paragraph (1), including the costs of the appraisal, title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(4) CONVEYANCE IS NOT A MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—A conveyance under paragraph (1) shall not be considered a major Federal action for purposes of section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

(c) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

(1) DETERMINATION.—The fair market value of the Property shall be—

(A) determined by an appraisal conducted by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary; and

(B) approved by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An appraisal conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(B) shall reflect the equitable considerations described in paragraph (3).

(3) EQUITABLE CONSIDERATIONS.—In approving the fair market value of the Property under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration matters of equity and fairness, including the City's past and current lease of the Property, any maintenance or improvements by the City to the Property, and such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) REVOCATION; REVERSION.—Effective on and after the date on which a conveyance of the Property is made under subsection (b)(1)—

(1) Executive Order 3528, dated August 9, 1921, is revoked; and

(2) the use of the tide and shore lands belonging to the State of Washington and adjoining and bordering the Property, that were granted to the Government of the United States pursuant to the Act of the Legislature, State of Washington, approved March 13, 1909, the same being chapter 110 of the Session Laws of 1909, shall revert to the State of Washington.

SEC. 609. VESSEL DETERMINATION.

The vessel assigned United States official number 1205366 is deemed a new vessel effective on the date of delivery of the vessel after January 1, 2012, from a privately owned

United States shipyard, if no encumbrances are on record with the Coast Guard at the time of the issuance of the new certificate of documentation for the vessel.

SEC. 610. SAFE VESSEL OPERATION IN THUNDER BAY.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not prohibit a vessel operating within the existing boundaries and any future expanded boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve from taking up or discharging ballast water to allow for safe and efficient vessel operation if the uptake or discharge meets all Federal and State ballast water management requirements that would apply if the area were not a marine sanctuary.

SEC. 611. PARKING FACILITIES.

(a) ALLOCATION AND ASSIGNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this section, the Administrator of General Services, in coordination with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall allocate and assign the spaces in parking facilities at the Department of Homeland Security St. Elizabeths Campus to allow any member or employee of the Coast Guard, who is assigned to the Campus, to use such spaces.

(2) TIMING.—In carrying out paragraph (1), and in addition to the parking spaces allocated and assigned to Coast Guard members and employees in fiscal year 2014, the Administrator shall allocate and assign not less than—

(A) 300 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2015;

(B) 700 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2016; and

(C) 1,042 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2017.

(b) TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each fiscal year thereafter in which spaces are allocated and assigned under subsection (a)(2), the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the impact of assigning and allocating parking spaces under subsection (a) on the congestion of roads connecting the St. Elizabeths Campus to the portions of Suitland Parkway and I-295 located in the Anacostia section of the District of Columbia; and

(2) progress made toward completion of essential transportation improvements identified in the Transportation Management Program for the St. Elizabeths Campus.

(c) REALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Administrator may revise the allocation and assignment of spaces to members and employees of the Coast Guard made under subsection (a) as necessary to accommodate employees of the Department of Homeland Security, other than the Coast Guard, when such employees are assigned to the St. Elizabeths Campus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5769.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5769, the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014, reauthorizes funding for the Coast Guard through fiscal year 2015 at levels that are fiscally responsible and that will reverse the misguided cuts proposed by the current administration.

The President proposed to slash the service's acquisition budget by over 20 percent, reduce the number of servicemembers by over 1,300, undermine readiness by cutting program hours for aircraft, and jeopardize the success of the search-and-rescue mission by taking fixed-wing air aircraft crews off alert status. The President's budget request will only worsen the Coast Guard's growing gaps in mission performance, increase acquisition delays, drive up the cost of new assets, and deny our servicemembers the critical resources needed to perform their duties.

□ 1245

H.R. 5769 authorizes sufficient funding to ensure these cuts do not happen and the service has what it needs to successfully conduct its missions. The bill also makes several reforms to the Coast Guard authorities, as well as laws governing shipping and navigation.

Specifically, H.R. 5769 supports Coast Guard servicemembers by ensuring the members of the Coast Guard are offered the same benefits available to members of the other armed services. It improves Coast Guard mission effectiveness by replacing and modernizing Coast Guard assets in a cost-effective manner.

It enhances oversight of the Coast Guard, reduces inefficient operations, and saves taxpayer dollars by making commonsense reforms to Coast Guard missions and administration. It helps veterans make the transition from service in the military to good-paying jobs in the maritime industry.

It includes an Arctic maritime transportation title, which provides the Coast Guard the authorities it needs to successfully carry out missions in the Arctic, as well as prepare for the safe operation of commercial vessels and increased human activity in the region.

It encourages job growth in the maritime sector by conducting regulatory burdens on job creators, and lastly, it reauthorizes and reforms the structure and operations of the FMC.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to section 323 of the bill, it is the committee's intent that the Department of Transportation use the Web site currently operated by the Coast Guard to the greatest

extent possible. The data presented on the Web site should be limited only to that required by statute and shown in a simple, easily used format.

The committee does not intend to use anything other than commercial off-the-shelf technology to establish the Web site or independently develop new software or acquire new hardware in operating the site.

H.R. 5769 presents a strong bipartisan and bicameral agreement. I want to thank Senators ROCKEFELLER, THUNE, BEGICH, and RUBIO for working with us on this important legislation. I also want to thank Ranking Member RAHALL and the subcommittee ranking member, Representative GARAMENDI, for their efforts, and Chairman SHUSTER for his leadership.

Finally, I want to take a minute to point out that this will be the last Coast Guard authorization bill that will benefit from the advice and support of the only Member of Congress with service in the Coast Guard, our colleague and friend, HOWARD COBLE.

HOWARD is a Korean war veteran with 5 years of active duty in the Coast Guard and another 18 years in the Coast Guard Reserve. He is the founder of the Congressional Coast Guard Caucus, as well as an active member and former chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation.

Throughout his career in Congress, HOWARD has been a tireless advocate for the men and women of the Coast Guard. I thank and commend him for this service to our Nation and for his contributions to this and past Coast Guard authorizations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, December 3, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: I write to you regarding the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 5769, the "Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014." The bill contains certain provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to proceed expeditiously to the House floor, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 5769. However, I do so only with the mutual understanding that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security over matters concerning the United States Coast Guard in this or similar legislation is in no way diminished. I further request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of this Committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

Finally, I request you include this letter and your response into the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 5769 on the House floor. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, December 3, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 5769, the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014.

I look forward to working with you concerning provisions in H.R. 5769, or similar legislation, that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. Finally, I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters in the Congressional Record during House floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation, and I look forward to working with the Committee on Homeland Security as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5769, the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014. This legislation was developed, as Mr. HUNTER has said, through very cooperative, bipartisan, and bicameral negotiations over the past 2 months.

That we are here today considering this legislation on the suspension calendar demonstrates again that, when we put aside partisan differences, we can find agreement on substantive legislation that serves the greater interests of the American public.

I commend full committee Chairman SHUSTER for his leadership in reaching out to the other body to initiate the process that has culminated in producing the outstanding bill that is before the House today.

I also want to thank and acknowledge the chairman of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, DUNCAN HUNTER, and the ranking Democratic member of our Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, Mr. JOHN GARAMENDI, for their tireless efforts to advance this important legislation.

As well, to our colleague HOWARD COBLE, whom I have served with on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee since he was first elected to the House in 1984.

It is truly fitting that the pending bill will be named after HOWARD. He is a true gentleman in every sense of the word, a gentleman of this House, and a superb friend to myself, as well as to many of our colleagues.

The U.S. Coast Guard, one of our Nation's five military services, remains an agency that is as indispensable today as it was 100 years ago. Whether maintaining the safety of maritime

commerce on the high seas, securing our ports, harbors, and inland waterways, or when protecting life at sea, the Coast Guard stands ready and able to serve whenever called.

I am pleased that this legislation will provide sufficient authorized funding to ensure that the Coast Guard has the resources and the personnel that it needs to accomplish its many missions, and most importantly, this legislation provides adequate funding to allow the Coast Guard to maintain progress in recapitalizing its offshore fleet of cutters, which is a very high priority.

I am also pleased that this legislation will advance several policies to support our merchant marine, especially a provision that will strengthen the enforcement of cargo preference requirements and ensure that the transport of U.S. Government cargoes continue to provide jobs for U.S. seafarers.

In general, this legislation will do much to advance our maritime industries and ensure that our maritime economy remains a vibrant contributor and source of jobs for millions of Americans.

This legislation is noncontroversial. It does have solid bipartisan and bicameral support, and I urge Members to support this worthy bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, there are a few people I want to thank, too. I want to thank JOHN and JEFF, who are here in this room, for the work that they have put into this. I want to thank Victoria Middleton, who is my chief of staff. This will be her last year. This is her first Coast Guard bill that we are getting done here. They have put in so much work and so much time.

For myself, this is my first piece of legislation that I am going to be passing in this Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee with Mr. GARAMENDI. It has been a great time working with everybody.

I want to thank, lastly, the men and women of the Coast Guard. They have been fantastic. They have really opened up their arms to us. We have been able to see what they do, how they do it, and what they have to do, day in and day out, for the people of this country and, frankly, people of every country.

If you are on the open seas and something bad happens to you, it is going to be the U.S. Coast Guard that comes and saves you. If you are a bad guy running drugs from South America up to Florida, it is going to be a U.S. Coast Guard vessel that interdicts.

I just want to thank the U.S. Coast Guard for what they do for this Nation because they are kind of the redheaded stepchild. They are a military service, but they are also a law enforcement entity. They get to do both things, and that is one of the things that makes them such a great organization.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, and I will be very brief. I thank the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, and the chairman of the subcommittee for your generous words. I am not sure that I am deserving, but I am appreciative. I appreciate the diligence which the Coast Guard men and women display daily in the discharge of their duties.

There is an old adage that is as old as the Coast Guard, and that is when distress calls are received, the Coast Guard must go out. It says nothing about them coming back. Most of them do come back, but on occasion, they don't. We should always remember that very clearly.

Again, I thank you for this honor.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 5769, the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act.

As explained by previous speakers, this bill is bipartisan, bicameral, and is noncontroversial. It reauthorizes the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve and the Federal Maritime Commission. The legislation includes many important provisions that were contained in H.R. 4005, the Coast Guard authorization legislation that was passed and reported by voice vote from the committee, as well as overwhelming support here on the floor on April 1 of this year.

Maintaining a safe, reliable, and efficient maritime commerce that enables our foreign and domestic trade to fuel the U.S. economy remains as important today as it was in 1790, when former Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton established the U.S. Revenue Cutter Service, the predecessor to the U.S. Coast Guard.

This new legislation will provide our Coast Guard with the resources and policy tools they need to meet the challenges presented by an ever-evolving economy and security demands of our Nation.

First, let me explain. A sincere gratitude to my colleague, DUNCAN HUNTER, the chair of the subcommittee, for the work that he and his extraordinary staff have done in putting together this bill. Working together, I think we have accomplished something useful.

Mr. RAHALL's leadership on our side was exemplary. He gave us the resources, the time, and the encouragement to get this job done, and that was repeated by Mr. SHUSTER on the other

side. We have a great team, and I am proud to be part of it.

This is a compromise to be sure, but it is a good one. First and foremost, the bill includes several noncontroversial administrative and management directives to better align the Coast Guard missions and needs with the long-term capital planning and annual budget requests.

Additionally, the bill would grant the Coast Guard with greater flexibility to augment Active Duty forces and provide explicit cooperative agreement authority to enhance the Coast Guard's ability to develop beneficial partnerships with other maritime stakeholders. The bill provides new guidance to the Coast Guard as it continues to rebuild its fleet of offshore cutters.

I am particularly pleased this legislation would advance several positive initiatives to reinvigorate the U.S. merchant marine and improve maritime transportation. Most noteworthy, this legislation would advance several positive policy initiatives, among them the enforcement of cargo preference laws and regulations, a move that is long overdue.

Additionally, the legislation requires the Department of Transportation to develop a new maritime strategy and direct the Government Accountability Office to conduct an assessment of how future export trade can be augmented.

I welcome the opportunities to chart new courses forward to improve the competitiveness of the U.S. flag fleet on the high seas, to increase opportunities for short sea shipping, and to expand our commercial shipbuilding industrial base.

I am pleased that this legislation will advance significant new policies already discussed by Mr. HUNTER to finally force the Federal Government and the Coast Guard especially to take constructive actions to address the implications of the thawing of the Arctic Ocean and the imminent demands for commercial maritime transportation and resource development across that vast region. A particular shout-out to Mr. HUNTER for leading the charge on this very important effort.

In closing, this bill is responsible legislation that would provide budget stability for the Coast Guard, advance sensible policy reforms, and promote our merchant marine. The bill deserves support from Members from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would not have happened without the leadership of Mr. RAHALL and the full committee chairman, BILL SHUSTER from Pennsylvania. They did a lot of work on this bill.

I am honored to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from California, Mr. HUNTER and Mr. GARAMENDI, for their

great work. There were a couple of rough patches, but in the House, we were able to figure it out. In the Senate, I especially thank Senator ROCKEFELLER for working through this. I know Senator ROCKEFELLER is retiring, so it is fitting that, as he leaves, this bill and his work is complete, and so we congratulate and thank him for his work.

This bill that Chairman HUNTER and Mr. GARAMENDI put together is truly bipartisan and bicameral. There are a lot of great reforms in it. The men and women of the Coast Guard that help to keep this country safe and enforce our laws, this is a tribute to them for what they do.

They risk their lives to save people and to save property, and so my hat goes off to them and to thank them again for the great work that they do protecting the American people on the waterways and on the high seas and the marine natural resources that they also help to protect. They have a huge job.

I am very, very proud that the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act is going to pass today. As I said, a lot of bipartisan reforms are in the bill that will help to streamline and ensure that our Coast Guard can do their job more efficiently and with less red tape, giving them the resources that they need.

Again, a special thanks to HOWARD COBLE, who the bill is named for. This is his final bill. We wish him well in his future journey. Being the only Member of Congress that is a coastie, we thank him for all of his years of service back to 1985.

I think I am one of the few Members who has known HOWARD COBLE since 1985—not that I was a Member then, but my father served with HOWARD on the committee. I was with my father last night, and I told him that we are doing the bill today, and he sends his best to you, HOWARD, and congratulates you on your retirement.

You have been a tireless worker for the interests of the Coast Guard and for the security of America, and we can't thank you enough for that.

□ 1300

In addition, the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, I believe this will be the final bill that he moves through the committee. I want to thank him for his friendship and for working with me the past 2 years. It has been a great partnership.

I have got a lot of great stories. As we went through the WRDA bill, a lot of great successes. A couple of them I can't tell, or I can't tell them on the House floor, but they are all clean. They are all good. But, again, we really worked well together on that, and I wish you the best in your future endeavors. You will be missed here in Washington. And again, a family friend

for almost 40 years, serving with my father and with me; and again, we can't thank you enough for the great work that you have done in your 38 years here.

Mr. COBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COBLE. I will be very brief.

In thanking Mr. RAHALL and Mr. HUNTER, I failed to thank the chairman. That is a mistake you should never commit. So I thank you as well, Mr. SHUSTER. Thanks to all of you.

Mr. SHUSTER. I was more than happy to let Mr. COBLE come up. He didn't have to thank me. His hard work is thanks enough. But, again, a fine member of the committee and a Member of Congress. We are going to miss him greatly.

So, again, as I want to sum up, Chairman HUNTER, Ranking Member GARAMENDI, great work on this bill. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for this, and hopefully we will get a vote in the Senate next week, and we can get this to the President's desk and he can sign it for Christmas. So, again, thanks to all.

I want to thank the staff for their great work, not only on the subcommittee but on the full committee. As we worked through the past 2 years, the staff has had a lot of good action together, and I want to thank the staff and wish them a Merry Christmas, a happy holiday, and a happy new year. If we don't see you, then we will see you around the first of the year.

I am particularly pleased that the bill includes a provision which equalizes the regulatory treatment among similar vessels which operate out of the British and U.S. Virgin Islands.

Current law puts certain vessels operating out of the U.S. Virgin Islands at a competitive disadvantage with similar vessels operating out of the British Virgin Islands. H.R. 5769 establishes an equal playing field for these vessels.

It allows vessels operating out of the U.S. Virgin Islands which meet safety requirements identical to those in effect for similar vessels operating out of the British Virgin Islands to carry an equal number of passengers.

It is clear the provision comes into effect on the date of enactment. The Coast Guard may write standards to implement the provision, but, again, the provision is clear, any such standards must be identical to those imposed on BVI vessels; and during any period prior to the implementation of such standards, vessels operating out of the U.S. Virgin Islands which meet the standards referenced in section 319, uninspected passenger vessels in the United States Virgin Islands, of H.R. 5769 shall be allowed to carry an equal number of passengers as those operating out of the British Virgin Islands.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Ranking Mem-

ber RAHALL for this time. I also thank him for his work on this legislation and for his decades of service to our great Nation. He will be sorely missed in the Transportation Committee and, indeed, in the Congress.

I also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman HUNTER, and Ranking Member GARAMENDI for all of their hard work on this legislation.

I rise today in support of this measure, H.R. 5769, the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014.

And it is interesting that Mr. COBLE just got up to make sure that he thanked everybody, but I want to thank him. When I served as the chairman of the subcommittee, he was one of my staunchest supporters. He was the epitome of bipartisanship. He always made it clear that the Coast Guard was sometimes not put on the front burner, was on the back burner, and he wanted to make sure that they were on the front burner, and I want to thank him for this. This is so very, very significant, and I want to thank him for his friendship over the many years.

This measure includes critical provisions strengthening the Department of Transportation's, DOT, authority to enforce cargo preference requirements to ensure that government-impelled cargoes are carried on U.S.-flagged vessels. Section 321 of this legislation clarifies that the DOT has exclusive authority to determine whether a government-impelled cargo is subject to these requirements.

Section 321 also requires the DOT to conduct an annual review to determine whether government programs are in compliance with cargo preference requirements. According to the Maritime Administration, the number of U.S.-flagged vessels operating in international trade has declined nearly 25 percent in just the last 3 years, falling from 106 in January of 2012 to just 81 as of this month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. CUMMINGS. It is not an exaggeration to say that if we don't take deliberate and swift steps to preserve the U.S. Merchant Marine, we will lose it, leaving our Nation dependent for merchant sealift capacity on foreign-flagged vessels and foreign mariners. Despite what some may claim, reserving the carriage of the U.S. Government-impelled cargoes is not unlike any other government program designed to ensure that the expenditure of U.S. taxpayer funds benefits Americans.

Again, this is a very important piece of legislation. I urge all the Members to vote for it. To all of those who have been a part of this in making it happen, I express my appreciation. On be-

half of the Coast Guard, I express my appreciation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), my good friend and colleague and the full committee chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the efforts of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Its leadership should be commended for this bipartisan effort to strengthen the Coast Guard in a time of heightened security threats to the United States.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has been working in a bipartisan way to reform international food assistance, so I particularly appreciate the fact that this legislation does not include a provision that would have raised the cargo preference requirements for these programs from 50 percent to 75 percent. A provision like this would cost U.S. taxpayers millions more and slow lifesaving assistance by months.

Lives are at stake, and I appreciate that the committee heard our view, and I also appreciate the assurances provided by the Transportation Committee that nothing in section 321 will drastically alter the existing consultation requirements for enforcement of cargo preference. I also understand that nothing in the bill will have the effect of raising cargo preference above an annual global threshold of 50 percent, particularly for the Food for Peace program.

Again, congratulations to Chairman HUNTER and his colleagues for crafting this important legislation and also Mr. COBLE and Mr. RAHALL for their work.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, may I have a time check, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the distinguished ranking member of our Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5769, the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014.

As a former ranking member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, I am very pleased that this bill provides the necessary resources to keep the men and women of the Coast Guard on the job. I am also pleased this bill makes needed advancements in our Nation's engagement in the Arctic.

Our country faces a steep opportunity curve when it comes to the Arctic. We haven't made the needed investments in that region to protect our environment, our economic interests, and our national security. But as our country gets ready to take over the chairmanship of the Arctic Council in 2015, this bill signals that our country is ready to engage further in Arctic

issues. It requires the Coast Guard to come up with a plan for moving our icebreaker fleet forward; it encourages the development of forward operating bases for the Coast Guard in the region; and it improves the ability of the Coast Guard to monitor, patrol, and protect our Nation's Arctic waters.

I am hopeful that this bill will finally push the Coast Guard to reactivate the mothballed Polar Sea icebreaker so that it can act as a bridge towards a new icebreaker fleet. In the longer term, funding a new icebreaker fleet will require a whole of government approach. The Coast Guard simply does not have the acquisition budget to build a new icebreaker fleet on its own.

The Department of Defense, Coast Guard, and National Science Foundation need to work together to develop a funding strategy for assets they will all use. This bill endorses such a strategy.

Finally, I am very pleased that this bill includes \$10 million for the Small Shipyard Grant Program, a successful effort that provides infrastructure spending to shipyards in the Pacific Northwest and around the country that creates jobs and supports local economies.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to commend our full committee chairman, Mr. SHUSTER; the subcommittee chair, Mr. HUNTER; our ranking member, Mr. GARAMENDI; and our staffs, as well, for the tremendous work that has gone in to producing this legislation.

Under Chairman SHUSTER's leadership, our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is indeed demonstrating once again today what bipartisanship can do and the productive manner in which we can work for the American people in what is often described as a dysfunctional city. I know that in the years ahead, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will step up to the plate and do its work again, especially in addressing a major transportation bill next year and a major aviation bill that is on its agenda.

I guess it is kind of fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the last bill that Senator ROCKEFELLER and myself are in part being managed by West Virginians. Both of us will be leaving this Congress. West Virginia is the great seafaring State that it is. But I do salute Senator ROCKEFELLER as well for his tremendous leadership as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, for his leadership on this legislation and so many other pieces of legislation that have benefited our State of West Virginia in a more direct way, perhaps, but also a benefit to this great country. He is one that has been concerned

for all of us, as we all are, about producing jobs for America, and that is what our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is about.

I commend the staffs and I commend my dear friend Mr. COBLE that so much has been said about and for whom this legislation is named. We have traveled together on a few occasions. During my entire time here, I have not seen any Member of this body conduct themselves in such a true gentleman fashion as HOWARD COBLE does. We all call him our dear friend.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and, again, commend Chairman HUNTER and Chairman SHUSTER for their bipartisan and cooperative manner in which they have worked on this and so many pieces of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia and my colleague from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) and the great staffs that spent time on this and, of course, the great HOWARD COBLE, who said in one of his elections probably about 10 years ago when he was down by a few hundred votes, I called him up on it election night and his answer was, "Look good, feel good." That is the great HOWARD COBLE.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on the bipartisan Howard Coble Coast Guard & Maritime Transportation Act of 2014. This bill is a great step for our nation's Coast Guard and federal maritime transportation. Under the constraints of limited resources, this important agreement will continue to provide our Coast Guard and Federal Maritime Commission with the ability to protect our nation's international borders while promoting American commerce around the world.

Having served the people of Los Angeles for nearly 15 years on the City Council and now in Congress, I have long appreciated the work of our Coast Guard and Federal Maritime Commission officials who support the largest port complex in the United States. America relies on the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, which is the gateway for forty percent of all maritime commerce, and providing security to these ports keeps goods flowing across the nation.

In addition, this act provides new incentives for the employment of veterans on U.S. flagged vessels, and directs the Secretary of Transportation to work with Congress to create a national maritime strategy to promote the competitiveness of the U.S. flagged fleet, increase the use of short seas shipping, and enhance U.S. shipbuilding capacity. Our nation's ports and maritime commerce drive all aspects of our economy, and this agreement will provide our nation's maritime gateways the federal support to ensure American ports remain the safest and most economical for shippers around the world.

I am pleased this strong agreement bears the name of our colleague HOWARD COBLE, a fellow member of the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee and a great friend of mine, who has long been a champion of America's Coast Guard and ports. Congress will miss his leadership. I urge the Senate to consider this legislation immediately and send it to the President's desk for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5769.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1315

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5771, TAX INCREASE PREVENTION ACT OF 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 647, ACHIEVING A BETTER LIFE EXPERIENCE ACT OF 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 766 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 766

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered

as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. In the engrossment of H.R. 5771 the Clerk shall—

(a) add the text of H.R. 647, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 5771;

(b) conform the title of H.R. 5771 to reflect the addition of H.R. 647, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(c) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(d) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, as the calendar year comes to an end, America's small businesses and taxpayers are looking to Congress for certainty before they file their taxes in April of 2015. While far from perfect, the Tax Increase Prevention Act will provide certainty by extending for 1 more year a number of tax relief provisions that simply would have expired at the end of this year. Put simply, this bill will prevent tax increases on millions of families that would happen if we were not bringing it to the floor today.

And to Mr. KINGSTON, I thank you for your years of service to this body on behalf of the American people and the people of Georgia.

In an ideal world, Mr. Speaker, the House would be debating a more comprehensive approach to tax reform. We would be worried and focusing our activities on growing jobs in America and giving the American people more of their hard-earned money back so they could invest either in their family or in their business—an opportunity to grow our economy to keep America strong—but our Tax Code is holding back America from being competitive and from providing America with more jobs.

American taxpayers deserve what we are doing today, which is an opportunity to work incrementally on a better, simpler, easy-to-navigate Tax Code with certainty, but only for 1 more year. We should be making long-range plans by working with the United States Senate and the President to make sure the American people come up winners. The United States tax rate is currently the highest in the world, and I would prefer to be debating reform, but we are here today for 1 more year's worth of opportunity to keep America where she and her citizens are prepared for the future.

Thanks to the leadership of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, DAVE CAMP from Michigan, we almost had a chance to fix these issues today, but he came to the rescue and said, "I am going to work with Republicans and Democrats and anybody who will work with me"—meaning the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—"on helping American business be stronger."

The bottom line is that I believe we are going to work together, and it starts in the House of Representatives to get that work done. So just like the deal that DAVE CAMP started, we are here for the process today of jump-starting American business for yet another year.

Sadly, reports tell us that the President's veto threat undermines these bipartisan negotiations. The things Chairman DAVE CAMP is working on to make American jobs stronger and a reality—and working on in a bipartisan effort—the President of the United States is threatening to veto that very legislation. So, today, despite the veto threat, we are here to do our work.

Today, you will see, Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats certainly have things in the bill which are special and important to them but that, more importantly, are about the American people and opportunities to save and grow jobs.

Earlier this year, and certainly last year, the House passed a number of permanent extensions of these policies on a bipartisan basis. That means, Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats tried to work together. But the failure of leadership on the Senate side meant those bills were not even brought before the Senate to debate them. Worse yet, the President of the United States opposes those efforts.

We are here for one simple reason today. By taking the leadership opportunity, we think we can gain the ability, on a bipartisan basis in the House of Representatives, to give the Senate and the President one more whack at it.

Let me be clear. Even if this legislation is not as ambitious as it could have been, it is still vitally important. I think what we are doing here, under the leadership of JOHN BOEHNER, is to

say to the American people that we know what our job is, even if we are not as wildly successful as we want to be. America's small businesses and families actually need, and rely upon, Congress to do its job.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the 32nd Congressional District of Texas, which is essentially Dallas, Texas, and some suburbs, I regularly meet with small businesses—important businesses—that employ people. Earlier in the year, I met with Jamey Rentfrow of Ascend Custom Extrusions in Wylie, Texas. Jamey's company manufactures and designs custom aluminum extrusions for industry. It was a most interesting visit. They call this manufacturing in America.

On the same day, I also met with JoAnn Gardner, a young woman who owns Savage Precision Fabrication. They make parts for military aircraft. They count on us to be able to get our job done to buy the newest and best equipment. It goes to help not only aerospace and military but other civilian needs also. They know that if we do this, the option for them to expense 50 percent of the purchase price of their assets can be taken care of. They can write it off when they want to rather than when the Tax Code wants.

In March, I met with Frank Millsap. It was a most interesting visit. He runs a rod car store called Sachse Rod Shop. He explained to me how our onerous Tax Code prevented him from employing more people.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. We are here to make sure we take care of the people in our home districts, many of them companies that are small mom-and-pop shops, but others that employ hundreds of people.

The bill would also affect a minority-owned business called Aluma Graphics, which is located in Wylie, Texas, and owned by Randall Williams, a young man who played professional football. When he got out, he decided he was going to go into business. He is realizing how tough it is to manufacture labels and decals for industrial products. This bill would help him and his employees.

These businesses, not just in the 32nd Congressional District but all over our country, are important, as they provide people the honesty of hard work and the return of continuing to come to work the next day because their company can make the money to get it done.

What we are doing today will extend for only 1 more year the tax provisions, but it will help millions and millions of people.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, this rule contains a great bill that's called the ABLE Act, which represents, I believe, what our country can do best when Republicans and Democrats and people who care in the United States Congress work together.

Almost every single person in America, I believe, knows someone with a disability: a family member, a best friend, perhaps a brother or sister, or maybe even an aunt or uncle. But we all know that it is only fair that we pay attention to the people we dearly love.

So, today is a game-changer. Today, we are removing what I think is a glass ceiling for disabled people who are held at a disadvantage in our Tax Code. The ABLE Act would make 529 tax-free savings accounts available so that families can cover important expenses such as postsecondary education, housing, career development, and medical expenses not covered by private insurance, Medicaid, or other benefits that might be available to them offered by government.

These tax-free savings accounts will empower families so that their loved ones can have opportunities they have not had in the past. It is personal to me because as my father looks at all of his grandchildren, he can have the opportunity of helping out in their education, but not for Alex Sessions, his grandson with Down syndrome. He can help all the grandkids, but not Alex.

This happens millions of times in our country. There are millions of people with disabilities who count on going into a program or being enrolled in something that the Federal Government pays for, but we discriminate against them. When this gets signed into law, my father, Judge Sessions, will be able to treat Alex as he does his other grandchildren. What is amazing is that Alex needs it more than all of them combined, but he is the one that we wanted to keep in his place because he has a disability called Down syndrome.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is important. It is important to the people whom it impacts. It is important to our families. But more importantly, it is important to our country. The gentleman, ANDER CRENSHAW from Jacksonville, has worked on this bill for 8 years. We are finding a way to put it into a piece of legislation. To help millions of people with their jobs, it needs to pass.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. We are here doing important work for millions of people. It does matter, and I think we make a huge difference.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we have two bills before us: one extending tax relief measures and another for helping our brothers and sisters and family members with disabilities. These bills, considered under two more closed rules, which I feel I must point out, adds to the tally of the most closed Congress in American history.

□ 1330

First, H.R. 5771, the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014. This 1-year extension will cover approximately 60 temporary Tax Code provisions that expired at the end of 2013 or during 2014. Many of the provisions have been previously extended with broad bipartisan support.

This bill is far from perfect, but it provides us a sorely-needed stopgap measure. Our economy has finally emerged from the shadow of the Great Recession, but playing games like this, lurching from one short-term measure to another, will certainly harm that recovery.

This bill will ensure some consistency in the Tax Code that will help the American people avail themselves of the tax credits that they depend on, just in time for the tax filing season.

However, of particular note, left out of this package is the health coverage tax credit, which is made available to workers who have lost their jobs as a result of unfair trade deals and retirees who are at risk of losing their pensions.

In my district, in Rochester, the retirees of Delphi and other local companies depend on the health coverage tax credit to cover their health care bills, and they have been fighting mightily for some relief from the fact that they have lost their pensions and their health care. This is all that they have, the government program.

Denying a critical tax credit to families who have been hit hardest by unfair foreign competition and a tough economy here at home is a mistake, and one I will fight hard to correct.

The second bill we have before us today is H.R. 647, the ABLE Act. This bill will right an injustice that has been impacting millions of Americans with disabilities, their families, and their caregivers.

Under current law, the individuals with disabilities can qualify to receive Social Security Disability Insurance, but there is an asset limit of \$2,000, meaning that if you have more cash than that on hand, your SSDI benefits will be reduced.

This disincentivizes work and saving, creates an unnecessary economic uncertainty, and it does nothing to better the circumstances of our Nation's most vulnerable.

The ABLE Act will change that by creating a tax-free savings account, with an annual cap on contributions of \$14,000, ensuring that people with disabilities have a better sense of security and ways that friends and family can contribute to their education, transportation, medical expenses, employment support, housing, and more without risking their eligibility for the badly-needed disability insurance.

I am pleased to see this come to the floor with such strong support because my district in Rochester has a vibrant

and involved community of people with disabilities.

I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, in particular, for the diligent, passionate, and careful work on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations about these bills, the first bill anyway, but stabilizing the Tax Code and ensuring financial independence for our brothers and sisters does provide much-needed support. So I urge my colleagues to do the best they can on the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Jackson County, North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for his leadership and his vision and his passion and his great words.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Jacksonville, Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW). He is a true leader, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the ABLE Act.

Today, we can talk about taxes, we can talk about legislation, but really, what we are talking about is people, Mr. Speaker.

I want to share two personal stories because, for me, I don't have to deal with children with disabilities on a daily basis. I was blessed with two kids that didn't have some of those same challenges.

What I have had is I have experienced the love and the compassion that two children with special needs have given to me over and over.

The first one of those is a young lady, 21 years of age, with Down syndrome named Chloe. Chloe is not only a dear friend but also is someone who has been able to share with me the struggles in her life, the passion in her life, the vision. She has a part-time job.

But the other part of that story is the difficulties that sometimes families with special needs have. What I have seen over and over again is that, even though I was able to experience the love firsthand, that there is a 24-hour, 7-day a week job that parents have to deal with, and some of those challenges are monumental.

We need to address that as a body. We need to partner with those moms and dads across America to make sure that, indeed, what they have to face is not really handicapped because of a Tax Code that penalizes them.

So the ABLE Act, after 8 long years of work by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), hopefully, will be voted on and passed in this very House to provide the needs and the help that those parents so desperately need.

But I also want to share another story about a young lady from my

home district who has just turned 1 named Holland Burleson, because, indeed, Down syndrome, whether it is with Chloe or this young lady, has a profound effect; same love, same compassion that I got to experience.

But yet, what happened is that those parents went out, funded a 5K run to bring the awareness to a community up in the mountains of western North Carolina, and overwhelmingly, that community came together, raising funds not just for the benefit of the Burleson family but for the benefit of all of those families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank the gentleman.

What happened is lives were transformed in that small little town. And so I am here today to speak on behalf of not only great work, but great vision and a partnership in which we can partner with families, moms and dads across this country, to do a job that should have been done long ago, to allow the special needs of those special families to be addressed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have one request for time, and so I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), within the parameters of the debate time, and provided that no one else shows up who requests time.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate what Mr. SESSIONS said, and thank you for your tremendous service here in this body. So thank you for acknowledging that too.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is broken. We know it, and the American people know it. The difference between us and them is that we can actually do something about it. In fact, that is our job.

But here we go again, ducking our responsibility and not doing our job. We ducked when we failed to pass a long-term transportation bill. We ducked when we failed to meet our constitutional responsibility to debate a new, long-term military commitment in the Middle East.

And now, here we go again with this tax extender bill.

We need tax reform. 435 Members of Congress agree. Both parties agree. This year we had an opportunity. The Ways and Means Committee, under Chairman DAVE CAMP, presented a real plan, real simplification and lower rates, and all of it was paid for.

There were many points of disagreement, as well as agreement in that bill. In a functioning legislature, we would have debated the Camp bill, modified it, and passed some version of it to move America forward.

Instead, Speaker BOEHNER said the Camp bill was dead on arrival. No discussion, no debate, no progress. More

ducking and dodging instead of Congress doing its job.

This tax extender package adds insult to the American people who want tax reform to the injury Congress inflicts by failing to do its job. When we pass tax extenders instead of tax reform, Congress, once again, is back to doing business as usual.

This bill, considered on December 3, is retroactive to January. How can we expect businesses and families to plan when we don't let them know what the rules for the tax year are until the year is nearly over?

It is business as usual when we preach fiscal responsibility, pledging allegiance to a balanced budget, and then pass a bill which adds \$44.7 billion to the taxpayers' credit card.

Mr. Speaker, how can Congress assert today that we will do tax reform next year, tax reform that the American people are demanding, when we are about to repeat the irresponsible practice of passing short-term, retroactive bills, something Congress has been doing year in and year out?

This bill says to the American people that Congress is up to its old tricks. Meet the new Congress—same as the old Congress. Congress says one thing: "We need tax reform," but Congress does another, kicks the can down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I do support some of the provisions in this bill and I would like to vote for them, but Congress must do its job, not dodge its responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to take the gentleman from Vermont up on, really, his issues. We are going to have a Republican House, a Republican Senate, that is able to effectively work with each other, look each other in the eye and find progress for the American people. So I promise the gentleman, he is going to get what he wants and more so that we can grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have as our next speaker a gentleman who, for 8 years, has toiled on the ABLE Act. He is the chief sponsor. He is the young man who has made so many conversations and discussions, not just among our Members here, but also among people all around this country, disability groups.

I earlier accused him of being from Texas. He is actually from Jacksonville, Florida, so I am sure I will get lots of cards and letters about that. We wish he were a Texan, but he is from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I thank Chairman SESSIONS for the work that he has done all along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the adoption of this rule and the underlying legislation, particularly the ABLE Act, which the chairman just talked about.

Eight years ago I first filed this legislation, and an awful lot of people have spent a lot of time and a lot of energy bringing us to where we are today.

The gentleman before me spoke about how Congress is often dysfunctional. As we look at the ABLE Act today, I think we will have a chance to see what can happen when people work together, when Democrats and Republicans come together, when the House and the Senate work together to do what is best for the people of our country.

I think it is a great illustration of what we can do, and the fact that we have over 380 cosponsors in the House, over 70 sponsors in the United States Senate, is a demonstration of that, what can be accomplished when we put our minds to it and work together.

It has been pointed out that most of us know someone with a severe disability, might be Down syndrome, might be autism. But sometimes it is hard for us to understand the difficulties that they have to go through, along with their families. They face challenges that we can hardly even imagine sometimes.

The ABLE Act seeks to try to remedy that situation, to bring justice, to bring peace of mind to millions of American families who have to live with disabilities every day. It does that by creating these tax-free savings accounts, allows the money that they set aside to grow tax-free as long as they use those proceeds for qualified expenses. And what that does is it simply gives those individuals with disabilities a chance for the American Dream.

They have hopes and dreams just like we all do, and this will give them the tool to open the door to a brighter future, the way to realize their full potential.

□ 1345

We help other people save for college by creating 529 tax-advantaged accounts. We allow people to save for their health care by creating health savings accounts. We allow people to save for their retirements through individual retirement accounts and 401(k)'s.

It seems only fair that we offer individuals with disabilities the same tax-advantaged tools, so they can realize their dreams, maybe get a job, maybe save for the future, maybe go to college.

I just hope that, as we adopt this rule and as we move into the ABLE Act, that we will all continue to work together because I can't think of anything more special, as more of a privilege, than for us as a Congress to speak up for those who so often can't speak for themselves.

I urge the adoption of the rule and of the underlying bill as well.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A number of people who asked to speak today are on their way here, and we will do that.

I really want to stand up for just a few minutes, pending those several Members coming here, to say to you and to the American people, Mr. Speaker, that this country—America—is a great, great, great country. It is great because of its people. There is a lot that has been said today and on other days about some of our frailties, about some of our warts, about some of the problems that we have.

I think what Mr. CRENSHAW said in his remarks is most appropriate because you have a man who has a number of very important issues that he carries on behalf of his congressional district in Jacksonville, Florida. He spoke about also taking the time to be a voice for millions of people across this country, not just for those whom he saw specifically in Jacksonville.

You heard the gentleman, Mr. MEADOWS, speak very plainly about two Down syndrome young women of our country who are key assets to our country. We weren't asking for anything else today through this ABLE Act that Mr. CRENSHAW has so ably moved forward—it has taken 8 years—than for people to have equity or fairness.

In the larger scheme of things, as a parent of a Down syndrome young man, I looked at where we stood, and said, "Why wouldn't we allow the fairness?"

Really, let's look at it another way. Why would we want to keep these disabled individuals from having fairness? Why do we want to keep them poor and in the same circumstances they are in? Why would we want everyone else to be treated under one set of rules and, because they are disabled, they are treated another way?

These are questions and discussions that have been in my family now for 20 years. I don't know why Alex is my special gift. He is perfect. God made every child perfect in His image. We are the ones who struggle.

Today, we are working together as the House of Representatives for a bill that Mr. CRENSHAW saw a need for, and he had the fortitude and the opportunity today because of JOHN BOEHNER. Yes, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, a Democrat Member of this body; yes, some United States Senators, including Senator HARKIN of Iowa and, yes, Senator CASEY from Pennsylvania; yes, CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, a senior member of our Republican leadership team who, by the way, has a Down syndrome son, Cole—we all worked together. This is a special thing.

I think, today, it ought to be a pat on the back for us, an opportunity for us to say this is important and this is good. That is what we should remember from today, in that we may not go to sleep knowing our job is done, but that we did something right by coming together as a body.

My dear colleague LOUISE SLAUGHTER, who is from New York, very clearly understood a long time ago, as she put her name on the bill, that this is a good bill. Members of the Rules Committee, who typically don't put their names on bills, put their names on this bill—380 Members of this body. See, there are good things that happen.

I do want to thank my colleague, Ms. SLAUGHTER. I do want to thank people because this is a bipartisan effort. This is a chance for us to work together, and I think we did a good job today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentlewoman, I will let her make her closing arguments, and then I will do the same.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the Democrats have reservations on these bills, but extending tax credits to ensure continuity in the Tax Code is very important to us, even though we know that large pieces of America have been left out of this bill.

It causes us great sadness, but nonetheless, we recognize the need to get this done. All of us appreciate the opportunity for the brothers and sisters with disabilities to have the stability that they need, and we are certainly in concert with that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It has been mentioned a couple of times today, but I also want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, for your distinguished service, not only to the people of Georgia in your district, but also to the people—your friends—who are in this body, who have benefited from your service on the Appropriations Committee and who knew that you took time, just as we are doing here today, to deal with the intricacies of NIH, to deal with the intricacies of cancer, to deal with the intricacies of disabilities, to deal with the intricacies of our working together as a country and as a body and as Americans to make life better for people.

Mr. Speaker, your years of service here—some 20 years of service that you have given—have been of distinguished service. I have known you for a long time and have admired you.

I want to thank the gentleman, JACK KINGSTON, for his great service to America, which is exactly in line with what we are doing today.

Thank you, sir. I appreciate your hard work. Your being in the chair as

we do this is not by accident. It is on purpose. With the distinguished opportunity that you have of serving as the Speaker pro tempore today, I appreciate your great service.

Mr. Speaker, we have made the case today of what we are trying to do. We are on the floor to bring certainty to the Tax Code for one more year. It is not perfect—the gentleman from Vermont noted that—but it is an opportunity as best as we can do in the environment that we are in, and that is what this is about. It is the knowledge that we are going to wake up and do the best that we can for the American people.

Today is about the American people and their Tax Code. Today is about the ABLE Act and about millions of people with disabilities who are attempting as best as they can to make due with what they have but who, tomorrow, can get fairness and equity in that process. It is about an opportunity for families not to question why but to dig in and help.

Today is yet another opportunity when not only the gentlewoman, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and I may work together in our tutelage as chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee but when we can have a common sense of purpose. This is not perfect, but the world can be better today and tomorrow.

I would ask my fellow Members to understand that we are here asking for everybody to vote "yes" on the rule. They can do what they want to do on the underlying legislation, but today is an opportunity to give thanks for the opportunities that lie ahead of us that are about others instead of ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, as the 113th Congress draws to a close, American businesses and families are looking to us with hopes for a new spirit of bipartisanship and decisive action. We should take this opportunity to find common ground and give certainty to our constituents instead of continuing to postpone difficult choices and leaving the tough decisions for next year.

The bill before us today, H.R. 5771, extends several important tax provisions, many of which I have actively supported over the last two years. But by failing to extend these provisions beyond 2014, we have missed the chance to provide much-needed certainty to our constituents. For this reason I am reluctantly supporting H.R. 5771, but also calling on my colleagues to embrace long-term solutions as we consider these important issues going forward.

The production tax credit for renewable energy has been key to the growth of an important industry in my home state of Oregon and in this country, and ending it in 2014 jeopardizes new investments in our communities and job creation opportunities. H.R. 5771 extends the production tax credit, but the short-term

nature of the extension makes it difficult for the wind industry and others to meaningfully plan future projects. This does nothing to end our dependence on fossil fuels from other nations, and it doesn't create any incentives for innovative clean energy companies to hire additional employees.

H.R. 5771 does provide some relief to underwater homeowners who have had a portion of their mortgage debt forgiven, and that is a provision that comes as a great relief to many of our constituents. But still others will wonder what to expect in tax year 2015 and beyond, thus adding to the financial instability that prevents families from feeling the benefits of the slowly developing economic recovery.

Making businesses and families in our districts wait until the end of the year to find out whether we will grant a retroactive extension of many tax provisions that affect their returns and their finances is unacceptable. Governing by crisis must end now. Americans and Oregonians expect more from us, and they deserve more from us. H.R. 5771 is a small step in the right direction, but Congress needs to do more and give our constituents the certainty they need to lead us to a robust economic recovery.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as Ranking Member of the House Budget Committee, it is abundantly clear to me that what our country needs most right now—and what we really should be voting on today—is comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform that encourages investment at home, drives job creation and delivers broadly shared prosperity to all Americans.

Instead, we are voting to retroactively extend a group of over 50, mostly business-related, temporary tax provisions that expired at the end of last year—until the end of this year. Which is now about four weeks away.

That's what today's legislation does. It retroactively takes these 50-odd expired provisions back to the beginning of the year, and then extends them forward for the next four weeks, at which point they will expire again and we'll be right back to square one.

Let me be clear: I support a number of these expiring provisions—like the R&D Tax Credit—and think they should be made permanent as part of comprehensive tax reform. And there are additional steps I think we should be taking—like extending the Health Care Tax Credit for trade-displaced workers and older workers whose pensions have been taken over by the PBGC. And ending the egregious practice of so-called corporate inversions once and for all.

I am reluctantly supporting this bill because, without it, many individuals and businesses would see an effective tax increase.

But Mr. Speaker, at some point, we're going to have to stop kicking the can down the road. From my perspective, that moment can't come soon enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1440

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of H. Res. 766, by the yeas and nays;

Motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 5769, by the yeas and nays;

Approval of the Journal, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5771, TAX INCREASE PREVENTION ACT OF 2014, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 647, ACHIEVING A BETTER LIFE EXPERIENCE ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 766) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

Amash	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Perry
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Barber	Grimm	Pitts
Barletta	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hanna	Pompeo
Barton	Harper	Posey
Benishek	Harris	Reed
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Black	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Blackburn	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Himes	Roby
Brat	Holding	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hunter	Rokita
Bucshon	Hurt	Rooney
Burgess	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Jenkins	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Campbell	Jolly	Royce
Capito	Jordan	Runyan
Carter	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	Kingston	Schock
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kline	Scott, Austin
Cole	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Conaway	Lance	Shuster
Cook	Lankford	Simpson
Cotton	Latham	Sinema
Cramer	Latta	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Lipinski	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Long	Smith (TX)
Daines	Lucas	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Delaney	Lummis	Stivers
Denham	Marchant	Stutzman
Dent	Marino	Terry
DeSantis	McAllister	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	McCauley	Tiberi
Duffy	McClintock	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McIntyre	Upton
Ellmers	McKeon	Valadao
Farenthold	McKinley	Wagner
Fincher	McMorris	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walden
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walorski
Fleming	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Flores	Messer	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Mica	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Fox	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Murphy (FL)	Wittman
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wolf
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Womack
Gibbs	Noem	Woodall
Gibson	Nugent	Yoder
Gohmert	Nunes	Yoho
Goodlatte	Nunnelee	Young (AK)
Gosar	Olson	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Palazzo	
Granger	Paulsen	

NAYS—192

Adams	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Barrow (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Becerra	Capps	Cleaver
Bera (CA)	Cárdenas	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Cohen
Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)	Connolly
Blumenauer	Cartwright	Conyers
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Cooper
Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)	Costa
Braley (IA)	Chu	Courtney

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee

Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Bishop (UT)
Capuano
Doyle

Duckworth
Gingrey (GA)
Hall
McCarthy (NY)

Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod
Price (GA)

□ 1510

Messrs. SCHNEIDER, DINGELL, STOCKMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MCINTYRE and Ms. SINEMA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD COBLE COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5769) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—413

Adams
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

DeGette
DeLaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Bonamici
DeFazio
Schrader

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt
Bishop (UT)
Capps
Capuano
Cole
Costa

Davis, Rodney
Doyle
Duckworth
Gingrey (GA)
Hall
Issa

Joyce
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod
Rogers (AL)
Woodall

□ 1517

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 541, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 541, I was off the floor in a meeting and missed this second vote in the series. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 275, nays 137, answered “present” 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

YEAS—275

Adams	Fortenberry	McCarthy (CA)
Amodei	Foster	McCaul
Bachmann	Frankel (FL)	McClintock
Bachus	Gabbard	McCollum
Barber	Gallego	McHenry
Barletta	Garrett	McKeon
Barrow (GA)	Gerlach	McMorris
Barton	Gibbs	Rodgers
Beatty	Goodlatte	McNerney
Becerra	Gowdy	Meadows
Bilirakis	Granger	Meehan
Bishop (GA)	Graves (GA)	Meng
Black	Grayson	Messer
Blackburn	Griffin (AR)	Mica
Blumenauer	Griffith (VA)	Michaud
Bonamici	Grimm	Miller (MI)
Boustany	Guthrie	Moore
Brat	Gutiérrez	Moran
Bridenstine	Hahn	Mullin
Brooks (AL)	Hanabusa	Murphy (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Harper	Nadler
Brown (FL)	Harris	Napolitano
Bustos	Hartzler	Neal
Butterfield	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer
Byrne	Heck (WA)	Noem
Calvert	Hensarling	Nunes
Camp	Higgins	Nunnelee
Campbell	Himes	O'Rourke
Capito	Hinojosa	Olson
Cardenas	Horsford	Palazzo
Carson (IN)	Huelskamp	Pascarella
Carter	Huffman	Payne
Cassidy	Hultgren	Pearce
Castro (TX)	Hunter	Pelosi
Chabot	Hurt	Perlmutter
Chu	Issa	Petri
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Clark (MA)	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Clawson (FL)	Jolly	Pocan
Clay	Joyce	Polis
Cleaver	Kaptur	Pompeo
Coble	Kelly (IL)	Posey
Cohen	Kelly (PA)	Price (NC)
Cole	Kennedy	Quigley
Collins (NY)	Kildee	Rangel
Connolly	King (IA)	Ribble
Conyers	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
Cook	Kingston	Roby
Cooper	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Courtney	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Cramer	LaMalfa	Rogers (MI)
Crawford	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Langevin	Rokita
Cuellar	Lankford	Rooney
Culberson	Larsen (WA)	Roskam
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Ross
Daines	Latham	Rothfus
Davis (CA)	Latta	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Levin	Royce
DeGette	Lipinski	Ruiz
DeLauro	Loeb	Runyan
DelBene	Loeb	Ruppersberger
Dent	Lofgren	Ryan (WI)
DesJarlais	Long	Salmon
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sanford
Dingell	Lowey	Scalise
Doggett	Lucas	Schiff
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Schneider
Duncan (TN)	Lujan Grisham	Schock
Edwards	(NM)	Schrader
Ellmers	Luján, Ben Ray	Schweikert
Engel	(NM)	Scott (VA)
Enyart	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Eshoo	Maloney	Scott, David
Farenthold	Carolyn	Sensenbrenner
Farr	Marchant	Serrano
Fattah	Marino	Sessions
Fincher	Massie	Shea-Porter
Fleischmann	Matsui	Sherman
	McAllister	

Shimkus	Tierney
Shuster	Titus
Simpson	Tonko
Sinema	Tsongas
Smith (MO)	Van Hollen
Smith (NE)	Vargas
Smith (NJ)	Vela
Smith (TX)	Wagner
Smith (WA)	Walden
Southerland	Walorski
Speier	Walz
Stewart	Wasserman
Stutzman	Schultz
Takano	Waters
Thornberry	Waxman

NAYS—137

Amash	Green, Al	Paulsen
Barr	Green, Gene	Perry
Bass	Hanna	Peters (CA)
Benishek	Hastings (FL)	Peters (MI)
Bentivoglio	Heck (NY)	Peterson
Bera (CA)	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Bishop (NY)	Holding	Poe (TX)
Brady (PA)	Holt	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Honda	Rahall
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Reed
Buchanan	Hudson	Reichert
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Burgess	Israel	Richmond
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rigell
Cartwright	Jeffries	Roe (TN)
Castor (FL)	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Jones	Sánchez, Linda
Coffman	Jordan	T.
Collins (GA)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Conaway	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Costa	Kind	Schakowsky
Cotton	Kinzinger (IL)	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Sires
Davis, Rodney	Kuster	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lance	Stivers
Delaney	Lee (CA)	Stockman
Olson	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
Palazzo	LoBiondo	Terry
Pascarella	Duffy	Thompson (CA)
Payne	Ellison	Thompson (MS)
Pearce	Esty	Thompson (PA)
Pelosi	Fitzpatrick	Tiberi
Perlmutter	Fleming	Tipton
Petri	Flores	Upton
Pingree (ME)	Forbes	Valadao
Pitts	Foxx	Veasey
Pocan	Frelinghuysen	Velázquez
Polis	Fudge	Visclosky
Pompeo	Garamendi	Walberg
Posey	Garcia	Weber (TX)
Price (NC)	Gardner	Wittman
Quigley	Gibson	Woodall
Rangel	Gosar	Yoder
Ribble	Graves (MO)	Young (AK)
Rice (SC)		
Roby		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Rokita		
Rooney		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothfus		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Ruiz		
Runyan		
Ruppersberger		
Ryan (WI)		
Salmon		
Sanford		
Scalise		
Schiff		
Schneider		
Schock		
Schrader		
Schweikert		
Scott (VA)		
Scott, Austin		
Scott, David		
Sensenbrenner		
Serrano		
Sessions		
Shea-Porter		
Sherman		

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Gohmert

Owens

NOT VOTING—20

Aderholt	Doyle	McIntyre
Bishop (UT)	Duckworth	Miller, Gary
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Negrete McLeod
Braley (IA)	Gingrey (GA)	Nolan
Capps	Grijalva	Schwartz
Capuano	Hall	Turner
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1524

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ACHIEVING A BETTER LIFE EXPERIENCE ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 766, I call up the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabili-

ties, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to H. Res. 766, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of House Report 113-643 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 647

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; ETC.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2014” or the “ABLE Act of 2014”.

(b) *AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.*—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; etc.

TITLE I—QUALIFIED ABLE PROGRAMS

Sec. 101. Purposes.

Sec. 102. Qualified ABLE programs.

Sec. 103. Treatment of ABLE accounts under certain Federal programs.

Sec. 104. Treatment of able accounts in bankruptcy.

Sec. 105. Investment direction rule for 529 plans.

TITLE II—OFFSETS

Sec. 201. Correction to workers compensation offset age.

Sec. 202. Accelerated application of relative value targets for misvalued services in the Medicare physician fee schedule.

Sec. 203. Consistent treatment of vacuum erection systems in Medicare Parts B and D.

Sec. 204. One-year delay of implementation of oral-only policy under Medicare ESRD prospective payment system.

Sec. 205. Modification relating to Inland Waterways Trust Fund financing rate.

Sec. 206. Certified professional employer organizations.

Sec. 207. Exclusion of dividends from controlled foreign corporations from the definition of personal holding company income for purposes of the personal holding company rules.

Sec. 208. Inflation adjustment for certain civil penalties under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Sec. 209. Increase in continuous levy.

TITLE I—QUALIFIED ABLE PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are as follows:

(1) To encourage and assist individuals and families in saving private funds for the purpose of supporting individuals with disabilities to maintain health, independence, and quality of life.

(2) To provide secure funding for disability-related expenses on behalf of designated beneficiaries with disabilities that will supplement, but not supplant, benefits provided through private insurance, the Medicaid program under

title XIX of the Social Security Act, the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such Act, the beneficiary's employment, and other sources.

SEC. 102. QUALIFIED ABLE PROGRAMS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subchapter F of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after section 529 the following new section:

“SEC. 529A. QUALIFIED ABLE PROGRAMS.

“(a) *GENERAL RULE.*—A qualified ABLE program shall be exempt from taxation under this subtitle. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, such program shall be subject to the taxes imposed by section 511 (relating to imposition of tax on unrelated business income of charitable organizations).

“(b) *QUALIFIED ABLE PROGRAM.*—For purposes of this section—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The term ‘qualified ABLE program’ means a program established and maintained by a State, or agency or instrumentality thereof—

“(A) under which a person may make contributions for a taxable year, for the benefit of an individual who is an eligible individual for such taxable year, to an ABLE account which is established for the purpose of meeting the qualified disability expenses of the designated beneficiary of the account,

“(B) which limits a designated beneficiary to 1 ABLE account for purposes of this section,

“(C) which allows for the establishment of an ABLE account only for a designated beneficiary who is a resident of such State or a resident of a contracting State, and

“(D) which meets the other requirements of this section.

“(2) *CASH CONTRIBUTIONS.*—A program shall not be treated as a qualified ABLE program unless it provides that no contribution will be accepted—

“(A) unless it is in cash, or

“(B) except in the case of contributions under subsection (c)(1)(C), if such contribution to an ABLE account would result in aggregate contributions from all contributors to the ABLE account for the taxable year exceeding the amount in effect under section 2503(b) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins.

For purposes of this paragraph, rules similar to the rules of section 408(d)(4) (determined without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof) shall apply.

“(3) *SEPARATE ACCOUNTING.*—A program shall not be treated as a qualified ABLE program unless it provides separate accounting for each designated beneficiary.

“(4) *LIMITED INVESTMENT DIRECTION.*—A program shall not be treated as a qualified ABLE program unless it provides that any designated beneficiary under such program may, directly or indirectly, direct the investment of any contributions to the program (or any earnings thereon) no more than 2 times in any calendar year.

“(5) *NO PLEDGING OF INTEREST AS SECURITY.*—A program shall not be treated as a qualified ABLE program if it allows any interest in the program or any portion thereof to be used as security for a loan.

“(6) *PROHIBITION ON EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.*—A program shall not be treated as a qualified ABLE program unless it provides adequate safeguards to prevent aggregate contributions on behalf of a designated beneficiary in excess of the limit established by the State under section 529(b)(6). For purposes of the preceding sentence, aggregate contributions include contributions under any prior qualified ABLE program of any State or agency or instrumentality thereof.

“(c) *TAX TREATMENT.*—

“(1) *DISTRIBUTIONS.*—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Any distribution under a qualified ABLE program shall be includible in

the gross income of the distributee in the manner as provided under section 72 to the extent not excluded from gross income under any other provision of this chapter.

“(B) *DISTRIBUTIONS FOR QUALIFIED DISABILITY EXPENSES.*—For purposes of this paragraph, if distributions from a qualified ABLE program—

“(i) do not exceed the qualified disability expenses of the designated beneficiary, no amount shall be includible in gross income, and

“(ii) in any other case, the amount otherwise includible in gross income shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to such amount as such expenses bear to such distributions.

“(C) *CHANGE IN DESIGNATED BENEFICIARIES OR PROGRAMS.*—

“(i) *ROLLOVERS FROM ABLE ACCOUNTS.*—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any amount paid or distributed from an ABLE account to the extent that the amount received is paid, not later than the 60th day after the date of such payment or distribution, into another ABLE account for the benefit of the same designated beneficiary or an eligible individual who is a family member of the designated beneficiary.

“(ii) *CHANGE IN DESIGNATED BENEFICIARIES.*—Any change in the designated beneficiary of an interest in a qualified ABLE program during a taxable year shall not be treated as a distribution for purposes of subparagraph (A) if the new beneficiary is an eligible individual for such taxable year and a member of the family of the former beneficiary.

“(iii) *LIMITATION ON CERTAIN ROLLOVERS.*—Clause (i) shall not apply to any transfer if such transfer occurs within 12 months from the date of a previous transfer to any qualified ABLE program for the benefit of the designated beneficiary.

“(D) *OPERATING RULES.*—For purposes of applying section 72—

“(i) except to the extent provided by the Secretary, all distributions during a taxable year shall be treated as one distribution, and

“(ii) except to the extent provided by the Secretary, the value of the contract, income on the contract, and investment in the contract shall be computed as of the close of the calendar year in which the taxable year begins.

“(2) *GIFT TAX RULES.*—For purposes of chapters 12 and 13—

“(A) *CONTRIBUTIONS.*—Any contribution to a qualified ABLE program on behalf of any designated beneficiary—

“(i) shall be treated as a completed gift to such designated beneficiary which is not a future interest in property, and

“(ii) shall not be treated as a qualified transfer under section 2503(e).

“(B) *TREATMENT OF DISTRIBUTIONS.*—In no event shall a distribution from an ABLE account to such account's designated beneficiary be treated as a taxable gift.

“(C) *TREATMENT OF TRANSFER TO NEW DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.*—The taxes imposed by chapters 12 and 13 shall not apply to a transfer by reason of a change in the designated beneficiary under subsection (c)(1)(C).

“(3) *ADDITIONAL TAX FOR DISTRIBUTIONS NOT USED FOR DISABILITY EXPENSES.*—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The tax imposed by this chapter for any taxable year on any taxpayer who receives a distribution from a qualified ABLE program which is includible in gross income shall be increased by 10 percent of the amount which is so includible.

“(B) *EXCEPTION.*—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if the payment or distribution is made to a beneficiary (or to the estate of the designated beneficiary) on or after the death of the designated beneficiary.

“(C) *CONTRIBUTIONS RETURNED BEFORE CERTAIN DATE.*—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply

to the distribution of any contribution made during a taxable year on behalf of the designated beneficiary if—

“(i) such distribution is received on or before the day prescribed by law (including extensions of time) for filing such designated beneficiary's return for such taxable year, and

“(ii) such distribution is accompanied by the amount of net income attributable to such excess contribution.

Any net income described in clause (ii) shall be included in gross income for the taxable year in which such excess contribution was made.

“(4) *LOSS OF ABLE ACCOUNT TREATMENT.*—If an ABLE account is established for a designated beneficiary, no account subsequently established for such beneficiary shall be treated as an ABLE account. The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of an account established for purposes of a rollover described in paragraph (1)(C)(i) of this section if the transferor account is closed as of the end of the 60th day referred to in paragraph (1)(C)(i).

“(d) *REPORTS.*—

“(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Each officer or employee having control of the qualified ABLE program or their designee shall make such reports regarding such program to the Secretary and to designated beneficiaries with respect to contributions, distributions, the return of excess contributions, and such other matters as the Secretary may require.

“(2) *CERTAIN AGGREGATED INFORMATION.*—For research purposes, the Secretary shall make available to the public reports containing aggregate information, by diagnosis and other relevant characteristics, on contributions and distributions from the qualified ABLE program. In carrying out the preceding sentence an item may not be made available to the public if such item can be associated with, or otherwise identify, directly or indirectly, a particular individual.

“(3) *NOTICE OF ESTABLISHMENT OF ABLE ACCOUNT.*—A qualified ABLE program shall submit a notice to the Secretary upon the establishment of an ABLE account. Such notice shall contain the name and State of residence of the designated beneficiary and such other information as the Secretary may require.

“(4) *ELECTRONIC DISTRIBUTION STATEMENTS.*—For purposes of section 4 of the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2014, States shall submit electronically on a monthly basis to the Commissioner of Social Security, in the manner specified by the Commissioner, statements on relevant distributions and account balances from all ABLE accounts.

“(5) *REQUIREMENTS.*—The reports and notices required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall be filed at such time and in such manner and furnished to such individuals at such time and in such manner as may be required by the Secretary.

“(e) *OTHER DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.*—For purposes of this section—

“(1) *ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.*—An individual is an eligible individual for a taxable year if during such taxable year—

“(A) the individual is entitled to benefits based on blindness or disability under title II or XVI of the Social Security Act, and such blindness or disability occurred before the date on which the individual attained age 26, or

“(B) a disability certification with respect to such individual is filed with the Secretary for such taxable year.

“(2) *DISABILITY CERTIFICATION.*—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The term ‘disability certification’ means, with respect to an individual, a certification to the satisfaction of the Secretary by the individual or the parent or guardian of the individual that—

“(i) certifies that—

“(I) the individual has a medically determinable physical or mental impairment, which

results in marked and severe functional limitations, and which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months, or is blind (within the meaning of section 1614(a)(2) of the Social Security Act), and

“(II) such blindness or disability occurred before the date on which the individual attained age 26, and

“(ii) includes a copy of the individual’s diagnosis relating to the individual’s relevant impairment or impairments, signed by a physician meeting the criteria of section 1861(r)(1) of the Social Security Act.

“(B) RESTRICTION ON USE OF CERTIFICATION.—No inference may be drawn from a disability certification for purposes of establishing eligibility for benefits under title II, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

“(C) DESIGNATED BENEFICIARY.—The term ‘designated beneficiary’ in connection with an ABLÉ account established under a qualified ABLÉ program means the eligible individual who established an ABLÉ account and is the owner of such account.

“(4) MEMBER OF FAMILY.—The term ‘member of the family’ means, with respect to any designated beneficiary, an individual who bears a relationship to such beneficiary which is described in subparagraph section 152(d)(2)(B). For purposes of the preceding sentence, a rule similar to the rule of section 152(f)(1)(B) shall apply.

“(5) QUALIFIED DISABILITY EXPENSES.—The term ‘qualified disability expenses’ means any expenses related to the eligible individual’s blindness or disability which are made for the benefit of an eligible individual who is the designated beneficiary, including the following expenses: education, housing, transportation, employment training and support, assistive technology and personal support services, health, prevention and wellness, financial management and administrative services, legal fees, expenses for oversight and monitoring, funeral and burial expenses, and other expenses, which are approved by the Secretary under regulations and consistent with the purposes of this section.

“(6) ABLÉ ACCOUNT.—The term ‘ABLÉ account’ means an account established by an eligible individual, owned by such eligible individual, and maintained under a qualified ABLÉ program.

“(7) CONTRACTING STATE.—The term ‘contracting State’ means a State without a qualified ABLÉ program which has entered into a contract with a State with a qualified ABLÉ program to provide residents of the contracting State access to a qualified ABLÉ program.

“(f) TRANSFER TO STATE.—Subject to any outstanding payments due for qualified disability expenses, upon the death of the designated beneficiary, all amounts remaining in the qualified ABLÉ account not in excess of the amount equal to the total medical assistance paid for the designated beneficiary after the establishment of the account, net of any premiums paid from the account or paid by or on behalf of the beneficiary to a Medicaid Buy-In program under any State Medicaid plan established under title XIX of the Social Security Act, shall be distributed to such State upon filing of a claim for payment by such State. For purposes of this paragraph, the State shall be a creditor of an ABLÉ account and not a beneficiary. Subsection (c)(3) shall not apply to a distribution under the preceding sentence.

“(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations or other guidance as the Secretary determines necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section, including regulations—

“(1) to enforce the 1 ABLÉ account per eligible individual limit,

“(2) providing for the information required to be presented to open an ABLÉ account,

“(3) to generally define qualified disability expenses,

“(4) developed in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, relating to disability certifications and determinations of disability, including those conditions deemed to meet the requirements of subsection (e)(1)(B),

“(5) to prevent fraud and abuse with respect to amounts claimed as qualified disability expenses,

“(6) under chapters 11, 12, and 13 of this title, and

“(7) to allow for transfers from one ABLÉ account to another ABLÉ account.”.

(b) TAX ON EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 4973 (relating to tax on excess contributions to certain tax-favored accounts and annuities) is amended by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (4), by inserting “or” at the end of paragraph (5), and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) an ABLÉ account (within the meaning of section 529A).”.

(2) EXCESS CONTRIBUTION.—Section 4973 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS TO ABLÉ ACCOUNT.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an ABLÉ account (within the meaning of section 529A), the term ‘excess contributions’ means the amount by which the amount contributed for the taxable year to such account (other than contributions under section 529A(c)(1)(C)) exceeds the contribution limit under section 529A(b)(2)(B).

“(2) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of this subsection, any contribution which is distributed out of the ABLÉ account in a distribution to which the last sentence of section 529A(b)(2) applies shall be treated as an amount not contributed.”.

(c) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE REPORTS.—Section 6693(a)(2) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (D), by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F), and by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) section 529A(d) (relating to qualified ABLÉ programs), and”.

(d) RECORDS.—Section 552a(a)(8)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (viii), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (ix), by adding “or” at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(x) matches performed pursuant to section 3(d)(4) of the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2014.”.

(e) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 26(b)(2) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (W), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (X) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after subparagraph (X) the following:

“(Y) section 529A(c)(3)(A) (relating to additional tax on ABLÉ account distributions not used for qualified disability expenses).”.

(2) Section 877A is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)(2) by inserting “a qualified ABLÉ program (as defined in section 529A),” after “529,”, and

(B) in subsection (g)(6) by inserting “529A(c)(3),” after “529(c)(6).”.

(3) Section 4965(c) is amended by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting “, or”, and by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

“(8) a program described in section 529A.”.

(4) The heading for part VIII of subchapter F of chapter 1 is amended by striking “HIGHER EDUCATION” and inserting “CERTAIN”.

(5) The item in the table of parts for subchapter F of chapter 1 relating to part VIII is amended to read as follows:

“PART VIII. CERTAIN SAVINGS ENTITIES.”.

(6) The table of sections for part VIII of subchapter F of chapter 1 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 529 the following new item:

“Sec. 529A. Qualified ABLÉ programs.”.

(7) Paragraph (4) of section 1027(g) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5517(g)(4)) is amended by inserting “, 529A” after “529”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s designee) shall promulgate the regulations or other guidance required under section 529A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by subsection (a), not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. TREATMENT OF ABLÉ ACCOUNTS UNDER CERTAIN FEDERAL PROGRAMS.

(a) ACCOUNT FUNDS DISREGARDED FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN OTHER MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law that requires consideration of 1 or more financial circumstances of an individual, for the purpose of determining eligibility to receive, or the amount of, any assistance or benefit authorized by such provision to be provided to or for the benefit of such individual, any amount (including earnings thereon) in the ABLÉ account (within the meaning of section 529A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of such individual, any contributions to the ABLÉ account of the individual, and any distribution for qualified disability expenses (as defined in subsection (e)(5) of such section) shall be disregarded for such purpose with respect to any period during which such individual maintains, makes contributions to, or receives distributions from such ABLÉ account, except that, in the case of the supplemental security income program under title XVI of the Social Security Act—

(1) a distribution for housing expenses (within the meaning of such subsection) shall not be so disregarded, and

(2) in the case of such program, any amount (including such earnings) in such ABLÉ account shall be considered a resource of the designated beneficiary to the extent that such amount exceeds \$100,000.

(b) SUSPENSION OF SSI BENEFITS DURING PERIODS OF EXCESSIVE ACCOUNT FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The benefits of an individual under the supplemental security income program under title XVI of the Social Security Act shall not be terminated, but shall be suspended, by reason of excess resources of the individual attributable to an amount in the ABLÉ account (within the meaning of section 529A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the individual not disregarded under subsection (a) of this section.

(2) NO IMPACT ON MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY.—An individual who would be receiving payment of such supplemental security income benefits but for the application of paragraph (1) shall be treated for purposes of title XIX of the Social Security Act as if the individual continued to be receiving payment of such benefits.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. TREATMENT OF ABLE ACCOUNTS IN BANKRUPTCY.

(a) EXCLUSION FROM PROPERTY OF THE ESTATE.—Section 541(b) of the title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon and “or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) funds placed in an account of a qualified ABLE program (as defined in section 529A(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) not later than 365 days before the date of the filing of the petition in a case under this title, but—

“(A) only if the designated beneficiary of such account was a child, stepchild, grandchild, or stepgrandchild of the debtor for the taxable year for which funds were placed in such account;

“(B) only to the extent that such funds—

“(i) are not pledged or promised to any entity in connection with any extension of credit; and

“(ii) are not excess contributions (as described in section 4973(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); and

“(C) in the case of funds placed in all such accounts having the same designated beneficiary not earlier than 720 days nor later than 365 days before such date, only so much of such funds as does not exceed \$6,225.”

(b) DEBTOR'S MONTHLY EXPENSES.—Section 707(b)(2)(A)(ii)(II) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end “Such monthly expenses may include, if applicable, contributions to an account of a qualified ABLE program to the extent such contributions are not excess contributions (as described in section 4973(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) and if the designated beneficiary of such account is a child, stepchild, grandchild, or stepgrandchild of the debtor.”

(c) RECORD OF DEBTOR'S INTEREST.—Section 521(c) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, an interest in an account in a qualified ABLE program (as defined in section 529A(b) of such Code,” after “Internal Revenue Code of 1986)”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to cases commenced under title 11, United States Code, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. INVESTMENT DIRECTION RULE FOR 529 PLANS.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO INVESTMENT DIRECTION RULE FOR 529 PLANS.—

(1) Paragraph (4) of section 529(b) is amended by striking “may not directly or indirectly” and all that follows and inserting “may, directly or indirectly, direct the investment of any contributions to the program (or any earnings thereon) no more than 2 times in any calendar year.”

(2) The heading of paragraph (4) of section 529(b) is amended by striking “No” and inserting “LIMITED”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

TITLE II—OFFSETS**SEC. 201. CORRECTION TO WORKERS COMPENSATION OFFSET AGE.**

(a) RETIREMENT AGE.—Section 224(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 424a(a)) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the age of 65” and inserting “retirement age (as defined in section 216(l)(1))”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any individual who attains 65 years of age on or after the date that is 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. ACCELERATED APPLICATION OF RELATIVE VALUE TARGETS FOR MISVALUED SERVICES IN THE MEDICARE PHYSICIAN FEE SCHEDULE.

Section 1848(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(c)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (VIII) of paragraph (2)(B)(v), as added by section 220(d)(2) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-93)—

(A) by striking “2017” and inserting “2016”; and

(B) by redesignating such subclause as subclause (IX);

(2) in paragraph (2)(O)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “2017 through 2020” and inserting “2016 through 2018”; and

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “2017” and inserting “2016”; and

(C) in clause (v), by inserting “(or, for 2016, 1.0 percent)” after “0.5 percent”; and

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking “2017” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 203. CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF VACUUM ERECTION SYSTEMS IN MEDICARE PARTS B AND D.

Section 1834(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(I) TREATMENT OF VACUUM ERECTION SYSTEMS.—Effective for items and services furnished on and after July 1, 2015, vacuum erection systems described as prosthetic devices described in section 1861(s)(8) shall be treated in the same manner as erectile dysfunction drugs are treated for purposes of section 1860D-2(e)(2)(A).”

SEC. 204. ONE-YEAR DELAY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ORAL-ONLY POLICY UNDER MEDICARE ESRD PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT SYSTEM.

Section 632(b)(1) of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (42 U.S.C. 1395rr note), as amended by section 217(a)(1) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-93), is amended by striking “2024” and inserting “2025”.

SEC. 205. MODIFICATION RELATING TO INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND FINANCING RATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4042(b)(2)(A) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) The Inland Waterways Trust Fund financing rate is 29 cents per gallon.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to fuel used after March 31, 2015.

SEC. 206. CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) EMPLOYMENT TAXES.—Chapter 25 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 3511. CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) GENERAL RULES.—For purposes of the taxes, and other obligations, imposed by this subtitle—

“(1) a certified professional employer organization shall be treated as the employer (and no other person shall be treated as the employer) of any work site employee performing services for any customer of such organization, but only with respect to remuneration remitted by such organization to such work site employee, and

“(2) the exemptions, exclusions, definitions, and other rules which are based on type of employer and which would (but for paragraph (1)) apply shall apply with respect to such taxes imposed on such remuneration.

“(b) SUCCESSOR EMPLOYER STATUS.—For purposes of sections 3121(a)(1), 3231(e)(2)(C), and 3306(b)(1)—

“(1) a certified professional employer organization entering into a service contract with a

customer with respect to a work site employee shall be treated as a successor employer and the customer shall be treated as a predecessor employer during the term of such service contract, and

“(2) a customer whose service contract with a certified professional employer organization is terminated with respect to a work site employee shall be treated as a successor employer and the certified professional employer organization shall be treated as a predecessor employer.

“(c) LIABILITY OF CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATION.—Solely for purposes of its liability for the taxes and other obligations imposed by this subtitle—

“(1) a certified professional employer organization shall be treated as the employer of any individual (other than a work site employee or a person described in subsection (f)) who is performing services covered by a contract meeting the requirements of section 7705(e)(2), but only with respect to remuneration remitted by such organization to such individual, and

“(2) the exemptions, exclusions, definitions, and other rules which are based on type of employer and which would (but for paragraph (1)) apply shall apply with respect to such taxes imposed on such remuneration.

“(d) TREATMENT OF CREDITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of any credit specified in paragraph (2)—

“(A) such credit with respect to a work site employee performing services for the customer applies to the customer, not the certified professional employer organization,

“(B) the customer, and not the certified professional employer organization, shall take into account wages and employment taxes—

“(i) paid by the certified professional employer organization with respect to the work site employee, and

“(ii) for which the certified professional employer organization receives payment from the customer, and

“(C) the certified professional employer organization shall furnish the customer and the Secretary with any information necessary for the customer to claim such credit.

“(2) CREDITS SPECIFIED.—A credit is specified in this paragraph if such credit is allowed under—

“(A) section 41 (credit for increasing research activity),

“(B) section 45A (Indian employment credit),

“(C) section 45B (credit for portion of employer social security taxes paid with respect to employee cash tips),

“(D) section 45C (clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions),

“(E) section 45R (employee health insurance expenses of small employers),

“(F) section 51 (work opportunity credit),

“(G) section 1396 (empowerment zone employment credit), and

“(H) any other section as provided by the Secretary.

“(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR RELATED PARTY.—This section shall not apply in the case of a customer which bears a relationship to a certified professional employer organization described in section 267(b) or 707(b). For purposes of the preceding sentence, such sections shall be applied by substituting ‘10 percent’ for ‘50 percent’.

“(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of the taxes imposed under this subtitle, an individual with net earnings from self-employment derived from the customer's trade or business (including a partner in a partnership that is a customer) is not a work site employee with respect to remuneration paid by a certified professional employer organization.

“(g) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND OBLIGATIONS.—The Secretary shall develop such reporting and recordkeeping rules, regulations, and

procedures as the Secretary determines necessary or appropriate to ensure compliance with this title by certified professional employer organizations or persons that have been so certified. Such rules shall include—

“(1) notification of the Secretary in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe in the case of the commencement or termination of a service contract described in section 7705(e)(2) between such a person and a customer, and the employer identification number of such customer,

“(2) such information as the Secretary determines necessary for the customer to claim the credits identified in subsection (d) and the manner in which such information is to be provided, as prescribed by the Secretary, and

“(3) such other information as the Secretary determines is essential to promote compliance with respect to the credits identified in subsection (d) and section 3302, and

shall be designed in a manner which streamlines, to the extent possible, the application of requirements of this section and section 7705, the exchange of information between a certified professional employer organization and its customers, and the reporting and recordkeeping obligations of the certified professional employer organization.

“(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.”

(b) CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—Chapter 79 is amended by adding at the end the following new section: **“SEC. 7705. CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, the term ‘certified professional employer organization’ means a person who applies to be treated as a certified professional employer organization for purposes of section 3511 and has been certified by the Secretary as meeting the requirements of subsection (b).

“(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—A person meets the requirements of this subsection if such person—

“(1) demonstrates that such person (and any owner, officer, and other persons as may be specified in regulations) meets such requirements as the Secretary shall establish, including requirements with respect to tax status, background, experience, business location, and annual financial audits,

“(2) agrees that it will satisfy the bond and independent financial review requirements of subsection (c) on an ongoing basis,

“(3) agrees that it will satisfy such reporting obligations as may be imposed by the Secretary,

“(4) computes its taxable income using an accrual method of accounting unless the Secretary approves another method,

“(5) agrees to verify on such periodic basis as the Secretary may prescribe that it continues to meet the requirements of this subsection, and

“(6) agrees to notify the Secretary in writing within such time as the Secretary may prescribe of any change that materially affects the continuing accuracy of any agreement or information that was previously made or provided under this subsection.

“(c) BOND AND INDEPENDENT FINANCIAL REVIEW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An organization meets the requirements of this paragraph if such organization—

“(A) meets the bond requirements of paragraph (2), and

“(B) meets the independent financial review requirements of paragraph (3).

“(2) BOND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A certified professional employer organization meets the requirements of this paragraph if the organization has posted a

bond for the payment of taxes under subtitle C (in a form acceptable to the Secretary) that is in an amount at least equal to the amount specified in subparagraph (B).

“(B) AMOUNT OF BOND.—For the period April 1 of any calendar year through March 31 of the following calendar year, the amount of the bond required is equal to the greater of—

“(i) 5 percent of the organization’s liability under section 3511 for taxes imposed by subtitle C during the preceding calendar year (but not to exceed \$1,000,000), or

“(ii) \$50,000.

“(3) INDEPENDENT FINANCIAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS.—A certified professional employer organization meets the requirements of this paragraph if such organization—

“(A) has, as of the most recent audit date, caused to be prepared and provided to the Secretary (in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe) an opinion of an independent certified public accountant as to whether the certified professional employer organization’s financial statements are presented fairly in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and

“(B) provides to the Secretary an assertion regarding Federal employment tax payments and an examination level attestation on such assertion from an independent certified public accountant not later than the last day of the second month beginning after the end of each calendar quarter.

Such assertion shall state that the organization has withheld and made deposits of all taxes imposed by chapters 21, 22, and 24 in accordance with regulations imposed by the Secretary for such calendar quarter and such examination level attestation shall state that such assertion is fairly stated, in all material respects.

“(4) CONTROLLED GROUP RULES.—For purposes of the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3), all certified professional employer organizations that are members of a controlled group within the meaning of sections 414(b) and (c) shall be treated as a single organization.

“(5) FAILURE TO FILE ASSERTION AND ATTESTATION.—If the certified professional employer organization fails to file the assertion and attestation required by paragraph (3) with respect to any calendar quarter, then the requirements of paragraph (3) with respect to such failure shall be treated as not satisfied for the period beginning on the due date for such attestation.

“(6) AUDIT DATE.—For purposes of paragraph (3)(A), the audit date shall be six months after the completion of the organization’s fiscal year.

“(d) SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may suspend or revoke a certification of any person under subsection (b) for purposes of section 3511 if the Secretary determines that such person is not satisfying the agreements or requirements of subsections (b) or (c), or fails to satisfy applicable accounting, reporting, payment, or deposit requirements.

“(e) WORK SITE EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this title—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘work site employee’ means, with respect to a certified professional employer organization, an individual who—

“(A) performs services for a customer pursuant to a contract which is between such customer and the certified professional employer organization and which meets the requirements of paragraph (2), and

“(B) performs services at a work site meeting the requirements of paragraph (3).

“(2) SERVICE CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.—A contract meets the requirements of this paragraph with respect to an individual performing services for a customer if such contract is in writing and provides that the certified professional employer organization shall—

“(A) assume responsibility for payment of wages to such individual, without regard to the receipt or adequacy of payment from the customer for such services,

“(B) assume responsibility for reporting, withholding, and paying any applicable taxes under subtitle C, with respect to such individual’s wages, without regard to the receipt or adequacy of payment from the customer for such services,

“(C) assume responsibility for any employee benefits which the service contract may require the certified professional employer organization to provide, without regard to the receipt or adequacy of payment from the customer for such benefits,

“(D) assume responsibility for recruiting, hiring, and firing workers in addition to the customer’s responsibility for recruiting, hiring, and firing workers,

“(E) maintain employee records relating to such individual, and

“(F) agree to be treated as a certified professional employer organization for purposes of section 3511 with respect to such individual.

“(3) WORK SITE COVERAGE REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of this paragraph are met with respect to an individual if at least 85 percent of the individuals performing services for the customer at the work site where such individual performs services are subject to 1 or more contracts with the certified professional employer organization which meet the requirements of paragraph (2) (but not taking into account those individuals who are excluded employees within the meaning of section 414(q)(5)).

“(f) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—The Secretary shall make available to the public the name and address of—

“(1) each person certified as a professional employer organization under subsection (a), and

“(2) each person whose certification as a professional employer organization is suspended or revoked under subsection (d).

“(g) DETERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT STATUS.—Except to the extent necessary for purposes of section 3511, nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the determination of who is an employee or employer for purposes of this title.

“(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3302 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) TREATMENT OF CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS.—If a certified professional employer organization (as defined in section 7705), or a customer of such organization, makes a contribution to the State’s unemployment fund with respect to wages paid to a work site employee, such certified professional employer organization shall be eligible for the credits available under this section with respect to such contribution.”

(2) Section 3303(a) is amended—

(A) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “; and” and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) if the taxpayer is a certified professional employer organization (as defined in section 7705) that is treated as the employer under section 3511, such certified professional employer organization is permitted to collect and remit, in accordance with paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), contributions during the taxable year to the State unemployment fund with respect to a work site employee.”, and

(B) in the last sentence—

(i) by striking “paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4)”, and

(ii) by striking “paragraph (1), (2), or (3)” and inserting “paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4)”.

(3) Section 6053(c) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of any report required by this subsection, in the case of a certified professional employer organization that is treated under section 3511 as the employer of a work site employee, the customer with respect to whom a work site employee performs services shall be the employer for purposes of reporting under this section and the certified professional employer organization shall furnish to the customer and the Secretary any information the Secretary prescribes as necessary to complete such reporting no later than such time as the Secretary shall prescribe.”

(4) Section 6652 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(n) FAILURE TO MAKE REPORTS REQUIRED UNDER SECTIONS 3511, 6053(c)(8), AND 7705.—In the case of a failure to make a report required under section 3511, 6053(c)(8), or 7705 which contains the information required by such section on the date prescribed therefor (determined with regard to any extension of time for filing), there shall be paid (on notice and demand by the Secretary and in the same manner as tax) by the person failing to make such report, an amount equal to \$50 for each report with respect to which there was such a failure. In the case of any failure due to negligence or intentional disregard the preceding sentence shall be applied by substituting ‘\$100’ for ‘\$50’.”

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for chapter 25 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 3511. Certified professional employer organizations.”

(2) The table of sections for chapter 79 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7704 the following new item:

“Sec. 7705. Certified professional employer organizations.”

(f) USER FEES.—Section 7528(b) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYER ORGANIZATIONS.—The fee charged under the program in connection with the certification by the Secretary of a professional employer organization under section 7705 shall be an annual fee not to exceed \$1,000 per year.”

(g) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to wages for services performed on or after January 1 of the first calendar year beginning more than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CERTIFICATION PROGRAM.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish the certification program described in section 7705(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by subsection (b), not later than 6 months before the effective date determined under paragraph (1).

(h) NO INFERENCE.—Nothing contained in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to create any inference with respect to the determination of who is an employee or employer—

(1) for Federal tax purposes (other than the purposes set forth in the amendments made by this section), or

(2) for purposes of any other provision of law.

SEC. 207. EXCLUSION OF DIVIDENDS FROM CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS FROM THE DEFINITION OF PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY INCOME FOR PURPOSES OF THE PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 543(a)(1) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively, and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) dividends received by a United States shareholder (as defined in section 951(b)) from a controlled foreign corporation (as defined in section 957(a)).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 208. INFLATION ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

(a) FAILURE TO FILE TAX RETURN OR PAY TAX.—Section 6651 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any return required to be filed in a calendar year beginning after 2014, the \$135 dollar amount under subsection (a) shall be increased by such dollar amount multiplied by the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$5, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$5.”

(b) FAILURE TO FILE CERTAIN INFORMATION RETURNS, REGISTRATION STATEMENTS, ETC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6652(c) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any failure relating to a return required to be filed in a calendar year beginning after 2014, each of the dollar amounts under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) shall be increased by such dollar amount multiplied by the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount adjusted under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) is not less than \$5,000 and is not a multiple of \$500, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$500, and

“(ii) is not described in clause (i) and is not a multiple of \$5, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$5.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The last sentence of section 6652(c)(1)(A) is amended by striking “the first sentence of this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting ‘\$100’ for ‘\$20’ and” and inserting “in applying the first sentence of this subparagraph, the amount of the penalty for each day during which a failure continues shall be \$100 in lieu of the amount otherwise specified, and”.

(B) Section 6652(c)(2)(C)(ii) is amended by striking “the first sentence of paragraph (1)(A)” and all that follows and inserting “in applying the first sentence of paragraph (1)(A), the amount of the penalty for each day during which a failure continues shall be \$100 in lieu of the amount otherwise specified, and in lieu of applying the second sentence of paragraph (1)(A), the maximum penalty under paragraph (1)(A) shall not exceed \$50,000, and”.

(c) OTHER ASSESSABLE PENALTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE PREPARATION OF TAX RETURNS FOR OTHER PERSONS.—Section 6695 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any failure relating to a return or claim for refund filed in a calendar year beginning after 2014, each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a), (b),

(c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) shall be increased by such dollar amount multiplied by the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount adjusted under subparagraph (A)—

“(A) is not less than \$5,000 and is not a multiple of \$500, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$500, and

“(B) is not described in clause (i) and is not a multiple of \$5, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$5.”

(d) FAILURE TO FILE PARTNERSHIP RETURN.—Section 6698 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any return required to be filed in a calendar year beginning after 2014, the \$195 dollar amount under subsection (b)(1) shall be increased by such dollar amount multiplied by the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$5, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$5.”

(e) FAILURE TO FILE S CORPORATION RETURN.—Section 6699 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any return required to be filed in a calendar year beginning after 2014, the \$195 dollar amount under subsection (b)(1) shall be increased by such dollar amount multiplied by the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(2) ROUNDING.—If any amount adjusted under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of \$5, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$5.”

(f) FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS.—Section 6721(f)(1) is amended by striking “For each fifth calendar year beginning after 2012” and inserting “In the case of any failure relating to a return required to be filed in a calendar year beginning after 2014”.

(g) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—Section 6722(f)(1) is amended by striking “For each fifth calendar year beginning after 2012” and inserting “In the case of any failure relating to a statement required to be furnished in a calendar year beginning after 2014”.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be filed after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 209. INCREASE IN CONTINUOUS LEVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 6331(h) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “and by substituting ‘30 percent’ for ‘15 percent’ in the case of any specified payment due to a Medicare provider or supplier under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 647.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, many of us know the joys and responsibilities of being a parent. We spend years ensuring our children have the skills and education to reach their full potential as they grow and enter adulthood.

Many of these everyday responsibilities parents face can and often do increase tremendously when they have a child with a disability. Today, we have an opportunity to ease some of those challenges.

The Achieving a Better Life Experience Act, commonly known as the ABLE Act, will allow those with disabilities and their caregivers to have the stability and security of knowing that they can save and provide for their education, housing, and medical expenses in the future.

In short, the ABLE Act lets those with disabilities set up tax-free savings accounts to help them manage the costs of medical care, housing, transportation, and continued education. This will allow those who are on Medicaid and SSI to work, earn, and save more while still receiving these important benefits.

It is important to note that these savings accounts will be available to all individuals with disabilities and their caretakers, not just those on Medicaid and SSI.

This is a commonsense bill that will aid those with disabilities and their caretakers so they can live more fulfilling, happy lives and have the ability to provide for a better future.

□ 1530

At the same time, this will not burden taxpayers since the cost of the ABLE Act is fully offset by the savings provisions in this bill. These offsets are a balanced and fair mix of savings provisions that all Members should be able to support.

This bill is supported by more than 70 leading organizations and health care professionals, including the American Association of People with Disabilities, the Autism Society of America, Autism Speaks, the Brain Injury Association of America, Easter Seals, the National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, the National Disability Institute, the National Down Syndrome Society, the National Federation of the Blind, and The Arc.

They support this bill because they know it will help more disabled individuals help themselves. That is all I can ask for—that is all anyone can ask for—and it is something I am pleased this legislation provides. This is why

the ABLE Act has 380 cosponsors in the House and 74 cosponsors in the Senate.

I want to particularly thank the sponsor of this legislation, my good friend from Florida, Representative ANDER CRENSHAW, as well as Representatives SESSIONS, MCMORRIS RODGERS, and VAN HOLLEN for their diligence in helping us bring this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that we have a chance to clear major hurdles in front of people who simply need a hand up. That is what this bill does, and I encourage all Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

With this bill, we can help millions of Americans who are living with disabilities become more financially secure. Just as families today can open tax-free accounts to save for the future costs of college for their children, this legislation would make it easier for families to save money for disability-related expenses like transportation, housing, and health prevention and wellness. The ABLE Act aims to ease the financial burden on these individuals and their families.

I applaud the efforts of Congressmen CRENSHAW, VAN HOLLEN, SESSIONS, and you, Chairman CAMP, among others.

The CBO estimates the cost of the bill will be \$2 billion over 10 years. The bill is paid for through \$638 million in revenue offsets and \$1.4 billion in spending cuts.

There has been active bipartisan work on paying for this bill, and there is broad agreement on the revenue offsets. There is some opposition to the Medicare offsets included in the bill because the legislation uses Medicare savings for nonhealth purposes.

We have challenges ahead, including important work on SGR. I understand the concern about Medicare offsets. I think it is important as we proceed on this bill to stress that it must not be considered a precedent for using Medicare savings to pay for unrelated costs associated with tax changes.

The ABLE Act provides much-needed relief, as we have said, to families and their children with disabilities. This is an important step forward for them in a very personal way. I support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), who is the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Let me first just say thank you to Chairman CAMP, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for his hard work in bringing this bill out of the Ways and Means Committee with a unanimous vote. I thank him and his

staff who have worked long and hard to bring this bill to the floor today.

On a personal note, as Chairman CAMP leaves the Congress this year, I want to express my thanks and gratitude for his friendship over the years and for his leadership not only for the people of Michigan, but for the people of America. You will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the ABLE Act, I think that this is a great example of what can be accomplished when people work together. People say we don't always work together, but here is a case where people have come together—Democrats and Republicans, the House working with the Senate—for the common good of the people of America.

I think all of us probably know somebody, either a family member or maybe a friend of the family—somebody—who has a disability. It might be Down syndrome, or it might be autism, or it might be some other disability, but sometimes, I don't think we understand the difficulty and the challenges that those individuals and their families face. They are beyond our comprehension sometimes because we are lucky in the way that we can live.

The ABLE Act seeks to address that inequity. It seeks to help those people who so often society overlooks or maybe the government overlooks. The ABLE Act is very simple, it is very straightforward, it is understandable, and we have come to this after 8 years of hard work.

When I first filed the bill in 2006, there were very few cosponsors of this legislation, but over the years, an awful lot of people on both sides of the aisle have worked long and hard to make this legislation better. Some of the individuals who have these disabilities come to Washington every year. They have gone out, and they have talked to their individual Representatives.

That is one of the reasons we have 380 cosponsors in the House. It is because those individuals have gone to an office and have sat down and have said, "This is something that would make a difference in my life." And those Members have said, "We want to help." The same thing has happened in the Senate.

You heard Chairman CAMP talk about how that takes place. Individuals with disabilities can create a tax-free savings account, put their own money in that account, and have a chance to actually save for their futures.

Those dollars grow tax free, and as long as they are used for qualified expenses, such as medical expenses or maybe educational or job training expenses, they can use those proceeds. We already allow folks to help themselves by setting up tax-free savings accounts to save for college. It is called a 529.

We allow people to save for their retirements through a tax-free savings account called an IRA or a 401(k), and

we allow people to save for their health insurance by the creation of health savings accounts. It only seems fair to me and to all of us that we would provide the same sort of treatment to those individuals who are less fortunate than we are.

Now, we have a situation in which the ABLE accounts will open a door to a bright future to millions of Americans. It will give those individuals a chance to realize their hopes and their dreams, to be part of the American Dream, and to be able to achieve their full potential.

I can't think of anything that is more rewarding. I can't think of any greater privilege than to speak out for people who can't always speak for themselves. This ABLE Act will bring justice, and it will bring peace of mind to millions of American families who live with disabilities every day. I think that is something worth fighting for.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my real pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), another person like Mr. CRENSHAW and others who have been working so hard on this issue for a long time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking my colleague, Ranking Member LEVIN, for yielding but, most importantly, for his partnership on this important bipartisan legislation.

I also want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Chairman CAMP, thank you for all of your efforts and diligence in getting us to this point. To our fellow cosponsors—Congressman CRENSHAW, Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS, Congressman SESSIONS, and others—thank you for all you have done to get us to this point.

To our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, Senator BOB CASEY and Senator RICHARD BURR, this has been a team effort.

Mr. Speaker, like Congressman CRENSHAW, I want to especially recognize and honor those families from across the country who actually worked so hard over so many years to get us to this point. Many of those families are in the gallery today. Others are watching from around the country.

At a time when there is deep cynicism about the ability or lack of ability of Congress and the government to function, they broke through that cynicism and are an example to others of what we can do and can accomplish by working together.

Because of their efforts, as we heard, we have 380 cosponsors, Republicans and Democrats, in the House and 74 United States Senators, Republicans and Democrats. With that broad bipartisan and bicameral support, everyone worked together to get to this point.

We have heard what this does. It provides an opportunity for families with kids or other members of the families

with disabilities to put aside a little money, tax free, to help defray some of the extra medical costs that are incurred by those families.

It is a benefit available to families who are sending their kids to college, and we should make sure that we provide that kind of benefit to families who are trying to make sure their loved ones are cared for.

That is what this does. It is about equity. It is about fairness. It is about making sure that every child has the opportunity to reach his or her full potential. It is a time-honored American value, and that is why this has attracted such broad support.

Mr. Speaker, no single piece of legislation—nothing we can do here—can single-handedly eliminate the additional medical and financial burdens faced by families living and loving and caring for their children with disabilities every day, but this act, this ABLE Act, can help ease that financial burden and can help assist families in some small way in ensuring that their children receive the love and care they deserve.

I thank my colleagues for coming together on this important effort, and I hope it gets through the Senate and to the President's desk, where it can be signed soon.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, everybody, for being a part of this effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The Chair would remind all Members that the rules require Members to refrain from referencing occupants in the gallery.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), the distinguished chair of the House Republican Conference.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for your tremendous leadership.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the House and in the Senate, I thank them for their tremendous support.

Mr. Speaker, I join in rising in strong support of H.R. 647, the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act, the ABLE Act, which will help millions of Americans and families save for their futures.

Today is the day we have been waiting for, for a long time, and I am so proud to stand here with my colleagues, with the advocates who are here, with the families across the Nation who have spent countless days, weeks, years pushing us across the finish line.

For me, personally, this bill is about a little boy who was diagnosed with Down syndrome 3 days after he was born. His diagnosis came with a list of future complications: endless doctors' visits and therapy sessions, potential heart defects, even early Alzheimer's.

Seven years later, as the mom of that little boy, nothing has given me greater joy than watching Cole grow and the tremendous impact that he is already having on this world.

When Cole was born, my husband and I were told don't put any assets in his name because he may need to qualify for one of these programs in the future. That is the wrong message to send to parents who are ready to save—who are ready to sacrifice—to ensure that their children have an opportunity for a better life.

The ABLE Act is going to change this. It is going to empower individuals with disabilities and empower their families through tax-free savings accounts to save for college, retirement, and other future expenses.

As a part of America's new Congress, we are here to advance real solutions, solutions to make people's lives better, solutions that will empower all Americans no matter where you come from, no matter how much money to your name, or what challenges you face.

The ABLE Act is one of the many ways that we are going to do that. It is going to empower millions, including my son Cole, with the opportunity for a better life.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 647.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), another distinguished member of our committee.

□ 1545

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by being very clear. I support the ABLE Act itself. It is a compassionate bill that seeks to expand the common good by providing tax-free savings accounts for disabled Americans. If we were voting on that bill today, I would strongly support it. But the ABLE Act isn't the issue here. The issue is how we are going to pay for it. And the proposal we are considering today is just one that jeopardizes the future of our safety net.

Newt Gingrich talked about wanting to have Medicare wither on the vine. That has always been the desire of the Republicans. So today we are setting out on an unprecedented and dangerous course in the funding of this bill.

In a last-minute development, the Congress is now considering using cuts to Medicare to offset the cost of this legislation, taking away from the old people and giving it to these folks. That is their idea of a balanced act.

There has been no serious debate. There has never been a hearing and no thoughtful discussion of the implications of this proposal. If we vote to make these cuts, we will take the first step down a slippery slope that directly undermines the social safety net.

I have checked with the experts in the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service and couldn't find one

example in which Congress has used Medicare as a piggy bank to pay for a tax bill. And that is what this bill is, basically, a tax exemption. It is a good idea, but are we going to use Medicare to pay for it? Because, mark my words, when it comes time to offer another tax break, my colleagues on the other side will come after Medicare again; and the next time, the cut will be deeper and easier because we did it today.

I believe that we should not be a part of beginning to rip Medicare at the very bottom. It looks like just a little bit. And they will say, oh, it is only a tiny bit, and it is not going to affect anybody. But you are establishing a precedent that you will hear again on this floor. For that reason, I intend to vote "no."

AARP,

Washington, DC, December 3, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the largest non-profit, nonpartisan organization representing the interests of Americans age 50 and older and their families, AARP urges you to reject using Medicare savings as an offset to pay for non-healthcare programs, including the cost of the Achieving a Better Life Experience (ABLE) Act of 2014.

AARP has consistently advocated against using permanent reductions in Medicare to pay for other unrelated government spending. While we agree it is important to help individuals with disabilities maintain health, independence, and quality of life, we oppose using Medicare savings to finance tax expenditures or other non-healthcare programs.

The ABLE Act establishes tax-exempt savings plans for persons with disabilities, making it much easier for them and their families to save for future expenses. Although ABLE accounts are only available for individuals under the age of 26, the savings accrued will help with living expenses as the person ages. This is especially important because at ages 50–64, adults with disabilities are less than half as likely to be employed as those without disabilities.

However, establishing the ABLE program should not be achieved by tapping into Medicare savings. This is especially true at a time when Medicare faces its own long term funding needs, and when Congress will shortly need to find savings to pay for either permanent Medicare SGR reform or another temporary "doc fix" in 2015. We urge you to remove Medicare offsets from the ABLE Act.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,
*Executive Vice President,
State & National Group.*

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington State (Mr. REICHERT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee.

I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington control the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CAMP for yielding and for all of his hard work on this legislation and for bringing it forward today.

I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), too, for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 647, as amended, also known as the ABLE Act. And we have heard what ABLE stands for, but let me just repeat it very slowly so people can understand really what this is about: achieving better life experience for people who have special needs and who are disabled.

We all strive to have better lives, but some people in this world need a little help, and that is what we are doing today. Some people might disagree with some of the ways we are going about this. The bottom line is we are helping people that need a little special help, a little extra help from us, and we are going to step up and do that.

This is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It is designed to help those individuals with disabilities overcome the hurdles that they often face holding a job and trying to live independently.

Here is the problem: if someone with a disability works and achieves even a modest level of savings, they lose their assets to certain safety net programs, such as Medicaid and SSI. This can discourage individuals from pursuing work opportunities and gaining the independence that comes through work.

Here is the solution: this legislation today. This is the solution, Mr. Speaker. It helps individuals, regardless of disability, to achieve the best possible quality of life by ensuring continued access to essential safety net programs as well as tax-free savings accounts, allowing them to pursue independence and community involvement.

These ABLE accounts would be used to cover a wide variety of expenses related to addressing and overcoming the disabilities, and they would grow tax-free. These costs quickly add up, as needs can range from uncovered health care needs, education costs, housing needs, transportation costs, assistive technology, speech-generating devices and other technology, and personal support services.

This bill is critical because it allows individuals with ABLE accounts to maintain their eligibility for benefits while working and saving more for their future needs. ABLE account balances and withdrawals are completely excluded for purposes of Medicaid; and under the SSI program, the first \$100,000 in account balances would be excluded from being counted as resources, meaning disabled individuals could save far more than today, while remaining eligible for benefits along the way.

This bill is about real people—we have heard some of the stories already this afternoon—real people who have real hopes and real dreams, dreams of being able to support themselves and plan for the future, dreams for a better life, and people like my godson, Kyle.

Now, Kyle today is 20 years old, but Kyle weighs 60 pounds and is in a wheelchair. Kyle was diagnosed at 18 months old with cancer. He can't speak. Up to this point, Kyle has only been able to save \$2,000. And once you reach that \$2,000 level, that is it. If you go over that, you don't get the benefits. Imagine if you were the parents of Kyle, trying to save for his future, to maybe get a speech device so Mom and Dad can hear Kyle say "I love you," because he hasn't been able to say that. Imagine not being able to hear your child say, "I love you, Mom. I love you, Dad."

This savings account allows people to save that money for their children, to buy that technology, to get that wheelchair that costs \$20,000. Some of us who are able-bodied and don't understand the disability that people live with every day, you see a wheelchair and there is no cost attached. We see people in wheelchairs, \$20,000 and more for people who can only use maybe their index finger and a thumb to operate the toggle switch on a wheelchair so they can go from point A to point B.

I am proud to be Kyle's godfather. When you wheel Kyle into a room, he lights up the room, and we want to give him a better life. That is what this bill does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

I would like to thank the cosponsors of this bill, the 379 Members. But more than anyone, I would really like to especially thank the families that have been working on this for years. It has been an honor to visit with them, to get to know them, and to get to know their families.

I urge a "yes" vote on this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone here would agree that the goals of the ABLE Act are worthy. The bill's title stands for achieving better life experience, and it would allow for the creation of tax-free savings accounts to benefit individuals with disabilities. These accounts would provide a way for families raising children with disabilities to set aside savings for their child's care.

What I am concerned about is the offsets. The bill before us today uses Medicare cuts to pay for a tax break. Medicare is a program that seniors and people with disabilities depend upon for their health care, and we should not be cutting Medicare to pay for this bill.

Meanwhile, we all know that our efforts to permanently repeal and replace the SGR in the lame duck are, unfortunately, falling flat. And while I hope we can still pass SGR this month, if it

does not get done, we are going to have a Medicare bill that will cost tens of billions of dollars in March, and Republicans will force us to pay for every last dime, and here we are, using \$1.2 billion in health offsets for non-health bills.

In addition to the Medicare offsets, there are other offsets included in this bill that are troublesome. The provision on certified professional employer organizations could have a negative effect on worker rights, including collective bargaining and organizing and worker protections.

I say again, the goals of the ABLE Act are laudable. I hope that our Senate colleagues will send the bill back to us without these offensive offsets so that we can enact a good law that we can all be proud of.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Imagine that sense when you get the word that a new baby has been diagnosed with something that was completely unanticipated. That has been a situation that has been present in the lives of constituents, family, friends, and those of us who are nearby.

I think there is a hopefulness today, Mr. Speaker, about what we are talking about. And there are so many people that have run for office with the idea of trying to get something done, the notion that you have this strong of a voice all coming together saying, You know what? We may not be able to agree about what time of day it is in this Congress, but we can agree that we all ought to come together to help those who are unable to help themselves or to help those who want to care for the ones who are around them. So it is also a good lesson to learn about the tenacity of Americans who have decided to substantively engage this place over a period of years.

A number of minutes ago, we heard from the gentleman from Florida, Representative CRENSHAW, who talked about introducing this back in 2006. He was tenacious, and he was joined by others, and they pushed and they pushed. Now they have accomplished something, and we are on the verge of, actually, a great moment.

So I am here to celebrate. I am here to celebrate with my colleagues who took the initiative. I am here to celebrate others who came alongside. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, we are here to celebrate the lives of those who are being supported by this act.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been working with Mr. CRENSHAW, with

Senator CASEY, and I congratulate them on this bill. But I want to say how deeply I regret that there are extraneous provisions in the bill concerning worker protections and offsets that keep it from being the bipartisan bill that it means to be, or else we wouldn't have seen virtually the whole House on the bill. So I have come to speak for the underlying bill and to hope that those provisions will somehow be swept aside and we can have the bill that I think most who signed on thought they were signing.

We talk on both sides of the aisle, as well we should, about personal responsibility, but what we have been doing until this time was leaving the disabled dependent on their own parents or on charities without any way to liberate themselves from others. I think about the parents of 20-year-old autistic brothers who kept them locked up and had no way to liberate them or to care for them.

Most woeful is dependence on charities who, themselves, get tax exemptions to take care of people who need them, and they do an excellent job. But, if we are going to give a tax break to people who take care of disabled people, surely there should be a tax benefit for them to take care of themselves.

And just consider this: most disabled people, truly disabled people, are unable to find jobs of any kind; but if they do, they will not be the kinds of jobs normally that leave them able to open savings accounts, prepare for their own retirement, and the rest. So even if they were able to be employed, they still, of course, must look to other sources of income.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. That is why this bill, in many ways, is so sensitive. It doesn't supplant any of the assistance that is necessary, like Medicaid and their own insurance that they may have or SSI.

My own daughter, Katherine Felicia Norton, was the Global Down Syndrome ambassador this year. Katherine will probably not need one of these savings accounts. But I am here this afternoon to speak for all of those who do—and there are millions in our country—and to thank particularly the sponsors for what they are trying to do with this bill.

I thank my good friend for yielding to me.

□ 1600

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), who is a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Earlier today I had the privilege of meeting with Kenneth Kelty and his

mother, Jacqueline. They are from my district, and this is a family who would benefit directly from the ABLE Act and who shared their support of this important bill with me just this afternoon. Kenneth recently graduated from the University Participant Program at Western Carolina University, a program that allows students with disabilities to study side-by-side with other students at the university. In Kenneth's words, it was "a chance to do all the same things as everyone else with nothing holding us back." Kenneth joined a fraternity, had a good time, learned a lot, was able to come back, has a job.

Mr. Speaker, just as the University Participant Program helps people with disabilities like Kenneth, so will this bipartisan ABLE Act. This bill will allow tax-free savings accounts for expenses such as housing, education, employment training. Similar to a 529 program college savings account, these accounts will help provide families with some peace of mind when trying to save for their children's long-term expenses.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the ABLE Act.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager, Mr. LEVIN, for his kindness, as well as the manager for the majority, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and the many others who, along with myself, cosponsored this legislation.

It is very moving to have a moment of family on the floor of the House as I listen to Members recount their individual stories of those in their families and those of us who encounter our constituents with wonderful, beautiful children, many of whom fit squarely in this relief that is being given.

As I watched two twins grow up who are prized and special in our community, I could just imagine what their mother and their late father would say about this opportunity. This legislation, H.R. 647, squarely answers our concerns.

I want to get to two points that I think are so important. We hear it all the time: it seems as if these are rich people trying to get money, but they are not. They may be working families and middle class families, and to be able to not deny them eligibility for Medicaid when there are severe health issues that many of these young people and children face, and also for them to be able to have SSI, which is sometimes a lifeline, to be able to put aside this savings that will help them in education and transportation—I hear it so often, training for employment; any of us who have dealt with Goodwill and seen what Goodwill does with young people whose parents bring them there—yet they need other ways of

being able to respond, and they should not be denied higher education.

This bill allows the savings to be part of the higher education efforts that these parents want for their children, and sometimes the ability for independence with primary residence, what it says is that these young people, as they grow, have developmental possibilities and opportunities, and that there are no throwaway children, there are no throwaway young people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman. There are no throwaway young people, and we should not throw them away.

I agree with my colleagues who have mentioned items that we would hope would be reframed, if you will, impacting workers' conditions and rights, provisions that may, in fact, impact Medicare. None of us who have committed ourselves to the strength of Medicare want to see that undermined. But I will say that the goodness of this legislation for my neighbors and my constituents whom I personally know, individuals whom I personally know—this is a lifeline.

I am very glad to speak on H.R. 647 for the lifeline that it provides for people who deserve it, and they do not in any way have the need or the desire to see the opportunities for their children and their young people be determined only by the limitations of their ability to provide for them.

This is an account. It is more than a savings account. It is a lifeline account to help give every American, no matter who they are, this equal opportunity and particularly those with disabilities.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of stories today about people in need, about people with disabilities and special needs, and we have had some names attached to those stories, which really touches the hearts of those people that know those individuals, and I hope touches the hearts of the Members here in this Chamber when they hear the stories of people in need who need that special attention.

One key challenge for disabled individuals is that their access to certain safety net programs can be lost if they work. I want to just repeat that. It can be lost if they work and achieve even a modest level of savings. To overcome that challenge, the ABLE Act would help more individuals with disabilities save and live independently without losing access to critical programs like Medicaid and SSI.

Now, starting in 2015, States could create an ABLE program under which individuals with disabilities could start an ABLE account modeled after cur-

rent section 529 savings accounts. Anyone—parents, grandparents, and other family members, and friends—could contribute to that account, which would grow tax free. Then when they need to withdraw from that account, those withdrawals would be tax free if spent on a wide variety of expenses related to helping them address and overcome their disability. That includes expenses like uncovered health care, education costs, housing needs, transportation costs, assistive technology, and others that I have mentioned earlier.

ABLE ACCOUNT DETAILS

One key challenge for disabled individuals is that their access to certain safety-net programs can be lost if they work and achieve even a modest level of savings.

To overcome that challenge, the ABLE Act would help more individuals with disabilities save and live independently without losing access to critical programs like Medicaid and SSI.

Starting in 2015, States could create an ABLE program, under which individuals with disabilities could start an ABLE account, modeled after current Section 529 savings accounts.

Anyone—parents, grandparents, and other family and friends—could contribute to their ABLE account, which would grow tax-free.

Then when they need to withdraw from the account, those withdrawals would be tax free if spent on a wide variety of expenses related to helping them address and overcome their disability.

That includes expenses like uncovered health care, education costs, housing needs, transportation costs, assistive technology, and personal support services.

Critically, individuals with ABLE accounts could maintain their eligibility for means-tested benefits while working and saving more for their future needs.

ABLE account balances and withdrawals are completely excluded for purposes of Medicaid.

And under the SSI program, the first \$100,000 in account balances would be excluded from being counted as resources, meaning disabled individuals could save far more than today while remaining eligible for benefits along the way.

This change will go a long way to easing the minds of disabled individuals and those around them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Let me ask my colleague if he is ready to close?

Mr. REICHERT. I am waiting for one other speaker. If the gentleman has another speaker, it would be helpful.

Mr. LEVIN. I do not.

Mr. REICHERT. I guess we are ready to close then, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEVIN. Okay. I would like to give your colleague a chance, but shall we proceed? Is that okay?

Mr. REICHERT. Yes, we are prepared to close.

Mr. LEVIN. Okay. I can do so very briefly. I think we face a somewhat unusual situation here. We have an oppor-

tunity to help people who have some very major challenges, including challenges related to their health, and so on balance I think there is a need for us to act, and so therefore I support this bill.

I just want us to remember, in a sense, the unusual opportunity that we have here to help millions of people who are living with disabilities that affect their lives, including their basic health status.

I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

I thank the gentleman for his comments and words of support and, again, thank all 379 cosponsors of this bipartisan bill. I thank the Senate, which has worked with the Members of the House on this bill, making it a bicameral bill, and I think it is also important, Mr. Speaker, to point out the outside support that this bill has garnered.

Let me just name a few of those: the American Association of People With Disabilities, Autism Society of America, Autism Speaks, the Brain Injury Association of America, Easter Seals, National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, National Disability Institute, National Down Syndrome Society, National Federation of the Blind, and the Arc, and that is just to name a few of the outside organizations and groups that support this legislation.

Again, this is important legislation designed to help individuals with disabilities overcome the hurdles that they often face in holding a job and living independently, and I appreciate again the comments of the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the ABLE Act. I would like to commend the efforts of my colleagues Representative ANDER CRENSHAW and Representative CHRIS VAN HOLLEN for their leadership and steadfast commitment to moving this legislation forward. This is truly a great bipartisan effort that will help families across this country and I've been proud to join the hundreds of members of Congress who support it as a cosponsor.

For years, I have heard from constituents like Andrew and Tamara Selinger from West Hartford, who have advocated not only on behalf of their own family, but for families across Connecticut and the country. Their two children have Fragile X syndrome and all they are asking for are the same opportunities for their children that other families have with the 529 plan, to have a savings mechanism that would enhance their lives and pay for non-covered medical expenses, while not minimizing the services that they receive. I have heard from people like Bob and Rosie Shea and Shannon Knall from our local Autism Speaks chapter and many others from families and groups advocating on behalf of individuals with disabilities, who have spoken so passionately about why this legislation is so important.

In spite of the partisan rancor that often dominates this building, this bill shows that we can come together in a meaningful way to act in a positive manner on behalf of the American people. It is truly inspiring how many advocates and families have made their voice heard on this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support this bill and finally get it across the finish line on behalf of families across this country.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the ABLE Act and its intent to promote greater independence and freedoms to disabled and handicapped Americans. However, I have great concerns with the policy that is being used to pay for this legislation because it would seek to further decrease Medicare reimbursement for physicians—an action that could threaten seniors' access to health care.

Since the passage of the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003 and the creation of the sustainable growth rate (SGR) formula, Congress has passed 17 “doc-fixes” to prevent further cuts to physicians providing care for our seniors. Each year, the entire medical community must pick up the tab to prevent the disastrous cuts that would be implemented if the SGR was to take effect. The result? Medicare reimbursement for physicians has decreased by 17% when adjusted for inflation, while the cost of care continues to rise.

In the most recent “doc fix” passed in March of this year, a controversial provision required the annual re-evaluation of codes matching 0.5% of total physician spending from 2017 through 2020. If this target is not met, the difference would be taken in the form of an across the board cut. The proposed offset included in the ABLE Act would shift these targets forward and compress them, requiring CMS to identify misvalued services equal to at least 1% of total physician spending in 2016, and 0.5% in 2017 and 2018. Moving the target to 2016 and frontloading it to require the identification of 1% of total physician spending in the first year would make it extremely difficult to meet the target.

However, CMS has no intention of implementing this law. In the 2015 Medicare Fee Schedule Final Rule, CMS finalized a proposal to transition 10- and 90-day global period codes to 0-day global period codes in 2017, and 2018, respectively, yet CMS has not developed a methodology for how that transition will be made. This is a major overhaul of close to half of the currently existing CPT codes and will dramatically reform how physicians are paid. Because CMS has not yet developed a methodology for how this transition will occur, the nature of the impact is currently unknown, leading to further instability in physician payments. CMS notes in the Rule that due to the work necessary to make this change, they will not have resources to review certain other potentially misvalued services for the “next several years”, almost certainly resulting in an across the board cut to all physicians caring for Medicare patients.

This continuous pursuit by our Congress and CMS to re-evaluate codes within the physician fee schedule will be detrimental to the medical community and to ensuring access for our Medicare beneficiaries. A 1% cut may not sound like much, but when taken in conjunc-

tion with the combined maximum penalties for not meeting the PQRS, physician value-based payment modifier, and EHR programs, the total potential cut faced by physicians will be -9% in 2016, and -11.5% in 2017. This does not even take into account the cuts required by the unresolved SGR.

Despite these concerns, I will support the ABLE Act today with the hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will recommit themselves in the new Congress to securing the Medicare program for all Americans.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, more than 37 million people in the United States have a disability, including more than 500,000 in Minnesota. For parents raising a child with a disability, it is both emotionally and financially draining.

While, individuals with disabilities are living longer and more productive lives than ever before, they still face barriers to finding and holding employment, living independently, and taking care of their daily needs. We can make it easier for these families to bear this financial burden.

The bipartisan ABLE Act, or Achieving a Better Life Experience, will give individuals with disabilities new opportunities for them to save and pay for the costs of their disabilities. Using an ABLE account, they and their families are able to put aside money tax free and then use it to cover qualified expenses such as health, education, housing, and transportation.

For eight years, this legislation has been proposed, talked about, and pending in Congress. I became an early advocate for the ABLE Act when I was first elected to the House. It is supported by more than 70 health care and disability organizations. Now's the time to get this across the finish line and pass the ABLE Act to help families and individuals most in need.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 647, the ABLE Act, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation today. If enacted, it would allow Americans living with a disability and their families to establish tax-exempt financial accounts so they can finance qualified expenses including education, housing, transportation, employment support, medical care and other personal necessities. Critically, it would not jeopardize eligibility for other important federal benefits like Medicaid and Social Security.

As a disabled American myself, I understand the financial strain a disability can have on individuals and their families. Not only do disabled Americans often face higher costs and lower incomes, but they are currently penalized for saving for their future. The ABLE Act will allow millions of Americans with disabilities to invest in their futures, live fulfilling lives and become more independent and less reliant on public benefits. It will empower them to build a better economic future for themselves and their families.

Disabled Americans deserve every opportunity to achieve their dreams. I urge the House to pass this important legislation as quickly as possible.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act or “the ABLE Act,” legislation I cosponsored that

is designed to improve the quality of life for individuals with disabilities by assisting in long-term financial planning.

As the founder and co-chair of the Coalition for Autism Research and Education, I understand the financial demands of raising a child with support needs. Education, housing, transportation, employment support, medical care, and other life expenses can quickly add up for persons with disabilities.

A study published this year in the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) Pediatrics* found that the lifetime cost for an individual with ASD averages \$1.4 million. These costs jump to \$2.4 million when autism involves intellectual disability—an estimated 40 percent of individuals with autism also have intellectual disability.

Unfortunately, under current law, saving more than \$2,000 jeopardizes access to services and supports, such as Social Security and Medicaid. If enacted, the ABLE Act—which establishes tax-exempt accounts, similar to the current 529 Education Savings Plans—will no longer force parents to choose between saving for their child's future and sacrificing the assistance their child requires.

I commend Speaker BOEHNER for bringing this bill to the floor today. It is especially timely for the autism community as we continue to address the looming crisis of aging out. Every year, 50,000 age-out of their support system and into a society that disincentivizes employment and financial security. Enactment of my legislation—the Autism CARES Act—earlier this year began the conversation of how to better address the needs of individuals with ASD who are aging out and we have much work to do.

The ABLE Act is a step in the right direction. While I have concerns regarding the Medicare physician services offsets, ABLE accounts are a sensible and fiscally responsible tool that will benefit some of the most vulnerable members of our society. It is a smart piece of legislation to assist families in saving and planning for the long-term needs of individuals with disabilities and a more secure future. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, it's a laudable and worthy goal to incentivize savings and ensure that families of individuals with disabilities have access to the resources they need. But Congress has a responsibility to ensure that limited resources benefit those who need the help the most. Unfortunately, this bill is yet another example of an upside-down tax code that provides the greatest benefits to those of greatest means, not to middle class families living paycheck to paycheck.

Additionally, as AARP has noted in the attached letter, “establishing the ABLE program should not be achieved by tapping into Medicare savings.” Using Medicare savings to offset non-health related programs sets a dangerous precedent. While there are elements to this bill that both sides can agree on, this bill takes one step forward and two steps back.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF RETIRED PEOPLE,
December 3, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the largest non-profit, nonpartisan organization representing the interests of Americans age 50 and older and their families, AARP urges you to reject using Medicare savings as an

offset to pay for non-healthcare programs, including the cost of the Achieving a Better Life Experience (ABLE) Act of 2014.

AARP has consistently advocated against using permanent reductions in Medicare to pay for other unrelated government spending. While we agree it is important to help individuals with disabilities maintain health, independence, and quality of life, we oppose using Medicare savings to finance tax expenditures or other non-healthcare programs.

The ABLE Act establishes tax-exempt savings plans for persons with disabilities, making it much easier for them and their families to save for future expenses. Although ABLE accounts are only available for individuals under the age of 26, the savings accrued will help with living expenses as the person ages. This is especially important because at ages 50-64, adults with disabilities are less than half as likely to be employed as those without disabilities.

However, establishing the ABLE program should not be achieved by tapping into Medicare savings. This is especially true at a time when Medicare faces its own long term funding needs, and when Congress will shortly need to find savings to pay for either permanent Medicare SGR reform or another temporary “doc fix” in 2015. We urge you to remove Medicare offsets from the ABLE Act.

Sincerely,

NANCY A. LEAMOND,
*Executive Vice President,
State & National Group.*

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, our nation encourages personal savings in a number of ways throughout the tax code and now with the ABLE Act we are adding one more, specifically for individuals with disabilities. As we acknowledge through this legislation the importance of saving for individuals with disabilities and their families, it is important to place this policy in context and ensure the public and policymakers appreciate the continued need for effective asset tests in means-tested programs.

The ABLE Act explicitly ignores ABLE account balances and withdrawals for purposes of determining eligibility for Medicaid and other means-tested programs; under the SSI program, the first \$100,000 in account balances is not counted as resources and withdrawals, except for those relating to housing, are not counted as income. This treatment is designed to provide generous new incentives to save for individuals with disabilities and their families, which current policy limits.

It would be a mistake for the public and future policymakers to argue that similar treatment should be afforded all low-income individuals under existing means-tested programs. Indeed, recent advances in administering resource limits suggests that such tools should be used more aggressively in making proper determinations about whether other individuals have sufficient personal means of support before asking taxpayers for government benefits. These advances rebut recent claims that administering resource limits is overly time consuming and burdensome, and suggest that State and Federal agencies are increasingly able to apply these limits in a cost-effective and efficient manner. For example, on March 11, 2011, the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee heard testimony from the Social Security Inspector General about the use of electronic tools such as the Access

to Financial Institutions (AFI) program, which allows the Social Security Administration to automate the process of checking for assets, limiting the burden on recipients and field office employees who administer the program.

Another argument for ensuring the use of effective resource limits for non-disabled individuals involves program cost. Especially if able-bodied individuals have significant assets or other resources on which to depend, they can and should be expected to use those resources first to support themselves before turning to taxpayer support. The alternative would be a significant expansion of taxpayer spending on able-bodied individuals who have significant personal resources they can and should turn to first for support. Recent years have seen examples of that through significant degradations in the effectiveness of the resource test in the food stamp program.

As of November 2010, thirty-three states and D.C. excluded the value of all vehicles in making food stamp eligibility determinations and in the last five years nearly every state has chosen to not have an asset test for food stamp benefits at all. Not surprisingly, due to these changes and other factors, the food stamp program has grown from 17 million recipients in the year 2000 to nearly 48 million recipients today, at four times its former cost to taxpayers. In July 25, 2012 testimony before the Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee, Professor Doug Besharov of the University of Maryland described this phenomenon as “eligibility creep,” or “The process through which programs are successively expanded through a series of small steps, many of whose impacts are imperceptible at the time.”

Future policymakers need to protect against such eligibility creep and continue to ensure that limited taxpayer dollars are properly targeted to individuals needing assistance. Just as the ABLE Act allows parents to ensure sufficient resources are available to support their disabled children after they no longer can do so, we need to be good stewards of taxpayer-funded programs to ensure they are sustainable in the future. Continuing to effectively and efficiently administer income and resources limits, especially with regard to able-bodied individuals, is critical to achieving that goal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 766, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

TAX INCREASE PREVENTION ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 766, I call up the bill (H.R. 5771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 766, the amendment printed in part A of House Report 113-643 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5771

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014”.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title, etc.

TITLE I—CERTAIN EXPIRING PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Individual Tax Extenders

- Sec. 101. Extension of deduction for certain expenses of elementary and secondary school teachers.
- Sec. 102. Extension of exclusion from gross income of discharge of qualified principal residence indebtedness.
- Sec. 103. Extension of parity for employer-provided mass transit and parking benefits.
- Sec. 104. Extension of mortgage insurance premiums treated as qualified residence interest.
- Sec. 105. Extension of deduction of State and local general sales taxes.
- Sec. 106. Extension of special rule for contributions of capital gain real property made for conservation purposes.
- Sec. 107. Extension of above-the-line deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses.
- Sec. 108. Extension of tax-free distributions from individual retirement plans for charitable purposes.

Subtitle B—Business Tax Extenders

- Sec. 111. Extension of research credit.
- Sec. 112. Extension of temporary minimum low-income housing tax credit rate for non-federally subsidized buildings.
- Sec. 113. Extension of military housing allowance exclusion for determining whether a tenant in certain counties is low-income.
- Sec. 114. Extension of Indian employment tax credit.
- Sec. 115. Extension of new markets tax credit.
- Sec. 116. Extension of railroad track maintenance credit.

Sec. 117. Extension of mine rescue team training credit.

Sec. 118. Extension of employer wage credit for employees who are active duty members of the uniformed services.

Sec. 119. Extension of work opportunity tax credit.

Sec. 120. Extension of qualified zone academy bonds.

Sec. 121. Extension of classification of certain race horses as 3-year property.

Sec. 122. Extension of 15-year straight-line cost recovery for qualified leasehold improvements, qualified restaurant buildings and improvements, and qualified retail improvements.

Sec. 123. Extension of 7-year recovery period for motorsports entertainment complexes.

Sec. 124. Extension of accelerated depreciation for business property on an Indian reservation.

Sec. 125. Extension of bonus depreciation.

Sec. 126. Extension of enhanced charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

Sec. 127. Extension of increased expensing limitations and treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

Sec. 128. Extension of election to expense mine safety equipment.

Sec. 129. Extension of special expensing rules for certain film and television productions.

Sec. 130. Extension of deduction allowable with respect to income attributable to domestic production activities in Puerto Rico.

Sec. 131. Extension of modification of tax treatment of certain payments to controlling exempt organizations.

Sec. 132. Extension of treatment of certain dividends of regulated investment companies.

Sec. 133. Extension of RIC qualified investment entity treatment under FIRPTA.

Sec. 134. Extension of subpart F exception for active financing income.

Sec. 135. Extension of look-thru treatment of payments between related controlled foreign corporations under foreign personal holding company rules.

Sec. 136. Extension of temporary exclusion of 100 percent of gain on certain small business stock.

Sec. 137. Extension of basis adjustment to stock of S corporations making charitable contributions of property.

Sec. 138. Extension of reduction in S-corporation recognition period for built-in gains tax.

Sec. 139. Extension of empowerment zone tax incentives.

Sec. 140. Extension of temporary increase in limit on cover over of rum excise taxes to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Sec. 141. Extension of American Samoa economic development credit.

Subtitle C—Energy Tax Extenders

Sec. 151. Extension of credit for nonbusiness energy property.

Sec. 152. Extension of second generation biofuel producer credit.

Sec. 153. Extension of incentives for biodiesel and renewable diesel.

Sec. 154. Extension of production credit for Indian coal facilities placed in service before 2009.

Sec. 155. Extension of credits with respect to facilities producing energy from certain renewable resources.

Sec. 156. Extension of credit for energy-efficient new homes.

Sec. 157. Extension of special allowance for second generation biofuel plant property.

Sec. 158. Extension of energy efficient commercial buildings deduction.

Sec. 159. Extension of special rule for sales or dispositions to implement FERC or State electric restructuring policy for qualified electric utilities.

Sec. 160. Extension of excise tax credits relating to certain fuels.

Sec. 161. Extension of credit for alternative fuel vehicle refueling property.

Subtitle D—Extenders Relating to Multiemployer Defined Benefit Pension Plans

Sec. 171. Extension of automatic extension of amortization periods.

Sec. 172. Extension of shortfall funding method and endangered and critical rules.

TITLE II—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Amendments relating to American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012.

Sec. 203. Amendment relating to Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012.

Sec. 204. Amendment relating to FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012.

Sec. 205. Amendments relating to Regulated Investment Company Modernization Act of 2010.

Sec. 206. Amendments relating to Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010.

Sec. 207. Amendments relating to Creating Small Business Jobs Act of 2010.

Sec. 208. Clerical amendment relating to Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act.

Sec. 209. Amendments relating to American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act of 2009.

Sec. 210. Amendments relating to Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008.

Sec. 211. Amendments relating to Tax Extenders and Alternative Minimum Tax Relief Act of 2008.

Sec. 212. Clerical amendments relating to Housing Assistance Tax Act of 2008.

Sec. 213. Amendments and provision relating to Heroes Earnings Assistance and Relief Tax Act of 2008.

Sec. 214. Amendments relating to Economic Stimulus Act of 2008.

Sec. 215. Amendments relating to Tax Technical Corrections Act of 2007.

Sec. 216. Amendment relating to Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006.

Sec. 217. Amendment relating to Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005: A Legacy for Users.

Sec. 218. Amendments relating to Energy Tax Incentives Act of 2005.

Sec. 219. Amendments relating to American Jobs Creation Act of 2004.

Sec. 220. Other clerical corrections.

Sec. 221. Deadwood provisions.

TITLE III—JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

Sec. 301. Increased refund and credit threshold for Joint Committee on Taxation review of C corporation return.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

Sec. 401. Budgetary effects.

TITLE I—CERTAIN EXPIRING PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Individual Tax Extenders

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (D) of section 62(a)(2) is amended by striking “or 2013” and inserting “2013, or 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME OF DISCHARGE OF QUALIFIED PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE INDEBTEDNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (E) of section 108(a)(1) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to indebtedness discharged after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF PARITY FOR EMPLOYER-PROVIDED MASS TRANSIT AND PARKING BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 132(f) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to months after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 104. EXTENSION OF MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS TREATED AS QUALIFIED RESIDENCE INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subclause (I) of section 163(h)(3)(E)(iv) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or accrued after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 105. EXTENSION OF DEDUCTION OF STATE AND LOCAL GENERAL SALES TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (I) of section 164(b)(5) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 106. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL RULE FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAPITAL GAIN REAL PROPERTY MADE FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (vi) of section 170(b)(1)(E) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS BY CERTAIN CORPORATE FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—Clause (iii) of section 170(b)(2)(B) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 107. EXTENSION OF ABOVE-THE-LINE DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 222 is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 108. EXTENSION OF TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT PLANS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (F) of section 408(d)(8) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to distributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

Subtitle B—Business Tax Extenders

SEC. 111. EXTENSION OF RESEARCH CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 41(h) is amended by striking “paid or incurred” and all that follows and inserting “paid or incurred after December 31, 2014”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (D) of section 45C(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) SPECIAL RULE.—If section 41 is not in effect for any period, such section shall be deemed to remain in effect for such period for purposes of this paragraph.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 112. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY MINIMUM LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT RATE FOR NON-FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 42(b)(2) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2014.

SEC. 113. EXTENSION OF MILITARY HOUSING ALLOWANCE EXCLUSION FOR DETERMINING WHETHER A TENANT IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES IS LOW-INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 3005 of the Housing Assistance Tax Act of 2008 is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 3005 of the Housing Assistance Tax Act of 2008.

SEC. 114. EXTENSION OF INDIAN EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 45A is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 115. EXTENSION OF NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (G) of section 45D(f)(1) is amended by striking “and 2013” and inserting “2013, and 2014”.

(b) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED LIMITATION.—Paragraph (3) of section 45D(f) is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2019”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 116. EXTENSION OF RAILROAD TRACK MAINTENANCE CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 45G is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to expenditures paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 117. EXTENSION OF MINE RESCUE TEAM TRAINING CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 45N is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 118. EXTENSION OF EMPLOYER WAGE CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEES WHO ARE ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 45P is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments made after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 119. EXTENSION OF WORK OPPORTUNITY TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 51(c) is amended by striking “for the employer” and all that follows and inserting “for the employer after December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to individuals who begin work for the employer after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 120. EXTENSION OF QUALIFIED ZONE ACADEMY BONDS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Paragraph (1) of section 54E(c) is amended by striking “and 2013” and inserting “2013, and 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to obligations issued after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 121. EXTENSION OF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN RACE HORSES AS 3-YEAR PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) of section 168(e)(3)(A) is amended—

(1) by striking “January 1, 2014” in subclause (I) and inserting “January 1, 2015”, and

(2) by striking “December 31, 2013” in subclause (II) and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 122. EXTENSION OF 15-YEAR STRAIGHT-LINE COST RECOVERY FOR QUALIFIED LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENTS, QUALIFIED RESTAURANT BUILDINGS AND IMPROVEMENTS, AND QUALIFIED RETAIL IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clauses (iv), (v), and (ix) of section 168(e)(3)(E) are each amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 123. EXTENSION OF 7-YEAR RECOVERY PERIOD FOR MOTORSPORTS ENTERTAINMENT COMPLEXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (D) of section 168(i)(15) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 124. EXTENSION OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION FOR BUSINESS PROPERTY ON AN INDIAN RESERVATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (8) of section 168(j) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 125. EXTENSION OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 168(k) is amended—

(1) by striking “January 1, 2015” in subparagraph (A)(iv) and inserting “January 1, 2016”, and

(2) by striking “January 1, 2014” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) SPECIAL RULE FOR FEDERAL LONG-TERM CONTRACTS.—Clause (ii) of section 460(c)(6)(B) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014 (January 1, 2015)” and inserting “January 1, 2015 (January 1, 2016)”.

(c) EXTENSION OF ELECTION TO ACCELERATE THE AMT CREDIT IN LIEU OF BONUS DEPRECIATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subclause (II) of section 168(k)(4)(D)(iii) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(2) ROUND 4 EXTENSION PROPERTY.—Paragraph (4) of section 168(k) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) SPECIAL RULES FOR ROUND 4 EXTENSION PROPERTY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of round 4 extension property, in applying this paragraph to any taxpayer—

“(I) the limitation described in subparagraph (B)(i) and the business credit increase amount under subparagraph (E)(iii) thereof shall not apply, and

“(II) the bonus depreciation amount, maximum amount, and maximum increase amount shall be computed separately from amounts computed with respect to eligible qualified property which is not round 4 extension property.

“(ii) ELECTION.—

“(I) A taxpayer who has an election in effect under this paragraph for round 3 extension property shall be treated as having an election in effect for round 4 extension property unless the taxpayer elects to not have this paragraph apply to round 4 extension property.

“(II) A taxpayer who does not have an election in effect under this paragraph for round 3 extension property may elect to have this paragraph apply to round 4 extension property.

“(iii) ROUND 4 EXTENSION PROPERTY.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘round 4 extension property’ means property which is eligible qualified property solely by reason of the extension of the application of the special allowance under paragraph (1) pursuant to the amendments made by section 125(a) of the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014 (and the application of such extension to this paragraph pursuant to the amendment made by section 125(c) of such Act).”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The heading for subsection (k) of section 168 is amended by striking “JANUARY 1, 2014” and inserting “JANUARY 1, 2015”.

(2) The heading for clause (ii) of section 168(k)(2)(B) is amended by striking “PRE-JANUARY 1, 2014” and inserting “PRE-JANUARY 1, 2015”.

(3) Subparagraph (C) of section 168(n)(2) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(4) Subparagraph (D) of section 1400L(b)(2) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(5) Subparagraph (B) of section 1400N(d)(3) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013, in taxable years ending after such date.

SEC. 126. EXTENSION OF ENHANCED CHARITABLE DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF FOOD INVENTORY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (iv) of section 170(e)(3)(C) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to contributions made after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 127. EXTENSION OF INCREASED EXPENSING LIMITATIONS AND TREATMENT OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY AS SECTION 179 PROPERTY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **DOLLAR LIMITATION.**—Section 179(b)(1) is amended—

(A) by striking “beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “beginning after 2009 and before 2015”, and

(B) by striking “2013” in subparagraph (C) and inserting “2014”.

(2) **REDUCTION IN LIMITATION.**—Section 179(b)(2) is amended—

(A) by striking “beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “beginning after 2009 and before 2015”, and

(B) by striking “2013” in subparagraph (C) and inserting “2014”.

(b) **COMPUTER SOFTWARE.**—Section 179(d)(1)(A)(ii) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

(c) **ELECTION.**—Section 179(c)(2) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

(d) **SPECIAL RULES FOR TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED REAL PROPERTY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 179(f)(1) is amended by striking “beginning in 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013” and inserting “beginning after 2009 and before 2015”.

(2) **CARRYOVER LIMITATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 179(f)(4) is amended by striking “2013” each place it appears and inserting “2014”.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The heading of subparagraph (C) of section 179(f)(4) is amended by striking “2011 AND 2012” and inserting “2011, 2012, AND 2013”.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 128. EXTENSION OF ELECTION TO EXPENSE MINE SAFETY EQUIPMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (g) of section 179E is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 129. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL EXPENSING RULES FOR CERTAIN FILM AND TELEVISION PRODUCTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (f) of section 181 is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to productions commencing after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 130. EXTENSION OF DEDUCTION ALLOWABLE WITH RESPECT TO INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES IN PUERTO RICO.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (C) of section 199(d)(8) is amended—

(1) by striking “first 8 taxable years” and inserting “first 9 taxable years”, and

(2) by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 131. EXTENSION OF MODIFICATION OF TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO CONTROLLING EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Clause (iv) of section 512(b)(13)(E) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to payments received or accrued after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 132. EXTENSION OF TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DIVIDENDS OF REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraphs (1)(C)(v) and (2)(C)(v) of section 871(k) are each amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 133. EXTENSION OF RIC QUALIFIED INVESTMENT ENTITY TREATMENT UNDER FIRPTA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Clause (ii) of section 897(h)(4)(A) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2014. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, such amendment shall not apply with respect to the withholding requirement under section 1445 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any payment made before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **AMOUNTS WITHHELD ON OR BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.**—In the case of a regulated investment company—

(A) which makes a distribution after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) which would (but for the second sentence of paragraph (1)) have been required to withhold with respect to such distribution under section 1445 of such Code,

such investment company shall not be liable to any person to whom such distribution was made for any amount so withheld and paid over to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 134. EXTENSION OF SUBPART F EXCEPTION FOR ACTIVE FINANCING INCOME.

(a) **EXEMPT INSURANCE INCOME.**—Paragraph (10) of section 953(e) is amended—

(1) by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”, and

(2) by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE FOR INCOME DERIVED IN THE ACTIVE CONDUCT OF BANKING, FINANCING, OR SIMILAR BUSINESSES.**—Paragraph (9) of section 954(h) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2013, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which any such taxable year of such foreign corporation ends.

SEC. 135. EXTENSION OF LOOK-THRU TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS BETWEEN RELATED CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS UNDER FOREIGN PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANY RULES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (C) of section 954(c)(6) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2013, and to taxable years of United States shareholders with or within which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

SEC. 136. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXCLUSION OF 100 PERCENT OF GAIN ON CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (4) of section 1202(a) is amended—

(1) by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”, and

(2) by striking “AND 2013” in the heading and inserting “2013, AND 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to stock acquired after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 137. EXTENSION OF BASIS ADJUSTMENT TO STOCK OF S CORPORATIONS MAKING CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PROPERTY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (2) of section 1367(a) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 138. EXTENSION OF REDUCTION IN S-CORPORATION RECOGNITION PERIOD FOR BUILT-IN GAINS TAX.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (C) of section 1374(d)(7) is amended—

(1) by striking “2012 or 2013” and inserting “2012, 2013, or 2014”, and

(2) by striking “2012 AND 2013” in the heading and inserting “2012, 2013, AND 2014”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 139. EXTENSION OF EMPOWERMENT ZONE TAX INCENTIVES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Clause (i) of section 1391(d)(1)(A) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TERMINATION DATES SPECIFIED IN NOMINATIONS.**—In the case of a designation of an empowerment zone the nomination for which included a termination date which is contemporaneous with the date specified in subparagraph (A)(i) of section 1391(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect before the enactment of this Act), subparagraph (B) of such section shall not apply with respect to such designation if, after the date of the enactment of this section, the entity which made such nomination amends the nomination to provide for a new termination date in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s designee) may provide.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to periods after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 140. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY INCREASE IN LIMIT ON COVER OVER OF RUM EXCISE TAXES TO PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (1) of section 7652(f) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to distilled spirits brought into the United States after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 141. EXTENSION OF AMERICAN SAMOA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (d) of section 119 of division A of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 is amended—

(1) by striking “January 1, 2014” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2015”,

(2) by striking “first 8 taxable years” in paragraph (1) and inserting “first 9 taxable years”, and

(3) by striking “first 2 taxable years” in paragraph (2) and inserting “first 3 taxable years”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

Subtitle C—Energy Tax Extenders**SEC. 151. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR NONBUSINESS ENERGY PROPERTY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 25C(g) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 152. EXTENSION OF SECOND GENERATION BIOFUEL PRODUCER CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) of section 40(b)(6)(J) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to qualified second generation biofuel production after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 153. EXTENSION OF INCENTIVES FOR BIODIESEL AND RENEWABLE DIESEL.

(a) CREDITS FOR BIODIESEL AND RENEWABLE DIESEL USED AS FUEL.—Subsection (g) of section 40A is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to fuel sold or used after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 154. EXTENSION OF PRODUCTION CREDIT FOR INDIAN COAL FACILITIES PLACED IN SERVICE BEFORE 2009.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 45(e)(10) is amended by striking “8-year period” each place it appears and inserting “9-year period”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to coal produced after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 155. EXTENSION OF CREDITS WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES PRODUCING ENERGY FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following provisions of section 45(d) are each amended by striking “January 1, 2014” each place it appears and inserting “January 1, 2015”:

- (1) Paragraph (1).
- (2) Paragraph (2)(A).
- (3) Paragraph (3)(A).
- (4) Paragraph (4)(B).
- (5) Paragraph (6).
- (6) Paragraph (7).
- (7) Paragraph (9).
- (8) Paragraph (11)(B).

(b) EXTENSION OF ELECTION TO TREAT QUALIFIED FACILITIES AS ENERGY PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 48(a)(5)(C) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2014.

SEC. 156. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR ENERGY-EFFICIENT NEW HOMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 45L is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to homes acquired after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 157. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL ALLOWANCE FOR SECOND GENERATION BIOFUEL PLANT PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (D) of section 168(l)(2) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 158. EXTENSION OF ENERGY EFFICIENT COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h) of section 179D is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 159. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL RULE FOR SALES OR DISPOSITIONS TO IMPLEMENT FERC OR STATE ELECTRIC RESTRUCTURING POLICY FOR QUALIFIED ELECTRIC UTILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 451(i) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2015”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to dispositions after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 160. EXTENSION OF EXCISE TAX CREDITS RELATING TO CERTAIN FUELS.

(a) EXCISE TAX CREDITS AND OUTLAY PAYMENTS FOR BIODIESEL AND RENEWABLE DIESEL FUEL MIXTURES.—

(1) Paragraph (6) of section 6426(c) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 6427(e)(6) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(b) EXTENSION OF ALTERNATIVE FUELS EXCISE TAX CREDITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 6426(d)(5) and 6426(e)(3) are each amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(2) OUTLAY PAYMENTS FOR ALTERNATIVE FUELS.—Subparagraph (C) of section 6427(e)(6) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2014”.

(c) EXTENSION OF ALTERNATIVE FUELS EXCISE TAX CREDITS RELATING TO LIQUEFIED HYDROGEN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 6426(d)(5) and 6426(e)(3), as amended by subsection (b), are each amended by striking “(September 30, 2014 in the case of any sale or use involving liquefied hydrogen)”.

(2) OUTLAY PAYMENTS FOR ALTERNATIVE FUELS.—Paragraph (6) of section 6427(e) is amended—

(A) by striking “except as provided in subparagraph (D), any” in subparagraph (C), as amended by this Act, and inserting “any”,

(B) by striking the comma at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “, and”, and

(C) by striking subparagraph (D) and redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to fuel sold or used after December 31, 2013.

(2) LIQUEFIED HYDROGEN.—The amendments made by subsection (c) shall apply to fuel sold or used after September 30, 2014.

(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN PERIODS DURING 2014.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in the case of—

(1) any biodiesel mixture credit properly determined under section 6426(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for periods after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) any alternative fuel credit properly determined under section 6426(d) of such Code for such periods,

such credit shall be allowed, and any refund or payment attributable to such credit (including any payment under section 6427(e) of such Code) shall be made, only in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall provide. Such Secretary shall issue guidance within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act providing for a one-time submission of claims covering periods described in the preceding sentence. Such guidance shall provide

for a 180-day period for the submission of such claims (in such manner as prescribed by such Secretary) to begin not later than 30 days after such guidance is issued. Such claims shall be paid by such Secretary not later than 60 days after receipt. If such Secretary has not paid pursuant to a claim filed under this subsection within 60 days after the date of the filing of such claim, the claim shall be paid with interest from such date determined by using the overpayment rate and method under section 6621 of such Code.

SEC. 161. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLE REFUELING PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (g) of section 30C is amended by striking “placed in service” and all that follows and inserting “placed in service after December 31, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 2013.

Subtitle D—Extenders Relating to Multiemployer Defined Benefit Pension Plans**SEC. 171. EXTENSION OF AUTOMATIC EXTENSION OF AMORTIZATION PERIODS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (C) of section 431(d)(1) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—Subparagraph (C) of section 304(d)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1084(d)(1)(C)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to applications submitted under section 431(d)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and section 304(d)(1)(C) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 172. EXTENSION OF SHORTFALL FUNDING METHOD AND ENDANGERED AND CRITICAL RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 221(c) of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 are each amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 221(c) of the Pension Protection Act of 2006 is amended by striking “January 1, 2015” and inserting “January 1, 2016”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2014.

TITLE II—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Tax Technical Corrections Act of 2014”.

SEC. 202. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO AMERICAN TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT OF 2012.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 101(b).—Subclause (I) of section 642(b)(2)(C)(i) is amended by striking “section 151(d)(3)(C)(iii)” and inserting “section 68(b)(1)(C)”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 102.—Clause (ii) of section 911(f)(2)(B) is amended by striking “described in section 1(h)(1)(B)” shall be treated as a reference to such excess as determined” and inserting “described in section 1(h)(1)(B), and the reference in section 55(b)(3)(C)(ii) to the excess described in section 1(h)(1)(C)(ii), shall each be treated as a reference to each such excess as determined”.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 104.—

(1) Clause (ii) of section 55(d)(4)(B) is amended by inserting “subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D) of” before “paragraph (1)”.

(2) Subparagraph (C) of section 55(d)(4) is amended by striking “increase” and inserting “increased amount”.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 310.—Clause (iii) of section 6431(f)(3)(A) is amended—

(1) by striking “2011” and inserting “years after 2010”, and

(2) by striking “of such allocation” and inserting “of any such allocation”.

(e) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 331.—Clause (iii) of section 168(k)(4)(J) is amended by striking “any taxable year” and inserting “its first taxable year”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 to which they relate.

SEC. 203. AMENDMENT RELATING TO MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2012.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 7001.—Paragraph (1) of section 7001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 is amended by striking “201(b)” and inserting “202(b)”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in section 7001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012.

SEC. 204. AMENDMENT RELATING TO FAA MODERNIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2012.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1107.—Section 4281 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 4281. SMALL AIRCRAFT ON NONESTABLISHED LINES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The taxes imposed by sections 4261 and 4271 shall not apply to transportation by an aircraft having a maximum certificated takeoff weight of 6,000 pounds or less, except when such aircraft is operated on an established line or when such aircraft is a jet aircraft.

“(b) MAXIMUM CERTIFICATED TAKEOFF WEIGHT.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘maximum certificated takeoff weight’ means the maximum such weight contained in the type certificate or airworthiness certificate.

“(c) SIGHTSEEING.—For purposes of this section, an aircraft shall not be considered as operated on an established line at any time during which such aircraft is being operated on a flight the sole purpose of which is sightseeing.

“(d) JET AIRCRAFT.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘jet aircraft’ shall not include any aircraft which is a rotorcraft or propeller aircraft.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in section 1107 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012.

SEC. 205. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2010.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 101.—

(1) Subsection (c) of section 101 of the Regulated Investment Company Modernization Act of 2010 is amended—

(A) by striking “paragraph (2)” in paragraph (1) and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) EXCISE TAX.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), for purposes of section 4982

of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply by substituting ‘the 1-year periods taken into account under subsection (b)(1)(B) of such section with respect to calendar years beginning after December 31, 2010’ for ‘taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act’.

“(B) ELECTION.—A regulated investment company may elect to apply subparagraph (A) by substituting ‘2011’ for ‘2010’. Such election shall be made at such time and in such form and manner as the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall prescribe.”.

(2) The first sentence of paragraph (2) of section 852(c) is amended—

(A) by striking “and without regard to” and inserting “, without regard to”, and

(B) by inserting “, and without regard to any capital loss arising on the first day of the taxable year by reason of clauses (i) and (iii) of section 1212(a)(3)(A)” before the period at the end.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 304.—Paragraph (1) of section 855(a) is amended by inserting “on or” before “before”.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 308.—

(1) Paragraph (8) of section 852(b) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G) and by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) POST-OCTOBER CAPITAL LOSS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘post-October capital loss’ means—

“(i) any net capital loss attributable to the portion of the taxable year after October 31, or

“(ii) if there is no such loss—

“(I) any net long-term capital loss attributable to such portion of the taxable year, or

“(II) any net short-term capital loss attributable to such portion of the taxable year.

“(D) LATE-YEAR ORDINARY LOSS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘late-year ordinary loss’ means the sum of any post-October specified loss and any post-December ordinary loss.

“(E) POST-OCTOBER SPECIFIED LOSS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘post-October specified loss’ means the excess (if any) of—

“(i) the specified losses (as defined in section 4982(e)(5)(B)(ii)) attributable to the portion of the taxable year after October 31, over

“(ii) the specified gains (as defined in section 4982(e)(5)(B)(i)) attributable to such portion of the taxable year.

“(F) POST-DECEMBER ORDINARY LOSS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘post-December ordinary loss’ means the excess (if any) of—

“(i) the ordinary losses not described in subparagraph (E)(i) and attributable to the portion of the taxable year after December 31, over

“(ii) the ordinary income not described in subparagraph (E)(ii) and attributable to such portion of the taxable year.”.

(2) Subparagraph (G) of section 852(b)(8), as so redesignated, is amended by striking “, (D)(i)(I), and (D)(ii)(I)” and inserting “and (E)”.

(3) The first sentence of paragraph (2) of section 852(c), as amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking “, and without regard to” and inserting “, without regard to”, and

(B) by inserting “, and with such other adjustments as the Secretary may prescribe” before the period at the end.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 402.—

(1) Subparagraph (B) of section 4982(e)(6) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or which determines income by reference to the value of an item on the last day of the taxable year”.

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 4982(e)(7) is amended by striking “such company” and all that follows through “any net ordinary loss” and inserting “such company may elect to determine its ordinary income and net ordinary loss (as defined in paragraph (2)(C)(ii)) for the calendar year without regard to any portion of any net ordinary loss”.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 201.—Subparagraph (A) of section 851(d)(2) is amended by inserting “of this paragraph” after “subparagraph (B)(i)”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Regulated Investment Company Modernization Act of 2010 to which they relate.

(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—In the case of an election by a regulated investment company under section 852(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to any taxable year beginning before the date of the enactment of this Act, such company may treat the amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c) as not applying with respect to any such election.

SEC. 206. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TAX RELIEF, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REAUTHORIZATION, AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2010.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 103.—Clause (ii) of section 32(b)(3)(B) is amended by striking “in 2010” and inserting “after 2009”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 302.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 2801(a) is amended by striking “(or, if greater, the highest rate of tax specified in the table applicable under section 2502(a) as in effect on the date)”.

(2) Subsection (f) of section 302 of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 is amended by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 753.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1397B(b)(1) is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) the day after the date set forth in section 1391(d)(1)(A)(i) were substituted for ‘January 1, 2010’ each place it appears.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010 to which they relate.

SEC. 207. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO CREATING SMALL BUSINESS JOBS ACT OF 2010.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 2102.—

(1) Subsection (h) of section 2102 of the Creating Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 is amended by inserting “, and payee statements required to be furnished,” after “information returns required to be filed”.

(2) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), and subsection (c)(1)(C), of section 6722 are each amended by striking “the required filing date” and inserting “the date prescribed for furnishing such statement”.

(3) Subparagraph (B) of section 6722(c)(2) is amended by striking “filed” and inserting “furnished”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Creating Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 to which they relate.

SEC. 208. CLERICAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO HIRING INCENTIVES TO RESTORE EMPLOYMENT ACT.

(a) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 512.**—Paragraph (1) of section 512(a) of the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act is amended by striking “after paragraph (6)” and inserting “after paragraph (5)”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act to which it relates.

SEC. 209. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT TAX ACT OF 2009.

(a) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1003.**—Paragraph (4) of section 24(d) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) **SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN YEARS.**—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2008 and before 2018, paragraph (1)(B)(i) shall be applied by substituting ‘\$3,000’ for ‘\$10,000’.”.

(b) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1004.**—Paragraph (3) of section 25A(i) is amended by striking “Subsection (f)(1)(A) shall be applied” and inserting “For purposes of determining the Hope Scholarship Credit, subsection (f)(1)(A) shall be applied”.

(c) **AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 1008.**—

(1) Paragraph (6) of section 164(b) is amended by striking subparagraph (E) and by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively.

(2) Subparagraphs (E) and (F) of section 164(b)(6), as so redesignated, are each amended by striking “This paragraph” and inserting “Subsection (a)(6)”.

(d) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1104.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 48(d)(3) is amended by inserting “or alternative minimum taxable income” after “includible in the gross income”.

(e) **AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 1141.**—

(1) Subsection (f) of section 30D is amended—

(A) by inserting “(determined without regard to subsection (c))” before the period at the end of paragraph (1), and

(B) by inserting “(determined without regard to subsection (c))” before the period at the end of paragraph (2).

(2) Paragraph (3) of section 30D(f) is amended by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of subsection (c), property to which this paragraph applies shall be treated as of a character subject to an allowance for depreciation.”.

(f) **AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 1142.**—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 38 is amended by striking “plus” at the end of paragraph (35), by redesignating paragraph (36) as paragraph (37), and by inserting after paragraph (35) the following new paragraph:

“(36) the portion of the qualified plug-in electric vehicle credit to which section 30(c)(1) applies, plus”.

(2)(A) Subsection (e) of section 30 is amended—

(i) by inserting “(determined without regard to subsection (c))” before the period at the end of paragraph (1), and

(ii) by inserting “(determined without regard to subsection (c))” before the period at the end of paragraph (2).

(B) Paragraph (3) of section 30(e) is amended by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of subsection (c), property to which this paragraph applies shall be treated as of a character subject to an allowance for depreciation.”.

(g) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1302.**—Paragraph (3) of section 48C(b) is amended by inserting “as the qualified investment” after “The amount which is treated”.

(h) **AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 1541.**—

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 853A(a) is amended by inserting “(determined after the application of this section)” before the comma at the end.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 853A is amended—

(A) by striking “with respect to credits” and inserting “with respect to some or all of the credits”, and

(B) by inserting “(determined without regard to this section and sections 54(c), 54A(c)(1), 54AA(c)(1), and 1397E(c))” after “credits allowable”.

(3) Subsection (b) of section 853A is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **EFFECT OF ELECTION.**—If the election provided in subsection (a) is in effect with respect to any credits for any taxable year—

“(1) the regulated investment company—

“(A) shall not be allowed such credits,

“(B) shall include in gross income (as interest) for such taxable year the amount which would have been so included with respect to such credits had the application of this section not been elected,

“(C) shall include in earnings and profits the amount so included in gross income, and

“(D) shall be treated as making one or more distributions of money with respect to its stock equal to the amount of such credits on the date or dates (on or after the applicable date for any such credit) during such taxable year (or following the close of the taxable year pursuant to section 855) selected by the company, and

“(2) each shareholder of such investment company shall—

“(A) be treated as receiving such shareholder’s proportionate share of any distribution of money which is treated as made by such investment company under paragraph (1)(D), and

“(B) be allowed credits against the tax imposed by this chapter equal to the amount of such distribution, subject to the provisions of this title applicable to the credit involved.”.

(4) Subsection (c) of section 853A is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.**—The amount treated as a distribution of money received by a shareholder under subsection (b)(2)(A) (and as credits allowed to such shareholder under subsection (b)(2)(B)) shall not exceed the amount so reported by the regulated investment company in a written statement furnished to such shareholder.”.

(5) Clause (ii) of section 853A(e)(1)(A) is amended by inserting “other than a qualified bond described in section 54AA(g)” after “as defined in section 54AA(d)”.

(i) **AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 2202.**—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 2202(b)(1) of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 is amended by inserting “political subdivision of a State,” after “any State.”.

(2) Section 2202 of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.**—The amount treated as a distribution of money received by a shareholder under subsection (b)(2)(A) (and as credits allowed to such shareholder under subsection (b)(2)(B)) shall not exceed the amount so reported by the regulated investment company in a written statement furnished to such shareholder.”.

(3) Clause (ii) of section 853A(e)(1)(A) is amended by inserting “other than a qualified bond described in section 54AA(g)” after “as defined in section 54AA(d)”.

(4) Subsection (c) of section 853A is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.**—The amount treated as a distribution of money received by a shareholder under subsection (b)(2)(A) (and as credits allowed to such shareholder under subsection (b)(2)(B)) shall not exceed the amount so reported by the regulated investment company in a written statement furnished to such shareholder.”.

(5) Clause (ii) of section 853A(e)(1)(A) is amended by inserting “other than a qualified bond described in section 54AA(g)” after “as defined in section 54AA(d)”.

(6) Subsection (c) of section 853A is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.**—The amount treated as a distribution of money received by a shareholder under subsection (b)(2)(A) (and as credits allowed to such shareholder under subsection (b)(2)(B)) shall not exceed the amount so reported by the regulated investment company in a written statement furnished to such shareholder.”.

(7) Section 2202 of division B of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **TREATMENT OF POSSESSIONS.**—

“(1) **PAYMENTS TO MIRROR CODE POSSESSIONS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each possession of the United States with a mirror code tax system amounts equal to the loss to that possession by reason of credits allowed under subsection (a) with respect to taxable years beginning in 2009. Such amounts shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on information provided by the government of the respective possession.

“(2) **COORDINATION WITH CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST UNITED STATES INCOME TAXES.**—No credit shall be allowed against United States income taxes for any taxable year under this section to any person to whom a credit is allowed against taxes imposed by the possession by reason of the credit allowed under subsection (a) for such taxable year.

“(3) **DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.**—

“(A) **POSSESSION OF THE UNITED STATES.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘possession of the United States’ includes the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(B) **MIRROR CODE TAX SYSTEM.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘mirror code tax system’ means, with respect to any possession of the United States, the income tax system of such possession if the income tax liability of the residents of such possession under such system is determined by reference to the income tax laws of the United States as if such possession were the United States.

“(C) **TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.**—For purposes of section 1324(b)(2) of title 31, United States Code, the payments under this subsection shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from the credit allowed under section 36A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this Act).”.

(j) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1131.**—Paragraph (2) of section 45Q(d) is amended by striking “Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency” and all that follows through “shall establish” and inserting “Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of the Interior, shall establish”.

(2) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1141.**—Paragraph (37) of section 1016(a) is amended by striking “section 30D(e)(4)” and inserting “section 30D(f)(1)”.

(3) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 3001.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 3001(a)(14) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 is amended by striking “is amended by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10)” and inserting “, as amended by this Act, is amended by redesignating paragraphs (9) and (10) as paragraphs (10) and (11), respectively.”.

(k) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act of 2009 to which they relate.

SEC. 210. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ENERGY IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION ACT OF 2008.

(a) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 108.**—Subparagraph (E) of section 45K(g)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(E) **COORDINATION WITH SECTION 45.**—No credit shall be allowed with respect to any coke or coke gas which is produced using steel industry fuel (as defined in section 45(c)(7)) as feedstock if a credit is allowed to any taxpayer under section 45 with respect to the production of such steel industry fuel.”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 113.—Paragraph (1) of section 113(b) of the Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) TRUST FUND.—The term ‘Trust Fund’ means the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund established under section 9501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 306.—

(1) Clause (ii) of section 168(i)(18)(A) is amended by striking “10 years” and inserting “16 years”.

(2) Clause (ii) of section 168(i)(19)(A) is amended by striking “10 years” and inserting “16 years”.

(d) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 308.—Clause (i) of section 168(m)(2)(B) is amended by striking “section 168(k)” and inserting “subsection (k) (determined without regard to paragraph (4) thereof)”.

(e) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 402.—Subparagraph (A) of section 907(f)(4) is amended by striking “this subsection shall be applied” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “this subsection, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008, shall apply to unused oil and gas extraction taxes carried from such unused credit year to a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2008.”.

(f) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 403.—

(1) Subsection (c) of section 1012 is amended—

(A) by striking “FUNDS” in the heading for paragraph (2) and inserting “REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES”;

(B) by striking “FUND” in the heading for paragraph (2)(B), and

(C) by striking “fund” each place it appears in paragraph (2) and inserting “regulated investment company”.

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 1012(d) is amended—

(A) by striking “December 31, 2010” and inserting “December 31, 2011”, and

(B) by striking “an open-end fund” and inserting “a regulated investment company”.

(3) Paragraph (3) of section 1012(d) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS; ELECTION FOR TREATMENT AS SINGLE ACCOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Rules similar to the rules of subsection (c)(2) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

“(B) AVERAGE BASIS METHOD.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in the case of an election under rules similar to the rules of subsection (c)(2)(B) with respect to stock held in connection with a dividend reinvestment plan, the average basis method is permissible with respect to all such stock without regard to the date of the acquisition of such stock.”.

(4) Subsection (g) of section 6045 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN STOCK HELD IN CONNECTION WITH DIVIDEND REINVESTMENT PLAN.—For purposes of this subsection, stock acquired before January 1, 2012, in connection with a dividend reinvestment plan shall be treated as stock described in clause (ii) of paragraph (3)(C) (unless the broker with respect to such stock elects not to have this paragraph apply with respect to such stock).”.

(g) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 108.—Paragraph (2) of section 45(b) is amended by

striking “\$3 amount” and inserting “\$2 amount”.

(2) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 306.—

(A) Paragraph (5) of section 168(b) is amended by striking “(2)(C)” and inserting “(2)(D)”.

(B) The last sentence of section 168(k)(4)(C)(i) is amended by striking “(b)(2)(C)” and inserting “(b)(2)(D)”.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008 to which they relate.

SEC. 211. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TAX EXTENDERS AND ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2008.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 208.—Subsection (b) of section 208 of the Tax Extenders and Alternative Minimum Tax Relief Act of 2008 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2008. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, such amendment shall not apply with respect to the withholding requirement under section 1445 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any payment made before October 4, 2008.

“(2) AMOUNTS WITHHELD ON OR BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—In the case of a regulated investment company—

“(A) which makes a distribution after December 31, 2007, and before October 4, 2008, and

“(B) which would (but for the second sentence of paragraph (1)) have been required to withhold with respect to such distribution under section 1445 of such Code,

such investment company shall not be liable to any person to whom such distribution was made for any amount so withheld and paid over to the Secretary of the Treasury.”.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 305.—Paragraphs (7)(B) and (8)(D) of section 168(e) are each amended by inserting “which is not qualified leasehold improvement property” after “Property described in this paragraph”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 706.—

(A) Paragraph (2) of section 1033(h) is amended by inserting “is” before “compulsorily”.

(B) Subclause (II) of section 172(b)(1)(F)(ii) is amended by striking “subsection (h)(3)(C)(i)” and inserting “section 165(h)(3)(C)(i)”.

(C) The heading for paragraph (1) of section 165(h) is amended by striking “\$100” and inserting “DOLLAR”.

(2) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 709.—Subsection (k) of section 143 is amended by redesignating the second paragraph (12) (relating to special rules for residences destroyed in Federally declared disasters) as paragraph (13).

(3) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 712.—Section 712 of the Tax Extenders and Alternative Minimum Tax Relief Act of 2008 is amended by striking “section 702(c)(1)(A)” and inserting “section 702(b)(1)(A)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the Tax Extenders and Alternative Minimum Tax Relief Act of 2008 to which they relate.

SEC. 212. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO HOUSING ASSISTANCE TAX ACT OF 2008.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 3002.—Paragraph (1) of section 42(b) is amended by striking “For purposes of this

section, the term” and inserting the following: “For purposes of this section—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 3081.—Clause (iv) of section 168(k)(4)(E) is amended by striking “adjusted minimum tax” and inserting “adjusted net minimum tax”.

(c) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 3092.—Subsection (b) of section 121 is amended by redesignating the second paragraph (4) (relating to exclusion of gain allocated to nonqualified use) as paragraph (5).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the Housing Assistance Tax Act of 2008 to which they relate.

SEC. 213. AMENDMENTS AND PROVISION RELATING TO HEROES EARNINGS ASSISTANCE AND RELIEF TAX ACT OF 2008.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 106.—Paragraph (2) of section 106(c) of the Heroes Earnings Assistance and Relief Tax Act of 2008 is amended by striking “substituting for” and inserting “substituting ‘June 17, 2008’ for”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 114.—Paragraph (1) of section 125(h) is amended by inserting “(and shall not fail to be treated as an accident or health plan)” before “merely”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 110.—Subparagraph (B) of section 121(d)(12) is amended by inserting “of paragraph (9)” after “and (D)”.

(2) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 301.—Paragraph (2) of section 877(e) is amended by striking “subparagraph (A) or (B) of”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the Heroes Earnings Assistance and Relief Tax Act of 2008 to which they relate.

SEC. 214. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STIMULUS ACT OF 2008.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 101.—Paragraph (2) of section 6213(g) is amended—

(1) by striking “32, or 6428” in subparagraph (L) and inserting “or 32”, and

(2) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (O), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (P) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after subparagraph (P) the following new subparagraph:

“(Q) an omission of a correct valid identification number required under section 6428(h) (relating to 2008 recovery rebates for individuals) to be included on a return.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 103.—Subclause (IV) of section 168(k)(2)(B)(i) is amended by striking “clauses also apply” and inserting “clause also applies”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 to which they relate.

SEC. 215. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO TAX TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2007.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 4(c).—Paragraph (1) of section 911(f) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“For purposes of this paragraph, the amount excluded under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the aggregate amount of any deductions or exclusions disallowed under subsection (d)(6) with respect to such excluded amount.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 11(g).—Clause (iv) of section 56(g)(4)(C) is amended by striking “a cooperative described in section 927(a)(4)” and inserting

“an organization to which part I of subchapter T (relating to tax treatment of cooperatives) applies which is engaged in the marketing of agricultural or horticultural products”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the Tax Technical Corrections Act of 2007 to which they relate.

SEC. 216. AMENDMENT RELATING TO TAX RELIEF AND HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2006.

(a) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 105.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 45A(b)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following: “If any portion of wages are taken into account under subsection (e)(1)(A) of section 51, the preceding sentence shall be applied by substituting ‘2-year period’ for ‘1-year period’.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 to which it relates.

SEC. 217. AMENDMENT RELATING TO SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT OF 2005: A LEGACY FOR USERS.

(a) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1161.**—Paragraph (1) of section 9503(b) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and taxes received under section 4081 shall be determined without regard to tax receipts attributable to the rate specified in section 4081(a)(2)(C)”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005: A Legacy for Users to which it relates.

SEC. 218. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ENERGY TAX INCENTIVES ACT OF 2005.

(a) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1341.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 30B(h)(5) is amended by inserting “(determined without regard to subsection (g))” before the period at the end.

(b) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 1342.**—Paragraph (1) of section 30C(e) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) **REDUCTION IN BASIS.**—For purposes of this subtitle, the basis of any property for which a credit is allowable under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount of such credit so allowed (determined without regard to subsection (d)).”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Energy Tax Incentives Act of 2005 to which it relates.

SEC. 219. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO AMERICAN JOBS CREATION ACT OF 2004.

(a) **AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 101.**—Subsection (d) of section 101 of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **COORDINATION WITH SECTION 199.**—This subsection shall be applied without regard to any deduction allowable under section 199.”.

(b) **AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 102.**—Paragraph (3) of section 199(b) is amended—

(1) by inserting “of a short taxable year or” after “in cases”, and

(2) by striking “AND DISPOSITIONS” and inserting “, DISPOSITIONS, AND SHORT TAXABLE YEARS”.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 413.**—Paragraph (7) of section 904(h) is amended by striking “as ordinary income under section 1246 or”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if

included in the provision of the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004 to which they relate.

SEC. 220. OTHER CLERICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) Paragraph (8) of section 30B(h) is amended by striking “(vehicle), except that” and inserting “(vehicle), except that”.

(b) Subparagraph (A) of section 38(c)(2) is amended by striking “credit credit” and inserting “credit”.

(c) Section 46 is amended by adding a comma at the end of paragraph (4).

(d) Subparagraph (E) of section 50(a)(2) is amended by inserting “, 48A(b)(3), 48B(b)(3), 48C(b)(2), or 48D(b)(4)” after “in section 48(b)”.

(e) Clause (i) of section 54A(d)(2)(A) is amended by striking “100 percent or more” and inserting “100 percent”.

(f) Paragraph (2) of section 125(b) is amended by striking “statutory nontaxable benefits” each place it appears and inserting “qualified benefits”.

(g) Paragraph (2) of section 125(h) is amended by striking “means, any” and inserting “means any”.

(h) Subparagraph (F) of section 163(h)(4) is amended by striking “Veterans Administration or the Rural Housing Administration” and inserting “Department of Veterans Affairs or the Rural Housing Service”.

(i) Subsection (a) of section 249 is amended by striking “1563(a)(1)” and inserting “1563(a)(1)”.

(j) Paragraphs (8) and (10) of section 280F(d) are each amended by striking “subsection (a)(2)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”.

(k) Clause (iii) of section 402A(c)(4)(E) is amended by striking “403(b)(7)(A)(i)” and inserting “403(b)(7)(A)(ii)”.

(l) Section 527 is amended—

(1) by striking “(2 U.S.C. 432(e))” in subsection (h)(2)(A)(i) and inserting “(52 U.S.C. 30102(e))”, and

(2) by striking “(2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.)” in subsections (i)(6) and (j)(5)(A) and inserting “(52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.)”.

(m) Subsection (b) of section 858 is amended by striking “857(b)(8)” and inserting “857(b)(9)”.

(n) Subparagraph (A) of section 1012(c)(2) is amended by striking “section 1012” and inserting “this section”.

(o) The heading for section 1394(f) is amended by striking “DESIGNATED UNDER SECTION 1391(g)”.

(p) Paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) of section 1394(f) are each amended by striking “a new empowerment zone facility bond” and inserting “an empowerment zone facility bond”.

(q) Clause (i) of section 1400N(c)(3)(A) is amended by striking “section 42(d)(5)(C)(iii)” and inserting “section 42(d)(5)(B)(iii)”.

(r) Subsections (e)(3)(B) and (f)(7)(B) of section 4943 are each amended by striking “January 1, 1970” and inserting “January 1, 1971”.

(s) Paragraph (2) of section 4982(f) is amended by adding a comma at the end.

(t) Paragraph (3) of section 6011(e) is amended by striking “shall require than” and inserting “shall require that”.

(u) Subsection (b) of section 6072 is amended by striking “6011(e)(2)” and inserting “6011(c)(2)”.

(v) Subsection (d) of section 6104 is amended by redesignating the second paragraph (6) (relating to disclosure of reports by the Internal Revenue Service) and third paragraph (6) (relating to application to nonexempt charitable trusts and nonexempt private foundations) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively.

(w) Subsection (c) of section 6662A is amended by striking “section 6664(d)(2)(A)” and inserting “section 6664(d)(3)(A)”.

(x) Subparagraph (FF) of section 6724(d)(2) is amended by striking “section 6050W(c)” and inserting “section 6050W(f)”.

(y) Section 7122 is amended by redesignating the second subsection (f) (relating to frivolous submissions, etc.) as subsection (g).

(z) Subsection (a) of section 9035 is amended by striking “section 320(b)(1)(A)” and inserting “section 315(b)(1)(A)”.

(aa) Section 9802 is amended by redesignating the second subsection (f) (relating to genetic information of a fetus or embryo) as subsection (g).

(bb) Paragraph (3) of section 13(e) of the Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act of 2009 is amended by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (c)”.

SEC. 221. DEADWOOD PROVISIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **ADJUSTMENTS IN TAX TABLES SO THAT INFLATION WILL NOT RESULT IN TAX INCREASES.**—Paragraph (7) of section 1(f) is amended to read as follows:

“(7) **SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN BRACKETS.**—In prescribing tables under paragraph (1) which apply to taxable years beginning in a calendar year after 1994, the cost-of-living adjustment used in making adjustments to the dollar amounts at which the 36 percent rate bracket begins or at which the 39.6 percent rate bracket begins shall be determined under paragraph (3) by substituting ‘1993’ for ‘1992’.”.

(2) **CERTAIN PLUG-IN ELECTRIC VEHICLES.**—

(A) Subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking section 30 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subpart).

(B) Subsection (b) of section 38, as amended by section 209(f)(1) of this Act, is amended by inserting “plus” at the end of paragraph (35), by striking paragraph (36), and by redesignating paragraph (37) as paragraph (36).

(C) Subclause (VI) of section 48C(c)(1)(A)(i) is amended by striking “, qualified plug-in electric vehicles (as defined by section 30(d)).”.

(D) Section 1016(a) is amended by striking paragraph (25).

(E) Section 6501(m) is amended by striking “section 30(e)(6).”.

(3) **EARNED INCOME CREDIT.**—

(A) Paragraph (1) of section 32(b) is amended—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C), and

(ii) by striking “(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of taxable years beginning after 1995:” in subparagraph (A) and moving the table 2 ems to the left.

(B) Subparagraph (B) of section 32(b)(2) is amended by striking “increased by” and all that follows and inserting “increased by \$3,000.”.

(4) **FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYER CREDIT.**—Section 6213(g)(2), as amended by section 214(a)(2) of this Act, is amended by striking subparagraph (P).

(5) **MAKING WORK PAY CREDIT.**—

(A) Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking section 36A (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subpart).

(B) Subparagraph (A) of section 6211(b)(4) is amended by striking “, 36A”.

(C) Section 6213(g)(2) is amended by striking subparagraph (N).

(6) **GENERAL BUSINESS CREDITS.**—Subsection (d) of section 38 is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(7) LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT.—Subclause (I) of section 42(h)(3)(C)(ii) is amended by striking “\$1.50 for 2001”.

(8) MINIMUM TAX CREDIT.—

(A)(i) Section 53 is amended by striking subsections (e) and (f).

(ii) The amendment made by clause (i) striking subsection (f) of section 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not be construed to allow any tax abated by reason of section 53(f)(1) of such Code (as in effect before such amendment) to be included in the amount determined under section 53(b)(1) of such Code.

(B) Paragraph (4) of section 6211(b)(4) is amended by striking “, 53(e)”.

(9) ADJUSTMENTS BASED ON ADJUSTED CURRENT EARNINGS.—Clause (ii) of section 56(g)(4)(F) is amended by striking “In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1992, clause” and inserting “Clause”.

(10) ITEMS OF TAX PREFERENCE; DEPLETION.—Paragraph (1) of section 57(a) is amended by striking “Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1992, this” and inserting “This”.

(11) INTANGIBLE DRILLING COSTS.—

(A) Clause (i) of section 57(a)(2)(E) is amended by striking “In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1992, this” and inserting “This”.

(B) Clause (ii) of section 57(a)(2)(E) is amended by striking “(30 percent in case of taxable years beginning in 1993)”.

(12) ENVIRONMENTAL TAX.—

(A) Subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking part VII (and by striking the item relating to such part in the table of parts for such subchapter).

(B) Paragraph (2) of section 26(b) is amended by striking subparagraph (B).

(C) Section 30A(c) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(D) Subsection (a) of section 164 is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(E) Section 275(a) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(F) Section 882(a)(1) is amended by striking “, 59A”.

(G) Section 936(a)(3) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

(H) Section 1561(a) is amended—

(i) by inserting “and” at the end of paragraph (2), by striking “, and” at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period, and by striking paragraph (4), and

(ii) by striking “, the amount specified in paragraph (3), and the amount specified in paragraph (4)” and inserting “and the amount specified in paragraph (3)”.

(I) Section 4611(e) is amended—

(i) by striking “section 59A, this section,” in paragraph (2)(B) and inserting “this section”, and

(ii) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(I) by striking “section 59A,” and

(II) by striking the comma after “rate”.

(J) Section 6425(c)(1)(A) is amended by inserting “plus” at end of clause (i), by striking “plus” and inserting “over” at the end of clause (ii), and by striking clause (iii).

(K) Section 6655 is amended—

(i) in subsections (e)(2)(A)(i) and (e)(2)(B)(i), by striking “taxable income, alternative minimum taxable income, and modified alternative minimum taxable income” and inserting “taxable income and alternative minimum taxable income”,

(ii) in subsection (e)(2)(B), by striking clause (iii), and

(iii) in subsection (g)(1)(A), by inserting “plus” at the end of clause (ii), by striking clause (iii), and by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (iii).

(L) Section 9507(b)(1) is amended by striking “59A.”.

(13) STANDARD DEDUCTION.—

(A) So much of paragraph (1) of section 63(c) as follows “the sum of—” is amended to read as follows:

“(A) the basic standard deduction, and
“(B) the additional standard deduction.”.

(B) Subsection (c) of section 63 is amended by striking paragraphs (7), (8), and (9).

(14) ANNUITIES; CERTAIN PROCEEDS OF ENDOWMENT AND LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACTS.—Section 72 is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(4), by striking “; except that if such date was before January 1, 1954, then the annuity starting date is January 1, 1954”, and

(B) in subsection (g)(3), by striking “January 1, 1954, or” and “, whichever is later”.

(15) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Section 85 is amended by striking subsection (c).

(16) ACCIDENT AND HEALTH PLANS.—Section 105(f) is amended by striking “or (d)”.

(17) FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS.—Section 106(c)(1) is amended by striking “Effective on and after January 1, 1997, gross” and inserting “Gross”.

(18) CERTAIN COMBAT ZONE COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Subsection (c) of section 112 is amended—

(A) by striking “(after June 24, 1950)” in paragraph (2), and

(B) by striking “such zone;” and all that follows in paragraph (3) and inserting “such zone.”.

(19) LEGAL SERVICE PLANS.—

(A) Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by striking section 120 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subpart).

(B)(i) Section 414(n)(3)(C) is amended by striking “120.”.

(ii) Section 414(t)(2) is amended by striking “120.”.

(iii) Section 501(c) is amended by striking paragraph (20).

(iv) Section 3121(a) is amended by striking paragraph (17).

(v) Section 3231(e) is amended by striking paragraph (7).

(vi) Section 3306(b) is amended by striking paragraph (12).

(vii) Section 6039D(d)(1) is amended by striking “120.”.

(viii) Section 209(a)(14) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(I) by striking subparagraph (B), and

(II) by striking “(14)(A)” and inserting “(14)”.

(20) PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—Section 121(b)(3) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B), and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—” and moving the text 2 ems to the left.

(21) CERTAIN REDUCED UNIFORMED SERVICES RETIREMENT PAY.—Section 122(b)(1) is amended by striking “after December 31, 1965.”.

(22) GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM.—Section 126(a) is amended by striking paragraph (6) and by redesignating paragraphs (7), (8), (9), and (10) as paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively.

(23) TREBLE DAMAGE PAYMENTS UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAW.—Section 162(g) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(24) STATE LEGISLATORS’ TRAVEL EXPENSES AWAY FROM HOME.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(h) is amended by striking “For taxable years beginning after December 31, 1980, this” and inserting “This”.

(25) INTEREST.—

(A) Section 163 is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (6) of subsection (d), and

(ii) by striking paragraph (5) of subsection (h).

(B) Section 56(b)(1)(C) is amended by striking clause (ii) and by redesignating clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) as clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv), respectively.

(26) QUALIFIED MOTOR VEHICLE TAXES.—Section 164, as amended by section 209(c) of this Act, is amended by striking subsections (a)(6) and (b)(6).

(27) DISASTER LOSSES.—

(A) Subsection (h) of section 165 is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(B) Paragraph (3) of section 165(h), as so redesignated, is amended by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”.

(C) Subsection (i) of section 165 is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “(as defined by clause (ii) of subsection (h)(3)(C))”, and

(II) by striking “(as defined by clause (i) of such subsection)”.

(ii) by striking “(as defined by subsection (h)(3)(C)(i))” in paragraph (4), and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTERS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘federally declared disaster’ means any disaster subsequently determined by the President of the United States to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

“(B) DISASTER AREA.—The term ‘disaster area’ means the area so determined to warrant such assistance.”.

(D) Section 1033(h)(3) is amended by striking “section 165(h)(3)(C)” and inserting “section 165(i)(5)”.

(28) CHARITABLE, ETC., CONTRIBUTIONS AND GIFTS.—Section 170 is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (3) of subsection (b),

(B) by striking paragraph (6) of subsection (e), and

(C) by striking subsection (k).

(29) AMORTIZABLE BOND PREMIUM.—

(A) Subparagraph (B) of section 171(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

“(B)(i) with reference to the amount payable on maturity (or if it results in a smaller amortizable bond premium attributable to the period before the call date, with reference to the amount payable on the earlier call date), in the case of a bond described in subsection (a)(1), and

“(ii) with reference to the amount payable on maturity or on an earlier call date, in the case of a bond described in subsection (a)(2).”.

(B) Paragraphs (2) and (3)(B) of section 171(b) are each amended by striking “paragraph (1)(B)(ii)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(B)(i)”.

(30) NET OPERATING LOSS CARRYBACKS, CARRYOVERS, AND CARRYFORWARDS.—

(A) Section 172, as amended by section 211(c)(1)(B) of this Act, is amended—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (D), (H), (I), and (J) of subsection (b)(1) and by redesignating subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F), respectively, and

(ii) by striking subsections (g) and (j) and by redesignating subsections (h), (i), and (k) as subsections (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(B) Each of the following provisions of section 172 (as amended by section 211(c)(1)(B) of this Act and as redesignated by subparagraph (A)) are amended as follows:

(i) By striking “ending after August 2, 1989” in subsection (b)(1)(D)(i)(II).

(ii) By striking “subsection (h)” in subsection (b)(1)(D)(ii) and inserting “subsection (g)”.

(iii) By striking “section 165(h)(3)(C)(i)” in subsection (b)(1)(E)(ii)(II) and inserting “section 165(i)(5)”.

(iv) By striking “subsection (i)” and all that follows in the last sentence of subsection (b)(1)(E)(ii) and inserting “subsection (h)).”.

(v) By striking “subsection (i)” in subsection (b)(1)(F) and inserting “subsection (h)”.

(vi) By striking subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) of subsection (g).

(vii) By striking “subsection (b)(1)(E)” each place it appears in subsection (g)(4) and inserting “subsection (b)(1)(D)”.

(viii) By striking the last sentence of subsection (h)(1).

(ix) By striking “subsection (b)(1)(G)” each place it appears in subsection (h)(3) and inserting “subsection (b)(1)(F)”.

(C) Subsection (d) of section 56 is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(D) Paragraph (5) of section 382(l) is amended by striking subparagraph (F) and by redesignating subparagraphs (G) and (H) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively.

(31) RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.—Subparagraph (A) of section 174(a)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) WITHOUT CONSENT.—A taxpayer may, without the consent of the Secretary, adopt the method provided in this subsection for his first taxable year for which expenditures described in paragraph (1) are paid or incurred.”.

(32) AMORTIZATION OF CERTAIN RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.—Paragraph (2) of section 174(b) is amended by striking “beginning after December 31, 1953”.

(33) SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION EXPENDITURES.—Paragraph (1) of section 175(d) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) WITHOUT CONSENT.—A taxpayer may, without the consent of the Secretary, adopt the method provided in this section for the taxpayer’s first taxable year for which expenditures described in subsection (a) are paid or incurred.”.

(34) CLEAN-FUEL VEHICLES.—

(A) Part VI of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking section 179A (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such part).

(B) Section 30C(e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) REFERENCE.—For purposes of this section, any reference to section 179A shall be treated as a reference to such section as in effect immediately before its repeal.”.

(C) Section 62(a) is amended by striking paragraph (14).

(D) Section 263(a)(1) is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(E) Section 280F(a)(1) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(F) Section 312(k)(3) is amended by striking “179A,” each place it appears.

(G) Section 1016(a) is amended by striking paragraph (24).

(H) Section 1245(a) is amended by striking “179A,” each place it appears in paragraphs (2)(C) and (3)(C).

(35) QUALIFIED DISASTER EXPENSES.—Part VI of subchapter A of chapter 1 is amended by striking section 198A (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such part).

(36) ACTIVITIES NOT ENGAGED IN FOR PROFIT.—Section 183(e)(1) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(37) DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES.—

(A) Subsection (a) of section 199 is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (2),

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and by moving paragraphs (1) and (2) (as so redesignated) 2 ems to the left, and

(iii) by striking “ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—” and all that follows through “There shall be allowed” and inserting the following:

“(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—There shall be allowed”.

(B) Paragraphs (2) and (6)(B) of section 199(d) are each amended by striking “(a)(1)(B)” and inserting “(a)(2)”.

(38) RETIREMENT SAVINGS.—

(A) Subparagraph (A) of section 219(b)(5) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The deductible amount is \$5,000.”.

(B) Clause (ii) of section 219(b)(5)(B) is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of clause (i), the applicable amount is \$1,000.”.

(C) Paragraph (5) of section 219(b) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

(D) Clause (ii) of section 219(g)(2)(A) is amended by striking “for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2006”.

(E) Section 219(g)(3)(B) is amended by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

“(i) In the case of a taxpayer filing a joint return, \$80,000.

“(ii) In the case of any other taxpayer (other than a married individual filing a separate return), \$50,000.”.

(F) Paragraph (8) of section 219(g) is amended by striking “the dollar amount in the last row of the table contained in paragraph (3)(B)(i), the dollar amount in the last row of the table contained in paragraph (3)(B)(ii), and the dollar amount contained in paragraph (7)(A),” and inserting “each of the dollar amounts in paragraphs (3)(B)(i), (3)(B)(ii), and (7)(A)”.

(39) REPORTS REGARDING QUALIFIED VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS.—

(A) Section 219 is amended by striking paragraph (4) of subsection (f) and subsection (h).

(B) Section 6652 is amended by striking subsection (g).

(40) INTEREST ON EDUCATION LOANS.—Paragraph (1) of section 221(b) is amended by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows and inserting “shall not exceed \$2,500.”.

(41) DIVIDENDS RECEIVED ON CERTAIN PREFERRED STOCK; AND DIVIDENDS PAID ON CERTAIN PREFERRED STOCK OF PUBLIC UTILITIES.—

(A) Sections 244 and 247 are hereby repealed, and the table of sections for part VIII of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by striking the items relating to sections 244 and 247.

(B) Paragraph (5) of section 172(d) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) COMPUTATION OF DEDUCTION FOR DIVIDENDS RECEIVED.—The deductions allowed by section 243 (relating to dividends received by corporations) and 245 (relating to dividends

received from certain foreign corporations) shall be computed without regard to section 246(b) (relating to limitation on aggregate amount of deductions).”.

(C) Paragraph (1) of section 243(c) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any dividend received from a 20-percent owned corporation, subsection (a)(1) shall be applied by substituting ‘80 percent’ for ‘70 percent’.”.

(D) Section 243(d) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(E) Section 246 is amended—

(i) by striking “, 244,” in subsection (a)(1),

(ii) in subsection (b)(1)—

(I) by striking “sections 243(a)(1), 244(a),”

and inserting “section 243(a)(1)”.

(II) by striking “244(a),” the second place it appears, and

(III) by striking “subsection (a) or (b) of section 245, and 247,” and inserting “and subsection (a) or (b) of section 245,” and

(iii) by striking “, 244,” in subsection (c)(1).

(F) Section 246A is amended by striking “, 244,” both places it appears in subsections (a) and (e).

(G) Sections 263(g)(2)(B)(iii), 277(a), 301(e)(2), 469(e)(4), 512(a)(3)(A), subparagraphs (A), (C), and (D) of section 805(a)(4), 805(b)(5), 812(e)(2)(A), 815(c)(2)(A)(iii), 832(b)(5), 833(b)(3)(E), and 1059(b)(2)(B) are each amended by striking “, 244,” each place it appears.

(H) Section 1244(c)(2)(C) is amended by striking “244.”.

(I) Section 805(a)(4)(B) is amended by striking “, 244(a),” each place it appears.

(J) Section 810(c)(2)(B) is amended by striking “244 (relating to dividends on certain preferred stock of public utilities).”.

(K) The amendments made by this paragraph shall not apply to preferred stock issued before October 1, 1942 (determined in the same manner as under section 247 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as in effect before its repeal by such amendments).

(42) ORGANIZATION EXPENSES.—Section 248(c) is amended by striking “beginning after December 31, 1953,” and by striking the last sentence.

(43) BOND REPURCHASE PREMIUM.—Section 249(b)(1) is amended by striking “, in the case of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness issued after February 28, 1913.”.

(44) AMOUNT OF GAIN WHERE LOSS PREVIOUSLY DISALLOWED.—Section 267(d) is amended by striking “(or by reason of section 24(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939)” in paragraph (1), by striking “after December 31, 1953,” in paragraph (2), by striking the second sentence, and by striking “or by reason of section 118 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939” in the last sentence.

(45) ACQUISITIONS MADE TO EVADE OR AVOID INCOME TAX.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 269(a) are each amended by striking “or acquired on or after October 8, 1940.”.

(46) MEALS AND ENTERTAINMENT.—Paragraph (3) of section 274(n) is amended—

(A) by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—”.

(B) by striking “substituting ‘the applicable percentage’ for” and inserting “substituting ‘80 percent’ for”, and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B).

(47) INTEREST ON INDEBTEDNESS INCURRED BY CORPORATIONS TO ACQUIRE STOCK OR ASSETS OF ANOTHER CORPORATION.—

(A) Section 279 is amended—

(i) by striking “after December 31, 1967,” in subsection (a)(2),

(ii) by striking “after October 9, 1969,” in subsection (b),

(iii) by striking “after October 9, 1969, and” in subsection (d)(5), and

(iv) by striking subsection (i) and redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i).

(B) The amendments made by this paragraph shall not—

(i) apply to obligations issued on or before October 9, 1969 (determined in the same manner as under section 279 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as in effect before such amendments), and

(ii) be construed to require interest on obligations issued on or before December 31, 1967, to be taken into account under section 279(a)(2) of such Code (as in effect after such amendments).

(48) BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.—

(A) Clause (iii) of section 304(b)(3)(D) is repealed.

(B) The heading of subparagraph (D) of section 304(b)(3) is amended by striking “AND SPECIAL RULE”.

(49) EFFECT ON EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—Subsection (d) of section 312 is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(50) DISQUALIFIED STOCK.—Paragraph (3) of section 355(d) is amended by striking “after October 9, 1990, and” each place it appears.

(51) BASIS TO CORPORATIONS.—Section 362 is amended by striking “on or after June 22, 1954” in subsection (a) and by striking “, on or after June 22, 1954,” each place it appears in subsection (c).

(52) TEMPORARY WAIVER OF MINIMUM REQUIRED DISTRIBUTION.—Section 401(a)(9) is amended by striking subparagraph (H).

(53) INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS.—Clause (i) of section 408(p)(2)(E) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the applicable amount is \$10,000.”

(54) TAX CREDIT EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS.—Section 409 is amended by striking subsection (q).

(55) CATCH-UP CONTRIBUTIONS.—Clauses (i) and (ii) of section 414(v)(2)(B) are amended to read as follows:

“(i) In the case of an applicable employer plan other than a plan described in section 401(k)(11) or 408(p), the applicable dollar amount is \$5,000.

“(ii) In the case of an applicable employer plan described in section 401(k)(11) or 408(p), the applicable dollar amount is \$2,500.”

(56) EMPLOYEE STOCK PURCHASE PLANS.—Section 423(a) is amended by striking “after December 31, 1963.”

(57) PENSION RELATED TRANSITION RULES.—

(A) Section 402(g)(1)(B) is amended by striking “shall be” and all that follows and inserting “is \$15,000.”

(B)(i) Subparagraph (D) of section 417(e)(3) is amended—

(I) by striking clauses (ii) and (iii),

(II) by striking “if—” and all that follows through “section 430(h)(2)(D)” and inserting “if section 430(h)(2)(D)”, and

(III) by striking “described in such section,” and inserting “described in such section.”

(ii) Clause (iii) of section 205(g)(3)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1055(g)(3)(B)) is amended—

(I) by striking subclauses (II) and (III),

(II) by striking “if—” and all that follows through “section 303(h)(2)(D)” and inserting “if section 303(h)(2)(D)”, and

(III) by striking “described in such section,” and inserting “described in such section.”

(C)(i) Paragraph (5) of section 430(c) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—”

(ii) Paragraph (5) of section 303(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1083(c)) is amended by strik-

ing subparagraph (B) and by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—”

(D)(i) Paragraph (2) of section 430(h) is amended by striking subparagraph (G).

(ii) Paragraph (2) of section 303(h) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1083(h)) is amended by striking subparagraph (G).

(E)(i) Paragraph (3) of section 436(j), as added by section 113(a)(1)(B) of the Pension Protection Act of 2006, is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—”

(ii) Subparagraph (C) of section 206(g)(9) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056(g)(9)) is amended by striking clauses (ii) and (iii) and by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—”

(F)(i) Section 436(j) is amended by striking the paragraph (3) added by section 203(a)(2) of the Preservation of Access to Care for Medicare Beneficiaries and Pension Relief Act of 2010.

(ii) Section 206(g)(9) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056(g)(9)) is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(G)(i) Section 436 is amended by striking subsection (m).

(ii) Section 206(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056(g)) is amended by striking paragraph (11).

(H) Section 457(e)(15)(A) is amended by striking “shall be” and all that follows and inserting “is \$15,000.”

(58) LIMITATION ON DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN FARMING.—

(A) Section 464 is amended by striking “any farming syndicate (as defined in subsection (c))” both places it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting “any taxpayer to whom subsection (d) applies”.

(B)(i) Subsection (c) of section 464 is hereby moved to the end of section 461 and redesignated as subsection (j).

(ii) Such subsection (j) is amended—

(I) by striking “For purposes of this section” in paragraph (1) and inserting “For purposes of subsection (i)(4)”, and

(II) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3) FARMING.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘farming’ has the meaning given to such term by section 464(e).

“(4) LIMITED ENTREPRENEUR.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘limited entrepreneur’ means a person who—

“(A) has an interest in an enterprise other than as a limited partner, and

“(B) does not actively participate in the management of such enterprise.”

(iii) Paragraph (4) of section 461(i) is amended by striking “section 464(c)” and inserting “subsection (j)”.

(C) Section 464 is amended—

(i) by striking subsections (e) and (g) and redesignating subsections (d) and (f) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) FARMING.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘farming’ means the cultivation of land or the raising or harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodity including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of animals. For purposes of the preceding sentence, trees (other than trees bearing fruit or nuts) shall not be treated as an agricultural or horticultural commodity.”

(D) Subsection (d) of section 464 of such Code (as redesignated by subparagraph (C)) is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, and

(ii) by striking “SUBSECTIONS (A) AND (B) TO APPLY TO” in the heading.

(E) Subparagraph (A) of section 58(a)(2) is amended by striking “section 464(c)” and inserting “section 461(j)”.

(59) DEDUCTIONS LIMITED TO AMOUNT AT RISK.—Subparagraph (A) of section 465(c)(3) is amended by striking “In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1978, this” and inserting “This”.

(60) PASSIVE ACTIVITY LOSSES AND CREDITS LIMITED.—

(A) Section 469 is amended by striking subsection (m).

(B) Subsection (b) of section 58 is amended by adding “and” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking paragraph (2), and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(61) ADJUSTMENTS REQUIRED BY CHANGES IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—Section 481(b)(3) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(62) EXEMPTION FROM TAX ON CORPORATIONS, CERTAIN TRUSTS, ETC.—Section 501 is amended by striking subsection (s).

(63) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXEMPTION.—

(A) Section 503(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—An organization described in paragraph (17) or (18) of section 501(c), or described in section 401(a) and referred to in section 4975(g) (2) or (3), shall not be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) if it has engaged in a prohibited transaction.”

(B) Paragraph (2) of section 503(a) is amended by striking “described in section 501(c)(17) or (18) or paragraph (a)(1)(B)” and inserting “described in paragraph (1)”.

(C) Subsection (c) of section 503 is amended by striking “described in section 501(c)(17) or (18) or subsection (a)(1)(B)” and inserting “described in subsection (a)(1)”.

(64) ACCUMULATED TAXABLE INCOME.—Paragraph (1) of section 535(b) and paragraph (1) of section 545(b) are each amended by striking “section 531” and all that follows and inserting “section 531 or the personal holding company tax imposed by section 541.”

(65) DEFINITION OF PROPERTY.—Subsection (b) of section 614 is amended—

(A) by striking paragraphs (3)(C) and (5), and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “whichever of the following years is later: The first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1963, or”.

(66) AMOUNTS RECEIVED BY SURVIVING ANNUITANT UNDER JOINT AND SURVIVOR ANNUITY CONTRACT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 691(d)(1) is amended by striking “after December 31, 1953, and”.

(67) INCOME TAXES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES ON DEATH.—Section 692(a)(1) is amended by striking “after June 24, 1950”.

(68) SPECIAL RULES FOR COMPUTING RESERVES.—Paragraph (7) of section 807(e) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(69) INSURANCE COMPANY TAXABLE INCOME.—(A) Section 832(e) is amended by striking “of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.”

(B) Section 832(e)(6) is amended by striking “In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1970, the” and inserting “The”.

(70) CAPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN POLICY ACQUISITION EXPENSES.—Section 848 is amended by striking subsection (j).

(71) TAX ON NONRESIDENT ALIEN INDIVIDUALS.—Subparagraph (B) of section 871(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) gains described in subsection (b) or (c) of section 631.”

(72) LIMITATION ON CREDIT.—Paragraph (2) of section 904(d) is amended by striking subparagraph (J).

(73) FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.—Clause (i) of section 911(b)(2)(D) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The exclusion amount for any calendar year is \$80,000.”

(74) BASIS OF PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM DECEDENT.—

(A) Section 1014(a)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) in the case of an election under section 2032, its value at the applicable valuation date prescribed by such section.”

(B) Section 1014(b) is amended by striking paragraphs (7) and (8).

(75) ADJUSTED BASIS.—Section 1016(a) is amended by striking paragraph (12).

(76) PROPERTY ON WHICH LESSEE HAS MADE IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 1019 is amended by striking the last sentence.

(77) INVOLUNTARY CONVERSION.—Section 1033 is amended by striking subsection (j) and by redesignating subsections (k) and (l) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively.

(78) PROPERTY ACQUIRED DURING AFFILIATION.—Section 1051 is hereby repealed, and the table of sections for part IV of subchapter O of chapter 1 is amended by striking the item relating to section 1051.

(79) CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES.—Section 1222 is amended by striking the last sentence.

(80) HOLDING PERIOD OF PROPERTY.—

(A) Paragraph (1) of section 1223 is amended by striking “after March 1, 1954.”

(B) Paragraph (4) of section 1223 is amended by striking “(or under so much of section 1052(c) as refers to section 113(a)(23) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939)”.

(C) Paragraphs (6) and (8) of section 1223 are repealed.

(81) PROPERTY USED IN THE TRADE OR BUSINESS AND INVOLUNTARY CONVERSIONS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1231(c)(2) is amended by striking “beginning after December 31, 1981”.

(82) SALE OR EXCHANGE OF PATENTS.—Section 1235 is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c) and by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and

(B) by striking “subsection (d)” in subsection (b)(2)(B) and inserting “subsection (c)”.

(83) DEALERS IN SECURITIES.—Subsection (b) of section 1236 is amended by striking “after November 19, 1951.”

(84) SALE OF PATENTS.—Subsection (a) of section 1249 is amended by striking “after December 31, 1962.”

(85) GAIN FROM DISPOSITION OF FARMLAND.—Paragraph (1) of section 1252(a) is amended—

(A) by striking “after December 31, 1969” the first place it appears, and

(B) by striking “after December 31, 1969,” in subparagraph (A).

(86) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED ON RETIREMENT OR SALE OR EXCHANGE OF DEBT INSTRUMENTS.—Subsection (c) of section 1271 is amended to read as follows:

“(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS WITH RESPECT TO WHICH ORIGINAL ISSUE DISCOUNT NOT CURRENTLY INCLUDEABLE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On the sale or exchange of debt instruments issued by a government or political subdivision thereof after Decem-

ber 31, 1954, and before July 2, 1982, or by a corporation after December 31, 1954, and on or before May 27, 1969, any gain realized which does not exceed—

“(A) an amount equal to the original issue discount, or

“(B) if at the time of original issue there was no intention to call the debt instrument before maturity, an amount which bears the same ratio to the original issue discount as the number of complete months that the debt instrument was held by the taxpayer bears to the number of complete months from the date of original issue to the date of maturity, shall be considered as ordinary income.

“(2) SUBSECTION (a)(2)(A) NOT TO APPLY.—Subsection (a)(2)(A) shall not apply to any debt instrument referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

“(3) CROSS REFERENCE.—For current inclusion of original issue discount, see section 1272.”

(87) AMOUNT AND METHOD OF ADJUSTMENT.—Section 1314 is amended by striking subsection (d) and by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

(88) ELECTION; REVOCATION; TERMINATION.—Clause (iii) of section 1362(d)(3)(A) is amended by striking “unless” and all that follows and inserting “unless the corporation was an S corporation for such taxable year.”

(89) OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE.—Subsection (a) of section 1401 is amended by striking “the following percent” and all that follows and inserting “12.4 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year.”

(90) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—Paragraph (1) of section 1401(b) is amended by striking: “the following percent” and all that follows and inserting “2.9 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year.”

(91) MINISTERS, MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS, AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PRACTITIONERS.—Paragraph (3) of section 1402(e) is amended—

(A) by striking “whichever of the following dates is later: (A)” and

(B) by striking “or (B)” and all that follows and inserting a period.

(92) WITHHOLDING OF TAX ON NONRESIDENT ALIENS.—The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 1441 and the first sentence of paragraph (5) of section 1441(c) are each amended by striking “gains subject to tax” and all that follows through “October 4, 1966” and inserting “and gains subject to tax under section 871(a)(1)(D)”.

(93) AFFILIATED GROUP DEFINED.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1504(a)(3) is amended by striking “for a taxable year which includes any period after December 31, 1984” in clause (i) and by striking “in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1984” in clause (ii).

(94) DISALLOWANCE OF THE BENEFITS OF THE GRADUATED CORPORATE RATES AND ACCUMULATED EARNINGS CREDIT.—

(A) Subsection (a) of section 1551 is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (1) and by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, and

(ii) by striking “after June 12, 1963,” each place it appears.

(B) Section 1551(b) is amended—

(i) by striking “or (2)” in paragraph (1), and

(ii) by striking “(a)(3)” in paragraph (2) and inserting “(a)(2)”.

(95) CREDIT FOR STATE DEATH TAXES.—

(A)(i) Part II of subchapter A of chapter 11 is amended by striking section 2011 (and by

striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subpart).

(ii) Section 2106(a)(4) is amended by striking “section 2011(a)” and inserting “2058(a)”.

(B)(i) Subchapter A of chapter 13 is amended by striking section 2604 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subpart).

(ii) Clause (ii) of section 164(b)(4)(A) is amended by inserting “(as in effect before its repeal)” after “section 2604”.

(iii) Section 2654(a)(1) is amended by striking “(computed without regard to section 2604)”.

(96) GROSS ESTATE.—Subsection (c) of section 2031 is amended by striking paragraph (3) and by amending paragraph (1)(B) to read as follows:

“(II) \$500,000.”

(97)(A) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 11 is amended by striking section 2057 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subpart).

(B) Paragraph (10) of section 2031(c) is amended by inserting “(as in effect before its repeal)” immediately before the period at the end thereof.

(98) PROPERTY WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—Subsection (c) of section 2104 is amended by striking “With respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1969, deposits” and inserting “Deposits”.

(99) FICA TAXES.—

(A) Subsection (a) of section 3101 is amended by striking “the following percentages” and all that follows and inserting “6.2 percent of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) received by the individual with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b))”.

(B)(i) Subsection (a) of section 3111 is amended by striking “the following percentages” and all that follows and inserting “6.2 percent of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) paid by the employer with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b)).”

(ii) Subsection (b) of section 3111 is amended by striking “the following percentages” and all that follows and inserting “1.45 percent of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) paid by the employer with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b)).”

(C)(i) Section 3121(b) is amended by striking paragraph (17).

(ii) Section 210(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking paragraph (17).

(100) RAILROAD RETIREMENT.—

(A) Subsection (b) of section 3201 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) TIER 2 TAX.—In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of each employee a tax equal to the percentage determined under section 3241 for any calendar year of the compensation received during such calendar year by such employee for services rendered by such employee.”

(B) Subsection (b) of section 3211 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) TIER 2 TAX.—In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of each employee representative a tax equal to the percentage determined under section 3241 for any calendar year of the compensation received during such calendar year by such employee representative for services rendered by such employee representative.”

(C) Subsection (b) of section 3221 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) TIER 2 TAX.—In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ, equal to the percentage determined under section 3241 for any calendar year of the compensation paid

during such calendar year by such employer for services rendered to such employer.”.

(D) Subsection (b) of section 3231 is amended—

(i) by striking “compensation; except” and all that follows in the first sentence and inserting “compensation.”, and

(ii) by striking the second sentence.

(101) CREDITS AGAINST FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX.—

(A) Paragraph (4) of section 3302(f) is amended—

(i) by striking “subsection—” and all that follows through “(A) IN GENERAL.—The” and inserting “subsection, the”,

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B),

(iii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and

(iv) by moving the text of such subparagraphs (as so redesignated) 2 ems to the left.

(B) Paragraph (5) of section 3302(f) is amended by striking subparagraph (D) and by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D).

(102) DOMESTIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT TAXES.—Section 3510(b) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(103) LUXURY PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES.—

(A) Chapter 31 is amended by striking subchapter A (and by striking the item relating to such subchapter in the table of subchapters for such chapter).

(B)(i) Section 4221 is amended—

(I) in subsections (a) and (d)(1), by striking “subchapter A or” and inserting “subchapter”.

(II) in subsection (a), by striking “In the case of taxes imposed by subchapter A of chapter 31, paragraphs (1), (3), (4), and (5) shall not apply.”, and

(III) in subsection (c), by striking “4001(c), 4001(d), or”.

(ii) Section 4222 is amended by striking “4001(c), 4001(d).”.

(iii) Section 4293 is amended by striking “subchapter A of chapter 31.”.

(104) TRANSPORTATION BY AIR.—Section 4261(e) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (C), and

(B) by striking paragraph (5).

(105) TAXES ON FAILURE TO DISTRIBUTE INCOME.—

(A) Subsection (g) of section 4942 is amended by striking “For all taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1975, subject” in paragraph (2)(A) and inserting “Subject”.

(B) Section 4942(i)(2) is amended by striking “beginning after December 31, 1969, and”.

(106) TAXES ON TAXABLE EXPENDITURES.—Section 4945(f) is amended by striking “(excluding therefrom any preceding taxable year which begins before January 1, 1970)”.

(107) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—Section 4682(h) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively, and

(B) in paragraph (1) (as so redesignated)—

(i) by striking the heading and inserting “IN GENERAL.”, and

(ii) by striking “after 1991” in subparagraph (C).

(108) RETURNS.—Subsection (a) of section 6039D is amended by striking “beginning after December 31, 1984.”.

(109) INFORMATION RETURNS.—Subsection (c) of section 6060 is amended by striking “year” and all that follows and inserting “year.”.

(110) COLLECTION.—Section 6302 is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “imposed by” and all that follows through “with

respect to” and inserting “imposed by sections 4251, 4261, or 4271 with respect to”.

(B) by striking the last sentence of subsection (f)(1), and

(C) in subsection (h)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, and

(ii) by amending paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

“(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS.—Under regulations, any tax required to be paid by electronic fund transfer under section 5061(e) or 5703(b) shall be paid in such a manner as to ensure that the requirements of the second sentence of paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection are satisfied.”.

(111) ABATEMENTS.—Section 6404(f) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(112) 2008 RECOVERY REBATE FOR INDIVIDUALS.—

(A) Subchapter B of chapter 65 is amended by striking section 6428 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subchapter).

(B) Subparagraph (A) of section 6211(b)(4) is amended by striking “6428.”.

(C) Paragraph (2) of section 6213(g), as amended by section 214(a)(2) of this Act and paragraphs (4) and (5)(C) of this subsection, is amended by striking subparagraph (Q), by redesignating subparagraph (O) as subparagraph (N), by inserting “and” at the end of subparagraph (M), and by striking the comma at the end of subparagraph (N) (as so redesignated) and inserting a period.

(D) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “6428, or 6431,” and inserting “or 6431”.

(113) ADVANCE PAYMENT OF PORTION OF INCREASED CHILD CREDIT FOR 2003.—Subchapter B of chapter 65 is amended by striking section 6429 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections for such subchapter).

(114) FAILURE BY CORPORATION TO PAY ESTIMATED INCOME TAX.—Clause (i) of section 6655(g)(4)(A) is amended by striking “(or the corresponding provisions of prior law)”.

(115) RETIREMENT.—Section 7447(i)(3)(B)(ii) is amended by striking “at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter”, and inserting “at 3 percent per annum”.

(116) ANNUITIES TO SURVIVING SPOUSES AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF JUDGES.—

(A) Paragraph (2) of section 7448(a) is amended—

(i) by striking “or under section 1106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939”, and

(ii) by striking “or pursuant to section 1106(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939”.

(B) Subsection (g) of section 7448 is amended by striking “or other than pursuant to section 1106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939”.

(C) Subsections (g), (j)(1), and (j)(2) of section 7448 are each amended by striking “at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter” and inserting “at 3 percent per annum”.

(117) MERCHANT MARINE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION FUNDS.—Paragraph (4) of section 7518(g) is amended by striking “any nonqualified withdrawal” and all that follows through “shall be determined” and inserting “any nonqualified withdrawal shall be determined”.

(118) VALUATION TABLES.—

(A) Subsection (c) of section 7520 is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(B) Paragraph (2) of section 7520(c) (as redesignated by subparagraph (A)) is amended—

(i) by striking “Not later than December 31, 1989, the” and inserting “The”, and

(ii) by striking “thereafter” in the last sentence thereof.

(119) DEFINITION OF EMPLOYEE.—Section 7701(a)(20) is amended by striking “chapter 21” and all that follows and inserting “chapter 21.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—Except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) or paragraph (2) of this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—If—

(A) any provision amended or repealed by the amendments made by this section applied to—

(i) any transaction occurring before the date of the enactment of this Act,

(ii) any property acquired before such date of enactment, or

(iii) any item of income, loss, deduction, or credit taken into account before such date of enactment, and

(B) the treatment of such transaction, property, or item under such provision would (without regard to the amendments or repeals made by this section) affect the liability for tax for periods ending after date of enactment, nothing in the amendments or repeals made by this section shall be construed to affect the treatment of such transaction, property, or item for purposes of determining liability for tax for periods ending after such date of enactment.

TITLE III—JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

SEC. 301. INCREASED REFUND AND CREDIT THRESHOLD FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION REVIEW OF C CORPORATION RETURN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 6405 are each amended by inserting “(\$5,000,000 in the case of a C corporation)” after “\$2,000,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that such amendment shall not apply with respect to any refund or credit with respect to a report that has been made before such date under section 6405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

TITLE IV—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 401. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5771.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we all know, there is a series of tax provisions that routinely expire that Congress must then renew, typically extending them for 1 year retroactively and 1 year prospectively. Congress routinely extends these policies without offsetting the revenue loss.

This on-again-off-again style of legislating on a temporary basis is a terrible way to make tax policy. We are the only Nation in the world that lets large pieces of its Tax Code expire.

Hard-working taxpayers deserve to know whether these tax policies are going to be there year in and year out on a permanent basis. Temporary renewals cannot provide the certainty that American businesses need in order to make the best decisions about how to invest in cutting-edge research, whether to buy new pieces of equipment, and most importantly, whether to hire that additional worker. These temporary renewals mean uncertainty for families as well as they try to plan their family budgets.

Throughout the year, the Ways and Means Committee has produced legislation that carefully examined many of these temporary extenders and reformed and made permanent several of the most important ones. The whole House on a bipartisan basis later passed this legislation.

This included important policies such as a permanent and improved credit for research and development and permanent higher section 179 expensing levels for small businesses—policies that were also included in the President's budget proposals.

Analysis by the nonpartisan experts at the Joint Committee on Taxation confirmed that permanent extensions of these policies would result in companies spending more on R&D and making new investments, all of which would promote job creation and higher wages.

Having passed a number of these policies through the House on a bipartisan basis, we proceeded with the rather old-fashioned approach of beginning bipartisan negotiations with the Senate.

□ 16515

Until last week, we were making significant progress in those negotiations as everyone involved worked in good faith to reach a successful conclusion. We were close to reaching an agreement that would ensure that many of the bills that passed the House on a bipartisan basis would be included.

In addition, we were going beyond the list of traditional tax extenders and including additional policies designed specifically to assist low- and middle-income American families, in

particular, policies such as the American Opportunity Tax Credit, which helps low- and middle-income families afford college, which was also included in the President's budget proposals. Other policies included making permanent the deduction for State and local sales taxes and the tax rules for mass transit benefits.

However, before these negotiations could conclude, the administration took the unbelievable step of issuing a veto threat. The President issued a veto threat over bipartisan, bicameral negotiations.

Now, I can't tell you with certainty exactly what the administration wants because the administration has not even bothered to reach out and tell us what the President's priorities are; rather than trying to engage and work with Congress, the administration is only communicating through press statements.

The President has often said that he wants to work with Congress to find bipartisan solutions. In fact, in his press conference after the election, the President said:

I am eager to work with the new Congress to make the next 2 years as productive as possible. I am committed to making sure that I measure ideas not by whether they are from Democrats or Republicans, but whether they work for the American people.

That statement is completely at odds with the President's actions last week, and we all know that actions speak louder than words. As a result of the administration's actions, negotiations with the Senate have come to a standstill.

Explicably, the administration and some Senate Democrats have taken the position that policies that promote savings, investment, charitable donations, and job creation are a "give-away" to big corporations.

These Senators and the administration should listen to the 1,032 charitable organizations that have written to every Member of Congress in support of the permanent tax incentives for charitable giving that would have been included in the agreement with the Senate. I don't think that policies that promote donations to food banks, homeless shelters, and hospitals are giveaways to corporate America.

The administration's actions now force us to take a different and less effective approach. With the end of the year and a new tax filing season rapidly approaching, we need to act. The IRS has been clear, unless Congress acts quickly, it will be forced to delay the start of the tax filing season.

American families are struggling to make ends meet as wages remain flat, even as expenses increase. These families can't and should not face a delay in getting their tax refund.

The legislation before us today will address the concerns raised by the IRS and ensure the tax filing season can

open on time. We should ensure that the President's actions do not hurt hardworking taxpayers who are counting on that tax refund; therefore, I urge the House to pass this legislation and ensure that the tax filing season opens on time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation is crucial as much for what it avoids as what it accomplishes. A 1-year extension avoids the dangerous plan pushed by House Republicans for much of this last year to make permanent a select number of provisions at a cost of nearly \$1 trillion.

That plan was not only fiscally irresponsible, it also left many provisions behind that are vital to working families and small businesses, including the exclusion for mortgage debt forgiveness, new market tax credits, continuations of the expansions to the earned income tax credit, and the refundable portion of the child tax credit.

This bill also avoids an almost equally harmful proposal under consideration last week that would have permanently extended a select group of expiring provisions and would also have given permanent breaks to a relative few while costing more than \$400 billion and leaving out critical provisions that help working families.

I actively and publicly opposed that proposal. Fortunately, it generated a veto threat from the President.

The provisions in today's extender bill need more serious consideration than would have been provided in that proposal both as to substance, whether they contribute to economic growth and jobs, and how they fit into the need for both equity and fiscal responsibility.

Some of the extender provisions have contributed to economic growth, such as the provisions for R&D, promoting development of renewable energy, encouraging development of small business, and increasing educational opportunity. Others should not be part of any permanent action, such as bonus depreciation, which was always contemplated as a temporary measure to stimulate economic growth and activity.

Some of the provisions in tax extenders should end, and others need to be addressed as we make better sense of the international tax structure, including closing tax loopholes. While I did not agree with many of the provisions of the tax reform proposal of the chairman, he did attempt to address issues in a more comprehensive way, unlike what was passed through the House up to \$1 trillion and was attempted last week.

It was a serious mistake, as I said, for the Republicans to have taken pieces of it, trying to make them permanent without paying a dime to offset the more than \$800 billion cost of doing so.

The bill today, therefore, only maintains the status quo for this year. Not to act would disrupt the coming tax filing season for millions of American workers and businesses which have relied on Congress to extend these provisions and will, in a matter of weeks, begin filing their 2014 tax returns. As a result, I will support this measure.

As we act in the future, including on tax reform, I believe the lesson that should be learned from the past is that it is critical to try to work on a bipartisan basis, recognizing the importance of maintaining support for the values that must underpin legislative action.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do want to thank my friend from Michigan for his support of this legislation before us today. It is something that we do need to do. We cannot allow these provisions to be expired for all of 2014, but I would say that, if you look around, we are not seeing the kind of growth and opportunity that we should see in America. We are not seeing the kind of job creation, we are not seeing the kind of income increases; yet expenses are going up for families.

The items that the gentleman talked about, whether it was research and development or section 179 or the American Opportunity Tax Credit, all of those were going to be permanent in the package that we were working on, and even the mortgage debt forgiveness for those who are selling their homes and their mortgages were underwater, we were extending that for 2 years, so there were a lot of things for families.

Certainly, the charitable provisions for food banks and for charitable giving, those would certainly help middle class Americans as well.

The reason why I think it is important to get permanent policy is that we haven't seen the kind of growth that we need to see, and the more of these items that we can make permanent, the more stability we have, the more likely it is that employers and individuals and families are going to make the kind of long-term decisions that will cause our economy to grow.

It is not just me saying this; it is the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation that says permanent policies such as these, as we were working on, are the kinds of things that the country needs to do to grow.

Again, I want to thank him for his support of the legislation. Hopefully, in the future, we will be able to get at some of these issues in a more permanent way, so that we don't have this unusual system where we have had all of these policies expired for all of 2014 and, in the final 2 weeks, we are going to retroactively put them into place for the final weeks of the year, so that when people file in April, they will be able to take advantage of these items. We should really do this on a more regular basis.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Look, you made provisions permanent, Mr. Chairman, and you paid for them in your bill. There is disagreement how you paid for them, but you paid for them, and then you come forth with up to \$1 trillion permanent unpaid for and leave out the child tax credit and the EITC.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Then we hear last week a proposal for \$400 billion of it unpaid for, permanent—unpaid for, permanent—leaving out the EITC and the child tax credit, so that is why the President acted, and that is why it was essential he act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CAMP for his courage. I am not going to thank him for this bill, however, but I am going to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, American families and businesses deserve certainty from their tax system—confidence, stability. I am glad we are able to move forward on this legislation rather than pursue a plan to make certain tax preferences permanent while ballooning our debt.

While I am supporting this tax extender package, Mr. Speaker, I do so with two very serious reservations. First, it adds the cost of extending this preference to our deficit. It is good, however, that we did not make unpaid-for extensions on a permanent basis, as the ranking member has just discussed.

Second, this is a very short-term fix when Congress needs to work toward a long-term solution. I join the ranking member in congratulating Mr. CAMP for bringing that forward—well, at least he put it on the table. It didn't come forward.

We ought to make the research and experimentation tax credit permanent, but we need to pay for it. While this legislation allows teachers to deduct their out-of-pocket expenses, it does not give them the certainty that they will be able to do so in 2015 or beyond. To that extent, they are in the same position as everybody else covered by this bill will be.

Neither does this bill provide appropriate tax support for renewable energy, biofuels, and energy efficiency—sadly, the failure to extend this for at least 2 years may result in the loss of up to 30,000 jobs—nor, Mr. Speaker, does it provide long-term clarity on long-term bonus depreciation or small business expensing, all of which would give greater confidence to the growth of jobs.

This all speaks to a larger challenge that Congress has an opportunity to address in the new year; instead of this annual ritual of extending individual credits and deductions, we ought to engage in meaningful, comprehensive, and pro-growth tax reform that provides greater certainty across our economy to businesses and individuals alike.

We all know that doing so will not be easy. It will involve difficult choices on both sides of the aisle.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you. You had the courage to put forward a bill earlier this year that made tough decisions in order to show a path to lower rates and a simpler Code without adding to the deficit, but that path wasn't the path taken by the majority in this Congress.

Instead, the House voted on bill after bill to cut taxes recklessly without any plan to stabilize the debt, invest in our future priorities, and create jobs in a meaningful way.

This package we will be voting on today is the least we can do. It isn't what I hoped for, and it isn't what I hoped I would stand in this well and urge my colleagues to support at the beginning of the 113th Congress, but it is better than many of the cynical alternatives that we have heard about.

□ 1630

I want to congratulate the ranking member and, frankly, the President of the United States for saying “no” to an irresponsible package.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

While I support this measure, I do so believing that America deserves better, wants better, hopes to get better. That is what each and every one of us was sent here to deliver: responsible policy for our country. This is not that policy. It is, however, as I said, better than the alternative in that it would at least give those in 2014 who have operated on the expectation of getting the credit the assurance that they will get it.

My hope, Mr. Speaker, is that, come next December, we won't be here again considering another tax extender bill to keep the economy from collapsing. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican majority and the Democratic minority can work together to effect responsible, fiscally sound tax reform which will help grow our economy and give the business community and our people the confidence they need to have to grow our economy and to participate effectively in making America better.

Mr. Speaker, again, in closing, I want to congratulate Mr. CAMP, because I think he did bring forth a bill that could have engendered that responsible

debate that we needed, a fiscally sound proposal making tough tradeoffs that we ought to have the courage to make. He had that courage, and I congratulate him for it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for his remarks. This is a debate America needs to have and, hopefully, next year that debate will move forward.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, American workers and businesses are most successful when they are able to keep, spend, and invest more of their hard-earned money. Our economy, which has already remained too weak for too long, simply cannot afford a series of irresponsible tax hikes that will target individuals, small businesses, and job creators all across the country. So this legislation will help protect those taxpayers—our taxpayers—and their pocketbooks and provide them some level of clarity as they plan for the new year.

Right now, working families and businesses are simply trying to make ends meet. I know from speaking with families and workers back home in Indiana that the last thing that they can afford is higher taxes when they need to be providing for their kids' education, savings, or growing their business.

In this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to support the provisions that would extend the increased section 179 deduction levels, as well as the extension of bonus depreciation. Countless farms, small businesses, and manufacturers in the Hoosier State and across the country use these important tools to make business-building capital investments. A failure to act on those tax extensions would only slow an economic recovery that desperately needs to pick up the pace.

Today, we have an opportunity to stand together as Republicans and Democrats and pass legislation that will prevent economic harm to millions of families and businesses across the United States. While this may not be the intention that we would all like to have, I do believe that this is the best that we can do for right now to prevent any sort of further damage to the economy.

I would like to, in closing, thank Chairman CAMP and the members of the Ways and Means Committee for their hard work on this issue, and I would urge my colleagues to support their efforts.

I would also like to take a brief moment to thank Chairman CAMP for his many years of service as a tireless advocate for the constituents back in Michigan. I have the opportunity to

travel with him to Detroit from time to time and appreciate his thoughtfulness and his leadership and his desire to do what is best for America. He is an honorable colleague, and I have been honored to have had the chance to serve with him. I wish him the very best in his retirement and know that he will continue to stay busy one way or another.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for your work on this. I know that you definitely set the table for further tax reform, which is desperately needed here in our country, and know that it would be good for our economy. Thank you for what you have done. This has given folks back home some clarity and certainty for this year.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental issue with our current policy on tax extenders.

I was a Ways and Means chairman in the State legislature and was told by a very important businessman in the State of Washington once: I don't care what rate you give me, tell me how long it is going to be; how am I going to amortize this? I need to know the length of time.

This bill, so people really understand, lasts exactly 28 days. It will die on January 1. It is for last year.

Now, businesses and individuals can't be certain they are going to get a tax break because of the stop-and-start, temporary nature of Congress reauthorizing these tax bills. Businesses and individuals need to know what the tax is going to be in the beginning of the year so that they can plan and take advantage of incentives rather than waiting until the last 2 weeks of the year when the Congress may or may not act.

This year, businesses that want to take advantage of the research tax credit have either been sitting on the sidelines or making investments or not making investments not knowing, or maybe they gambled and said: Well, we figure that Congress will do something some day.

Everyone should take note of today, the 3rd of December. Next year, right about this time, we will be right back here with the same bill—we can have the same speeches put right out here—because we simply do not give businesses certainty. If we did, we would have the economy rolling better.

Individuals and businesses are going into this year wondering whether they will have to act retroactively on these provisions. I am going to vote "yes" like everybody else, but it makes no sense that you have a bill like this 28 days before the end of the year. You have got the IRS wondering if they are going to be able to do the tax stuff and all of this chaos that is created. There

are calls coming into our office: Are you going to pass this? Are you going to pass that? What should I do for next year? The answer that a Congressman has to give if he is honest is, "I don't know."

This place is dysfunctional. It may be some of the explanation of why people didn't vote in the last election. They figured that Congress isn't going to do anything, and this is a perfect example of it. We should have done it a long time ago, and done it permanently.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the Budget Committee and the incoming chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair.

The reason I came down here is to speak in favor of this legislation, to suggest that I wish we could have gotten where we were with the bipartisan negotiations that occurred before White House involvement. This is obviously something that is necessary that has to pass.

But here is the reason that I came down. I came down to say thank you to DAVE CAMP for being an absolutely stellar chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. This is a man who spent 24 years in this room making a difference in the lives of the people from Michigan and the lives of the 300 million Americans in this country. This country is so much better off because of the dedicated service of this man, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He came in at a young age, reforming a lot of different programs, but one of the biggest marks he made in his early days in Congress is welfare reform.

DAVE CAMP was one of the principal architects of that 1996 welfare reform, which did so much to move people from welfare to work, to reduce child poverty, to help single moms get back to work, to get people lives of dignity. And he went from there to trade, to tax reform, to health care reform, on and on and on.

I only hope that I can do somewhat of the job that he has done in being a stellar steward of this magnificent committee and being a fantastic chairman. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish him great success in his future endeavors.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would extend my congratulations to Mr. CAMP. I have enjoyed being able to work with him for a lot of these 20 years. I enjoy his leadership, his dedication, and his friendship. In a sense, I feel that it was unfortunate that he had to navigate all these bizarre, choppy waters. It would have been fun to

see what would have happened in a little more measured environment.

The legislation we are dealing with here today is kind of a symbol of the difficulty he faces and the frustrations we all met. This should be the first legislation that we deal with in the next Congress, not the last legislation we deal with now.

It has been referenced that this is only going to be in effect for a few days. Look at what has happened when we deal with areas that I care deeply about. I have worked for years with short-line railroad interests. They rely on a tax credit to be able to make a difference in rural and small town America. Some of them are plunging in and have taken the risk that will be extended, some have not. These are investments that can't be made in that fashion.

I have enjoyed working with the wind energy industry and looking at what we have done over the course of 2005 to 2012. When we had the production tax credit in place and there was some certainty, we had the wind industry grow nine times over, over \$100 billion in investment and helping us generate clean energy and drop the price per unit profoundly. Now who knows what they are facing.

Looking at the transit benefit, I was pleased to have worked to be able to give transit parity to the millions of Americans who take buses and trains to work, to treat them the way we treat people who drive a car. For 3 years, they were treated that way. And then Congress, after the change in power had dropped to \$125 a month, and then we kind of got it back when we dealt with the fiscal cliff, now it is back to \$130. It is not fair to people in Chicago, in Detroit, in Metropolitan Washington, in New Jersey, in small town America where they take advantage of this. It is another example of where we are in this squirrel cage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his courtesy.

I am to the point where I don't actually know what is the right vote. I have no doubt that it will pass, but is it the right signal to send for so many industries that have a right to expect certainty, that have a right to expect the things that they have relied upon for years, built their business models around, are treated in the cavalier fashion by this Congress? I don't think that is right.

I think there are many areas of reform. I appreciate my friend Mr. CAMP diving in and dealing with some of these tough issues. We had a demonstration that it is not going to be easy to deal with tax reform. But it is not going to help anybody for the long

term or short term to have businesses roll the dice on things in many cases that are critical to the national interest and that they rely upon. They deserve better, and so does the American public.

□ 1645

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this may be one of the last times I have an opportunity to address the current chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP from Michigan, and I just want to commend him for such a distinguished career in the United States Congress. He has been an honest broker on the issues, a good friend, and I know all of us are going to miss him terribly when he decides to retire and go on to other ventures in his life. We all wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us, it is safe to assume, are not happy with this process or the fact that we are here again at the end of the year trying to do a 1-year extension on tax breaks that will be retroactive to 2014, mind you, and not paid for. This is a lousy way to run a Tax Code. It is a lousy way to run a government. I think individuals and businesses, large and small, need greater certainty for the decisions they have got to make with their lives and their businesses, especially the investment decisions; and by doing things retroactively around here and maintaining that uncertainty in future years, it is not the right way to go. And, also, not paying for it.

I think there are opportunities. Certainly the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget laid out a whole list of potential pay-fors that, if we had real interest, we could have very easily scrubbed the Code to find some offsets to pay for the \$40 billion cost that this 1-year extension has today, rather than just adding it to the debt and deficit in our country. We have got to do a better job at that.

But if this also means we have an opportunity moving into next year of being serious about comprehensive tax reform, something that is long overdue—again, with the leadership of the Ways and Means Committee and Mr. CAMP and introducing his discussion draft proposal earlier this year, so a lot of a groundwork has been made—then this might be the pressure that we need to get the committee and this body to do what is long overdue, and that is reform an antiquated Tax Code to make it more fair, more simple, to make it more competitive in the global environment.

I think that is a goal that, again, hopefully, we share, and it might be an

avenue of bipartisan cooperation as we do move forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KIND. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I continuously hear from small business owners and farmers back home about the need for greater certainty and the need to revamp a Tax Code that has outlived its usefulness. It is riddled with inefficiencies. It is riddled with certain expenditures that have been included in it throughout the years due to powerful special interests who know how to work the Halls of Congress to get their special provisions in it, and who we are leaving behind are hardworking families back home and the small businesses on Main Street who can't hire their legion of lobbyists out here to protect their interests or to get their special provisions in.

So as we move forward, hopefully this will be one of those areas where we can find some common ground and do what is right for our Nation. That would help jump-start the U.S. economy and put us in a much more competitive place, when it comes to the global economy, at the same time.

I reluctantly support it. I think we could have done a better job. But I think it is also important for policy reasons to maintain these tax provisions until we get a chance to do comprehensive reform around here.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another distinguished member of our committee.

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened to both sides, and you have given me the reasons that I am going to be opposed to this legislation.

For the past 4 years, the Ways and Means Committee has debated comprehensive tax reform. Sadly, the fruit of that discussion before us is a 1-year retroactive extension of a temporary tax provision. This is an illusion. This is a Fellini movie we are seeing on a late afternoon in Washington, D.C. It is completely unpaid for. It gives no certainty to businesses or individuals because it expires 1 month from today.

Unlike today's bill, Chairman CAMP's tax reform draft dealt with many expiring tax provisions in a courageous way. We were dealing with wind credits, R&D tax credits, mortgage debt forgiveness, all the way down the line, as well as the mortgage principal extension, which is needed for people who have had catastrophic problems within their own States. This is an example of

what a responsible approach to extenders looks like.

This bill before us today is wholly inadequate. Not only does it add billions of dollars to the deficit, we kick the can down the road by only dealing with extenders in a retroactive manner. In other words, this money has been spent over the last 11 months, hopefully, getting to the point where we would pay for it. That is not the way to run the show, and you know that only puts us deeper into uncertainty and certainly deeper into debt.

Does anyone believe the 2 weeks these provisions will be in effect will encourage any business to make decisions about whether to hire more workers or invest in alternative energy or research, new equipment for small businesses or development in disadvantaged communities?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you.

I am not finished yet, but I want to say to Mr. CAMP, you have been a civil voice that will be missed in this hallowed Hall. And I mean that sincerely from my heart, because civil discussion is necessary in the House of Representatives.

Many times, in other places, it has not been civil. It will do nothing to encourage this legislation, this new development in renewable energy.

I want to be clear. I strongly support, my record will show, many of these tax provisions. I want to work with colleagues on the other side and my own side to make many of them permanent.

While this approach may help taxpayers and businesses who made decisions assuming Congress would act responsibly, it is not in the country's long-term interest, Mr. Speaker. At a bare minimum, Congress should be extending these provisions until the end of 2015 in a fiscally responsible way.

Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately must oppose this legislation, the so called "Tax Increase Prevention Act." For the past four years, the Ways and Means Committee has debated comprehensive tax reform. Sadly, the fruit of that discussion before us is a one-year, retroactive extension of temporary tax provisions, completely unpaid for, and that gives no certainty to businesses or individuals because it expires one month from today.

It didn't have to be this way. Earlier this year, Chairman CAMP released an ambitious proposal for a comprehensive reform of our tax code. I did not agree with everything in that proposal, and neither did many of my friends on the other side of the aisle. But I was confident that both sides could use Chairman's CAMP's draft as a starting point to come together around a reform plan that would finally address the many loopholes and inefficiencies in our tax code.

Mr. CAMP's draft also dealt with the many expiring tax provisions before us today in a courageous way. He resisted the temptation to

assume these breaks would be indefinitely extended and added to the deficit. Instead, he made permanent the ones he wanted to keep and paid for them, while separately identifying ones he would let expire. This is an example of what a responsible approach to extenders looks like. Unfortunately, what happened next could not have been less reflective of Mr. CAMP's earlier work.

Before the ink had even dried on Chairman CAMP's tax reform draft, the majority of Ways and Means began passing permanent extensions of nearly \$1 trillion in tax provisions and did not even make an attempt to pay for one dime of them. This approach is the height of irresponsibility and has squandered any good will that had been developed during the years of debate over tax reform.

This bill before us today is wholly inadequate. Not only does it add to the deficit and kick the can down the road, but by only dealing with extenders in a retroactive manner, it will not even encourage any business investment in the future. Does anyone really believe that the two weeks these provisions will be in effect will really encourage any business make decisions about whether to hire more workers, or invest in alternative energy, research and development, new equipment for small businesses or development in disadvantaged communities?

A retroactive extension will do nothing for commuters in New Jersey, who have been denied parity in their transit benefits for the last 11 months and will now be denied them again next year. It will do nothing to encourage new development in renewable energy, including offshore wind in my home state, as developers will have no certainty at all that the critical tax credits in this bill will be there for them next year.

I want to be clear: I strongly support many of these tax provisions, and I want to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to make many of them permanent. However, while this bare minimum approach might help taxpayers and businesses who made decisions assuming Congress would act responsibly, it is not in the country's long-term interest. At a bare minimum, Congress should be extending these provisions until the end of 2015, in a fiscally responsible way, and then get back to work on real, permanent tax reform that ends this destructive cycle of expiring and renewing temporary tax policy once and for all.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say to my friend from New Jersey, I agree with you on the need for certainty. We have heard today a lot of common discussion about the need for certainty in our Tax Code and how difficult it is to be the only country in the world that let's tax policy expire and what that means for families and employers. But in terms of the concerns you raise about the deficit, as the gentleman well knows, these measures have never been offset. These measures have never been paid for, whether it was a Republican majority or a Democrat majority. Whether it was a Republican President or a Democrat President, these provisions have never been paid for.

I would just say to the gentleman and to the Members of this body, why do we need to raise taxes on somebody to keep taxes the same? What we are doing is continuing current policy. In many cases, like R&D, it has been continued since 1981. Let's call it what it is.

If we are continuing something in a piecemeal fashion every few years, let's just make it permanent so we can get the benefits of those provisions in terms of reliability and certainty, as the gentleman raised, so that the small businesses all throughout the country can actually plan and expect that these items will be in place.

I share the concerns that have been raised by a number of speakers. Here we are at the end of 2014, retroactively putting in policies for the whole year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) another member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this 1-year retroactive extension is not ideal. It is not the best that we should or could do. It does little to provide certainty to individuals and businesses for 2015. My constituent, Mary Jo, still will not know whether she can give money from her IRA to a Chicago charity without tax liability in 2015, nor does my constituent, Henry, know if he can receive enhanced tax benefits for donating food to the Chicago Food Depository.

Further, I am deeply disappointed that this bill fails to extend the Trade Adjustment Assistance for health care workers laid off through no fault of their own. However, I believe that this bill may be our only option for this year to provide these tax benefits for 2014 and to ensure the taxpayers can begin filing their taxes and receiving their refunds early next year. There are many provisions included that are critical to Chicago and Illinois, and that must be covered in 2014.

This is not the best bill, but it is a necessary bill. I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to ensure comprehensive permanent reforms to the Tax Code that help all Americans, including provisions that help the lowest income workers, such as the earned income tax credit and enhanced child tax credit.

I end, Mr. Speaker, by commending Chairman CAMP.

Mr. CAMP, I commend you on your efforts to bring comprehensive tax reform to the forefront, and I wish you well as you finish out a very distinguished career in the people's House. Sir, I salute you.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You are never sure what is going to happen the next day around here, so I

am not sure if this is the last time you will be presenting a bill—something could come up next week—but let me assume that it is for just a moment and speak on a personal basis if I might. I hope the speaker won't cut me off. You are not supposed to talk to each other, so I will try to speak to you while I speak to the chair. I will try to do both.

Around here we can question each other's positions. In a sense, that is why we are here. DAVE CAMP leaves here having participated in a discussion of substance and questioning each other's positions in a way to try to come forth with legislation. But I think, in a rather unique way, our chairman has been able to do that with complete integrity, with complete seriousness—now and then a sense of humor, but complete seriousness—and the ability to question within a framework of some friendship.

So if this is your last management of a bill, I simply want to say for myself and, more importantly, I think, for this institution, if I might, that your decision to leave here means that you are leaving with your head so high and with, I hope, a feeling of real accomplishment and complete integrity and seriousness about your work. I am sure that your constituents are very proud to have voted for you 12 times. That was a commendable dozen.

So with some feeling of gratitude for having been able to serve with you, DAVE, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my friend, colleague, and partner on the Ways and Means Committee from Michigan for those very gracious and kind remarks.

I think the Ways and Means Committee is the best committee in Congress. We have a lot of bills that come to us. We have a lot of hard decisions. There is a lot of discussion. As you know, this is a big country and there are a lot of different opinions, but we always try to find a way to at least do that in a manner that is productive for the people we represent and that sent us here.

I want to thank you for the ability to work with you over these last few years. Maybe I should have turned that 12 into a baker's dozen, with all the kind remarks that have been said here today. I just want thank you and thank the members of the committee and staff on both sides of the aisle.

One of the things that is required in a committee like Ways and Means, with all of the responsibilities, is a staff that is able to work together as well.

□ 1700

So they help make us do the job well. They help keep us informed and really help make all the things that we do

come together, including items like this legislation today so, thank you.

I would just urge passage of H.R. 5771, what we call the extenders bill, or the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 766, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NEAL. I am opposed to the bill in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NEAL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5771 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of title I the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

Subtitle E—No Government Subsidies for Corporations That Move Their Headquarters Overseas to Avoid Paying Taxes

SEC. 191. TAX BENEFITS DISALLOWED IN CASE OF INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer which is, or is a member of an expanded affiliated group which includes, an applicable inverted corporation, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of, and amendments made by, this title (other than this subtitle) had never been enacted.

(b) APPLICABLE INVERTED CORPORATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term “applicable inverted corporation” means any foreign corporation which—

(A) would be a surrogate foreign corporation under subsection (a)(2) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 if such subsection were applied by substituting “80 percent” for “60 percent”; or

(B) is an inverted domestic corporation.

(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

(B) after the acquisition, either—

(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of applying section 7874(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the preceding sentence, the term “substantial business activities” shall have the meaning given such term under Treasury regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary of the Treasury may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

(4) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

(5) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States, determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under

regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to “foreign country” and “relevant foreign country” as references to “the United States”. The Secretary of the Treasury may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms “domestic corporation”, “foreign corporation”, and “expanded affiliated group” shall each have the same meaning as when used in section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Mr. NEAL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the reading of the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill in its current form, and I want to remind colleagues that this amendment to the bill will not kill the bill, nor will it send it back to committee, and, in fact, if adopted, we will immediately proceed to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today debating this faulty effort for one reason and one reason only: the failure fundamentally to change the Tax Code.

Now, let me say to my friends, the praise delivered on behalf of Mr. CAMP is well-earned. But I also want to say something today. We all love to say, “I hate to say I told you so,” but we really like to say, “I told you so.”

I told you so. The staff would be rich if they took that bet that I offered not long ago on the very floor of this House.

Now, Mr. CAMP, the wily sorcerer of tax policies that he is, he employed every bit of magic at his disposal to bring forth tax reform. He put together a great model and, for 3 years, without the glare of publicity, we actually had an adult conversation between the parties, principals and the stakeholders, who listened carefully to what everyone had to say.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership was not spellbound by the sorcerer’s good deeds. When he was pleased to release his tax proposal, the leadership of the Republican side said, Blah, blah, blah.

Well, one blah in support of continuing uncertainty for the American family and for business; two blahs, or a second blah, for cutting economic growth and business investment; and finally, a third blah to the lowest worker participation rate in 36 years.

Seven to 8 million Americans still looking for work, but we can’t do tax reform.

The last time we reformed our code, the Internet didn’t exist, but we can’t do tax reform.

Economic growth at 2 percent, but we can’t do tax reform.

Forty percent of the Business Roundtable’s major alliances said this week they plan on hiring new employees. That means 60 percent don’t—but we can’t do tax reform.

Thirteen percent of these companies said they are committing to investing in buying new equipment, but that means 87 percent are not.

Our inaction on tax reform is harming this economy, and it is not Mr. CAMP’s fault. Rather than working on this bill and staying with it, with wage stagnation, low worker participation rate, depressed business investment, instead of addressing these problems, we are debating a bill that, once the President signs it, we will immediately see it as being outdated, and we are going to start the process all over again, maybe in just a couple of days.

What we have before us, in terms of process, is the pinnacle of congressional nonsense. This bill does not incentivize companies to invest more; no more for research. We are rewarding companies for their past behavior.

You cannot find any economist with credibility that will suggest that retroactivity in the Tax Code is sound policy.

Pick up the newspaper and you are going to find very quickly that, as we released this draft, over that same period of time, more companies inverted. The sound of the dam breaking is all around us.

Recent reports have stated that the United States stands to lose \$2 billion next year alone, and since the first inversion in 1982, we have lost more than \$9 billion. Sadly, these inversions are a part of an epidemic that started a decade ago.

CRS points out that at least 47 companies have inverted since the beginning of the last year, 19 inversion deals are still pending, and 14 more are sure to come in the coming year alone.

The Joint Committee on Taxation says now it is costing us \$33.6 billion in lost tax revenue because of our inability to deal with corporate tax inversions.

I understand the argument about tax avoidance versus tax evasion. We have done a reasonably good job at cracking down on Switzerland and Liechtenstein and other places, but we need to address this question of Bermuda and these other tax havens where corporate residents of America pay their fair share, and those who invert to escape taxes—while, incidentally, we are engaged militarily across the globe with a substantial bill—they feel as though they don’t have to deliver anything.

Now, my motion to recommit today is very simple. Those companies that have inverted cannot take advantage of the very tax benefits that we are going to vote upon in a few minutes, which, by the way, I favor extending. If you

have inverted, you should not be allowed the same credits and deductions and exclusions that American businesses who have stayed here dutifully, respectfully, and with great patriotic fervor continue to pay.

I don’t understand, for the life of me, why Republicans can’t support doing something about corporate tax inversions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I seek time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would just say, in brief, there is nothing in this motion to recommit that addresses the issues raised by my friend from Massachusetts. The problems the gentleman identified are not dealt with at all here.

Does this motion to recommit increase investment, create jobs, and raise wages?

Does this motion to recommit create certainty in what is an uncertain Tax Code with this process?

It doesn’t. What this does is make our Tax Code more complex, makes American workers and American employers less competitive, and it will actually hurt our economy and stifle growth.

I urge a “no” vote on this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the question of passage, if ordered, and passage of H.R. 647.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 223, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—197

Adams	Bonamici	Carson (IN)
Barber	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Barrow (GA)	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Chu
Becerra	Bustos	Ciциlline
Bera (CA)	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Cárdenas	Clay
Blumenauer	Carney	Cleaver

Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Perlmuter	Kline	Paulsen	Shimkus	Bustos	Grayson	McIntyre
Cohen	Jones	Peters (CA)	Labrador	Pearce	Shuster	Butterfield	Green, Al	McKinley
Connolly	Kaptur	Peters (MI)	LaMalfa	Perry	Simpson	Byrne	Green, Gene	McMorris
Conyers	Keating	Peterson	Lamborn	Petri	Smith (MO)	Calvert	Griffin (AR)	Rodgers
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Lance	Pittenger	Smith (NE)	Camp	Griffith (VA)	McNerney
Costa	Kennedy	Pocan	Lankford	Pitts	Smith (NJ)	Campbell	Grimm	Meehan
Courtney	Kildee	Polis	Latham	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)	Capito	Guthrie	Meeks
Crowley	Kilmer	Price (NC)	Latta	Pompeo	Stewart	Capps	Gutiérrez	Meng
Cuellar	Kind	Quigley	LoBiondo	Posey	Stivers	Cárdenas	Hahn	Messer
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Rahall	Long	Price (GA)	Stockman	Carney	Hanabusa	Mica
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Rangel	Lucas	Reed	Stutzman	Carson (IN)	Hanna	Michaud
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Richmond	Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Terry	Carter	Harper	Miller (FL)
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard	Lummis	Renacci	Thompson (PA)	Cartwright	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ruiz	Marchant	Ribble	Thornberry	Cassidy	Hastings (WA)	Miller, George
Delaney	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger	Marino	Rice (SC)	Tiberi	Castor (FL)	Heck (NV)	Moore
DeLauro	Levin	Rush	Massie	Rigell	Tipton	Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Moran
DelBene	Lewis	Ryan (OH)	McAllister	Roby	Turner	Chabot	Hensarling	Mullin
Deutch	Lipinski	Sánchez, Linda	McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Upton	Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (FL)
Dingell	Loeb sack	T.	McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Valadao	Chu	Higgins	Murphy (PA)
Doggett	Lofgren	Sanchez, Loretta	McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Wagner	Cicilline	Himes	Nadler
Duncan (TN)	Lowenthal	Sarbanes	McKinley	Rogers (MI)	Walberg	Clark (MA)	Hinojosa	Neal
Edwards	Lowe y	Schakowsky	McMorris	Rohrabacher	Walden	Cleaver	Holding	Neugebauer
Ellison	Lujan Grisham	Schiff	Rodgers	Rokita	Walorski	Clyburn	Holt	Noem
Engel	(NM)	Schneider	Meadows	Rooney	Weber (TX)	Coble	Honda	Nolan
Enyart	Luján, Ben Ray	Schrader	Ros-Lehtinen	Roskam	Webster (FL)	Coffman	Horsford	Norcross
Eshoo	(NM)	Messer	Mica	Ross	Wenstrup	Cohen	Hoyer	Nugent
Esty	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Westmoreland	Cole	Hudson	Nunes
Farr	Maffei	Scott, David	Miller (MI)	Royce	Whitfield	Collins (GA)	Huffman	Nunnelee
Fattah	Maloney,	Serrano	Mullin	Runyan	Williams	Collins (NY)	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Foster	Carolyn	Sewell (AL)	Mulvaney	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)	Conaway	Hultgren	Owens
Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Shea-Porter	Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Wittman	Hunter	Hurt	Palazzo
Fudge	Matheson	Sherman	Neugebauer	Sanford	Wolf	Cook	Israel	Pastor (AZ)
Gabbard	Matsui	Sinema	Noem	Scalise	Womack	Cook	Isaia	Paulsen
Gallego	McCollum	Sires	Nugent	Schock	Woodall	Costa	Jackson Lee	Pearce
Garamendi	McDermott	Slaughter	Nunes	Schweikert	Yoder	Courtney	Jeffries	Pelosi
Garcia	McGovern	Smith (WA)	Nunnelee	Scott, Austin	Yoho	Cramer	Jenkins	Perlmuter
Grayson	Speier	Swalwell (CA)	Olson	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)	Crawford	Johnson (GA)	Perry
Green, Al	McNerney	Takano	Palazzo	Sessions	Young (IN)	Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Peters (CA)
Green, Gene	Meeks	Thompson (CA)				Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (MI)
Grijalva	Meng	Thompson (MS)				Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Peterson
Gutiérrez	Michaud	Tierney	Aderholt	Duckworth	Miller, Gary	Culberson	Jolly	Petri
Hahn	Miller, George	Titus	Bishop (UT)	Hall	Negrete McLeod	Cummings	Joyce	Pingree (ME)
Hanabusa	Moore	Tonko	Capito	McCarthy (NY)	Southerland	Daines	Kaptur	Pittenger
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Tsongas	Capuano	McCaul	Wasserman	Davis (CA)	Keating	Pitts
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Van Hollen	Doyle	McKeon	Schultz	Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Poe (TX)
Higgins	Nadler	Vargas				Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Posey
Himes	Napolitano	Veasey				DeFazio	Kennedy	Price (GA)
Hinojosa	Neal	Vela				DeGette	Kildee	Price (NC)
Holt	Nolan	Velázquez				Delaney	Kilmer	Quigley
Honda	Norcross	Visclosky				DeLauro	Kind	Rahall
Horsford	O'Rourke	Walz				DelBene	King (IA)	Rangel
Hoyer	Owens	Waters				Denham	King (NY)	Reed
Huffman	Pallone	Waxman				Dent	Kingston	Reichert
Israel	Pascrell	Welch				DeSantis	Kinzing (IL)	Renacci
Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)	Wilson (FL)				DesJarlais	Kirkpatrick	Rice (SC)
Jeffries	Payne	Yarmuth				Deutch	Kliene	Richmond
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi					Diaz-Balart	Kuster	Rigell
						Dingell	LaMalfa	Roby
						Doggett	Lance	Roe (TN)
						Duncan (TN)	Langevin	Rogers (AL)
						Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
						Ellmers	Larson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
						Engel	Latham	Rohrabacher
						Enyart	Latta	Rokita
						Eshoo	Levin	Rooney
						Esty	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
						Farenthold	LoBiondo	Roskam
						Farr	Loeb sack	Ross
						Fattah	Lofgren	Rothfus
						Fincher	Long	Roybal-Allard
						Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Ruiz
						Fleischmann	Lowe y	Runyan
						Flores	Lucas	Ruppersberger
						Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Rush
						Fortenberry	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)
						Foster	(NM)	Ryan (WI)
						Fox	Luján, Ben Ray	Salmon
						Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda
						Franks (AZ)	Lynch	T.
						Frelinghuysen	Maffei	Sanchez, Loretta
						Fudge	Maloney,	Sarbanes
						Gabbard	Carolyn	Schalise
						Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
						Garamendi	Marchant	Schneider
						Garcia	Marino	Schock
						Gardner	Massie	Schrader
						Gerlach	Matheson	Schwartz
						Gibbs	Matsui	Schweikert
						Gibson	McAllister	Scott (VA)
						Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Scott, Austin
						Gohmert	McCaul	Scott, David
						Goodlatte	McCollum	Scott, David
						Gosar	McDermott	Serrano
						Granger	McGovern	Sessions
						Graves (GA)	McHenry	
						Graves (MO)		

NOT VOTING—14

□ 1737

Messrs. PEARCE, BARR, BACHUS, YOHO, BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. WAXMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 378, noes 46, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—378

Amash	Conaway	Gosar	Adams	Benishek	Brady (TX)
Amodei	Cook	Gowdy	Amodei	Bentivolio	Braley (IA)
Bachmann	Cotton	Granger	Bachmann	Bera (CA)	Brat
Bachus	Cramer	Graves (GA)	Bachus	Bidenstine	Bridenstine
Barletta	Crawford	Graves (MO)	Bilirakis	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (AL)
Barr	Crenshaw	Griffin (AR)	Barber	Bishop (NY)	Brooks (IN)
Barton	Culberson	Griffith (VA)	Barletta	Black	Brown (FL)
Benishek	Daines	Grimm	Barr	Blackburn	Brownley (CA)
Bentivolio	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie	Barrow (GA)	Blackburn	Buchanan
Bilirakis	Denham	Hanna	Barton	Bonamici	Bucshon
Black	Dent	Harper	Bass	Boustany	
Blackburn	DeSantis	Harris	Beatty		
Boustany	DesJarlais	Hartzler			
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)			
Brat	Duffy	Heck (NV)			
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Hensarling			
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler			
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Holding			
Brown (GA)	Fincher	Hudson			
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp			
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)			
Burgess	Fleming	Hultgren			
Byrne	Flores	Hunter			
Calvert	Forbes	Hurt			
Camp	Fortenberry	Issa			
Campbell	Fox	Jenkins			
Carter	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)			
Cassidy	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam			
Chabot	Gardner	Jolly			
Chaffetz	Garrett	Jordan			
Clawson (FL)	Gerlach	Joyce			
Coble	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)			
Coffman	Gibson	King (IA)			
Cole	Gingrey (GA)	King (NY)			
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Kingston			
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	Kinzing (IL)			

Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Walz	Burgess	Gibbs	Luján, Ben Ray	Royce	Sires	Veasey
Shea-Porter	Thompson (PA)	Wasserman	Bustos	Gibson	(NM)	Runyan	Slaughter	Vela
Sherman	Thornberry	Schultz	Butterfield	Gingrey (GA)	Lummis	Ruppersberger	Smith (MO)	Velázquez
Shimkus	Tiberi	Waters	Byrne	Gohmert	Lynch	Rush	Smith (NE)	Visclosky
Simpson	Tierney	Waxman	Calvert	Goodlatte	Maffei	Ryan (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Sinema	Tipton	Weber (TX)	Camp	Gosar	Maloney,	Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Walberg
Sires	Titus	Webster (FL)	Campbell	Gowdy	Carolyn	Salmon	Smith (WA)	Walden
Slaughter	Tonko	Wenstrup	Capito	Granger	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Southerland	Walorski
Smith (MO)	Tsongas	Westmoreland	Capps	Graves (GA)	Marchant	T.	Speier	Walz
Smith (NE)	Turner	Williams	Cárdenas	Graves (MO)	Marino	Sanchez, Loretta	Stewart	Waters
Smith (NJ)	Upton	Wilson (FL)	Carney	Grayson	Massie	Sarbanes	Stivers	Waxman
Smith (TX)	Valadao	Wilson (SC)	Carson (IN)	Green, Al	Matheson	Scalise	Stockman	Webster (FL)
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Wittman	Carter	Green, Gene	Matsui	Schiff	Stutzman	Webster (TX)
Southerland	Vargas	Wolf	Cartwright	Griffin (AR)	McAllister	Schneider	Swalwell (CA)	Welch
Speier	Veasey	Womack	Cassidy	Griffith (VA)	McCarthy (CA)	Schock	Terry	Wenstrup
Stewart	Vela	Woodall	Castor (FL)	Grimm	McCaul	Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland
Stivers	Velázquez	Yarmuth	Chabot	Guthrie	McClintock	Schwartz	Thompson (MS)	Whitfield
Stutzman	Wagner	Yoder	Chaffetz	Gutiérrez	McCollum	Schweikert	Thompson (PA)	Williams
Swalwell (CA)	Walberg	Yoho	Chu	Hahn	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Thornberry	Wilson (FL)
Takano	Walden	Young (AK)	Cicilline	Hanabusa	McHenry	Scott, Austin	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Terry	Walorski	Young (IN)	Clarke (MA)	Hanna	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner	Tierney	Wittman
			Clarke (NY)	Harper	McKinley	Serrano	Tipton	Wolf
			Clawson (FL)	Harris	McMorris	Sessions	Titus	Womack
			Clay	Hartzler	Rodgers	Sewell (AL)	Tonko	Woodall
			Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Shea-Porter	Tsongas	Yarmuth
			Clyburn	Hastings (WA)	Meadows	Sherman	Turner	Yoder
			Coble	Heck (NV)	Meehan	Shimkus	Upton	Yoho
			Coffman	Heck (WA)	Meeks	Shuster	Valadao	Young (AK)
			Cohen	Hensarling	Meng	Simpson	Van Hollen	Young (IN)
			Cole	Herrera Beutler	Messer	Sinema	Vargas	
			Collins (GA)	Higgins	Mica			
			Collins (NY)	Himes	Michaud			
			Conaway	Hinojosa	Miller (FL)			
			Connolly	Holding	Miller (MI)			
			Conyers	Holt	Miller, George			
			Cook	Honda	Moran			
			Cooper	Horsford	Mullin			
			Costa	Hoyer	Mulvaney			
			Cotton	Hudson	Murphy (FL)			
			Courtney	Huffman	Murphy (PA)			
			Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Nadler			
			Crawford	Hultgren	Neal			
			Crenshaw	Hunter	Neugebauer			
			Crowley	Hurt	Noem			
			Cuellar	Israel	Nolan			
			Culberson	Issa	Norcross			
			Cummings	Jackson Lee	Nugent			
			Daines	Jeffries	Nunes			
			Davis (CA)	Jenkins	Nunnelee			
			Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke			
			Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Olson			
			DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Owens			
			DeGette	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo			
			Delaney	Jolly	Pallone			
			DeLauro	Jordan	Pascarell			
			DelBene	Joyce	Pastor (AZ)			
			Denham	Kaptur	Paulsen			
			Dent	Keating	Payne			
			DeSantis	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi			
			DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Perlmutter			
			Deutch	Kennedy	Perry			
			Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Peters (CA)			
			Dingell	Kilmer	Peters (MI)			
			Doggett	Kind	Peterson			
			Duffy	King (IA)	Petri			
			Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Pingree (ME)			
			Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Pittenger			
			Edwards	Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts			
			Ellison	Kirkpatrick	Polis			
			Elmers	Kline	Pompeo			
			Engel	Kuster	Posey			
			Enyart	Labrador	Price (GA)			
			Eshoo	LaMalfa	Price (NC)			
			Esty	Lamborn	Quigley			
			Farenthold	Lance	Rahall			
			Farr	Langevin	Rangel			
			Fattah	Lankford	Reed			
			Fincher	Larsen (WA)	Reichert			
			Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)	Renacci			
			Fleischmann	Latham	Ribble			
			Fleming	Latta	Rice (SC)			
			Flores	Lee (CA)	Richmond			
			Forbes	Levin	Rigell			
			Fortenberry	Lewis	Roby			
			Foster	Lipinski	Roe (TN)			
			Fox	LoBlundo	Rogers (AL)			
			Frankel (FL)	Loeb	Rogers (KY)			
			Franks (AZ)	Loeb	Rogers (MI)			
			Frelinghuysen	Long	Rohrabacher			
			Fudge	Lowenthal	Rokita			
			Gabbard	Lowey	Rooney			
			Gallego	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Garcia	Luetkemeyer	Roskam			
			Gardner	Lujan Grisham	Ross			
			Garrett	(NM)	Rothfus			
			Gerlach		Roybal-Allard			

NOES—46

Amash	Harris	Pallone
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Huelskamp	Pocan
Broun (GA)	Jones	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Pompeo
Clawson (FL)	Labrador	Ribble
Clay	Lamborn	Sanford
Cooper	Lankford	Schakowsky
Cotton	Lee (CA)	Shuster
Duffy	Lewis	Stockman
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	McClintock	Visclosky
Fleming	Meadows	Welch
Garrett	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gowdy	Napolitano	
Grijalva	O'Rourke	

NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt	Duckworth	Miller, Gary
Bishop (UT)	Hall	Negrete McLeod
Capuano	McCarthy (NY)	
Doyle	McKeon	

□ 1745

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACHIEVING A BETTER LIFE
EXPERIENCE ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 17, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

YEAS—404

Adams	Benish	Brady (PA)
Amodi	Bentivoglio	Brady (TX)
Bachmann	Bera (CA)	Braley (IA)
Bachus	Bilirakis	Brat
Barber	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (AL)
Barletta	Bishop (NY)	Brooks (IN)
Barr	Black	Broun (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Blackburn	Brown (FL)
Barton	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Bonamici	Buchanan
Beatty	Boustany	Bucshon

NAYS—17

Amash	Jones	Sanford
Becerra	McDermott	Schakowsky
Bridenstine	Moore	Scott, David
Garamendi	Napolitano	Takano
Grijalva	Pocan	Wasserman
Huelskamp	Ruiz	Schultz

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Duckworth	Negrete McLeod
Bishop (UT)	Hall	Pearce
Capuano	McCarthy (NY)	Poe (TX)
Castro (TX)	McKeon	
Doyle	Miller, Gary	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1755

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 545, H.R. 647, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 545 on H.R. 647—ABLE Act of 2014. I was present for the vote but not recorded due to a mechanical problem with my voting card. I am a cosponsor of this legislation and I intended to vote “aye.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE SCOTT PERRY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable SCOTT PERRY, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States Army, seeking documents for use by the prosecution in a court-martial. The subpoena seeks documents in my custody and control that relate to various communications, dated in 2008, between a constituent and the office of former U.S. Representative Todd Platts.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

SCOTT PERRY,
Member of Congress.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE WORLD WAR II MEMBERS OF THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 120, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 120

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO WORLD WAR II MEMBERS OF CIVIL AIR PATROL.

Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on December 10, 2014, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol collectively, in recognition of the military service and exemplary record of the Civil Air Patrol during World War II. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1800

ADDING EBOLA TO THE FDA PRIORITY REVIEW VOUCHER PROGRAM ACT

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2917) to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2917

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Adding Ebola to the FDA Priority Review Voucher Program Act".

SEC. 2. PRIORITY REVIEW TO ENCOURAGE TREATMENTS FOR TROPICAL DISEASES.

Section 524 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360n) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (Q) as subparagraph (R);

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (P) the following:

“(Q) Filoviruses.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (R), as so redesignated, by striking “regulation by” and inserting “order of”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding “There is no limit on the number of times a priority review voucher may be transferred before such voucher is used.” after the period at the end; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking “365 days” and inserting “90 days”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUDDEN UNEXPECTED DEATH DATA ENHANCEMENT AND AWARENESS ACT

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 669) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sudden Unexpected Death Data Enhancement and Awareness Act”.

SEC. 2. CONTINUING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO STILLBIRTH, SUDDEN UNEXPECTED INFANT DEATH AND SUDDEN UNEXPLAINED DEATH IN CHILDHOOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall continue activities related to still birth, sudden unexpected infant death, and sudden unexplained death in childhood, including, as appropriate—

(1) collecting information, such as socio-demographic, death scene investigation, clinical history, and autopsy information, on stillbirth, sudden unexpected infant death, and sudden unexplained death in childhood through the utilization of existing surveillance systems and collaborating with States to improve the quality, consistency, and collection of such data;

(2) disseminating information to educate the public, health care providers, and other stakeholders on stillbirth, sudden unexpected infant death and sudden unexplained death in childhood; and

(3) collaborating with the Attorney General, State and local departments of health, and other experts, as appropriate, to provide consistent information for medical examiners and coroners, law enforcement personnel, and health care providers related to death scene investigations and autopsies for sudden unexpected infant death and sudden unexplained death in childhood, in order to improve the quality and consistency of the data collected at such death scenes and to promote consistent reporting on the cause of death after autopsy to inform prevention, intervention, and other activities.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress a report that includes a description of any activities that are being carried out by agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health, related to stillbirth, sudden unexpected infant death, and sudden unexplained death in childhood, including those activities identified under subsection (a).

SEC. 3. NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS.

This Act shall not be construed to increase the amount of appropriations that are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year.

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.”.

Mr. BILIRAKIS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Senate amendments be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONDEMNING THE ACTIONS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 758) strongly condemning the actions of the Russian Federation, under President Vladimir Putin, which has carried out a policy of aggression against neighboring countries aimed at political and economic domination, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 758

Whereas the Russian Federation has subjected Ukraine to a campaign of political, economic, and military aggression for the purpose of establishing its domination over the country and progressively erasing its independence;

Whereas the Russian Federation's invasion of, and military operations on, Ukrainian territory represent gross violations of Ukraine's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity and a violation of international law, including the Russian Federation's obligations under the United Nations Charter;

Whereas the Russian Federation has, since February 2014, violated each of the 10 principles of the 1975 Helsinki Accords in its relations with Ukraine;

Whereas the Russian Federation's forcible occupation and illegal annexation of Crimea and its continuing support for separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine are violations of its obligations under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which it pledged to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of Ukraine, and to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine;

Whereas the Russian Federation has provided military equipment, training, and other assistance to separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine that has resulted in over 4,000 civilian deaths, hundreds of thousands of civilian refugees, and widespread destruction;

Whereas the Ukrainian military remains at a significant disadvantage compared to the armed forces of the Russian Federation in terms of size and technological sophistication;

Whereas the United States strongly supports efforts to assist Ukraine to defend its territory and sovereignty against military aggression by the Russian Federation and by separatist forces;

Whereas the terms of the cease-fire specified in the Minsk Protocol that was signed on September 5, 2014, by representatives of the Government of Ukraine, the Russian Federation, and the Russian-led separatists in the eastern area of Ukraine have been repeatedly violated by the Russian Federation and the separatist forces it supports;

Whereas separatist forces in areas they controlled in eastern Ukraine prevented the holding of elections on May 25, 2014, for a new President of Ukraine and on October 26, 2014, for a new Rada, thereby preventing the people of eastern Ukraine from exercising their democratic right to select their candidates for office in free and fair elections;

Whereas on November 2, 2014, separatist forces in eastern Ukraine held fraudulent and illegal elections in areas they controlled for the supposed purpose of choosing leaders of the illegitimate local political entities they have declared;

Whereas the Russian Federation continues to provide the military, political, and economic support without which the separatist forces could not continue to maintain their areas of control;

Whereas the reestablishment of peace and security in Ukraine requires the full withdrawal of Russian forces from Ukrainian territory, the resumption of the Government of Ukraine's control over all of the country's international borders, the disarming of the separatist and paramilitary forces in the east, an end to Russia's use of its energy exports and trade barriers to apply economic and political pressure, and an end to Russian interference in Ukraine's internal affairs;

Whereas Malaysia Airlines Flight 17, a civilian airliner, was destroyed by a missile fired by Russian-backed separatist forces in eastern Ukraine, resulting in the loss of 298 innocent lives;

Whereas the Russian Federation continues to supply the vast majority of arms purchases, which include anti-aircraft missile systems and other lethal weapons, to the Bashar Assad regime in Syria, a state sponsor of terrorism that is actively backed by Hezbollah, a sophisticated terrorist group hostile to the United States and its close allies;

Whereas the Russian Federation has protected the Assad regime and backed its brutal assault against the Syrian people;

Whereas the Russian Federation has used and is continuing to use coercive economic measures, including the manipulation of energy prices and supplies, as well as trade restrictions, to place political and economic pressure on Ukraine;

Whereas France agreed to sell to the Russian Federation two Mistral-class amphibious assault ships in 2011 for \$1.7 billion;

Whereas Russian possession of these ships would be a destabilizing addition to the Russian military, which would likely have boosted its ability to invade Crimea;

Whereas given the Russian invasion of sovereign territory of the Republic of Ukraine in Crimea and elsewhere and its dangerous behavior throughout the region, France decided to suspend delivery of the Mistral-class warships to the Russian Federation;

Whereas purchase of the two Mistral-class warships by North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries would expand NATO's capabilities, resolve France's legitimate concern over the cost of the ships, and eliminate a potential threat to countries in Eastern Europe;

Whereas the Russian Federation invaded the Republic of Georgia in August 2008, continues to station military forces in the regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and is implementing measures intended to progressively integrate these regions into the Russian Federation, including by signing a "treaty" between Georgia's Abkhazia Region and the Russian Federation on November 24, 2014;

Whereas the Russian Federation continues to subject the Republic of Georgia to political and military intimidation, economic coercion, and other forms of aggression in an effort to establish its control of the country and to prevent Georgia from establishing closer relations with the European Union and the United States;

Whereas the Russian Federation continues to station military forces in the

Transnistria region of Moldova in violation of the express will of the Government of Moldova and of its Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) commitments;

Whereas the Russian Federation continues to provide support to the illegal separatist regime in the Transnistria region of Moldova;

Whereas the Russian Federation continues to subject Moldova to political and military intimidation, economic coercion, and other forms of aggression in an effort to establish its control of the country and to prevent efforts by Moldova to establish closer relations with the European Union and the United States;

Whereas the Russian Federation acceded to the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty obligation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in a declaration issued at Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, in October 1992;

Whereas under the terms of the INF Treaty, a flight-test or deployment of any INF-banned weapon delivery vehicle by the Russian Federation constitutes a militarily significant violation of the INF Treaty;

Whereas on April 2, 2014, the Commander, U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Breedlove, stated that, "A weapon capability that violates the INF, that is introduced into the greater European land mass is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with. . . I would not judge how the alliance will choose to react, but I would say they will have to consider what to do about it. . . It can't go unanswered.";

Whereas on July 29, 2014, the United States Department of State released its report on the Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments, as required by Section 403 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, for calendar year 2013, which found that, "[t]he United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty not to possess, produce, or flight-test a ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) with a range capability of 500 km to 5,500 km, or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles";

Whereas concerns also exist with respect to a new Russian ballistic missile, the RS-26, which, according to reports, has been tested on multiple occasions at intermediate ranges, and in different configurations, which would be covered by the interpretative statements the United States Senate relied upon when it ratified the INF Treaty in May 1988;

Whereas the Russian Federation has requested the approval of new sensors and new aircraft to be flown over the United States and Europe as part of the Treaty on Open Skies, and serious concerns have been raised regarding impacts to United States national security if such approval is given;

Whereas on November 11, 2014, the Commander, U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Breedlove, stated that, Russian forces "capable of being nuclear" are being moved to the Crimea Peninsula;

Whereas according to reports, the Government of the Russian Federation has repeatedly engaged in the infiltration of, and attacks on, computer networks of the United States Government, as well as individuals

and private entities, for the purpose of illicitly acquiring information and disrupting operations, including by supporting Russian individuals and entities engaged in these actions;

Whereas the political, military, and economic aggression against Ukraine and other countries by the Russian Federation underscores the enduring importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as the cornerstone of collective Euro-Atlantic defense;

Whereas the United States reaffirms its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, especially Article 5 which states that “an armed attack against one or more” of the treaty signatories “shall be considered an attack against them all”;

Whereas the Russian Federation is continuing to use its supply of energy as a means of political and economic coercion against Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, and other European countries;

Whereas the United States strongly supports energy diversification initiatives in Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, and other European countries to reduce the ability of the Russian Federation to use its supply of energy for political and economic coercion, including the development of domestic sources of energy, increased efficiency, and substituting Russian energy resources with imports from other countries;

Whereas the Russian Federation continues to conduct an aggressive propaganda effort in Ukraine in which false information is used to subvert the authority of the legitimate national government, undermine stability, promote ethnic dissension, and incite violence;

Whereas the Russian Federation has expanded the presence of its state-sponsored media in national languages across central and western Europe with the intent of using news and information to distort public opinion and obscure Russian political and economic influence in Europe;

Whereas expanded efforts by United States international broadcasting across all media in the Russian and Ukrainian languages are needed to counter Russian propaganda and to provide the people of Ukraine and the surrounding regions with access to credible and balanced information;

Whereas the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), incorporated continue to represent a minority market share in Ukraine and other regional states with significant ethno-linguistic Russian populations who increasingly obtain their local and international news from Russian state-sponsored media outlets;

Whereas the United States International Programming to Ukraine and Neighboring Regions Act of 2014 (PL 113-96) requires the Voice of America and RFE/RL, Incorporated to provide programming content to target populations in Ukraine and Moldova 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, including at least 8 weekly hours of total original video and television content and 14 weekly hours of total audio content while expanding cooperation with local media outlets and deploying greater content through multimedia platforms and mobile devices; and

Whereas Vladimir Putin has established an increasingly authoritarian regime in the Russian Federation through fraudulent elections, the persecution and jailing of political opponents, the elimination of independent media, the seizure of key sectors of the economy and enabling supporters to enrich themselves through widespread corruption, and implementing a strident propaganda cam-

paign to justify Russian aggression against other countries and repression in Russia, among other actions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) strongly supports the efforts by President Poroshenko and the people of Ukraine to establish a lasting peace in their country that includes the full withdrawal of Russian forces from the territory of Ukraine, full control of Ukraine’s international borders, the disarming of separatist and paramilitary forces in eastern Ukraine, the adoption of policies to reduce the ability of the Russian Federation to use energy exports and trade barriers as weapons to apply economic and political pressure, and an end to interference by the Russian Federation in the internal affairs of Ukraine;

(2) affirms the right of Ukraine, Georgia, Moldova, and all countries to exercise their sovereign rights within their internationally recognized borders free from outside intervention, and to conduct their foreign policy in accordance with their determination of the best interests of their peoples;

(3) condemns the continuing political, economic, and military aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova and the continuing violation of their sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity;

(4) states that the military intervention by the Russian Federation in Ukraine—

(A) is in breach of its obligations under the United Nations Charter;

(B) is in clear violation of each of the 10 principles of the 1975 Helsinki Accords;

(C) is in violation of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances in which it pledged to respect the independence, sovereignty, and existing borders of Ukraine and to refrain from the threat of the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of Ukraine; and

(D) poses a threat to international peace and security;

(5) calls on the Russian Federation to reverse its illegal annexation of Crimea, to end its support of the separatist forces in Crimea, and to remove its military forces from that region other than those operating in strict accordance with its 1997 agreement on the Status and Conditions of the Black Sea Fleet Stationing on the Territory of Ukraine;

(6) calls on the President to cooperate with United States allies and partners in Europe and other countries around the world to refuse to recognize any *de jure* or *de facto* sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, its airspace, or its territorial waters;

(7) calls on the Russian Federation to remove its military forces and military equipment from the territory of Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova, and to end its political, military, and economic support of separatist forces;

(8) calls on the Russian Federation and the separatist forces it supports and controls in Ukraine to end their violations of the ceasefire announced in Minsk on September 5, 2014;

(9) calls on the President to cooperate with United States allies and partners in Europe and other countries around the world to impose visa bans, targeted asset freezes, sectoral sanctions, and other measures on the Russian Federation and its leadership with the goal of compelling it to end its violation of Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity, to remove its military forces and equipment from Ukrainian territory, and to

end its support of separatist and paramilitary forces;

(10) calls on the President to provide the Government of Ukraine with lethal and non-lethal defense articles, services, and training required to effectively defend its territory and sovereignty;

(11) calls on the President to provide the Government of Ukraine with appropriate intelligence and other relevant information in a timely manner to assist the Government of Ukraine to defend its territory and sovereignty;

(12) calls on North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies and United States partners in Europe and other nations around the world to suspend all military cooperation with Russia, including prohibiting the sale to the Russian Government of lethal and non-lethal military equipment;

(13) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, especially Article 5, and calls on all Alliance member states to provide their full share of the resources needed to ensure their collective defense;

(14) urges the President, in consultation with Congress, to conduct a review of the force posture, readiness, and responsibilities of United States Armed Forces and the forces of other members of NATO to determine if the contributions and actions of each are sufficient to meet the obligations of collective self-defense under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and to specify the measures needed to remedy any deficiencies;

(15) welcomes the decision of France to indefinitely suspend the delivery of the Mistral-class warships to the Russian Federation and urges the United States, France, NATO, and other partners to engage in consultations and consider all alternative acquisition options for such warships which would not include transfer of the ships to the Russian Federation;

(16) urges the President to publicly hold the Russian Federation accountable for violations of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and to take action to bring the Russian Federation back into compliance with the Treaty;

(17) urges the President to work with Asian, European, and other allies to develop a comprehensive strategy to ensure the Russian Federation is not able to gain any benefit by its development of military systems that violate the INF Treaty;

(18) believes the emplacement by the Russian Federation of its nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory would constitute a provocative and destabilizing move;

(19) calls on Ukraine and other countries to support energy diversification initiatives to reduce the ability of the Russian Federation to use its energy exports as a means of applying political or economic pressure, including by promoting energy efficiency and reverse natural gas flows from Western Europe, and calls on the United States to promote increased natural gas exports and energy efficiency;

(20) calls on the President and the United States Department of State to develop a strategy for multilateral coordination to produce or otherwise procure and distribute news and information in the Russian language to countries with significant Russian-speaking populations which maximizes the use of existing platforms for content delivery such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), Incorporated, leverages indigenous public-private partnerships for content production, and

seeks in-kind contributions from regional state governments;

(21) calls on the United States Department of State to identify positions at key diplomatic posts in Europe to evaluate the political, economic, and cultural influence of Russia and Russian state-sponsored media and to coordinate with host governments on appropriate responses;

(22) calls on the Russian Federation to cease its support for the Assad regime in Syria;

(23) calls on the President to publicly and privately demand the Russian Federation cease its destabilizing behavior at every opportunity and in every engagement between the United States and its officials and the Russian Federation and its officials;

(24) calls upon the Russian Federation to seek a mutually beneficial relationship with the United States that is based on respect for the independence and sovereignty of all countries and their right to freely determine their future, including their relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries; and

(25) calls for the reestablishment of a close and cooperative relationship between the people of the United States and the Russian people based on the shared pursuit of democracy, human rights, and peace among all nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 758 and commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for his work in bringing this important measure to the floor tonight. I also commend the work of our great chairman, Chairman ROYCE, and our fabulous ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), for their work on this critical issue.

As this resolution documents, Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Putin has repeatedly demonstrated that he is a threat not just to our friends and allies, but to international peace and stability. From Ukraine, Moldova, and the Republic of Georgia, to arms control violations and support for the Assad regime in Syria, Putin's continuing military, economic, and political aggression against Ukraine and others is on full display. Of course, his most dramatic action was the forcible occupation and annexation of Crimea earlier this year.

Today, as we consider this resolution, Russian forces are operating on Ukrainian soil supporting separatists that they have heavily armed. The apparent intent of the Russian-backed separatists is to carve out an area that Russia will be able to permanently dominate. This is not what the people of Ukraine want.

Already, thousands of Ukrainians have died in the fighting, and hundreds of thousands have been made refugees, with many more suffering severe deprivation. The destruction of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 demonstrated the threat to civilians in this conflict, but many more have been killed in the months since; yet these tragedies go mostly unnoticed in the West.

Ukraine is not asking the U.S. to defend it against Russia, but instead to provide it with the means with which it can defend its people and its sovereignty, but the administration has refused to do so, instead, restricting U.S. assistance to small amounts of nonlethal goods and equipment.

As Ukraine's President said when he addressed us in Congress in September, one cannot win a war with blankets. Ukraine is clearly in need of urgent military assistance. The administration must act quickly to equip it with the means not just to clothe its soldiers, but to stop tanks as well.

The assault on Ukraine isn't being carried out by military means alone. Putin has also attempted to use economic coercion on Ukraine. He has used Russia's supply of energy to Ukraine and to other countries, including many in the European Union, as a political weapon, shutting off deliveries in the middle of winter.

The United States and our friends and allies in Europe and around the world are taking action to ensure that he and his regime pay a heavy price for this aggression. By imposing sanctions on key sectors, especially financial institutions and the oil sector, we have put enormous pressure on the Russian economy, which its officials openly admit.

More needs to be done, Mr. Speaker. We must also counter Russia's ability to use energy as a weapon. The U.S. can play an important role in this effort simply by removing the unilateral restrictions we have imposed on our export of natural gas.

Finally, we must work with our allies in NATO to enhance the security of the Baltic States and other countries of the alliance that are menaced by Russian aggression. A perceived weakness could lead to miscalculation on Moscow's part with incalculable consequences. No one should doubt our commitment to NATO.

Through these and other measures, Mr. Speaker, we can demonstrate to Putin and the world that we will do what is necessary to protect Ukraine and other countries that are threat-

ened by his imperial ambitions and ensure that they can live in peace and security.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H. Res. 758.

Mr. Speaker, after the cold war, we all hoped that Russia would emerge as a modern power, governed by democratic norms, the rule of law, and respect for human rights. Regrettably, things didn't turn out that way. It is time to recognize the fact that Russia, under the leadership of Vladimir Putin, is a threat to European security and to U.S. interests in the region.

We must be clear that our concerns are not directed toward the Russian people. In fact, as Putin tightens his grip, his own citizens are among those suffering the most. Basic freedoms are under attack. The media has become a mouthpiece for Putin and his cronies, and as Russia continues its aggression in Ukraine, international sanctions are hitting home, dragging down Russia's economy.

Nevertheless, we have high hopes for those inside Russia who seek an alternative, who want a brighter future for their country and for their children, so this resolution encourages the establishment of close and cooperative ties between the people of the United States and the people of Russia.

It pains me that Putin has effectively destroyed democracy in Russia. We must let the Russian people know that we stand by them against this tyrant. We need to keep supporting those in Russia who are struggling against tough odds to keep the media and civil space open, to share ideas that originate beyond the Kremlin's walls, to shine a light on the corruption in Moscow and the misinformation on the airwaves.

I think this resolution sends an important message, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for taking the lead on this important issue, but I also think we should be doing more, and I am pleased to be working with Chairman ROYCE on new legislation to support Ukraine and further penalize Russia for its continued trampling of Ukrainian sovereignty.

I am also pleased that this resolution lays out Congress' strong opposition to France's sale of two Mistral warships to Russia, a key priority of mine over the last several months. We should all thank France for indefinitely suspending transfer of the ship to Russia, but I think we can go even further, with NATO buying or leasing the ships.

I believe that this would be a win-win-win: a win for NATO, which would acquire these powerful ships; a win for France, whose legitimate financial interests would be addressed; and a win

for the countries in Eastern Europe, which would be further threatened if Russia, indeed, had these vessels.

Among those countries under Moscow's pressure are Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia, where Russia continues to stoke separatism. There was a vote recently in Moldova which rejected Putin and his nonsense, and I was happy to see it.

In the Baltic States and elsewhere, Russian propaganda fills the airwaves, spreading deceptions about the West. Across Eastern Europe, millions wait with apprehension to see what Putin will do next. They have good reason. We know that he is willing to flout international law and trample his neighbors' sovereignty, so better to stand up to a bully now than to try to reverse his future gains.

When Putin talks about going into Crimea to protect ethnic Russians, it sounds to me a very lot like Hitler in 1938 who said he was going into Czechoslovakia to the Sudetenland to protect ethnic Germans.

During the cold war, the United States stared down the Soviet Union at the height of its power and refused to blink. We sided with those behind the Iron Curtain who stood up for their universal rights.

Today, those rights are once again under threat; so, my colleagues, let's pass this resolution, and let's keep working to meet the challenge of Russia's growing aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the author of this important measure.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for yielding the time. Thanks to the committee and the leadership for bringing this very important issue forward.

Russia's continuing political, military, and economic aggression against Ukraine, as well as Georgia and Moldova, must be addressed; in short, this aggression will not stand. Mankind everywhere has a responsibility to stand up for territorial integrity and sovereignty in Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova.

U.S. and European sanctions, to date, have unfortunately not caused Russia to change course. It is imperative that this body continues to pressure Russia and remain focused on exposing their illegal actions.

Mr. Putin would love nothing more than the world to simply not take notice or not have the political will to directly push back against his illegal annexation of Crimea. In fact, there is some who would promote a policy of appeasement for political, business, or other purposes against Russia.

That approach is woefully short-sighted and naive and underestimates what Mr. Putin's regime is capable of throughout Eastern Europe and now, unfortunately, the Middle East.

The U.S., Europe, and our allies must aggressively keep the pressure on Mr. Putin to encourage him to change his behavior. Sadly, Mr. Putin will only respond to raw power, and we must remain unified in our opposition to the annexation of Crimea and continued efforts to destabilize eastern Ukraine. We must be willing to change Mr. Putin's calculation to make it far too costly for him to continue down this path.

My constituents in Illinois have been shocked by Russia's military aggression into Ukraine, and over the past year, they have been afraid that we are moving into a second cold war. I agree with my constituents and believe Putin has alienated all the Western countries he ostensibly was trying to woo by the Sochi Olympics and is on the path to reigniting a second cold war.

Moreover, Putin has enraged the world by denying Russia's involvement in the death of 200 civilian passengers on a commercial Malaysian airplane from Holland to Malaysia in the spring of 2014.

□ 1815

Russia, sending arms and rockets to the Russian-aligned forces in Ukraine, was the match that lit the fire for this heinous act.

On another note, I have had the opportunity to visit the country of Georgia on several occasions over the past few years and have been impressed with its people and their political aspirations. I have personally witnessed Russian troops in Georgia, where they continue to occupy Abkhazia and South Ossetia. In the same way Crimea should be returned to Ukraine, Russia should immediately withdraw its troops from Georgia.

The recent "treaty" between Georgia's Abkhazia region and the Russian Federation is a farce. Abkhazia and South Ossetia remain integral parts of Georgia and deserve to be part of an independent, sovereign Georgia.

It is long past time to stand up to Mr. Putin and his wars of opportunities in Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine, and I would urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Lastly, I would be remiss if I did not thank Chairman ROYCE for his strong leadership on this and many other issues that have come before the Foreign Affairs Committee this past Congress. It has been an absolute pleasure to serve on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The past 2 years have been an extremely tumultuous time for the world. I am extremely proud of this committee's work to directly confront the problems quickly and with clear, unified voice.

While I can't thank everyone, I would like to specifically thank the following staff for their tremendous diligence and hard work: Tom Sheehy, Edward Burrier, Doug Seay, Elizabeth Heng, and, out of my personal office, Michael Essington. You have been wonderful to work with on this committee, and I am sure you will continue the hard work in the next Congress as we confront a world that is severely lacking in global American leadership.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Let me express my appreciation to the author of this bill, Mr. KINZINGER, and to the managers on the bill, as well as, in particular, to thank the ranking member, the chairman, and, of course, the manager today. Thank you for your leadership.

I associate myself with Congressman ENGEL's remarks about leaving a space for affirmation of the Russian people but to make it very clear that we condemn the actions of Mr. Putin. Maybe calling him that is even too polite.

Remember the days of Gorbachev when we understood that there was an open Russia, there was a Russia who was committed to working for world peace, standing on their own principles and values and history, not denying their strength, but yet working collaboratively in a civilized way. What happened to that Russia? What happened to the Russia that was supposed to be shown to the world during the Olympics? What happened to the Russia that believed in its great history and was prepared to stand alongside of all world leaders to make a better place?

The taking over, the dominance, the literal invasion of Crimea was intolerable and an unacceptable action by a nation that calls itself "standing civilized with other nations." The horrific tragedy of Malaysian Airlines and what many of us viewed around the world as we watched bodies being unattended and thugs not allowing persons to come and see to those bodies, how long they languished in those fields.

So I think it is important to ask the question of Mr. Putin: What has happened to the Russia that we have known?

I would say that this resolution condemns the actions of the government and the leadership of the government, but not the Russian people. I look forward to legislation coming forward that we all will debate on how we interact with the Russian people and provide the freedom of press and the freedom of speech and the opportunities for them.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude my remarks, I would be remiss not to be able to acknowledge Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, who has an excellent bill on the floor,

H. Res. 714, but to be able to say to him, I consider him a great American and a representative of his community and his region and all that he has done to turn our attention to south China, east China, and the Asian Pacific region. We are grateful for what he has done and grateful for his service. I thank him very much and wish for the continued support of his legislation and his service to this country.

Let me also say that I support S. 2673, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act, and look forward to its passage.

Again, in conclusion, I hope that this legislation, the underlying legislation, is a statement on behalf of America, of what we mean and what we stand for.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR, who has been a leader in Ukraine freedom and other issues involving Eastern Europe.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and colleague, the ranking member, Congressman ELIOT ENGEL of New York, for yielding me this time, and also wish to thank the chair, LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, obviously Chairman ROYCE, Congressman KINZINGER, all those who have brought this important resolution to the floor, and I rise in support.

Let me just say that the actions of Russia have truly disappointed any liberty-loving person that exists on the face of the Earth. I think this resolution further undergirds the high regard this Nation places on the value of liberty, and liberty for all; its provisions that deal with increasing sanctions and with added efforts in the energy security arena for Ukraine are extraordinarily important; the focus on additional communications; defensive equipment for the military of Ukraine to defend the interests of that country; and, importantly, cooperation with NATO nations and nonallied NATO nations to develop the kind of international cooperative effort that truly can yield a better Central and Eastern Europe in the decades ahead.

I want to commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle. This is a bipartisan effort, what the American people are asking us for, aspiring to the highest values that we hold as a nation, and that is liberty for all, liberty for those who live in places where individuals have not had the opportunity to fully flourish because of the totalitarian and repressive regimes that make normal life impossible.

I would urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I thank the leadership for bringing this up in the closing hours of this Congress.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida and also Mr. KINZINGER, the sponsor for this fine resolution.

In 1 minute I have one very simple thing to say. It is time that we recognize who we are dealing with here. I know that it is easy and it is fun to talk about diplomacy and diplomatic talk and pretend that Mr. Putin is this democratic leader who has democratic aspirations, but as this resolution clearly states, facts just do not bear that out.

So I thank the sponsor, and I thank the chairwoman for bringing to the floor the truth of what Europe is threatened with and the world is threatened with. Mr. Putin, that regime, is a regime of a thug for thugs, and he must be treated that way.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me again stress the importance of this resolution. It is strong and it is comprehensive. It says what needs to be said, namely, that the United States stands firmly with Ukraine as it faces Russia's aggression, period, plain and simple, and it condemns that aggression in unambiguous terms.

But this resolution also keeps the door open to improved U.S.-Russian relations should Mr. Putin cease his aggression against Ukraine and observe the rules and norms that undergird the international order.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. It is very important. It is very timely. It is important that we act now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank our esteemed chairman, Mr. ROYCE of California, as well as Mr. KINZINGER, the author of this resolution, for bringing forth this timely resolution before us.

By approving this resolution, Mr. Speaker, the House will send Vladimir Putin a clear and unmistakable message, one aimed not only at him, but at all of those in other countries who are tempted to use aggression and invasion to achieve their objectives.

There is more at stake here than simply defending Ukraine's independence and sovereignty, although that is our primary goal. The message is that the United States will not simply stand by and silently watch the world ascend into anarchy nor allow aggressors to accomplish their goals by force and coercion.

By demonstrating to Putin that his aggressive actions will only result in unacceptable costs to him and his regime, we can prevent others from concluding that we and our allies will do nothing to stop them and that they are free to impose the law of the jungle once again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 758 as amended, which condemns Russian aggression against her neighbors. In the past year, we have seen Russia's determination to exert influence over neighboring sovereign states such as Ukraine. Ever since November 2013, when the Ukrainian people gathered peacefully in Maidan Square to protest against a corrupt, Russian-backed government, the Ukrainian people have come under siege by separatist forces supported and armed by Russia. It is clear to all of us that in spite of the ceasefire, Russia has never intended to honor the terms of the agreement and has continued to undermine any genuine effort to stabilize Ukraine.

Here in the United States, we must fully understand that such acts of aggression undermine peace and security—not just for Ukraine, but for all of Europe and the international community. At this critical juncture when normalcy seems unattainable, the United States must stand with the Ukrainian people and support their own desire to build a free and democratic country, free from Russia's interference—in complete freedom to determine Ukraine's own course of history.

We and our NATO allies have taken important steps in support of Ukraine. We are collectively providing \$100 million in military assistance and have increased military cooperation. We have imposed economic sanctions that force Russia pay a heavy price for its aggression. The international community has spoken with one voice—if Russia chooses aggression, there are clear consequences to its expansionist agenda.

But there is much more that needs to be done. I urge my colleagues to continue their support of the Ukrainian people by passing additional legislation that provides for military and humanitarian assistance. The Ukrainian people have demonstrated time and again their will to defend their nation against a more powerful aggressor—with no expectation that anyone would come to their aid. Now, we need to do our part and give them the chance to stand up for the same values and principles that define us as a nation.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 758 as amended. President Vladimir Putin seems to have learned nothing from history other than that power grows out of the barrel of a gun. The Russian Federation under President Putin has demonstrated an ethos of naked aggression that threatens the principle of nation-state sovereignty and the territorial integrity of Russia's neighbors.

When Russian troops were identified as fomenting unrest in Crimea in February of this year, President Putin adamantly denied Russian involvement. By April, Russia had illegally annexed Crimea, and Putin had come clean about the blatant Russian intrusion.

He admitted that Russian troops had been deployed to Crimea before the illegal annexation on March 21, and exposed the illegitimate referendum on independence in Crimea for what it was, a referendum held at the end of the barrel of a gun. As Ukrainians in Crimea flee their Russian occupiers, I cannot help but feel the reverberations of Crimea's bloody history.

What we are witnessing in eastern Ukraine constitutes one of the most audacious power

grabs of the 21st century, and it is happening in Europe no less.

I recently participated in a bipartisan delegation to the Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. I can attest that our NATO allies are under no illusions about Mr. Putin and they see him for what he is, a bully who will only be encouraged by concession.

The 28 nations represented at the NATO PA adopted strong language calling on NATO member countries to “make it unambiguously clear that the illegal ‘annexation’ of Crimea will never be recognized.”

The leadership of the NATO PA has rotated to the United States, and my colleague, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, has been elected President of the parliamentary body. The world is looking to the United States to reverse the dangerous precedent that has been set in Crimea.

To that end, I am pleased to see that H. Res. 758 includes language that echoes bipartisan legislation I introduced earlier this year with my colleague Rep. STEVE CHABOT, the Crimea Annexation Non-Recognition Act, H.R. 5241.

Today’s resolution calls on the President to cooperate with United States allies and partners in Europe and other countries around the world to refuse to recognize any *de jure* or *de facto* sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, its airspace, or its territorial waters.

Some of my colleagues may recall that in the Cold War era, the U.S. had a policy of non-recognition regarding the Soviet Union’s illegal annexation of the Baltic Republics. The U.S. recognized neither the *de jure* nor *de facto* sovereignty of the Soviet Union over the Baltic Republics.

Our policy of non-recognition did not end in 1991 because it had become outdated or failed to recognize a *fait accompli*. It ended because the Baltic people gained their independence in 1991 almost 50 years after the Soviet occupation began, and today, Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia are NATO allies.

Without a clear stance on the issue of Crimea, the West becomes unwittingly complicit in Putin’s further aggression in eastern Ukraine and offers little hope to Ukrainians leaving Crimea that they will ever have the opportunity to return home.

For the United States to allow this naked aggression to go unaddressed would be truly an abrogation of our moral responsibility and would turn our back on what we should have learned from 20th century history.

Congress must make a stand, and I, for one, am stuck at Crimea.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 758, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this motion will be postponed.

REAFFIRMING THE PEACEFUL RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES IN THE SOUTH CHINA AND THE EAST CHINA SEAS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 714) reaffirming the peaceful and collaborative resolution of maritime and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea and the East China Sea as provided for by universally recognized principles of international law, and reaffirming the strong support of the United States Government for freedom of navigation and other internationally lawful uses of sea and airspace in the Asia-Pacific region, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 714

Whereas the maritime domains of the Asia-Pacific region, which include both the sea and airspace above the domains, are critical to the region’s prosperity, stability, and security, including global commerce;

Whereas the maritime domain in the Asia-Pacific region between the Pacific and Indian Oceans includes critical sea lines of commerce and communication;

Whereas China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Taiwan, Malaysia, and Brunei have disputed territorial claims over the Spratly Islands, and China, Taiwan, and Vietnam have disputed territorial claims over the Paracel Islands;

Whereas, although the United States Government is not a claimant in maritime disputes in either the East China or South China Seas, the United States has an interest in the peaceful diplomatic resolution of disputed claims in accordance with international law, in freedom of navigation and overflight, and in the free-flow of commerce free of coercion, intimidation, or the use of force;

Whereas in 2002, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and China agreed to the Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea, and committed to developing an effective Code of Conduct;

Whereas that declaration committed all parties to those territorial disputes to “reaffirm their respect for and commitment to the freedom of navigation in and over flight above the South China Sea as provided for by the universally recognized principles of international law”, and to “resolve their territorial and jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, without resorting to the threat or use of force”;

Whereas since that time, tensions over the disputed maritime and territorial areas have increased;

Whereas on September 2010, tensions escalated in the East China Sea near the Senkaku (Diaoyutai) Islands, a territory under the legal administration of Japan, when a Chinese fishing vessel deliberately rammed Japanese Coast Guard patrol boats;

Whereas on February 25, 2011, a frigate from the People’s Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) fired shots at three fishing boats from the Philippines;

Whereas on March 2, 2011, the Government of the Philippines reported that two patrol boats from China attempted to ram one of its surveillance ships;

Whereas on May 26, 2011, a maritime security vessel from China cut the cables of an exploration ship from Vietnam, the Binh Minh, in the South China Sea in waters near Cam Ranh Bay in the exclusive economic zone of Vietnam;

Whereas on May 31, 2011, three Chinese military vessels used guns to threaten the crews of four Vietnamese fishing boats while they were fishing in the waters of the Spratly Islands;

Whereas on June 9, 2011, three vessels from China, including one fishing vessel and two maritime security vessels, ran into and disabled the cables of another exploration ship from Vietnam, the Viking 2, in the exclusive economic zone of Vietnam;

Whereas on July 22, 2011, an Indian naval vessel, sailing about 45 nautical miles off the coast of Vietnam, was warned by a Chinese naval vessel that it was allegedly violating Chinese territorial waters;

Whereas in April 2012, tensions escalated between the Philippines and China following a standoff over the Scarborough Shoal;

Whereas in June 2012, Vietnam passed a Maritime law that claimed sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Paracel and Spratly Islands;

Whereas in June 2012, China’s cabinet, the State Council, approved the establishment of the city of Sansha to oversee the areas claimed by China in the South China Sea;

Whereas in July 2012, Chinese military authorities announced that they had established a corresponding People’s Liberation Army garrison in Sansha, in the new prefecture;

Whereas on June 23, 2012, the China National Offshore Oil Corporation invited bids for oil exploration in areas within 200 nautical miles of the continental shelf and within the exclusive economic zone of Vietnam;

Whereas in January 2013, a Chinese naval ship allegedly fixed its weapons-targeting radar on Japanese vessels in the vicinity of the Senkaku islands in the East China Sea, and, on April 23, 2013, eight Chinese marine surveillance ships entered the 12-nautical-mile territorial zone off the Senkaku Islands, further escalating regional tensions;

Whereas on May 9, 2013, a fatal shooting incident occurred in which shots fired from a Philippine Coast Guard patrol boat resulted in the death of a Taiwanese fisherman;

Whereas on May 1, 2014, China’s state-owned energy company, CNOOC, anchored its deepwater drilling rig Hai Yang Shi You 981 (HD-981) in Vietnamese waters and deployed over 80 vessels, including seven military vessels, to support its provocative actions and attempt to change the status quo by force;

Whereas Chinese vessels accompanying Hai Yang Shi You 981 (HD-981) intimidated Vietnamese Coast Guard ships in violation of the Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, ramming multiple Vietnamese vessels, and using helicopters and water cannons to obstruct others;

Whereas on May 5, 2014, vessels from the Maritime Safety Administration of China (MSAC) established an exclusion zone with a radius of three nautical miles around Hai Yang Shi You 981 (HD-981);

Whereas China’s actions in support of the Hai Yang Shi You 981 (HD-981) drilling activity constitute a unilateral attempt to change the status quo by force;

Whereas claimants have participated in land reclamation and building up of land features, and whereas such activities have raised tensions among the claimants;

Whereas, without prior consultations with the United States, Japan, the Republic of Korea or other nations of the Asia-Pacific region, China declared an Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ) over the East China Sea on November 23, 2013;

Whereas China announced that all aircraft, even if they do not intend to enter the ADIZ airspace, would have to submit flight plans, maintain radio contact, and follow directions from the Chinese Ministry of National Defense;

Whereas the “rules of engagement” declared by China, which at one time included the threat of “emergency defensive measures”, are in violation of the concept of “due regard for the safety of civil aviation” under the Chicago Convention of the International Civil Aviation Organization and thereby are a departure from accepted practice;

Whereas China’s declaration of an ADIZ over the East China Sea has contributed to increased uncertainty and unsafe conditions in the maritime region in East Asia and the broader Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas freedom of navigation and other lawful uses of sea and airspace in the Asia-Pacific region are embodied in international law, not granted by certain states to others;

Whereas the United States Government expressed profound concerns with China’s unilateral, provocative, dangerous, and destabilizing declaration of such a zone, including the potential for misunderstandings and miscalculations by aircraft operating lawfully in international airspace;

Whereas China’s declaration of an ADIZ in the East China Sea will not alter how the United States Government conducts operations in the region or the unwavering United States commitment to peace, security and stability in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas other governments in the Asia-Pacific region, including the Governments of Japan, Korea, Philippines, Australia and Indonesia have expressed deep concern about China’s declaration of such a zone, regarding it as an effort to unduly infringe upon the freedom of flight in international airspace and to change the status quo that could escalate tensions and potentially cause unintentional consequences in the East China Sea;

Whereas the United States Government does not support unilateral actions taken by any claimant seeking to change the status quo through the use of coercion, intimidation, or military force;

Whereas the United States Government is deeply concerned about unilateral actions taken by any state to prevent any other state from exercising its sovereign rights to the resources of the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) and continental shelf by making claims to those areas that have no apparent basis in international law; declarations of administrative and military districts in contested areas in the South and East China Seas; and the imposition of new fishing regulations covering disputed areas, which have raised tensions in the region;

Whereas international law is important to safeguard the rights and freedoms of all states in the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas China and Vietnam have undertaken discussions to reduce tensions between their navies;

Whereas in November 2014, the United States and China signed a non-binding memorandum of understanding (MOU) on “rules of behavior for safety of air and maritime encounters”;

Whereas the MOU currently addresses only maritime behaviors and both sides have agreed to complete an additional annex on air-to-air encounters in 2015;

Whereas the United States welcomes the agreement by Japan and China, in advance of their bilateral meeting in November 2014, to reduce tensions over disputed islands in the East China Sea and to “gradually resume political, diplomatic and security dialogues”; and

Whereas a peaceful and prosperous China, which acts as a responsible international stakeholder and which respects international laws, standards, and institutions, will enhance security and peace in the Asia-Pacific region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms the strong support of the United States for the peaceful resolution of maritime territorial disputes in the South China Sea and the East China Sea and pledges continued efforts to facilitate a collaborative, peaceful process to resolve these disputes;

(2) reaffirms the strong support for freedom of navigation and over flight and condemns coercive and threatening actions or the use of force to impede these freedoms in international maritime domains and airspace by military or civilian vessels, to alter the status quo or to destabilize the Asia-Pacific region;

(3) does not recognize the East China Sea Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ) declared by China, which is contrary to freedom of overflight in international airspace, and calls on China to refrain from taking similar provocative actions elsewhere in the Asia-Pacific region, including in the South China Sea;

(4) urges the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), all United States allies and partners, and all claimants to amicably and fairly resolve these outstanding disputes, including through the conclusion of a Code of Conduct for the South China Sea;

(5) urges the conclusion of the annex to the non-binding memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the United States and China on “rules of behavior for safety of air and maritime encounters” addressing air-to-air encounters in 2015;

(6) supports the continuation of operations by the United States to support freedom of navigation in international waters and air space in the South China Sea and the East China Sea; and

(7) encourages the continuation of efforts by the United States Government to strengthen partnerships in the region to build capacity for maritime domain awareness in support of freedom of navigation, maintenance of peace and stability, and respect for universally recognized principles of international law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 714.

I would like to recognize the gentleman from American Samoa, our good friend, ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, for introducing this important measure, and I was proud to have joined him as the lead cosponsor.

I would like to commend and thank Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA for his nearly four decades of service in the United States Congress and to our Foreign Affairs Committee, which will soon come to an end, sadly, and we will all miss him dearly.

Throughout his career, ENI has fought for human rights and for the rule of law, especially in the Asia-Pacific region, and the idea that all people should have the opportunity to prosper without fear for their family’s safety or livelihoods. This resolution that he presents before us is a fitting representation of the ideals and goals that ENI has worked so hard in support of during his many years in Congress.

This resolution encourages a peaceful reconciliation of the maritime and jurisdictional disputes in the South and East China Seas, as well as the kind of peace that is too often lacking in our world today. This resolution is also an important statement in support of the universally recognized principle of the freedom of navigation.

Mr. Speaker, peace in Asia has held for over a generation, and we have seen incredible economic growth. Home to a vast combination of global sea routes and shipping lanes, substantial energy resources, and significant fishing territories, the importance of maintaining peace in the South China Sea and the East China Sea cannot be overstated.

□ 1830

According to estimates, the South China Sea contains oil reserves of 900 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, making the area second only to Saudi Arabia in regard to oil supply. With Asian energy consumption set to double by the year 2030, the conflicting claims in this region will likely grow more intense.

Beyond the region’s vast energy resources, peace in the South China Sea is essential for international commerce. Each year, \$5.3 trillion in trade passes through the South China Sea, over \$1 trillion of which can be attributed to the United States. But the fragile stability that has held in Asia is now being threatened by China’s hegemonic ambitions and its aggressive stance towards its neighbors. From its declaration of an Air Defense Identification Zone to its ramming of other

nation's fishing boats to its economic coercion of U.S. allies like Taiwan, China has rapidly raised tensions in the region.

China is pushing the limits on the high seas, motivated by potent nationalist trends and the resources at stake. China's territorial stakes are a clear challenge to its neighbors and must not be allowed to go unchallenged. This resolution rightfully states that China's declaration has contributed to increased uncertainty and unsafe conditions in East Asia.

Additionally, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA's resolution calls for freedom of navigation, which is a bedrock principle of international commerce that dates back centuries, helping to ensure the continued flow of global trade.

Mr. Speaker, given the importance of this region, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA's resolution, which puts the House on record supporting a peaceful process to resolve these disputes.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 714. Let me start by thanking my colleague from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for authorizing this resolution. I also thank him for his many years of distinguished service here in Congress. This is especially moving for me because ENI and I were both elected to Congress on the same day and started to serve that first day. We were elected in November of 1988, and we both served starting January 3, 1989. As the jargon is here in Washington, we are classmates. We sat next to each other on the Foreign Affairs Committee for all those years and had a good chance to travel together and have our families get to know each other, especially our wives. It really has been a pleasure to be a friend and a colleague of Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. We are going to miss him, but I know he will grace our presence and come back and visit.

So this is really a tribute. This is an important resolution. It is important for its substance, but it is also important because I look at it as a tribute to ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, my colleague, my friend, a really great human being, great American, and great person representing American Samoa for so many years. Thank you, ENI.

As both the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific throughout the years, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA was focused on U.S. policy involving the Asia-Pacific region. He was focused on this policy long before anyone decided we need a "pivot" or "rebalance" to the region. ENI always knew—and knows—that Asia is important, and that the United States, as a Pacific power, has a vital role to play.

The measure we are considering today reaffirms our strong support for a peaceful resolution to disputes in the South China Sea and East China Sea. It calls on all parties to reduce tensions, manage disputes peacefully, and adhere to international law. It encourages our own government to keep working with allies and partners, helping expand their ability to keep an eye on their own maritime domains.

The United States, as I mentioned before, is a Pacific power. We have a vital interest in freedom of navigation and overflight in these disputed areas, which are vital to economic security and lawful commerce in the region. These are universal rights, not rights granted by some states to others and not rights that China thinks it can dominate and be aggressive in terms of claiming the seas as its own, even though many of those seas are literally thousands of miles away from mainland China.

Tensions in the East and South China Sea have been steadily increasing for the last several years. Provocations have become bolder and more frequent, and little progress has been made on a code of conduct in the South China Sea to establish rules of the road among claimants.

When I went there more than a year ago with Chairman ROYCE, we were told by the government of the Philippines and Japan that they were very, very concerned with what China has been doing and claiming. The United States does not take sides in these disputes. We believe that they should be resolved diplomatically and without force or coercion. Territorial claims—and arbitration of those claims—should be based on international law.

There have been some hopeful signs. Japan and Taiwan have worked out an agreement relating to fishing rights. China and Vietnam have began discussions on how to reduce tensions between their respective navies. In advance of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit, called APEC, and bilateral meetings, Japan and China decided to "agree to disagree" on the issue of the Senkaku Islands. They are now looking for other ways to expand their diplomatic, political, and security ties, despite their differences.

In addition, the President announced during his recent visit to Beijing that the United States and China agreed to a range of maritime confidence-building measures. We will continue working to expand this cooperation into airspace next year.

These developments are positive and should continue in earnest, but they are not enough. H. Res. 714 urges all parties to stay focused on this progress and to continue working for a peaceful resolution of maritime disputes in areas that are vitally important to the continued economic development, peace, and security of the Asia-Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure and honor to yield 5 minutes to the Representative from American Samoa, Mr. ENI FALEOMAVAEGA.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to especially thank my good friend from New York and the gentlewoman from Florida for their leadership and their support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 714, a resolution I introduced calling for the peaceful and collaborative resolution of maritime territorial disputes in the South China Sea and the East China Sea.

I thank my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, who have stood with me since 2012 on this issue. I want to especially thank again Chairwoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and Chairman STEVE CHABOT for their leadership and support. I also thank Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for their support and help.

I am so serious about this matter that I have introduced this language as a resolution, as a bill, and now again as a resolution in hopes that the House will take a stand in response to China's aggressive actions in the South China Sea and the East China Sea.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to China, I consider myself a fair broker, but it is time for China to stop provoking its neighbors and pursue a course of peace. This is the last resolution I have introduced that the House will consider, and I am proud that this resolution calls for peace in the Asia-Pacific region.

Also, as a matter of observation, Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of the world's population is in the Asia-Pacific region. For years, I have always had a little sense of complaint that it seems that our focus has always been toward Europe and the Middle East. Not that they are not important, but the fact is that issues coming out of the Asia-Pacific region should be given our proper attention.

I have served on the House Foreign Affairs Committee since I first came to the U.S. Congress in 1989. For as long as I have served, it has always been, and continues to be, my belief that the United States should pay more attention to the Asia-Pacific region. As of now, we should pay particular attention to the ongoing tensions in the South China Sea.

Also, although the United States Government is not a claimant in maritime disputes in either the East China Sea or the South China Sea, the United States has an interest in the peaceful diplomatic resolution of disputed claims in accordance with international law; in freedom of navigation and overflight; and in the free flow of

commerce that is free of coercion, intimidation, or the use of force.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of Vietnam in standing for peace—even when China violated its sovereignty by planting its oil rig, HD-981, in the waters of Vietnam's Exclusive Economic Zone. I also commend Taiwan and Japan for peacefully reaching an agreement to jointly share fishing resources in their overlapping Exclusive Economic Zones through the East China Sea Initiative, which demonstrates that resolutions can be achieved through peaceful means.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we should earnestly seek ways to promote peace, and I thank you for the opportunity I have had to associate with you and our colleagues to carry out our responsibilities in this great Nation.

It has been my distinct honor to serve the people of American Samoa in the U.S. House of Representatives for the past 25 years. I thank them for giving me the opportunity to serve them and this great Nation. I believe I did my best, and I hope I will be remembered for giving all I could to American Samoa and to our great Nation, especially to the Asia-Pacific region, a region that has been too long neglected by our national government.

To borrow the words of Mahatma Gandhi:

I hope my life will be my message.

Mr. Speaker, we will meet again, hopefully, and I extend to each of my colleagues my fondest aloha.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam, Representative MADELEINE BORDALLO.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H. Res. 714, authored by my very good friend, Representative ENI FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa. This resolution reaffirms the United States' interest in a peaceful and collaborative resolution of maritime and jurisdictional disputes in the South and East China Seas.

Disputes over islands in the South and East China Seas have broad economic and security implications to United States interests in the Asia-Pacific region. Escalation of these disputes undercut peace and stability in the region and seriously impact economies across the globe.

I strongly believe that the United States must take a leadership role in these disputes and work with our Asian allies to support a peaceful and collaborative resolution to these issues. The resolution takes a step in the right direction. We cannot accept unilateral action by any of the countries involved in these disputes, as it further degrades security in the region. Here is a clear example of Congress supporting the United States' role in the rebalance of the Asia-Pacific region.

In particular, we cannot allow recent aggressive actions by China to go unchecked. So I urge all parties, like Secretary Clinton did in 2012, to push toward finalizing a code of conduct that would establish a mechanism to resolve these differences. I believe that it is important for all parties to come to a resolution over these disputes and not allow them to fester any longer.

□ 1845

These disputes should no longer be used as weapons to bolster nationalism helping to secure domestic power.

We must do all that we can to ensure continued peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region, and I am glad that the House of Representatives is acting on this important measure to send a clear message to China and our allies in the region.

I want to close by saying that I am a close friend of Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA. I am from Guam, he represents American Samoa, islands in the Pacific area. I want to thank him for his leadership on this issue and his long and dedicated service in the House of Representatives. I understand not just as an elected Member, but as a staffer as well, serving here over 40 years, as well as all the other issues in the Asia-Pacific region that he has looked after.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly, again, urge my colleagues to pass H. Res. 714.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to close now. In closing, I would like to underscore the importance and timeliness of this resolution. It is imperative that disagreements in the East or South China Seas be resolved peacefully, without force or coercion, and in accordance with international law.

Anything less than this jeopardizes the interests of the United States, of our allies and partners, and the continued economic development, peace, and security of the Asia-Pacific region.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important resolution, H. Res. 714.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and certainly want to thank him for his most eloquent statements towards me. I feel a little embarrassed by it, but I do want to thank him.

I do want to note, also, that it has been my honor to have served with him and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle very well, on affairs affecting our national interests, our government.

The gentlelady from Florida will note that I have a relative who happens to live in her district. His name happens to be Dwayne Johnson, and if you

haven't seen his latest movie, "Hercules," I suggest to my colleagues that you should see the movie "Hercules" and see what Samoans are like.

I do want to thank the gentleman again for yielding.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman, and I want to just say, I think we all have relatives that live in ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN's district. And if we don't, we want to go to her district in the wintertime.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. And I would like to point out that Dwayne Johnson, The Rock, is a University of Miami Hurricanes alum. It is not bragging if it is true. But thank you.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, I have noticed, we all have noticed a worrying trend in Asia. What we are seeing is that Asia's collective attention is gradually shifting away from economic prosperity to security concerns.

Where nations used to focus on trade and commerce, there is increasing discussion of nationalism, of military budgets, and even provocative behavior. There is no better example than the territorial disputes that Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA points out in his resolution in the South China and East China Sea.

We need to work against this shift toward nationalism and promote a peaceful resolution to these disputes. This resolution by Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA encourages just that. I urge my colleagues to support it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our good friend and colleague Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA for his lifetime of service. And I know that I am speaking for our esteemed chairman, Mr. ROYCE, and all of the Members when we say, thank you, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for your service to our country during the Vietnam war.

Thank you for the service in the cause of peace in the decades that followed that conflict during his distinguished career here in the people's House. We are a better institution for you having served here, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 714, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution reaffirming the strong support of the United States Government for the peaceful and collaborative resolution

of maritime and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea and the East China Sea as provided for by universally recognized principles of international law, and reaffirming the vital interest of the United States in freedom of navigation and other internationally lawful uses of sea and airspace in the Asia-Pacific region.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2014

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2673) to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2673

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The people and the Governments of the United States and of Israel share a deep and unbreakable bond, forged by over 60 years of shared interests and shared values.

(2) Today, the people and Governments of the United States and of Israel are facing a dynamic and rapidly changing security environment in the Middle East and North Africa, necessitating deeper cooperation on a range of defense, security, and intelligence matters.

(3) From Gaza, Hamas continues to deny Israel’s right to exist and persists in firing rockets indiscriminately at population centers in Israel.

(4) Hezbollah—with support from Iran—continues to stockpile rockets and may be seeking to exploit the tragic and volatile security situation within Syria.

(5) The Government of Iran continues to pose a grave threat to the region and the world at large with its reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons.

(6) Given these challenges, it is imperative that the United States continues to deepen cooperation with allies like Israel in pursuit of shared policy objectives.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to reaffirm the unwavering support of the people and the Government of the United States for the security of Israel as a Jewish state;

(2) to reaffirm the principles and objectives enshrined in the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-150) and ensure its implementation to the fullest extent;

(3) to reaffirm the importance of the 2007 United States-Israel Memorandum of Understanding on United States assistance to Israel and the semi-annual Strategic Dialogue between the United States and Israel;

(4) to pursue every opportunity to deepen cooperation with Israel on a range of critical issues including defense, homeland security, energy, and cybersecurity;

(5) to continue to provide Israel with robust security assistance, including for the

procurement of the Iron Dome Missile Defense System; and

(6) to support the Government of Israel in its ongoing efforts to reach a negotiated political settlement with the Palestinian people that results in two states living side-by-side in peace and security.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ISRAEL AS A MAJOR STRATEGIC PARTNER.

It is the sense of Congress that Israel is a major strategic partner of the United States.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF WAR RESERVES STOCKPILE AUTHORITY.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005.—Section 12001(d) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-287; 118 Stat. 1011) is amended by striking “more than 10 years after” and inserting “more than 11 years after”.

(b) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 514(b)(2)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “and 2014” and inserting “, 2014, and 2015”.

SEC. 6. ELIGIBILITY OF ISRAEL FOR THE STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION EXCEPTION TO CERTAIN EXPORT CONTROL LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that Israel—

(1) has adopted high standards in the field of export controls;

(2) has declared its unilateral adherence to the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Australia Group, and the Nuclear Suppliers Group; and

(3) is a party to—

(A) the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, signed at Geneva October 10, 1980;

(B) the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925; and

(C) the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on October 26, 1979.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR STRATEGIC TRADE AUTHORIZATION EXCEPTION.—The President, consistent with the commitments of the United States under international arrangements, shall take steps so that Israel may be included in the list of countries eligible for the strategic trade authorization exception under section 740.20(c)(1) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, to the requirement for a license for the export, reexport, or in-country transfer of an item subject to controls under the Export Administration Regulations.

SEC. 7. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ON ENERGY, WATER, HOMELAND SECURITY, AGRICULTURE, AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized, subject to existing law—

(1) to undertake activities in cooperation with Israel; and

(2) to provide assistance promoting cooperation in the fields of energy, water, agriculture, and alternative fuel technologies.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out subsection (a), the President is authorized, subject to existing requirements of law and any applicable agreements or understandings between the United States and Israel—

(1) to share and exchange with Israel research, technology, intelligence, information, equipment, and personnel, including through sales, leases, or exchanges in kind, that the President determines will advance

the national security interests of the United States and are consistent with the Strategic Dialogue and pertinent provisions of law; and

(2) to enhance scientific cooperation between Israel and the United States.

(c) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PILOT PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Director of the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized, subject to existing law, to enter into cooperative research pilot programs with Israel to enhance Israel’s capabilities in—

(1) border, maritime, and aviation security;

(2) explosives detection; and

(3) emergency services.

SEC. 8. REPORT ON INCREASED UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION ON CYBERSECURITY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report, in a classified format or including a classified annex, as appropriate, on the feasibility and advisability of expanding United States-Israeli cooperation on cyber issues, including sharing and advancing technologies related to the prevention of cybercrimes.

SEC. 9. STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING THE VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.

It shall be the policy of the United States to include Israel in the list of countries that participate in the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187) when Israel satisfies, and as long as Israel continues to satisfy, the requirements for inclusion in such program specified in such section.

SEC. 10. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 4 OF THE UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENHANCED SECURITY COOPERATION ACT OF 2012.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall, to the extent practicable and in an appropriate manner, provide an update to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on current and future efforts undertaken by the President to fulfill the objectives of section 4 of the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act (22 U.S.C. 8603).

SEC. 11. IMPROVED REPORTING ON ENHANCING ISRAEL’S QUALITATIVE MILITARY EDGE AND SECURITY POSTURE.

(a) BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT REEVALUATIONS.—Section 201(c) of the Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2008 (22 U.S.C. 2776 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) BIENNIAL UPDATES.—Two years after the date on which each quadrennial report is transmitted to Congress, the President shall—

“(A) reevaluate the assessment required under subsection (a); and

“(B) inform and consult with the appropriate congressional committees on the results of the reevaluation conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A).”.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.—Section 36(h) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(h)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DETERMINATION FOR MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.—A

determination under paragraph (1) relating to the sale or export of major defense equipment shall include—

“(A) a detailed explanation of Israel’s capacity to address the improved capabilities provided by such sale or export;

“(B) a detailed evaluation of—

“(i) how such sale or export alters the strategic and tactical balance in the region, including relative capabilities; and

“(ii) Israel’s capacity to respond to the improved regional capabilities provided by such sale or export;

“(C) an identification of any specific new capacity, capabilities, or training that Israel may require to address the regional or country-specific capabilities provided by such sale or export; and

“(D) a description of any additional United States security assurances to Israel made, or requested to be made, in connection with, or as a result of, such sale or export.”.

SEC. 12. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY CO-OPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 917(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”;

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “possible many” and inserting “possible—

“(A) many”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “and

“(B) significant contributions to the development of renewable energy and energy efficiency through the established programs of the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking “renewable” and inserting “covered”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) United States-Israel energy cooperation and the development of natural resources by Israel are in the strategic interest of the United States;

“(9) Israel is a strategic partner of the United States in water technology;

“(10) the United States can play a role in assisting Israel with regional safety and security issues;

“(11) the National Science Foundation of the United States, to the extent consistent with the National Science Foundation’s mission, should collaborate with the Israel Science Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation;

“(12) the United States and Israel should strive to develop more robust academic cooperation in—

“(A) energy innovation technology and engineering;

“(B) water science;

“(C) technology transfer; and

“(D) analysis of emerging geopolitical implications, crises and threats from foreign natural resource and energy acquisitions, and the development of domestic resources as a response;

“(13) the United States supports the goals of the Alternative Fuels Administration of Israel with respect to expanding the use of alternative fuels;

“(14) the United States strongly urges open dialogue and continued mechanisms for reg-

ular engagement and encourages further cooperation between applicable departments, agencies, ministries, institutions of higher education, and the private sector of the United States and Israel on energy security issues, including—

“(A) identifying policy priorities associated with the development of natural resources of Israel;

“(B) discussing and sharing best practices to secure cyber energy infrastructure and other energy security matters;

“(C) leveraging natural gas to positively impact regional stability;

“(D) issues relating to the energy-water nexus, including improving energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, water treatment in gas and oil production processes, and other water treatment refiners;

“(E) technical and environmental management of deep-water exploration and production;

“(F) emergency response and coastal protection and restoration;

“(G) academic outreach and engagement;

“(H) private sector and business development engagement;

“(I) regulatory consultations;

“(J) leveraging alternative transportation fuels and technologies; and

“(K) any other areas determined appropriate by the United States and Israel;

“(15) the United States—

“(A) acknowledges the achievements and importance of the Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation; and

“(B) supports continued multiyear funding to ensure the continuity of the programs of the foundations specified in subparagraph (A); and

“(16) the United States and Israel have a shared interest in addressing immediate, near-term, and long-term energy, energy poverty, energy independence, and environmental challenges facing the United States and Israel, respectively.”.

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 917(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “renewable energy or energy efficiency” and inserting “covered energy”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) natural gas energy, including conventional and unconventional natural gas technologies and other associated technologies, and natural gas projects conducted by or in conjunction with the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation and the United States-Israel Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation; and

“(I) improvement of energy efficiency and the overall performance of water technologies through research and development in water desalination, wastewater treatment and reclamation, and other water treatment refiners.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “energy efficiency or renewable” and inserting “covered”.

(c) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS; REGIONAL ENERGY COOPERATION.—

(1) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 917 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17337) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (d);

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e);

(C) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations, may enter into cooperative agreements supporting and enhancing dialogue and planning involving international partnerships between the Department, including National Laboratories of the Department, and the Government of Israel and its ministries, offices, and institutions.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary may not pay more than 50 percent of Federal share of the costs of implementing cooperative agreements entered into pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—If the Secretary enters into agreements authorized by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that describes—

“(A) actions taken to implement such agreements; and

“(B) any projects undertaken pursuant to such agreements.

“(d) UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ENERGY CENTER.—The Secretary may establish a joint United States-Israel Energy Center in the United States leveraging the experience, knowledge, and expertise of institutions of higher education and entities in the private sector, among others, in offshore energy development to further dialogue and collaboration to develop more robust academic cooperation in energy innovation technology and engineering, water science, technology transfer, and analysis of emerging geopolitical implications, crises and threats from foreign natural resource and energy acquisitions, and the development of domestic resources as a response.”; and

(D) in subsection (e), as redesignated, by striking “the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “September 30, 2024”.

(2) CONSTRUCTIVE REGIONAL ENERGY CO-OPERATION.—The Secretary of State shall continue the ongoing diplomacy efforts of the Secretary of State in—

(A) engaging and supporting the energy security of Israel; and

(B) promoting constructive regional energy cooperation in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to

include extraneous material on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a long time coming, but I am so pleased that we finally have an opportunity to send to the President's desk the bill before us, the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act.

I authored the original bill, alongside my Florida colleague, my good friend Mr. DEUTCH, and together we introduced it in the House almost 2 years ago. Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and their staffs were immensely supportive in pushing this bill through, and we ultimately passed the House version, H.R. 938, in this body in March, with an overwhelming vote of 410-1.

I want to thank our colleagues in the other Chamber, Senator BOXER and Senator BLUNT, for introducing the companion bill in the Senate.

Today is, indeed, a significant day in the history of the United States-Israel relationship. Our bill takes the already strong bond between our two countries and makes it even stronger.

In the aftermath of this summer's Gaza conflict, in which we saw Hamas fire thousands of rockets indiscriminately into innocent Israeli civilian populations, and with the alarming rise in terror attacks in Jerusalem these past few weeks, well, Mr. Speaker, now is precisely the time for us to make this bill a law.

Our bill is as important strategically as it is symbolically. It shows the world how deeply America values its bilateral relationship with Israel, affording the democratic Jewish state the unique label of major strategic partner of the United States.

At a time when many around the world seek to test our resolve and our commitment to our friend and ally, passing this bill will reaffirm an unwavering commitment to Israel, to its right to defend herself and her citizens, and redoubles our efforts to ensure that Israel always maintains a qualitative military edge over its enemies.

Israel has many enemies, like Hamas. Hamas is, no doubt, planning its next assault against our ally.

Hezbollah, another enemy which may be preoccupied right now in Syria, certainly has not forgotten its desire to wipe out Israel, especially not when its patron, the Iranian regime, continues to incite violence against Israel and calls for its very destruction.

Iran's Supreme Leader, while he is telling his people to continue to string along the P5+1 countries in the nuclear negotiations under the ruse of wanting to reach an agreement, is calling for all

Palestinians in the West Bank to take up arms against Israel.

And while the administration continues to extend and negotiate a very weak and dangerous Iran nuclear deal, it is important that we in the United States Congress send a signal to Khamenei and Rouhani and all the mullahs in Iran that the United States Congress will not undermine our ally, Israel, for a regime that cannot be trusted and is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism.

This bill will do that, Mr. Speaker. It will do that and much more, and I am so honored to have led the charge, with Mr. ROYCE, with Mr. ENGEL, with Mr. DEUTCH, in getting this bill to the President's desk. I look forward to it finally becoming law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2673, the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act, and I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, the chair of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee, and Mr. DEUTCH, the ranking member of that subcommittee, for authoring the House version of this legislation, which passed by a vote of 410-1 on March 5 of this year.

I will have to figure out who that one is.

They have worked tirelessly, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. DEUTCH, with their Senate counterparts, Senators BOXER and BLUNT, to send this bill to the President.

This legislation would reaffirm our support for the U.S.-Israel relationship at a time of unprecedented threats.

In the north, Israel sees Syria engulfed in a civil war that has killed upwards of 200,000 people. The extremists who have filled the vacuum of leadership, like the al-Qaeda-affiliated al-Nusra front, are sitting right on Israel's border. They even kidnapped U.N. peacekeepers tasked with keeping that border calm.

From Jordan, typically a quiet ally, we have seen some ugly rhetoric over the past few weeks. After terrorists seized a synagogue and slaughtered rabbis in their place of worship, the Jordanian Parliament praised the so-called martyrs who perpetrated this heinous attack.

This summer's war against Hamas and Gaza left the Israeli public acutely aware of their own vulnerabilities. For years, Israelis on border towns have said that they have heard digging underneath their feet, scratches and vibrations that kept them up at night.

It turns out they were right. Hamas was digging tunnels in order to kidnap Israeli civilians and soldiers, or perpetrate large-scale terrorist attacks in some of Israel's largest cities.

I stood with Chairman ROYCE in one of those tunnels just a couple of

months ago. We were also with Mr. ROHRBACHER, and we looked at those tunnels. It was just amazing. They were solidly-constructed and well-engineered.

I couldn't help but wonder what Gaza would look like today if Hamas had put those resources into building schools or hospitals or a modern infrastructure for the Palestinian people. But they didn't. They, instead, made them terror tunnels. What a waste.

Hamas is now a legitimate political actor. It uses violence to gain power. It sees no value in human life, neither its Israeli victims nor its Palestinian human shields. And we did pass a resolution earlier this year condemning Hamas' use of innocent civilians as human shields.

And, of course, Israel faces the existential threat of Iran and its illicit nuclear weapons program. Even as talks continue between the P5+1 and Iran, Tehran continues to support international terrorism that targets Jews in Israel and other parts of the world.

Israel is a bright light, Mr. Speaker, in a very, very dark region, the only democracy in the Middle East, and a valued ally of the United States. That is why we are considering this bill to strengthen our relationship with the state and the people of Israel, and to send a clear and unmistakable message to Israel's foes, and that message is: America stands with Israel.

Specifically, this bill would build on our robust defense cooperation. It would ramp up U.S.-Israel collaboration on cybersecurity, expand U.S.-Israel energy cooperation, and reaffirm our commitment to Israel's QME, or qualitative military edge.

This legislation names Israel as a major strategic partner, demonstrating that our relationship is not transactional, it is not assistance-based. Our relationship is based on shared cultural, societal, and historical ties, and is clearly ingrained in the values we hold dear. It is mutually beneficial and serves the strategic interests of both countries.

Again, in my trip to Israel with Chairman ROYCE and Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. GREGORY MEEKS, we understood why America stands with Israel.

So, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is very important. It is very important that we do this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. NITA LOWEY, who is the ranking member of the Appropriations subcommittee which deals with all of these important issues.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to thank all of the authors of this bill for your important work, and I appreciate your bringing these issues once again to the attention of my colleagues and to all of those who are watching us this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act.

During a period of tremendous turmoil in the Middle East, the passage of this important legislation sends a strong signal to our steadfast ally that the United States Congress remains fully committed to its security.

This bill, which I cosponsored, supports greater U.S.-Israeli cooperation on a number of fronts, including energy, cybersecurity, homeland security, and agriculture. It also extends the authorization for U.S. weapons to be stored in Israel in case they are needed by either of our countries to respond to an emergency.

Additionally, this bill provides for the greater congressional oversight of Israel's qualitative military edge over its neighbors, a status that remains absolutely critical to Israel's ongoing security needs. Lastly, this bill encourages Israel's inclusion in the Visa Waiver Program and supports a greater engagement with Israel on meeting the program's requirements.

I remain committed to making it easier for young Israelis to travel to the United States. As I have said before, our visa policies should reflect the unbreakable bond between our nations and people.

Supporting Israel, our strongest ally and the only democracy in the region, remains a vital component of protecting U.S. national security interests.

As ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, I will continue to fight to provide Israel with the resources it requires to secure its borders and protect its citizens.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. TED DEUTCH, one of the authors of this bill.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today, the House is taking up the Senate version of the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act, a bill that passed this Chamber in March with a vote of 410-1. Our vote today will send this important piece of legislation to the President's desk.

I am particularly grateful for the efforts of my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, notably those by Chairman ED ROYCE; by ranking member and my friend, ELIOT ENGEL, for helping to ensure this legislation's passage; by the Senate sponsors, Senator BOXER and Senator BLUNT; and by my friend, chairman,

and stalwart champion of the U.S.-Israel relationship, chairman emeritus ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

I would also like to offer a special thanks as well to Casey Kustin, in my office; to Eddy Acevedo; and to the entire committee staff, including Matt Zweig and Mira Resnick, who worked so hard to bring this bill to the floor at this moment.

This critical bill enhances the broad cooperation between the United States and Israel on a wide spectrum of issues, and it reflects the simple truth that our bilateral relationship spans not only shared security interests but shared values.

This bill was crafted with particular consideration of the heightened security situation faced by Israel today. This summer's Operation Protective Edge reminds us just how vital and strong U.S. support for Israel can be as the Iron Dome missile defense system saved tens of thousands of lives by taking down hundreds of Hamas rockets aimed at civilians and as the U.S. was able to quickly assist Israel in the resupply of defense articles, so that it could defend its citizens from brutal terror attacks.

The United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act also highlights Israel's significant contributions to the areas of water, irrigation, agriculture, and energy issues by expanding collaborative research efforts. It recognizes that the United States is strengthened by these joint efforts with Israel to tackle shared problems and to advance shared interests.

Through dire security threats and unimaginable hostility from the outside actors, the State of Israel has managed to thrive as an open and free democratic society, and it has prospered into a global leader in research and development in countless fields.

This bill, the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act, sends a clear and a bipartisan message to our ally Israel and to the rest of the world that the U.S.-Israel relationship runs wide and deep, that our commitment to the lasting safety and security of Israel is and always will be unbreakable, and that our work together not only in security but in agriculture, cybersecurity, water, and energy advances the interests of our Nation, as well as those of our great ally.

I urge my colleagues to support the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that I am very proud to help send this bill to the President's desk. This is really significant and important.

The United States stands with Israel during these challenging times, and deepening our ties with Israel will only help strengthen our mutually beneficial relationship. Let me say that

again, "mutually beneficial relationship."

It benefits both countries to have the kind of relationship that we have with Israel. It benefits both countries because we have shared values and care about democracy. It benefits both countries because we share intelligence and do so many things together as closest allies.

This is a very important piece of legislation, and I urge everyone to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is in our national security interests of the United States to strengthen our relationship with our strongest ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Our two nations share more than just a strategic partnership—we share the same values; we share the same ideals. The United States and Israel are both freedom-loving and democratic nations that serve as a model of how free and open societies can work and can thrive, but it is also our belief in these ideals that has made us a target by those who seek to oppress their people and impose strict laws that govern their everyday lives and restrict their freedom of expression and their freedom of religion.

The citizens of the United States and of Israel speak openly, and we live honestly, but our enemies hate everything that we stand for, and they will stop at nothing to harm or destroy our way of life.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is so important that we continue to strengthen our relationship with Israel and support its right to defend itself and its citizens, and that is exactly what we will be doing when we pass this bill.

I would like to say to my Florida colleague, Mr. DEUTCH, that it has been a joy to have joined him in our recent trip to Israel, and I have greatly enjoyed our Florida road trip as we speak around our great State about the strength and the vitality of the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2673, the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act. I'd like to note that the groundwork for this legislation was laid when the House-passed H.R. 938 by a vote of 410-1 in March. I would like to recognize the Gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and the Gentleman from Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, for their leadership in authoring that important measure. With passage of this legislation today, this bill now goes to the President's desk for his signature.

I also want to thank the Ranking Member of the Committee, the Gentleman from New York, Mr. ENGEL, for his assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor and for his long-standing support for the State of Israel. Over the past two years, Mr. ENGEL and I have had

the chance to travel twice to Israel together as Chair and Ranking Member, showing bipartisan support for the relationship.

We witnessed together the many factors that drive our relationship. Israel is a pluralistic democracy which includes the freedoms we cherish: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of association, freedom of the press, and government by the consent of the governed.

Our militaries hold combined exercises where they constantly learn from each other. A key collaboration here has been in missile defense. Jointly developed and produced by the U.S. and Israeli militaries, the Arrow defense system, Iron Dome, and David's Sling system—which is currently under development—will soon be combined to create the world's most sophisticated missile shields. And given the threats Israel faces, this is needed now more than ever. This summer, once again we saw how the Iron Dome helped save innocent Israeli lives, giving its leaders breathing room and preventing more bloodshed. Congress can be proud of its role in backing the Iron Dome.

But we must always be working to ensure that our support for Israel keeps pace with the threats proliferating against the country—from Iran to Hamas.

That is why today's legislation is important. Once signed into law, it will expedite the provision of critical security assistance to Israel by ushering in an expedited licensing regime and increasing the U.S. war reserves stockpile, for Israel to access, if needed. It will also require more frequent and detailed reporting on Israel's Qualitative Military edge—a provision which is the direct result of Mr. COLLINS' good efforts—so I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his contribution. Finally, the legislation will expand our cooperation with Israel on energy research and development.

I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my colleagues Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. DEUTCH who worked on the House version of this much-needed and timely bill.

This substantive bill expands our relationship with our closest ally by formally declaring Israel a "major strategic partner" of the U.S. It provides for increased cooperation in many spheres, including homeland security, cyber security, defense and intelligence, as well as water, energy, agriculture, and alternative fuels. This will send a signal to Israel's enemies that, despite their manipulative and dishonest global campaign against Israel, the U.S.-Israel relationship continues to deepen—as it should. It is right and good for both of our countries.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is largely a response to anti-Semitism—to militant, military and terrorist, and profoundly evil expressions of anti-Semitism. That's what poisons the hearts and minds of those who launch rockets at Israel and tunnel under its borders.

As we see on a sickeningly regular basis, many governments in the Middle East (and elsewhere) propagate anti-Semitic incitement as an official or quasi-official state ideology—the hate that still kills. They do this in order to distract people from their own authoritarian rule and human rights abuses. This constant

incitement is a major factor in the security situation in the Middle East. In February of last year I chaired a hearing at which we heard important testimony from Dr. Zuhdi Jasser on this subject. He made the point that it is not only Jews who suffer from this incitement, but that Muslims suffer too, as Middle-Eastern despots deploy anti-Semitism as one of their principal tools in the subjugation and impoverishment of entire Muslim peoples.

Mr. Speaker, this bill fights the evil effects of anti-Semitism. I urge my colleagues to support this outstanding bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support S. 2673, the U.S.-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014.

I rise to reiterate my support of our strategic ally, and the only true democracy in the Middle East, Israel.

I want to applaud my colleagues in the House and Senate for passing this legislation. It is vital that Israel and the U.S. continue to protect our shared values including our commitment to liberty, equality and religious freedom.

I am pleased to offer my support to the legislation that shares technology, prioritizes trade, exchanges information and intelligence and expands the Iron Dome.

Israel's security should be our first priority but this includes more than just weapons funding.

It requires joint-cooperation with the Israeli government and the Israeli people.

When Israel's national interests are protected, the United States' national security is enhanced.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited Israel almost a dozen times and each time I visit I am reminded of the challenges faced by Israelis every day.

The Israeli people face these challenges with confidence and self-assurance because they know they are an ally of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2673.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXECUTIVE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have got a heavy heart because I feel like, in just the short time you and I have been in this body, we have seen the same story play out more than once. You would like to think that we would all learn from our mistakes in this body.

In fact, I don't fault any of my colleagues who make mistakes. I am one of the folks who is guilty of having

made a mistake before, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to put you in that same box; but, yes, I have made a mistake before. The question isn't: "Do you make mistakes?" The question is: "What do you learn from your mistakes?"

As we go down this road of executive action, this conversation that the country is having today, I feel like we have been down this road before, and I want to try to connect a couple of those dots for folks tonight, Mr. Speaker.

You can't see what I have here, but it is something that is near and dear to your heart. It is article II, section 2, of the United States Constitution.

It says:

The President shall have the power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their session.

Now, you wonder why this is important. It is just one paragraph in a relatively lengthy and really meaty Constitution. The answer is because it defines the relationship between the article I, Congress, and the article II, White House.

It says, White House, if you want to make appointments to positions of great power, of great authority, in the United States Government, you must do so with the advice and consent of the United States Senate, that the Senate must confirm all of those individuals the President wishes to place in these positions of great power.

The President back in 2012, 2011, had some folks he wanted to appoint to positions of great responsibility. One of those was to the National Labor Relations Board. You will recall this, Mr. Speaker. The President made some nominations, and the Senate said, "No, this isn't going to fly."

Now, the President could have gone back and said: "Do you know what? If you don't like these nominees, this is an important job, it is an important responsibility, I am going to appoint some different nominees. I am going to put some different names out there. I am going to work with you to try to find some folks we can agree on as the Constitution requires."

It is not what the President did. In fact, there is a pattern of that not being what the President does.

What the President did instead of working with the Senate—what the President did instead of offering some different names—what the President did instead of trying to find common ground was he went to this article II, section 2, of the United States Constitution and said: "I have the power to fill these spots without anybody else's advice or counsel, without anybody else's consent, as long as I do it during recess."

He woke up one morning, and he declared the Senate in recess, and he

made these appointments. Now, that would be all well and good, Mr. Speaker, if the Senate had, in fact, been in recess, but the Senate was not in recess.

I have here on a chart, Mr. Speaker, a quote from Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID. It is November 16, 2007, when President Bush was still the President of the United States. He, too, wanted to make some nominations. The Senate then, as in 2012, disagreed with those nominations and didn't want to appoint those people.

Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID said this:

The Senate will be coming in for pro forma sessions during the Thanksgiving holiday to prevent recess appointments. My hope is that this will prompt the President to see that it is in our mutual interests for the nominations process to get back on track.

Hear that, Mr. Speaker? Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID said to then-President George Bush: "I don't like the folks you are trying to nominate. I disagree with you on those nominations, so I am going to keep the Senate in, in pro forma session, to prevent you from nominating those folks during a period of recess, to prevent you from using article II, section 2. I hope that will encourage you to come and work with us together to find folks who are mutually agreeable for these positions."

In November 2007, HARRY REID kept the Senate in session, these pro forma sessions, all through the Thanksgiving holiday.

□ 1915

I now bring you to December 19, 2007, later that same year. Again, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID said this: I could be a grinch. I could tell the President that I would not move any nominations, given his demand to make controversial recess appointments. But I am not going to do that tonight, Mr. President. I am not going to meet intransigence with intransigence. We will confirm those appointments this evening, and I will keep the Senate in pro forma session to block the President from doing an end run around the Senate and the Constitution with his other controversial nominees.

Hear that: Getting ready to head home for Christmas, Senator HARRY REID said to then-President George Bush: I will not let you do an end run around the Constitution by appointing individuals to these powerful positions across the government without the consent of the Senate. I will not let you do it, and I will prevent you from doing it by keeping the Senate in pro forma session during the holidays.

Pro forma session means you are in once every 3 days. That is how the law defines it. You come in once every 3 days. It doesn't count as a recess. HARRY REID knows this. It is the tool

that he uses to prevent then-President George Bush from doing, and I quote, an end run around the Senate and the Constitution.

I found it fairly persuasive, Mr. Speaker. In fact, President George Bush found it fairly persuasive. And this ended the argument because no President has a vested interest in making an end run around the Senate and the Constitution.

But President Obama didn't see things that same way. In January of 2012, faced with the exact same circumstances, Mr. Speaker, a Senate in pro forma session designed specifically to prevent recess appointments, the President woke up one morning in January and said: The Senate is, in fact, in recess. They say that they are not, but they are wrong. They, in fact, are. I am going to make four appointments today.

Now, you would think, having read what we read from Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID, that the Senate would have melted down with defenders of article I standing up and saying: Mr. President, we may agree with your politics, we may agree with your policy, but we disagree with this end run that you are making around the Senate and the United States Constitution.

It is what you would have expected. It is what you would have hoped for. But it is not what you got.

Senator TOM HARKIN, when asked about those appointments, said the President "acted responsibly" in making those appointments. He "acted responsibly."

This is the National Labor Relations Board we are talking about. So, of course, the AFL-CIO commented that President Richard Trumka said the President was "exercising his constitutional authority to ensure that crucially important agencies protecting workers and consumers are not shut down."

The Labor Secretary is one of those Members that had to be confirmed by the United States Senate. Then-Labor Secretary Hilda Solis said: "We can't afford to not move on very important issues that affect working class people." We cannot afford not to move. We cannot afford to allow the Constitution to get in the way of those things that we would like to do.

This isn't sour grapes from a Republican in the U.S. House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker. This case went to the Supreme Court. This case went to the Supreme Court. And on that Court, of course, sit two Obama appointees; two Clinton appointees sit there. Mr. Speaker, 2½ years later, 9-0 was the ruling from the Supreme Court that what the President did was patently unconstitutional. Unconstitutional.

Now, this isn't a surprise to anyone. You will remember the words of HARRY REID when he implemented these sessions to prevent recess appointments.

He said: I am not going to let the President do "an end run around the Constitution." The Constitution has these requirements. HARRY REID knew it. President Bush knew it. HARRY REID knew it again in 2012. President Obama knew it in 2012, and he did it anyway, as then-Labor Secretary Hilda Solis said: because we have important things that we need to do, and we can't let things get in the way.

Quoting from that 9-0 decision, Mr. Speaker, Justice Breyer wrote the majority opinion. He said: "The recess appointments clause is not designed to overcome serious institutional friction. Friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure."

That bears repeating, Mr. Speaker. The "clause is not designed to overcome serious institutional friction. Friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure."

I don't even know if that captures it, Mr. Speaker. It is not really an inevitable consequence. It is there by design. It is not an accident that we have this friction. It is there by design.

This isn't the ranting of a sour grapes conservative Republican. This is the unanimous decision of a Supreme Court that is as divided as any Court we have seen in my lifetime.

But they unanimously said: President Obama, your goals are not what we are litigating today. The process that you are using to achieve your goals is unconstitutional. Why? Because Congress got in your way. And instead of working with Congress, you went around Congress, and the law doesn't allow for that.

Sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? Sound familiar? It took 2½ years to litigate that case. It took 2½ years to get an answer from the Supreme Court. In those 2½ years, over 400 cases were decided by the National Labor Relations Board, now all invalidated by this Supreme Court decision, lives thrown into turmoil.

Not one Senator, not one Democratic Senator, not one Senator from the leadership spoke out to say: Mr. President, I may agree with your politics, I may agree with your policies, but the way you are getting them done is unconstitutional.

And every one of them knew it, just like the Supreme Court did, 9-0, when they ruled 2½ years later.

Now fast-forward to today, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about immigration. And we are not talking about good immigration policy, because that is what we talk about in the Judiciary Committee. We are not talking about immigration law in this country, because that is what is decided in the House and the Senate. What we are talking about is the President taking action on his own in an end run around the Senate, an end run around the

House, an end run around the Constitution and implementing immigration policy all by himself.

He was asked about that in a Univision town hall, Mr. Speaker. It was March of 2011, and the question that was put to the President was: "Mr. President, my question will be as follows: With an executive order, could you be able to stop deportations of the students?"

Fair question. Fair question. A lot of folks out there have this issue on their mind.

It was March of 2011, and this is what President Barack Obama said in answer to the question: Mr. President, can't you just stop deportations by executive order? The President said this: "With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations with executive order, that's just not the case because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed."

The President was right on that day in March.

"I can't just do this by executive order," he told the questioner, "because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed." He says: "Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. Then the judiciary has to interpret those laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President."

Those are not my words, Mr. Speaker. Those are President Barack Obama's words. "There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear"—very clear—"in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my responsibilities as President."

Now, that is powerful, Mr. Speaker; but that is not even the most interesting part of that response. He went on in that question and said this:

That doesn't mean that we can't make decisions to emphasize enforcement. It doesn't mean that we can't strongly advocate and propose legislation that would change the law in order to make it fair or more just and ultimately would help young people who are here trying to do the right thing and whose talents we want to embrace in order to succeed as a country. It doesn't mean that we can't work hard to change the law. It just means that I, as President, don't have the ability to do it by myself. The Constitution requires a team effort between Congress and the White House.

Mr. Speaker, this wasn't just a one-time thing. This wasn't just a quote

that I pulled out of thin air. I am not trying to mischaracterize the President's feelings.

November 2013, he is being heckled. He is giving a speech, and he is being heckled by protesters who want him to do more in terms of changing immigration law. You have just heard his last quote, where he said, I can't do this by myself. Congress has to lead in this area. He is being heckled; and he says this:

"What you need to know, when I'm speaking as President of the United States and I come to this community, is that if, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing laws in Congress, then I would do so."

That is what he says to the heckler. He said: Sir, what you need to know is, if I could, I would. If I could change these laws without Congress, I would. But the Constitution doesn't allow for it.

President Obama went on to say:

"We're also a nation of laws. That's part of our tradition. And so the easy way out is to try to yell and pretend like I can do something by violating our laws. And what I'm proposing is the harder path, which is to use our democratic processes to achieve the same goal that you want to achieve. But it won't be as easy as just shouting. It requires us lobbying and getting it done."

Wow, Mr. Speaker. He is being heckled for his position on immigration policy, and he says to the heckler: If I could do something about it, I would, but I can't because America's tradition is a tradition of laws. He says: It is not as easy as just one man deciding that he is going to ignore the law or change the law. What it takes is hard work, working with Congress, lobbying in Congress, working through legislation and changing the laws. It is not as easy as one man deciding he doesn't like the law, because our tradition is a tradition of law.

He goes on to that heckler, Mr. Speaker, and he says to him: If you are serious about making that happen—that change happen, changing the law—if you are serious about making that happen, then I am willing to work with you, but it is going to require work.

He says: It is not simply a matter of us just saying we are going to violate the law. That is not our tradition. The great thing about this country, President Obama said, is we have this wonderful process of democracy. And sometimes it is messy, and sometimes it is hard, but ultimately, justice and truth win out. That has always been the case in this country, and that is going to continue to be the case today.

Mr. Speaker, that was a year ago. That was a year ago that President Obama said to the heckler wanting him to do unilateral immigration action, he said it is not just a matter of us saying

we are going to violate the law. He said we have got this wonderful process, this crazy, crazy process called democracy, where we go to the House and we go to the Senate and we work to change the law. He says it is hard. He says it is a hard process. It is a messy process. But ultimately, truth and justice win out. And he is so right. He is so right.

Justice Breyer in that 9-0 decision, rebuking the President for violating the Constitution, said: "Friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure."

□ 1930

We have been down this road before.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a community of immigrants, a vibrant, wonderful, wonderful community of immigrants, folks who have stood in line and paid their money, folks who have relatives overseas who have been waiting in line 5 years, or 10 years, or 20 years, and I welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues to change the law to bring fairness and justice to them. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I have got folks in my district with big brains, big minds, strong work ethics, but the visas they are here under don't allow them to go to work.

The President has proposed offering 4 million new work permits to folks who have done it the wrong way. I have got folks in my district who have done it the right way, waiting in line without the ability to work.

Are there things on which we can agree? There absolutely are. But isn't the first of those things that the President cannot unilaterally change the law from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue? He knew that was true in 2012. He knew that was true in 2013. What has changed about our 250-year-old Constitution today that suddenly makes it okay? The silence in this town is deafening from folks who know the right way, who know the right way to pass a law, to change a law, to implement a law, and to enforce a law in the America that you and I love, the America that we inherited from patriots before us.

The President says it is sometimes messy and it is sometimes hard, but the great thing about this country is we have this wonderful process called democracy. Justice Breyer says, "Mr. President you might have forgotten a little bit about that democracy." And 9-0 the Supreme Court says the Constitution was thrown by the wayside in the President's zeal to implement his policies, in the President's zeal to do, as HARRY REID described it, an end run around the Senate, and the President's zeal to do, as Mr. REID described it, an end run around the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome a policy debate with the President. I welcome a partnership with the President to fix a

muddled immigration process that we have in this country today. We are a land of immigrants. We always have been, and we always will be. And I thrive on that. I celebrate that. But we are also a land of laws, a sentiment the President has acknowledged and celebrated in years past and a sentiment that just days after the last election the President threw out the window in the spirit of the ends justifying the means.

I don't think the American people are going to let that stand, Mr. Speaker. And I call on folks from the left and the right to be a part of that chorus of voices. We are not having a debate tonight. We are not having a debate tomorrow about policies of immigration reform. The discussion we are having is about process. The discussion we are having is about whether or not the Constitution matters. The discussion we are having is, who writes the laws? Does Congress craft the laws and the President signs them? Or does the President craft the laws and the President signs them?

"It is not simply a matter of our saying we are going to violate the law," the President said. "The easy way is to yell and scream and pretend that I can do something by violating our laws, but the better path is the harder path," the President says. "With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportation through executive order, that is just not the case because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed," the President says. "There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply through executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President," President Obama says.

Nine to zero in defense of the Constitution the last time the President decided he was going to go it alone, an end run around the Senate, as HARRY REID says, an end run around the Congress, as HARRY REID says. But it took 2½ years for the Supreme Court to sort that out.

I think America deserves better, I think those trying to immigrate to this country deserve better, I think those fighting for work back home deserve better, and perhaps worst, Mr. Speaker, I think the President knows better and has chosen the path he has chosen anyway. There is still time to turn back on that decision, Mr. Speaker.

There is still time to engage in that partnership, to engage in that messy, that hard, but that oh so rewarding process as the President has described it that is the Constitution-defined democracy that we live in today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

NO INDICTMENT IN ERIC GARNER'S CHOKE HOLD CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRAT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight, ladies and gentlemen, with a heavy heart because today we had a secret grand jury finding in New York that resulted in no charges against the police officer who killed an unarmed man named Eric Garner, a man whom they accused of trying to sell some cigarettes. That man was approached by law enforcement on the streets of New York, and when approached, he said that he had not done anything wrong. He held his hands up in the hands up, don't shoot position, and they took him down while his hands were up and applied a choke hold, an illegal choke hold, and applied it until the man took his last breath.

What did Eric Garner say 13 times before he died? What did he say 13 times before he died? He said, "I can't breathe. I can't breathe. I can't breathe." And he said that over and over again until he could not breathe. He took his last breath just like Michael Brown, accused of stealing some cigarettes—or cigars, excuse me—Michael Brown, accused of stealing some cigars, Eric Garner, accused of selling some cigarettes. I don't know when possession and/or sale of tobacco merited a death penalty in this country, but both of them, both of those cases involved tobacco products. Both of them involved men—Black men—with their hands up in the "don't shoot" position. Both of them were killed. Both cases were handled in a secret grand jury process. We don't know the names of the grand jurors, we don't know what went on in that grand jury room, although we do have the transcript in the Michael Brown case, and it shows that a lot of injustice was done in that grand jury room which resulted in an unjust no bill against the police officer involved in that case.

We don't know what happened in the New York case, but we got a result, a no bill against that police officer who was caught on tape just like in the Rodney King case, all caught on tape, Eric Garner caught on tape, the killing, but still no justice done. Cameras are not the sole answer, it appears. It runs deeper than a camera.

These are dark days, ladies and gentlemen, that we are living in today. The first African American President is treated like no other President has ever been treated before. Is this a symptom of the Obama backlash that is occurring in this country? Is there any connection between what we see happening in the streets of Ferguson and on the streets of New York, with what is going on with the dehumanization of the leader of the free world?

First they said he was not a resident, not a citizen of this country. Then they said he was a Communist, a socialist. They accused him of being weak and indecisive as a President and not really having the intellectual capacity to be the President. Now they are saying he was a Muslim. Now they are saying that he is an emperor, a king, disregarding the Constitution. Where are we in America when it comes to Black males and how we treat them and how they end up faring in life?

Is it our fault? Yes, we do have responsibility. We can always do better. But don't put your foot on my neck and tell me that it is my fault that your foot is on my neck. People are tired of seeing what is happening over and over again. A young, 12-year-old Black male with a BB gun at a park on the streets and a police car rolls up, a police officer gets out and immediately shoots the young man and kills him. Will that go to another secret grand jury process and have the same result as what we saw with Michael Brown and Eric Garner? It is happening throughout the streets of the Nation.

I tell you, I have been gratified by the protesters. I have seen protesters out there. It has been Black and White protesters out there demonstrating peacefully being met with a militarized response. And I say that to say this, that I am going to paraphrase something that you will probably be familiar with:

They first came for the gypsy, and I wasn't a gypsy, and I didn't say anything. Then they came for the Jews, and I was not a Jew, and so I didn't say anything. Then they came for the women, and I wasn't a woman, and I didn't say anything. Then they came for me, and there was nobody left to say anything.

Is that where we are headed in this country, ladies and gentlemen? Because there are all kinds of people out peacefully protesting, and that is what I advocate for, peaceful protests. Violence is not the way. Violence just produces more pain and agony. Violence is not the way. Nonviolence is the way that we must confront this because really, when you move past the fact that Black males are at the bottom of the totem pole, and we are the ones who bear the brunt, these who come to aid us are in the line of fire also.

□ 1945

What happens to one of us happens to all of us. If not you now, then what happens tomorrow when you come to my assistance? So we all are our brother's keeper.

Right now, we are operating under an economic philosophy in this country that only the strong survive. If you are weak, it is your fault, and I don't owe you anything. Don't ask me for nothing. You get yours. I got mine; you get yours. Don't worry about me. Don't ask me for nothing.

That is the economic attitude that we have that we are trying to preserve

and protect in this hallowed body here. It is called laissez-faire capitalism, and it is supported by the U.S. Supreme Court that has contorted itself in such ways so as to rule in ways that enable a corporation to become a person.

When we have a corporation having a right to free speech and having unlimited funds and unlimited duration and we have a corporation that has a right to religious freedom, so that it can dictate to its employees their religious beliefs—it doesn't even make sense for a corporation to have a religious belief, but that is what our Supreme Court has found—and every other way that it can aid corporations to become richer.

The rich get richer, and the poor get poorer, and I don't owe you a thing—you are on your own. That is what they want us to believe, but it is time for people—for us to come together. It is all about economics.

They put Blacks against Whites, poor Whites and poor Blacks against each other, and then they are going to the bank in the Brink's truck, and we are sitting, pointing fingers at ourselves, when we are all in the same boat together, the 99 percent—or the 47 percent, as one of our Presidential candidates most famously talked about in the last election. I am proudly one of those 47 percent, and I represent the 47 percent that is really the 99 percent.

So this extrajudicial killing of Black men has to end. If not, then what is going to happen to you tomorrow?

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the words of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL). I think this body has been blessed by ROB WOODALL being here, and his words tonight just reinforce that.

The President has declared an amnesty. The law of the land is if someone is in this country illegally, they are not allowed to legally work. To change that law requires a bill. As Saturday Night Live pointed out in their version of Schoolhouse Rock, a bill has to pass the House, it has to pass the Senate, and then it goes to the President and gets his signature if it is going to change existing law.

For anyone to just pronounce "here is the new change" is an indiscriminate approach to changing the law without following the law.

I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there will be no repercussions for such a decision, and this could lead to a

surge in more illegal immigration, and it would also ignore the millions of people around the world who are waiting to come here legally.

Ultimately, our Nation, like all nations, has the right and obligation to control its borders and set laws for residency and citizenship, and no matter how decent they are, no matter their reasons, the 11 million who broke these laws should be held accountable. That is what I believe.

All of the words—every one of the words I just spoke, beginning with "I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair"—were words directly out of the mouth of the United States of America's Barack Hussein Obama.

He was right. In everything he said in that quote, he was exactly right. There are millions of people lined up around the world who are wanting to come here legally. Most of those who would be coming would have to have some way to support themselves; yet the President spoke into law and signed his oral fiat saying: "You know what, I am going to disregard everything I have previously said that was exactly right, change the law without a bill going to the House or the Senate or without coming to me for my signature after it has passed both."

Our President also said:

I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we are facing right now is the President trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all, and that is what I intend to reverse when I am President of the United States of America.

The trouble is he said that on March 31, 2008, and when he became President, he forgot that promise. Somebody needs to get that promise in front of him again.

Also, in 2008, before he got elected, he said:

We have got a government designed by the Founders so there will be checks and balances. You don't want a President who is too powerful or a Congress that is too powerful or a court that is too powerful. Everybody has got their role. Congress' job is to pass legislation. The President can veto it or he can sign it.

Senator Obama said:

I believe in the Constitution, and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We are not going to use signing statements as a way of doing an end-run around Congress.

I had a practice court instructor at Baylor Law School. He was an incredible trial lawyer before he came to be a professor at Baylor Law School. He talked even slower than I talk. I can still hear Matt Dawson saying, when he caught a witness saying something different one time than he said another time, he would say to the witness: "Well, were you lying then, or are you lying now?"

Let the shoe fit on the foot that wears that size.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about the law, and I have been called

anal and everything else around this House floor, even by people in my party, for actually reading bills and reading laws, but 8 United States Code section 1324a(a)(1) says:

It is unlawful for a person or other entity— (A) to hire, or to recruit or refer for a fee, for employment in the United States an alien knowing the alien is an unauthorized alien, as defined in subsection (h)(3) of this section, with respect to such employment; or (B) (i) to hire for employment in the United States an individual without complying with the requirements of subsection (b) of this section; or (ii) if the person or entity is an agricultural association, agricultural employer, or farm labor contractor, to hire, or to recruit or refer for a fee, for employment in the United States an individual without complying with the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

Basically, it makes clear, and it is easier for me to see it in print, but when I see it in print, it is very clear, it is illegal for someone to get a job in America who is not an authorized alien.

If you are an illegal alien or an unauthorized alien, as the language is here, then you are not entitled, it is illegal for you to get a job in the United States, and it is illegal for someone to hire you.

It really raises an interesting question, and I haven't seen this in the President's fiat, the royal decree that he made, I haven't seen if he is providing amnesty for every employer that hires someone who is here illegally because the President is saying, basically, "I'm giving you amnesty, so you can go work wherever you want to," but as the law makes clear in section 1324 of volume 8 of the United States Code, it is illegal to hire someone that is illegally in the country.

Is the President going to pardon every employer that hires one of the 5 million that is going to get a permit? We know that the President wants to give pardons to folks who are here illegally, but the trouble is a pardon doesn't work for someone wanting to grant legal status. A pardon only works if you want to forgive a crime that has been committed, like President Clinton did.

President-elect George W. Bush and Vice President Cheney, he kept them waiting. The service was supposed to start, and President Clinton was over there, just signing pardons as fast as he could. It took him a while to get that done.

He left President-elect George W. Bush and Vice President Cheney waiting. They were late starting the service that day on Inauguration Day for George W. Bush because he was signing those pardons as fast as he could, because he had to sign the individual pardons.

Well, the President hasn't signed 5 million pardons, and even if he did, a pardon forgives the committing of a crime. It does not change the status of

someone that is illegally in the country. A pardon pertains to criminal law.

The changing of status is under naturalization and immigration, and that power is strictly reserved to this House and the body down the hall, the U.S. Senate.

□ 2000

We have the power under article I, section 8, to make the law on those things; the President does not. And there is no provision that allows him to pardon someone from the requirements of the naturalization or immigration laws.

Now, something else caught my attention. It is down in the miscellaneous provisions of section 1324, because I am always looking: Okay, does the President have a loophole here? And at first I thought maybe he did. It turns out he doesn't. But under the definition of "unauthorized alien," it says:

As used in this section, the term "unauthorized alien" means, with respect to the employment of an alien at a particular time, that the alien is not at that time either:

A) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or

B) authorized to be so employed by this chapter or by the attorney general (now the Secretary of Homeland Security).

So I thought maybe this is their loophole here that the President might try to use, even though that is not what was said in a basis that was provided.

But then when you get over here, it says this exception may not be provided to the alien unless the alien is lawfully admitted for permanent residence or otherwise would, without regard to removal proceedings, be provided such authorization.

So again, it kicks it back to the law as Congress has decreed it in the past, by both Houses passing it with a majority and a President previously signing it, that you have to follow the law in order to get this lawful permanent resident status. You have to be lawfully admitted. You are not even eligible for that miscellaneous exception under section 1324.

There are people that have violated the law to come into the country in such a way that it is not necessarily a crime, but if they go to work, under volume 8 of the United States Code, section 1324, it will be a crime for anybody that hires them, and it will be a crime for them. That is where the crime may get committed.

I guess at that time if the President wants to sign 5 million pardons for 5 million employers, well, he could do that. He has that authority under the Constitution. He can sign pardons for all 5 million employers that employ people who are unauthorized aliens in this country. No matter what the President gives them under the law, that person is still an unauthorized alien under this criminal provision.

There are some interesting days ahead, and the statute of limitations will not have run out when a new President comes into office. The only way that wouldn't happen is if the President got a third term, and, of course, we know that would be as unconstitutional as the President legislating, and surely that wouldn't happen.

Now, it is interesting, too, that in the manner in which the President has given this amnesty and is authorizing these work permits, he has actually doubled down legally on his violation of the law previously under DACA in which he had said that—well, this is the way he doubled down on it. Basically, he expands his previous unconstitutional action that the House passed a law the last week of July canceling but the Senate didn't take it up. That is why, when the President says Congress hadn't done anything, the House did. They talked about the Senate passing a comprehensive bill, and they forget to mention that the Senate's bill is unconstitutional. We are not allowed to take it up because it raised revenue, and under the Constitution, such a bill has to originate in the House.

If the Senate gets around to sending it down here, we don't get to bring it on the floor. It would be what is called "blue slipped," where you put a blue slip on there and say the House cannot take this up. It raises revenue. It has to originate in the House. Therefore, the House is not allowed to take it up.

Since the Senate passed a bill that was not allowed under the Constitution, we took one up ourselves and we passed that one, and it was constitutional and it was a good bill. There was more that needed to be done, but for what it did, it was a good bill. It dealt largely with securing our border. Because the question people are not asking and the President is not answering is a very important question.

If this act of amnesty, unconstitutional, illegal as it is, if this act of amnesty is allowed to stand, and obviously the border is not secure, we still have thousands and thousands continuing to come across our border illegally, and nowadays nobody apparently is being turned away, then the big question I am getting to that has to be answered is: How often should we go ahead and have an amnesty? Because clearly, since the President has chosen to provide an amnesty unconstitutionally without securing the border first—and the vast majority of Americans do, and even a majority of our Hispanic friends that are legally here want the border secure before we do anything else.

I have said over and over, if the President will just secure the border, as we get confirmed by the border States, not by anybody over at Homeland Security—we have already seen

their kind of work, at least the people at the top—but if it is confirmed by the border States that the borders are now factually secured, then people would be amazed at what the House and the Senate can negotiate on and get accomplished.

But until the border is secured, then we have to decide, if this amnesty is going to stand, as unconstitutional and as illegal as it is, how often should we give an amnesty? The President has given amnesty to 5 million this time. And, of course, those 5 million are in this time where there is already over 92 million people of working age who are not working, they have given up even trying to get a job, and there are millions more that are looking for jobs and can't find them. So we will put 5 million Americans out of work, middle class, poor working Americans that are legally here. They will be put out of work. Why? Because people that have just gotten an amnesty, as unconstitutional as it is, they will surely take jobs for lesser pay than what the American citizens or legal permanent residents were getting paid, so they will bump them out of a job.

And then also for any employer that hires more than 50 employees, they have learned over the last few years since ObamaCare passed, actually in 2010, employers have learned if you have got more than 50 employees, then you are going to end up paying a \$3,000 fine for anybody that you don't provide what the Federal Government considers adequate insurance for.

So, for example, today, our friend Dennis Michael Lynch was pointing out that he has about 200 or so employees that are either American citizens or legally here, and the law is clear he is going to have to provide insurance that is approved by this government. That means even if they are 60 years old and they are a single man, they are going to have to have maternity coverage. Or as the couple I saw on TV, the gay or lesbian couple, women in their sixties, saying, "We don't need maternity care." Well, it won't matter because they require it.

If you don't provide that very expensive insurance for your employees, if you have more than 50 employees, then you are going to be paying the \$3,000 fine, penalty. As Chief Justice Roberts called it at page 14 and 15 of his opinion, clearly it is not a tax, it is a penalty, it is a fine. Never mind what he said 40 pages later. But you are going to have to pay this fine, this penalty, of \$3,000 per employee.

So for somebody like our friend Dennis Michael Lynch, this President has, by his act of amnesty, conveyed to Dennis Michael Lynch: If you will let those 200 American citizens or legal permanent residents who have done everything the right way, if you will allow them to be fired, let them go, and then hire these people who are illegally

in the country, then my administration has put in place a law called, informally, ObamaCare that will save you \$600,000.

So basically, Dennis Michael Lynch, how would you like to take home an extra \$600,000 this next year? All you have got to do is let your American citizens go, hire people illegally in the country, because under this royal decree from the White House they don't have to be provided insurance.

So Dennis Michael Lynch can save at least \$600,000. It may be he had 300 employees, in which case he gets to pocket an extra \$900,000 if he'll just let the American citizens go and hire those folks that are illegally here. And since there are 5 million of those folks that are going to be looking for jobs, then 300 is a drop in the bucket compared to the 5 million. But \$600- to \$900,000 for one person in extra income, that is some serious money. Even for people in Congress, that is serious money.

But that also doesn't address the issue of whether or not Dennis Michael Lynch, if he went ahead and did that and made himself an extra \$600- to \$900,000 next year, it doesn't address the issue of whether a new President that comes in in January of 2017 might have their Justice Department actually follow the law, and even though might not be able to pursue the aliens illegally here that got jobs, certainly would be able to prosecute the employers.

But here again, the President could do what President Clinton did and leave his successor sitting there waiting on Inauguration Day while he signs 5 million pardons, and he could do that. That doesn't seem to have been this administration's history. If you get thrown under the bus, someone else has said before: When this administration throws you under the bus, they mean for you to stay there. So you probably shouldn't count on a pardon in the future for people that violate the law and don't have a pardon in their hand before this President leaves office.

Now, there has been a lot of discussion among Republicans here in the House and among some of our friends. In fact, some of us have been talking tonight about what is the best way to address this unconstitutional amnesty. And I know our leadership has talked about, well, we could fund all of the government with an omnibus, taking appropriations bills that have been done already by the House—there have been seven of those—adding four to them, and then not funding the Department of Homeland Security and only funding them until March, and then by March of next year we could try to overturn the amnesty action taken by the President.

□ 2015

Most of us believe if those permits are issued before Congress stops them,

it is going to be difficult to get enough votes to withdraw the permits. Once they are out there, it is going to be so tough to get them withdrawn. Some of us have been saying we don't think we can wait until March because, if you wait until March, there is a real risk that permits are done.

Maybe if we just do a short-term CR until January, when we get the new Senate in, then we can act on that, but another problem there is that it is not just the Department of Homeland Security that is involved in this process for people that are here illegally.

You have the Department of Homeland Security. You also have the Bureau of Consular Affairs that is involved in this unconstitutional amnesty. That is the State Department that is involved. You have the Department of Defense that has been involved in housing for the next influx of people as they flood in. DOD housed many of those people initially.

You have got Health and Human Services, who takes custody of minors that come in and ships them all over the country. You have got Social Security that is going to be issuing Social Security numbers. You have got the Department of Justice and CJS for immigration court processing. You have got HUD for housing.

There are a lot of issues here, and as somebody once said, you should never take a hostage that the other person you are trying to influence by taking hostage is willing for you to shoot. It doesn't do you much good to take a hostage that the other side wants you to shoot.

We need to be concerned that if we say, "All right. We are not funding the Department of Homeland Security until you cease this illegal and unconstitutional action," the President might say, "So you mean you're not going to fund the Border Patrol? In other words, you're going to leave the border wide open, so that anybody wants to come in, can. And that's your threat. You are going to leave the border wide open for anybody to come in unless I back off of my amnesty."

Well, good luck. That is not going to do the trick. We need a short-term CR to get us into the first of the year. For example, the House has defunded ourselves over a 4-year period by over 20 percent. We cut our own budgets over 20 percent. Nobody noticed, nobody cared, except those of us in the House. We had to make real adjustments.

If we can make those adjustments, I think the White House ought to be able to make those adjustments. Maybe they could do with a few less czars—maybe we defund all the czars—but there are smart ways to defund the waste, fraud, and abuse in the executive branch, and I don't think it is a good idea to start with Homeland Security.

At the same time, what happens when those employers that hire the 5

million people that have just been given amnesty are able to save millions of dollars? What happens to them? They are going to make more money than ever, and that is during a President's administration who has presided for the first time in our history over a Nation where 95 percent of all the income has gone to the top 1 percent. It has got to stop.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2139

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS) at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3979, PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5759, EXECUTIVE AMNESTY PREVENTION ACT OF 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5781, CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-646) on the resolution (H. Res. 770) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5759) to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5781) to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY of California) for today on account of a family illness.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family medical issues.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1237. An act to improve the administration of programs in the insular areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources; in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2203. An act to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 4, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8134. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Regulation Systems Compliance and Integrity [Release No.: 34-73639; File No.: S7-01-13] (RIN: 3235-AL43) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8135. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Food Labeling; Nutrition Labeling of Standard Menu Items in Restaurants and Similar Retail Food Establishments [Docket No.: FDA-2011-F-0172] (RIN: 0910-AG57) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8136. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Food Labeling; Calorie Labeling of Articles of Food in Vending Machines [Docket No.: FDA-2011-F-0171] (RIN: 0910-AG56) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8137. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Periodic Report on the National Emergency Caused by the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for February 26, 2014, to August 25, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8138. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8139. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Agency Financial Report for FY 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8140. A letter from the Chairwoman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8141. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revisions to Framework Adjustment 51 to the Northeast Multi-species Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updated Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2014 [Docket No.: 140624530-4848-01] (RIN: 0648-XD354) received November 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8142. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Western Pacific Pelagic Fisheries; U.S. Territorial Catch and Fishing Effort Limits [Docket No.: 130708597-4380-01] (RIN: 0648-BD46) received November 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4971. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct annual surveys of veterans on experiences obtaining hospital care and medical services from medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 770. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the

bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5759) to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5781) to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California (Rept. 113-646). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 5783. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, and the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to require that the value of child's savings accounts be disregarded for the purpose of determining eligibility to receive benefits under such Acts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5784. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide additional educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to certain eligible individuals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion from gross income of discharges of qualified principal residence indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5786. A bill to amend certain banking statutes to exempt community banks from certain regulatory requirements, to include a community bank representative in the membership of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to create a process for a county to be designated as a rural area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 5787. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude payments received under the Work Colleges Program from gross income, including payments made from institutional funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 5788. A bill to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City,

Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5789. A bill to establish a system for integration of Rapid DNA instruments for use by law enforcement to reduce violent crime and reduce the current DNA analysis backlog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 5790. A bill to authorize the Director of the National Institutes of Health to design and enter into agreements for the implementation of prize competitions with the goal of improving health outcomes and thereby reducing Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol; to the Committee on House Administration. Considered and agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is authorized by Congress' power to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States" pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 5786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the explicit constitutional authority to regulate commerce "with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes:" as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes. . .," and Article I, Section 7, which states "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 5788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 "The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 5790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 352: Mr. PITTINGER.

H.R. 597: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 942: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1015: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1094: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1229: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1998: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 2288: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2591: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2907: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2994: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROSS, Ms. MENG, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 3116: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 3172: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3836: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COSTA, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 4122: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4188: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4341: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4395: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 4752: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4842: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4851: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 4930: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 4951: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 4969: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 5082: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 5197: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5226: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 5227: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 5294: Mr. POCAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 5343: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 5353: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 5364: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 5368: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 5373: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 5380: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 5403: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 5417: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 5454: Mr. MORAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 5478: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 5484: Ms. ESTY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 5504: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 5505: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 5580: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 5620: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 5644: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 5656: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 5705: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 5706: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 5710: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 5721: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 5737: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 5753: Ms. KAPTUR and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 5759: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 5768: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COOK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YODER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 5780: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 5782: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 109: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H. Res. 190: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. DOYLE.

H. Res. 281: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. GIBSON.

H. Res. 428: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H. Res. 596: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 688: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Res. 728: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 757: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H. Res. 758: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. CHABOT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY Mr. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 5759 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY Mr. HASTINGS of WASHINGTON

The provisions of H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House Rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

113. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Commission of Miami, Florida, relative to Resolution R-14-0387 urging the 113th Congress to enact the “All-American Flag Act”; which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

SENATE—Wednesday, December 3, 2014

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our gracious God and friend, great is Your faithfulness. Guard our Senators. As they wait expectantly for Your salvation, may they not stumble in the darkness.

Lord, protect their minds with Your instructions so that they will not deviate from the path of integrity. May they follow Your directions and embrace Your counsel so that America can be like a shining city on a hill.

Give their petitions Your personal care so that no weapon formed against them will prosper. Let praises cascade from their lips and Your promises ring from their tongues, O God of our salvation.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will proceed to executive session, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At 10 a.m. the Senate will proceed to five rollcall votes on confirmation of the Burrows and Lopez nominations and on cloture on the Hale, Kearney, and Pappert nominations.

There will be another series of up to five rollcall votes at 5:30 p.m. this afternoon.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2970

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2970 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2970) to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with respect to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**NOMINATION OF CHARLOTTE A. BURROWS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES**LANCE CORPORAL CHADWICK A. GILLIAM**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning, I rise to share with my colleagues the story of one brave marine

from Kentucky who lost his life while wearing our country's uniform.

LCpl Chadwick A. Gilliam of Mayking, KY, passed away on January 3, 2009, of an apparent cardiac arrest at Camp Buehring, Kuwait. He was 29 years old.

For his service in uniform, Lance Corporal Gilliam received several medals, awards, and decorations, including the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal and the National Defense Service Medal.

Chris Damron, Chad's brother-in-law, recalls how Chad was happy to enlist. "He'd said that it was just something he wanted to do," Chris says. "All his life he wanted to be a Marine."

Before entering the U.S. Marine Corps, Chad graduated from Whitesburg High School in the mid-1990s. After earning his bachelor's degree, he also graduated from Lindsay Wilson College with a master's degree in counseling and human development.

One of his former high school teachers, Scottie Billiter, said Gilliam was an inspiration to other students. Billiter remembers that Chad had a wide array of interests, from the football team to the Spanish club. "I have nothing but great, fond memories of him," Billiter says. "He was a big part of who we were."

As a marine, Chad continued to be a natural inspiration to others. "All the Marines seemed to really look up to Chad," says brother-in-law Chris Damron. "He was a leader in the Marine Corps."

Chad was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 6th Marines, 2nd Marine Division, Second Marine Expeditionary Force, based out of Camp Lejeune, NC. He was an infantryman and joined the unit in June 2007. He was promoted to lance corporal in 2008 and deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

We are thinking of Chad's family as I share his story with my Senate colleagues, particularly his parents Paul Gilliam and Mary Ellen Cook Gilliam, his wife Corinne Marie Stewart Gilliam, his sister Paula Regina Damron, his brother Michael Wayne Gilliam, his brother-in-law Chris Damron, along with many other beloved family members and friends. Chad was preceded in death by his paternal grandparents Willard and Belvia Holbrook Gilliam and his maternal grandparents Arlie and Edna Sergeant Cook.

I know my Senate colleagues join me in expressing gratitude and sympathy to the family of LCpl Chadwick A.

Gilliam—gratitude for his life of service and sympathy for his ultimate sacrifice. Without brave men and women such as Lance Corporal Gilliam to defend our country, we would not be free. Those of us who cherish our freedoms must never ever forget that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I support the nomination of Charlotte Burrows to be a commissioner of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or EEOC, and David Lopez to continue to serve as the agency's general counsel.

These are two eminently qualified nominees. Mr. Lopez is a dedicated public servant who has spent over two decades protecting people from workplace discrimination. He did an admirable job during his first term, and was responsible for marked improvements in both the agency's litigation program and in its outreach to stakeholders.

Ms. Burrows has also had a distinguished career in public service. She is currently Associate Deputy Attorney General at the Department of Justice, and previously served as general counsel for Civil and Constitutional Rights for Senator Kennedy and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. She is a leading expert in the field of discrimination law, and she has proven herself committed to public service.

Both of these nominees deserve to be confirmed by the Senate. And our Nation needs public servants of their caliber and experience at the EEOC, which has the critical mission of protecting working Americans from workplace discrimination.

Throughout my career I have been guided by the vision of an America that is compassionate, just, and inclusive—a society where the government provides a ladder, or sometimes a ramp—of opportunity that gives every American a fair shot at the American dream. However, that ladder cannot function properly if there are barriers of discrimination that unfairly limit opportunities for some Americans to fully participate in the social, political, and economic life of this Nation.

Over the last 50 years, we have made great strides towards eliminating discrimination in the workplace. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin and religion. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act, in 1967, prohibited discrimination on the basis of age. The Americans with Dis-

abilities Act, in 1990, and the ADA Amendments Act, in 2008, prohibited discrimination on the basis of disability.

These important guarantees, however, are not self-enforcing. They are only as strong as the agency charged with enforcing them, the EEOC. The EEOC's mission is simple and profoundly important—to promote equality of opportunity in the workplace and enforce Federal laws prohibiting employment discrimination.

While much progress has been made in recent decades, discrimination in the workplace continues to be all too common. Too many employment decisions are based on insidious stereotypes and prejudices rather than an employee's talent, ability, and qualifications. Too many hardworking Americans face the harsh reality of getting a pink slip or not being hired at all because of race, sex, national origin, religion, age, disability or some other irrelevant factor.

The realities are especially harsh for individuals with disabilities. Less than 30 percent of working-age Americans with disabilities participate in the workforce, and households with an adult member with a disability earn 38.4 percent less than households without an adult member who has a disability. These facts make it clear that people with disabilities are still encountering roadblocks, and that the ADA's goal of economic self-sufficiency is far from achieved.

The EEOC has an important role to play in combating discrimination and supporting employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities and for all Americans.

Unfortunately, today's EEOC faces enormous challenges. The agency has a substantial backlog of almost 71,000 cases. And it takes an average of 267 days to process a discrimination claim. The truth is that the EEOC suffers from chronic underfunding, and this underfunding has resulted in a significant reduction in full-time employees. Under this administration, the agency has made real progress moving investigations forward in a timely manner, but all too often justice delayed is justice denied.

American workers deserve better, especially in these times of economic turmoil, when discrimination often increases and workers who are victims of discrimination face even greater challenges. Now more than ever, we need strong leadership at the EEOC. The nominees are both extremely well-qualified and have a deep commitment to public service. They possess the extraordinary skills and experience that will help them advance the EEOC's mission and ensure proper enforcement of critically important laws.

Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have raised concerns that EEOC is too quick to bring lawsuits.

That is just not the case. Litigation is a last resort for the agency, and represents less than 0.5 percent of all charges filed and only around 5 percent of charges where the commission has issued a cause finding.

The EEOC under this administration has made enormous strides in improving the conciliation process. In the last 3 years, the EEOC improved its conciliation results significantly with successful conciliations now at a rate of 41 percent of all cases that are conciliated, up from 31 percent in fiscal year 2011. It is important to remember that EEOC v. CRST, the case so often cited as evidence that the agency isn't doing enough in the conciliation process, was a case brought by a Bush administration-appointed general counsel.

My Republican colleagues also criticize the Commission for delegating the prosecution of routine cases to the general counsel. There is absolutely nothing inappropriate about that practice, and it should not be a controversial issue. It is a practical measure to make sure the Commissioners are focusing on the most important issues and have ample opportunity to deliberate on broader policy issues. That is why the EEOC's delegation policy has been carried forward across multiple administrations and has bipartisan support from both Republican and Democratic Commissioners.

Now, I think we can all agree that there have been some unacceptable instances where courts have required the EEOC to pay attorney's fees for a defendant. But those cases are rare and need to be viewed in perspective. Out of the 1,045 lawsuits filed from fiscal year 2009 through fiscal year 2013, there have only been seven in which fees have been assessed, and two of those are pending an appeal. Generally, the EEOC is prudent and successful in litigation, and the agency has won 11 out of 16 trials from fiscal year 2013 to the present.

I want to comment on another issue that came up at the HELP Committee hearing on these nominees—the EEOC's work with regard to wellness programs. I am a strong supporter of wellness programs, and I was intimately involved in drafting the section of the Affordable Care Act that encourages such programs. Recently, the EEOC has been involved in litigation involving wellness programs, and I think a lot of people are trying to cloud the issue here. The EEOC has never—never—taken the position that wellness programs are illegal. They are, however, investigating extreme cases where employers have allegedly forced their employees to participate in programs that require medical testing. That raises Americans with Disabilities Act issues, and the EEOC is right to look carefully at the issue. Plus, the agency has indicated that it intends to issue guidance next year to

help employers and employees navigate the tricky legal issues.

One final point, none of the manufactured concerns coming from the other side of the aisle have anything to do with the ability of these two nominees to do the job for which they were nominated. No one has questioned their qualifications. Both Ms. Burrows and Mr. Lopez are eminently qualified. Some of my Republican colleagues just do not like the fact that the EEOC is doing its job and enforcing our Nation's civil rights laws. That is a shame because civil rights should not be a partisan issue. We should all be coming together to support the agency and the important role it plays in making fairer, more equal workplaces.

I urge my colleagues to support both of these distinguished nominees and confirm them quickly so they can get to work ensuring fairness and equal opportunity for every American worker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all cloture time has expired.

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Burrows nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I don't know of anybody seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time having been yielded back, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charlotte A. Burrows, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission?

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 301 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Blumenthal	Cantwell
Ayotte	Blunt	Cardin
Baldwin	Booker	Carper
Barrasso	Boozman	Casey
Begich	Brown	Chambliss
Bennet	Burr	Coats

Collins	Isakson	Portman
Coons	Johanns	Pryor
Corker	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Reid
Crapo	Kaine	Risch
Cruz	King	Rubio
Donnelly	Kirk	Sanders
Durbin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Enzi	Leahy	Schumer
Feinstein	Lee	Scott
Fischer	Levin	Sessions
Flake	Manchin	Shaheen
Franken	Markey	Stabenow
Gillibrand	McCain	Tester
Graham	McCaskill	Thune
Grassley	McConnell	Toomey
Hagan	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Harkin	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Hatch	Mikulski	Vitter
Heinrich	Moran	Walsh
Heitkamp	Murkowski	Warner
Heller	Murphy	Warren
Hirono	Murray	Whitehouse
Hooven	Nelson	Wicker
Inhofe	Paul	Wyden

NAYS—2

Roberts

Shelby

NOT VOTING—5

Boxer
Coburn

Cochran
Landrieu
Rockefeller

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF P. DAVID LOPEZ TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Lopez nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of P. David Lopez, of Arizona, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the nomination.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today we are voting on the nomination of P. David Lopez to serve as general counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The EEOC is an important agency with a critical task.

In August 1963, I stood in the crowd on the National Mall and listened to Dr. Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech when he called for our Nation to "make real the promises of democracy."

The next year, the historic Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed, establishing the EEOC as an important, independent agency to put an end to workplace discrimination, particularly in hiring, firing, and promoting.

Today, employees are protected by law if they are discriminated against because of race, color, religion, sex, pregnancy, national origin, age, disability, or genetic information.

The EEOC is charged with investigating complaints of discrimination to determine whether or not they have merit, and then attempting to resolve them informally, through conciliation and mediation.

The general counsel at the EEOC has a great deal of responsibility—he or she is in charge of conducting litigation at this important agency.

Mr. Lopez is being re-nominated for the general counsel position. I do not believe he has fulfilled his charge over the last four and one-half years and will not support extending his time at the agency. I would strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this nomination as well.

It is critical that the general counsel make wise decisions about which cases to litigate and how. Unfortunately, Mr. Lopez, often has failed to meet this standard.

I have three primary concerns about the EEOC.

First, EEOC has placed too much emphasis on litigating high profile lawsuits, some of which have been rebuked by the courts, rather than resolving its backlog of discrimination charges filed by individuals.

Second, EEOC has not been fully transparent in how it issues guidance to the public and in the information it shares with the public about its activities.

And third, EEOC is suing employers for following the President's very own health care law.

On the first concern, a judicious general counsel should view costly and time-consuming litigation as a last resort. However, this EEOC has placed too great an emphasis on litigating high-profile cases, some of which have been rebuked by the courts, rather than resolving its backlog of discrimination charges filed by individuals.

In fiscal year 2014, more than 88,000 charges of discrimination were filed with the EEOC and at the end of November 2014, EEOC reported it had 75,935 unresolved discrimination charges pending.

A backlog of charges pending is nothing new for EEOC, but given this backlog, I am disappointed that this EEOC has placed such a strong emphasis on actions and lawsuits—predicated upon not a single complaint—that do not address actual charges of discrimination brought to the Agency by employees.

Under this administration, the EEOC has focused too heavily on headline-making lawsuits at the expense of fair and swift resolution of claims for those alleging workplace discrimination.

The desire to win big lawsuits has backfired. Numerous Federal courts have criticized EEOC's litigation practices, failure to attempt to resolve cases and avoid court, misuse of authority, and reliance on faulty expert analysis, among other complaints.

Example No. 1—EEOC's case against Kaplan Higher Education Corporation received such a sharp rejection by a unanimous three-judge panel on the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in 2014 that The Wall Street Journal named it the "Opinion of the Year."

EEOC sued Kaplan for alleged race discrimination due to the use of credit background checks. The court wrote, "EEOC brought this case on the basis

of a homemade methodology, crafted by a witness with no particular expertise to craft it, administered by persons with no particular expertise to administer it, tested by no one, and accepted only by the witness himself." The court also criticized EEOC for bringing a case against Kaplan for "using the same type of background check that the EEOC itself uses."

Example No. 2—Another Federal court reprimanded EEOC for being "negligent in its discovery obligations, dilatory in cooperating with defense counsel, and somewhat cavalier in its responsibility to the United States District Court."

Example No. 3—EEOC caused a small employer to spend \$100,000 attempting to comply with requests for information that, according to a Federal judge, "EEOC had no authority to obtain."

Since 2011, EEOC has been ordered to pay attorney's fees in 10 different cases. In six cases, fees were awarded under a rare step allowed by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which according to the U.S. Supreme Court is reserved for cases that are "frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation" or "continued to [be] litigate[d]" after those circumstances became present.

In the four other cases, the court awarded fees for failing to prevent the destruction of evidence, for discovery abuses and for pursuing a case that lacked substantial justification.

Not all of these cases where EEOC was ordered to pay attorney's fees were initiated on this general counsel's watch, but he did initiate five of them and it appears he continued to pursue four of them. These court losses cost taxpayers and hurt the victims of workplace discrimination whose charges are backlogged at EEOC.

EEOC's credibility is at risk. As one commissioner described, EEOC's "reputation and credibility has . . . suffered from several recent lawsuits where [EEOC was] not only sanctioned, but openly chastised by the courts."

EEOC should immediately reconsider the strong emphasis on lawsuits that are not based on any complaint and do not even have a victim plaintiff.

In recent years, EEOC has pursued a number of cases without complaints, such as age discrimination cases against large accounting firms—PricewaterhouseCoopers, Deloitte, and KPMG—whose partners have voluntarily adopted a mandatory retirement age.

Age discrimination is certainly a significant problem that EEOC should work to address. But they should go about it by assisting the more than 21,000 people who complained to EEOC of age discrimination in 2013, rather than directing investigations at an industry they find suspect.

The five-member Commission has exercised too little restraint over the general counsel. In 1995, the EEOC's

then Commissioners gave the general counsel far more authority to bring whatever cases he wanted, with no check from the Commission. By 2012, this practice led to only 3 of the 122 lawsuits filed that year coming before the Commission for approval. Although EEOC has taken some steps to increase the Commission's role in approving litigation, more should be done. The Commission has the authority and duty to reverse this imprudent decision and return to performing its statutorily obligated responsibilities.

On my second concern, I believe the Commission has not been transparent in its issuance of guidance and the information it shares with the public about its activities. The EEOC sets national workplace discrimination policy by issuing formal regulations as well as guidance, which are meant to help employers and employees understand how the law applies to them. EEOC does not allow the public to review or comment upon its draft guidance, even in cases of novel, significant or controversial guidance.

This is especially concerning because in two cases last year, the Supreme Court rejected substantive positions found in EEOC guidance. EEOC's issuance of guidance is not in compliance with the administration's own best practices recommendations or the recommendations of three of the current Commissioners.

I am concerned about this because agencies expect people to follow guidance. At a hearing in June, I asked the head of the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education whether she expected higher education institutions to comply with the Office for Civil Rights guidance and she said yes.

Senator ENZI also urged greater transparency on significant guidance when he was ranking member of the HELP Committee, and I share his view.

So what harm would come from allowing the public to comment on draft guidance prior to issuing it?

Finally, my third concern about EEOC and its general counsel, Mr. Lopez, is this. Employer wellness plans with premium discounts were specifically authorized in the health care law and I worked on it with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—it was one of the few provisions of Obamacare with Republican and Democrat buy in.

I am concerned that EEOC has pursued litigation against employers who have followed the health care law and implemented voluntary employer wellness plans to encourage healthy lifestyle choices.

These wellness plan lawsuits are sending a confusing message to employers—reliance on the health care law's authorization of wellness plans does not mean you would not be sued by the EEOC.

This is why I intend to introduce legislation to prevent EEOC from suing

employers who are following the law in offering wellness programs. Employers who are acting in good faith, relying on a law should not face uncertainty of litigation due to an agency's misguided priorities.

EEOC is tasked with an important mission—to ensure workplaces are free from discrimination. EEOC's misdirected focus and high-profile litigation failures are coming at significant cost to taxpayers and victims of workplace discrimination.

Unfortunately, when questioned about these missteps and the Agency's focus on litigation without a single complaint, Mr. Lopez was not forthcoming with his answers. Therefore, I cannot support Mr. Lopez's nomination.

Mr. REID. I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of P. David Lopez, of Arizona, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission?

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 302 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Levin	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Walsh
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Hagan	Murray	

NAYS—43

Alexander	Burr	Cornyn
Ayotte	Chambliss	Crapo
Barrasso	Coats	Cruz
Blunt	Collins	Enzi
Boozman	Corker	Fischer

Flake	Kirk	Rubio
Graham	Lee	Scott
Grassley	McCain	Sessions
Hatch	McConnell	Shelby
Heller	Moran	Thune
Hoeven	Murkowski	Toomey
Inhofe	Paul	Vitter
Isakson	Portman	Wicker
Johanns	Risch	
Johnson (WI)	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—4

Coburn	Landrieu
Cochran	Rockefeller

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David J. Hale, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard Blumenthal, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie Hirono, Amy Klobuchar, Al Franken, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jeanne Shaheen, Claire McCaskill, Christopher A. Coons, Mark Begich, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Hale nomination.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent all time be yielded back on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of David J. Hale, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 303 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Ayotte	Hagan	Nelson
Baldwin	Harkin	Paul
Begich	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Isakson	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Chambliss	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall (CO)
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McConnell	Vitter
Durbin	Menendez	Walsh
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Flake	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Graham	Murray	

NAYS—31

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heller	Scott
Burr	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Wicker
Cruz	Lee	
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—4

Coburn	Landrieu
Cochran	Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 65, the nays are 31.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF DAVID J. HALE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David J. Hale, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate on the motion to invoke cloture on the Kearney nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark A. Kearney, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Bill Nelson, Barbara A. Mikulski, Amy Klobuchar, Al Franken, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Robert Menendez, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Richard Blumenthal, Sherrod Brown, Dianne Feinstein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Mark A. Kearney, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 304 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Ayotte	Hagan	Nelson
Baldwin	Harkin	Paul
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Toomey
Coons	McCaskill	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Merkley	Walsh
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warner
Franken	Murkowski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Graham	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—36

Alexander	Fischer	McCain
Barrasso	Flake	McConnell
Blunt	Grassley	Moran
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johanns	Shelby
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cruz	Kirk	Vitter
Enzi	Lee	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Coburn	Landrieu
Cochran	Rockefeller

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 36.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF MARK A. KEARNEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Mark A. Kearney, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to the cloture vote on the Pappert nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. REID. I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Gerald J. Pappert, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Harry Reid, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Debbie Stabenow, Michael F. Bennet, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jon Tester, Jack Reed, Mark R. Warner, Tim Kaine, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer, Christopher A. Coons, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Gerald J. Pappert, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 305 Ex.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Baldwin	Bennet
Ayotte	Begich	Blumenthal

Blunt	Heitkamp	Portman
Booker	Hirono	Pryor
Boxer	Isakson	Reed
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Cantwell	Kaine	Rubio
Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Coats	Levin	Shaheen
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Toomey
Donnelly	McCain	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Vitter
Flake	Merkley	Walsh
Franken	Mikulski	Warner
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Warren
Graham	Murphy	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murray	Wyden
Harkin	Nelson	
Heinrich	Paul	

NAYS—28

Barrasso	Grassley	Moran
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Scott
Corker	Inhofe	Sessions
Cornyn	Johanns	Shelby
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cruz	Kirk	Wicker
Enzi	Lee	
Fischer	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—5

Coburn	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Rockefeller	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 28.

The motion is agreed to.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I was unable to attend today's cloture vote on the nomination of Gerald Pappert to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Had I been present, I would have supported this cloture motion.●

NOMINATION OF GERALD J. PAPPERT TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald J. Pappert, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Virginia.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, next Monday will mark 4 months since the President commenced military action in Syria and Iraq against ISIL. As of December 2, Operation Inherent Resolve, which the administration calls a war on ISIL, has involved more than 1,100 coalition airstrikes in Iraq and Syria, the vast majority carried out by American air men and women. The President has authorized currently 1,400 U.S. ground troops who are deployed in Iraq to train and advise re-

gional forces. The President has authorized an additional 1,500 U.S. troops to serve in that train-and-advise capacity. This past Monday, 250 paratroopers from the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, NC, were sent to Iraq. The total cost of the operation thus far to U.S. taxpayers is in excess of \$1 billion.

There have been three deaths of Americans serving in Operation Inherent Resolve. On October 1, Marine Cpl Jordan Spears of Memphis, TN, was lost at sea while conducting flight operations over the Persian Gulf. On October 23, Marine LCpl Sean Neal of Riverside, CA, died in Iraq. On December 1, Air Force Capt. William Dubois of Newcastle, CO, died in support of Operation Inherent Resolve.

Senator KING and I visited Al Udeid Air Base in Qatar in October to see the Combined Air Operations Center in action, and I saw many Virginians there working with colleagues from all service branches and many other coalition nations in directing the air strike campaign.

Let's not make any mistake about this—America is at war. The number of air and ground troops deployed is steadily creeping upwards every day. Our troops are dying. And the fiscal cost to American taxpayers is growing every day.

But this is a most unusual war. While all the activities of war are occurring, there is a strange conspiracy of silence about it in the White House and in the Halls of Congress.

The President has not offered any proposed authorization for the war, despite his suggestions that one is needed. Congress has not debated on, taken committee action on, or voted on the ongoing war. The House is contemplating adjourning for the holidays on December 11, without saying anything about an ongoing war. And because neither the President nor Congress has undertaken the necessary public debate over the war, the American public has not had the chance to be fully educated about what is at stake and why it is in our international interest to ask our troops to risk their lives thousands of miles away.

We owe it to our troops serving abroad—troops who are engaged in war even as we think about recessing and leaving Washington on December 11 for the holidays—to do our job and to have a debate and vote about the war that our Constitution demands.

Let me make an earnest request to our President and to my colleagues in Congress.

To the President: I have previously taken the floor to strongly argue that the President needs new legal authority to conduct the war on ISIL.

When the President spoke to the Nation on September 10, he said that he would "welcome" a congressional authorization. And on November 5, he affirmatively asserted that a new congressional authorization was needed

and that he would “engage” Congress in passing one. But to this date, 4 months after the initiation of war, the administration has not even been willing to present a draft authorization of the mission to Congress.

In testimony yesterday at the Armed Services Committee, no DOD witness could recall a single other instance in which a President told Congress of the need for a war but failed to present a proposed authorization spelling out the dimensions of the military mission.

Instead, the President has persisted in a war that is not within the scope of his Article II powers, that is not authorized by any treaty obligation, that is not justified under either of the congressional authorizations passed in 2001 or 2002. The President’s unilateral action has even extended beyond the 60- and 90-day timing requirements created by the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

The President’s willingness to push a war without engaging Congress has even violated his own solemn and wise pronouncement of just 1 year ago:

I believe our democracy is stronger when the President acts with the support of Congress. This is especially true after a decade that put more and more war-making powers in the hands of the President—while sidelining the people’s representatives from the critical decisions about when we use force.

So I request our President: Make good on your promise to engage Congress. Do what other Presidents have done—demand that we debate and vote on an authorization, and that we do it now.

The votes are here in this body to support the President. I am a supporter of the need for military action against ISIL, and I know that is a position held by a strong majority of the Senate and a strong majority of the House. There is no reason for the President to not demand that we actually have that debate and have that vote.

To my congressional colleagues, I have a similar request. Let’s not leave this Capitol without a debate and a vote on this war on ISIL. We have gone 4 months without any meaningful action about this war.

First, we were told that Congress would get to it after the midterm elections, and so we recessed for 7 weeks in the middle of a war without saying one thing—shirking our constitutional duties. Now many are saying we need to delay until after New Year’s before having any meaningful discussion of this war. So the unilateral war would extend to at least 5 months—and, in all likelihood, longer—before Congress gets around to any meaningful discussion of the ISIL threat and what we should do to counter it.

Giving this President—giving any President—a green light to wage unilateral war for 5 or 6 months without any meaningful debate or authorization would be deeply destructive of the

legitimacy of the legislative branch of our government; it would be deeply disrespectful of our citizens; and it would be especially disrespectful of the troops who are risking their lives every day while we do nothing.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

POWER TO DECLARE WAR

Mr. KING. Madam President, Senator KAINE has spoken eloquently about events of today. I wish to speak for a few moments about events of 200-plus years ago.

On Tuesday, August 17, 1787, at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, the delegates debated the question of war. They debated it passionately and with a sense of history and human nature. They understood the propensity of the Executive—any Executive throughout history, a prince, a king, a potentate, a sultan—to lead their country into war for good reasons or no good reasons. They understood that this was a basic question before the body—before the Constitutional Convention, and I would assert that the Framers knew what they were doing.

Interestingly, in the first draft of the Constitution, the clause in article I, section 8 that says the Congress shall have the power to declare war, said: The Congress shall have the power to make war. That was the first draft.

The debate was about whether Congress could effectively make and execute war. They wisely, I believe, realized that was impractical, given the nature of Congress and the large number of representatives, and the exigencies of war. So they left the power to the Commander in Chief, to the Chief Executive. They also recognized the Chief Executive’s inherent power to repel an attack on this country. But in all other cases what the Constitution says is very clear. Article 1, section 8, says the Congress shall declare war. There was some discussion about this. Some people said, well, we don’t want to tie the hands of the Executive, but others made it more clear.

Madison’s notes are a fascinating source of information about the history of the Constitution. The notes were taken the day of the debate on Tuesday, August 17, 1787. Mr. Ellsworth of Connecticut stated that “it should be more easy to get out of war than into it.” He understood this principle.

Pierce Butler of South Carolina said the Executive should have the power to repel sudden attacks. That is common sense. But then Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, I think, put it most succinctly. He said, “I never expected to hear in a Republic a motion to empower the Executive alone to declare war.” That is the fundamental issue that is before us today.

Then George Mason of Virginia later in the debate used a wonderful phrase that I think aptly captures what the

Framers were after. He said: “I am for flogging rather than facilitating war.” That is what we are supposed to do, is to debate, discuss, and have the people engaged in the discussion before this country is committed to war.

The Constitution in the Preamble makes it very clear that one of the fundamental purposes of this government or any government is to provide for the common defense. Nobody questions that. Neither Senator KAINE nor myself nor anyone else who is talking about this issue questions, A, whether we should be debating it and, B, that it is our solemn responsibility to provide for the common defense. I happen to think, as Senator KAINE does, that the fight against ISIL is worthy of national attention, worthy of national effort, and should be debated and circumscribed through some form of authorization in this body. There has not been a declaration of war by the Congress since 1942.

I will conclude with the observation that power doesn’t spring from one branch of our government to the other overnight or in some flash of inspiration or change. I would argue more aptly it oozes from one branch to the other, not necessarily through Executive usurpation as through congressional application. For us to go home, to take a recess, to say: We don’t really want to be talking about this, we don’t want to be responsible for this, I think is unfair to the American people. It is unfair to the people who are being put into harm’s way. It is unfair and not responsive to the basic principles of the Constitution.

We owe it to our country to have this debate, and it is one that I believe is important and is constitutionally based. We are very good in Congress about not making decisions and then criticizing the Executive for what they do. This is an opportunity where we have the power, the constitutional power and the constitutional responsibility to discuss, debate, and authorize the Executive’s actions against this terrible foe. I believe it is our responsibility to do so. To not do so is simply one more sliding away, one more giving away of our constitutional authority to the Executive that I think is in detriment not only to the Constitution itself, clearly, but also to the interests of the American people.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, ever since November 4—this last election,

some 3 or so weeks ago—a number of people have speculated as to what a new Republican majority in the Senate will mean for the country. We will be working together with our Republican colleagues in the House and with the President, who has hopefully heard the message the American people sent him on November 4. He was the one who said it was his policies that were on the ballot. I believe the vote by the American people came through pretty loud and clear as to what they thought of those policies. It was pretty clear that they want a new direction.

When people ask me what my constituents expect—my 26.5 million constituents in Texas—I tell them they want us to demonstrate that we can govern. They want us to demonstrate that we can actually solve some of the problems confronting our country. Those problems primarily deal with how we unleash the American economy, get it growing again to create jobs and opportunity so people can find work, provide for their families, and pursue their dreams.

I believe that is what Senator SCHUMER was saying the other day at the National Press Club. We need to focus on the needs of the middle class and the wage earners. They are seeing stagnant wages. While health care, energy, and other costs go up, their paychecks are shrinking. As a result, they are having to live on less, which is not the American dream most people have bargained for.

The truth is no political party or branch of government can govern on its own. The fact is that even though we have a Republican majority in the House and Senate, we still have a divided government, with President Obama in the White House—and he is not constitutionally irrelevant. In fact, he is critical in terms of actually getting things done.

My hope is that we can find issues we can work on together. I believe Republicans and Democrats can vote to put legislation on the President's desk, but then he has a choice to make—either to sign that legislation into law or veto it. We then have a decision to make as to whether we want to try—and whether we can—override his veto.

The truth is none of us can govern on our own. What has been troubling to me—since the election—is that President Obama seems to think he can govern on his own without regard for the Congress. Now, part of the consequences are the debates going on in the House and here in the Senate about the appropriate response to what has been widely seen as an overreach by the President—particularly when it comes to his Executive action on immigration, which circumvented the Congress. He acted as though he could do this alone without any consequence.

We know one thing for sure, and that is the President cannot appropriate

money, which is why we are now having this discussion. But there will be other ramifications and consequences as well. I hope one of those consequences is not that we fall back into the dysfunction we have experienced over the last few years where we find ourselves incapable of working together and getting things done. All we can do is all we can do. As a Senate—as a Congress—we can't make the President do anything he is bound and determined not to do, but we can do our job.

I and others have said: Well, with a new majority in the Senate, we have to show we can govern. The truth is we can't govern by ourselves. The President can't govern by himself, and we can't govern by ourselves. That is the constitutional separation of powers and the division of responsibility that we must embrace together.

I don't know where the President has gotten this idea that he thinks he can govern on his own. For 225 years our constitutional norms have said otherwise, and experience has shown otherwise. If we want to make real progress on improving our broken immigration system—we actually saw a bill passed out of the Senate. The President said he is frustrated with the timetable in the House. But there continues to be a bipartisan desire, I believe, to fix our broken immigration system.

If we want to reform our Tax Code, I think that is something we ought to be getting to work on. The fact of the matter is we have the highest tax rate in the world. That is making America less competitive in terms of attracting investment and jobs. It discourages multinational corporations headquartered in the United States from bringing back the money they have earned overseas because they don't want to have to pay taxes twice—for what they have earned on their income overseas and then pay double again when they bring that money back home. We ought to look at what kind of Tax Code makes sense for us and incentivizes investment and job creation in the United States and not be content with a system that discourages that.

I believe there is bipartisan support for doing what we can to shore up Medicare and Social Security. We have all seen the numbers—the aging baby boomers and more and more people retiring. Unfortunately, these young people are being left holding the bag. We are going to be OK—people my age and my generation—but future generations will not be OK unless we do our job now to deal with Medicare and Social Security and make them sustainable into the future.

What I feel has been most discouraging is health care. Whether you supported the Affordable Care Act or were a skeptic, such as I was, I think by and large the evidence is that it didn't

work the way the people who were the biggest cheerleaders thought it would work.

One little factoid that jumped out at me yesterday in the Wall Street Journal is that between 2007 and 2013 the average cost for middle-class families for their health care went up 24 percent. That is part of what has made this wage stagnation even worse because people are actually paying more for items such as health care. If there is one thing we ought to all be able to agree on is that what makes health care more available and accessible to more people is when it is more affordable. Unfortunately, the Affordable Care Act did not do that.

Well, I mentioned my disappointment with some of the President's actions—including his Executive action on immigration, which I think has made our job harder—not easier. More recently there were stories of a pending negotiation on the tax bill that the President said he would veto if it got to him. Why didn't the President say: Mr. Majority Leader, if this isn't in it, I am going to consider vetoing it? In other words, why didn't he use the bully pulpit and the leverage the President has to change the package if he didn't like it and make it more acceptable? That is the kind of compromise and negotiation that needs to occur.

What happens when you say I want everything my way or I want nothing? More often than not, you are going to get nothing. Unfortunately, that is what the taxpayers got—a temporary reprieve from the retroactive taxes and no real long-term solution which creates an opportunity to plan and make investments. That is what encourages job creation and job growth and grows the economy. All of this churning and uncertainty is the antithesis of what we need when it comes to growing our economy, creating jobs, and creating more predictability.

I know back in 2008 when President Obama was elected, millions of Americans thought President Obama would be the kind of President that would bring the country together on a number of levels—whether it was a matter of race or just getting the government to be responsive to the needs of the middle class. Unfortunately, he seems to have developed this disdain for the very job he was elected to do. This stuff doesn't happen by accident. It happens as a result of hard work. A lot of that hard work happens behind closed doors where Members of both parties sit around the table and say how can we work this out. When we are doing our best work, it does work out, and although it is not perfect, it is a vast improvement over the status quo. That is the sort of thing the President, unfortunately, seems unwilling or unable to do.

The Executive action on immigration is perhaps the freshest demonstration

of the President's contempt for the role of Congress and the normal legislative process. What I find hard to understand and believe is that for the weeks and months leading up to the announcement, the President was repeatedly warned that such a decision would provoke a constitutional crisis. And he was repeatedly warned that what he was getting ready to do was something he did not have the power under the Constitution to do. And not coincidentally, the President—I think on 22 different occasions—admitted publicly that he didn't have the authority to do what he ultimately decided to do with this Executive order, but he did it anyway.

I can't think of many things he could have done that would be more damaging to public confidence and Congress and the Presidency and our ideal of self-government. If the President says "I don't have the authority to do this without Congress" but then he proceeds to do it anyway, what are we supposed to think?

As a result of the President's ill-advised action, the coming weeks and months threaten to be dominated by a political fight that was completely unnecessary. Meanwhile, the bipartisan prospects for compromise on everything from immigration to tax reform have been significantly reduced.

The tragedy is that once we get beyond the daily partisan rhetoric, there are more areas of bipartisan agreement in this Senate than people might think.

For example, Members of both parties want to vote on the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Members of both parties want to pass commonsense regulatory reform that will reduce the burdens on families and businesses.

Members of both parties want to improve our patent system in order to discourage the abuse of costly litigation.

Members of both parties want to address America's counterproductive business tax rate to help boost investment and create jobs here at home.

Members of both parties want to take action to restore the 40-hour workweek that was penalized by ObamaCare to get people back on full-time work and off of part-time work. People would like to work full time. And there are Members from both parties who want to repeal the law's medical device tax, falling as it does on the gross receipts of medical device innovators here in America, causing some of my constituents, for example, from Dallas to move their operations to Costa Rica and places where this tax won't be collected. Those are the sorts of incentives and disincentives that tax policy can have—and in this case, very damaging.

Both parties want an immigration system that puts more emphasis on

skills and on education. We are a very compassionate country when it comes to immigration. We naturalize almost 1 million people a year in this country. It is part of what makes our country great. But we ought to recognize that we need to use both our heads and our hearts on a lot of these issues. It makes sense to me and I think to a lot of other people to say: What do these immigrants bring to America that will make us better, and not just operate strictly on the basis of compassion, as in, what do they need? This seems to be a system that helps us to continue to attract the best and the brightest people from around the world through a legal immigration system.

Finally, Members of both parties believe we need a permanent solution to our transportation needs in this country. I come from the fast-growing State of Texas, where we simply don't have enough resources to build the mass transits and the highways and deal with the transportation needs we have in order to continue to grow our economy and create jobs. What we have done, sadly—and both parties are complicit in this—is one temporary bandaid after another, making it very hard to plan. We have just put patches on it, and then we come back and—sort of like the movie "Groundhog Day" we do it all over again 6 months or a year later.

None of this is going to be easy. Nobody told us it would be easy, but we need to do it anyway. We need to vote, and we need to come up with solutions.

This is only a partial list of some of the bipartisan, smart ideas that could become law pretty quickly with the right leadership. I am hopeful that after the first of the year in the new Congress, we will look for opportunities—and I am confident we will—to work together to put legislation on the President's desk to show we can actually function and hopefully regain some of the public's lost confidence in their government and in self-government itself.

So the question is, What do we do if the President continues to give very little indication that he is going to be a partner in this effort? We need to do our job anyway. His initial reaction in 2014 has been to flout the will of Congress and the will of the American people. I know the temptation is to say we are going to retaliate for the President's action which we consider unlawful. I think we need to make a measured and prudent and appropriate response. There needs to be consequences when one branch usurps its power under the Constitution. But we don't need to fall back into the same sort of dysfunction we were in previously that got us to where we are today.

So governing is not about having the executive branch or the legislative branch see how much they can get away with on their own. That is not

our Constitution. That is not our form of government. It is about having the two branches working together to try to find common ground and proposing and negotiating policies that serve the national interests—not the interests of one political party or the other but the interests of the country as a whole.

In January I hope to demonstrate that the newfound confidence voters have in Republicans is well-founded, not in the sense that we receive any mandate—believe me, I don't believe that for a minute, but I do believe people are looking for responsible alternatives to the status quo, and I believe sincerely that, working together, Republicans and Democrats, the Senate and the House and the President can demonstrate that we can actually do our jobs and govern. None of us can do it alone. We can and we must demonstrate that we are able to do our job and function. But, again, in order to move the country forward, in order to find solutions to the problems we have on so many fronts, we are going to have to do this together. I only hope the President reconsiders his record and his attitude about trying to go it alone because we know that is not going to end very well.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX EXTENDERS

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the tax extenders package the House is likely to vote on today.

Unfortunately and sadly, it looks as though we have reached another low point in the world of dysfunctional Washington politics. The House will vote on what is being called a 1-year retroactive extension of dozens of expired tax laws. This bill contains everything from the research and development tax credit, to the wind production tax credit, to the new markets tax credit, and they have let us know that this is the best bill they could cobble together. But in reality this is not a 1-year extension; it is a 3-week extension of expired tax laws until the end of this year—3 weeks until the end of this year. On January 1 all of our tax laws will expire again. No one in the real world would ever run an enterprise in this manner.

It is bad enough that we do extenders for 2 years without making them permanent, but to say the best we can do is a 1-year extension and to know that really it is only a 3-week extension makes no sense at all. If the purpose of this bill is to encourage investments in

business or our communities, how does a 1-year retroactive bill make any sense at all? If the purpose of the bill is to provide greater certainty for families and for businesses, how does a 1-year retroactive bill accomplish that? Only in the land of flickering lights—in Washington, DC—where we are barely keeping the government running, does it make sense.

I thought we had reached a new low 2 years ago when we voted on the so-called fiscal cliff deal—when the Bush tax cuts were expiring and there was a bipartisan deal that was meant to, among other things, avoid the sequester. That bill passed at 2:30 in the morning; then, 90 days later, the sequester went into effect—the very thing we were supposed to be protecting against. That deal is sometimes touted as a great act of bipartisanship. The only thing bipartisan about it was the confession that the two parties couldn't figure out how to actually get our fiscal house in order. Had we known that night that the sequester was going to go into effect 90 days later—had we known that that night—there is no way there would have been 92 “yes” votes for that deal. There is no way it would have passed. And we are still living with it today.

Coincidentally, the last time we passed tax extenders, it was part of that deal. The fiscal cliff deal at least provided a 2-year extension to these temporary tax laws. Here, it turns out we will be lucky if we provide 3 weeks of certainty.

Many of the people I represent say this bill is only marginally better than no bill at all, and they reasonably wonder why in the world we wouldn't just do another 2-year extension. They prefer more certainty than that to plan for their businesses and for their communities. Instead of doing the short-term House bill, the Senate should instead take up the bipartisan bill the Senate Finance Committee reported over 6 months ago. I always hear people in this body lament the lack of regular order, and I lament the lack of regular order. This bill represented a great attempt at regular order and it got the votes of Republicans and Democrats on the Finance Committee. We had a markup, and we voted on amendments. Some passed, some didn't. And then we voted the bill out to the Senate floor 6 months ago.

The Ways and Means Committee in the House didn't hold a markup on the House bill they are considering today. It is my understanding the House will be allowing few, if any, amendments. So why is that bill in any way preferable to the Senate bill, where we did the work of legislating? Our 2-year bill deserves a vote here on this floor.

Among dozens of provisions that are important to families and businesses in Colorado and across the country, I wanted to highlight two today. The

first is the credit for wind energy. The wind PTC and ITC—the production tax credit and the investment tax credit—have always enjoyed broad support from both sides of the aisle, ranging from its original cosponsor, Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa, to my friend and colleague from Colorado, MARK UDALL. And I should say that nobody has been a greater champion for wind or more relentless over the years in support of the wind industry in Colorado and those high-paying jobs in our State than MARK UDALL.

If enacted into law, the Senate version of the PTC and ITC for wind will continue to drive job growth in Colorado. We are not talking about some fly-by-night experiment here. This isn't some Bolshevik takeover of the United States. These are jobs—manufacturing jobs and other high-paying jobs—right here in the United States.

In Colorado, we have 5,000 people working in this industry. In Colorado, Vestas, which manufactures wind turbines, employs over 1,400 workers across 4 factories—from Pueblo all the way up I-25 to Brighton and Windsor. These are not just manufacturing and design jobs in urban centers, but construction and operations jobs at the actual wind farms.

I visited one of these turbine farms in Peetz, CO, a couple of years ago. It was a little scary because we climbed up—I climbed up—to the very top of the wind turbine. I thought we were done climbing, but then they opened a hatch in the top of this thing and they said: Senator, it is time to go out and see what this looks like, which I did, standing on the top of this wind turbine housing in the shoes I wear on the floor of the Senate. Even though I was hooked up, it was a little scary.

The guy who took me there was telling me he had been able to come back to his home community—a rural community in Colorado—and work in this high-paying job because the wind industry was there. This was something he never would have imagined as a kid, but now he has real opportunity, and there are thousands of people just like him all over my State who are concerned the political conversation here has decoupled once again from their concerns and has become about the internal politics of Washington, DC, and not what is actually going on in places such as rural Colorado or in rural places all across the United States.

This industry drives economic growth across our State—from the conference rooms of tech startups in Boulder and Denver all the way to the 6,000-acre Kit Carson wind power generating site just west of the Kansas State line.

The production tax credit has driven \$105 billion in private investment. This is actually amazing when you think about it, given the fact there has been so much uncertainty associated with

it—\$105 billion. It has opened up 550 industrial facilities and provided \$180 million in lease payments to rural farmers, to ranchers, and to landowners who host wind farms.

The mention of those rural farmers and ranchers brings me to the second provision of the EXPIRE Act that I would like to highlight: the tax incentive for conservation easements.

Private land conservation is critical in States such as Colorado. Healthy grasslands, open landscapes, and abundant wildlife are a fundamental part of what is to be in the West and in Colorado. In the 2014 farm bill, we worked really hard to build a strong conservation title.

The easement incentive in the Senate finance bill is an important complement to the work in the farm bill. This incentive accounts for the true value of conserved land, which allows family farmers, ranchers, and moderate-income landowners to preserve land for our kids and for our grandkids to enjoy.

In Colorado, we have landowners lined up to take advantage of this very well-designed program. It opens up conservation opportunities to people who might be land rich but cash poor—producers who feed this country. This is land we have to keep in production. But when you are living in a place where the value isn't calculated properly, and there is a high value associated with it and you don't have the money to be able to put it into easement, this program can help you do that.

If we do that, we get to hold on to our farms and ranches in our States. But here we are again considering a bill that extends these benefits for only 3 weeks. If it is good policy for 3 weeks, why isn't it good policy for 2 years? If we pass the House bill, we are telling the farmers and ranchers across States such as Colorado that we don't value long-term conservation, that we don't take it seriously.

The loss of this tax incentive would mean less land across the West would be protected—again, a voluntary program. This isn't telling anybody they have to do anything with their farms and ranches; it is an option for them if they want to use it. More wildlife habitat will be lost, water quality will suffer, and Colorado's scenic beauty, which is critical to our way of life and our economy, will be threatened.

If we pass the House bill, people's jobs across Colorado will be placed at risk. And this is all due to Congress's failure to do its job. We can do better than that. We should, at this late hour, reconsider this and pass the Senate bill—pass the EXPIRE Act. We should pass a bipartisan piece of legislation that came out of the Finance Committee through regular order 6 months ago. We have had plenty of time to consider that. Then we should come back

and we should do comprehensive tax reform and give our country a Tax Code that is actually worthy of the entrepreneurs who are out there working every day to invent our future. The last time the Tax Code—this might be of interest to the pages here today—the last time the Tax Code was updated in this country, I was in college. I was in college. What are the chances that today's Tax Code reflects the American economy as it actually is, to say nothing of the global economy as it actually is? The chances are zero. This is the work we have been sent here to do. It is hard, but that is what we are supposed to be doing here.

I hope in the new year there is going to be a big change around this place, and I hope all of us use that change to the advantage of the American people by putting ourselves back to work. They are working hard. The least we can do is work together to actually align our legislation and our regulation to the world as it actually exists rather than one that existed 50 or 100 years ago.

Madam President, I appreciate the chance to speak today on these important issues to Colorado.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR DAVID WILSON

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this is a bittersweet moment for me, because Maj. David Wilson, who has served in my office in an exemplary way in the Air Force Fellowship Program, will be leaving my office this week. He has been there for the past year. He has been an incredibly valuable member of my staff.

I would like to encourage my colleagues to join me in thanking my military fellow for his exemplary service to the Senate and to wish him well in his next endeavor at the Pentagon. Maj. David Wilson has dedicated his life to serving our Nation. David was commissioned by the U.S. Air Force in 2002 as a graduate of the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps at Texas Tech University.

David has served in Texas, Montana, and Germany and has been deployed to Kuwait, Cuba, and Liberia. He has served the Air Force in a wide range of missions, from personnel and readiness to executive officer and deployed squadron commander. While on Active Duty, David has earned a master's degree in international relations.

Major Wilson joined my office as part of the Air Force Legislative Fellowship

Program. I know my colleagues familiar with that program know how valuable it is. It is a year-long program that offers those in the military an opportunity to learn about the legislative process firsthand. But for me he has been an additional valuable member of my staff who has advised me on defense issues. He has been very helpful on so many issues.

My staff and I will truly miss Major Wilson. David hit the ground running. When he joined the office, he started contributing immediately. He is personable, hard-working, and enthusiastic. He has been a key member of the staff, providing me with concise, straightforward guidance on some of our most sensitive defense-related legislative issues. He has advised me on issues ranging from how to best address claims backlogs and other problems at the Veterans' Administration to military strategies against Islamic State terrorists.

I know the Presiding Officer joins me in knowing the complications and concerns we get from our veterans community, particularly on delays in getting claims heard. I thank Major Wilson for helping us to understand how we could better serve our veterans in this country.

David has drafted innovative legislation to improve the recruitment of our Guard and Reserve Forces, which I hope to introduce soon. David has worked extremely hard to ensure that Maryland veterans have adequate and timely access to the services they need.

I think our Nation's greatest resource is its young people, especially those who have joined our All-Volunteer Force to defend our country and our way of life. Many times we take the opportunity to thank those who wear the uniform of our Nation for defending our principles. We think about what is happening around the world and recognize that in the United States we can pray to the God we want without fear of intimidation. In other parts of the world they would cut your head off for that.

We can express our opposition to government peacefully. We can have an election where the outcomes are in the hands of the voters, and we celebrate that. In other countries they lock up people for dreaming that. Our military makes sure we preserve those freedoms.

The Air Force should be proud of the extraordinary talent they have in Maj. David Wilson. My staff and I still refer to David as "Major," but in fact he has been selected to the rank of lieutenant colonel 2 years below the promotion zone, which is quite an accomplishment. Fewer than 1 percent of the officers up for promotion get promoted 2 years early. So this is a rare accomplishment. It is not surprising in this instance, given David's drive, ambition, and talent.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Major Wilson on his graduation and thanking him for his service to our country. I also wish to take this opportunity to thank David's wife Susan and daughter Ella for sharing him with the Senate. We have been enriched by his presence. I know of the late hours he has worked and the sacrifices he has made to his family.

MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Mr. President, I was pleased to be appointed by the President to be one of the two Senate representatives to the United Nations for the 69th United Nations General Assembly Session. Senator RON JOHNSON of Wisconsin is the other member. The two of us have visited New York together. We have talked about how we can best represent the legislative branch of government at the U.S. Mission in New York to further the objectives the United States has within the United Nations.

Just recently I visited New York. I had a chance to meet with Helen Clark, who is the U.N. Development Program Director, the former Prime Minister of New Zealand, a person who is instrumentally involved in dealing with the development programs within the United Nations.

I mention that because we are now at the conclusion of the 2000 Millennium Development Goals. I want to mention that for a moment because our goals were to reduce poverty, increase the stability of governments. As the Presiding Officer knows, yes, these are core U.S. principles. The Presiding Officer has been very active in Africa, has done an incredible job in Africa in pointing out the need for reducing poverty and increasing stability.

These are our core principles. That is why we do it, our humanitarian goals—yes, absolutely, our participation. But it is also important for our national security goals. Because if we have nations that are prosperous, that include their people in the prosperity of their nation, have good governance, it is going to be a more stable government and it will help us have partners whom we can rely on to help us deal with world stability, rather than have to call upon our military to restore order.

This helps us reduce our need for conflicts around the world. So the U.N. programs dealing with the Millennium Development Goals were well received when they were conceived a decade ago. There are eight specific goals. What is interesting about the eight specific goals is they had specific, achievable objectives to achieve by 2015.

It was basically to reduce poverty and disease by next year, cutting in half the number of undernourished individuals on this planet to deal with child mortality and maternal health. It was interesting that we recognized last decade that we could deal with some simple issues, such as dealing with infection at birth, dealing with nutrition,

dealing with how we deal with an infant being able to breathe properly through simple devices and that we could significantly reduce infant mortality and we could significantly improve maternal health.

So we set those goals. We set the goals of improving primary education because we knew education was an opportunity for children to be able to succeed. Gender equity and equality was a huge issue. Secretary Clinton, when she was Secretary of State, was our leader on this issue globally.

Combating HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases. The United States took a leadership role in the PEPFAR Program that made a consequential difference in dealing with the spread of HIV/AIDS. Environmental sustainability was one of our Millennium Development Goals because we recognized that to be perhaps the greatest challenge on how we are going to deal with the sustainability of our environment with the challenges of global climate change.

We also recognized that we needed global partners for development. These are all part of the Millennium Development Goals. We recognized these are not just goals of each nation working together within the United Nations to achieve, but it also involves private foundations. It involves international organizations, NGOs, all working together in order to achieve these objectives.

Guess what. Now that we are reaching that plateau in 2015, we can look back and say we accomplished a great deal for this planet, a 15-percent reduction in extreme poverty since the Millennium Development Goals were established. That is an incredible accomplishment. We now have safe drinking water in so many parts of the world that did not have safe drinking water when these goals were developed.

Gender disparity in education has been dramatically reduced. It has been estimated that since the Millennium Development Goals were established, we have saved—100 million babies have survived who would otherwise not survive. That is an incredible accomplishment we have been able to achieve since the development of these goals.

Yes, there is much more that needs to be done. Every year about 6 million babies die needlessly at birth. We can do much better and save more children. The Ebola crisis in West Africa teaches us that we still need to deal with basic health services. In so many countries in the world the spread of Ebola was because they were not prepared to deal with basic health care needs. They could have dramatically reduced the spread of the Ebola virus.

We still have, unfortunately, widespread corruption affecting our Millennium Development Goals in countries around the world. Quite frankly, we cannot accomplish what we want in a

country—that is, get their agriculture sustainable, develop the health clinics they need, deal with the gender equity—if they have corrupt government.

So dealing with the issue of good governance is clearly an area we need to improve. We are now talking about the post-2015 development goals, Millennium Development Goals. The United Nations is working on that. Helen Clark, whom I talked to, is working on that. They have some working documents in which they are prepared to come together, as they did for the original Millennium Development Goals, which offer again additional opportunities.

We need to build on what we have done and make sure we have achievable goals. I want to mention a couple of areas that I hope will be included in the post-2015 Millennium Development Goals. First, we need to deal with the realities of the current threats we have. The Ebola crisis points that out.

It is interesting that Nigeria had a few cases of Ebola, but they were able to eradicate it. One of the reasons they were able to eradicate it is because they had a health clinic set up from the PEPFAR money that was made available through what we did with HIV/AIDS. The point is this: Let's use this opportunity, this crisis of Ebola, to make sure we have basic health care services in all our countries so we do not have another Ebola-type crisis in the future. That should be clearly one of our development goals.

Let's deal with good governance by having anticorruption guidelines. In my work as Chair of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, we have workable ways we can deal with corruption in countries and how we can fight corruption. Our trade negotiators right now are dealing with countries that are developing countries in the Trans-Pacific Partnership and are looking at how we can improve good governance in countries through trade legislation. We can be the leader in dealing with good governance and anticorruption issues. It should be a Millennium Development Goal post-2015.

We need to have specific targets in educating boys and girls on health access and food security, climate change, good governance. The United States can be a leader. I do want to point out—and the Presiding Officer is very much aware of this—we have taken steps, this administration and this Congress, to pave the way for the post-2015 Millennium Development Goals. For example, we have the Feed the Future Initiative, where we help small farmers, particularly women, in dealing with sustainable agricultural products.

We do not just give food to the poor, we are looking at changing the economics within the country so they can have sustainable agriculture. The Global Development Lab that Adminis-

trator Shaw has proposed, again the Presiding Officer is one of the leaders on that. But here what we are doing is we are taking the USAID development assistance dollars and we are leveraging it with work already being done by our academic centers in America that are active internationally.

I am proud of the work Johns Hopkins does globally. I am sure many Members of the Senate know of the great work done by their academic centers with private companies. Why private companies? Because they get markets. They are interested in working with us to help sustainable economic progress in other countries, which helps us and allows our development assistance to be leveraged and to go further.

We need to be a leader in the post-2015 goals for millennium development within the United Nations.

I wish to underscore this last point. We need to do this because that is who we are—our values. Our values are humanitarian. We believe we have a responsibility to help, and that includes globally. But we do it because our national security also depends upon it.

We really understand that our national security is more than our soldiers and our weapons. It is very important to those who serve in our military. But our diplomacy, development assistance, and having stable governments globally help us become a more stable society and help us with our own national security.

I urge my colleagues to be involved with us. I look forward to working with Senator JOHNSON at the United Nations as we pursue many different missions. I hope one that we will pursue is the continuation of Millennium Development Goals post-2015 to continue to make progress in reducing world poverty and hunger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in quorum calls be equally divided between the Democrats and the Republicans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELEASE OF GUANTANAMO DETAINEES

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my colleague from New Hampshire, to discuss an

issue that has been spoken about on this floor over the last several years many times, but it continues to be a problem. The Senator from New Hampshire has been very focused, as have I, on this issue, which is the release of detainees from Guantanamo and the fact that we know that not only are there dangerous individuals there who should not be released, but we also know these individuals are returning to the fight, and they are scheming and planning and intending to do harm to America and Americans. So we wish to visit this issue again.

I wish to start off by saying that it is well-founded in our Nation's history that the United States has the authority to hold enemy combatants until the end of hostilities in order to prevent their return to the battlefield. For the past several years, each National Defense Authorization Act that has been signed into law by the President has recognized this principle and made clear that any Al Qaeda-affiliated terrorists, whether foreign or American, who takes up arms against the United States can be held under the law of war.

Because Congress authorized the use of military force against these terrorists shortly after they attacked us on September 11, 2001, detention within a military framework is often the best means of collecting valuable intelligence to prevent further terrorist attacks, while ensuring they remain on the sidelines for the duration of the conflict.

There are fundamental failures of the administration in the war against terrorism.

First, when the President announced the closing of the detention facility at Guantanamo in January of 2009, he left our Nation without a clear policy for detaining and interrogating suspected terrorists. Without such a policy, including one that identifies a facility for holding terrorists who are captured outside of Afghanistan, the intelligence community's ability to conduct ongoing intelligence operations has been severely limited.

Second and even more alarming is the ill-advised release of these Gitmo detainees back to the battlefields from which they came. I would suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that we are doing material harm to our national security efforts by purging the Guantanamo facility, particularly without a long-term plan for guaranteed monitoring, and I know she is going to address this issue. In fact, those who remain at Guantanamo Bay today are not low-level fighters who were in the wrong place at the wrong time; they are some of the most hardened, determined extremists we have encountered and remain singularly focused on bringing violence to the United States and our allies.

Shockingly, many of the detainees who are being transferred were deter-

mined to be too dangerous to transfer by the administration's own Guantanamo Review Task Force. Yet many of them are still being transferred. I have been to Guantanamo on several different occasions, the most recent time being about 3 months ago. I can attest once again that these truly are the most hardened and the most dangerous terrorists who exist today, particularly who are, obviously, in captivity. As we see these individuals on the screen, in their cells, we can see in their eyes that criminal activity is occupying 100 percent of their thoughts and that they truly are determined that they are going to, one of these days, get out of that facility and return to the battlefield.

There was one particular anecdote where the leadership at the facility and I were engaging in a conversation, and it was close to the cell of one of the individuals. All of a sudden we realized that individual was telling other cell mates that he was trying to hear what was going on in our conversation. It has gotten that sophisticated on their part when it comes to trying to figure out ways to communicate with the outside the ideas they have about killing and harming Americans and planning and scheming to one day, as I said earlier, leave that place and reengage in the fight.

Instead of working with Congress to develop commonsense policies to enable our national security personnel to detain and interrogate terrorists, this administration is releasing them back with little thought to their future actions. In this haphazard fashion, there is no uniform procedure for the continued monitoring of these individuals—individuals, I might add, who have already demonstrated a propensity for violence. Each country accepts them on their own terms with varying commitments and cooperation, making further monitoring by the intelligence community and our partners nearly impossible.

This is neither a safe nor a sustainable way of ensuring the national security of the United States, yet it has become an all too common practice in this administration. We know for a fact that a number of these former detainees are returning to the battlefield with renewed zeal to wage war against our American way of life.

According to the Director of National Intelligence, an additional four former Guantanamo detainees were confirmed to have rejoined the fight between July of 2013 and January of 2014, raising the combined suspected and confirmed recidivism rate to 29 percent. In addition, although the next report has not been released, we know this number will increase.

We constantly face new plots and operatives looking for ways to murder Americans, such as the foiled May 2012 AQAP plot that put another IED on a

United States-bound aircraft. Thankfully, this plot and others did not materialize. But we are not going to always be that fortunate, especially in the absence of meaningful interrogation of terrorists and their imminent return to the battlefield.

We know that Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, or AQAP, today represents one of the biggest threats to the United States homeland, as well as personnel serving overseas. They are continually plotting against our interests and seeking new recruits, especially among our own citizens as well as former Guantanamo detainees.

Explosives experts, such as Ibrahim al-Asiri, continue to roam free, posing a tremendous threat to the safety and security of U.S. citizens. It is Mr. al-Asiri who is the bomb-making expert who has attempted to devise bombs that cannot be detected by the equipment in airports, so that they can hopefully place a bomb either inside an individual or on an individual who can secure a seat on an airplane without that bomb being detected as they go through the various checkpoints at airports around the world.

Additionally, as the Senator from New Hampshire again will allude to, this proposed closure of Guantanamo Bay presents significant risks for the United States as well as Yemeni efforts to counter AQAP inside of Yemen.

A substantial portion of the detainees remaining in Guantanamo Bay are, in fact, Yemeni citizens. Transferring these individuals to a country plagued by prison breaks, assassinations, and open warfare at this point could prove catastrophic. These detainees would likely rejoin several other former Gitmo detainees who have returned to the fight in Yemen, further destabilizing the country, and worsening an already tenuous security situation.

The most recent example of a totally failed and dangerous policy on the part of this administration is the exchange of the Taliban Five back in May. That decision, to release five individuals who now wake up every morning thinking of ways to kill and harm Americans, was wrong. This administration clearly and callously failed in its obligations of notifying Congress. It appears they did not comply with this requirement because they knew there would be objections to the release of those five individuals from both sides of the aisle here in the Senate, as well as across the Capitol on the House side. This administration clearly decided they wanted to intentionally release these individuals in spite of the fact that we had included language in the previous Defense authorization bills requiring specific notification to Congress in advance of them doing so.

In addition to simply violating that notification requirement, the administration violated the Antideficiency Act by obligating funds that were not legally available. While the President

has a habit of ignoring laws relating to domestic policies such as health care and immigration, this overreach will likely directly threaten the lives of our citizens and servicemembers in Afghanistan.

In the wake of the President's bold defiance of congressional oversight, I wrote the White House requesting the declassification of the 2009 Guantanamo Bay review task force assessments for the Taliban Five. I also requested, on the floor of the Senate, that the administration release these files so the American people can know what I know, and what the Presiding Officer knows, and decide for themselves if that was the right decision.

Today I renew that request and I call on this administration to fulfill its failed promises of transparency and show to the American people the very real stakes they are gambling with in their attempts to empty Guantanamo.

Nevertheless, this dangerous trend continues unabated, even amidst bipartisan calls for greater oversight after the Taliban Five release.

In November alone, seven detainees were transferred, three to the country of Georgia, two to Slovakia, one to Saudi Arabia, and another to Kuwait. Some of these countries have previously had detainees sent to them. We have mixed reaction as to the reengagement or the oversight that is provided in those countries. Some of those countries have never had a detainee they have taken possession of. We have no idea what kind of supervision they are going to exercise over these individuals.

Whether it is in Iraq, Afghanistan, or in other parts of the Middle East, Americans have fought and died in the war against Al Qaeda. Our Nation may be weary of war, but threatening elements still remain. Those five individuals, the Taliban Five to whom I alluded, are clearly threats to the United States. I urge President Obama as well as my congressional colleagues and the American people not to abandon the gains we have made in this fight against terrorism since 9/11. We must remain steadfast in our resolve to defeat extremists who oppose freedom, democracy, and our American way of life.

I look forward in my remaining days here in the Senate to working with colleagues such as my friend from New Hampshire and other Members of this body as we continue to face this growing threat.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank my colleague from Georgia, Senator CHAMBLISS, for

his incredible leadership on the Intelligence Committee, on the Armed Services Committee, and his deep commitment to ensuring that our country remains safe, that our freedoms are protected. I daresay from the time I have been in the Senate, Senator CHAMBLISS is one of the most knowledgeable people in this body about the threats we face, how we address those threats, and how we ensure that America remains safe. I thank Senator CHAMBLISS for his incredible leadership in this body, not only on the issue of how do we address ensuring that the detainees who are held—who are very dangerous—at Guantanamo Bay do not present additional threats to our country and to our allies, but on so many issues, ensuring that our intelligence officials have strong information and oversight to ensure that America remains protected.

I rise in support of what my colleague from Georgia has just talked about. If we look at what is happening around the world, the recent developments with ISIS, combined with the continuing threats we face here at home from Al Qaeda and its affiliates, it underscores the continuing need we have for a military detention facility that is outside the United States of America, that prevents enemy combatants who are at war with us from returning to the battle, and allows us a secure location to gather intelligence, to ensure that when we capture a member of Al Qaeda, or when we capture one of its affiliates that is in a position where the organization is threatening the United States of America that we take the opportunity to ensure there is a full and complete interrogation of those terrorists to make sure we know everything they know, to ensure we can prevent future attacks, and that the United States of America is protected.

So I would argue, as we look at what is happening around the world, the need for this detention facility actually has become more apparent. Yet what we have seen with the administration, as Senator CHAMBLISS has so eloquently outlined, is there has been a push—there was a political promise made in the President's campaign to close Guantanamo Bay. Despite having a policy as to how we are going to handle the capture of these enemy combatants, one that he worked with Congress on, and how we will ensure the full interrogation of those combatants to ensure information we need to protect our country, we have seen a rush to release people from Guantanamo Bay that has been accelerated recently, as my colleague from Georgia talked about, where the Department of Defense has announced the transfer of seven detainees fairly recently.

Some of those detainees were reportedly assessed to be high risk. There are also questions about what are the con-

ditions the countries that are taking these detainees are going to ensure so they do not return to the fight, where we have direct evidence of a 29-percent reentry rate with those who have been released from Guantanamo Bay, not just under this administration but under prior administrations, who are confirmed or suspected of having reengaged in terrorism.

There is nothing that must appall our troops more than to be on the battlefield, or our intelligence officials or our allies, to reencounter a terrorist we had safely detained at a detention facility, at Guantanamo Bay, and to see that person again and to know they continue to be a threat to the United States of America and to our interests.

I would urge, I hope, my colleagues, now more than ever, that it is important we have that detention facility there that is safe, secure, and we can ensure that those who are captured, who want to do us harm, members of Al Qaeda terrorist groups—that we can ensure they cannot get back in this battle against us.

I specifically want to talk about the country of Yemen, because as a member of the Armed Services Committee—and Senator CHAMBLISS supported this effort—we passed an amendment in the Senate Armed Services Committee that would have prohibited the transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to the country of Yemen until December 31 of 2015. That provision was removed during the conference committee. I am being told we will not have a chance to debate that issue on the Senate floor or to amend the Defense authorization as it comes to the floor because—this is something that I cannot understand, why this provision was removed and why the administration would want the ability to transfer Guantanamo Bay detainees to Yemen.

Let's talk about what is happening in Yemen. Last May, President Obama, in my view unwisely, lifted the moratorium on detainee transfers to Yemen. Since that decision was made, between the date of the President's and the administration's order that we could potentially release detainees to Yemen—let me outline what has happened in Yemen since then.

That country has continued to be a place where there is instability, lack of government control, and, in fact, between November 24 and December 2 of 2014, Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula reportedly claimed responsibility for 17 attacks in 8 Yemeni provinces.

I have a laundry list of very dangerous attacks that have occurred in Yemen. One of the most troubling things that has occurred—as we think about those who are present at Guantanamo who are very dangerous individuals, a number of them are Yemeni. If they were to be transferred back to the country of Yemen—for example, in February of 2014, militants attacked

Yemen's main prison, killing 7 and enabling 29 inmates to escape, including 19 members who were convicted members of Al Qaeda.

So I don't know why the administration would seek to transfer Guantanamo detainees to this country, where there have been prison breaks and where there have been multiple incidences of violent attacks by Al Qaeda. Yet this provision got dropped from the Defense authorization even though it had the support of the Senate committee. I am very troubled by that.

I am very troubled we will not have an opportunity to debate that on the floor. I would hope the administration would look very closely at the record of what has occurred in Yemen since the President has made the decision to end the moratorium on transfers to Yemen because it is an incredible list of dangerous activities and prison breaks by members of Al Qaeda.

So there is no way if we transfer someone from Gitmo to Yemen there, we can guarantee that those individuals will not get back in the fight, that they will not escape from any prison we put them in because that country cannot secure their security.

I want to talk about a very important issue as we look at this issue of the administration's rush to close Guantanamo; that is, the issue of ISIS.

There have been reports that a certain number of former Guantanamo detainees may be fighting with ISIS. We all saw—with horror—the acts of ISIS, how brutal they are, and the brutality that they have taken out on Americans, including one of my constituents. We all know ISIS is a group the President himself has said we need to defeat.

I have written the President and asked him about these reports. In fact, I wrote a letter to President Obama and requested that all international transfers be suspended until we could know more about potential Guantanamo detainees whom we released who may be getting in the fight in support of ISIS. It was recently reported that one former Guantanamo detainee has pledged his allegiance to the leader of ISIS and is recruiting fighters for ISIS in northern Pakistan.

If that is true we need to revisit not only ensuring that we aren't transferring dangerous detainees from Guantanamo to countries such as Yemen—and allowing them to be in a position to get back in the fight—but that we are also ensuring that we have a moratorium on transfers until we understand how many of these detainees may actually be joining ISIS and present a threat to us.

This issue—as we look at the national security challenges we face now—we have to reevaluate. I would hope the President would reevaluate the campaign promise he made in light of the national security threats we face. Now is not the time to be closing

the facility of Guantanamo when we are presented with so many threats around the world—not only from Al Qaeda but from ISIS—and we need a secure facility to ensure that those who are there now, who are tremendously dangerous individuals, don't get back in the fight to continue to harm us and our allies. Also, we need to ensure that if future enemy combatants are captured who are members of Al Qaeda or its affiliates, that they have a secure place where they can be held and fully interrogated.

I again thank my colleague from Georgia for his leadership on this issue and on so many national security issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to be joined with my distinguished friend and extraordinary colleague Senator HARKIN of Iowa to support continued funding of the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

He has been a leader in this area, so I am particularly privileged to stand with him on behalf of a fund that is absolutely necessary to address prevention of serious and chronic diseases. It is fiscally and morally and absolutely essential that we approach health care in this way.

I am going to ask for permission to continue to speak. I am not sure what the allotted time is. If there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent for the time through 5 o'clock for myself, Senator HARKIN, and others who may join us in this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Our Nation currently spends 75 cents of every \$1 on health care for the treatment of preventable conditions.

These diseases can be stopped and prevented in people through simple, commonsense measures. Yet a meager 3 cents of every \$1 goes toward those treatments, therapies, and practices that can help prevent the diseases that are so wasteful to our economy, to individuals, and their livelihoods.

Our young people are on track to be the first generation of Americans to live a shorter, unhealthier life than their parents. The responsibility to change the course of this history is in our hands.

One step this body—led by Senator HARKIN—has taken is to establish the Prevention and Public Health Fund. It is the only dedicated Federal fund for the prevention and improvement of our Nation's public health. Prevention is the most effective way to improve the health of Americans while reducing health care costs in the United States. This funding supports efforts to reduce our Nation's rate of infant death, cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and to-

bacco use. They are the killers and they kill unnecessarily and avoidably.

Sadly, many Connecticut residents suffer from those very same chronic diseases I mentioned. Thirty percent of Connecticut residents have high blood pressure, 9 percent have diabetes, 21,000 residents of Connecticut are diagnosed with cancer annually, and 16 percent still use tobacco.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund invests in a broad range of evidence-based activities—not speculative, not abstract, conceptual, theoretical—including community and clinical prevention initiatives that can help stop all Americans from developing debilitating and chronic disease in the future.

So far grants from this fund were awarded to support four Connecticut projects, including mental health and addiction, diabetes management in older and disabled adults, and the establishment of an electronic birth registration system to improve the ability to track the health and well-being of infants. It sounds pretty rudimentary—and it is—using technology to track the health and well-being of infants.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has a hard-hitting anti-tobacco media campaign—funded from this fund—focused on the destructive health effects of smoking. It is not only effective, but it is supported by the efforts that we have advocated on prevention in health management.

Over the next 3 years this campaign is expected to save the country \$170 million in nonincurred health costs and lowered productivity that results from smoking. The CDC has estimated that this campaign will assist 50,000 tobacco users to quit smoking.

I know from my own work in suing the tobacco companies and establishing the fund to support exactly these kinds of efforts, that millions of Americans across the United States want to quit. They have tried repeatedly. Ninety-nine percent of all smokers want to quit and also try to quit, but quitting is hard because nicotine is one of the most powerfully addictive drugs known to man and cigarettes are a powerfully effective nicotine delivery tool.

These 50,000 tobacco users who quit smoking are better off, not only in their health but their pocketbooks. They save countless dollars that they would otherwise squander on unhealthy tobacco products. They are healthier, their families are happier, and they save themselves from a lifetime of addiction and disease. The preventive efforts of the CDC as a result of this fund are preventive in stopping young people from beginning to smoke as well.

It is monumental, it is historic, and it is a fund that should be fully supported by Congress. The fund accorded

the CDC the ability to run another tobacco education campaign called "Tips from Former Smokers."

According to a recent study, this campaign led 1.64 million Americans to attempt to quit smoking. Those who have completely quit smoking as a result of the campaign added half a million quality-adjusted life years to the population of the United States.

I know these numbers sound abstract and obtuse. They are real lives, and they have been saved from the evils of tobacco addiction and smoking, which in turn could cause cancer, heart disease, and all kinds of preventive diseases.

This funding is essential to running the local departments of health in many areas of our Nation. Workers at those departments of public health are in the forefront of preventing infectious diseases, an issue that most recently came into focus as part of the domestic Ebola response.

Without adequate funding for these departments, the people most closely tasked and most immediately responsible for providing services and information to people in the time of a crisis may be unable to respond when communities are most in need.

We must change the focus of our health care from sickness and disease to wellness and prevention.

We grew up, many of us, with our mothers telling us that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. That is not only an adage that is commonly repeated, it is commonly proved in everyday life.

I strongly encourage my fellow Members to support the Prevention and Public Health Fund to help ensure the future well-being of our fellow citizens.

I yield to my colleague Senator HARKIN, one of the leaders in this effort.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I thank my friend and colleague from Connecticut for his very excellent, profound statement and for taking a leadership position on this very crucial issue.

It is obviously well known I am retiring in 3 weeks. The Prevention and Public Health Fund of which the Senator spoke so eloquently just now is going to continue, and it is going to need people such as the Senator from the State of Connecticut to take that kind of leadership position.

I believe people are catching on to it around the country, but there are still those who say: People get high blood pressure, they get borderline diabetes, they have high cholesterol. These things just sort of happen—sort of like they are preordained.

Chronic diseases are not preordained. As the Senator said, 75 percent of the money we spent was accountable for preventable chronic diseases and condi-

tions. As the Senator so rightly said, what we need to focus on is keeping people healthy, not paying for it later on when they are in the hospital. That is something that this Prevention and Public Health Fund is making strides on.

People have perhaps a mistaken idea that health care only occurs in the doctor's office or in the exchange between doctor and patient or health care provider and patient. But we know that it takes place in all aspects of life—in the workplace, in the communities in which we live, in our schools, in our homes. It has to be something that is sort of pervasive in our society.

I say to my friend from Connecticut that I have often said in America it is easy to be unhealthy and hard to be healthy. It seems to me that ought to be turned around. It ought to be easy to be healthy and harder to be unhealthy. That means the simple things in life, such as kids walking to school. If they have a school in their neighborhood, they should be able to walk to school and back. I often talk about when my kids went to school here in Virginia when we moved here from Iowa many years ago. We had a high school 1 mile from our house, but the kids couldn't walk to school. Why? There was no sidewalk. It was a busy street, but there was no sidewalk. Simple things like that.

Things such as the Senator mentioned, making sure people get their checkups every year. The prevention fund does that. It makes sure of that. The money we put in the Affordable Care Act provides for annual checkups and vaccinations for people with no copays and no deductibles. I am told that now over 100 million people have taken advantage of that in this country—no copays, no deductibles. They can go in for a free check and get their cholesterol checked, a blood pressure screening, and all that done on an annual basis.

We also have to be cognizant that our kids need to have better physical opportunities at school and better food at school. With the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 we started to change the way we provide foods for our kids—healthy foods, free and fresh fruits and vegetables in schools all over America. These are the things that make it easier to be healthy—easier to be healthy.

There are the quilines the Senator spoke about, which have been enormously successful, and the "Tips from Former Smokers." We have the data on that from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. So we know they are working.

So again, I wish to thank the Senator for his focus on this and wish him well in the future in being sort of the champion on this because there are a lot of pulls around this place. I think everyone here would say: Yes, I am for health care; I am for keeping people

healthy. We all get that. But there are so many pulls around here on how to appropriate money and what we do that sometimes this gets lost in the shuffle. So I am encouraged and pleased the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will be focused on this Prevention and Public Health Fund. It is making changes all over this country in profound ways—in profound ways—and in our communities.

Our communities are now getting together. I say to the Presiding Officer, the communities in Maine are now getting together and thinking about what they can do as a community to provide for more healthy activities and encouragement for people in their communities, and they are getting grants from the Prevention and Public Health Fund to do just that. Communities all over America are beginning to think about this and taking action.

It is simple things sometimes. A small community in Iowa—a very small town—had a retirement home for the elderly, but they didn't have any place for the elderly to exercise. So they built a walking path. They put park benches along the way and a couple of little shelters so they could come right out the door and walk. I don't know how far it is—maybe a mile or two. So it is just simple things like that. Before they had no place to go at all to get that kind of exercise.

So again, this Prevention and Public Health Fund, I hope, will remain a priority, and I hope the Senator from Connecticut will continue his great leadership in this area. I thank him for that and for his excellent statement. If on the outside I can ever be of help in any way, let me know. But I know it is in good hands with the Senator from Connecticut.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I want, again, to thank my great friend, Senator HARKIN, for the legacy of public health advocacy that he will leave for all of us. I pledge to him that I will carry on, among many others, I am sure, that legacy and advocacy.

The Senator mentioned that it is easy to be unhealthy and harder to be healthy. Part of the reason is lack of awareness and education, and perhaps, in some instances, even a lack of income and wherewithal. Just let me pose the question to him of whether that impression is true.

Mr. HARKIN. If my friend will yield, I think that is absolutely true. First of all, it is true that a lot of times low-income people don't have access to a more healthy environment. The food deserts we call them in our inner cities, where they do not get the fresh fruits and vegetables and items like that. That has to be addressed also, making it easier for them to be healthy. Again, it is an awareness.

I would say to my friend one other thing, and I hope my friend will take a look at what is now undergoing a trial period. It is something that was put in the last farm bill as a trial period for food stamp recipients—people who are on what they call food stamps, which are not food stamps anymore, as the Senator knows—to provide incentives for low-income people, people who use food stamps, to purchase more fruits and vegetables rather than just starches, fats, and sugars. That project is ongoing now. So I would say to the Senator that perhaps next year he might want to take a look at that with the Secretary of Agriculture and see how that project is doing.

Again, this is just a trial, an experiment, to see what we can do to incentivize people who are on food stamps to use them more for more healthy foods. But it is that lack of awareness. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. My impression also is—and perhaps the Senator has some views on this—that, in a way, we have a responsibility in this body to create that awareness and to spend the money on what should be regarded as an investment. It is spending, and it involves funding. But really the way to look at it is as an investment in education, in the clinics and the doctors and the services that can make Americans healthier and save us dollars over the long term—not only in the money spent on truly preventable diseases but also avoiding the suffering and the pain that is involved in many of those diseases, whether it is cancer or heart disease or diabetes, which are connected to so many preventable conditions.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my friend. I remember Dr. Andrew Weil, who is very well known in this country and a good friend of mine, once made the statement sometime ago in a hearing that the default state of the human body is to be healthy. The body wants to be healthy. After all these millennia of changes, the body wants to be healthy. The problem is we put all these obstacles in the way.

I think that is true of people. People want to be healthy. They may not know that some of their lifestyle choices, some of what they do is provoking their illnesses. So I think it is our job to make people more aware of that and to help to provide some assistance, to provide some incentives for them to have a more healthy lifestyle.

I say to my friend from Connecticut, people will be here, I hope, for the next highway bill. We haven't been able to get one for a long time. I was here for the last one. I had an amendment I thought was going to pass. It was simply this: Any time Federal funds are involved in communities for streets or roads or highways or bridges or whatever, there must be incorporated in the plan provisions for walkways or bike

paths along the side. I didn't say they had to build them. I just said they had to be put in the plans.

They are doing that in Europe, by the way. Every road, every street built has a walkway or a bike path—both for walking or biking.

Someone here objected to it, and we didn't get it. But I still think that would be something, again, to make people more aware. If they are incorporated in the plans, they might see it doesn't cost that much more to add it on to a road or bridge or whatever—the streets we are building in this country. Again, it makes it easier for people to be healthy—just a little thing like that. So I hope the Senator would take a look at that the next time the highway bill comes up.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I certainly will pledge to do so and will think of the Senator from Iowa when we do, hopefully, consider the next such highway bill. But let me just say, in conclusion, for myself, I was not going to mention the “R” word—the retirement word—because it seems almost impossible to imagine this body without the Senator from Iowa not only because of his advocacy of the Prevention and Public Health Fund but also his constant reminding us and his unceasing advocacy for better public health, for championing the interests of ordinary working men and women. So I thank him for that legacy to me and for so many others.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for his kindness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

INTERNATIONAL DISABILITY RIGHTS DAY

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I see my friend from Tennessee here on the floor, but I want to take a few minutes on another subject.

Today, December 3, is International Disability Rights Day—International Disability Rights Day. It is observed around the globe as a day to think about, consider, and support more fully inclusion of people with disabilities in all aspects of our societies, to provide the support and the accommodations for people with disabilities to get a good education, to get employment, and to be able to enjoy all aspects of life with their families and their friends in all societies around the world.

This date commemorates this fight for equality and opportunity and access for people with disabilities all around the globe. In 150 countries and the European Union, they have ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, a day to celebrate a future of increased opportunities and inclusion for people with disabilities.

I am proud of the fact that we in America have been the leader in the world on disability rights and inclusion. Beginning with IDEA—the Indi-

viduals with Disabilities Education Act—and followed up by the Rehabilitation Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act of 2008, we helped set the framework for equal opportunity and full participation for individuals with disabilities. Most of the world now shares those principles, and they have shown their support by signing onto this treaty—this convention. But there is a difference between signing on to principles and implementing them.

By ratifying the CRPD, as it is known—the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities—we can play an important role in helping other countries actually implement that treaty, that convention, those principles.

Under our system of government, the President of the United States has already signed for the United States on this treaty, but under our system of government, under our Constitution, that must be ratified by a vote in the Senate, a vote requiring two-thirds of those present and voting—not two-thirds of the Senate, two-thirds of those present and voting. That is what it says in the Constitution.

As we all know, 2 years ago this month we brought this treaty up for a vote in the Senate, and it failed by six votes. I think at that time there was a lot of misinformation about it. But under our system, it had to go back to the White House, it having died that Congress. It came back this Congress under the great leadership of Senator MENENDEZ. We had further hearings on it. The bill was reported out of the Foreign Relations Committee this summer. Yet we cannot bring it to the floor because of some objections by a few on the Republican side—not every Republican, just a few.

I always want to point out that we had courageous Republicans supporting this. Ever since the adoption of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Senator McCain has been a stalwart supporter of the rights of people with disabilities. Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming, Senator KIRK from Illinois, Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire, Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska, and Senator COLLINS from Maine have all been supporters. That is as it should be. Disability policy has never been a partisan issue. In this body, in the 30 years I have served here, it has never been a partisan issue.

I am sorry the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities seems to be caught up in some kind of partisanship, and that shouldn't be. I was hoping we might bring it up for another vote before we left. I asked consent to do so, and it was objected to by the junior Senator from Utah at that time. So this Congress will adjourn once again without ratifying this convention.

Last evening I was privileged to share an honor by the U.S. International Council on Disabilities with Professor Patrick Quinn, a citizen of Ireland, who was very instrumental in drafting the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities at the United Nations. He pointed out that much of what they did was based on the Americans with Disabilities Act and that it would send a bad signal around the world if we aren't going to join with the community of nations in helping them implement the principles. As I said, we can sign on to the principles, but implementing them is quite another story. That is where we can be very helpful.

Some people say that we can do that on our own, that we don't need to be a part of this treaty. But we don't have the wherewithal to go to every country and do that. We don't have that many personnel. We have budget constraints too. But if we join with other nations—and there are other nations that are very good at implementing disability policy, both in the European Union—and I might mention that great nation of Ireland. They have been very good at implementing disability policies. We could work with other countries, and when we go to other countries to help them implement these principles so that people with disabilities can have a fair place in their societies, an equal place in their societies, it is better if we speak a common language—not the United States going in and telling them “Here is what you should do” but go into a country with other nations and say “Here is what we do. Here is what we do together. Here is what we can do to help you implement the principles on which you signed the treaty.” It is a shame we can't ratify it.

Again I point out, as I have many times, that it has broad support in our society. Think about this. We have a measure coming before the Senate—that doesn't go before the House, just the Senate. We have a measure that is supported by the following: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce—Tom Donahue has been a stalwart supporter of this from the very beginning. We have the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The Business Roundtable, led by a former Republican Governor of Michigan, John Engler, came out in strong support of this. The veterans groups all support this. We have all of the faith-based groups. In fact, on November 10 of this year, we received a letter from the National Association of Evangelicals supporting this treaty. The high-tech industries. All of the disability groups without exception support this.

I must also mention that one of the strong supporters who has poured his heart into trying to get this adopted is our former majority leader of the Senate, Bob Dole. I would also point out that every former Republican leader of the Senate supports this treaty—Bob

Dole, Trent Lott, and Bill Frist. Every former President of the United States, from Jimmy Carter, to George H.W. Bush, to President Clinton, President George W. Bush, and President Obama—all support this. So we would think this would be a slam dunk, but there are a few who have blocked this from coming up. Over 800 disability, civil rights, and faith groups, 20 top veterans organizations, and I mentioned the Chamber of Commerce and the Business Roundtable—all support this.

It is sad that on this International Disability Rights Day, I am sad to say, it looks as though the clock is running out and we will not even vote again on it this year, let alone adopt it.

Next year I will not be here. I am retiring next year. My friends on the Republican side will take over the Senate. I hope they will pick up on this and take this treaty—move it through their committee and bring it out on the floor. It should not be a partisan issue. If there are some things that need to be done with the reservations, understandings, and declarations, fine. There were some changes made this last time to accommodate the concerns of people who were concerned about homeschooling. There is a whole new thing that was put in there on homeschooling.

I am hopeful we will continue our efforts to pass this and to become a part of this international effort.

People wonder: The United States—we are so good on disability policy, we can help people with disabilities all around the globe. I can't say how many times I have had people who have talked to me in the past, young people who are students in universities who got some kind of a grant to go overseas to study but can't do it because of accessibility issues in other countries. They just can't get around. They can't find adequate housing. So it is still part of discrimination globally, and, again, we should be a part of it.

So I take the floor on this International Disability Rights Day to ask that this Senate in the future take up the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, ratify it, and let's become a part of the international effort to work with every other country in the world to implement the kinds of policies we have in this country that provide equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency to people with disabilities—the four great goals of the Americans with Disabilities Act. We can do this, we should do it, and we should do it with our friends around the globe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I wish to ac-

knowledge once again my gratitude for Senator HARKIN and his leadership for these past 2 years that I have had the privilege of working with him as ranking member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and to acknowledge once again that there has been no one in this body on either side of the aisle who has been a greater champion for Americans with disabilities.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for those kind remarks. Let me say again what a pleasure it has been to work with the Senator from Tennessee for the last few years. In the last couple of years, we brought a lot of meaningful legislation through our committee, signed by the President. In fact, as my friend from Tennessee pointed out, we had 21 bills through our committee signed by the President—the most productive committee I think in the entire Congress; I know in the Senate.

So as I retire, the Senator from Tennessee, I hope, will be taking over the HELP Committee, and it will be in good hands. The Senator is a person of good will and good heart and good mind. After all, he has all the background needed—former president of the University of Tennessee, former Secretary of Education, former Governor, and, of course, U.S. Senator. So the HELP Committee will be in good hands with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa.

INLAND WATERWAYS TRUST FUND FEE INCREASE

Mr. President, the House of Representatives is expected to pass tonight legislation that should be very good news to Americans who care about their jobs and Americans who care about the condition of our inland waterway systems.

Inland waterway systems aren't on the front page of the U.S. newspapers until a lock closes or something happens and the cargo can't get down the river, and then it is big trouble. Which is the case in Tennessee with the Chickamauga Lock, an old lock that the Army Corps of Engineers says could close. It is in such bad shape, and if it were to close it would throw 150,000 heavy trucks on I-75 and disrupt the economy in all of eastern Tennessee. That same picture applies in many other parts of our country to these important waterways: The Mississippi, the Missouri, the Tennessee, and the Ohio—rivers that carry so much of the heavy cargo that provides income and jobs for so many American families.

Tonight the House of Representatives is expected to enact the third part of a three-part plan that was envisioned in the American Waterworks Act of 2012, which would provide a permanent, long-term solution to having the kind

of inland waterway system that a great country such as the United States deserves. I wish to speak for a moment about the effect that has not just on our country but on my home State of Tennessee.

For our country, it would be hard to imagine how we could carry cars and coal and agricultural equipment from the great Midwest and the South to the rivers to be shipped overseas without the barges that carry that equipment, millions of tons of cargo every year, and it is usually cheaper and faster than many other forms of transportation. That means more jobs and more money in the pockets of Americans who are able to work for industries that are competitive.

The legislation the House is expected to pass will provide \$260 million for inland waterway projects across the country over the next 10 years. It is important to note that this fee is paid entirely by the owners of the big commercial barges that use the locks when they go down the rivers, and that none of it would be paid by the fishing boats and recreation boats which also use the locks. In other words, the big commercial barges are going to pay more to get through the locks faster, to save money and to save time, and that is good for the fishermen as well, without any cost. This is the third step in the American Waterworks Act that was proposed in 2012.

This step would increase by 9 cents the way the fee is calculated that the big barge companies pay to go through the locks. The barge companies have volunteered to do this. They have been pleading with the U.S. Congress, saying, "Please raise the fee we pay to go through the locks so you can use the Corps of Engineers to replace the locks so we can go through faster and cheaper." So the House is taking steps to do that tonight. The fee will increase from 20 to 29 cents per gallon of fuel used and, as I said, \$260 million of that over the next 10 years will go to help repair these locks.

The first two steps in the plan of the American Waterworks Act were enacted by law earlier this year as part of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. Step 1 was to take the Olmsted lock in Ohio and treat it separately, because it was soaking up all the money that might be available for all the other locks in the country. Step 2 was to create a prioritization of the locks, so we didn't come here every year and say my lock is more important than your lock. And, in fact, with that, the Chickamauga lock in Tennessee became No. 4. And Step 3 is the user fee I talked about earlier.

What difference does this legislation mean for the State of Tennessee and the Chickamauga lock? Well, for years the Chickamauga lock has been subject to year-by-year efforts by those of us in Congress to find a little money to

repair it, to keep it from closing, all knowing full well that if we didn't replace it, it would one day soon close. Those days are over. This is a long-term solution that says, No. 1, the Olmsted lock which has been soaking up the money has been reduced, Chickamauga lock is a fourth priority in the government, and now we have money paid by the big barge owners that, when combined with the annual appropriations, should make it possible to begin to replace Chickamauga lock beginning in the year in 2016. That would mean it would still take several years to replace the lock. It would mean it would still cost about half a billion dollars. But it would mean that instead of year-by-year appropriations and guessing games that the Army Corps of Engineers can have a long-term plan and begin to do the job, and those who are making plans to invest in our part of the region—not just in Chattanooga but in eastern Tennessee—can know if they do that, the lock would be there to help provide low-cost transportation for what they manufacture and what they grow.

I want to thank a variety of people who have taken great leadership in this. The Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY, and I have been the joint sponsors of this legislation in the Senate. We are very hopeful that the House will do its work tonight and the Senate will do its work next week and that the bill will go to the President before the end of the year and this will be law by the end of the year. So I thank him for his leadership.

I also want to congratulate Congressman FLEISCHMANN of Chattanooga who rounded up a group of Republican Members to support this effort, and Congressman DUNCAN from Knoxville. Speaker BOEHNER has been very helpful, and Congressman CAMP has been very helpful.

In the Senate I would like to thank Senator VITTER, who is the ranking member of the Environment & Public Works Committee for his leadership on this effort, and I would like to thank Senator REID, the majority leader, and Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, for their cooperation on this.

Nothing is ever done in the U.S. Congress until it is finally done. So this is passing the House tonight and it is expected to pass the Senate next week, which is very good news for Americans who depend on the inland waterways for their jobs, and in Tennessee where change—instead of a year-by-year appropriation, it is an effort, it is the first chance we have had to have a long-term solution to the replacement over the next several years of Chickamauga lock beginning as early as the year 2016.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

KEARNEY AND PAPPERT NOMINATIONS

Mr. CASEY. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise and ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise this evening to talk about two of our judicial nominations who are before the Senate today. We have gotten through one vote, and we will be having several more on a number of judges. The two I will speak about are Mark Kearney and Jerry Pappert, and I know my colleague Senator TOOMEY is with us and I will make some remarks and I will obviously be here for his remarks as well.

First and foremost, I am grateful to be working with Senator TOOMEY on these nominations as we have on others. It is a long and difficult process for everyone, ever more so if you are a candidate, someone who puts yourself forward to be a U.S. district court judge. We are grateful that individuals are willing to do that, but it does not work unless we work together here in the Senate, and Senator TOOMEY and I have been working together over several years now. We have got one additional nomination after this, we hope, by the end of the year.

I would like to give a little bit of biographical background on both of these nominees. Mark Kearney is currently managing shareholder at Elliot Greenleaf & Siedzikowski, where he has worked since 1990. He has spent almost a quarter of a century in a firm that does a wide variety of legal matters. I know this firm well and I know the work they do on litigation and all kinds of complex litigation. Mark has broad and diverse experience in that firm. Previously he worked at the Elliot Mannino & Flaherty firm, going back and forth in his days at the Elliot Greenleaf & Siedzikowski firm.

After law school he clerked in the Delaware Court of Chancery following his legal training. Of course that is a court that has a high degree of specialization. A lot of business matters and obviously corporate matters come before that very well-known court in Delaware.

Mark Kearney is also obviously very active in his community and I have known him for a couple of decades now. He serves on various charitable and civic organizations including director for Legal Aid of Southeastern Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Bar Institute as well, and the Montgomery County Bar Foundation.

Finally, in that vein of service to his community, he has worked as a volunteer child advocate of the Montgomery Child Advocacy Project since 2007 and served as director of that organization from 2009 to 2012. Montgomery County is one of our largest counties by way of

population, just bordering Philadelphia. It is a big county that has challenges as any county of its size, and to have a judge—or nominee whom we hope will become a judge after our voting—to have spent that time with children in an advocacy position is a great testament to Mark's commitment.

So whether you focus on his academic credentials as someone who had a wide variety of matters come before him as a lawyer in a big firm, whether it is volunteer work and therefore his commitment to service, Mark is well prepared and I believe one of the best nominees we have put forward for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

I have known him a long time. When I make a decision about whether to support a particular candidate for judge of any court, but especially a district court judge, I look at their academic training and experience and whether it is experience as a lawyer and advocate or in some cases a lawyer as well as a judge. You have to make an assessment of someone's character, their integrity, their judicial temperament, all of those qualities and attributes you would want to find in a judge. On all those, Mark Kearney is someone I know personally who possesses those attributes and qualifications. But I also know him as someone who just by virtue of his record that we can recite here is well prepared to serve as a district court judge.

I would ask my colleagues to give him on this vote all the consideration that is warranted.

Jerry Pappert, more formally Gerald Pappert—I think I am allowed to call him Jerry until he becomes a judge—is someone I met in State government. I was in an elected position—it is now 18 years ago I was elected, and early in my term I was having a meeting with the attorney general, Mike Fisher, who is now on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Attorney General Fisher brought his chief of staff, his first deputy, as they called it in that department, to a meeting with my chief of staff and we sat down at a restaurant to have pizza one night to talk about how our offices could work together, even though they don't have an overlapping jurisdiction. But it was one of those meetings you never forget. It was the first time I met Jerry Pappert. I knew then of his commitment to service, because he was serving in the top position in the State attorney general's office. Years later he became an attorney general when there was a vacancy. He served as the attorney general of Pennsylvania.

He currently serves as the chairman of the Pennsylvania Banking and Securities Commission in Harrisburg. Previously he was a legislative appointee to the Commonwealth Financing Authority and Department of Community and Economic Development, a very im-

portant authority which makes determinations about where to invest tax dollars—economic development dollars—across Pennsylvania and how to make those difficult decisions about where dollars should go and how to grow the economy.

From December of 2003 to January of 2005, as I mentioned, he was the attorney general of the State, and prior to that serving as first deputy. As attorney general he was in the National Association of Attorneys General, dealing with issues that relate to Pennsylvania and law enforcement and prosecution, but also on national issues that are common to all the States. So I know Jerry well and I know him to be someone of the highest caliber and integrity and commitment to service and commitment to justice. His long and significant history of service to our Commonwealth prepares him well to serve his Commonwealth, but also a Federal district court position as a U.S. district court judge.

I can say the same of Jerry that I said of Mark Kearney, in terms of his qualifications, experience, but also his character and his integrity. I am grateful to have the opportunity to speak about both of these candidates and certainly am grateful to have a chance to work with Senator TOOMEY on moving these nominations forward and we hope tonight bringing them to a conclusion upon confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to offer my support as well to the two nominees to serve as judges for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Jerry Pappert and Mark Kearney, whom we are scheduled to confirm in a short time.

Let me start by thanking Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member GRASSLEY for facilitating this process and handling this at the committee level, and I want to thank Leader REID and Leader MCCONNELL for bringing these nominees to the Senate floor. I also want to take a moment to thank my colleague from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Senator CASEY, for all the work he and I have been able to do together. The collaboration we have had has been very constructive and it has been a pleasure to work with Senator CASEY. In the 4 years I have been in the Senate, we have confirmed 11 district court judges. We have been able to place a judge in the Reading courthouse in Berks County which had been vacant for 3 years. We were able to place a judge in Easton courthouse in Northampton County which had been vacant for 10 years. With the confirmations that I am certainly hopeful about tonight, Mr. Pappert and Mr. Kearney, that number will rise to 13 members of

the Federal bench from Pennsylvania in just the past 4 years.

We have one additional district court nominee, Joseph Leeson, awaiting a vote from the full Senate, and I am looking at a speedy confirmation of his candidacy as well.

Before I speak on the two nominees before us this evening, I want to briefly note how pleased I was that on November 20 the Senate confirmed Wendy Beetlestone to serve on the District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. She was confirmed unanimously by voice vote and I think that was a testament to her strong qualifications. I am delighted that Senator CASEY and I were able to see that to completion.

Let me say a couple of words about Jerry Pappert.

Senator CASEY spoke about Mr. Pappert. Jerry Pappert is eminently qualified for this post. He is a graduate of Notre Dame Law School and has an extensive and diverse legal background. He is currently a partner at Cozen O'Connor, which is a practice that has an emphasis on commercial litigation.

Prior to that he was the general counsel at Cephalon, where he oversaw all of the company's litigation, financial transactions, and intellectual property issues.

Not only has he handled a very wide range of issues in the private sector, but Mr. Pappert has also demonstrated his dedication to public service. As Senator CASEY pointed out, he was a very successful attorney general for Pennsylvania for 6 years. He has successfully argued cases before the U.S. and Pennsylvania Supreme Courts. He won a landmark case before the U.S. Supreme Court, *Booth v. Churner*, which set forth the administrative exhaustion requirement for a prisoner seeking to sue in Federal court.

Mr. Pappert has also enjoyed bipartisan support in the Senate. The Senate Judiciary Committee successfully voted him out of committee on a voice vote back in September.

Mark Kearney is the other gentleman we will be voting on in a short time. He is a graduate of Villanova University School of Law and a very successful attorney. As Senator CASEY pointed out, he is a managing shareholder at Elliott Greenleaf & Siedzikowski, where he has been for 24 years and practices commercial litigation.

Mr. Kearney is highly respected by his colleagues. He received the AV peer review rating in the Martindale-Hubbell system—the highest rating. He has also taken time to give back to his community. He put a lot of time and energy into an issue that is very important to me; that is, protecting children from dangerous predators. Mr. Kearney has worked with the Montgomery County Child Advocacy Project, representing abused children, and I commend him for that service.

Mr. Kearney has also enjoyed bipartisan support in the Senate. He was voice voted out by the Senate Judiciary Committee, reflecting unanimous support for his candidacy.

It is clear, and I believe strongly, that both Mr. Pappert and Mr. Kearney have the experience, acumen, and commitment to public service that will make them excellent additions to the Federal bench. I am pleased to speak on their behalf, and I am grateful to Senator CASEY for the cooperative effort that has gotten us to this point.

I urge my colleagues to support the confirmation of these two outstanding individuals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

NOMINATION OF DAVID J. HALE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David J. Hale, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF MARK A. KEARNEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mark A. Kearney, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF GERALD J. PAPPERT TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gerald J. Pappert, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania?

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Orr nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield back our time.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Franklin M. Orr, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy.

Harry Reid, Mary Landrieu, Jon Tester, Barbara Boxer, Charles E. Schumer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, John D. Rockefeller IV, Carl Levin, Bill Nelson, Ron Wyden, Sheldon Whitehouse, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Franklin M. Orr, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 71, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 306 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Rockefeller
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Kirk	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Chambliss	Leahy	Toomey
Coats	Levin	Udall (NM)
Collins	Manchin	Vitter
Coons	Markey	Walsh
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Flake	Murkowski	

NAYS—25

Blunt	Hoeven	Roberts
Boozman	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Johanns	Scott
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Cruz	Lee	Shelby
Enzi	McCain	Thune
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker
Grassley	Moran	
Heller	Risch	

NOT VOTING—4

Coburn	Landrieu
Cochran	Udall (CO)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 71, the nays are 25. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF FRANKLIN M. ORR, JR., TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Franklin M. Orr, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Hezir nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. CARDIN. I ask unanimous consent all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Joseph S. Hezir, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy.

Harry Reid, Mary Landrieu, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Barbara Mikulski, Jack Reed, Richard Blumenthal, Carl Levin, Christopher Murphy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Thomas Carper, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin Cardin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Joseph S. Hezir, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Energy, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from West Virginia

(Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 307 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson
Bennet	Harkin	Paul
Blumenthal	Hatch	Pryor
Blunt	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coats	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Toomey
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—27

Alexander	Grassley	Moran
Barrasso	Heller	Portman
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Burr	Johanns	Roberts
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Crapo	Kirk	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Enzi	McCain	Vitter
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Coburn	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Rockefeller	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 27.

The motion is agreed to.

JOSEPH S. HEZIR TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Joseph S. Hezir, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, with respect to the confirmation votes on the Hale, Kearney, and Pappert nominations, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

Mr. HOEVEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the Orr and Hezir nominations be considered expired and the votes on confirmation of these nominations occur at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF GREGORY N. STIVERS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1039.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gregory N. Stivers, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk, and I ask for it to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Gregory N. Stivers, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher Murphy, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Michael F. Bennet, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Edward J. Markey, Al Franken, Tom Harkin, Sheldon Whitehouse.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1040.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk that I ask to have reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Michael F. Bennet, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jeff Merkley, Christopher Murphy, Edward J. Markey, Al Franken, Tom Harkin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Angus S. King, Jr.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 835.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk that I ask to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Tom Udall, Mazie Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1082.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk, and I ask the Chair to order it reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Bernard Sanders.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LAUREN MCGARITY MCFERRAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1083.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk that I ask to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ELLEN DUDLEY WILLIAMS TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 552.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ellen Dudley Williams, of Maryland, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a cloture motion at the desk I ask to be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ellen Dudley Williams, of Maryland, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.

Harry Reid, Christopher Murphy, Elizabeth Warren, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Ron Wyden, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Charles E. Schumer, Mazie Hirono, Amy Klobuchar, Barbara Boxer, Tammy Baldwin, Bernard Sanders, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF VIRGINIA TYLER LODGE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1080.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Virginia Tyler Lodge, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Virginia Tyler Lodge, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Bernard Sanders.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RONALD ANDERSON WALTER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1081.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ronald Anderson Walter, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. The cloture motion has been filed, and I ask that the Chair have it reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ronald Anderson Walter, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Bernard Sanders.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 10 a.m., on Thursday, December 4, 2014, all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of Calendar Nos. 555 and 660; further, that following these votes, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 1039, 1040, and 835; further, that if cloture is in-

voked on any of these nominations, that the time until 1:45 p.m. be in morning business, for debate only, equally divided in the usual form, and that at 1:45 p.m. all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that following these votes, the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 1082, 1083, and 552; further, that if cloture is invoked on any of these nominations, that on Monday, December 8, 2014, following my remarks and those of Senator McConnell, the time until 5:30 p.m. be in morning business, for debate only, equally divided in the usual form; and that at 5:30 p.m. all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; further, that following those votes, the Senate be in a period of morning business, for debate only; further, that on Tuesday, December 9, 2014, the Senate be in a period of morning business, for debate only, with the time equally divided in the usual form; that at 10:30 a.m. the Senate proceed to vote on cloture on Calendar Nos. 1080 and 1081; further, that if cloture is invoked, the time until 6 p.m. be in morning business, for debate only, equally divided in the usual form; that at 6 p.m. all postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate proceed to vote on the nominations in the order listed; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote and all rollcall votes after the first vote in each sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, with respect to the nominations in this agreement, that if any nomination is confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SAM HEMINGWAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one of Vermont's longest-serving journalists, Sam Hemingway, recently retired after a distinguished 37-year career with the Burlington Free Press. His career at the paper spans a period of our State's history filled with interesting stories, and Sam covered so many of them.

During the course of those many years Sam captured the pulse of Vermont, whether through his personalized columns or his probing reports. Sam's institutional memory was a rich and vital resource for the newspaper and for his readers. His writing talents, his reporting skills and his ability to make personal connections will be sorely missed.

Marcelle and I join all Vermonters in extending all best wishes to Sam and his family as they begin a new chapter in their lives.

I ask that this Burlington Free Press article sketching Sam's tenure and retirement plans be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Oct. 7, 2014]

HEMINGWAY TO RETIRE AFTER 37 YEARS
(By Adam Silverman, Free Press Staff Writer)

Sam Hemingway, a reporter, editor and columnist who is among Vermont's most well-known journalists, will retire from the Burlington Free Press after a career of more than 37 years.

"You don't know how much this place means to me," he told the staff in announcing his departure Tuesday afternoon, "and I will miss you, and I will miss this work, so much."

A self-described "generalist," Hemingway's award-winning coverage stretched from the rejection of a controversial shopping mall development in Williston in 1977, through the illegal shipping of arms from a Vermont business to South Africa in violation of the apartheid-era embargo, to a weeks-long trip to embed with the Vermont National Guard in Afghanistan in 2010, among numerous examples across portions of five decades.

"There's a great thrill, if you're into journalism, if it's in your blood, to be present in moments of great importance and to write stories that actually make a difference," Hemingway said Tuesday in an interview before addressing his colleagues.

"When you work for a paper like this, in a state like Vermont, if you do a story and do it well, with the idea that this is going to turn the rock over and show something that people need to know about, there will be results," he continued. "You can help make something happen. That's a great feeling."

Free Press Executive Editor Michael Townsend praised Hemingway as a colleague and a journalist.

"With his breadth of experience, Sam knew where to find the information," Townsend said. "He had a great eye for a hard news story. He was dependable, productive and engaged. We will miss his unique style."

Hemingway, 66, wanted to be a newspaper reporter since boyhood in New Haven, Conn.

With the help of a ditto machine, he produced a newspaper for his neighborhood. Coverage included missing dogs, families' vacations plans and who might have been suffering from the measles.

He edited his high-school newspaper and then studied journalism at Syracuse University in New York before moving to Vermont in 1971. He helped start the Lamoille County Weekly in Johnson, spent a year teaching journalism at Johnson State College, and then began freelancing for the Burlington Free Press.

He joined the staff in 1977, when he was assigned to provide full-time coverage of the debate over the Pyramid Mall proposal percolating in Williston. Hemingway attended 54 night meetings regarding the Act 250 development-control law over two years before the project was rejected.

Then came the story Space Research Corp., a North Troy weapons manufacturer that was breaking an international embargo to sell millions of dollars of artillery and shells to South Africa—possibly with the backing of the CIA. Hemingway recalled sneaking onto the military base at Camp Lejeune, N.C., with a colleague and knocking on the door of a suspected CIA agent said to be involved—and then departing in a hurry when the agent called base security. Eventually, two company officials were convicted of related crimes.

As with his more recent coverage, including of teen girls from the Burlington area lured into working as prostitutes in New York, of the priest sex abuse claims against the Roman Catholic Church, of the heroin epidemic sweeping Vermont, Hemingway's reporting exposed a rarely seen underbelly of Vermont.

"If you didn't shine a light on it, the cases might or might not have reached a point where people went to jail," Hemingway said. "But there's more assurance that justice is going to be meted out."

Hemingway is perhaps best known for his column, which he wrote from 1989 to 2005 (with a yearlong hiatus to cover the presidential campaign of former Gov. Howard Dean).

"It was wonderful to have a voice," Hemingway said. "The great thing about that column was it wasn't just a political column, it wasn't just a crime column, it wasn't a slice of life, it wasn't a feature—it was all of those things. And it would change. Sometimes it was first-person. Sometimes it was personal. Sometimes it was investigative. I broke stories in the column. And it was very well-read."

The column aimed to give a voice to the powerless, Hemingway said.

"It was average folks," he said, "and that was the whole point of the column: to be an outlet for people who weren't newsmakers who maybe had trouble with government or a problem or a personal issue, somebody who lost a kid in a traffic accident."

Hemingway's work earned him 11 Best of Gannett awards from the Burlington Free Press' parent company, along with citations for excellence from the New England Newspaper and Press Association, the Vermont Press Association and others.

The time is right to step away, Hemingway said. He has been thinking of stepping away for some time, and he's ready for a change. He plans to write, travel and spend time with family: his wife, Lee, his four adult children and his two grandchildren—and a third on the way.

His announcement came as the Burlington Free Press shared plans for a newsroom reor-

ganization, a process other Gannett properties also are undergoing. Hemingway said his departure is unrelated.

"It's very hard to walk away from this," Hemingway said. "I need to go. It's time for me to go."

He has yet to decide on the timing of his last day.

"I'll miss my colleagues in the newsroom," he said. "I'll miss the camaraderie of the journalism community at large in Vermont, which, even though we sometimes compete, we all for the most part respect each other."

Hemingway ended with advice for his colleagues:

"Don't just do the stories that you have to do. Try to keep looking for the stories that need to be done. . . . You have to push the limits, go after stories that are out there but aren't waiting to be written, that you've got to go and dig out."

"That's what I've tried to do."

CONGRATULATING CELLARS AT JASPER HILL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont is a farming State: dairy, livestock, vegetables or fruit, farms across Vermont are known for their innovative and sustainable approaches to farming and food production.

The dairy industry in particular is known throughout Vermont, and far beyond. Dairy cows are a familiar sight for those who live in or visit our State, and Vermont farms have been recognized both domestically and internationally for their dairy-based products. The cheese-making tradition in Vermont dates back to the early 1900s, when Vermont dairy farmers sought uses for their surplus milk. Since those early days, many farms have developed methods for artisanal cheese production.

Recently, Jasper Hill—a celebrated farm in Greensboro Bend, VT—won international recognition at the World Cheese Awards in London, when its Bayley Hazen Blue cheese won the award for the "World's Best Unpasteurized Cheese." Besting more than 2,600 submissions, Jasper Hill's award-winning blue cheese also took home a Super Gold award. Six other cheeses produced by Jasper Hill also won awards. And two other Vermont cheese makers—Grafton Village Cheese and the Vermont Creamery—were also recognized.

Some might skip over a story about the World Cheese Awards. But in Vermont, we take pride in the products we produce from the livestock nurtured and raised on Vermont's rich land. Farming remains a fabric of our American story, and in Vermont, it is a tradition that has spanned generations.

Congratulations to the Cellars at Jasper Hill, to Grafton Village Cheese, and to the Vermont Creamery for their recent recognitions. They represent the quality and high standards that are a hallmark of the Vermont brand.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a story recently featured about

these dairies on Vermont Public Radio be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Vermont Public Radio, Nov. 17, 2014]

CELLARS AT JASPER HILL WINS "WORLD'S BEST UNPASTEURIZED CHEESE"

(By Angela Evancie)

Before a recent batch of the Cellars at Jasper Hill's Bayley Hazen Blue cheese was finished aging, before it was ready to sell, and before it would be crowned—or rinded?—"World's Best Unpasteurized Cheese" at the World Cheese Awards in London, its makers knew they had something special.

"I'm not lying when I say we were excited about it at a young age," Vince Razionale, sales and inventory manager for Jasper Hill, said by phone Monday. "We tasted it on day 50, and this particular batch was one that we thought was really on point." (So on point, they thought, that it merited an Instagram post.)

The more than 250 international cheese experts who judged the 26th annual World Cheese Awards this weekend agreed. Bayley Hazen Blue was selected from more than 2,600 cheeses, first winning a Super Gold award and then its "World's Best" award.

It isn't the only superlative Vermont can add to its list of aged-milk achievements; Grafton Village Cheese also earned two Super Golds, for its Shepsog and Bismark cheeses, while Vermont Creamery took home one gold for its Bijou goat's milk cheese, and seven bronzes. Six other cheeses by Jasper Hill also won awards, including gold medals for its Cabot Clothbound and Moses Sleeper. "Ten years ago, American cheese was something to be laughed at in England. Now, collectively, we're a force to be reckoned with."—Vince Razionale, Jasper Hill Farm

Vermont cheese has certainly made a notable debut on the domestic stage. Vermont's Secretary of Agriculture Chuck Ross recently noted that cheeses made here have been named "Best In Show" at the American Cheese Society Conference for the past two years: Jasper Hill's Winnimere in 2013, and the Farms for City Kids Foundation's Tarentaise Reserve this year.

But Razionale says the international acclaim shows how far cheese making, in the U.S. in general and Vermont in particular, has come.

"Ten years ago, American cheese was something to be laughed at in England. Now, collectively, we're a force to be reckoned with."

ALAN GROSS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the fifth anniversary of the unfair arrest and imprisonment of an American citizen in Cuba from Maryland, Mr. Alan Gross. I stand with his wife Judy, and their two daughters in calling for the immediate release of Mr. Gross by the Cuban government.

In 2009, Mr. Gross went to Cuba as a contractor for the U.S. Agency for International Development. On this visit to Cuba, he wanted to assist Cuba's Jewish community by improving their access to the internet. With a background in social work, he dedicated his career to helping others around the world.

The Cuban government arrested Mr. Gross on December 3, 2009. He was held for 14 months without being charged with a crime. He was eventually charged as a spy and sentenced to 15 years in prison.

At 65 years old, Mr. Gross' physical and mental health has suffered severely over the past 5 years. He has lost a significant amount of weight and developed several painful medical conditions. His contact with his family is extremely limited, compounding his anxiety. On his birthday, May 2, 2014, Mr. Gross made several statements that demonstrated the mental strain and anguish that he feels daily. Following the death of his mother in June, he was visited by his wife Judy and said his goodbyes to her. Mr. Gross's current physical and mental state is at a critical point. The Cuban government must allow him to come home to the United States.

Judy Gross has never given up. She continues to put pressure on the Cuban government, speaking out against the poor treatment of her husband. She is a true inspiration, continuing her fight despite the health and financial challenges that her family has felt.

Every day I think of and pray for the Gross family. I pray that they are reunited soon. If Cuba wants to improve relations with the United States, they need to release Mr. Gross now. I thank my colleagues for standing with me and calling for the release of Alan Gross. I look forward to the day that we welcome him home to Maryland, and most importantly, to his family.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, last week I released a staff report that found litigation missteps at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission are costing taxpayers millions, while at the same time EEOC faces a deep backlog of discrimination complaints.

The report finds that the EEOC has had a recent pattern of pursuing questionable cases through sometimes overly aggressive means and as a result has suffered significant court losses that are embarrassing to the agency and costly to taxpayers.

Courts have found EEOC's litigation tactics to be so egregious they have ordered EEOC to pay defendants' attorney's fees in 10 cases since 2011. The courts have criticized EEOC for misuse of its authority, poor expert analysis, and pursuit of novel cases unsupported by law.

While the agency has pursued high-profile lawsuits without a complainant, in March 2014 EEOC reported almost 71,000 unresolved complaints of discrimination from individuals who filed charges. The agency's litigation has recovered almost \$200 million less for victims than under the previous administration over the same timeframe.

The report finds that EEOC also has suffered from a troubling lack of transparency. In the past 2½ years, EEOC has ignored calls from current Commissioners and Congress to allow public review of significant and controversial guidance prior to its adoption. Also, the Office of General Counsel has, since 2010, failed to issue its standard annual report, and the agency is being sued for violating the Freedom of Information Act.

Certainly, the EEOC of today has had successful enforcement efforts and court victories for victims of discrimination, but this report finds the agency is increasingly demonstrating poor judgment and using questionable tactics in pursuit of cases that are not fulfilling the EEOC's objective of protecting employees from workplace discrimination.

The full report, "EEOC: An Agency on the Wrong Track? Litigation Failures, Misfocused Priorities and Lack of Transparency Raise Concerns about Important Anti-Discrimination Agency," may be viewed on the HELP Committee's website, <http://www.help.senate.gov/>.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report's executive summary and key findings printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions—Ranking Member Lamar Alexander (R-TN) Minority Staff Report, Nov. 24, 2014]

EEOC: AN AGENCY ON THE WRONG TRACK? LITIGATION FAILURES, MISFOCUSED PRIORITIES, AND LACK OF TRANSPARENCY RAISE CONCERNS ABOUT IMPORTANT ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AGENCY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) serves an important role in our nation's workplaces. Under the leadership of five commissioners and a general counsel, EEOC is charged with protecting employees from discrimination at work through enforcement of equal opportunity employment laws. The commission investigates allegations of discrimination and seeks to mediate cases, allowing lawsuits to go forward if settlements are unsuccessful. The general counsel pursues allegations of discrimination in court and has been deputized by the commission to initiate litigation in many instances. The commission also issues guidance to inform the public about how it believes employers should interpret and apply the laws.

Today's EEOC, however, is pursuing many questionable cases through sometimes overly aggressive means—and, as a result, has suffered significant court losses that are embarrassing to the agency and costly to taxpayers. Courts have found EEOC's litigation tactics to be so egregious they have ordered EEOC to pay defendants' attorney's fees in ten cases since 2011. The courts have criticized EEOC for misuse of its authority, poor expert analysis, and pursuit of novel cases unsupported by law. Several courts have openly criticized EEOC for its failure to satisfy pre-litigation requirements, such as attempting to resolve discrimination disputes

out of court; yet, the general counsel is leading an effort to prevent court review of such requirements.

These court losses also have come at a significant cost to victims of workplace discrimination. While EEOC's monetary recoveries for victims through settlements are up, EEOC's litigation has recovered almost \$200 million less for victims than under the previous administration over the same time frame. In March 2014, EEOC reported almost 71,000 unresolved complaints of discrimination from individuals who filed charges with EEOC.

EEOC also has suffered from a troubling lack of transparency. In the past two and a half years, EEOC has ignored calls from current commissioners and Congress to allow public review of significant and controversial guidance prior to its adoption. Also, the Office of General Counsel has, since 2010, failed to issue its standard annual report, and the agency is being sued for violating the Freedom of Information Act.

This staff report will first explain the background and operation of EEOC. Next, the report will explore costly rebukes of EEOC's recent litigation practices. The report will also discuss the ways in which EEOC has shown a lack of transparency.

Today's EEOC has had successful enforcement efforts and court victories for victims of discrimination, but this report finds the agency is increasingly demonstrating poor judgment and using questionable tactics in pursuit of cases that are not fulfilling the EEOC's objective of protecting employees from workplace discrimination.

KEY FINDINGS

EEOC's Office of General Counsel frequently initiates litigation without the benefit of a commission vote. In FY 2012, only three of 122 lawsuits filed by EEOC were brought to the commission for a vote. According to a former EEOC general counsel who served from 2003 to 2005, this represents a significant departure from the previous commission.

EEOC has been sanctioned by courts and ordered to pay attorney's fees ten times since 2011 for untenable litigation and litigation strategies. (See Appendix 1.)

Monetary awards pursued in litigation for victims of discrimination are down from previous years. In FY 2012 and 2013, EEOC recovered \$44.2 million and \$38.6 million, respectively—the lowest recovery amounts in the past 16 years.

As of March 2014, EEOC had 70,781 unresolved discrimination charges pending.

EEOC's credibility is at risk. As one commissioner described, EEOC's "reputation and credibility has . . . suffered from several recent lawsuits where [EEOC was] not only sanctioned, but openly chastised by the courts."

A federal court reprimanded EEOC for being "negligent in its discovery obligations, dilatory in cooperating with defense counsel, and somewhat cavalier in its responsibility to the United States District Court."

EEOC caused a small employer to spend \$100,000 attempting to comply with requests for information that, according to a federal judge, "EEOC had no authority to obtain."

A unanimous three judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit found "[t]he EEOC continued to litigate . . . claims after it became clear there were no grounds upon which to proceed."

EEOC is not consistently meeting its statutory mandate to attempt to resolve discrimination disputes out of court. One court found EEOC "blatantly contravene[d] Title

VII's emphasis on resolving disputes without resort to litigation," and another found EEOC ignored its obligation to conciliate. EEOC's general counsel is leading the fight to prevent court review of such efforts, and the U.S. Supreme Court is reviewing the issue this term.

Successful conciliations (i.e. resolution of a case outside of court) have decreased from 8,273 during the first five years of the previous administration to 6,967 during the same time period in the current administration.

Despite Office of Management and Budget best practices found in an agency bulletin and support from a majority of commissioners, EEOC does not allow the public to review or comment upon its draft guidance, even in cases of novel, significant or controversial guidance. This is especially concerning because in two cases last year, the U.S. Supreme Court rejected substantive positions found in EEOC guidance.

Unlike prior years, EEOC's Office of General Counsel has only published one annual report since 2010. These reports summarize the activities and litigation record of the Office of General Counsel.

EEOC is being sued for failing to meet statutory deadlines imposed by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and EEOC's own FOIA regulations.

REMEMBERING COLONEL ELIOT NATHANIEL PEARL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I wish to express our Nation's deepest thanks and to honor the life of Col. Eliot N. Pearl, U.S. Air Force (Ret.). On July 12, 2014, Colonel Pearl died at the age of 95 peacefully at his home in Silver Spring, MD.

Today, Colonel Pearl's family will lay him to rest at Arlington National Cemetery with full military honors in recognition of his 36 years of service to our Nation. In 1939, Eliot graduated from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Instead of becoming a doctor, Eliot chose to serve his Nation during World War II, much to the chagrin of his father. He was commissioned into the Army Air Corps and served as a cryptographic message center officer. Colonel Pearl served two active duty tours in World War II and the Korean war including a deployment to Panama. Colonel Pearl was also one of the founding instructors of the Department of Defense's cryptology schoolhouse.

After Colonel Pearl separated from active duty service, he continued to serve our Nation in the Air Force Reserve for another 25 years concurrently working as a cryptologist at the National Security Agency, Fort Meade, MD.

On August 16, 1978, Colonel Pearl retired from the Air Force. He was awarded the American Theater Service Medal, World War II Victory Medal, and National Defense Service Medal.

We continue to live safe and free because of individuals like Colonel Pearl. He committed his life to serving our Nation while in uniform and as a civil-

ian. Eliot defended our Nation and led the way for the next generation that will secure our future.

Colonel Pearl's beloved son David and his beloved second wife Joyce, preceded him in death. He is survived by his sons, Mark A. Pearl (Pamela), Scott M. Pearl (Renee) and Geoffrey B. Anthony Pearl; five loving grandchildren: David, Vincent, Samuel, Anthony and Daniel; his devoted sister Eva Erony; his first wife Thelma Pearl; his loving niece Susan Erony (Jay Jaroslav); and his nephew Alan Erony.

As we say goodbye, we also say thank you for your service that keeps our Nation strong and free. May God bless Colonel Pearl and his family, and welcome him with open arms.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING EMILY KATH

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Emily Kath for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Emily is a native of Powell, WY, and a graduate of Powell High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming, where she is studying communications and prelaw. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Emily for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING MAEGAN MURPHY

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Maegan Murphy for her hard work as an intern in my Casper, WY, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Maegan is a native of Casper, WY, and a graduate of Natrona County High School. She currently attends Casper College, where she is studying preoccupational therapy and Spanish. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Maegan for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with

all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING CHELSEA RODEKUHR

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Chelsea Rodekuhr for her hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne, WY, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Chelsea is a native of Cheyenne, WY, and a graduate of Cheyenne Central High School. She currently attends the University of Wyoming, where she is studying physiology and business. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Chelsea for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her next journey.●

RECOGNIZING GRANT ROGERS

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Grant Rogers for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Grant is a native of Jackson, WY, and a graduate of Jackson Hole High School. He currently attends the University of Wyoming, where he is studying political science and economics. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Grant for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING IAN WORTHINGTON

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Ian Worthington for his hard work as an intern in my Republican policy committee office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office.

Ian is from Charleston, SC, and a graduate of Porter-Gaud School. He currently attends Georgetown University where he is studying towards a bachelor of science in foreign service,

majoring in science, technology and international affairs. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Ian for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It was a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his next journey.●

RECOGNIZING BUTCH MORRIS

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor Sheriff Randall "Butch" Morris who will retire after over three decades of honorable service to the people of Howard County, AR.

A lifelong resident of Howard County, Sheriff Morris was born and raised in Umpire, AR. He began working as a deputy sheriff in Howard County and was later named the office's chief deputy and investigator, a position he held for over 16 years before being elected sheriff.

For over 18 years, Butch Morris served as the Howard County sheriff and collector, winning nine straight elections, including eight of them in which he ran unopposed. During the course of that time, Sheriff Morris also worked to advance law enforcement best practices as a member of Arkansas Sheriffs' Association board of directors and the Commission on Arkansas Law Enforcement Standards and Training.

On a personal note, I am grateful for the professionalism that Sheriff Morris's office always exhibited throughout my tenure in the Senate. My staff and I always had pleasant interactions with the sheriff's office and that is a testament to the exceptional leadership of Butch Morris.

I thank Butch Morris for his dedication, commitment, and eagerness to serve his community. We are all grateful for his years of service and leadership to Howard County and Arkansas. I wish him continued success in his future endeavors and many years of good health to enjoy with his grandchildren, Brooklyn and Brantley.●

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHELBI

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to speak about a New Jersey company, Louis Berger, and to draw the Senate's attention to the 30th anniversary of CHELBI, Louis Berger's successful engineering, design and infrastructure partnership in the People's Republic of China.

Louis Berger was established in 1953 and has in the years since developed into a multidisciplinary global consulting firm founded on its dedication to engineering excellence.

Today it has partnerships in major infrastructure projects spanning the

globe, including in North America, Asia, Africa, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East.

More than just undertaking projects, though, one of Louis Berger's founding principles is to transfer knowledge to people in the local countries and communities in which it operates to ensure the long-term sustainability of its projects.

For example, in 1984, Louis Berger undertook a groundbreaking partnership known as CHELBI—a joint venture between Louis Berger International and China Highway Planning and Design Institute, HPDI, Consultants.

This partnership created a new pathway for knowledge sharing in engineering design between the United States and China, and to millions of dollars for the U.S.—and New Jersey—economy.

Over the past 30 years, CHELBI has provided international and domestic consulting services for more than 600 highways, bridges, and other projects in over 30 provinces and cities in China, totaling more than 10,000 kilometers, including the 36 kilometer long Hangzhou Bridge, one of the longest ocean-crossing bridges in the world.

CHELBI also fosters international communications and cooperation between the Chinese consulting engineering field and counterparts in Western countries and projects beyond China.

In fact, it is my understanding that the partners in CHELBI have agreed to extend their historic venture for another 10 years beginning in 2014.

So today I would like to recognize the cooperation in engineering design between the United States and China since 1984, as encompassed by CHELBI's work, including its partners at Louis Berger and China Highway Planning and Design Institute, HPDI, Consultants.

The continued exchange of knowledge and coordination of work in large scale infrastructure projects in China and around the globe help to better connect people within and between countries and is of tremendous benefit, both for the countries where these infrastructure projects take place but also for U.S. global leadership in engineering consultation and design.

CHELBI is to be commended for 30 years of productive work—and I would like to express my continued support for initiatives undertaken by the venture and the benefits that such cooperation and coordination provides to both the United States and China.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:28 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2040. An act to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2366. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

H.R. 2790. An act to authorize private nonprofit organizations to administer permanent housing rental assistance provided through the Continuum of Care Program under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3240. An act to instruct the Comptroller General of the United States to study the impact of Regulation D, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3572. An act to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units.

H.R. 4200. An act to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies.

H.R. 4329. An act to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4569. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5050. An act to repeal the Act of May 31, 1918, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5471. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5629. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to strengthen the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5714. An act to permit commercial applicators of pesticides to create, retain, submit, and convey pesticide application-related records, reports, data, and other information in electronic form.

H.R. 5739. An act to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:10 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks,

announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2203. An act to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2790. An act to authorize private nonprofit organizations to administer permanent housing rental assistance provided through the Continuum of Care Program under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3240. An act to instruct the Comptroller General of the United States to study the impact of Regulation D, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4200. An act to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4329. An act to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 4569. An act to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5471. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5629. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to strengthen the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5714. An act to permit commercial applicators of pesticides to create, retain, submit, and convey pesticide application-related records, reports, data, and other information in electronic form; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2970. A bill to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-7966. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7967. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7968. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7969. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation Systems Compliance and Integrity" (RIN3235-AL43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7970. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-426, "Wage Theft Prevention Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7971. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Requests" (5 CFR Part 1630 and 5 CFR Part 1631) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7972. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Student Loan Repayment Program Calendar Year 2013"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7973. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7974. A communication from the Treasurer, National Gallery of Art, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Gallery's Performance and Accountability Report for the year ended September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7975. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-78; Small Entity Compliance Guide" (FAC 2005-78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7976. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments" (FAC 2005-78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7977. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Year Format" ((RIN9000-AM53) (FAC 2005-78)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7978. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation: Streamlining Claims Processing" ((RIN9000-AM83) (FAC 2005-78)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7979. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Incorporating Section K in Contracts" ((RIN9000-AM78) (FAC 2005-78)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7980. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-78; Introduction" (FAC 2005-78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7981. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirements" ((RIN9000-AM65) (FAC 2005-78)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7982. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marine Mammals; Subsistence Taking of Northern Fur Seals; St. George Island, Alaska" (RIN0648-BD12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7983. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia's Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan of the West Virginia Portion of the Martinsburg-Hagerstown, WV-MD Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9919-65-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7984. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rulemaking to Amend Dates in Federal Implementation Plans Addressing Interstate Transport of Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter" ((RIN2060-AS40) (FRL No. 9919-71-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7985. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: 2014 Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems; Final Rule" ((RIN2060-AR96) (FRL No. 9918-95-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7986. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas" (FRL No. 9919-74-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7987. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; 2014 Iowa State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9919-87-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7988. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Availability of Data on Allocations of Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Allowances to Existing Electricity Generating Units" (FRL No. 9919-91-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7989. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; CFR Update" (FRL No. 9919-83-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7990. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County's Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Four Industry Categories for Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions" (FRL No. 9919-66-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7991. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion" (FRL No. 9919-72-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7992. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Balanced System for Measuring Organizational and Employee Performance Within the Internal Revenue Service" ((RIN1545-BL89) (TD 9703)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7993. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—December 2014" (Rev. Rul. 2014-31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7994. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Minimum Essential Coverage and Other Rules Regarding the Shared Responsibility Payment for Individuals" ((RIN1545-BL91) (TD 9705)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7995. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure Providing Indexing Under Section 36B and Section 5000A (2016)" (Rev. Proc. 2014-62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7996. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Individual Shared Responsibility Payment Hardship Exemptions that May Be Claimed on a Federal Income Tax Return Without Obtaining a Hardship Exemption Certification from the Marketplace" (Notice 2014-76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7997. A communication from the Acting Chief Management Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in

the position of Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7998. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7999. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exemption From Registration for Persons Authorized Under U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission or Agreement State Medical Use Licenses or Permits and Administering the Drug Product DaTscan" ((RIN1117-AB38) (Docket No. DEA-394)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 25, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-8000. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mail or Telephone Order Merchandise Rule" (RIN3084-AB07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8001. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska Management Area" (RIN0648-XD590) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8002. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska Management Area" (RIN0648-XD589) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8003. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fraser River Sockeye Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Orders" (RIN0648-XD548) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 24, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SCHUMER for the Committee on Rules and Administration.

*Matthew Vincent Masterson, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term expiring December 12, 2017.

*Christy A. McCormick, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Election Assistance Commission for a term expiring December 12, 2015.

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

*Sarah R. Saldana, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2971. A bill to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2972. A bill to require all equestrian helmets manufactured or sold in the United States to meet a minimum safety standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL:

S.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution to declare that a state of war exists between the organization referring to itself as the Islamic State and the Government and the people of the United States, and to make provisions to prosecute the same; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 593. A resolution designating December 13, 2014, as "Wreaths Across America Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 714

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 714, a bill to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 1011

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1011, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in com-

memoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 1038

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1038, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

S. 1323

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1323, a bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1921, a bill to require a Federal agency to include language in certain educational and advertising materials indicating that such materials are produced and disseminated at taxpayer expense.

S. 2694

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2694, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services.

S. 2714

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2714, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

S. 2723

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2723, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit.

S. 2762

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2762, a bill to prevent future propane shortages, and for other purposes.

S. 2930

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2930, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of an evaluation of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2944

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2944, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2944, *supra*.

S. 2963

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2963, a bill to remove a limitation on a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to normal operation of vessels.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 578, a resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the world's poorest countries have access to vaccines and immunization through Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance.

AMENDMENT NO. 3421

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3421 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 593—DESIGNATING DECEMBER 13, 2014, AS “WREATHS ACROSS AMERICA DAY”

Mrs. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 593

Whereas 23 years ago, the Wreaths Across America project began an annual tradition of donating, transporting, and placing Maine balsam fir remembrance wreaths on the graves of our fallen heroes at Arlington National Cemetery during the month of December;

Whereas more than 1,700,000 wreaths have been sent to locations, including national cemeteries and veterans memorials, in every State and overseas;

Whereas the mission of the Wreaths Across America project to “Remember, Honor, Teach” is carried out in part by coordinating wreath-laying ceremonies at Arlington National Cemetery as well as veterans cemeteries and other locations in all 50 States and overseas;

Whereas the Wreaths Across America project carries out a week-long veterans parade between Maine and Virginia, stopping along the way to spread a message about the importance of remembering the fallen heroes of the United States, honoring those who serve, and teaching the people of the United States about the sacrifices made by veterans and their families to preserve freedom in the United States;

Whereas in 2013, remembrance wreaths were sent to more than 900 locations across the United States and overseas, 100 more locations than the previous year;

Whereas in December 2014, the Patriot Guard Riders, along with other patriotic groups, will continue the tradition of escorting tractor-trailers filled with donated wreaths from Harrington, Maine, to Arlington National Cemetery;

Whereas the Nation's trucking industry continues to support Wreaths Across America by providing drivers, equipment, and related services to assist in the transportation of wreaths to over 1,000 locations across the country;

Whereas thousands of individuals volunteer each December to lay remembrance wreaths;

Whereas 2014 is the 150th Anniversary of Arlington National Cemetery, where some 230,000 markers stand in honor of those who have served this country;

Whereas this year, it is the aspiration of Wreaths Across America to lay a wreath at the grave of every veteran buried at Arlington National Cemetery;

Whereas December 14, 2013, was previously designated by the Senate as “Wreaths Across America Day”; and

Whereas on December 13, 2014, the Wreaths Across America project will continue the proud legacy of bringing remembrance wreaths to Arlington National Cemetery to honor our veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates December 13, 2014, as “Wreaths Across America Day”; and

(2) honors the Wreaths Across America project, the Patriot Guard Riders, the trucking industry, and all of the volunteers and donors involved in this worthy tradition; and

(3) recognizes the service and sacrifice that our veterans, members of the Armed Forces, and their families have made, and continue to make, for our great Nation.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3971. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 531, honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis Zamperini and expressing condolences on his passing.

SA 3972. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3971. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 531, honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis Zamperini and expressing condolences on his passing; as follows:

The resolving clause is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (3).

SA 3972. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NOTICE OF STATUS AS AN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMER.

The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 605, by adding at the end the following:

“(i) NOTICE OF STATUS AS AN ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMER.—With respect to an adverse item of information about a consumer, if the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred while the consumer was an active duty military consumer, the consumer may provide appropriate proof, including official orders, to a consumer reporting agency that the consumer was an active duty military consumer at the time such action or inaction occurred, and any consumer report provided by the consumer reporting agency that includes the item shall clearly and conspicuously disclose that the consumer was an active duty military consumer when the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred.”; and

(2) in section 605A(c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and moving such redesignated subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking "Upon" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon";

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) NEGATIVE INFORMATION ALERT.—If a consumer reporting agency receives an adverse item of information about a consumer who has provided appropriate proof that the consumer is an active duty military consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall promptly notify the consumer—

"(A) that the consumer reporting agency has received the adverse item of information, along with a description of the item; and

"(B) the method by which the consumer may dispute the validity of the item.

"(3) CONTACT INFORMATION FOR ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMERS.—If a consumer who has provided appropriate proof to a consumer reporting agency that the consumer is an active duty military consumer provides the consumer reporting agency with contact information for the purpose of communicating with the consumer while the consumer is an active military consumer, the consumer reporting agency shall use such contact information for all communications while the consumer is an active military consumer.

"(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any person making use of a consumer report that contains an adverse item of information should, if the action or inaction that gave rise to the item occurred while the consumer was an active duty military consumer, take such fact into account when evaluating the creditworthiness of the consumer."; and

(D) in section 611(a)(1), by adding at the end the following:

"(D) NOTICE OF DISPUTE RELATED TO ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY CONSUMERS.—With respect to an item of information described under subparagraph (A) that is under dispute, if the consumer to whom the item relates has notified the consumer reporting agency, and has provided appropriate proof, that the consumer was an active duty military consumer at the time the action or inaction that gave rise to the disputed item occurred, the consumer reporting agency shall—

"(i) include such fact in the file of the consumer; and

"(ii) indicate such fact in each consumer report that includes the disputed item.".

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator ORRIN G. HATCH, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Carolyn Watts Colvin, to be Commissioner of Social Security, dated December 3, 2014.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Farmers and Fresh Water: Voluntary Conservation to Protect our Land and Waters."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, at 9 a.m. in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "NRC's Implementation of the Fukushima Near-Term Task Force Recommendations and other Actions to Enhance and Maintain Nuclear Safety."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct an East Asian and Pacific Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, "Evaluating the Impact of the 'Umbrella Movement'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Dismantling Iran's Nuclear Weapons Program: Next Steps to Achieve a Comprehensive Deal."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD-216 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, in room S-216 immediately following the floor vote at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, at 11:30 a.m. in room SR-418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Infrastructure of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 3, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Natural Gas Vehicles: Fueling American Jobs, Enhancing Energy Security, and Achieving Emissions Benefits."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Laura Sherman, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Maj. David Wilson, a U.S. Air Force officer who is currently serving as a defense legislative fellow in my office for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION ON THE USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5681, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5681) to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5681) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RELEASING THE CITY OF ST. CLAIR, MISSOURI, FROM ALL RESTRICTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND LIMITATIONS ON THE USE, ENCUMBRANCE, CONVEYANCE, AND CLOSURE OF THE ST. CLAIR REGIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 609, S. 2759.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2759) to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2759) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND LIMITATIONS ON THE USE, ENCUMBRANCE, CONVEYANCE, AND CLOSURE OF THE ST. CLAIR REGIONAL AIRPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, shall release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport, as described in the most recent airport layout plan approved by the Federal Aviation Administration, to the extent such restrictions, conditions, and limitations are enforceable by the Administrator.

(b) LIMITATION.—The release under subsection (a) shall not be executed before the City of St. Clair, or its designee, transfers to the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri—

(1) the amounts described in subsection (c), to be used for capital improvements within the meaning of airport development (as defined in section 47102(3) of title 49, United States Code) and consistent with the obligations of the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri under the State block

grant program of the Federal Aviation Administration; and

(2) for no consideration, all airport and aviation-related equipment of the St. Clair Regional Airport owned by the City of St. Clair and determined by the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri to be salvageable for use.

(c) AMOUNTS DESCRIBED.—The amounts described in this subsection are the following:

(1) An amount equal to the fair market value for the highest and best use of the St. Clair Regional Airport property determined in good faith by an independent and qualified real estate appraiser on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) An amount equal to the unamortized portion of any Federal development grants other than land paid to the City of St. Clair for use at the St. Clair Regional Airport, which may be paid with, and shall be an allowable use of, airport revenue notwithstanding section 47107 or 47133 of title 49, United States Code.

(3) An amount equal to the airport revenues remaining in the airport account for the St. Clair Regional Airport as of the date of the enactment of this Act and otherwise due to or received by the City of St. Clair after such date of enactment pursuant to sections 47107(b) and 47133 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) REQUIREMENT TO REMOVE RUNWAY LIGHTING SYSTEM.—The Federal Aviation Administration shall remove the runway end indicator lighting system at St. Clair Regional Airport.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the applicability of—

(1) the requirements and processes under section 46319 of title 49, United States Code;

(2) the requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(3) the requirements and processes under part 157 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(4) the public notice requirements under section 47107(h)(2) of title 49, United States Code.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans Affairs' Committee be discharged from the consideration of and the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following measures, which are VA facility-naming bills, en bloc: H.R. 3682, H.R. 3375, S. 2921, and S. 229.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills, en bloc.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed, en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LYLE C. PEARSON COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC

The bill (H.R. 3682) to designate the community based outpatient clinic of

the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1961 Premier Drive in Mankato, Minnesota, as the "Lyle C. Pearson Community Based Outpatient Clinic," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PFC FLOYD K. LINDSTROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC

The bill (H.R. 3375) to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LANE A. EVANS VA COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC

The bill (S. 2921) to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic," was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2921

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LANE A. EVANS VA COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the community based outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

CORPORAL MICHAEL J. CRESCENZ DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

The bill (S. 229) to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenzo Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center," was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 229

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenzo Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. CORPORAL MICHAEL J. CRESCENZ DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located

at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the medical center referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following measures, which are post office-naming bills, en bloc: Calendar No. 585, H.R. 43; Calendar No. 586, H.R. 451; Calendar No. 587, H.R. 1391; Calendar No. 589, H.R. 3085; Calendar No. 590, H.R. 3957; Calendar No. 591, H.R. 4189; Calendar No. 592, H.R. 4443; Calendar No. 593, H.R. 4919; Calendar No. 595, H.R. 5106; and Calendar No. 584, S. 2523.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills, en bloc.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed, en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFICER TOMMY DECKER MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 43) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD K. SALICK POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 451) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the "Richard K. Salick Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LONDON FALLEN VETERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 1391) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the "London Fallen Veterans Memorial Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CAPTAIN HERBERT JOHNSON ME- MORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 3085) to designate the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CYNTHIA JENKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 3957) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MASTER SERGEANT SHAWN T. HANNON, MASTER SERGEANT JEFFREY J. RIECK AND VET- ERANS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4189) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CORPORAL JUAN MARIEL ALCANTARA POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 4443) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LANCE CORPORAL WESLEY G. DA- VIDS AND CAPTAIN NICHOLAS J. ROZANSKI MEMORIAL POST OF- FICE

The bill (H.R. 4919) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PHILMORE GRAHAM POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 5106) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the "Philmore Graham Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 2523) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW., in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building," was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2523

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW., in Chisholm, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building".

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF DEMOCRACY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 576, S. Res. 540.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 540) recognizing September 15, 2014, as the International Day of Democracy, affirming the role of civil society as a cornerstone of democracy, and encouraging all governments to stand with civil society in the face of mounting restrictions on civil society organizations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 540) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 540

Whereas in 2007, September 15 of each year was established by the United Nations as the International Day of Democracy, a day set aside to review the state of democracy in the world;

Whereas democracy is a means of government that makes manifest the free exercise of certain inalienable rights, among them being the freedom of assembly, the freedom of association, the freedom of the press, and the freedom of speech;

Whereas democracy allows for participatory governance, mobilizing citizens to strive for their version of the good and instilling hope that the aspirations of the people may one day be realized;

Whereas an analysis of 84 independent studies shows that democracy has a favorable impact on the formation of human capital, the rate of inflation, the level of economic freedom, and the stability of political institutions;

Whereas democracy promotes tolerance and respect by recognizing the human dignity of all people and is necessary to the full realization of the values enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Whereas the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) defines “civil society” as associations around which society voluntarily organizes itself and which represent a wide range of interests and ties, including community-based organizations, indigenous peoples’ organizations, and non-government organizations (NGOs);

Whereas a vibrant civil society is an essential element of democratic societies and plays a key role in providing transparency, ensuring the legitimacy of elections, advocating for marginalized groups, and making clear the will of the people;

Whereas, since 2012, the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law has identified 69 new restrictive measures in over 50 countries hindering the ability of civil society organizations (CSOs) to freely operate;

Whereas of the 98 countries for which data is available, research presented in a 2013 article for the Journal of Democracy explains that 12 prohibit and 39 restrict foreign funding of domestic NGOs;

Whereas in 2000, the Community of Democracies was founded “to bring together governments, civil society, and the private sector in the pursuit of a common goal: supporting democratic rules and strengthening democratic norms and institutions around the world”;

Whereas in 2011, the United States joined other like-minded governments to establish the “Lifeline: Embattled Civil Society Organizations Fund” to provide small grants to CSOs for immediate needs and to support short-term advocacy projects;

Whereas, through the Open Government Partnership, 63 countries have committed to protecting the ability of CSOs to operate in a manner that is consistent with the rights to freedom of expression, association, and opinion;

Whereas in September 2013, on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly, the United States launched a coordinated multilateral effort encouraging countries to stand with civil society and push back against growing restrictions on CSOs;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association stands on the front lines of civil society protection, documenting extensive global threats to civil society and strengthening international norms; and

Whereas the United States remains committed to its stand with civil society by developing new mechanisms to combat restrictions on civil society and bolster civil society’s efforts to support democracy around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the International Day of Democracy;

(2) recognizes the importance of civil society to the healthy development of nations;

(3) celebrates the invaluable contributions civil society has made to the creation, strength, and preservation of vibrant democracies and democratic institutions;

(4) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the protection, advance-

ment, health, and sustainability of democracy throughout the world;

(5) condemns the use of restrictions, coercion, threats, or force to impede the activities of civil society organizations;

(6) recognizes the important multilateral work of the Community of Democracies, the “Lifeline: Embattled Civil Society Organizations Fund”, the Open Government Partnership, and the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association to protect global civil society;

(7) recognizes the important role diplomacy plays in defending global civil society and creating new openings for civic space;

(8) emphasizes the value of programs of the United States Government in protecting civil society and defending civic space, including the work by the Senior Advisor for Civil Society and Emerging Democracies and the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the United States Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID);

(9) calls on private sector partners and other governments to develop new tools and leverage existing technologies to support the efforts of civil society; and

(10) encourages the people of the United States and the world to observe the International Day of Democracy, September 15, 2014, with appropriate programs and activities.

HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF LOUIS ZAMPERINI

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 531 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 531) honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis Zamperini and expressing condolences on his passing.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Feinstein amendment which is at the desk be agreed to; the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; the preamble be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3971) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the resolving clause)

The resolving clause is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(3) by striking paragraph (3).

The resolution (S. Res. 531), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 531

Whereas Louis Silvie “Lou” Zamperini was born on January 26, 1917, to Anthony and Louise Zamperini, in Olean, New York;

Whereas Louis Zamperini represented the United States in the 1936 Olympics in Berlin as a distance runner;

Whereas Louis Zamperini graduated from the University of Southern California in 1940 and enlisted in the United States Army Air Corps in 1941, earning the rank of lieutenant;

Whereas in May 1943, Louis Zamperini’s B-24 bomber malfunctioned and crashed during a search-and-rescue mission over the Pacific Ocean, leaving him and 2 other individuals stranded;

Whereas Louis Zamperini survived for 47 days adrift in a life raft with Second Lieutenant Russell Phillips before being captured by Japanese forces and placed in a prisoner of war camp;

Whereas for more than 2 years, during his imprisonment, Louis Zamperini endured brutal treatment and forced labor with courage and resilience;

Whereas upon the conclusion of World War II, Louis Zamperini was released from the prisoner of war camp in September 1945;

Whereas Louis Zamperini was promoted to captain and awarded multiple distinguishing military honors, including the Purple Heart, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Prisoner of War Medal;

Whereas Louis Zamperini was given the honor of carrying the Olympic flame in 1984, 1996, and 1998;

Whereas in the years after World War II, Louis Zamperini traveled as an inspirational public speaker, using his experiences to inspire a message of forgiveness;

Whereas the airport in Torrance, California, was named “Zamperini Field” in honor of Louis Zamperini; and

Whereas Louis Zamperini leaves a legacy as a national hero and an inspiration to future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis Zamperini and;

(2) extends heartfelt sympathies and condolences to the family of Louis Zamperini.

NATIONAL PHENYLKETONURIA AWARENESS DAY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 585.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 585) designating December 3, 2014, as “National Phenylketonuria Awareness Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 585) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of November 20, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

WREATHS ACROSS AMERICA DAY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 593, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 593) designating December 13, 2014, as "Wreaths Across America Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague Senator KING in submitting S. Res. 593 to designate December 13, 2014, as Wreaths Across America Day. Since its inception 23 years ago, the Wreaths Across America project has become an annual tradition of donating, transporting, and placing Maine balsam fir remembrance wreaths on the graves of our fallen heroes buried at Arlington National Cemetery, as well as at veterans' cemeteries and memorials in every State and overseas. In the program's first 23 years, more than 1.7 million wreaths have been placed in honor of those who have served our country.

On this December 13, thousands of volunteers across the river in Arlington, throughout our nation, at such overseas locations as Normandy, and on our Navy ships at sea, will carry out the mission of Wreaths Across America to "Remember, Honor, Teach." This will be the culmination of a week-long procession between Maine and Virginia, with stops along the way to spread a message about the importance of remembering and honoring those who serve, and teaching the people of the United States about the sacrifices made by Veterans and their families.

This year, as in years past, the Patriot Guard Riders, along with other patriotic groups and Maine's First Lady Ann LePage, will escort the tractor-trailers filled with donated wreaths from Maine to Arlington National Cemetery. America's trucking industry will continue to support Wreaths Across America by providing drivers, equipment, fuel, and related services to assist in the transportation of wreaths across the country to more than 1,000 locations.

In recent years, Wreaths Across America has provided some 130,000 wreaths to Arlington National Cemetery. To mark Arlington's 150th anniversary, the goal this year is to decorate each of the 230,000 Veterans' graves and memorials on that hallowed

ground. Thanks to the generosity and gratitude of the American people, this goal will surely be achieved.

The origin of Wreaths Across America is an inspiring example of that generosity and gratitude. During the Christmas season in 1991, Morrill and Karen Worcester took time during their busiest season to donate and deliver 5,000 wreaths from their company in Harrington, ME, to Arlington National Cemetery to honor the heroes who lie at rest there. At first, a small band of volunteers laid the wreaths quietly and with little notice. In recent years, however, the Arlington Wreath Project has grown to become a national phenomenon. The people of Maine are proud that this heartfelt gesture of America's gratitude began in our state.

Wreaths Across America honors our departed heroes, but it does even more. It tells the Veterans still with us that we honor their service. It tells our men and women in uniform today that we are grateful for their courage and devotion to duty. It tells the families of those serving our country that they are in our thoughts and prayers. And it tells the families of the fallen that we share their grief.

Throughout human history, the ever-green wreath has been offered as a tribute to heroes. On December 13, we will again offer this enduring symbol of valor and sacrifice. In this season of giving, we will pay tribute to those who have given us the most precious gift of all, our freedom.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 593) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2014

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its businesses today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, December 4, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume executive session and consideration of the Orr nomination, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be up to five rollcall votes at 10 a.m. on confirmation of the Orr and Hezir nominations and cloture on the Stivers, Leeson, and Griggsby nominations. Another series of up to six rollcall votes will occur at 1:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:44 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, December 4, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT B. O. ALLEN
CATHERINE A. BONHOFF
BRAD C. BORDS
JEREMY L. BRASWELL
JEFFREY S. CHAPERON
ANTHONY W. CRANE
BRENT J. CUNNINGHAM
STELLA E. V. GARCIA
MIGUEL A. GUEVARA
ANDREW A. HERMAN
CHARLES S. HUGHES
DAVID HUINKER
NATHAN T. KELLETT
JENNIFER M. LAVERGNE
DONALD E. LOFTON, JR.
SEAN E. MARSHALL
LUZ A. MAYA
ALEXANDER L. MILLMAN
AIMEE L. MORALES
LURA A. PATZ
JUSTICE M. SAKYI
TRACIE R. TIPPINS
ERNESTINA E. VAN LEER
KEITH M. VOLLENWEIDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD Y. BAIRD
MICHAEL S. BOGAARD
TIMOTHY J. BONJOUR
BRYAN DAVID BONZO
GOLDIE R. E. BOONE
COLIN M. BURCHFIELD
JACQUELINE E. BVLGARI
ANTHONY J. CAGLE
CATHERINE M. CALLENDER
JENNIFER R. CAREY
JOHN F. CARGIOLI
RICHARD C. T. CASABAR
TROY D. CHINEVERE
JOANNE S. CLARK
JEFFREY S. COLLINS
PAUL M. CONROY
HJALMAR CONTRERAS
KELLY L. CZEISZPERGER
JON K. EHRENFRIED
CARL S. ERICKSON
BRIAN C. EVERITT
RICHARD C. EVORS
STEPHANIE A. FORSYTHE
NICOLE D. GARRIS
DAVID R. GILLIAM, JR.
STEVEN B. GRAVES
ALAN C. HALE
MIRANDA L. HANCOCK
BENJAMIN R. HANDO
JESSICA D. HUGHES
TARA M. JAYNE
CHELSEA D. JOHNSON
JULIE M. JOHNSON
JONELLE J. KNAPP
JAY S. KOST
JEANE M. LAMBRECHT

BRIAN J. LANGFORD
COURTNEY M. LEE
ROGER A. LEE
DENISE M. LENNON
FE LOBOMENENDEZ
HANS J. MEISSNEST
ARTHUR L. MILLER
ERIC J. OGLESBEE
CRYSTAL E. PRICE
BRANDI A. RITTER
KATHRYN B. SHAW
STEPHEN C. SIMPSON
JEREMY SKABELUND
MICHAEL A. SKINNER
SCOTT W. STEIGERWALD
RANDALL L. STEVENS
TIMOTHY W. STOUT
DANIEL D. SWEENEY
JENNIFER A. TAY
JUSTIN L. THEISS
JEROME L. VINLUAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RICHARD M. BURGON
JOSHUA N. SCOTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ALLYSON M. YAMAKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

AARON J. AGIRRE
ERIK B. ANDERSON
TANYA P. BERG
BRIAN F. BRAGASSA
JONATHAN R. CARDON
TIMOTHY A. CARLSON
ANTHONY J. CARTER
ALLEN CHAN
WILLIAM R. CONE, JR.
JOSEPH G. CURTIS
AMBER D. DAILEY
J. SEPH ANTHONY DEMEO
FRANCINE A. DRUMMOND
HENRY A. FOERSTER
CHRISTOPHER J. FRIES
FRANCISCO F. GALLARDO, JR.
BRETT M. GERMAIN
NATALIE FAITH GERMAIN
CHELSIE L. GRITZMACHER
JEFFERY Y. HENDERSON
ALEXANDRA E. HERNANDEZ
ELISE L. HICKERSON
RYAN S. HOLBROOK
MELISSA C. HOLT
SHANE A. JENKS
JASON F. KOESTERS
JONATHAN P. KRUIZE
KEVIN R. KUNZ
KAREN R. LAPHAM
LISA K. U. LE
DEBBIE R. LEE
JIEUN LEE
KATHERINE MALDONADO ALFANDARI
MARICRUZ S. MARTINEZ
JARED D. MASON
EGYPT RAH Y. MCADOO
ERIN M. MCNAMARA
MANDY M. MILLER
HOON MIN
HELENA M. MINYE
NIKKI L. MOCHKO
JUNHYUNG PARK
CHRISTINA A. PFLIPSEN
KIMBERLY C. QUILAO
KEVIN D. RASMUSSEN
ASHLEY J. REYES
MARY UM ROBINSON
AMBER J. RUSSELL
JONATHAN J. SCHUBERT
SCOTT J. SHUMWAY
WESLEY S. SHUTE
WILLIAM E. SLACK
DANIEL J. SMITH
ROBERT M. SPRIGGEL
BRANDON C. STANLEY
PAULA A. STEPP
MARK R. STEVENSON
TATIANA P. TOQUICA
STEPHANIE L. TRAHAN
DANIEL P. TRUE
SARAH K. TURBUSH
ROBERT E. WAKE III
DANIELLE E. WEHRI
JESSICA R. WHITE
TUNGSHU M. YANG
GREGORY S. ZILINSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ERIKA S. ABRAHAM

WINFRED B. ABRAMS, JR.
MICHELLE R. ALDERS
DANIEL G. ALLEN
JACOB A. ANDERSON
MELANIE N. ASBURY
MARIE C. AUDETT
HEATHER E. AULTMAN
EDWIN R. AUSTIN
MELINDA M. AUXIER
JASON A. BABCOCK
LANCE T. BACON
ALAN S. BAGGETT
MATTHEW J. BAKER
GARY A. BARBER, JR.
ADRIAN R. BARRON
JONATHAN S. BASSETT
THOMAS J. BAYUK
KEITH T. BEAM
PATRICK C. BEEMAN
JEREMY M. BERNOT
DENAE MARGUERITE BEVILLE
ROBERT D. BOLTON
HOWARD E. BOWERS
AARON B. BRADY
JOSHUA P. BRAUTIGAM
DANIEL R. BREWER
JOHN R. BREWER
LAURA M. BRIDGE
STUART K. BRIGHAM
GABRIEL W. BRISCOE
ADAM S. BROWN
KAESSEE L. BROWN
SHANNON P. BUCK
WILLIAM E. BYNUM IV
NICHOLAS R. CARR
BRADLEY J. CARRA
JAMES T. CASSLEMAN
DARWIN CASTILLO
RYAN S. CHO
JONATHAN K. CHONG
KERRY L. CHRISTENSEN
JUN MO N. CHUNG
ROSELYN J. CLEMENTE FUENTES
JASON B. COOMBS
EMMANUEL CRUZ CABAN
JANET CRUZ
MICHAEL F. DAMORE
CORY J. DARROW
JULIE A. DAVENPORT
TIMOTHY M. DAVIS
NICOLE F. DE SIMONE
CAITLIN A. DUFAULT
ELIZABETH ANNE DUFFY MILMO
EVAN J. DUNN
STEVEN J. DURNING
JOSHUA L. EATON
JASON M. EDWARDS
MARY ANNE Q. EISMA
KATHERINE H. ELLIS
CHARISMA BAUTISTA EVANGELISTA
TIMOTHY J. EWALD
MATTHEW D. FAIN
SABRINA M. FELTON
ROSALINDA F. FITTS
KRISTEN E. FLEMING
ANDREW D. GALUSHA
ERICH M. GAUGER
KARIN SOBY GILKISON
PATRICK T. GLYNN
RYAN C. GOTTFREDSON
MICHAEL J. GRAVETT
ROBERT H. GRAY
GRANT W. GRIFFITH
RICHARD D. GRINSTAD
JONATHAN T. HANCOCK
ANNA HANG
NICOLE M. HANS
NEEMA R. HARDEMAN
MISHA O. HARRELL
DANIEL E. HATZ
KATHERINE G. HAYES
ADAM D. HEBDON
HUYNH ANH HINSHAW
DEANN M. HOELSCHER
MASON C. HUNT
ALECIA R. HUTSLER
KOJI S. IIZUKA
FRANCIS E. JANES
BRETT C. JOHNSON
BRIAN W. JOHNSON
ELLYN M. JOHNSON
JENNIFER L. JOHNSON
WILLIE K. JONES
NATHAN R. KELSEY
MICHAEL A. KOROSCIL
MATTHEW W. KRAMER
JOSHUA G. KUBIT
STEPHANIE M. LAMPKE
JENNIFER L. LANDUCCI
JAMES H. LANTRY III
ADRIENNE M. LAURY
PETER A. LENNOX
ANDREW W. LEWIS
BRIAN J. LEWIS
YANG LIU
SUSAN B. LOBRANO
HAROLD J. LOCHNER III
JENNIFER D. LORENZ
MICHAEL T. LOUGHLIN
REGAN F. LYON
JOHN P. MAGULICK, JR.
ERIN M. MAI

KURIAN T. MALIEL
KEREEM M. D. MARLOW
ANNA M. MARUSKA
JONATHAN A. MAXHAM
DIXIE ANN MCCLENDON COKER
SETH B. MCCORD
GREGORY K. MCCOY
EMILY M. MCELVEEN
SEAN P. MEAGHER
JASON L. MELLO
ERIC G. MEYER
CHRISTOPHER J. MICALLEF
SHANA M. MILES
NATHAN R. MOODY
CAROLYN S. MOORE
JEFFREY D. MORGAN
TRENT L. MORGAN
BETHANY M. MULLA
HEATHER D. MUNDY
MICHAEL R. NAY
BRITTANIE INGRAM NEAVES
MEAGHAN P. NELLES
JOANNA M. NELMS
ALEXIS E. NELSON
STEVE M. NELSON
MICHELLE R. NEWKIRK
MONIQUE R. NOBLE
DAVID M. NORTHERN
NATHANIEL S. NYE
TAMANNA ODEA
KENNETH L. OFFUTT
NATHAN W. OLSON
MARY K. OSBORNE
NATHAN T. PALMER
JOSHUA E. PASCOE
NEHA K. PATEL
JUSTIN G. PEACOCK
TROY J. PEARCE
VANESSA MICHELLE PEARSON
BRIAN M. PENNINGTON
ASEEM V. PETERSON
MARK R. PETERSON
MAI T. PHAM
REBEKAH E. PIEGOLS
ADAM J. POLOZOLA
LISA MARIE POOLE
ALICIA C. PRESCOTT
ANGELA T. PRESCOTT
LESLIE L. K. PRISTAS
NAVINDRA RAMDATH
RACHEL TENNESSEE RAMSOWER
FREDERIC A. RAWLINS III
EMERSON M. RAZA
BRADLEY A. REEL
MATTHEW T. REYNOLDS
SARAH M. REYNOLDS
TALAYEH REZAYAT
JOHN M. RICHARDSON
RAMON A. RIOJAS
JAIME LYNN ROBEY
SHAINA J. ROGERS
JENNIFER ELIZABETH ROPER
LINDY M. ROSAL
MATTHEW J. ROYALL
FRANK D. RUSSO
HENRY S. SCHEULLER
AMY L. SCHIMKE
ERIKA J. SCHNEBLE
CHRISTOPHER P. SCHWAN
DANNIELLE M. SCHWARTZ
WANDER S. SEGURA
CHARLES S. SHAFFER
ERWIN T. SHAW
TIFFANY M. SHELTON
MICHELLE M. SHIPP
THOMAS M. SKINNER
NICOLAS J. SKORDAS
REBECCA S. SLOGIC
BENJAMIN P. SMITH
DEREK M. SMITH
JOHN R. SMITH
NATHANIEL E. SMITH
NATOSHA D. SMITH
STACY A. SOLHEIM
JOSEPH S. SONTGERATH
CHRISTOPHER M. STANLEY
KOURTNI L. STARKEY
MEGHAN A. STEINOUR
KELLY N. STINSON
JOSHUA C. STOREY
JOHN M. STOWERS
TIFFANY R. STRATTON
PHILLIP A. STRAWBRIDGE
MATTHEW T. STRINGER
NOAH T. SUTTON
CHRISTOPHER N. SWEIGART
SOFIA M. SZARI
CHAUNCEY D. TARRANT
STEVEN A. TAYLOR
NATHAN J. TESCHAN
KELTON M. THOMAS
SARAH E. Y. THOMAS
JAMES A. THOMPSON
MARC D. TOLLEY
ALFRED F. TRAPPEY III
WESLEY E. TRUEBLOOD
MARK R. TRUXILLO
RENE D. TURNER
JOHN R. UNTISZ
MATTHEW D. VANDERHOEK
ANNE M. VENABLE
JAMESON D. VOSS

PAUL D. VU
JUSTYNA T. WADOLOWSKI
ALLISON J. WALKER
HANS R. WATSON
JOHN D. WATSON
MATTHEW F. WATTO
KHANDIE Y. WAUGH
BRYANT J. WEBBER
AMANDA M. WEINDL
JASON P. WELTER
LAURA B. WHITE
ELAINA C. WILD
JON P. WILLIAMS
JORDAN M. WILLIAMS
ADAM M. WILLIS
THOMAS J. WILLSON
CORTNEY C. WILSON
EMILY J. WINTERTON
LAURA B. WOLFE
HALEI K. WONG
JENNIFER L. WOODWARD
APRIL LASHEL WOODY
CHRISTOPHER D. YOUNG
FEI ZHANG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RHETT B. CASPER
JAMES K. T. CULLEN
MICHAEL W. DUERS
NICHOLAS B. DUVALL
PAULA K. HOANG
MATTHEW M. HUFFAKER
THEODORE M. JACKSON
JOANNA B. JAMINSKA
JINYOUNG KIM
MISUKE KIM
MARCUS P. KROPP
BRENDAN M. LANE
WENDY D. LOBRE
JAMES M. PIPER II
CHRISTOPHER L. PODLIN
ALLEN M. PRATT
NATHAN T. SCHWAMBURGER
ERIN M. SPEIER
BRADSHAW M. STOUT
BETH L. TOMIC
MARK A. VANZANT
BRENT J. WALDMAN
STERLING J. WHIPPLE
JAESUK YOO
JAMES M. YOUNG
STACEY ELIZABETH ZAIKOSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSE C. AGUIRRE
ANGELA M. ALBRECHT
MICHAEL R. ALCORN
DOUGLAS R. ALFAR
JENNIFER A. ALFAR
DAVID A. APPEL
ALVI A. AZAD
CHRISTOPHER E. BACKUS
BRUCE R. BALL
HEATHER M. BARBIER
TRAVIS CARLOS BATT'S
CLAYNE BENSON
KORY R. BODILY
CALE WALTER BONDS
JASON D. BOYD
ERNEST E. BRAXTON
RUTH BRENNER
TYSON C. BROWN
CHRISTOPHER W. BUNT
JEFFREY S. BURBRIDGE
DANIELLE J. CERMAK
WENDY CHAO
SPENCER C. CHECKETTS
DAVID S. CHOI
JARED GLEN CLAY
ANGELIQUE N. COLLAMER
MARIA A. CONLEY
CHANTAL COUSINEAU KRIEGER
CARLTON J. COVEY
JOHN R. CUNNINGHAM
BRANDON J. CUTLER
DILLARD L. DEHART III
STEFANI L. DIEDRICH
MELISSA J. DOOLEY
JOSHUA S. DUBOIS
BRANDEN G. DUFFEY
JENNIFER E. DUNLAVY
TODD ALIN EADS
LANCE D. EDMONDS
NATHAN R. EVANS
CRISTINA L. FRANCHETTI
BRUCE JAY GARDNER II
RYAN F. GIBBONS
THOMAS O. GIFFORD
KRISTEN R. GLASS
BRIAN B. GLODT
ARTHUR J. GREENWOOD
IAN D. GREGORY
JOHN THOMAS HARDY
BRANDE M. HARRIS
JAMES C. HARTLEY

JOSHUA A. HARTMAN
KERMIT G. HELO III
ANTONIO J. HERNANDEZ
BERNARD A. HILDEBRAND, JR.
ROBIN A. HOLZER
BORISLAV HRISTOV
MARK W. HUBBELL
BRENT J. HUDDLESTON
JOSEPH A. HUSEMAN II
NICHOLE K. INGALLS
BRENT IZU
CHRISTOPHER E. JONAS
EVAN M. JONES
KEVIN P. JUOZAPAVICIUS
MARTIN P. KASZUBOWSKI
JEFFREY D. KISER
ADAM C. KOERTNER
CHRISTOPHER K. LAWLER
PAMELA R. LECLAIRE
CHRISTOPHER C. LEDFORD
BRETT E. LINCK
JEFFREY M. LODERMEIER
MICHELLE MARINO
SEAN P. MARTIN
LESLIE D. MATESICK
MICHAEL J. MATSUURA
JOHN J. MAXEY
BRADLEY A. MCGREGOR
DAVID C. MILLER
CHRISTINE A. MIRABAL
BENJAMIN J. MITCHELL
BENJAMIN MONSON
STEFANIE M. NANCE
CATHERINE E. NOBLE
CADE M. NYLUND
KATHLEEN M. OLEARY
MICHAEL P. OREJUDOS
REID N. ORTH
CASEY L. PARINI
JASON M. PFLUKE
NECIA M. POPE
DAMIEN C. POWELL
FRANCISCO J. RAMIREZ
JAMIE M. RAND
JOEL ADLAI REYES
RICHARD J. ROBINS
VANCE M. ROTHMEYER
AARON M. RUBIN
MEREDITH A. SARDA
MATTHEW R. SCHMITZ
ROSS A. SCHUMER
FAYE B. SERKIN
JENNIFER A. SEXTON
CYNTHIA S. SHEN
CHRISTINE A. SMETANA
JESSICA K. SMYTH
MARCUS S. SNYDER
RICHARD O. SPEAKMAN
SAMUEL A. SPEAR
DANIEL A. STEIGELMAN
ALLEN I. STERING
TIMOTHY J. STRIGENZ
ANDRE J. SULLIVAN
ROBERT C. SWIFT
BRYAN D. SZALWINSKI
KENJI L. TAKANO
TRAVIS C. TAYLOR
ANDREW A. THORESON
WILLIAM TOTTH
VINH Q. TRAN
MARC S. TUBAY
LUCRETIA LYNNE VAUGHAN
KENNETH W. VAWTER
RODNEY C. WADLEY, SR.
JASON M. WEBB
LISA M. WEEKS
JACOB M. WESSLER
NED L. WILLIAMS
PETER M. WILLIAMS
TIMOTHY K. WILLIAMS
SCOTT A. WILTZ
EMILY B. WONG
VANESSA W. WONG
CURTIS J. WOZNIAK
FI A. YI
SANDY K. YIP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JASON D. EITUTIS
MICHAEL D. FOUTCH
PATRICIA D. FOWLER
SALLY ANN KELLYRANK
RANDALL C. LAMBERT
GREGORY W. PAPKE
ROBERT M. PAZ
SCOT S. SPANN
BRYAN E. WOOLLEY
BRIAN K. WYRICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

SARAHANN BEAL
RICHARD J. BERT, JR.
JOSEPH COSTANTINO
CRAIG H. FORCUM
PAUL J. HOERNER

SCOTT M. MCKIM
JAMES R. POEL
MARK A. STAAL
KEVIN W. TILLER
RYAN L. TRAVER
JAY A. VIETAS
CAROL C. WALTERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KEITH L. CLARK
MICHAEL E. CRABTREE
WILLIAM K. LIN
PAUL A. LONGO
VICTOR B. MAGGIO
JAMES R. MOORE
KYLE E. PELKEY
ENRIQUE E. ROSADO
JENNIE LEIGH L. STODDART

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

TALIB Y. ALI
JAY R. ALLEN
JASON G. ARNOLD
ANTHONY S. BANKES
VIKHYAT S. BEBARTA
JAMES E. BERMUDEZ
JOHN N. BERRY
ANTHONY I. BEUTLER
CHRISTOPHER T. BIRD
JEREMY W. CANNON
JERRY M. CLINE
ROBERT W. CRAIGGRAY
PAUL F. CRAWFORD, JR.
SCOTT M. CUMMIS
RONALD S. DAY
ANTONIO J. DELGADO
BRIAN L. DELMONACO
KELLY L. DORENKOTT
DAVID J. DUVAL
KENNETH S. EGERSTROM
MARY T. GUEST
GREGORY J. HAACK
CHAD A. HAMILTON
JASON T. HAYES
RACHEL A. HIGHT
MICHAEL GLENN HODGES
ERIC F. HOLT
BRANDON R. HORNE
CHRISTOPHER M. HUDSON
SEAN L. JERSEY
KEVIN J. KAPS
TONY S. KIM
PAULETTE D. LASSITER
MAXIMILIAN S. LEE
MARK D. LYMAN
ROBERT M. MONBERG
THOMAS O. MOORE
BRENDAN M. NOONE
SAMIA A. OCHIA
SAMUEL T. OLATUNBOSUN
STEVEN D. PEINE
MICHAEL C. PETRO
JENNIFER L. RAVENSCROFT
JOSEPH R. RICHARDS
JAMES B. SAMPSON
ZAIGA KAREN SEARS
PATRICK A. SHEA
DAVID L. STEINHISER II
GALE T. TUPER, JR.
CEASAR A. VALLIE
JAMES F. WALROTH
STEVEN R. WARD
DERRICK B. WILLSEY
GABRIEL ZIMMERER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BAMIDELE A. ADETUNJI
TERESE L. ALLISON
LIAM M. APONTE
JULEE L. AVRAM
BRETT J. BALLARD
SHARON A. BALLINGER
NICHOLAS S. BANCROFT
PAMELA D. BANKS
KATHLEEN V. BELL
NATASHA I. BEST
JUDY L. BLANCHARD
BRIAN T. BOOTH
CASSIDY JO BOYER
TINA S. BRADFORD
MICHAEL J. BRAKEL
LAURIE A. BREZINA
REBECCA A. BRIONES
KELLY ANN CARTER
MARIA C. CASTRO
JENNIE L. CAVAL
MARGARET G. CENTENO
LEWIS G. CHRISTENSEN
DAWN M. CLAUSON
MARION A. COLLINS
JENNIFER L. CONAWAY

JONATHAN C. CRISS
KAREN J. DARGAN
CARMANTA L. DAVIS
MONICA I. DENNING
GUILENE C. DERISMA
RACHELLE R. DIXON
TIFFANI M. DORCH
DEAN P. DORE
DEBBIE J. DORSEY
KATHLEEN M. DRUM
APRIL J. DUNLEVY
CHRISTOPHER D. DUVALL
ABIGAIL J. EASTMAN
LORI E. FLORI
JOAQUINA PONTES LOPES
MOAYAD FOWLER, SR.
JENNIFER L. FRANKS
DENISE M. FREDERIKSEN
ERIC M. FROST
MCKISA P. FRYER
MARY E. GAMBLE
STEPHANIE P. GARCIA
ANGELA C. GOOKIN
KATHERINE R. GRIFFITHS
TWANA A. HADDEN
WENDY H. HEIBEL
KATHERINE M. HITZ
ANGELICA M. HOLLIDAY
JK SHANE HOUSE
HEATHER S. HUBBARD
LAURA A. HUMES
CHENNEL CHRISTIAN JOHNSON
BENJAMIN D. JORGENSEN
SUSAN E. JOSEPH
DIANE J. JURSKA
KATHERINE S. KASCH
TUESDAY M. KAYONGO
SHARA R. KOCH
VALERIE P. KOSOBUCKI
TAMMY R. KRITZER
MICHELLE A. LEMPKE
JOSEPH C. LEONDIKE
MARCIE A. LEWIS
BETHANY L. LIEBERMAN
BESSA JANE E. LIVICA
LOU A. LYSENGEN
ERIC W. MAGNUSON
ANASTASIA T. MCKOY
SHERRY L. MITCHELL
CYNTHIA G. MONTESI
ROMEATRIUS NICOLE MOSS
RICHARD J. ODOSSO
JAMES C. ONEILL
LIBERTY C. ORADA
HEATHER L. ORTIZ
TINA MARIE OUELLETTE
ANNETTE R. PATTON
DOUGLAS S. POGUE
STEPHANIE M. POWERS
JESSICA L. PRICE
STEPHEN G. RAY
RICHARD P. ROGERS
ESMERALDA SALAZAR
DARRELL C. SANDERS
JEANETTE K. SANDERS
SUZANNE E. W. SEE
SHAWNICE LEE SHANKLE
ANTHONY P. SIBILIA
JOHANA SIERRANUNEZ
MICHELLE B. SMITH CLEGGETT
STEFFANIE L. SOLBERG
BRIAN L. SPURLOCK
ANTHONY R. STEPHENS
THEODORE J. SZERSZENSKI III
GRETCHEN E. SZYMANSKI
SCOTT G. THALLEMER
STACY L. TUTTLE
VERONICA B. VALERIO
ELIZABETH L. VATH
JOEL M. VILLAVERT
TOBIE J. WATKINS
BRENDA D. WHITE
ROSEMARIE WIBISONO
BRIAN K. WIENHOFF
TIFFANY D. WILLIAMS
MICHELLE T. WISE
RHYS I. WOODALL
ZOE T. WOOLSTON
JONATHAN R. WURZELBACHER
KERI L. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

TRAVIS M. ALLEN
THOMAS R. BAIZE
KARL N. BLANCAFLOR
ROBERT DALE BOHNSACK
DANIEL S. CALL
STEVEN R. CUNEIO
GARY J. DAVIDSON
CRAIG MILTON FORSYTHE
DAVID M. HORTON
KEVIN M. HUDSON
PAUL B. JOYNER, JR.
JASON P. KIM
JASON T. KLODNICKI
DAVID R. LEONARD
CHRISTOPHER L. REEDER
DAVID D. REEDY
JONATHAN T. RUNNELS

DAVID Y. SUH
CHRISTOPHER D. UNDERWOOD II
JEREMY JAMES WELLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DAVID P. ABBOTT
COURTNEY A. ADDY
REGINA R. BEINHAUR
JOHN D. BIGBIE
CHARLES MATTHEW BOYD
KRISTEN E. CARTER
RAMONA S. DAUGHERTY
JOSHUA D. DEAN
LOUIS C. EDWARDS, JR.
STUART D. FILLMORE
MICHELLE A. FRONZAGLIA
RAYMOND W. FUNKE
ERIC C. GARDNER
JOHN D. GILLARD
DANIEL A. GRIFFITH
MARK W. HASSETT
HEATHER C. HAYDEN
CORBY J. HEYNE
AMMON B. HICKMAN
CHRIS A. IANNI
JEREMIAH R. JACOBS
GREGORY A. KIRKWOOD
SARAH V. LINDSAY
VIKKI LORRAINE LOPEZ
MEGAN G. MALCOM
STACEY R. MCCRAW
RYAN J. MCGUIRE
JOSHUA LEE MILLER
DENISE K. MIRANDA
TROY R. A. NOVAK
ELIZABETH K. OSANTOWSKI
PRICE T. PARAMORE
DAMIAN K. PARDEE
ARCHIE R. PHLEGAR
ERIN LEIGH ROBERTS
JASON A. SALASKI
JONATHAN S. SEMPLER
ANDREW F. SEVERT
BRANDON LEONARD SHEALEY
DONNA L. SICKLER
JOY SPILLERS
JENNIFER JEAN TOMLINSON
KEVIN D. UNDERWOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MOHAMMED H. ALJALLAD
AMBER M. ALLARDICE
JESSICA M. ALLINGER
DANIEL M. ANDERSON
FUNMILAYO A. ARANMOLATE
MICHAEL A. ARMSTRONG
LATOYA S. ARTIS
ULISES JOE ATILANO
CHRISTOPHER S. BATES
MEGAN M. BATTEN
COREY M. BAYLISS
DOUGLAS J. BIRD
KODI M. BONE
FRANCISCO A. BORAL
DENNIS R. BOURDO II
LAURA M. BOYLAN
TODD D. BRACKETT
DAPHNE E. BREWTON
SHAMIKA PRYOR BROOKS
CRYSTAL C. BROWN
MICHAEL JOHN BRYANT
JENNIFER M. BUCKINGHAM
NATASHA W. BULLOCK
ROBERT L. CARLSEN
COREY CARNES
KAO YENG CHANG
ERIC CHASE
SPENCER P. CLAYTON
BRANDY K. CONWAY
TATANYA L. COOPER
MARGARET M. COPPINI
MAYARA MERCADO COULTER
BENJAMIN P. CRANDALL
MATTHEW S. DAVIS
EMILY G. DIETRICH
PATRICK DITULLIO
JONATHAN F. DOTI
CHRISTOPHER J. DYKES
RONALD I. ELAZEGUI
DANNY R. ELICH
NEYSA M. ETIENNE
ANNA V. FEDOTOVA
ALFRED J. FELIPE
ARNALDO J. FIGUEROA
KELLY L. FRANKLIN
BERNARDO L. GARCIA
THOMAS S. GARRIDO
JEFFREY D. GEDDES
MELISSA R. GILLINGHAM
MICHAEL S. GITCHEL
SHERRY D. GLENN
EMILY A. GRAZE
EDWARD P. GRIFFIN
ZACKERY A. GROOVER
ALEX H. GUBLER

BRYAN T. HAIL
JOHN M. HAMMILL
AMANDA O. HARDY
BRANDON P. HARRIS
KRISTENE A. HARRIS
JOEL M. HARTONG
RELINDA D. HATCHER
CHRISTINA H. HAYS
QUINTIN A. HECHT
ASPEN C. HEGER
TIFFANY R. HELINE
HEIDI A. HERNANDEZ
KYLE C. HIATT
JOANNA S. HO
KEVIN R. HOOKER
ANDREW C. HOUCINS
MELINDA HUNT
FELICIA A. JACKSON
KYLE M. JOHNSTON
CHRISTOPHER D. JUDY
RYAN MYUNGHEE JUNG
MICHAEL K. KAN
RYAN L. KASTERN
ROHIN N. KASUDIA
VERONIKA N. KHRAKOVSKAYA
JORDAN W. KIELISZEWSKI
JIN H. KIM
TERRY L. KLEIN
BREANNE M. KORMENDY
MARILYN T. T. LAI
JIMMY F. LAM
JOHN C. LAVIN
LESLIE N. LOVETT
ANNE LY
RAYMOND W. MAK
JEFFERY S. MARTIN
PAUL E. MASON
KRISTEN M. MAYER
ANDREW J. MCUMBER
GARRETT A. MILLER
RONALD P. MILLER
VIVIAN J. MILLER
SHAOPING MO
KASEY MOORERITCHIE
MELANIE K. MULDROW
RICHARD J. NAVAREZ, JR.
JEFFREY G. NELSON
SANG Q. NGO
LYNH H. NGUYEN
KEMEJUMAKA N. OPARA
DAVID PANBOON
MELISSA A. PETERS
BRIAN D. PETROVICH
SONRIE G. PICKENS
JAIME J. PONS VALERIO
LEWIS M. PULLEY
LATEASA REED
CHRISTOPHER P. REICHLEN
JAMES A. RESCH
PETER GEORGE REY
LISA M. ROACH
AMANDA M. RUST
JOSHUA A. RYAN
MICHAEL D. SALYER, JR.
ELIZABETH A. SCHNABEL
DARNELL R. SCHUETTLER
MICHAEL A. SCIORTINO
RYAN M. SEYMOUR
NATHAN P. SHEPARD
ARIELLE R. SHIELY
BRIAN D. SHULER
AMANDA R. SIMSHIGH
EMILY E. SKINNER
RICHARD T. SMITH, JR.
CLIFFORD C. SOUDER
THADDEUS A. SPEED
FELISHA STANCIL
KARA B. TAYLOR
DANA R. THOMAS
EARL E. J. THOMAS
STEPHANIE M. TRACY
QUAN N. TRAM
ALEXANDRA L. TRAN
DEKONTEE M. TRAUB
DAVID S. TUBMAN
SYLVIA K. VALVERDE
JOHN A. VANN
COLLEEN M. VARGA
STEPHEN E. VELA
LETICIA VENEGAS
MICHAEL JOHN VIETTI
JOHN M. WADE
ANDREW B. WALLACE
FELECIA R. WASHINGTON
CHARLA R. WATSON
BENJAMIN C. WEAVER
TIMOTHY C. WEIGLE
MATTHEW S. WILLERICK
ADAM C. WILLETT
ANDREW P. WILLIAMS
SEAN M. WILSON
SETH P. WILSON
JOHN S. WU
ANITA M. YATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD S. BEYEA III
CHRISTIAN L. BISCOTTI
MATTHEW A. BOARTS

KRISTOFFER K. COX
LARRY J. FOWLER
JULIAN C. GAITHER
KENNETH E. JOHNSON, JR.
EUGENE F. LAHUE
CHRISTOPHER M. LAPACK
CHARLES R. MONTOYA, JR.
SCOTT P. NUFSON
RANDY L. SELLERS
MICHAEL D. SHANNON
MARK F. THOMAS
SAMMY C. TUCKER, JR.
TRAVIS C. YELTON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MARION A. ALSTON
SCOTT J. ANDERSON
SHANE J. ANDREWS
KRISTOPHER T. APPLER
CHRISTOPHER D. BASS
FRANCOIS A. BATES
LARA A. BRENNKECKE
JESSICA N. BUCHTA
ALICIA D. CAWLFIELD
CURTIS R. CLINE
JESSICA M. CONNOLLY
DANIELLE M. DIAMOND
BETHANY A. EVERETT
CYNTHIA A. FALLNESS
SARA R. HEGGE
MELISSA D. HEHR
DEANNA K. HOWELL
JESSICA J. HUWA
ELIZABETH A. JAMES
ANDREW J. A. KAY
NOEL L. KUBAT
RACHEL E. LEE
TIFFANY D. MCQUEEN
ANNA B. MULLINS
MATTHEW C. REED
JILL A. REIDELBERGER
CARA P. REITER
LAURA E. RIDDLE
MARTY G. ROACHE
DUSTIN J. STAAB
JASON J. THORNTON
NATHAN A. E. WIENANDT
STEFANIA V. WILCOX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

RACHEL R. ANTHONY
SARAH E. BAKER
PATRICK L. BARKER
STEPHANIE M. BOCANEGRA
BENJAMIN K. BOWER
STEVEN A. BREWER
BARBARA K. BUJAK
BRENDA D. BUSTILLOS
ALVARO CALVILLO
CHRISTINA M. CARRIGAN
CARLA R. CARRILLOKING
ANTONIO F. CHANG
JOHN J. CICCARELLO
ERICKA M. CISCO
SCOTT C. DEMBOWSKI
KIMBERLI A. DEMENT
JEFFERY A. DOLBEER
DAVID L. DRISKELL
WILLIAM H. EDMONDS
CHRIS M. GONZALEZ
VIVIEN S. GUEVARA
ROBERT J. HALLE
REBECCA A. HAWKINS
NATHAN E. HENRY
MATTHEW S. HOLT
MICHAEL R. HUNT
JAMES E. JACKSON
JASON L. JUDKINS
KARYN E. KAGEL
BRYAN C. KOZAK
JOHN M. KURTZ
ANDREA C. LOHMANN
JAMES S. LORENZ
JOHN MASON
RONALD K. MCANDREW
STEVE E. MCKELLAR, JR.
CHRISTOPHER B. MERCER
LETRENDRA R. MILES
AMY M. MOORE
RACHEL E. MORGANS
REBECCA L. MORRELL
SHAUN J. OLAUGHLIN
ROBERT M. PADEN
JOSHUA M. PAGE
WILLIAM J. PITT
KAYLA O. RAMOTAR
TRAVIS ROBBINS
RYAN M. RODRIGUEZ
CHERI M. RUIZ
JAMES A. RULEY
MATTHEW Z. SAMONTE

MARION J. SMITH III
RACHEL M. SNEEL
SARAH K. SOJA
SEAN T. SUTTLES
LEIGH A. SWAFFORD
ELIZA B. SZYMANEK
ANDREA R. TARRANCE
KERRI A. VANARNEM
LUIS E. VIDAL
HUGH D. WALLER II
NATHAN D. WILLIAMS
TODD WILLIAMS
JAMES P. WINSTEAD
LARRY E. WITTHAM
D011532

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

NADINE M. ALONZO
ALFONSO J. ALVAREZ III
NICHOLAS J. BARANELLO
CARLOS A. BARRERA
KRISTINA L. BARTEE
VALERIE S. BARTONICO
JON M. BASHAM
TORRANCE C. BECK
SEAN P. BEEMAN
JAMES F. BEHELER
MIGUEL BENZOR
JARED L. BLACK
AUDREY A. BOENKER
MORRIS J. BOOTH
LONNIE S. BRADFORD
PAOLO C. BRIONES
JEFFREY L. BROWN
KENDRA L. BROWN
DANIEL L. BUNN
DAVID W. BYRD
GABRIELLE N. CALDARA
CHRISTOPHER C. CARPENTER
JESSICA T. CARTHON
PABLO A. CERCENIA
ERICA L. CHABALKO
EUN S. CHOI
BRANDEN K. CHUN
BRIAN E. COAKER
MEGAN A. CONNELL
JOSHUA L. CONNOR
MICHAEL R. COOPER
JARED M. COX
KIMI R. DAMASSIA
DAVID DELGADO
RICHARD A. DEMARAIS
ELIZABETH A. DESITTE
SAMUEL J. DIEHL
DAN T. DITZLER, JR.
BRIAN M. DOWNS
RAN DU
STUART R. DUBRIER
MARC N. DUFFING
TODD R. EAVES
BRITTANY L. ELLIS
NOLAN G. ELLIS
DAMON W. ELLISON
GARY S. FALZONE
ALEC L. FINLAY
JOSEPH E. FISHER
JESSICA L. FORMAN
MICHAEL S. FRANKEL
ASHLEY L. FRANKLIN
JEFFREY W. FROUDE II
PATRICK J. FRY
ANGELA N. FULBRIGHT
MELISSA K. GALAZIN
MICHELLE M. GARCIA
WILLIAM P. GEHLEN
PATRICK R. GLASS
JUSTIN R. GOLDMAN
ELVIS A. GONZALEZ
NATHANIEL B. HAGEN
WILLIAM C. HAMRICK
JODY J. HARBETTTASK
JEAN P. HARE
ROBERT E. HAUPT
DANIEL D. HEFFNER
RICHARD A. HEIPERTZ
SEAN J. HENDERSON
RONALD R. HENRIQUEZ
QUANESHA K. HENRY
MEEGAN M. HENSON
WILLIAM D. HICKEY
RONNIE HILL
CHRISTOPHER M. HINNERICHS
GARRETT W. HOLT
ADAM T. HUGHES
PATRICK KAYLOR
BEATRICE I. KEARNEY
PATRICK R. KELLEY
KEVIN A. KIRCHGRABER
MELISSA K. KODANI
KATHERINE L. KOLACKI
MATTHEW KRULL
MICHAEL J. KWON
SPENCER D. LEE
BRET M. LEHMAN
THOMAS M. LEHMANN
MARVIN A. LEONARD
REBECCA K. LESEMANN
WILLIAM B. LEWIS

FRANK L. J. LILES
JISUN S. LIM
LUKE A. LINDAMAN
LIONEL Q. LOWERY II
KYLE R. LUND
GREGORY C. MABRY
MARY E. MARKIVICH
MARCOS MARTINEZ
DEEPAK J. MATHEW
JANEEN L. MATHIES
JIMMY L. MCCLAIN, JR.
MAHEALANI N. MCFARLAND
DAMIEN MCGUIGAN
ERIC J. MIES
ERIN E. MILNER
DEREK R. MONTHIE
MATTHEW J. MOOSEY
SCOTT T. MUELLER
NOE R. MUNIZ
STEVEN C. MURTY
BRYAN P. NOWAK
NICHOLAS J. NUSSDORFER
SEAN K. OBRIEN
MICHAEL M. OGANOVICH
EDDIE B. OLIVER
RUFINO D. ONG, JR.
ELIZABETH ORTIZ
VERONICA D. J. ORTIZ
RILIWAN O. OTTUN
STEPHEN W. OWEN
TRAVIS H. OWEN
CARPACCIO E. OWENS
JOHN W. PAAP
SEAN M. PALMER
XAVIER R. PENA
RANDY D. PERRY
BRANDON S. PYBUS
SUSAN H. RAGLIN
JOSHUA D. REECE
LYMAN S. REYNOLDS
CAMERON L. RICHARDSON
ANTHONY H. B. ROBINSON
RONNIE P. ROBINSON
FAUSTINO RODRIGUEZ, JR.
KENNETH J. RODRIGUEZ
RICARDO J. RODRIGUEZCRUZ
NOLAN D. ROGGENKAMP
RALPH T. SALAZAR
TEFFANY N. SAMPLE
MARK G. SANDER
JOSE A. SANFELIZ
EDILBERTO SANTOS
BETTINA SCHMID
ISAAC S. SCHUNK
TODD C. SCHWARZ
JON M. SHARP
JULIE A. SHIN
RYAN C. SHUBAT
WALTER J. SKEISTAITIS, JR.
BRIAN G. SMITH
MAXWELL H. SMITH
LUIS F. SOTOORTIZ
MICHAEL P. STEVENS
DEREK T. STRANTON
JOHN T. STRINGER
JESSE J. TAFUYA
RONALD M. TALIS
DANIEL H. TENHAGEN
AARON THOMPSON
CRAIG E. THOMPSON
WILLIAM G. THOMPSON
TAMIKA N. THORNTON
JEREMY J. TRESOTT
NORMAN V. TUALA
JAMES R. TULLIS
ALISA M. VANLANDINGHAM
KAYLA L. VICKERS
ABIGAIL S. VINCENT
KEVIN J. VOGT
LORI B. VOORHEES
MARK D. WALKER
ROBERT M. WEBER
BRAD A. WESLEY
MARK R. WESSELER
MICHELLE WHITLOCK
MARK T. WILLIAMS
ANDREW W. WILSON
JAMES E. WILSON
JOHN R. WOLF
DAVID P. WRIGHTEN
ANGELA M. YARNELL
MATTHEW B. YOUNG
JOSEPH G. ZIEBELL
D012227
D012229

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MARK ACOPAN
THOMAS C. AGNEW
MAYAMONA D. AIKEN
CHRIS N. ANGELES
MANUSHKA ANGOY
HOLLY R. ARCHER
APRIL L. BACCINELLI
PHILLIP L. BALDWIN
JADELYN T. BANIQUED
REBECCA G. BARRERA
MELVENA R. BARTON

GABRIEL M. BELTRAN
 AMBER M. BIRKLE
 BRIAN D. BLUMHAGEN
 MELANIE R. BOWMAN
 CHRISTINE BRANDT
 RUTH J. BROWNE
 REVENIA J. BUCK
 LISA K. BUCKLES
 MELANIE C. BUDNIK
 ADAM R. CAMPBELL
 MICHAEL A. CAMPBELL
 KATHLEEN E. CASPER
 JESSICA CHAVEZ
 JESUS CHAVEZ
 KATRINA L. CHEEK
 SOCHARA CHUMNOEUR
 SCOTT A. COLEMAN
 JASON M. CRISP
 JUDY L. CRUZ
 RUBEN D. CRUZ
 TANISHA L. CURRIE
 EMILIE M. DANKO
 ERNESTINA DELAPENAGUBA
 TERRI L. DORN
 KEDRICK A. DRAKES
 DORIS F. DUALAN
 JOCELYN A. EVBUOMWAN
 GORDON L. FALVEY
 JENNIFER C. FIANDT
 CATRENA D. FINDLEY
 DAVID R. FISHER
 ANNEMARIE FLANIGAN
 COURTNEY A. FOLDERAUER
 KATINA M. FOXWORTH
 ERICK D. GABRIEL
 LAURA GALINDOYOUNG
 JENNIFER L. GLEN
 HIRAM GONZALEZ
 ERICA K. GRANT
 MONIQUE E. GRINNELL
 TREVOR D. HALL
 TRANESSIA M. HANSON
 SEAN L. HARRIS
 IAN K. HENNEBERGER
 TINA L. HILL
 RICHARD L. HOWARD
 ANGELA S. HOWELL
 ERIN M. JACKSON
 NORISHA L. JACKSON
 LESLEY M. JACOBS
 KENNEATTA M. JASPER
 MARGO S. JENKINS
 MONIQUE S. JESIONOWSKI
 CHRISTOPHER C. JOHNSON
 LAKEISHA D. JONES
 BROOKE L. KAHL
 ARIELLE J. KALIN
 PAUL H. L. KILEY
 MARILYNN M. KNORR
 KATIE H. KUZMA
 SHARIKA D. LABRIE
 JAMES LACOMBE
 JAMES LAWHORN, JR.
 HEATHER S. LEAL
 TRACEY L. LEE
 JESSICA E. LIETZ
 STACY J. LOSEY
 PHILIPP T. LUCKOWSKI
 CHANTY M. MACKINS
 ALEXIS MARTINEZSUAREZ
 JOHN R. MCINERNEY
 JOSE MEJIA
 JERRY L. MOON
 TANYA B. MOORE
 JULES R. MYERS
 ABISAI NEGRON
 JAMIE L. NEUMANN
 DANA NICHOLSON
 THERESA J. NOWAK
 MARIA E. ORTEGAARTACHE
 ANDRE J. PACHO
 VALARIE R. PALACIOS
 SHANDEL L. PANNETON
 CHARLES A. PAUL
 TABATHA E. PEPIN
 THORBJORN K. PERSSON
 DEREK L. PIERCE
 LYNNAE D. PLACE
 YURENA PRIETOCORUJO
 JEFFREY L. QUAN
 KRYSTAL J. RALL
 NATHAN R. RAVE
 CONSUELO N. REED
 AUDREY N. RICHERT
 ALICIA D. ROBINSON
 JOSE A. RODRIGUEZ
 YAMILLE P. ROPER
 JOYCE A. ROSADOHUGHES
 JOHN W. ROY
 JACQUELINE M. RUSHTON
 JAMES M. SCHALK
 PATRICIA M. SCHMIDT
 STEVE C. SCUBA
 YVONNE R. SENDEJO
 KELLY M. SHAMLIAN
 PATRICK B. SIMON
 ADINA M. SIPPEL
 ALISHA L. SOMERO

ESTHER H. SOUTHERLAND
 GENNA S. SPEED
 KYLE A. STEVENS
 LAURA A. STOGER
 JESSICA E. STONE
 KIMBERLY L. SUGG
 DEBRA L. THORN
 ELIZABETH J. TRICOZZI
 JORGE A. TRONCOSO
 MARY A. G. UGADDAN
 ELIZABETH B. VANDERHOOF
 MARIELOS VEGA
 YASSIR B. VIZCAYA
 MARSHA G. WALKER
 SHEMICA M. WARD
 THOMAS M. WATERS
 STEPHEN M. WATT
 TIMOTHY C. WICAL, JR.
 KELLI C. WILSON
 JOHN R. WISDOM
 JENNIFER J. WITT
 JESSICA M. WOJCICKI
 KEVIN T. WORTH
 LESEAN A. WRIGHT
 JONATHAN G. YOST
 TIMOTHY R. YOURK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

KATHARINE M. E. ADAMS
 KEVIN M. ADAMS
 DAVID L. ADAMSON
 CHRISTOPHER K. ANDERSON
 BRIAN D. ANDES
 DEIRDRE K. BAKER
 KATHERINE R. BANNING
 BRANDON R. BERGMANN
 STEPHEN J. BISHOP
 MICHELLE E. BORGINO
 MICHAEL G. BOTELHO
 STEPHEN R. CINCOTTA
 LANCE E. CLARK
 GREGORY J. COSTELLO
 FAITH R. COUTIER
 CHRISTOPHER M. COY
 PATRICK A. CROCKER
 DONEL J. DAVIS
 SHEROD L. DAVIS, SR.
 KATHERINE T. DENEHY
 JACK D. EINHORN
 SEAN P. FITZGIBBON
 DAVID L. FORD
 MATTHEW L. FORST
 KRISTEN M. FRICCHIONE
 SAMUEL GABREMARIAM
 MATTHEW C. GALLAGHER
 MARK E. GARDNER
 EMILY E. GEISINGER
 DANIEL M. GOLDBERG
 HOUSTON J. GOODELL
 TRACY L. GREINERLEE
 KURT S. P. GURKA
 STACEY A. GUTHARTZ COHEN
 JOHN B. HABERLAND
 JACK R. HATFIELD II
 TYLER J. HEIMANN
 BENJAMIN W. HILLNER
 LATISHA IRWIN
 HANNAH E. KAUFMAN
 ELINOR J. KIM
 JAMES W. KITCHEN
 MELVIN A. LEE
 JANAE M. LEPIR
 KURTIS S. MACIOROWSKI
 JOHN H. MARK
 JASON R. MARQUEZ
 CYNTHIA MARSHALL
 EVAN R. MATTHEWS
 PHILIP C. MAXWELL
 BRUCE L. MAYEAUX
 JULIE A. MCCONNELL
 MATTHEW T. MILLER
 DANIEL B. MITCHELL
 JASON W. MOY
 WILLIAM J. OSTAN
 ANGEL M. OVERGAARD
 MAJELLA C. POPE
 AUTUMN R. PORTER
 SETH B. RITZMAN
 SEAN D. ROGERS
 KURT M. ROWLAND
 JOHN K. SCHELLACK III
 JOHN L. SCHRIVER
 DANIEL W. SCIALPI
 CRAIG M. SCROGHAM
 CHRISTOPHER S. SEXTON
 RICHARD J. SLEESMAN
 ANDREW D. SMITH
 STEPHEN P. SMITH
 KATHERINE M. SPENCER
 HEIDI M. STEELE
 BRIAN J. SULLIVAN
 BRENT W. THOMPSON
 MICHAEL M. TOWNSEND

CARRIE L. WARD
 BRITTANY R. WARREN
 JULIE K. WATERS
 DEVON A. R. WELLS
 LAURA B. WEST
 EDWARD J. WHITTFORD
 MATTHEW B. WILLIAMS
 JAMES K. WOLKENSBERG
 HANS P. ZELLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT J. ABBOTT
 BRIAN P. ADAMS
 ELIZABETH F. ALLEN
 ALAN APPLE
 EDWARD G. BAHDİ
 MICHAEL P. BAILEYS
 GREGORY B. BATDORFF
 CHRISTIAN E. BEESE
 EDWARD W. BERG
 JOSHUA F. BERRY
 CATHERINE M. A. BOWERY
 CAROL A. BREWER
 SUSAN A. CASTORINA
 ELISABETH A. CLAUS
 ALBERT G. COURIE III
 JEFFREY S. DIETZ
 CHRISTINE C. FONTENELLE
 DERRICK W. GRACE
 NJERI S. HANES
 TODD J. HANKS
 ERIC A. HETTINGA
 JAMES T. HILL
 ADAM S. KAZIN
 TONY Y. KIM
 KEVIN W. LANDTROOP
 ROBERT M. LEONE
 EDWARD C. LINNEWEBER
 JOHN R. MALONEY
 YOLANDA D. MCCRAYJONES
 EVAH K. P. MCGINLEY
 JOHN J. MERRIAM
 DOUGLAS W. MOORE
 JAMES W. NELSON
 ROBERT B. NELSON
 JENNIFER A. NEUHAUSER
 ERIC D. NOBLE
 JOHN M. RATLIFF
 PIA W. ROGERS
 FRANKLIN D. ROSENBLATT
 ROBERT E. SAMUELSEN II
 PHILIP M. STATEN
 ALISON M. TULUD
 ELIZABETH A. WALKER
 MARC B. WASHBURN
 HEIDI E. WEAVER
 ERIC W. WIDMAR
 WINSTON S. WILLIAMS, JR.
 D011857

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

FRANCIS J. RACIOPPI, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JUSTIN C. LEGG

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 3, 2014:

THE JUDICIARY

DAVID J. HALE, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY.

MARK A. KEARNEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

GERALD J. PAPPERT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

P. DAVID LOPEZ, OF ARIZONA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

CHARLOTTE A. BURROWS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2019.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSMAN RALPH REGULA'S
90TH BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE

HON. BOB GIBBS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th birthday of former Representative, Ralph Regula.

Ralph Strauss Regula was born in Beach City, Ohio, on December 3, 1924. Prior to his election to Congress, Mr. Regula served in the United States Navy, worked as a school teacher and principal in Stark County schools, served on the Ohio State Board of Education and was a member in both the Ohio State House and State Senate. In 1973, Mr. Regula was elected to Congress and served 18 consecutive terms, until his retirement in 2009.

During his tenure in Congress, Mr. Regula served as the Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, where he worked across party lines to improve educational opportunities, workforce training programs and healthcare. He was a passionate advocate for research and the advancement of science.

Congressman Regula billed himself a "regular" guy. He was the son of a dairy farmer and part of a high school graduating class of only 25, where he developed a strong work ethic and love of community. Ralph loved serving here because he cared about people and helping improve their quality of life. In this House he was a pragmatic leader willing to find solutions to tough problems.

I have personally known Ralph for over three decades and have many fond memories meeting with him both here and in Ohio as my Congressman. Like many others I have learned so much from Congressman Regula over the years. To that I say, Thank you!

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the great life and career of Mr. Ralph Regula, wishing him a very happy 90th birthday.

ISRAEL AT THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw your attention to a speech given last week by Israel's Ambassador to the United Nations, Ron Prosor. Ambassador Prosor spoke passionately before the U.N. General Assembly about the U.N.'s persistent anti-Israel agenda, which continues to manifest itself in many forms such as special sessions, formal inquiries, and one-sided resolutions that

single out Israel. I am proud of my steadfast support for the State of Israel and will continue my work to combat the U.N.'s bias against our greatest ally. I found Ambassador Prosor's words enlightening, and applaud him for speaking the truth. I would now like to submit Ambassador Prosor's speech.

AMBASSADOR RON PROSOR AT THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON NOVEMBER 24, 2014

AMBASSADOR RON PROSOR

"Mr. President,
I stand before the world as a proud representative of the State of Israel and the Jewish people. I stand tall before you knowing that truth and morality are on my side. And yet, I stand here knowing that today in this Assembly, truth will be turned on its head and morality cast aside.

The fact of the matter is that when members of the international community speak about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a fog descends to cloud all logic and moral clarity. The result isn't realpolitik, it's surrealpolitik.

The world's unrelenting focus on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is an injustice to tens of millions of victims of tyranny and terrorism in the Middle East. As we speak, Yazidis, Bahai, Kurds, Christians and Muslims are being executed and expelled by radical extremists at a rate of 1,000 people per month.

How many resolutions did you pass last week to address this crisis? And how many special sessions did you call for? The answer is zero. What does this say about international concern for human life? Not much, but it speaks volumes about the hypocrisy of the international community.

I stand before you to speak the truth. Of the 300 million Arabs in the Middle East and North Africa, less than half a percent are truly free—and they are all citizens of Israel.

Israeli Arabs are some of the most educated Arabs in the world. They are our leading physicians and surgeons, they are elected to our parliament, and they serve as judges on our Supreme Court. Millions of men and women in the Middle East would welcome these opportunities and freedoms.

Nonetheless, nation after nation, will stand at this podium today and criticize Israel—the small island of democracy in a region plagued by tyranny and oppression.

Mr. President,
Our conflict has never been about the establishment of a Palestinian state. It has always been about the existence of the Jewish state.

Sixty seven years ago this week, on November 29, 1947, the United Nations voted to partition the land into a Jewish state and an Arab state. Simple. The Jews said yes. The Arabs said no. But they didn't just say no. Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon launched a war of annihilation against our newborn state.

This is the historical truth that the Arabs are trying to distort. The Arabs' historic mistake continues to be felt—in lives lost in war, lives lost to terrorism, and lives scarred by the Arabs' narrow political interests.

According to the United Nations, about 700,000 Palestinians were displaced in the war

initiated by the Arabs themselves. At the same time, some 850,000 Jews were forced to flee from Arab countries.

Why is it, that 67 years later, the displacement of the Jews has been completely forgotten by this institution while the displacement of the Palestinians is the subject of an annual debate?

The difference is that Israel did its utmost to integrate the Jewish refugees into society. The Arabs did just the opposite.

The worst oppression of the Palestinian people takes place in Arab nations. In most of the Arab world, Palestinians are denied citizenship and are aggressively discriminated against. They are barred from owning land and prevented from entering certain professions.

And yet none—not one—of these crimes are mentioned in the resolutions before you.

If you were truly concerned about the plight of the Palestinian people there would be one, just one, resolution to address the thousands of Palestinians killed in Syria. And if you were so truly concerned about the Palestinians there would be at least one resolution to denounce the treatment of Palestinians in Lebanese refugee camps.

But there isn't. The reason is that today's debate is not about speaking for peace or speaking for the Palestinian people—it is about speaking against Israel. It is nothing but a hate and bashing festival against Israel.

Mr. President,
The European nations claim to stand for Libert , Egalit , Fraternit —freedom, equality, and brotherhood—but nothing could be farther from the truth.

I often hear European leaders proclaim that Israel has the right to exist in secure borders. That's very nice. But I have to say—it makes about as much sense as me standing here and proclaiming Sweden's right to exist in secure borders.

When it comes to matters of security, Israel learned the hard way that we cannot rely on others—certainly not Europe.

In 1973, on Yom Kippur—the holiest day on the Jewish calendar—the surrounding Arab nations launched an attack against Israel. In the hours before the war began, Golda Meir, our Prime Minister then, made the difficult decision not to launch a preemptive strike. The Israeli Government understood that if we launched a preemptive strike, we would lose the support of the international community.

As the Arab armies advanced on every front, the situation in Israel grew dire. Our casualty count was growing and we were running dangerously low on weapons and ammunition. In this, our hour of need, President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, agreed to send Galaxy planes loaded with tanks and ammunition to resupply our troops. The only problem was that the Galaxy planes needed to refuel on route to Israel.

The Arab States were closing in and our very existence was threatened—and yet, Europe was not even willing to let the planes refuel. The U.S. stepped in once again and negotiated that the planes be allowed to refuel in the Azores. The government and people of Israel will never forget that when our

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

very existence was at stake, only one country came to our aid—the United States of America.

Israel is tired of hollow promises from European leaders. The Jewish people have a long memory. We will never ever forget that you failed us in the 1940s. You failed us in 1973. And you are failing us again today.

Every European parliament that voted to prematurely and unilaterally recognize a Palestinian state is giving the Palestinians exactly what they want—statehood without peace. By handing them a state on a silver platter, you are rewarding unilateral actions and taking away any incentive for the Palestinians to negotiate or compromise or renounce violence. You are sending the message that the Palestinian Authority can sit in a government with terrorists and incite violence against Israel without paying any price.

The first E.U. member to officially recognize a Palestinian state was Sweden. One has to wonder why the Swedish Government was so anxious to take this step. When it comes to other conflicts in our region, the Swedish Government calls for direct negotiations between the parties—but for the Palestinians, surprise, surprise, they roll out the red carpet.

State Secretary Söder may think she is here to celebrate her government's so-called historic recognition, when in reality it's nothing more than a historic mistake.

The Swedish Government may host the Nobel Prize ceremony, but there is nothing noble about their cynical political campaign to appease the Arabs in order to get a seat on the Security Council. Nations on the Security Council should have sense, sensitivity, and sensibility. Well, the Swedish Government has shown no sense, no sensitivity and no sensibility. Just nonsense.

Israel learned the hard way that listening to the international community can bring about devastating consequences. In 2005, we unilaterally dismantled every settlement and removed every citizen from the Gaza Strip. Did this bring us any closer to peace? Not at all. It paved the way for Iran to send its terrorist proxies to establish a terror stronghold on our doorstep.

I can assure you that we won't make the same mistake again. When it comes to our security, we cannot and will not rely on others—Israel must be able to defend itself by itself.

Mr. President,

The State of Israel is the land of our forefathers—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It is the land where Moses led the Jewish people, where David built his palace, where Solomon built the Jewish Temple, and where Isaiah saw a vision of eternal peace.

For thousands of years, Jews have lived continuously in the land of Israel. We endured through the rise and fall of the Assyrian, Babylonian, Greek and Roman Empires. And we endured through thousands of years of persecution, expulsions and crusades. The bond between the Jewish people and the Jewish land is unbreakable.

Nothing can change one simple truth—Israel is our home and Jerusalem is our eternal capital.

At the same time, we recognize that Jerusalem has special meaning for other faiths. Under Israeli sovereignty, all people—and I will repeat that, all people—regardless of religion and nationality can visit the city's holy sites. And we intend to keep it this way. The only ones trying to change the status quo on the Temple Mount are Palestinian leaders. President Abbas is telling his people

that Jews are contaminating the Temple Mount. He has called for days of rage and urged Palestinians to prevent Jews from visiting the Temple Mount using (quote) “all means” necessary. These words are as irresponsible as they are unacceptable.

You don't have to be Catholic to visit the Vatican, you don't have to be Jewish to visit the Western Wall, but some Palestinians would like to see the day when only Muslims can visit the Temple Mount.

You, the international community, are lending a hand to extremists and fanatics. You, who preach tolerance and religious freedom, should be ashamed. Israel will never let this happen. We will make sure that the holy places remain open to all people of all faiths for all time.

Mr. President,

No one wants peace more than Israel. No one needs to explain the importance of peace to parents who have sent their child to defend our homeland. No one knows the stakes of success or failure better than we Israelis do. The people of Israel have shed too many tears and buried too many sons and daughters.

We are ready for peace, but we are not naïve. Israel's security is paramount. Only a strong and secure Israel can achieve a comprehensive peace.

The past month should make it clear to anyone that Israel has immediate and pressing security needs. In recent weeks, Palestinian terrorists have shot and stabbed our citizens and twice driven their cars into crowds of pedestrians. Just a few days ago, terrorists armed with axes and a gun savagely attacked Jewish worshippers during morning prayers. We have reached the point when Israelis can't even find sanctuary from terrorism in the sanctuary of a synagogue.

These attacks didn't emerge out of a vacuum. They are the results of years of indoctrination and incitement. A Jewish proverb teaches: “The instruments of both death and life are in the power of the tongue.”

As a Jew and as an Israeli, I know with utter certainty that when our enemies say they want to attack us, they mean it.

Hamas's genocidal charter calls for the destruction of Israel and the murder of Jews worldwide. For years, Hamas and other terrorist groups have sent suicide bombers into our cities, launched rockets into our towns, and sent terrorists to kidnap and murder our citizens.

And what about the Palestinian Authority? It is leading a systemic campaign of incitement. In schools, children are being taught that ‘Palestine’ will stretch from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea. In mosques, religious leaders are spreading vicious libels accusing Jews of destroying Muslim holy sites. In sports stadiums, teams are named after terrorists. And in newspapers, cartoons urge Palestinians to commit terror attacks against Israelis.

Children in most of the world grow up watching cartoons of Mickey Mouse singing and dancing. Palestinian children also grow up watching Mickey Mouse, but on Palestinians national television, a twisted figure dressed as Mickey Mouse dances in an explosive belt and chants “Death to America and death to the Jews.”

I challenge you to stand up here today and do something constructive for a change. Publicly denounce the violence, denounce the incitement, and denounce the culture of hate.

Most people believe that at its core, the conflict is a battle between Jews and Arabs or Israelis and Palestinians. They are wrong.

The battle that we are witnessing is a battle between those who sanctify life and those who celebrate death.

Following the savage attack in a Jerusalem synagogue, celebrations erupted in Palestinian towns and villages. People were dancing in the street and distributing candy. Young men posed with axes, loudspeakers at mosques called out congratulations, and the terrorists were hailed as “martyrs” and “heroes.”

This isn't the first time that we saw the Palestinians celebrate the murder of innocent civilians. We saw them rejoice after every terrorist attack on Israeli civilians and they even took to the streets to celebrate the September 11 attack on the World Trade Center right here in New York City.

Imagine the type of state this society would produce. Does the Middle East really need another terror-ocracy? Some members of the international community are aiding and abetting its creation.

Mr. President,

As we came into the United Nations, we passed the flags of all 193 member States. If you take the time to count, you will discover that there are 15 flags with a crescent and 25 flags with a cross. And then there is one flag with a Jewish Star of David. Amidst all the nations of the world there is one state—just one small nation state for the Jewish people. And for some people, that is one too many.

As I stand before you today I am reminded of all the years when Jewish people paid for the world's ignorance and indifference in blood. Those days are no more.

We will never apologize for being a free and independent people in our sovereign state. And we will never apologize for defending ourselves.

To the nations that continue to allow prejudice to prevail over truth, I say “J'accuse.”

I accuse you of hypocrisy. I accuse you of duplicity.

I accuse you of lending legitimacy to those who seek to destroy our State.

I accuse you of speaking about Israel's right of self-defense in theory, but denying it in practice.

And I accuse you of demanding concessions from Israel, but asking nothing of the Palestinians.

In the face of these offenses, the verdict is clear. You are not for peace and you are not for the Palestinian people. You are simply against Israel.

Members of the international community have a choice to make.

You can recognize Israel as the nation-state of the Jewish people, or permit the Palestinian leadership to deny our history without consequence.

You can publically proclaim that the so-called “claim of return” is a non-starter, or you can allow this claim to remain the major obstacle to any peace agreement.

You can work to end Palestinian incitement, or stand by as hatred and extremism take root for generations to come.

You can prematurely recognize a Palestinian state, or you can encourage the Palestinian Authority to break its pact with Hamas and return to direct negotiations.

The choice is yours. You can continue to steer the Palestinians off course or pave the way to real and lasting peace.

Thank you, Mr. President.”

TRIBUTE TO THE KENTUCKY COMMUNITIES ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL (KCEOC) COMMUNITY ACTION PARTNERSHIP

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Kentucky Communities Economic Opportunity Council (KCEOC)—Community Action Partnership in celebration of the agency's 50th anniversary of service to the people of southeastern Kentucky.

As one of the first 23 agencies established in 1964 to address poverty, KCEOC has raised the bar high, going above and beyond the call of duty to provide greater opportunities for those in need. Thanks to a group of local citizens who applied for a competitive grant opportunity five decades ago, this organization has flourished into the multi-million dollar service agency that it is today.

KCEOC has inspired people across our region to put compassion for our neighbors into action. Through its programs and innovative responses to dire needs in our impoverished communities, more families today have access to child development programs, food resources, affordable housing, and assistance with financial needs than ever before. This agency has also been a critical partner for economic development, from recruiting jobs to providing the infrastructure for new businesses. The employees of KCEOC serve as great ambassadors for eastern Kentucky, proving that we have a strong, dedicated workforce and an intricate support community that believes in helping one another succeed.

Through the vision of leaders like Paul Dole, this agency has turned community losses into gains. One of the greatest examples of those efforts was the transformation of the old asbestos-plagued Corbin Hospital into clean, state-of-the-art housing for senior citizens.

Winston Churchill once said that a pessimist sees difficulty in every opportunity; an optimist sees the opportunity in every difficulty. That's what KCEOC works to convey every single day by providing a hand-up, rather than a hand out. They provide hope in an otherwise dark hour for many families and I can't thank this agency enough for its efforts day-in and day-out, letting our neighbors know that someone cares.

KCEOC has forged important partnerships with local schools, employers and other community organizations to capitalize on the resources that are abundant in our communities. Together, we have made great strides in southeastern Kentucky, but we certainly wouldn't be where we are today without the foundation that KCEOC has carefully crafted for thousands of families in our region.

In celebration of this 50th anniversary, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding the work of the KCEOC Community Action Partnership in southeastern Kentucky.

7TH ANNUAL LAKESHORE CLASSIC BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize the Gary Chamber of Commerce as the organization celebrates the 7th annual Lakeshore Classic basketball tournament. In honor of this occasion, the Gary Chamber of Commerce hosted a celebratory event in Gary, Indiana, which included a corporate luncheon held at the Majestic Star Casino on Tuesday, November 25, and a basketball tournament at West Side High School on Friday and Saturday, November 28 and 29.

Northwest Indiana has a rich history of sports and impressive team players. The theme for this year's Lakeshore Classic is the "Cavalcade of Champions," saluting all of the region's state basketball champions from 1940 to 2014. These exceptional players and coaches have made a mark in the region's notable sporting history and are to be highly commended. Along with these outstanding basketball teams, the Gary Chamber chose a prominent featured speaker for their corporate luncheon, Mr. Ulysses "Junior" Bridgeman, a former National Basketball Association star and one of the most successful businessmen in the United States. Alongside his extraordinary success, Mr. Bridgeman has also proven to be a great model in transitioning from professional sports to the business industry.

I would like to take this time to honor the region's state basketball champions from 1940 to 2014. These teams have set the standard for sports excellence in our region while creating an inspiring example for the community of Northwest Indiana. The girls basketball teams include East Chicago Roosevelt (1977), East Chicago Roosevelt (1979), Crown Point High School (1984), Crown Point High School (1985), and Lake Central High School (1994). The boys basketball teams include Hammond Technical High School (1940), East Chicago Washington High School (1960), Michigan City Elston High School (1966), Gary Roosevelt High School (1968), East Chicago Roosevelt High School (1970), East Chicago Washington High School (1971), Gary Roosevelt High School (1991), Gary West Side High School (2002), East Chicago Central High School (2007), Thea Bowman Academy (2010), Wheeler High School (2010), and Thea Bowman Academy (2013).

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the Gary Chamber of Commerce, the organizers and sponsors of the 7th annual Lakeshore Classic, and the prestigious state champion teams that have been honored. Their noteworthy commitment, leadership, and contributions have inspired generations to come.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER CARSWELL

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to honor Christopher Carswell, an inspirational young man who has faced numerous medical struggles with grace and poise and has used his experiences as motivation to start his own non-profit organization, 1Boy4Change, when he was only 13 years old. Today, he is 16 and has a story that we all could learn a lesson from.

Throughout his decade and a half of life, Chris has suffered a tonsil adenoid surgery that resulted in the need for a feeding tube, multiple hand reconstructive surgeries, as well as a connective tissue disorder that put him in a wheelchair for a time. Then, he started having seizures that put him into respiratory/cardiac arrest as well as a stroke which robbed him of the right half of his field of vision. But through this long list of challenges, Chris has remained an upbeat person and has dedicated himself to the service of others.

In 2010, Chris was matched up with Bronx, a service dog who became his constant companion, ensuring he would never face what life threw at him alone. Shortly after that, he started 1Boy4Change, with the mission of raising awareness and providing support for individuals and families with disabilities. In the early days of the organization, Chris helped match up 70 service dogs to veterans and children.

Since then, he has expanded his mission to support others who have also chosen to live a life of service: our soldiers and police officers. In that capacity, Chris has started programs meant to help out K9 units by providing them comprehensive first aid kits as well as car heat alarms that can save the lives of dogs that are left in patrol cars.

Chris is to undergo brain surgery in January, and his doctors are hopeful that the procedure will stop his seizures. I hope all of my colleagues in the House will join with me as we wish Chris a successful operation and a speedy recovery so he can come back and continue the good work he's doing.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF MARTIN LITTON

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the extraordinary life and work of Martin Litton, a legendary and passionate environmentalist and wilderness preservationist who died on November 30, 2014, at his home in Portola Valley, California. Mr. Litton was born in Los Angeles on February 13, 1917, and was 97 years of age when he died of age-related causes.

Martin Litton was introduced early to the joys of the wilderness. He attributed a 12-day trip on Mt. Whitney that he and a friend took

as teens as the inspiration for his lifelong crusade to protect our environment. At age 18 he wrote a letter to the Los Angeles Times urging Californians to save Mono Lake. Martin Litton was best known for his fierce opposition to the destruction of the Colorado River by the construction of dams, often in association with the Sierra Club. He was one of the first several hundred people to float the river in 1955, and after fourteen years as the travel editor at *Sunset Magazine* he began running the river often, founding Grand Canyon Dories in 1970 and running commercial trips through the 1970s and 1980s, until he sold the business in 1988. He ran his last trip in 2004 at age 87, rowing his own wooden dory.

Martin Litton was an author, activist, pilot, and a catalyst for change. He was close to major figures in the environmental movement, such as David Brower, Edward Abbey and others. Martin Litton gave generously of his time and considerable talents to the conservation movement as a Director of the Sierra Club from 1964 to 1973, as a member of the Executive Committee of the American Land Conservancy, as an Advisor to the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance and on the Honorary Board of Directors of the Glen Canyon Institute.

Martin Litton leaves his wife, Esther, his children John, Kathleen and Helen, as well as five grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in extending our most sincere condolences to Martin Litton's family, and in honoring his extraordinarily productive life. Martin Litton was a soaring figure, larger than life, with a magnificent voice, a powerful presence, an all-consuming passion for the wilderness, and a passion to preserve and protect the natural beauty of our nation.

HAMAS KILLS AGAIN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "We love death more than the Jews love life." This Hamas propaganda phrase says it all. International outsiders cry "peace, peace," but there can be no peace as long as Hamas refuses to recognize Israel's right to exist. No matter how many times leaders shake hands or how many agreements are signed, peace cannot be achieved if peace is not desired. The only reason Israel exists is because the Jews persist in surviving.

In the morning hours of November 18, a group of Orthodox Jews gathered at a synagogue in Jerusalem to pray. In the middle of their prayers, at 7 a.m., two terrorists wielding guns, axes, and butcher knives attacked them. Odai Abu Jamal and his cousin, Ghassan Abu Jamal, killed 4 rabbis and one police officer and injured 8 others before they were shot by local police. Three of the four rabbis were American citizens.

The men were members of the terrorist group known as the Popular Front for Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). While the group itself

did not claim responsibility, it was quick to support the attack. Hamas, another terrorist group bent on the destruction of Israel, not only commended the attacks but called for more. Terrorist groups supporting terrorist attacks does not surprise me. But Hamas is not your typical terrorist group. It governs the entire Gaza Strip as a result of the 1.8 million Palestinians there voting them into power. And the reaction from some of the people of Gaza to the attack shows that they share its terrorist government's feelings. In the town of Rafah, the people celebrated by handing out sweets, carrying axes, and holding up posters of the terrorists. The religious elites joined in the celebration as well: loudspeakers at mosques in Gaza called out congratulations. Palestinian radio reports described the attackers as "martyrs". Undoubtedly, the terrorists' family will receive compensation from the government's "terrorist fund", which pays stipends to the families of terrorists who are imprisoned or who died during their attacks.

When an elected government and the people it governs celebrate a brutal terrorist attack, it is a reminder of the challenges Israel faces as it works for peace in the region. For the last six years, this White House has pressured the Israeli government to make concession after concession for peace. The reaction of the people in Gaza to this latest attack should wake the White House up to the unfortunate reality that, no matter how many concessions Israel makes, many Palestinians do not want peace if it means Israel continues to exist. Palestinian acts of terrorism are not just a problem of a couple of lone rats or individual terrorist groups, but they are supported by an entire infrastructure throughout the Palestinian territories that has close ties to the senior Palestinian leadership. Instead of repeatedly twisting Israel's arm to make peace when peace can't be made, the United States should stand strong with our democratic ally against terrorists. The same attackers that want to destroy Israel also call the United States the Great Satan. They want to kill Americans too, as this latest attack that killed three Americans showed. Our first step should be to cut the funding we give to the Palestinian Authority (PA) until they take specific, verifiable, and significant acts to go after those who commit acts of terrorism. At the very least, the PA needs to stop paying reward money to the families of terrorists. Second, we should make sure that our funding to Israel is strong and robust, focused on ensuring Israel can beat back these terrorists. Finally, we need to stop publicly and privately insulting Israel. Israel is the only liberal democracy in the Middle East and one of our strongest allies in the world.

The right response to a terrorist act is not words of condemnation followed by continued pressure on the victims of terrorism. The right response is recognizing the evil for what it is and countering it with swift justice against the perpetrators and strong support for the victims.

And that's just the way it is.

10TH ANNUAL NORTHWEST INDIANA INNOVATION INDUCTION CEREMONY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and enthusiasm that I congratulate Ivy Tech Community College Northwest and its regional partners, who recently celebrated their 10th Annual Northwest Indiana Innovation Induction Ceremony. At the ceremony, which reflects the "Spirit of Innovation" in Indiana, fifteen individuals and fourteen teams were inducted as members of the 2014-2015 class of The Society of Innovators of Northwest Indiana. Of these individuals, several members were inducted as Society Fellows for their significant efforts in innovation. These individuals are Scott Albanese, Robert Coangelo, Robert Palumbo, Ph.D., Neeti Parashar, Ph.D., and Roger Pradhan, Ph.D. William E. Nangle was honored as the Gerald I. Lamkin Fellow for Innovation and Service, a special recognition named for the President Emeritus of Ivy Tech College of Indiana. Also honored were two Chanute Prize recipients, the BP "One Global Team" for the Whiting Refinery Modernization Project and PCL Alverno. In addition, a new team award designated "Accelerating Greatness" was presented for the first time this year, and the recipients were James S. Markiewicz Solar Energy Research Facility, Valparaiso University, and the Northwest Indiana Regional Development Authority. For their truly remarkable contributions to the community of Northwest Indiana and their continuous efforts to cultivate a culture of innovation, these honorees were inducted at the Horseshoe Casino in Hammond, Indiana, on Thursday, October 16, 2014.

The Society of Innovators of Northwest Indiana was created by Ivy Tech Northwest with the goal of highlighting and encouraging innovative individuals and groups within the not-for-profit, public, and private sectors, as well as building a "culture of innovation" in Northwest Indiana. The importance of innovation in Northwest Indiana, as well as globally, is crucial in today's ever-changing economy. Leading the Northwest Region is Dr. Thomas G. Coley, Chancellor, Ivy Tech Community College North West and North Central Regions.

The fellows selected by the Society of Innovators were chosen for their significant innovative leadership and the impact of their accomplishments throughout Northwest Indiana and beyond. Scott Albanese, founder and chief executive officer of Albanese Confectionery Group, Incorporated, in Merrillville, launched his business thirty years ago. Today, the company generates over \$100 million in sales and its products can be found nationwide, as well as in nine other countries. In addition, Scott invented the first gummy candy in the world with a distinguishable flavor, which was previously deemed impossible. Robert Coangelo is the founding farmer of Green Sense Farms, which is the nation's largest indoor, commercial, vertical farm and the largest user of Phillips LED grow lights. The organization grows produce in a controlled environment that is free of pesticides, herbicides, and

GMO seeds while distributing its products throughout the Midwest. Robert Palumbo, Ph.D., professor and Alfred W. Sieving chair of engineering, inspired the effort to build the nation's fifth solar furnace at the College of Engineering at Valparaiso University, which is utilized by undergrad students to explore new ideas in solar research. Dr. Palumbo is now part of a "pioneering" team at the James S. Markiewicz Solar Energy Research Facility. Neeti Parashar, Ph.D., spearheaded a High Energy Physics Team at Purdue University Calumet as part of a large global collaboration to discover the Higgs-Boson subatomic particle, which gave the Nobel Prize to Peter Higgs of the United Kingdom and Francois Englert of Belgium. Roger Pradham, Ph.D. played a key role in the development of new carbon steel products for the automotive industry, and he is the leading developer of bake-hardenable steels. Dr. Pradham received an AISI Gold Medal for his research outlining the implementation of bake-hardenable steels at Burns Harbor, and he currently holds four patents.

I am also honored to acknowledge William E. Nangle, executive editor (ret.), The Times of Northwest Indiana, who was recognized as the Gerald I. Lamkin Fellow for Outstanding Innovation & Service. In his role, Mr. Nangle introduced the "Munster Model," which provided the community with in-depth local and neighborhood news while also covering regional news. This model became a huge success in the journalism industry and is utilized nationwide. In addition, Mr. Nangle brought Indiana's seven largest newspapers together, producing statewide access to public records. Under Mr. Nangle's direction, The Times of Northwest Indiana became a national leader in its industry.

The recipients of the Chanute Prize for Team Innovation should be commended for their contributions. The BP "One Global Team" for the Whiting Refinery Modernization Project utilized a single team concept on a world scale to conduct the largest and most complex refinery construction project in BP history. PCL Alverno introduced total microbiology automation, which revolutionized the delivery of results to patients and physicians. PCL is the first to be designated as a Seimen's Microbiology Innovation Center in the United States.

The Accelerating Greatness Award for Team Innovation included two recipients. The James S. Markiewicz Solar Energy Research Facility, located at Valparaiso University, houses the fifth solar furnace in the United States and the world's only solar furnace primarily designed, built, and used by undergrad students at an institution of higher learning. The Northwest Indiana Regional Development Authority is a regional organization that provides nearly \$30 million annually in a proven collaborative model to leverage failing assets into more than \$1 billion in infrastructure and economic development.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in commending these outstanding innovators. The contributions they have made to society here in Northwest Indiana and worldwide are immeasurable and lifelong. For their truly brilliant innovative ideas, projects, and leadership, each recipient is worthy of the highest commendation.

HONORING WILLIAM H. "BILL"
DETRICK

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I submit these remarks today to honor William H. "Bill" Detrick, who passed away at the age of 87 on September 19, 2014. Bill Detrick was the long-time coach of the Central Connecticut State University Basketball team, and after that was the coach of Trinity College Golf team. He was everything that embodies a passionate, tough, and tenacious coach and person. He taught college sports until the age of 86, which is something that very few can claim.

Throughout his 29 year tenure as the Central Connecticut basketball coach, he won 468 games with two undefeated seasons out of 24 winning seasons. He brought the program to six Division II NCAA tournaments and ushered them into Division I basketball, where they remain today. The standard and foundation set by his legacy at Central Connecticut will continue on for the future of their athletic programs.

As a coach, one must assume the responsibility of developing younger generations of people as students, athletes, and most of all as people. Bill Detrick knew this as well as anyone and was able to impact the lives of each of those he coached even to this day. He instilled the same values in his three children and six grandchildren as he did his players: Hard work and dedication to what you love will always prevail in the end. Always go the extra mile in your endeavors. He preached these kinds of lessons to his children and players in order to prepare them not just for the game, but for their entire lives ahead.

A great example of his attitude in life came from a friend and golf partner of many years, who said that Bill would never ride in a cart, and always insisted on walking. Just a week before he passed away, he walked nine holes at the age of 87. Always push yourself, even if it is during a game of such relaxation such as golf.

Mr. Detrick is survived by his wife Barbara, three children, and six grandchildren. I would like to extend my condolences to the family of Mr. Detrick during this difficult time. I hope the Holiday season reminds everyone in his life of the joyful memories that he brought, and the importance of enjoying every moment they had together. Let us all remember the values that William Detrick brought to everyone around him, and try to implement them in our everyday lives in order to strive to be the best people we can be.

DR. GUY "MOJO" LEWIS, DDS—
MAKING TEXANS SMILE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when Dr. Guy "Mojo" Lewis walks into a room, every-

one knows it. With his larger-than-life stature and the mystic of Texas legend Sam Houston, his commanding presence captures attention. People can't help but smile when they see him, his presence is contagious.

As a personal friend and fellow Abilene Christian University Alum, I would like to congratulate this outstanding Texan for celebrating his 30th anniversary of practicing dentistry.

Dr. Lewis knew from early on that he wanted to be a dentist, never wavering in his decision to make people smile. After graduating from Abilene Christian University ('80), Dr. Lewis earned his Doctorate of Dentistry from Baylor College of Dentistry.

In 1984, he became a founding member of the American Academy of Cosmetic Dentistry (AACD), at a time when cosmetic dentistry was beginning to emerge. He became the youngest cosmetic dentist to be accredited by the AACD. Additionally, he is also a member of the Texas Dental Association and the American Dental Association. He received a fellowship in the International Academy for Dental Facial Esthetics.

Dr. Lewis continues to give back to the community and takes time to guide aspiring dentists as well. Recognizing the importance of education, Dr. Lewis is an adjunct professor of dentistry at Baylor College.

The legend that is Dr. Lewis is known far and wide. His extensive knowledge of cosmetic dentistry and his incredible work ethic quickly gained him respect from his colleagues in the dental profession. Over his career, Dr. Lewis was routinely recognized for his expertise and contributions to the dental community.

His list of credentials could fill a sports arena, literally. He is the dentist of Olympic gold medal athletes, the Houston Astros, the Houston Rockets and many more.

He was named a "Top Doc" for 7 consecutive years by H Texas Magazine and was listed as a "Super Dentist" by Texas Monthly Magazine for multiple years. In addition, Dr. Lewis was elected by a group of his peers to be in the book Best Dentists in America.

In addition to his notable recognition for his work within the dental community, Dr. Lewis has continued to serve on advisory boards of many non-profit organizations and on the boards of several schools. I served alongside him on the Abilene Christian University Board.

Our community has benefited greatly from the decades of service that Dr. Lewis has devoted. Dr. Lewis and his staff continue to be involved with Cypress-Woodlands Junior Forum, Be an Angel Fund, and Give Back a Smile.

The list of this model citizen's accomplishments is impressive and well-deserved, and it's no surprise that he's a Texan.

Dr. Lewis's service to his city, state and nation as well as his faith will have an enduring positive impact.

A dedicated family man, Dr. Lewis has been married to his wife, Holly for 33 years. Together, they are the proud parents of five children. Firm believers in Christian education, Dr. Lewis sent his children to Northland Christian School, the same school that my children attended, and where we both served on the Board of Trustees.

His success can be attributed to his faith, happy attitude about life and his career, and

his genuine compassion and care for his patients. Dr. Lewis, thank you for your 30 years of service to our community and the State of Texas.

Another great, Texas legend we are proud to have among our neighbors. To 30 more years of making people smile, thank you Dr. Guy "Mojo" Lewis.

And that's just the way it is.

CELEBRATING THE SAN FRANCISCO GIANTS' WORLD SERIES WIN

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime season ticket holder and proud fan, I rise today to pay tribute to the 2014 World Series Champions, the San Francisco Giants.

On October 29, 2014, our beloved Giants won San Francisco's third championship in five years, defeating the Kansas City Royals in the seventh game of a down-to-the-wire World Series.

The Giants' post-season performance was masterful, a shared victory built on the shoulders of our entire team. The people of San Francisco salute our champions—players, coaches and staff who carried forward the banner of our city to seize the pennant and final victory. With timely hitting and phenomenal pitching, the Giants rose from the Wild Card to reclaim their position as baseball's champions.

In their hard-fought victory, the Giants have once again made us the proudest city in baseball, and given fresh energy to the talk of a rising dynasty on the Bay. Congratulations to all our 'Stronger Together' players, especially the members of the World Series roster: Tim Hudson, Jake Peavy, Ryan Vogelsong, Jeremy Affeldt, Santiago Casilla, Tim Lincecum, Javier López, Yusmeiro Petit, Sergio Romo, Hunter Strickland, Buster Posey, Jean Machi, Andrew Susac, Joaquín Arias, Brandon Belt, Brandon Crawford, Matt Duffy, Joe Panik, Pablo Sandoval, Gregor Blanco, Travis Ishikawa, Michael Morse, Hunter Pence, Juan Pérez and of course, our latest legend on the pitcher's mound, NLCS and World Series MVP Madison Bumgarner.

Bumgarner's composure and phenomenal pitching silenced the bats of the Kansas City Royals, and vaulted himself into the ranks of the greatest playoff pitchers in history—pitching more innings in a single post-season than anyone in history and securing the lowest World Series ERA of any pitcher with at least 25 World Series innings pitched: only one run allowed in three World Series.

In our march back to the championship, we were also grateful for our gifted announcer, Renel Brooks-Moon, and talented English and Spanish-language broadcasters: Duane Kuiper, Mike Krukow, Jon Miller, Dave Flemming, Tito Fuentes and Erwin Higueros.

The Giants represented excellence from the field to the front office. As San Francisco cherishes our latest victory, our gratitude extends as well to the team's Chief Executive Officer

Larry Baer, General Manager Brian Sabean, Manager Bruce Bochy, and to the men and women of the Giants' excellent staff. Their leadership and vision continue to support and strengthen our team.

The heart and hard work of the Giants extend well beyond the baseball diamond through the Giants Community Fund, which has donated more than \$18 million to vital community efforts. Under their auspices, communities and non-profit organizations throughout Northern California team with our champions to promote health and violence prevention, youth fitness and recreation, education and literacy. And, as the Junior Giants celebrate their 20th anniversary with more than 24,000 participants, we know there is perhaps no better gift we could have received than the Commissioner's Trophy.

As we celebrate our latest championship and turn our eyes to future World Series, we know that our team is blessed by the millions of passionate and devoted San Francisco Giants fans in Northern California, across the country, and around the world. We are proud fans of a proud community. In pride, let us say once more say: Go Giants!

HISTORICAL RECORD OF FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE AFFECTING AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information on the timeline regarding the federal minimum wage issue affecting American Samoa as debated and discussed in the U.S. Congress.

When the Democratic Party took control of both houses of Congress following the 2006 elections, it promised to increase the federal minimum wage to \$7.25 per hour in its "first 100 hours" on the floor. On January 10, 2007, the House passes H.R. 2, the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007, by a vote of 315-116. CNMI was included in the bill and subject to annual increases until the Territory reached a rate of \$7.25 per hour. American Samoa was excluded from the bill, meaning Special Industry Committees would continue to determine increases in American Samoa. False media reports begin to circulate suggesting Speaker Pelosi excluded American Samoa from H.R. 2 because Congressman Eni Faleomavaega (EF) is a Democrat, and because Del Monte is contributing to the Speaker's campaign. The media also implies that the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) does not apply to American Samoa. A campaign begins to make American Samoa subject to the \$7.25 federal minimum wage standard.

On January 16, EF responds by informing the press and Members of Congress that the FLSA has applied to American Samoa since 1938 and that since 1956, under Section 5 and 8 of the FLSA, Special Industry Committees administered by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor have determined wage rates in American Samoa. EF asks for Special Industry Committees to continue and for CNMI to be brought under the Special Industry umbrella. EF also writes to

Senator Daniel Inouye, Senator Daniel Akaka and the following Senators from the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP): Senator Lamar Alexander, Senator Wayne Allard, Senator Jeff Bingaman, Senator Sherrod Brown, Senator Richard Burr, Senator Hillary Clinton, Senator Tom Coburn, Senator Chris Dodd, Senator Michael B. Enzi (Ranking Member), Senator Judd Gregg, Senator Tom Harkin, Senator Orrin Hatch, Senator Johnny Isakson, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Chairman), Senator Barbara Mikulski, Senator Lisa Murkowski, Senator Patty Murray, Senator Barack Obama, Senator Jack Reed, Senator Pat Roberts, and Senator Bernie Sanders. EF also writes to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Rep. George Miller, Chairman, House Committee of Education and the Workforce, Rep. Howard Buck McKeon, Ranking Member, House Committee on Education and the Workforce, and Speaker Pelosi. On January 18 and January 19, EF speaks out on the House floor. On January 22, EF and Senator Inouye write Senator Kennedy, Chairman of the Senate Committee on HELP, in support of using Special Industry Committees to determine wage rates for American Samoa and CNMI. On January 24, in an attempt to make a stink about Democrats' minimum-wage and territorial voting proposals, House Republicans take to the floor wearing white stickers of Charlie the Tuna with a caption stating "Something's Fishy!" EF writes to Secretary of the Interior Dirk Kempthorne, StarKist and Chicken of the Sea write to EF. On January 30, the Senate passes wage bill.

On February 5, EF writes to conferees in support of strengthening Special Industry Committees, including Chairman Kennedy and Ranking Member Enzi of the Senate HELP Committee, and Ranking Member Howard "Buck" McKeon and Chairman Miller of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. On March 12, EF writes to Chairman Miller. On March 15, minimum wage bill is attached to Emergency Iraq War Supplemental bill. Republican Mark Kirk also offers an amendment to extend federal minimum wage rates to American Samoa by \$0.50 cents per hour every year until the Territory reaches the mainland rate of \$7.25 per hour. Amendment is accepted by House Appropriations Committee. On March 15, EF writes to Rep. David Obey, Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations in opposition to the Kirk amendment. Obey promises that the issue will be resolved during conference.

On May 11, EF writes to Chairman Miller offering compromise amendment to the Kirk proposal in which workers would be provided a one-time increase of \$0.50 cents per hour and the U.S. Department of Labor would be empowered to determine future increases, though Special Industry Committees would be abolished. EF writes to Speaker Pelosi, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Senator Inouye, Senator Akaka, and Senator Bingaman, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. EF also writes to Del Monte CEO Richard Wolford, forwarding copy of letter and amendment to House and Senate. EF writes to Chicken of the Sea CEO John Signorino and Del Monte CEO Richard Wolford to set the record straight about comments made by Del Monte's Executive Vice President regarding EF's position on minimum wage. On May 18, EF, Senator Inouye, Senator Bingaman, Senator Akaka and Rep. Donna Christensen write to Chairman David Obey and Ranking Member Jerry Lewis of the House Committee

on Appropriations and Chairman Robert Byrd and Ranking Member Thad Cochran of the Senate Committee on Appropriations urging support of EF's amendment but with an initial increase of \$0.35 cents per hour. On May 21, Del Monte CEO Richard Wolford writes to EF in support of his EF's efforts in Congress to resolve the challenges regarding the impact of increased wages on tuna canner operations in American Samoa. On May 25, conferees do not accept the proposal but do agree to include EF language calling upon the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct a study to determine impact of future increases. Wage hike with automatic escalator clauses is included in the Iraq War supplemental spending bill and President George W. Bush signs it into law on May 25. The first wage increase occurs on June 24.

On June 6, EF writes to Rep. Christensen, Chair of the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Insular Affairs requesting an oversight hearing on the impact of the federal minimum wage legislation. EF copies his letter to Governor and Legislature. On June 11, Chicken of the Sea President John Signorino writes to EF, enclosing copy of letter COS Senior Vice President Jim Davet wrote to Del Monte and copied to Governor Togiola. On June 21, EF writes to Thai Union President Thiraphong Chansiri and copies his letter to Senator Inouye, Governor Togiola, Lieutenant Governor Sunia, ASG Legislature, COS President John Signorino, and COS Vice President of Operations Jim Davet. EF responds to Davet's comments and requests meeting with Thai Union President Chansiri. Mr. Chansiri agrees to meet. The same day, EF writes to COS President John Signorino and sets the record straight about Mr. Davet's comments. EF encloses a copy of his letter to Chairwoman Christensen as well as his letter to Thai Union President Thiraphong Chansiri. EF also writes to Del Monte CEO Richard Wolford and encloses a copy of his letter to Rep. Christensen requesting a hearing as soon as possible. EF writes to Governor Togiola informing him that he will meet be meeting with StarKist, Chicken of the Sea, Del Monte, Thai Union and boat owners in San Diego, California regarding the impact of federal minimum wage law. EF also informs Governor that he will be meeting with Thai Union President Thiraphong Chansiri on July 1. EF copies his letter to Senator Inouye, Lieutenant Governor, and the American Samoa Legislature.

On July 1, EF meets with Thai Union President Thiraphong Chansiri in Bangkok, Thailand. On July 24, EF meets with U.S. Department of Labor officials, including Dr. Ronald Baird, Chief Economist from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, who is tasked to undertake the study mandated by Congress to determine impact of minimum wage increases. On July 25, EF writes to Secretary of the Interior Dirk Kempthorne regarding his meeting with the U.S. Department of Labor and requesting support in assisting ASG and CNMI officials in how to collect the necessary data needed to make determinations about both economies.

On January 25, 2008, U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) releases it report. On January 29, EF introduces H.R. 5154 to condition further increases in minimum wage on a determination by the Secretary of Labor. EF writes to Governor Togiola and provides him with a copy of the DOL report and informs him that he has introduced H.R. 5154. EF copies Senator Inouye, U.S. Secretary of the Interior, Lieutenant Governor, ASG Legislature. On February 12, EF writes to Para-

mount Chief Mauga regarding field hearing to be held in American Samoa regarding impact of minimum wage increases. On February 14, EF writes to Chairman Miller regarding H.R. 5154 and thanking him for sending 2 professional staff members to field hearing scheduled to be held in American Samoa on February 22. On February 22, Rep. Christensen, Chair of the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, holds field hearing in American Samoa at EF's request regarding impact of federal minimum wage increases on American Samoa's economy. EF testifies before the House Resources Subcommittee on Insular Affairs. On February 28, EF testifies before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources regarding the Impact of the Recently Increased Minimum Wage in American Samoa.

On March 14, Chairman Miller writes to EF and raises concerns about DOL. The same day, EF, Senator Inouye, Senator Akaka, Senator Bingaman write to Chairman Robert C. Byrd and Ranking Member Thad Cochran of the Senate Committee on Appropriations requesting delays in minimum wage. On March 31, Secretary of the Interior to Dirk Kempthorne writes to EF offering support. On April 3, EF writes to Senator Inouye thanking him for agreeing to offer an amendment based on H.R. 5154 to delay minimum wage increases and to review further increases. EF also writes to Senator Bingaman and Senator Akaka. On April 18, EF writes to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid. On April 20, EF writes to Senator Orrin Hatch. On April 22, EF and Governor Fitial write to Senator Kennedy, Senator Inouye, Senator Bingaman, and Senator Akaka. EF and Governor Fitial also write to Chairman Miller. On April 24, EF and Governor Fitial write to House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer. On May 13, EF and CAPAC members Rep. Mike Honda, Rep. Joseph Crowley, Rep. Christensen, Rep. Albio Sires, Rep. Solomon Ortiz, Rep. Nydia Velazquez, Rep. Bennie Thompson, Rep. Neil Abercrombie, Rep. Al Green, Rep. Luis Gutierrez, Rep. Joe Baca, Rep. Mazie Hirono, and Rep. Hank Johnson write to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Speaker Nancy Pelosi, House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, Chairman David Obey of the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman Norm Dicks of the Interior Appropriations Committee, Chairman Miller of the Education and Workforce Committee, Chairman Kennedy of the Senate HELP Committee, Senator Inouye, Senator Akaka, and Chairman Bingaman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources requesting support for delays. On May 21, Senate passes language in the Emergency Supplemental to conduct new GAO study. On May 30, the 2nd minimum wage increase goes into effect. On July 31, EF, Chairman Rahall of the House Committee on Natural Resources and Rep. Christensen write to U.S. Secretary of the Interior Dirk Kempthorne requesting technical assistance funds to conduct comprehensive economic study of American Samoa. On November 25, EF writes to StarKist regarding announcement to lay off workers and copies Senator Inouye, Governor Togiola and Chairman Kim Jae-Chul of the Dongwon Group.

On January 28, 2009, EF writes to Chairman Miller requesting delays in further increases. On January 30, EF meets with Senator Inouye and thanks him for agreeing to include language in H.R. 1, the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) that would require the GAO to conduct a new study by April 15, 2010. On February 17, H.R.

1 is signed into law with 3rd wage increase to go forward and a mandate for a new GAO report to be released by April 2010. On February 19, EF writes to Governor Togiola, President of the Senate Gaoteote, Speaker Savali and asks them to join him in sending a letter to Chairman Miller requesting a deferment of the 3rd increase until GAO has time to complete its study. On February 23, EF holds meeting in his DC office with Governor Togiola and Governor Fitial for purposes of drafting a letter and sending a unified message to Congress and the Administration regarding the need to delay minimum wage. On February 24, EF, Governor Togiola and Governor Fitial deliver their letter to U.S. Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar during meeting of Interagency Group on Insular Affairs (IGIA). On May 7, EF writes to Governor Togiola regarding COS closure and copies letter to American Samoa Legislature. On May 30, the 3rd minimum wage increase goes into effect. On July 24, EF responds to ASG petition to President Obama. On December 14, House and Senate agree to EF's request to postpone 4th increase from May 2010 to September 2010 to give Congress time to act on the GAO study.

On April 8, 2010, GAO releases new study on the impact of minimum wage hikes in American Samoa and CNMI. On April 30, EF thanks Chairman Miller for agreeing to his request to modify minimum wage law based on findings of GAO and copies Senator Inouye, Chairman Nick Rahall of the House Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, Governor Togiola, and the American Samoa Legislature. On May 5, EF forwards Senator Inouye copy of letter to Chairman Miller. On May 12, Senator Inouye thanks EF for copy and assures him of support in Senate. On June 12, EF and Rep. Sablan of CNMI write to Senator Inouye, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and include language approved by Chairman Miller that would halt minimum wage increases in American Samoa for 2010 and 2011 and for CNMI for 2011 based on GAO report, and asking for inclusion in any legislative vehicle that might be moving. EF and Rep. Sablan also write to Senator Tom Harkin, Chairman of the Senate HELP Committee, Senator Bingaman, Chairman of Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and Chairman David Obey of the House Committee on Appropriations. On July 27, Senator Bingaman and Senator Murkowski agree to include EF and Sablan language in H.R. 934, a CNMI bill already passed by the House, which is hotlined for Unanimous Consent (UC) in the Senate. Bill clears Democratic hotline. Republican hold placed on CNMI provision relating to submerged lands. Rep. Sablan would not agree to take out his submerged lands provision. In response, Senator Bingaman and Senator Murkowski agree to include EF and Sablan minimum wage language in H.R. 3940, a Guam bill already passed by the House, which is hotlined for Unanimous Consent in the Senate.

On August 3, EF writes to Senator Bingaman thanking him for agreeing to include minimum wage language in H.R. 3940. EF writes to Senator Murkowski thanking her for support. On August 6, EF provides updates informing public that H.R. 3940 has cleared Democratic holds but Republicans did not have time enough to review before August recess.

On September 14, House returns from District work period. UC process begins again. Senator Bingaman and Senator Murkowski's committee staff inform EF and Sablan that

Democrats have cleared H.R. 3940 for UC. On September 16, at 4 pm, Republican cloakroom informs Democrats that 2 holds have been placed including one by Senator DeMint (R-SC). Senate ends business for the day and does not go in Session on Friday. On September 18, Saturday night, Senator Bingaman and Senator Murkowski's staff inform EF and Sablan that there is nothing they can do to overcome Senator DeMint's hold. On September 20, EF's office contacts Senator DeMint's Chief of Staff at 10:29 am. At 11:52 am, Senator DeMint's Chief of Staff responds stating he has forwarded EF information and comments to policy staff for review. On September 21, at 11:28 am, Senator DeMint's staff informs EF office that Senator DeMint will agree to let minimum wage section pass, but expresses concerns about Guam provision. EF office informs Rep. Bordallo's office of concerns raised about Guam. Rep. Bordallo's office begins process of working out compromise regarding Guam provisions. On September 27, at 4:36 pm, Rep. Bordallo's office and Sen DeMint's office reach agreement on new language regarding Guam provision. On September 28, at 9:45 am, Senator DeMint's office informs Republican cloakroom that he has released his hold on H.R. 3940 pending the change in language regarding the Guam provision. Change is made and H.R. 3940 is hot-lined again. At 1:36 pm, Democrats begin hotline process. At 3:48 pm, Democratic staff informs EF and Sablan that Senator Coburn is raising questions but Senator Murkowski's staff is trying to resolve his concerns. At 4:13 pm, EF speaks with Senator Majority Leader Harry Reid asking that bill be placed on floor for DC once it clears the Democratic and Republican cloakrooms. However, Senator Murkowski's staff is unable to clear Senator Coburn's hold. At 4:42 pm, EF office contacts Senator McCain's office asking for help to release Senator Coburn's hold. Senator McCain's office agrees. At 5:17 pm, EF office phones Senator Coburn's office. At 6:03 pm, Senator Coburn's office informs EF's office that Senator Coburn has agreed to release his hold. At 6:09 pm, Senator McCain's office also informs EF office that Senator Coburn has agreed to release his hold. Senate passes H.R. 3940 by DC. At 10:28 pm, EF sends letter to Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, House Majority leader Steny Hoyer, Chairman Miller of the House and Committee on Education and Labor, Leader and Chairman Nick Rahall of the House Committee on Natural Resources requesting that H.R. 3940 be brought to the House floor for immediate passage.

On September 29, at 8:05 am, EF office phones House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer's Chief of Staff again requesting that H.R. 3940 be brought to Floor for passage. ML Hoyer's office states that Republican Leadership must be on board. At 10:33 am, EF office contacts Republican Leader John Boehner's Chief of Staff, Republican Whip Eric Cantor's Chief of Staff, Republican Staff Director for Ranking Member John Kline of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and Republican Staff Director for Ranking Member Doc Hastings of the House Committee on Natural Resources, providing copy of EF letter to Republican leadership. At 10:38 am, EF office contacts Rep. Flake (R-AZ), member of the Resources Committee and LDS Member of Church, requesting help in getting support from Republicans, including Ranking Member Doc Hastings of the Natural Resources Committee. At 10:39 am, Rep. Flake's office informs EF office that message will be forwarded to Rep. Flake. At

12:08 pm, Rep. Flake sends message saying he will speak to Ranking Member Doc Hastings of Natural Resources Committee. At 12:31 pm, Republican Leader John Boehner's Chief of Staff responds thanking EF office for bringing this to his attention and stating that they will respond appropriately base on conversations with their two Ranking Members. At 12:30 pm, EF speaks to Ranking Member Doc Hastings on House floor, and also Rep. Flake who has also spoken to Ranking Member Hastings. Ranking Member Hastings and Ranking Member John Kline of the Education and Labor Committee agree to let bill go to the Floor by suspension. At 12:38 pm, EF office informs Majority Leader Hoyer's office that Republicans will agree to let the bill be brought to the House floor by suspension instead of UC, meaning a voice vote will be requested and that the measure must win by a vote of 290. At 5:18 pm, ML Hoyer's office agrees to put bill on House floor. ML Hoyer calls EF. At 8:52 pm, EF office begins providing Samoa News with regular updates.

On September 30, at 12:19 am, EF office informs Samoa News that vote is taking place. At 12:27 am, EF issues press release stating bill passes House by a vote of 386 to 5. At 12:31 am, EF office emails White House requesting assistance to get bill on President's desk for signature. At 8:00 am, White House emails EF office thanking EF for flagging the bill for signature. At 8:36 am, EF office contacts Majority Leader Hoyer's Chief of Staff requesting assistance to get the bill from the House to the White House. At 8:40 am, ML Hoyer's COS states he is working it. At 10:58 am, Majority Leader Hoyer's Chief of Staff informs EF office that he has taken the bill to the Clerk's office and that it is at the Parliamentarian's office awaiting clearance, then it goes to Speaker Pelosi, then to the Senate, then to the President of the United States for signature. At 5:06 pm, White House informs EF that President has signed H.R. 3940. At 5:09 pm, EF office informs Samoa News bill has been signed. Samoa News issues breaking news flash. At 5:38 pm, EF issues press release announcing that bill has been signed into law.

FRAN BAKER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Fran Baker for her tireless dedication and love for the community in Jefferson County.

As the founder and Executive Director of the Gold Crown Enrichment Program, a free program that serves 400 kids per year which focuses on art and technology, Fran has raised over \$350,000 each year to keep the program running for free. Under Fran's direction, Gold Crown Enrichment was awarded licensing for an international after school program, The Computer Clubhouse, part of a global network of tech based after school programs. While dedicating herself full time to this program, she does not take home a paycheck. In addition to being a full-time volunteer for Gold Crown, she also works in Jefferson County for other causes that support children.

For nine years, Fran worked as a Title One Reading Teacher and Literacy Coach in Jef-

erson County. Fran has received the Jefferson Foundation Community Service Award and was named Channel 7's Everyday Hero.

I extend my deepest appreciation and congratulations to Fran for her positive impact in Jefferson County and for the numerous kids she has and continues to support.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY CLUB OF PONTIAC, MICHIGAN

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Golden Opportunity Club, which was established as a venue for senior citizens in the Greater Pontiac community to connect and learn. Founded with the philosophy that increasing age does not need to impact an individual's quality of life, the Golden Opportunity Club is a community organization that directly engages senior citizens in the City of Pontiac to support a wide variety of activities that keeps them both mentally and physically active.

Founded in October 1964, the Golden Opportunity Club first met at the Lakeside Homes Center in Pontiac with ten original members in attendance. Its supervisor, Mrs. Johnson, immediately recognized the club's unique potential and engaged in efforts to expand its reach within the community. After much debate, she came up with the club's signature name under the presidency of Mrs. Annie Thompson. Two locations and thirteen presidents later, the thriving Golden Opportunity Club is now comprised of 400 members.

To carry out its mission, the club arranges activities and events for all people aged fifty-six and up. Club members participate in recreational gatherings including: trips, picnics and parties. In addition, the club offers its members a forum to use their compassion and desire to others by participating in charitable events to support their community. The Golden Opportunity Club also reaches out to ill, hospitalized and homebound members by providing financial and emotional support to them and their families.

Under the leadership of its current president, Carolyn Price, the Golden Opportunity Club has continued to stay focused on its mission of engaging seniors in activities that encourage civic activism and promote an active lifestyle. Recently, the Golden Opportunity Club has allied with Community Network Services and other organizations to ensure that their charitable contributions are benefiting the community. The funds that the Golden Opportunity Club raises through its events are used to make a significant impact on the residents of Pontiac. Specifically, the Golden Opportunity Club uses some of these funds to award annual scholarships to graduating high school seniors, as well as an annual contribution to the God U-C Youth Group, which is committed to inspiring and enriching the lives of youth in Pontiac. In conjunction with annual

donations, the Golden Opportunity Club is committed to improving Pontiac as it continues to grow and develop. This past year it made significant contributions to Coats for Kids, and the WHRC Elementary School when its roof caved in.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the remarkable impact the Golden Opportunity Club has made over the last 50 years on the lives of senior citizens in the City of Pontiac. As more and more members of the Baby Boomer generation become seniors, the health and happiness of senior citizens will become increasingly important to sustain robust communities. The Golden Opportunity Club is vital to this work in the Pontiac community. I congratulate the Golden Opportunity Club on its many achievements and wish its members continued success in fulfilling their mission and encouraging the spirit and vitality of Pontiac's seniors.

CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HISPANIC-AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Morris County Hispanic-American Chamber of Commerce, located in Morristown, New Jersey as it celebrates its 25th Anniversary.

The Morris County Hispanic-American Chamber of Commerce is a not-for-profit organization, whose purpose is to serve the growing market needs of the U.S. Hispanic-American businesses and residential communities, specific to Morris County and adjacent areas.

In the summer of 1989, Esperanza Porras-Field, John Sanchez, and Neyla Porras Moreno founded the Morris County Hispanic-American Chamber of Commerce. The three founding members began an organization with the mission to "advocate, promote, and advance the interests of business owners, professionals, organizations and corporations within Morris County and the adjacent areas that target and serve the U.S. Hispanic-American market." Since then, the Hispanic-American Chamber of Commerce has helped to foster the prosperity not only of the Hispanic community, but of Morris County as a whole. Both Esperanza Porras-Field and John Sanchez remain active members of the chamber, while Neyla Porras de Moreno remains an active member of another Hispanic Chamber.

Esperanza Porras-Field, a founding member, current president and CEO of the Chamber, is stepping down after years of distinguished service. She has shown her dedication to promoting the welfare of the community in founding several more Chambers of Commerce and facilitating their development. Her involvement extends beyond Morris County to an international scale, where she is on the Advisory Board for the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce in Toronto. Over the years her experience and guidance have been a major factor in the success of the Chamber, and her leadership will be missed.

Throughout the past 25 years, the chamber has continuously been recognized as one of the Best Chambers in the Northeast, within Region V, by the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. In 2007, the chamber was declared the Best National Medium Hispanic Chamber, and received the award again in 2014. At the 2014 United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce Convention, the Morris County Hispanic-American Chamber of Commerce signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Toronto Hispanic Chamber of Commerce to provide mutual membership in each other's respective chamber and host cross-border events with their Canadian friends in order to promote international trade.

With over 350 members, the chamber offers over 20 annual events purposed to further growth and success. These events include networking and social events, fundraising, business incubation, business card exchanges, procurement opportunities, training, and seminars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 25th Anniversary of the Morris County Hispanic-American Chamber of Commerce.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,988,139,701,976.27. We've added \$7,361,262,653,063.19 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.3 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF HARLEM RENAISSANCE POET LAUREATE JAMES BALDWIN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration that I rise today to join all of the people in the village of Harlem and my Congressional District to pay tribute to Mr. James Baldwin, a legendary writer who broke new literary ground by exploring racial and social issues embedded in American history.

On Saturday, August 2, 2014, the Greater Harlem Chamber of Commerce, the Harlem Arts Alliance, the New Heritage Theatre Group, Columbia University School of the Arts, The National Black Theater, Street Corner Resources, Harlem Renaissance High School, and HARLEM WEEK, Inc. joined elected officials, community board members, residents, and poet laureates to recognize August 2nd

as James Baldwin Day in celebration of his 90th birthday. Among the many tributes, the marquee of the famous Apollo Theater read "Happy 90th Birthday James Baldwin." Above all, a portion of East 128th Street, between Fifth Avenue and Madison Avenue, where he once lived was renamed "James Baldwin Way".

Mr. Baldwin was born to Emma Jones, a single mother, on August 2, 1924 in Harlem, New York. While he never met his biological father, Mr. Baldwin did have a father figure growing up, Baptist Minister David Baldwin. The preacher's religious influence had a lasting impression on James and his writings. The language of the church shaped the cadences and tones of his work, becoming unmistakable hallmarks of his literary style. He would go on to spend three years as a youth minister.

After striking out on his own and moving away from home, Mr. Baldwin published short stories in national periodicals under the tutelage of his mentor, Beauford Delaney, a renowned Harlem Renaissance painter. Disillusioned by the growing bigotry towards African-Americans and the gay community, Baldwin left our country and settled in France at the age of 24. He found that the distance gave him enough space to reflect on his experience as a black man in white America. Please allow me to quote Mr. Baldwin's later thoughts on this dramatic change in his life: "Once I found myself on the other side of the ocean, I saw where I came from very clearly . . . I am the grandson of a slave, and I am a writer. I must deal with both." Through his writing, Baldwin was forced to confront this enlightening reality.

While he spent much of his life abroad, Baldwin was recognized as a quintessential American writer. In 1953, Baldwin published his first novel, a semi autobiography called *Go Tell It on the Mountain*, which explores the repression, moral hypocrisy, religious inspiration, and community ties that characterized the Black American experience. His two collections of essays, *Notes of a Native Son* (1955) and *Nobody Knows My Name* (1961), as well as his two novels, *Giovanni's Room* (1956) and *Another Country* (1962), were immediate bestsellers. The works Baldwin published during this unsettling time in American history, explored the deep-rooted racial tension with eloquence and unparalleled honesty. As his collection of notable literary works continue to exude words of strength, power, and wisdom, his writing will forever remain an essential part of the American literary canon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me as we celebrate this year, the 90th Birthday of Harlem Renaissance Poet Laureate James Baldwin.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES TO AMERICAN SAMOA 1995-2012

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, the following information on federal expenditures to American Samoa.

From 1995 to 2001, the amount of federal expenditures from federal agencies to American Samoa totaled over \$1 billion. The following is the amount of federal expenditures per year:

1995: \$116,008,922
 1996: \$115,099,073
 1997: \$174,193,691
 1998: \$150,888,302
 1999: \$171,449,811
 2000: \$175,979,717
 2001: \$181,203,793
 TOTAL: \$1,084,823,309

From 2002 to 2007, the federal expenditures from federal agencies to American Samoa totaled nearly \$1.4 billion. The following is the amount of federal expenditures per year:

2002: \$212,103,366
 2003: \$231,696,258
 2004: \$249,179,251
 2005: \$238,160,608
 2006: \$226,979,671
 2007: \$233,242,815
 TOTAL: \$1,391,361,969

From 2008 to 2012, the federal expenditures from federal agencies to American Samoa totaled over \$1.6 billion. The following is the amount of federal expenditures per year:

2008: \$234,839,570
 2009: \$333,785,001
 2010: \$510,005,555
 2011: \$293,663,747
 2012: \$262,246,963
 TOTAL: \$1,634,540,836

HONORING THE LIFE OF CECIL MOZEL BAILEY

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the life of Cecil Movel Bailey who recently passed away on February 23 at the age of 91. Cecil was a man of God dedicated to his faith, family, and community. I consider myself fortunate to count Cecil and his family as personal friends and I know he will be greatly missed.

Cecil was born on November 11, 1922 in Grand Saline, Texas. The values of family and hard work were ingrained in Cecil from an early age as he grew up helping his parents, Harvey and Tennie Fisher Bailey, on the family farm. After graduating from Grand Saline High School, he received an offer to play football for Arlington State College. Cecil then decided to serve his country in the United States Army where he was stationed in Germany.

After returning home from war, Cecil and his first wife Margarite raised their family together while Cecil worked as a warehouse superintendent with A&P Grocery in Dallas and served as a Sunday School Teacher and deacon at Urban Park Baptist Church.

Following the passing of his wife Margarite, Cecil returned to Grand Saline. He then married his second wife, Irene, and the two moved to Canton where they retired. His faith was important to him, and together, Cecil and Irene Bailey helped start Lakeside Baptist

Church. Cecil continued to actively serve the Lord and His church body as the First Chairman of the deacons.

Family was also very important to Cecil. The Baileys enjoyed many trips together, traveling to Israel, Hawaii, Alaska, New England, and Branson. He also spent time growing large vegetable gardens, canning its produce, and sharing what he grew with his family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Cecil Bailey. He was a man who fully believed in the values of faith, family, and community, and I believe everyone can benefit from his example.

HEATHER KAPANDE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Heather Kapande for her outstanding service to our community.

While building her own successful small business in Jefferson County, Heather has positively influenced the small business community as a whole across the County. She began her professional career as a teacher and has continued with her legacy of serving others. Heather is an influential mentor in the community and goes the extra mile to deliver the absolute best she can to her family, friends, clients and community.

Since 1999, Heather manages Nick's Pro Fitness and has helped make it into the prosperous organization it is today. In 2003, Heather took on the additional role as an international event planner. She continues to run Nick's Pro Fitness, but also has a key role at The Bastian Group planning events for businesses in the corporate and entertainment arenas. Heather has a passion and drive that her family, friends, clients and the community all benefit from.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Heather Kapande for her well-deserved honor by the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF JOHN H. RIVES

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of John H. Rives, who passed away on November 22, 2014 at his home, surrounded by loved ones.

John was a dedicated and loving husband and father. John devoted his life to his passions: clock repair and restoration. For 15 years, John was responsible for the weekly winding of the Worcester City Hall clock tower. John was an avid runner, having completed 14 marathons; he was also the running coach at the Notre Dame Academy in Worcester.

On behalf of the people of Worcester, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in keeping the Rives family in our thoughts and prayers.

IN CELEBRATION OF DR. TIMOTHY S. MESCON, PRESIDENT OF COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to extend my personal congratulations to Dr. Timothy S. Mescon, the fourth president of Columbus State University, who will be leaving Columbus State to work at the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International as the senior vice president and chief officer for Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. On Wednesday, December 3, 2014, he will be honored by the community for his career and many achievements at Columbus State University.

Dr. Mescon, along with his wife Lauren and four children William, Preston, Abbie, and David, have lived a fulfilling life supporting the mission of excellence at Columbus State.

Before arriving at Columbus State in August 2008, Dr. Mescon was Dean of the Michael J. Coles College of Business at Kennesaw State University in Atlanta for 18 years, holding the Tony and Jack Dinos Eminent Scholar Chair of Entrepreneurship. He is a Ph.D. recipient from the University of Georgia's Terry College of Business, and also has received an MBA from Southern Methodist University's Cox School of Business and a B.A. from Tulane University. Dr. Mescon also served on the faculties of the University of Miami and Arizona State University. He was founding Dean of the Frank Perdue School of Business at Salisbury University in Maryland and serves on the Advisory Board of the Kingston University (U.K.) School of Business and Law. Additionally, Dr. Mescon has served as a visiting fellow at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Under his six years of leadership, Columbus State University has grown in prestige and stature. It launched its first doctoral program and an array of graduate programs, including the nation's first program in Servant Leadership. The university restructuring under his tenure created Columbus State's Honors College and Graduate School, College of Letters and Sciences, College of the Arts Turner College of Business, and College of Education and Health Professions. Additionally, the School of Nursing added graduate programs and changed its accreditation to the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, the chemistry program received national accreditation from the American Chemical Society, and in 2014 CSU was named winner of the Senator Paul Simon Prize for outstanding international education programs.

Columbus State has established extensive partnerships with Ft. Benning, the Maneuver Center of Excellence, and has been recognized as both a Yellow Ribbon and a Military Friendly School. It added 20 club sports, five NCAA Intercollegiate sports, and built the nation's top Student Recreation Center. Lastly,

under his leadership, the 2011 NCAA National Rifle Championship was hosted by Columbus State University and the Army Marksmanship Unit based at Ft. Benning.

For the first time ever, Columbus State was named by U.S. News and World Report as one of the top 50 Comprehensive Public Universities in the South for 2013 and 2014. Additionally, Columbus State's online graduate programs in business and education were named among the top 35 in the nation by U.S. News and World Report for 2013.

Dr. Mescon is the author of more than 200 articles and case studies, and has co-authored four books and an audio book series covering topics ranging from entrepreneurship to management, development to business success.

Locally, Dr. Mescon has given much to our community. As a trustee of the RiverCenter for the Performing Arts in Columbus, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), and the Chattahoochee Council with the Boy Scouts of America, Dr. Mescon's philanthropic presence will be sorely missed in the greater Columbus area. He also serves as an ally in the Circles in Columbus anti-poverty program, Chair for the annual campaign for the United Way of the Chattahoochee Valley, and a member of the Fort Benning Futures Partnership Board.

Of course, Dr. Mescon's service has not gone unnoticed. Georgia Trend Magazine named Dr. Mescon one of the 100 Most Influential Georgians in 2012, 2013, and 2014. Nationally, the White House has named him a winner of the President's Volunteer Service Award from the President's Council on Service and Civic Participation and he has received the national Award of Excellence from the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating Dr. Timothy S. Mescon for six outstanding years as President at Columbus State University. He has truly implemented an outstanding vision for Columbus State University and brought leadership to our community. I am profoundly grateful for his outstanding stewardship and dedication and wish him well in all his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE UAB
DENTISTRY CARES COMMUNITY
DAY

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, it is the privilege of the State of Alabama and the City of Birmingham to be the site of the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) School of Dentistry, host to the second annual UAB Dentistry Cares Community Day held on Wednesday, November 5, 2014. UAB Dentistry Cares is an event that brings together UAB and community volunteers, sponsors and partners to provide one day of free dental treatment and oral health education to the homeless and underserved, giving priority to patients suffering from dental infections or pain. It was my pleasure to be able to see this event first-hand and the dedicated work provided by everyone

involved, including the dental students, was truly impressive.

Recognizing that lack of Medicaid dental coverage for adults has created a pressing need for primary care dental treatment among the low-income, UAB School of Dentistry and Alabama Dental Association leadership have collaborated on initiatives such as an incentive program to encourage dentists to establish practices in rural and underserved areas of the state. In 2012, the groups also joined to establish the first UAB Dentistry Cares Community Day which was held in October 2013. The day-long event provided emergency dental treatment to over 300 needy adults. Services included examinations, blood pressure checks, x-rays, almost 100 dental cleanings and 130 dental fillings, and over 300 dental extractions, all at an estimated cost of \$130,000.

The event has grown to include many sponsors and partners. This year, over 400 needy adults were provided with free dental treatment at one of four clinic sites around the Birmingham area. UAB School of Dentistry served as the primary site, while Christ Health Center, The Foundry and Jefferson County Health Department dental clinics offered their facilities as an extension of the event.

UAB School of Dentistry is among very few dental schools in the country to host this type of benevolent event through its partnerships with The Caring Foundation—BlueCross BlueShield of Alabama, Henry Schein, UAB School of Public Health, Alabama Dental Association, Brasseler USA, Courtyard Marriott & SpringHill Suites, OKU Honor Society, Oral Arts Dental Laboratories, UAB Health System, and numerous private supporters. In addition to the Alabama Dental Association and three companion sites, other event partners include the Birmingham District Dental Society, Cahaba Valley Health Care, Fortis Institute School of Dental Hygiene, Samford School of Pharmacy and UAB School of Nursing.

Since its founding in 1948, the UAB School of Dentistry has developed a rich history of healthcare innovation and gained an international reputation for excellence. With an accredited predoctoral and eight accredited postdoctoral areas of study, the School is a world class institution ranking number one in funding from the National Institutes of Dental and Craniofacial Research, with a 100% pass rate for students on National Board exams and a positive track record for community outreach and collaboration. The UAB School of Dentistry continues to supply the City of Birmingham and the State of Alabama with nothing but the world's most equipped and knowledgeable scholars and dentists, a tradition of research and rich community outreach experiences like UAB Dentistry Cares day of service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the combined efforts of the UAB School of Dentistry and its partners who have given of their time and talents to provide critical dental care to Alabama's underserved. Let us congratulate UAB School of Dentistry and its partners on this successful approach to the pressing access to care problem in their state.

KAY MILLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kay Miller for her outstanding service to the field of health and our community.

As the Vice President of Patient Care Services and Chief Nursing Officer at St. Anthony Hospital, Kay is known for her dedication to her patients, staff and hospital associates. Prior to working at St. Anthony Hospital, she served as Vice President and Chief Nursing Officer at Medical Center of the Rockies in Loveland. Kay brings more than 30 years of experience in nursing, health care administration, and patient safety. Throughout her work at St. Anthony, Kay has been committed to enhancing the culture of the hospital through employee engagement and a continual focus on patient satisfaction.

Kay uses her passion to help inspire others, and uses her knowledge to mentor nursing directors and those aspiring to be at the nurse executive level. Her teams' accomplishments include the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award for health systems, the youngest hospital to receive a Magnet Designation, the Beacon Award for Critical Care Excellence, two Lantern Awards for Emergency Nursing Excellence and Patient Satisfaction Overall Top Performer for five years. Kay is also a member of the Front Range Community College Area Advisory Council.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kay Miller for her well-deserved honor by the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

HONORING DR. HOWARD SILVER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CONSORTIUM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATIONS

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the accomplishments of my colleague, Dr. Howard Silver, on the occasion of his recent retirement as the Executive Director of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA).

COSSA is the largest consortium dedicated to promoting the social and behavioral sciences and the federal agencies that directly and indirectly supports them. COSSA is comprised of over 100 professional associations, scientific societies, research institutes, and universities, including two in my district—Princeton University and Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

Since its inception in the early 1980s, Howard has been with COSSA. A former political science professor, campaign manager, and legislative analyst at the Department of Education, Howard came to COSSA during its

darkest, earliest chapter when the Reagan Administration was attempting to undermine federal support for the social and behavioral sciences. From 1983–88, Howard served COSSA as its Associate Director for Government Relations, establishing effective and innovative strategies that successfully defended the social and behavioral sciences (SBS) against these efforts and promoted understanding of SBS's important contributions to the nation's scientific enterprise. Howard also worked to expand federal support of SBS, advocating for the creation of the Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences at the National Science Foundation. During challenging and prosperous times, Howard has never lost sight of his primary objectives—to protect and promote the social and behavioral sciences in the context of all scientific disciplines.

In recognition of his leadership, Howard has served on numerous advisory boards and committees and received many honors. For example, from 1994–2000, Howard served as the elected Chair of the Coalition for National Science Funding (CNSF), an elite scientific advocacy group with membership from scientific and engineering societies, higher education associations, and industrial groups. In 1998, he was elected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In 2006 he became the President of the National Capital Area Political Science Association, after serving on its council. From 1998–2000 he served on the Council of the American Political Science Association (APSA). His prior service includes serving as President, Treasurer and Program Chair of the Section on Applied Political Science of the American Political Science Association, the Executive Committee of the Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics, and on the steering committees of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools and the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies. He also was a member of the 2010 Decennial Census Advisory Committee.

In a town known for its transience, for over 30 years, Howard has been an enduring leader in Washington, DC, providing members of Congress, congressional staff, federal employees, and advocates alike with accurate, incisive, timely, and useful information and guidance. His annual budget issue of the COSSA Washington Update is mandatory reading for anyone who needs to understand federal funding of social and behavioral scientific research. It is hard to imagine COSSA without Howard at the helm, leading the charge—especially when, once again, critics of the social and behavioral sciences have resurfaced to wage battles Howard has fought successfully over the years. Nonetheless, Howard has earned the right to retire and to reflect upon a long distinguished career characterized by many triumphs. I join his friends and colleagues in wishing Howard and his wife, Marilyn, well and thanking him for his years of dedicated, impressive service.

EXPRESSING THANKS TO DR. MARK S. MYERSON, MEDICAL DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE FOR FOOT AND ANKLE RECONSTRUCTION AT MERCY

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Mark S. Myerson for his extraordinary care and skill.

Dr. Myerson is one of the world's foremost experts for foot and ankle surgery. Orthopedic surgeons from around the world turn to him for direction.

Dr. Myerson studied at the University of Cape Town in South Africa. He did his residency in orthopedics at Sinai Hospital, Johns Hopkins University, University of Maryland. He completed a Fellowship for foot and ankle surgery at the Hospital for Joint Diseases in New York. He founded The Institute for Foot and Ankle Reconstruction at the Mercy Medical Center in Baltimore, Maryland, and now serves as its Medical Director. He is rated among the best doctors in the world.

Dr. Mark Myerson's research and dedication to finding the best solutions for foot and ankle injuries has led to his authoring two foot and ankle textbooks. He also has authored various chapters in scientific textbooks and is published in numerous professional and medical journals.

Dr. Myerson has pioneered surgical techniques that have revolutionized the diagnosis, treatment and recovery of disorders of the foot and ankle. He provides one-of-a-kind treatment options for foot and ankle injuries ranging from the routine to the complex. From football players to ice skaters, professional athletes have trusted Dr. Myerson to help them return to their elite level of play. Parents have trusted Dr. Myerson's skills in relieving their children's foot and ankle pain associated with rare birth defects. Others, injured in traumatic accidents that crush the foot or ankle, have trusted Dr. Myerson to help them recover from their debilitating injuries. Dr. Myerson has performed many surgeries that have saved and prolonged careers, and led to patients being able to once again enjoy their daily activities.

Many patients believe Dr. Myerson is the best of the best, and so do I. I can never thank Dr. Myerson enough for what he has done for me. Because of his skills, I am able to walk again, and I will always be grateful to God for bringing Dr. Myerson into my life.

On a personal level, I am honored to know Dr. Myerson and his son, Lucas, who interned for me years ago. Both father and son are exceptional men. They share their talents with underprivileged communities and impact lives at home and abroad. I wish Dr. Myerson and his family the very best, and I thank him and his staff for all they do to make a difference in the lives of those they serve.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF THE REVEREND MONSIGNOR MICHAEL F. KOSAK, P.A.

HON. DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding leader from my congressional district in the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Reverend Monsignor Michael F. Kosak, a Roman Catholic Priest, for his many contributions to St. Croix and the Virgin Islands community over 44 years.

Born in Brooklyn, New York on December 7, 1938, the first-born child of Michael and Rose Marnick Kosak, Monsignor Kosak graduated from high school in 1956 and enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1957, serving for several years before beginning his religious studies. In 1966, Monsignor Kosak earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in philosophy from St. Mary's College in St. Mary, Kentucky and his Masters in Divinity from St. Mary's Seminary and the University of Baltimore, Maryland in 1970.

On June 6, 1970, Monsignor Kosak was ordained as a Roman Catholic Priest for the Prelature of the Virgin Islands by the Most Reverend Edward J. Harper, Bishop of the Virgin Islands at the Basilica of Our Lady of Perpetual Help, Brooklyn, New York. That same year on July 26, Monsignor Kosak became pastor of St. Ann's Church, Barrenspot Hill, St. Croix, Virgin Islands and was appointed Director of Vocations in 1970; Director of Charismatic Renewal in 1977; Director of the Office of the Permanent Diaconate in 1981; Director of Communications in 1982; Dean in 1985; and Episcopal Vicar, St. Croix, a position he held until 1987. Monsignor Kosak was appointed to the position of Vicar General of the Diocese on July 30, 1987, and the title of Monsignor was conferred upon him by the Most Reverend Sean O'Malley on March 13, 1989.

Mr. Speaker, through Monsignor Kosak's ministry at St. Ann's Church, it grew in stature from a simply country chapel to a significant parish in the community, which offers Christian education classes to children who attend public and private schools in order that they may receive the sacraments. He has always encouraged the training and involvement of youth in the music ministry of the church. As spiritual director at the St. Joseph High School, Monsignor Kosak, was instrumental in obtaining summer youth programs at St. Joseph's in the early 1970s for the youth of the St. Croix community. He presented evangelical seminars to the churches, first in St. Croix and then in St. Thomas and St. John, the impact of which spread to every island in the Caribbean and, since 1982, to Ghana, Uganda, Botswana, Kenya and Zimbabwe.

After Monsignor Kosak was appointed Pastor of Sts. Peter & Paul Cathedral, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands on May 16, 1989, he performed spiritual director service in Trinidad and in Malta from 1990 to 1991; He was again appointed Pastor of Sts. Peter & Paul Cathedral on August 1, 1992. During the 1990s, Monsignor Kosak oversaw the renovations of

the Cathedral which included preserving precious works of art that dated back to the 19th century.

On October 1, 1995, Monsignor Kosak was appointed Pastor of St Ann's Church, where he began major construction of the Sts. Joachim & Ann Church and the renovation of the sugar mill into the Shrine of Our Lady of Barrenspot. Other major construction of the Marian Hall, the paving of new roads and the parking lot, as well as the beautification of the 9.5 acres of parish property at St. Ann's commenced from 1999 to 2007. Always one to continue the path of education and spirituality, Monsignor Kosak took a sabbatical at North American College in Rome 2000 and took a spirituality course at Angelicum, Rome in 2004. The Most Reverend Bishop George Murry appointed him as Vicar General on August 15, 2005 and following Bishop Murry's transfer, Monsignor Kosak was elected Diocesan Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, in January 2008, Monsignor Kosak published his memoir titled, "Journey of a Homeboy," which chronicles his life's journey from his time at a home for boys in Brooklyn to the tropical breezes of the Virgin Islands. He writes of serving as pastor during life-altering events to include the destruction of Hurricane Hugo in 1989 and Hurricane Marilyn in 1995 and spiritual experiences along the way, including a mountaintop experience at Mt. St. Benedict in Trinidad on January 6, 1977 that lit the shepherd on fire and there was no turning back in his ministry.

Mr. Speaker, Monsignor Kosak celebrated his 40th anniversary as an ordained priest on June 6, 2010 and later that year, the Holy Father conferred upon him the papal honor of Prothonotary Apostolic, which is dated July 12, 2010 at the Vatican. From June 2012 to December 2013, Monsignor Kosak served as Editor of the Catholic Islander, the Diocesan Monthly Magazine.

Monsignor Kosak retired as pastor of St. Ann's Catholic Church on August 31, 2014 and is now Pastor Emeritus of St. Ann Barrenspot. Monsignor Kosak will remain active as a Diocesan Consultant to The Most Reverend Herbert Brevard, Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of St. Thomas to assist him in matters concerning health care, property insurance and pension issues in the diocese. At the conclusion of his memoir, Monsignor Kosak wrote, "God isn't finished with me yet and I ask your prayerful support so that this 'homeboy' will always be a faithful disciple of the Holy Spirit."

Mr. Speaker, Monsignor Kosak has served his country and my constituency well and on behalf of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands and a grateful flock, I wish "Father Mike" continued success and on behalf of the Congress of the United States, thank him for his long, dedicated and bountiful service to the parish of Sts. Ann and Joachim, the community of St. Croix and the Diocese of St. Thomas. May God continue to richly bless him with good health and many more years in service to the Almighty God.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, due to injuries sustained in an automobile accident, I was unable to travel to Washington to cast votes from November 12, 2014 until November 20, 2014.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll calls numbered 516, 517, 519, 520, 522, 523, 525, 528, and 531.

Also, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll calls numbered 526 and 529.

KIT NEWLAND

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kit Newland, Director of the Community Resources Department at the City of Lakewood, for her outstanding service to our community.

Kit has perfected the career of helping individuals stay active and fit and helped to improve the physical and emotional health of her community. She is the current Director of the Community Resources Department for the City of Lakewood. As recreation manager, she oversees Lakewood's parks, trails, open space, recreation and many aspects of human service provision, including early childhood and older adult services. Kit works tirelessly to advocate for the creation of programs and methods for those with chronic conditions to transition seamlessly from medical facilities to community settings in order to remain physically active and engaged with others.

One of Kit's biggest successes is the creation of the CancerFit Program, an exercise program designed specifically for cancer survivors. CancerFit is now a program that is available across the State of Colorado.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kit Newland for her well-deserved honor by the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. The dedication Kit has for her community and her family exemplifies her strong work ethic and character, and I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

MAYOR TRISH KELLEY

HON. JOHN CAMPBELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Trish Kelley, Mayor of the City of Mission Viejo, on her outstanding service to our community and to congratulate Mayor Kelley on her retirement.

Since taking office in 2002, Mayor Kelley has been a leading advocate in preserving

and enhancing public safety, transportation, and quality of life of the Mission Viejo's residents.

Because of Mayor Kelley's leadership, Mission Viejo has received recognition as the safest city in California each year since she was first elected.

She has implemented and advanced transportation and infrastructure programs that have lowered traffic collisions and enabled safer travel for residents.

Furthermore, Mayor Kelley led efforts to establish the City as a Community of Character, developing a youth education program that won national recognition for promising practices by the Character Education Partnership.

Mayor Kelley's volunteerism, vision, and commitment to excellence has created a sense of pride for the City of Mission Viejo as a premier city of Orange County.

I wish Mayor Kelley the very best in her retirement and I thank her for the extraordinary legacy she is leaving behind; a true inspiration for future generations.

REMEMBERING PALMER J. "BARNEY" MACALI

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Palmer J. "Barney" Macali, 93, who passed away Thursday, Nov. 20, 2014, surrounded by his loving family.

Barney devoted his life to his family and was an active member of his community. Barney served his country in the U.S. Air Force as part of the 5th Air Depot Group. He was a member of numerous organizations, and received multiple awards. Barney received the Community Star from the Tribune Chronicle for outstanding service in the community, due to his integral part in coordinating numerous fundraisers and other charitable events. From the young age of 10, Barney began delivering groceries after school, and for 80 years, he committed himself to the business, his customers, and employees. Barney was a dedicated family man and a valued citizen of Northeast Ohio.

Preceded in death by his parents and two brothers, Armand and Gilbert Macali. Barney is survived by his wife, Anne Macali, whom he married Feb. 14, 1955; four children, Ralph, Paula, Palmer, Mary Beth; their AFS student, of Frankfurt, Germany, Hannelore; eight grandchildren, Christopher, Quinn, Tyler, Marco, Nina and Nicholas, Spencer and Anneliese; two sisters, Eleanor and Norma, and sister-in-law, Delores. There is no doubt, Barney left his community a much better place to live in and he will be missed.

**LEGISLATIVE HISTORY ON HOUSE
PASSAGE OF FALEOMAVEGA'S
BILL TO COMBAT TOBACCO
SMUGGLING IN AMERICAN
SAMOA AND OTHER U.S. TERRI-
TORIES**

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information about a bill I introduced to combat tobacco smuggling in American Samoa and other U.S. Territories.

[Press Release, June 14, 2012]

FALEOMAVEGA INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO COMBAT TOBACCO SMUGGLING IN AMERICAN SAMOA AND OTHER U.S. TERRITORIES

Congressman Faleomavaega today announced that he has introduced the Stop Tobacco Smuggling in the Territories Act of 2012 (H.R. 5934) to add American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas and Guam to the current Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act which makes it illegal to knowingly ship, transport, receive, possess, sell, distribute, or purchase 10,000 or more contraband cigarettes that do not have a state or territorial tax stamp. Violators of the act will face fines and criminal penalties.

"This legislation will provide law enforcement an additional tool to combat tobacco smuggling in American Samoa. According to a 2011 Feasibility Study commissioned by American Samoa Community Cancer Network on a Cigarette Tax Stamp Program in American Samoa, an estimated 5.8 million cigarettes were smuggled into American Samoa in 2010; this represents an estimated revenue loss of over \$724,000 to the American Samoa government." Faleomavaega said.

"Furthermore, the study reported that cigarettes are smuggled into American Samoa by individual travelers, who do not declare cigarettes that are in excess of the amount of tax-free cigarettes allowed for personal use (up to 200 per trip) and also by boats that evade Customs inspections. Contraband cigarettes are also obtained when a purchaser buys them at the Post Exchange (PX) in Tafuna and sold to local merchants who in turn resell them to members of the public. The purchase of cigarettes at a PX is only legal when they are purchased for personal consumption and not for resale."

"Besides depriving American Samoa of much needed tax revenues, cigarette smuggling contributes to a growing health crisis on our island. There are many health risks associated with cigarette smoking. Smoking causes many different types of cancer such lung, pancreatic, bladder, kidney and throat cancer. Smoking also causes coronary heart disease and is a factor in sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS)."

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), "The adverse health effects from cigarette smoking cause an estimated 443,000 deaths or nearly one of every five deaths, each year in the United States. Additionally, tobacco related illnesses cost nearly \$100 billion in health care costs each year in the United States."

"Currently, on the federal level there are only civil penalties that can be enforced on smugglers in American Samoa pursuant to the Prevent All Cigarette Trafficking Act (the PACT Act). The PACT Act only applies

to internet and mail order cigarette smuggling and it only imposes civil penalties while the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act imposes criminal penalties."

"As cigarette smuggling continues in American Samoa, the Stop Tobacco Smuggling in the Territories Act of 2012 will help local authorities combat the growing cigarette smuggling in our territory," Faleomavaega concluded.

LAUREN EVANS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Lauren Evans for her outstanding service to business development and our community.

Lauren is the President of Pinyon Environmental, Inc., a company dedicated to fair and ethical business practices since it was founded 21 years ago. Lauren is committed to the advancement of the entire team and the business of engineering through mentoring of staff and interns. Since 2009, Pinyon has been honored as a Top 100 Woman-Owned business in Colorado by ColoradoBiz Magazine.

Lauren has an equally generous spirit outside of her business endeavors, and commits herself to many community non-profit organizations. She serves on the Board of Directors for Socially Conscious Coffee and participates with Denver Animal Shelter, Sweat Equity, Water for People and Greenhouse Scholars. Lauren's work ethic and character shows her commitment to promoting the best interests of all.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lauren Evans for her well-deserved honor by the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

**AIR FORCE CAPTAIN WILLIAM H.
DUBOIS**

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Air Force Captain William H. DuBois, whose life was tragically lost in support of Operation Inherent Resolve on December 1, 2014.

Captain DuBois grew up in New Castle, Colorado, where he attended Rifle High School. After high school, he studied Aeronautical Engineering at the University of Colorado in Boulder, later joining the United States Air Force.

As a member of the 77th Fighter Squadron out of Shaw Air Force Base in South Carolina, Captain DuBois was a specialist aviator in air-to-ground attacks against enemy forces. On Monday, December 1, 2014, Captain DuBois took off from a U.S. Coalition air base for a combat mission in Operation Inherent Re-

solve, when his F-16 aircraft began to experience mechanical problems. Captain DuBois attempted to return to the air base and was unable to eject before his airplane crashed.

Captain DuBois was only 30 years old and recently married to his wife Ashley (Jones) DuBois. According to those who knew him, there was rarely a moment when he didn't have a smile on his face, and his selfless and encouraging personality was contagious to anyone who had the pleasure of meeting him. The numbers of lives touched by this courageous young man are innumerable and the love and memories he shared with his friends and family will live on through them.

The death of Captain DuBois is an unfortunate reminder of the dangers our service men and women face every day as they defend our country, as well as of the many sacrifices they make to protect our freedoms and way of life. Captain DuBois served his country with great pride and honor, doing what he had dreamed of since he was a boy. He will be greatly missed by his family, friends and squadron.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Captain William H. DuBois. His dedication to our country, and the way he selflessly lived his life, serve as an inspiration to a grateful nation, as well as to the State of Colorado.

**RECOGNIZING ROMANIA'S GREAT
UNION DAY AND ITS 25TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE**

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as President of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly and co-Chairman Congressional Romania Caucus, I congratulate Romania on its Great Union Day, celebrating the anniversary of its unification on December 1, 1918, and its 25th anniversary of independence following the fall of communism.

Romania is a stalwart U.S. and NATO ally. Romania and the United States work closely together to confront a host of global challenges, including through our joint efforts to bolster regional defense, halt nuclear proliferation, and increase energy security. For example, the Permanent Forward Operating Site at Mihail Kogalniceanu Air Base not only enables a vital U.S. forward presence in the region, but also provides essential opportunities for joint training with NATO allies. With the signing of the U.S.-Romania Ballistic Missile Defense Agreement in September 2011, Romania established itself as a key strategic partner in NATO's emerging missile defense capabilities effort. The Missile Defense Interceptor site at Deveselu Air Base near the Bulgarian border will provide missile defense protection to our allies in Europe and the Middle East.

Tragically, ongoing events in Ukraine are unsettling the region and testing the transatlantic alliance. As you know, Russia seeks to once again destabilize much of Eastern Europe and restore influence over territories lost following the collapse of the Soviet Union. That is why it is critically important for the United States, Romania, and other European

allies to continue to work together to strengthen the transatlantic alliance and bolster regional security.

The strategic partnership between the United States and Romania has greatly advanced our common interests in promoting transatlantic and regional security and free market opportunities, and should continue to foster greater economic and cultural exchanges, trade and investment, and social contacts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in celebrating Romania's Great Union Day and its 25th anniversary of independence since the fall of communism.

HONORING ROBERTS TREE FARM

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Indiana's economic engine is driven by Hoosier innovation and entrepreneurship. Our state's small businesses are a source of pride for towns and cities across the state for the high quality goods and services they provide and the jobs they support. One such small business is the Roberts Tree Farm.

Each year, Americans look forward to Christmastime as a season that brings back memories of family and long-held traditions, as well as offering the promise of creating new memories with our loved ones. The look and smell of a freshly-cut pine tree is something I and others will always associate with the holiday season. Every year, hundreds of families around the state rely on Roberts Tree Farm of Seymour, Indiana to help keep these traditions alive.

Located on 25 acres owned by the same family since 1852, Roberts Tree Farm has been in operation for four decades. Working out of an authentic log cabin that originally housed Roberts Grocery Store, Jerry and Libby Roberts offer services that keep customers coming back year after year.

Jerry oversees the planting and maintenance of thousands of trees throughout the year, taking special care to ensure that they grow to become full and healthy. During the farm's business hours on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays starting in late November, the Roberts provide much more than just rows of mature trees to choose from. Customers are driven around the grounds on a wagon, provided help in cutting and loading their favorite tree, and even get to enjoy Libby's homemade cookies along with a cup of hot chocolate or apple cider.

Family-owned small businesses are the backbone of Indiana's economy. However, Roberts Tree Farm is about more than just dollars-and-cents: They have helped make the holidays special for one generation after another. I wish the Roberts family—along with all the other holiday themed Hoosier small businesses—all the best, and most importantly, a Merry Christmas!

LESLEY DAHLKEMPER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Lesley Dahlkemper for her outstanding service to education and our community.

As the current Vice President of Strategic Engagement and Communications for the Colorado Education Initiative, Lesley has an exemplary passion for public education and has made a huge impact in her field. Her experience spans from the Jefferson County Board of Education to award-winning national reporting for National Public Radio. Lesley brings her experience in public policy, politics and journalism to support the Jefferson County community.

Outside of her professional experience, she provides her time to many non-profits including the Action Center, CASA of Jefferson and Gilpin Counties and Colorado I Have A Dream Foundation. Lesley's leadership has impacted Jefferson County for the better.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lesley Dahlkemper for her well-deserved honor by the West Chamber serving Jefferson County. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING JIM ADAMS

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and career of Jim Adams. Mr. Adams serves as the Orange County Council Representative for the Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council. A longtime resident of Anaheim, Mr. Adams has worked tirelessly to increase work opportunities for local union members. He has represented the Council in negotiations with corporate entities, local governments, schools and college boards, and politicians to ensure workers and their families have a shot at achieving the American dream.

Originally from Cameron, Oklahoma, Mr. Adams came to Los Angeles on a Greyhound bus in 1959 and entered the floor covering trade. He joined Local 1247 in 1962 and was initiated in 1963. Since then, Mr. Adams has worked hard to help the Trades turn jobs and keep a prevailing wage.

After 50 years as a loyal union member, Mr. Adams is set to retire at the end of this year. His retirement is a great loss to the community and the California Trades. I thank him for his service to my constituents and my union colleagues and wish him and his family the best as he enters this new chapter in his life.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF
FALEOMAVAEGA'S RESPONSE TO
CLOSURE OF SAMOA PACKING IN
AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information on the closure of Samoa Packing in American Samoa.

[Press Release, May 7, 2009]

FALEOMAVAEGA INFORMS GOVERNOR THAT MINIMUM WAGE IS NOT THE REASON FOR SAMOA PACKING RELOCATING TO GEORGIA

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that, in a letter dated May 7, 2009 and in response to Governor Togiola's letter of May 1, he has informed the Governor that minimum wage is not the reason for Samoa Packing relocating to Georgia. The full text of the Congressman's letter, which was copied to the President and Senators, and the Speaker and Representatives, is included below.

"Dear Governor Togiola:

I am writing in response to the recent announcement by Chicken of the Sea/Samoa Packing that it will close operations in American Samoa effective September of this year. I am also writing in response to your letter of May 1, 2009. Enclosed for your information is a copy of my letter of May 7 to Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which explains my position regarding the plant's closure, and my request for his assistance.

While you have suggested that the cannery is leaving due to minimum wage increases, the company has made it clear that minimum wage is only one of many reasons that influenced its decision and, frankly speaking, I believe minimum wage was the least of its reasons, especially considering that the company is relocating to Lyons, Georgia where effective July 24, 2009, minimum wage rates are \$7.25 per hour, compared to American Samoa's current rate of \$4.26 and American Samoa's projected rate of \$4.76 per hour effective July 2009.

That Chicken of the Sea would relocate and immediately pay workers in Georgia double the moneys is not fair to our Samoan workers who spent the last 50 years making Chicken of the Sea one of the most profitable brands of canned tuna in America. It is also not fair that our cannery workers have been paid way below the national average when the vast majority of ASG workers have salaries comparable to national minimum wage standards.

If it is possible to increase salaries of departments by as much as \$10,000, why would ASG leaders not support an increase of 50-cents per hour for private sector tuna cannery workers? Regardless of what your position is about the poorest among us, now is not the time to be pointing fingers. We need to work together to find a solution, and my office has already had discussions with the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL).

Enclosed for your information is a point of contact to assist you with ASG's application for national emergency funds to provide job training for our workers. According to the DOL, the request for this assistance must be made by you, and must originate from the Governor's office. Your staff may contact Adri Jayaratne at jayaratne.adri@dol.gov

for further information on how to apply for a national emergency grant. This information may also be accessed at <http://www.doleta.gov/neg/eligibility.cfm>. I will send a letter of support to the U.S. Secretary of Labor prior to the submission of ASG's application.

However, before any action can be taken by Congress or the DOL, I have been informed that ASG will need to provide the DOL and Congress with documentation showing the legal status of our cannery workers. Samoa Packing's current workforce consists of 2,172 active employees of which 274, or 13%, are American Samoans, 87%, or 1,821 workers are Western Samoans, and 3.5%, or 77 employees, are other foreign nationals. The total payroll for all workers for the cannery including benefits annually is approximately \$22-\$23 million.

I have been informed that ASG will have to certify the legal status of our workers at Chicken of the Sea/Samoa Packing before we can expect federal assistance. Even though most of our tuna cannery workers are from Western Samoa, many of them are married to U.S. nationals and U.S. citizens and, for purposes of helping these families, I am hopeful that you will send me the necessary immigration documentation showing that these workers do have legal status so that we may move forward with assisting them.

I am also hopeful that ASG will inform my office of what kind of trust fund is in place for our local workers in the case of unemployment. As you know, after all these years, ASG has chosen not to participate in the federal Unemployment Insurance (UI) program. Under terms of the UI program, when eligible workers lose their jobs, the UI program may provide them with income support for 6 months based on certain calculations. These unemployment benefits are paid out of a federal trust fund. However, the money for the trust fund comes from taxes States impose on employers.

The State of Hawaii, for example, has protected its workers by taxing employers like Hawaiian Air. The State of Hawaii then sends a portion of those taxes to the federal government to hold in trust for workers who may become unemployed should Hawaiian Air lay off some of its workers. Once a worker is laid off, that worker can apply for unemployment benefits and the federal government will send that worker a check from the trust fund.

When workers in American Samoa get laid off, they are not eligible for UI benefits because ASG has not sent any money to the federal government to hold in trust for our local workers. Since ASG chose not to have the federal government hold money in trust, I am hopeful that ASG has held those funds in trust at the local level from the taxes it has collected from StarKist and Chicken of the Sea so that our workers can seek immediate relief and unemployment checks come September. In the case of layoffs or closures, unemployment compensation should have been at the heart of ASG's lease agreements with the canneries.

If ASG has no local trust fund in place, I would hope that ASG would support my efforts to bring ASG under the federal umbrella. My office has contacted the House Ways and Means Committee and I have every intention of working closely with Chairman Charles Rangel to devise a program that will require ASG to set aside a portion of the taxes it collects either in a local or federal trust fund so that future workers will be protected in the case of layoffs or plant closures. Like every American, our workers de-

serve protection, and they are entitled to peace of mind in knowing that their local government reserved a portion of taxes for them, in case of their unemployment. Every State plus Puerto Rico, DC, and the Virgin Islands provide their workers with this kind of safety net, and Guam established a modified program. It is time for ASG to follow suit, if it has not done so already.

While I am seeking a \$20 million emergency set aside in the supplemental appropriations bill, and while I will also ask to increase operations and CIP funding for ASG, I am not sure how successful federal efforts might be, especially given our tuna canneries were recently provided with a \$33 million federal income tax break at a time when the United States is faced with an unprecedented financial crisis. Prior to this extension, each cannery received over \$5 million per year in federal tax breaks for almost 20 years, which equates to well over \$200 million, not to mention the tax breaks they got for the 20 or so years preceding this.

Also, in 1999, at cost of \$600,000 from the U.S. Congress, a U.S. Department of the Interior Secretarial Commission was established to examine American Samoa's economic condition and make recommendations to ASG and the Department of the Interior on how to diversify and expand American Samoa's economy. This was the first time in American Samoa's 100-year relationship with the United States that a Secretarial Commission was established.

This Secretarial Commission was supported by Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, chaired by the former Governor of Hawaii John Waihee, and administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior. You served as a commission member. I served as an ex officio member.

In conjunction with the people of American Samoa, the Commission, over about a two-year time period, developed an economic plan which offered specific recommendations on how to diversify the Territory's local economy based on the will of the people. In fact, over 8,000 people were surveyed at the request of the Commission by the American Samoa Community College. In April 2002, the Secretarial Commission issued its final report. To date, the U.S. Department of the Interior has failed to move forward on this plan and I must say our local government officials also have not acted.

I will continue to update you regarding my efforts at the federal level, and I look forward to working with you and the Fono to discuss possible options and new steps forward.

The Congressman concluded his letter by stating, "Next week, I will be meeting with Bumble Bee's top executive, Mr. Chris Lischewski, and I will keep you apprised of his insights and interests in American Samoa. Until then, I continue to wish you the very best."

[Press Release, June 19, 2009]

FALEOMAVAEGA CALLS FOR COOPERATION NOT CONFRONTATION

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he is calling for cooperation not confrontation in response to Samoa Packing's closing.

"At a time when our Territory is faced with the challenges caused by the collapse of the global economy which has also impacted our local businesses, including Samoa Packing, I believe it is very important for our leaders to pull together and do what is right for our people, rather than waste time engaged in personal attacks. For this reason, I

will not respond to the negative comments being made on radio and in the press, but I will continue to provide information which is important for the public to know."

"First and foremost, since the day Chicken of the Sea announced it would be closing its operations, my office has been aggressively working to find solutions at the federal level that would complement local efforts. In fact, it was my office, not ASG, that first contacted the U.S. Department of Labor on behalf of our cannery workers to make sure they could be provided with a stipend and an opportunity to be re-trained or to attend ASCC."

"In a letter dated May 7, 2009, I informed the Governor of this opportunity and stated that national emergency grant (NEG) funds would be made available if he would submit the necessary application. I also provided the Governor with names and email addresses of contacts at the U.S. Department of Labor who could assist him in this effort."

"On May 7, I wrote to Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar to make him aware of our situation and request his support. On May 8, I wrote to Senator Daniel Inouye, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Chairman David Obey of the House Committee on Appropriations, requesting \$20 million in emergency aid which they were unable to provide in the supplemental, although I am hopeful that they will be able to set aside some funds at a later date."

"On May 14, I held a meeting in my office with officials from the Employment Training Agency at the U.S. Department of Labor, and followed up with a letter on the same day personally thanking Secretary of Labor Hilda Solis for working closely with my office since May 7, 2009 to find real solutions for American Samoa's cannery workers. In a letter dated June 10, 2009 and received in my office on June 17, the DOL thanked me for my letter and stated the following: 'The DOL's San Francisco Regional Office has been providing technical assistance to American Samoa on how to submit a NEG application; however, American Samoa has not submitted a NEG application as of yet.'"

The DOL also stated: 'I can assure you that once the application is submitted, it will be afforded every consideration, and your office and the Governor will be notified as soon as a decision has been made.'

"Regarding the minimum wage issue, it was my office that contacted Chairman Miller and asked for a delay in minimum wage increases, and it was my office that informed Senator Inouye that Chairman Miller and Chairman Kennedy had agreed to my request for the delay of the fourth increase until their Committees have a chance to review the GAO report due in April 2010."

"Unfortunately, the Governor issued a press release last week stating that Congress was not supportive of the delay, and both Chairman Miller and Senator Kennedy's staff went on record to state that this was not true. Both Chairman Miller and Chairman Kennedy are supportive of a delay and Senator Inouye's office informed my office that he will be working to include our language in the FY2010 Appropriations bill."

"Also, as a matter of fact, I opposed automatic increases in minimum wage and from the outset have been united with ASG officials in calling for an end to automatic increases."

"Finally, while I do not know what ASG is doing to keep StarKist in American Samoa or to buy back the cannery from Samoa Packing at a nominal fee in order to attract other investors to set up tuna canning operations, my office has been in discussions

with StarKist, Bumble Bee, Taiwan, China, and the Philippines, and I have every intention of continuing discussions until we find a solution to provide employment for our workers."

"While it would have been best if ASG had prepared for this day and diversified its economy and acted on the recommendations of the American Samoa Economic Advisory Commission some seven years ago, what matters most is how ASG now responds to Samoa Packing's departure."

"This is why my door will continue to remain open to the Governor and our Fono leaders, no matter what, and this is why I will also clarify the record every step of the way. In response to the Governor's most recent statements to the press, he stated that I said I was not aware that he was in Washington. To be clear, what I said was that I was unaware of who the Governor was meeting with while he was in Washington."

"As a matter of record, it was Senator Inouye, not the Governor, who informed me that the two had met. The only information I received from the Governor was through his consultant who left a voicemail with my staff stating that if I wanted to meet with the Governor, to call and let her know. My office returned the call and set up a time to meet with the Governor at which time I invited Chairman Miller's senior staff and Nik Pula of the OIA to meet with us, and I thought we had an excellent meeting in my office."

"Hopefully, we will continue to move forward in a positive manner and, with the support and prayers of our people, I remain optimistic that American Samoa will come through this stronger and better than before."

"As a final point, I also want to correct the record regarding Bumble Bee. Up until November of last year, Bumble Bee was Canadian owned until the U.S. management team partnered with U.S. Centre Partners to buy the company and take it private," Faleomavaega concluded.

ALZHEIMER'S

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, for the time, and I congratulate him for organizing this evening's Special Order Hour on Alzheimer's Disease.

As the Co-Chair of the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, I know how devastating this disease can be on patients, families, and caregivers. The Task Force works on a bipartisan basis to increase awareness of Alzheimer's, strengthen the federal commitment to improving the lives of those affected by the disease, and assist the caregivers who provide their needed support.

Alzheimer's disease in the U.S. is at crisis proportions. As our population ages, the number of persons affected by this brain disorder are expected to triple by 2050. The costs associated with Alzheimer's disease and other forms of dementia are also growing at an unsustainable rate. A recent RAND study of adults ages 70 and older found that the total economic cost of dementia in 2010 was esti-

mated to be \$109 billion for direct care alone. That is higher than the cost of both heart disease and cancer. Furthermore, the economic cost of dementia rises to \$159 billion to \$215 billion when the cost of informal care is included.

In the U.S., someone develops Alzheimer's every 67 seconds. According to recent data, women have a 1 in 6 estimated lifetime risk of developing the disease at age 65, while the risk for men is nearly 1 in 11. The Alzheimer's Association estimates as many as 16 million Americans over age 65 could suffer from Alzheimer's by 2050. It is now the fifth leading cause of death in my home state of California.

Alzheimer's has a devastating impact upon families. Right now nearly 15 million people, mostly family members, provide unpaid care for individuals with Alzheimer's or dementia, a market value of more than \$220.2 billion. In California alone, about 1.5 million unpaid caregivers grapple with the tremendous challenges of Alzheimer's disease or dementia every day. Caregivers include spouses, children, and even grandchildren. As compared to caregivers for other diseases, Alzheimer's caregivers disproportionately report being forced to miss work, reduce work hours, quit their jobs, or change jobs due to caregiving demands. They are more likely to experience financial hardship, report health difficulties, experience emotional stress and suffer from sleep disturbance.

The bipartisan supported National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease calls for a cure or an effective treatment for Alzheimer's by 2025. In an effort to meet this goal, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education approved a budget for fiscal year 2015 that calls for an additional \$100 million in funding for the National Institute on Aging (NIA) to expand Alzheimer's disease research. NIA, along with other institutes at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), are supporting a number of promising Alzheimer's disease research projects, including cutting-edge "prevention" trials that are studying whether or not the disease can be prevented or slowed substantially by administering treatments earlier in the disease process.

I am urging the leaders of the House Appropriations Committee to include at least the additional \$100 million for the NIA in the final budget package for FY 2015. This modest increase in Alzheimer's research funding will provide vital resources to support meritorious Alzheimer's disease research projects. This action will also demonstrate further resolve in support of our national priority of eradicating this insidious brain disorder.

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education also included language directing NIH to submit a professional judgment budget for Alzheimer's disease research. As a co-sponsor of the Alzheimer's Accountability Act (H.R. 4351), I believe that unfiltered information specifying the resources necessary to meet the goals and objectives laid out in the National Plan would provide Congress with a valuable tool for setting research and service priorities.

I also plan to urge the President to include robust funding for Alzheimer's research and

caregiver support services in his fiscal year 2016 budget, which the President will be submitting to Congress early next year. Increased funding for Alzheimer's programs will allow us to meet these challenges head on and enhance our chances of meeting the goals articulated in the National Plan.

As we continue to search for a cure, our nation is at a critical crossroads that requires decisive action to assure the safety and welfare of the millions of Americans with Alzheimer's disease and dementia. Together, let us commit to take every possible action to improve treatments for Alzheimer's patients, support caregivers, and invest in research to find a cure for this disease.

Once again, I thank my colleague from California for organizing tonight's Special Order.

ELEVATIONS CREDIT UNION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Elevations Credit Union as a recipient of the 2014 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. This award is the nation's highest Presidential honor recognizing excellence in innovation, improvement, and visionary leadership.

Elevations, based in Boulder, Colorado, is one of only four organizations in the U.S. to receive the honor this year. Even more impressive, Elevations is the first credit union ever to win this prestigious award.

Established in 1952, Elevations is one of the largest and most successful credit unions providing a wide range of exceptional financial products and services. Along with banking services, Elevations connects with its community by providing grants and giving programs, supporting educational opportunities, delivering affordable housing in the Colorado area, and protecting the environment. Since 1999, they have been recognized as one of Boulder County's top financial institution, underscoring their commitment to the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to congratulate Elevations Credit Union for their accomplishment as a 2014 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award recipient and commend them for their dedication to providing extraordinary services to Colorado.

RECOGNIZING OSAN CITY'S EFFORTS TO HONOR THE U.S. SOLDIERS OF TASK FORCE SMITH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the continuous efforts of The City of Osan in South Korea, to honor the men of Task Force Smith, the first American unit to engage North Korean troops in July of 1950, following the immediate outbreak of the Korean War on June 25, 1950. As an artillery operations specialist in the all-black 503rd Field

Artillery Battalion in the 2nd Infantry Division, I arrived in Pusan, South Korea, in August of 1950, shortly after Task Force Smith valiantly held back the North Korean assault and made it possible for my unit to eventually begin moving north as the U.N. Forces advanced deep into North Korea.

The City of Osan, Kyung-gi Province and the Korean Government, with the help of former U.S. Congressman Jay Kim, are planning to construct a memorial park at the site of the Battle of Osan to honor the troops of Task Force Smith and all the other forces from the participating U.N. nations that fought to protect South Korea from the communist invasion.

The Task Force Smith Memorial Park will encompass some twelve acres along the road where a hastily organized force of 540 Americans dug in on July 5, 1950 to slow the advance by a larger, better equipped force of North Korean tanks and infantry. Some 181 Task Force members were killed, wounded, taken prisoner or counted missing in action, but they were able to delay the North Korean advance while other U.S. and Korean units prepared defensive positions. The Memorial Park will include walking paths, historical markers, statues, pavilions and 540 pine trees, one planted for each of the soldiers of Task Force Smith.

This past July 3, former Congressman Jay Kim, his wife, Jennifer Ahn, along with four Task Force Smith veterans and their family members traveled to Korea to participate in the 59th annual ceremony to commemorate the U.N. Forces First Battle Memorial. Those in attendance were: John H Sanchez (52nd) from Waukesha, WI, William C Coe (B co) from Cohoes, NY and daughter Suann M. Ingle, Norman Matthews (C co) from Dexter, MN and his wife Lindy Matthews, Charles Fronapfel (MED co, POW) from Lakewood, CO and son Lee Charles Fronapfel, and Lisa Gay Sholl in honor of her father, Norman Fosness (B co) of Fargo, ND.

According to Osan City, the museum was built in 2013 to remember and honor the brave soldiers of Task Force Smith. Now they want to expand and include a memorial park to provide a place for Korean children to learn and carry forward this special memory and a special appreciation of the friendship between the United States and the Republic of Korea.

Osan is an especially important place to remember the sacrifice and dedication of our American troops. At this site some 540 young Americans, ill-prepared and ill-equipped, were thrown into battle against tremendous odds on behalf of a people and a nation they barely knew.

The relationship between our two countries is a precious one that will continue to grow. It is amazing that after all these decades, Korea and the Korean people have never stopped thanking us. Korea will always have a place in my heart as it does in the hearts of all U.S. veterans who have served then and those who serve now.

HONORING NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the founding of the National Academy of Engineering.

The NAE was founded in 1964 and immediately made its mark. It was soon advising NASA how to organize the design and operation of the Space Shuttle, where the NAE provided guidelines for technology and operations that help launch the craft into space.

The NAE's record of accomplishments continued in the 1970s. In a study commissioned by the Port Authority of New York, the NAE came up with some of the first solutions for airport noise, which continue to benefit all of us even to this day.

In 1973, the NAE helped warn us of the effects of ultraviolet radiation from the sun.

In 1974, the Academy provided us with some of the first important scholarship on the adverse health effects of air pollution, and the costs and benefits of controlling auto emissions.

In the years and decades that followed, the National Academy of Engineering continued to pioneer new solutions to some of our nation's most pressing problems. Nothing highlights this better than the instrumental role NAE played in drafting the landmark report, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*. This 2007 report described a nation at risk of falling behind our competitors: not educating our children in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; not inventing at the same pace as other nations; and not producing new jobs in high-technology fields. The report was a call to action, and while its vision still needs to be fulfilled, it captured the attention of scientists, economists, think tank experts, government officials, and lawmakers. Led by Norm Augustine, the Chair of the NAE Council, the message of that report remains a compelling call for Congress to recognize how science and engineering can move us toward economic security.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to join me in celebrating the National Academy of Engineering, its accomplishments, and to congratulate them on 50 years of service to the nation.

PASSING OF MAYOR MARION BARRY

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in remembrance of Mayor Marion Barry, and my heart and prayers go out to his family, friends, and to the entire city of Washington, D.C.

Mayor Barry was truly Washington's "Mayor for Life." He devoted his life to social justice and equality and bettering the lives of Washington D.C.'s residents.

I had the honor of knowing and working with Mayor Barry for many years, as a Member of Congress and as a congressional staffer for Congressman Ron Dellums.

Mayor Barry was born in Itta Bena, Mississippi and would go on to be the first chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

As SNCC Chairman, he played a critical role in organizing the grassroots efforts that would make the Civil Rights Movement a success.

Later, as a Councilman and Mayor of Washington, D.C., he continued to be a tireless champion for equality and justice.

Mayor Barry will be greatly missed by all and his absence will be felt by many here in Washington, D.C.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY ON PASSAGE OF MINIMUM WAGE DELAY AFFECTING AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information about the passage of a minimum wage delay in 2010 affecting American Samoa.

[Press Release, Sep. 27, 2010]

FALEOMAVAEGA THANKS SENATOR DEMINT FOR ALLOWING MINIMUM WAGE DELAY TO MOVE FORWARD BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he is thanking U.S. Senator Jim DeMint for agreeing to allow H.R. 3940, which includes minimum wage delays for American Samoa and CNMI, to move forward by Unanimous Consent (UC).

H.R. 3940 was originally introduced in the House by Congresswoman Madeleine Bordallo and cosponsored by the Delegates to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to extend grants and other assistance to facilitate political status public education programs for the peoples of the non-self-governing territories of the United States. It was modified in the Senate to include language to delay minimum wage increases in American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

"As I explained in my press release of August 6, 2010, H.R. 3940 was modified and hot-lined in the Senate. The hot-lining process is an informal term to describe the procedure whereby the Leaders inform Senators of their respective party caucus about changes to the floor schedule and/or proposed business. Part of the hotline is also to inform Senators of any unanimous consent (UC) requests the Leaders intend to eventually make on the floor. It is a way of clearing legislation by all Senators so that it can actually move to the floor and be called up, read for a third time, and passed by UC."

"H.R. 3940 cleared the hot-line process for the Democrats. But, the Republicans did not have time to review the bill before Congress went out of session for the August recess. When Congress returned in September, a hold was placed on H.R. 3940 by two Republican Senators. One Republican lifted his hold and the other, U.S. Senator Jim DeMint of S.C., kept his hold in place."

"Since September 20, 2010, my office has been in direct contact with Senator DeMint's

office and by the early morning of Tuesday, September 21, 2010, Senator DeMint's office informed my office that they'd be happy to let our minimum wage provision pass separately," Faleomavaega said. "I did not announce this publicly because Senator DeMint's office informed my office that the Guam provisions were a non-starter for them and, in fairness to Ms. Bordallo, I wanted to give her every opportunity to work out her provisions without bringing media attention to the issue."

"Given the sensitivities surrounding the minimum wage issue for both Republicans and Democrats, I also did not want to jeopardize the outcome for American Samoa. In fairness to Senator DeMint, he also has every reason to seek federal minimum wage delays in South Carolina because he represents rural communities that are also struggling to survive. But I am deeply appreciative that he stood by American Samoa in our time of need and he has my personal assurances that I will stand with the people of South Carolina should he ever need my help and if I'm ever in a position to help him."

"I also want to personally thank Senator Jeff Bingaman, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and Senator Lisa Murkowski, Ranking Member. As a result of their leadership and commitment to this process, they have hopefully given the American Samoa Government the time it needs to put together a plan of action to diversify its economy."

"Finally, I thank Governor Togiola for his attempts to help. Although Senator DeMint had already informed my office that he would let the minimum wage provisions pass separately, I know Governor Togiola had his heart in the right place by also reaching out to Senator DeMint."

"Tomorrow, H.R. 3940 will be hot-lined again and, hopefully, this time we will clear all holds and delay the next scheduled increases by September 30, 2010. While I have mixed emotions about this because I want our workers to continue to be paid fair wages, I am thankful that our workers have received a \$1.50 per hour increase since minimum wage increases were mandated in 2007. As our economy stabilizes and ASG diversifies, I am hopeful that we will revisit this issue in 2012."

"Again, I thank all those who have been involved and I am also pleased that Congresswoman Bordallo was able to work the compromises she needed for Guam. She and Senator DeMint's office reached their agreement this evening and Senator DeMint informed our offices accordingly. This is why we are able to now speak publicly and inform our constituencies that Senator DeMint has now released his hold and is allowing H.R. 3940, as revised, to move forward by U.C."

However, we still must clear the hot-line process again but I remain hopeful that this will happen before September 30, 2010," Faleomavaega concluded.

[Press Release, Sep. 28, 2010]

SENATE PASSES MINIMUM WAGE DELAY BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that he is thanking U.S. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Senator Jim DeMint (R-SC), Senator Tom Coburn (R-SC), Senator John McCain (R-AZ), Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) and Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) for the support and assistance they provided his office in passing H.R. 3940 which includes a Sense of Congress regarding political status education in Guam and language to delay minimum wage increases in American

Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) until such time as these economies can be stabilized.

The language delays minimum wage in American Samoa in 2010 and 2011, and in CNMI in 2011. "Because H.R. 3940 was modified by the Senate, it must now come back to the House for consideration and final passage, hopefully by voice vote," Faleomavaega said.

"By way of separate letters, both Congressman Sablan and I have made our House leadership aware of this legislation and have asked for Speaker Pelosi, Leader Hoyer, Chairman Miller of the Education and Labor Committee, and Chairman Rahall of the Natural Resources Committee to schedule action on H.R. 3940 before Congress adjourns and before the next scheduled minimum wage increase is due to go into effect in American Samoa on September 30, 2010."

"Successfully passing this legislation in the Senate has been a long and difficult journey with many twists and turns along the way and it took the cooperation of both parties to get this done. Senator DeMint and Senator Coburn both expressed concerns and placed holds because they, too, have legitimate concerns about the economies of their districts and, in fairness, also want to seek minimum wage delays in the rural communities that they represent."

"I fully understand their concerns and my heart is also with their people. Both Senators have my assurance that I will help them in any way I can, now or later, if I am ever in a position to do so. Since September 20, 2010, my office has been in direct contact with Senator DeMint's office explaining American Samoa's unique situation. By Tuesday morning, September 21, 2010, Senator DeMint's office informed my office that they'd be happy to let our minimum wage provision pass separately. However, because Senator DeMint's office informed my office that the Guam provision was a non-starter for them, I did not announce Senator DeMint's decision at that time. In fairness to Ms. Bordallo, I wanted to give her every opportunity to work out her provisions without bringing media attention to the issue."

"Yesterday, Senator DeMint and Guam worked out their differences and last night I issued a release publicly thanking Senator DeMint for releasing his hold. Today, Senator Coburn placed a hold. After discussions with my office, he agreed to release his hold and I want to thank him and also Senator McCain's office for weighing in on our behalf."

[Press Release, Sep. 29, 2010]

HOUSE PASSES MINIMUM WAGE DELAY FOR AMERICAN SAMOA ON ANNIVERSARY OF TSUNAMI; H.R. 3940 NOW AWAITING PRESIDENT'S SIGNATURE

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that the House overwhelmingly passed by a vote of 386 to 5 the Senate's revised version of H.R. 3940 which includes language to delay minimum wage increases in American Samoa for 2010 and 2011, and in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) for 2011. The bill passed the Senate last night by Unanimous Consent (UC) and is now awaiting the President's signature.

"First and foremost, I want to thank the people of American Samoa, especially on this day when we pause to remember those we lost as a result of the massive tsunami that struck our islands last year on this very day," Faleomavaega said. "While I wish I did not have to speak of other matters on this somber occasion, the reality is one day after

American Samoa was struck by a tsunami, Chicken of the Sea closed its operations in the Territory, displacing over 2,000 workers whose jobs were outsourced to Thailand where workers are paid \$0.75 cents and less per hour to clean fish."

"Given that more than 74% of American Samoa's private-sector workforce has been almost entirely dependent on the tuna fishing and processing industries for more than 50-years and considering that more than 80% of our private-sector economy has hinged, directly or indirectly, on the operations of only two tuna processors, Chicken of the Sea and StarKist, Chicken of the Sea's closure was devastating, especially in the aftermath of a tsunami from which we have not fully recovered."

"With Chicken of the Sea's closure and increased competition from Thailand, American Samoa's economy has not been able to absorb the rapid minimum wage increases mandated by federal law. While I supported a one-time increase of \$0.50 cents per hour, I urged my colleagues to consider American Samoa's remote location and the single-industry status of our economy before mandating further increases."

"At my request, Congress directed the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct a study regarding the impact of past, present and future minimum wage increases on the economies of American Samoa and CNMI. When the DOL released its report, Congress mandated that a new study be conducted by the GAO. The GAO released its report in April 2010 at which time Congress agreed to take action."

"However, legislation to delay minimum wage has been stalled and I am fully aware that Republicans who represent rural communities face similar challenges as us. But I am deeply appreciative that many Republicans chose to stand with American Samoa in our time of need."

"Because American Samoa does not have a vote on the House floor and has no representation in the Senate, it has always been my policy to work with both parties in good-faith, and I am grateful that both parties have stood with the people of American Samoa when we needed them most."

"Once more, I thank Senator DeMint of S.C., Senator Tom Coburn of Oklahoma, and Senator John McCain of Arizona who lifted their holds in the Senate and lent their support. Without their support, this legislation would not have moved forward."

"I also thank Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid who made this legislation one of his highest priorities yesterday. As a result of his leadership and once the Republicans cleared their holds, Senator Reid made certain that H.R. 3940 was brought to the Senate floor for UC."

"Today, the House also acted quickly and I thank Majority Leader Steny Hoyer for making this happen. He and his staff got H.R. 3940 placed on the suspensions calendar and supported us every step of the way, and somewhere in the middle of it all, Majority Leader found the time to personally call and let me know he was able to get this done."

"I also want to thank Republican Leader John Boehner who also agreed to place H.R. 3940 on the suspension calendar. In this political climate, Republican Leader Boehner could have opposed and objected, but he did not. Instead, he supported the people of American Samoa, and I am grateful for his support."

"I also want to personally thank Republican Congressman Doc Hastings who serves as the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Natural Resources and Ranking

Member John Kline of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Both agreed to let H.R. 3940 move to the House Floor, although they had every right to hold it since the bill only arrived late last night from the Senate."

"I also thank Congressman Jeff Flake (R-AZ). Congressman Flake and I serve together on the Natural Resources Committee and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Congressman Flake is personally acquainted with the needs of the Territories, and he worked side-by-side with me to see this through, and I appreciate his support and friendship."

"I also thank Speaker Pelosi and Chairman George Miller of the House Committee on Education. Their support was critical. Without them, this legislation would have failed. On behalf of the people of American Samoa, I thank them for their help."

"Finally, I thank Congresswoman Madeleine Bordallo and Congresswoman Donna Christensen. They have been with me from the very beginning of this long and difficult journey and their support has been unwavering. They are true friends."

"I appreciate both the House and Senate which have come together to get this done. I have every confidence that President Obama will sign this into law and I hope that the American Samoa Government will now use these delays to begin the serious process of diversifying our economy. I also hope that by 2012 our economy will be able to sustain another increase so that our workers can continue to be paid wages comparable with the increases in the cost of living."

"Again, I thank everyone who has been involved in this process including staff from the Senate and House. Once more, my heart goes out to the victims of last year's tsunami and my prayers are joined with yours," Faleomavaega concluded.

[Press Release, Sep. 30, 2010]

**PRESIDENT OBAMA SIGNS MINIMUM WAGE
DELAY INTO LAW**

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that President Obama signed H.R. 3940 into law. As a result, minimum wage increases in American Samoa will be delayed for 2010 and 2011. The issue of future increases will be revisited in 2012 based on the findings of a GAO study to be completed by 2011.

"In previous press releases and on behalf of the people of American Samoa, I have publicly thanked Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-NM), Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK), Senator Daniel K. Inouye (D-HI), Senator Jim DeMint (R-SC), Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK), Senator John McCain (R-AZ), Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV), Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-MD), House Republican Leader John Boehner (R-OH), Chairman George Miller (D-CA) and Ranking Member John Kline (R-MN) of the House Committee on Education, Chairman Nick Rahall (D-WV) and Ranking Member Doc Hastings (R-WA) of the House Committee on Natural Resources, Congressman Jeff Flake (R-AZ), Congresswoman Madeleine Bordallo (D-GU), and Congresswoman Donna Christensen (D-VI) for their leadership and support on the successful passage of H.R. 3940," Faleomavaega said. "Without the support of these key leaders, we would not have been able to pass this legislation which is necessary for stabilizing our economy."

"Without the prayers of our people, I also do not believe this legislation would have passed the House or Senate. The Senate passed the bill by Unanimous Consent (UC).

The House passed H.R. 3940 by a vote of 386 to 5. The overwhelming support we received from both Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate is a testament to the prayers of our people, and I could not help but note that the final vote took place on the one-year anniversary of the tsunami that claimed the lives of those we loved."

"The final vote was the final vote before Congress went out of session. There is no doubt in my mind that God has heard and answered our prayers."

"At this time, I want to thank House and Senate staff who worked behind the scenes to make this happen including Terry Lierman, Barry Jackson, Steve Stombres, Jody Calemine, Barrett Karr, Todd Young, Anne Thorsen, Al Stayman, Isaac Edwards, Bob Greenawalt, Bret Bernhardt, Marie Blanco, Jim Zoia, Nick Matiella, Clay Lightfoot, Kimberly Wallner, Ed Corrigan, Jed Bullock, Matthew Hermann, John Whitt, Alexis Covey-Brandt, Austin Burnes, Bob Schwalbach, Brian Modeste, Nikki Bullock, Colleen Gilbert, Bonnie Bruce, as well as my personal office staff and many others."

"Finally, I thank President Obama for signing this bill today, and I appreciate the support that Nik Pula, Director of the Office of Insular Affairs at the U.S. Department of the Interior, provided in making White House staff aware that the bill was coming over from the U.S. House of Representatives for signature. I also thank Alejandro Perez at the White House for working closely with my office to bring this to the attention of the President so that our deadline for signature would be met."

"Also, I would be remiss if I did not thank StarKist. I especially want to thank Chairman Kim Jae-chul of the Dongwon Group for his patience and support throughout this long and difficult process. As owner of StarKist, he could've moved his operations elsewhere, but he has not, and I thank him for his commitment to the people of American Samoa."

"I also thank and appreciate Mr. Don Binotto, President and CEO of StarKist. I know that Don's heart is with our people and he is proven over and over again that he is doing everything he can to keep StarKist in American Samoa. Mr. Binotto and Chairman Kim have my personal assurances that I will continue to stand with StarKist and do all I can to level the playing field so that we can maximize and protect the jobs of our local cannery workers who cannot fairly compete against workers that are paid \$0.75 cents and less per hour in Thailand."

"Once more, I thank our people, the Governor and also the American Samoa Legislature, and everyone who has been a part of this important effort," Faleomavaega concluded.

IRS PROTECTS FAMOUS DEBTORS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my chief of staff, Bob Griffiths, received an email from a constituent, Mr. Joe Steuer, regarding Rev. Al Sharpton and his tax debt. I would like for my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to read this email and one of the news stories about Mr. Sharpton, published in the November 19, 2014, edition of

the Long Island, New York, newspaper Newsday, that explains his tax situation in more detail.

Mr. Sharpton has a national television program, which gives him more respect than many people feel he deserves. Most people with tax debt would not be given as much leniency as the IRS is giving Sharpton.

From: Joe Steuer

Sent: Friday, November 21, 2014 11:47 AM

To: Griffiths, Bob

Subject: Al the Elite Sharpton & Taxes

BOB, the tax issue regarding Rev. Al Sharpton strikes a nerve with me personally as a few years ago I was contacted by the IRS. I had not filed or paid taxes for 1 year, an oversight on my part none-the-less I was wrong, admitted my mistake and paid the back taxes, interest and penalties. I did ask the IRS employee at the start of the investigation for consideration as I have never had any issue with the IRS ever. The request for consideration fell on deaf ears.

Thusly, my reaction to high profile individuals like Rev. Sharpton is one of disdain which appears to me to be class warfare, the elites vs. the people.

What efforts are being made to represent the people as well as holding the "elites" to the same standards that the rest of live by?

For your information, I am going to write to MSNBC and ask how they condone this blatant disregard of the law? If I do happen to receive a response I will pass it along to your office.

I do look forward to receiving a response from Congressman Duncan.

JOE STEUER.

[From Newsday, Nov. 19, 2014]

**SHARPTON SAYS HE'S WORKING OUT TAX-DEBT
ISSUES**

(By Anthony M. DeStefano)

The Rev. Al Sharpton, responding to new stories about his tangled finances, acknowledged Wednesday that he and his civil rights organization still owe back taxes and significant penalties but asserted that both were up-to-date in paying their "current" taxes. Seeking to put a positive spin on the issues, Sharpton said he and his National Action Network have worked out installment payment plans to wipe out the tax debt.

Sharpton said that the National Action Network owes about \$400,000 in what were unpaid payroll taxes and an additional \$400,000 in penalties—down from about \$1.9 million assessed in 2008. But when asked at a news conference what he currently owes in personal back taxes, interest and penalties, Sharpton answered "I don't know" and indicated he might not say even if he had the numbers on hand.

"We are paying current taxes and my current one [taxes], while keeping up with installments," Sharpton told reporters at Network headquarters in Harlem.

He said he hoped to reduce the balances further through negotiations. In a story Tuesday, The New York Times reported that Sharpton at one point had more than \$4.5 million in current state and federal tax liens against him and his for-profit business.

Sharpton has two businesses, which the Times said face \$717,329 in tax liens. The story said Sharpton personally faced more than \$3 million in federal tax liens and \$777,657 in state liens.

An IRS spokesman said he could not legally discuss individual taxpayer matters. A spokesman for the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance said Wednesday that Sharpton had two current personal

state liens totaling \$779,577 and two totaling \$457,968 for one of his private communications firm.

Those balances, including penalties, have actually risen over the years, the spokesman said. For privacy reasons, the spokesman couldn't discuss any payment plans. Sharpton speculated new stories about his taxes were politically motivated because of his high profile and ties with Mayor Bill de Blasio and President Barack Obama.

"After negotiations in 2009, there was a signed document which worked out a payment plan to pay off those [debts]," said Sharpton, referring to the back federal taxes.

The Network's 2013 federal charitable organization filing showed the group had income of \$4.9 million in contributions and grants against \$5.1 million in expenses. Sharpton was paid a salary of \$241,545.

ERIK WEIHENMAYER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Erik Weihenmayer for receiving the 2014 City of Golden Mayor's Award of Excellence.

The City of Golden honors Erik for his inspirational pursuit of climbing, running, skiing, cycling, and kayaking challenges all over the world. Known for being the only blind man to climb Mount Everest, Erik co-founded an organization called No Barriers USA, whose mission is to encourage people to conquer barriers in their own lives. While in Golden, he dedicates his time to encouraging the community to live a No Barriers Life, giving speeches at Golden High School, the Mountaineering Center, Bent Gate Mountaineering, and the Buffalo Rose. He also donates his time to lead physically-challenged and underprivileged groups on outings.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Erik Weihenmayer for this well-deserved recognition by the City of Golden.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF DR. AARON SHIRLEY

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Aaron Shirley, a public health visionary and trailblazer in the medical profession, who dedicated his life to bringing medical services to underserved rural and urban communities in Mississippi. Not only was he great for his medical acumen and creativity in conceiving unique and innovative service delivery methods but also for his commitment to the cause of equality and civil rights.

Born in Gluckstadt, MS, Dr. Shirley eventually moved with his family to Jackson, MS, where he graduated from Lanier High School. In 1955, Dr. Shirley graduated from Tougaloo

College and then received a scholarship to attend Meharry Medical School in Nashville, TN. After he graduated from Meharry in 1959, he moved back to Mississippi to begin a general practice. During this time, he held on to a desire to practice pediatric medicine. In Mississippi, in 1960, this type of specialization seemed an impossibility. Still, Dr. Shirley forged ahead, gaining valuable experience practicing family medicine.

In 1965, Dr. Shirley was invited into the pediatric residency program at the University of Mississippi Medical Center. There, he became the first Black pediatrician in Mississippi and the first Black resident trained at the University of Mississippi Medical Center.

Dr. Shirley often related a story of being advised by one of his mentors to be prepared for white people to not want him to touch their kids. However, he quickly saw that this was never the case. He saw that when people are in need of medical attention or need help for their kids, the divides of race, color, or ideology simply evaporate. This realization made him understand that there are often bridges between individuals and communities, and from that point on, Dr. Shirley was consistently effective at building bridges across communities.

With this knack for building bridges, and a brilliant mind that eventually led to him receiving a MacArthur 'Genius Award' Fellowship, Dr. Shirley embarked on a mission to help communities that had very little access to the medical care that they badly needed.

In 1970, Dr. Shirley helped to establish the Jackson-Hinds Comprehensive Health Center which has since become the largest provider of primary health care services to the poor, uninsured and underserved population in central Mississippi. Additionally, he created a comprehensive school-based clinic addressing myriad community health issues including, drug abuse, mental health issues, and teen violence. Both the health center and the clinical program have become models for similar programs across the country.

Dr. Shirley was a visionary. He saw solutions where some people had not even recognized that a problem existed. This was the case with the Jackson Medical Mall—a one stop shop for medical services and treatment. Where most people looked at the dilapidated Jackson Mall building and saw an eyesore, Dr. Shirley saw an opportunity, and in 1997, after much hard work to get stakeholders to buy into the idea, he helped establish the Jackson Medical Mall facility which has subsequently become one of America's most unique and important community health ventures.

Dr. Shirley was committed to achieving quality outcomes and access to medical care. To that end, he looked to a medical system that seemed very effective in Iran—using community health workers in 'health houses' to provide certain services, especially in rural places.

He saw these health houses as a way of bridging the gap and providing a network, through the community health worker, to assure that the patient receives the best and most complete care. With this concept in mind, in 2010, he founded the HealthConnect program that helps prevent unnecessary emergency room visits by sending physicians

and nurses directly into the homes of people in underserved communities.

Aaron Shirley's legacy is well-established in this country. Dr. Shirley challenged the system to provide services to the less fortunate and became a tireless advocate for civil and human rights. He provided immeasurable guidance to me during my entire tenure in elective office, making me personally indebted to him. Dr. Shirley's impact on our community cannot be overstated and his accomplishments will benefit generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life of Dr. Aaron Shirley, a visionary in American medicine, trailblazer for rural and underserved communities, and dedicated community leader.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF
MAYOR MARION BARRY, JR.

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am expressing condolences and commemoration for the life of Mayor Marion Barry, Jr.

In addition, I submit the following:

Whereas, Marion Barry, Jr. was an American activist and politician who served three terms as the Mayor of Washington, District of Columbia, and

Whereas, Mayor Barry served on the Council of the District of Columbia as an at-large member and subsequently in Ward 8, and

Whereas, Mayor Barry was involved in the African-American civil rights movement as a member of the Nashville Student Movement sit-ins and as the first chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and

Whereas, Mayor Barry gave more than 100,000 young people summer jobs and served as a catalyst for thousands of jobs for minorities, and

Whereas, he fought constantly and tirelessly for Home Rule and democracy for the District, and

Whereas, he increased senior citizen involvement and support of their programs, and

Whereas, he worked closely with business leaders to bring increased commerce and recognition to "America's First City", and

Whereas, he showed the District of Columbia and the world what resilience and perseverance truly looks like by providing an example of inspiration and hope that a person who falls can indeed rise again, and

Whereas, Mayor Barry was one of the most influential, impactful and savvy local politician of his generation, and will be greatly missed by the community he selflessly dedicated his life to improving, now

Therefore, be it resolved that on behalf of the 5th Congressional District of Florida, I extend my sincerest condolences and deepest sympathy to the family and loved ones of Mayor Marion Barry, Jr., and I wish you God's peace that surpasses all understanding as you take comfort in knowing that he fought a good fight, finished his course, and kept the faith.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT MERWIN CEO
OF MILLS-PENINSULA HEALTH
SERVICES ON THE OCCASION OF
HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplished career of a distinguished Californian, Mr. Robert Merwin of San Mateo County, who is retiring at the end of 2014 from his position as Chief Executive Officer of Mills-Peninsula Health Services, a post he has held since January, 1996.

A resident of Menlo Park, California, Bob Merwin is a 1971 graduate of the United States International University, and earned his M.B.A. from UCLA in 1973. He began his career in hospital management in 1973 as Assistant Executive Director of the Long Beach Community Hospital. He progressed up the corporate ladder at Long Beach and other facilities, coming to Mills-Peninsula in 1987 as Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer.

Bob Merwin serves his community as a member of the San Mateo Rotary Club, the American College of Health Care Executives, and as Chair of the West Bay Hospital Conference, San Mateo Section, and Chair of the Hospital Consortium of San Mateo County. He is a past director of the American Red Cross Bay Area and a member of the Finance Committee of the Health Plan of San Mateo.

Mills-Peninsula has thrived under Bob Merwin's leadership. He has improved relations between physicians and management, contained costs while increasing productivity and helped develop a strategic plan for the combined hospitals. Under his leadership a new 241 bed acute care facility, Mills-Peninsula Medical Center was constructed. It is a state-of-the-art, \$640 million, 450,000 square foot facility that is a source of pride to our entire community.

Bob Merwin is married to the former Nancy Madigan and they have two children, Michael and Megan. He enjoys golf, tennis and photography.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring Bob Merwin for his stellar career in hospital management and for his extraordinary contributions to our community and our country.

HISTORICAL RECORD ON PASSAGE
OF FALEOMAVAEGA'S LEGISLA-
TION TO INCREASE THE NUMBER
OF MILITARY ACADEMY AP-
POINTMENTS FROM AMERICAN
SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, the following information on the passage of legislation to increase the number of military academy appointments from American Samoa.

[Press Release, Nov. 24, 2003]

PRESIDENT SIGNS INTO LAW LEGISLA-
TION FALEOMAVAEGA INTRODUCED TO INCREASE
THE NUMBER OF MILITARY ACADEMY AP-
POINTMENTS FROM AMERICAN SAMOA

Congressman Faleomavaega announced that President Bush signed into law today the National Defense Authorization Act for FY04 which included language Faleomavaega offered to increase the number of military academy appointments from American Samoa.

On May 7, 2003, the House Subcommittee on Total Force unanimously voted in favor of my amendment to increase the number of military academy appointments from American Samoa to the U.S. Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy, Congressman Faleomavaega said. On May 9, 2003, the Armed Services Committee also agreed to include this language in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2004.

This legislation passed the House on May 22, 2003 and the Senate and the House agreed to the conference report as of November 12, 2004. I am now pleased that President Bush has signed this historic legislation into law. As a result of this new law, American Samoa will be able to send two students to each service academy. Prior to this law being passed, American Samoa was only able to send one student to each academy.

This also means that I will be able to nominate up to twenty students per academy. Each academy scholarship is worth approximately \$250,000 and each service academy is ranked among the top rated educational institutions in the U.S. Given that American Samoa has a population of about 60,000, a per capita income of less than \$4,500 and almost 5,000 men and women serving in the U.S. Armed Services, I am pleased that we may be able to offer more students the opportunity to attend one of our nations prestigious military academies.

At this time, I want to thank my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, for supporting my initiative to increase American Samoa's academy appointments and, again, I commend President Bush for signing this important legislation into law, the Congressman concluded.

WADSWORTH "LALIE" DICKERSON

HON. DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in posthumous recognition of Wadsworth Dickerson, a Friend, Mentor, campaign and personal supporter, who was with me at the beginning of my political career. He was one of those individuals that could be accurately described as "Larger than Life"! He would enter a room and fill it with a Presence bigger than his person, and begin to talk in that voice that was oh so powerful—even in a whisper. Many memories come to mind of 'that smile' and how he enjoyed a good joke.

He had more than a finger on the pulse of sentiments being felt by the constituency and their concerns that were often not brought to the attention of those seeking public office. His was an absence that was, and still is, greatly and pointedly missed, in every election I have participated in since his untimely demise a decade ago.

Mr. Dickerson was also affectionately known as "Lalie", to those that knew him on a first name or nickname basis. He was born on the island of Antigua to parents that came from the island of St. Kitts. He was the only son that his parents had and those who were brave enough to say it, said that he always got his way and succeeded in getting away with conduct that was never tolerated from his sister siblings or other relatives. This privilege helped to give him stellar and sterling attributes that later on became exemplary characteristics that endeared him to many: a care free, head strong and independent person, with a love for life, adventure and animals, which all started at an early age.

As a young boy, Lalie travelled back and forth from Antigua to St. Croix, until he decided that St. Croix was where he wanted to live and raise a family with his then girlfriend, Cavelle. The island of St. Croix, in the early days of their marriage, provided vast opportunities to young people with talent; and Lalie's carpentry craftsmanship allowed him to make a lot of people very happy when he built cabinets, wall aquariums, mahogany beds and other priceless treasures. This is how he began to establish and maintain close connections with the "grass roots".

Lalie's eulogy credited his love for democracy and politics as coming from his mother and former Congressman Ron de Lugo, my predecessor. He was always a person who enjoyed a good time and an intense political chat. This was another method that enabled him to keep his hand on the pulse and enabled him to know who was who and how they thought and felt on various subjects. Other characteristics that endeared him to many was his ability to be there for others, always ready to lend a helping hand to others less fortunate, or to those that just needed advice. "He was steadfast in whatever he believed in even if it meant he was on the losing side"—which was a very rare event.

Lalie became mesmerized with the beauty of St. Croix so much that he enjoyed hanging out with friends on the waterfront or even just to go to take a sail with a friend. In addition to his carpentry skills, he worked at the Department of Sanitation; the U. S. District Court; the Youth Rehabilitation Center and the Department of Education; where a job injury ended his working career. He was also a Life-long Democrat because his mother told him there could be no other party than the Democratic Party, because it was the Party for poor people. He has also been involved and a member of numerous Democratic Clubs, including the People's Democratic Club and the Democratic Territorial Committee.

I know that many Democrats still deeply miss the presence and unwavering support from one of our most dedicated party members who also just happened to be the "Conscience" of the Party. Even though he seemed to breathe politics, he also had another passion which was gardening. His green thumb caused his family to always be able to have fresh vegetables and even fruits at times.

Lalie was also a family man, proud of his children; loved his grandchildren and was overjoyed being in the presence of his great-grandchildren. His and Cavelle's home was the center and heartbeat of the family.

As I bring my congressional tenure to closure and reflect on the beginning: the joy, happy memories, the sadness of losing him and appreciation of him and all that he brought to me, my life, family and campaigns; always contributed to making it extremely difficult to think and write about him. It is so easy to be sad in nostalgia but, he would not want us to feel anything but happiness for life and opportunity to move on and improve. May he rest in peace.

JOHN WILSON

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the distinguished career of John Wilson. His remarkable broadcasting accomplishments and his outstanding work in the Tampa Bay community is worthy of recognition by all.

Mr. Wilson grew up in a small coal-mining town in Virginia. When he was 15, Mr. Wilson started his work in broadcasting as a disc jockey and news reporter for his local television station. After graduating from the Virginia Commonwealth University, Mr. Wilson was drafted into the U.S. Army where he served with the Armed Forces Radio in Panama. He was honored with the Army Commendation Medal for Excellence in Broadcasting for his service.

Mr. Wilson's tremendous career has led him across the country and around the world. Before settling in the Tampa Bay area in 1981, he anchored primetime newscasts in Richmond, Norfolk, Charlotte, and St. Louis. His passion for reporting took him abroad several times to conduct special reports about hard-hitting issues in Normandy, Guantanamo Bay, Saudi Arabia, Haiti, and Moscow. Over his 50 years in broadcasting, Mr. Wilson has been recognized with three Emmy Awards, numerous Associated Press awards, and most recently, the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Broadcasters Club of Florida in 2013.

Not only has Mr. Wilson impacted the Tampa Bay area with his excellent journalistic reporting, he has also strengthened our community through his support of nonprofit organizations. Mr. Wilson and his wife of 48 years, Mary K., regularly volunteer by singing and performing for many civic and charitable organizations including The Boys and Girls Clubs, the National Red Cross, St. Anthony's Hospital, and The Junior League of St. Petersburg. Mr. Wilson is also a gifted and popular emcee, narrator, and speaker.

As Mr. Wilson moves towards retirement, he must be particularly proud to have his son, Mark, continue his legacy as the evening news anchor for WTVT. Mr. Wilson's innumerable achievements are a true reflection of his exceptional success in the broadcasting industry. His insight, professionalism, and support of our community have earned him an unprecedented level of respect that is well deserved. On behalf of the Tampa Bay community that has greatly benefited from his dedicated service, I am honored to congratulate Mr. Wilson on his remarkable career.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF U.S. ARMY RESERVE FACILITY IN AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information about the U.S. Army Reserve Facility in American Samoa.

[Press Release, July 20, 2000]

U.S. ARMY RESERVE GETS APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT \$20 MILLION FACILITY AT TAFUNA AIRPORT

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is ready to release to the American Samoa Government 6.5 acres of land at the Tafuna Airport so that the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) can begin construction of its new \$20 million training facility.

There was considerable amount of time spent on discussions between my office, the FAA and the USAR to work out this deal, and I am just glad that we have resolved it, Faleomavaega said. With this agreement from the FAA, the ASG and USAR can now begin the process to secure the property and enter into detailed lease negotiations.

As it now stands, the FAA has agreed to release the land from Federal obligation and redesignate the property for non-aeronautical purposes. The FAA has also agreed to extend a 55-year lease to USAR. For its part, USAR has agreed to pay fair-market value for the property. It's a win-win for everybody, Faleomavaega said. Prior to this agreement, the airport stood to lose Federal funding if ASG leased the site to USAR at a nominal lease rate. Now that the military has agreed to pay fair-market value, the airport will retain its right to Federal funding and will still receive fair-market rates from USAR. In turn, the military will be able to construct its \$20 million facility on a site that is best-suited to meet the training needs of our troops.

All that's left is for ASG to submit a formal request to the FAA Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region to release the said property, Faleomavaega said. In fact, Mr. Herman C. Bliss, Manager of the FAA Western Division has already been notified to expedite the handling of this FAA request and to coordinate with ASG the preparation and submission of the release. Beyond the details of the lease agreement, Faleomavaega also noted Senator Inouye's involvement in securing funds for construction of the new military facility in American Samoa. Senator Inouye and I have worked on this project for the past five years, Faleomavaega said. I am confident this facility will be both a boon to our economy and a much-needed and welcome operation.

I thank Senator Inouye for his commitment and assistance and I also thank Governor Tauese and his staff for their support in getting this project underway, Faleomavaega said. I think it's fair to say that we're all looking forward to groundbreaking and to renewed and strengthened relations with the United States Army Reserve.

[Press Release, Feb. 8, 2006]

FALEOMAVAEGA RECOMMENDS THAT NEW ARMY RESERVE CENTER BE NAMED IN HONOR OF THE LATE SFC KONELIO PELE

In response to recent inquiries from the press and public, Congressman

Faleomavaega announced today that on January 25, 2006 and also on April 7, 2004 he wrote a letter to Brigadier General John Ma, Commanding General, 9th Regional Readiness Command, in Hawaii recommending that the newly built \$20 million U.S. Army Reserve Center in Tafuna, American Samoa be named in honor of the late Sergeant First Class (SFC) Konelio Pele. I am pleased that in the January 30, 2006 issue of Samoa News, retired U.S. Army Lieutenant Colonel Mapu Jamias announced on behalf of our local Veterans of Foreign Wars that they were also recommending that the new Army Reserve Center be named in honor of SFC Konelio Pele. I was unaware that our veterans made the same recommendation but I am pleased by this outcome, Congressman Faleomavaega said.

SFC Konelio Pele was assigned to the Alpha Company, 3rd Brigade, 25th Infantry Division based in Hawaii and was deployed in Vietnam under the command of Major General Carpenter. On July 25, 1966, SFC Konelio Pele was awarded the Silver Star, the third highest medal for valor, for his gallant service in the field of battle during the Vietnam War. SFC Pele served in three wars and was awarded a Bronze medal, two Purple Hearts, and three Combat Infantryman Badges.

On July 25, 1966, the Department of the Army issued General Orders: Number 4997 awarding SFC Konelio Pele the Silver Star for his actions on May 29, 1966. The citation states: Sergeant First Class Pele distinguished himself on 29 May 1966 while serving as a platoon sergeant securing a landing zone in the Pleiku Province, Republic of Vietnam. When his platoon moved out from the landing zone to render assistance to other elements of the company that were pinned down by a large Viet Cong force, Sergeant First Class Pele repeatedly exposed himself to the intense hostile fire as he maneuvered his platoon. During the course of action, he singlehandedly charged a Viet Cong machine gun emplacement, killed two of the crew members with his rifle, and caused the remaining insurgents to flee. After he covered the evacuation of the dead and wounded, he carried the hostile machine gun and ammunition through the bullet swept area to friendly positions. When he returned to the landing zone, he realized that a wounded member of his platoon had been left behind. Sergeant First Class Pele, with complete disregard for his safety, moved several hundred meters across open terrain, found his fallen comrade, and carried him back to be evacuated. Through his heroic efforts, the Viet Cong were defeated in that area. Sergeant First Class Pele's extraordinary heroism in close combat against a numerically superior Viet Cong force was in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflects great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

SFC Pele's action is a pure example of personal courage. His unit and the U.S. Army recognized his selfless actions and for this reason he was awarded the Silver Star. It is my understanding that SFC Pele was also recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor for his heroic actions but there were problems in processing the paperwork through the higher command and his recommendation never made it through. I feel that SFC Pele was not awarded the full recognition that he deserved, Congressman Faleomavaega said.

In fact, SFC Pele's combat record reminds me of some 52 recipients of the Distinguished Service Cross Award that were presented to the Japanese-American soldiers who fought

in Europe during World War II. There was only one Medal of Honor awarded to the brave Japanese-American soldiers who sacrificed so much during World War II, despite the tremendous amount of bigotry and racism brought against these Japanese-American Citizens.

As I recall, in 1996, Senator Daniel Akaka authored a provision in the Defense Authorization Act mandating a review of the service records of the 52 recipients who received the Distinguished Service Cross. As a result, 19 additional Medals of Honor were awarded to our Japanese-American veterans including Senator Daniel Inouye of Hawaii.

I believe that SFC Peles record is very similar to that of our Japanese-American veterans and I feel that it is only appropriate to request the Department of Defense to review his actions during the Vietnam War and it is my intention to consult closely with Senator Daniel Akaka on this matter. We will explore all options on how best to reexamine SFC Peles war record, and see if he should be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

At the same time, I am also recommending that our new Army Reserve Center be named in honor of SFC Pele. SFC Pele lived his life to the fullest and represented all seven values of the United States Army including loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage. For his commitment to God and country, for his example to you and me, I am hopeful that the U.S. Army will recognize his distinguished service and name the new Army Reserve Center in his honor, Congressman Faleomavaega concluded.

[Press Release, June 30, 2006]

NEW U.S. ARMY RESERVE CENTER IN AMERICAN SAMOA WILL BE NAMED IN HONOR OF SAMOAN SOLDIERS

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that the new U.S. Army Reserve Center in American Samoa will be named in honor of Sergeant First Class Konelio Pele and Staff Sergeant Frank F. Tiai.

The U.S. Army Reserve Center will be named in honor of the late SFC Konelio Pele who served in three major wars and was awarded the Silver Star, the third highest medal for valor during the Vietnam War. SFC Pele is also a recipient of the Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts, and three Combat Infantryman Badges.

The Maintenance Storage Facility of the Army Reserve Center will be named in honor of the late SSG Frank Tiai, a member of the 100th Battalion, 442nd Infantry, who was killed in July 2005 while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom. SSG Tiai was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star and Purple Heart medals.

Congressman Faleomavaega and the American Samoa Veterans of Foreign Wars both recommended to the U.S. Army that the newly built Army Reserve Center be named after Sergeant First Class Konelio Pele.

I am pleased the U.S. Army accepted our recommendation to name the Army Reserve Center after SFC Konelio Pele in recognition of his distinguished service, said Congressman Faleomavaega. To my knowledge, SFC Peles Silver Star is the highest award received by any Samoan for courageous valor in the field of battle.

I am also pleased the U.S. Army decided to name the Maintenance Storage Facility after SSG Frank Tiai who as I recall, was the first local reservist from American Samoa to die in the war in Iraq.

Both war heroes have served our country with utmost dedication and honor. They are

a great example of the determination and selfless service of our many Samoan sons and daughters who have served or are currently serving in the military today.

The dedication ceremonies are scheduled for Saturday, July 15, 2006 at the new Tafuna facility. Congressman Faleomavaega and Governor Togiola are both invited to the ceremonies. At this moment, I want to express my sincere appreciation to the U.S. Army for its commitment to American Samoa. Most of all, I want to thank all Samoans in the military and their families for their sacrifices and service to our country, concluded Faleomavaega.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE ONE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HAMTRAMCK FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the first responders of the Hamtramck Fire Department (HFD) as the community celebrates the department's centennial anniversary. This historic milestone in HFD's history is a testament to the thirty-one brave men of the department and their predecessors, who have made the safety of their community their livelihood.

First responders are a critical part of communities across our nation—dedicated individuals who are putting themselves in harm's way to ensure the safety of our communities. For the HFD, the roots of this deep commitment to its community extend all the way back to 1857, before Hamtramck was even incorporated as a village. It was then that the Hamtramck Spouters first organized and formed the Spouters Company Number Eleven. Forged with a mission of protecting the citizens of Hamtramck and their property, it formally became the Hamtramck Fire Department in 1914, and has diligently dedicated itself to fulfilling its mission.

Like all first responders, the HFD provides support and protection to the residents of its community in their moments of greatest need. This support and protection includes: responding to fire emergencies, preventing fires, mitigating hazardous situations, investigating fire emergencies for potential arson and providing emergency medical services—in 2011, the HFD responded to over 3,000 emergencies.

As the HFD has grown, it has continued to obtain and incorporate new technology, equipment and training, to strengthen its ability to protect the community. All of these resources, along with those of neighboring fire departments in Detroit and Highland Park, were put to the test on August 6, 1984, when the HFD responded to a five-alarm industrial fire. The HFD and the other responding departments were instrumental in containing this fire and preventing its spread to neighboring residences and properties. It serves as a poignant example of the important role of first responders in protecting the safety of our communities.

For the firefighters of the HFD, their commitment and dedication to their community are

principles which motivate their actions, both in their first responders' duties and in the other endeavors they lead to strengthen Hamtramck. These efforts include: raising funds to support breast cancer research, leading community clean-up days and providing the support necessary for Hamtramck to hold Independence Day festivities for its residents.

Mr. Speaker, our first responders deserve our admiration, our respect and our unending gratitude for the incredible responsibility they shoulder on a daily basis. They provide the security and protection that help bind our communities together, both in their official duties and their volunteer endeavors, which are often focused on supporting the members of our communities that are most in-need. It is my honor to congratulate and thank Fire Chief Paul Wilk, the firefighters of the Hamtramck Fire Department and their families who support them, for the incredible impact they have made and continue to make on their community. The centennial of the HFD is a significant milestone in its history and I wish all of its firefighters and their families continued success and safety in their endeavor to protect the residents of Hamtramck.

TED AND FRANI BICKART

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ted and Frani Bickart for receiving the 2014 City of Golden Mayor's Award of Excellence.

The City of Golden honors Ted and Frani Bickart for their service to the Golden community, specifically their support of Golden's culture, civics and students. Ted served as President of the Colorado School of Mines from 1998 to 2000. During that time and after, Ted and Frani devoted themselves to deepening the town-and-gown bond and to enriching Golden's quality of life. Today Ted serves as chair of the Golden Urban Renewal Authority and devotes time to high school and university education issues. Frani has been chair of the Jefferson Symphony Orchestra Board and the Symphony International Young Artists Competition, as well as a longtime volunteer for the Foothills Art Center, Golden History Museums, and Golden Fortnightly Club.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ted and Frani Bickart for this well-deserved recognition by the City of Golden.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES ALLEN, A HERO TO OUR COMMUNITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in tribute to a very important and influential citizen of this Good Nation, Mr. James Allen. Mr. Allen has recently stepped down as Executive Director and CEO of the Addict Rehabilitation

Center (ARC) which began in 1957, at first as a small day program which met in the Manhattan Christian Reform Church. Mr. Allen is an inspiring man who has brought much needed assistance, love, and care to the addicts of our community, taking the steps to bring them back into the folds of society.

Even without his accomplishments in terms of giving back to the world, Mr. Allen's personal story of struggle and growth is enough in itself to merit this tribute. Mr. Allen was himself a heroin addict, and had pushed away his family, friends, and all of his emotions in order to maintain his negative relationship with his drug of choice. After ten years of hopelessness and lack of connection with the world around him, Mr. Allen made the toughest decision addicts are faced with: to get help for his problem. He had the support of his wife, Mary, who pushed him to join a treatment facility in Kentucky. It was there that Allen overcame his previous anger and contempt for religion, and he began to pray to God to help him through his struggle. With an amount of work unimaginable to those who have never dealt with addiction, Allen overcame his dependence on heroin. His journey is an inspiring one, and I am honored to call Mr. Allen my friend.

Yet Mr. Allen's fight did not end here. In addition to facing the daily battles recovered addicts must face throughout their lives, Mr. Allen took the next step to help others dealing with similar struggles. His life crossed paths with that of another dear friend and civil rights leader, the late Reverend Dr. Eugene S. Callender of the Manhattan Christian Reform Church, and he immediately volunteered to assist the Reverend with a church-sponsored narcotics rehabilitation program. Since that day, Mr. Allen has not paused in his goal of helping other addicts change their lives around. As founder of the Addict Rehabilitation Center, he transformed the small church-funded program into a successful, far-reaching organization. Under Allen's loving and committed leadership, ARC has served thousands of people dealing with substance abuse, and the hope he brought to these people's lives will forever remain in their hearts.

HISTORICAL RECORD ON PASSAGE OF AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND RELATED HEALTHCARE FUNDING IN AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include, for historical purposes, information on the passage of the Affordable Care Act and related healthcare funding in American Samoa.

[Press Release, Mar. 25, 2010]

HOUSE PASSES FINAL VERSION OF HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION, INCLUDES INCREASE IN MEDICAID AND HEALTH INSURANCE EXCHANGE FOR AMERICAN SAMOA

Congressman Faleomavaega announced today that by a vote of 220-207 the U.S. House of Representatives passed the final version of H.R. 4872, the Health Care and

Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. The bill now goes to President Obama for signature.

"As a result of this historic legislation, for the next 9 years American Samoa will receive an increase of \$180 million in its total Medicaid spending cap for a total of \$285.5 million," Faleomavaega said. "American Samoa will continue to receive the 5% increase in its Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) that was signed into law by the President this past Tuesday. This means that the American Samoa Government (ASG) will pay 45% of the Medicaid costs while the federal government pays 55%."

"This legislation continues to provide \$1 billion for the Territories to participate in the Health Insurance Exchange program. Each of the Territories will be afforded the option to participate or transfer their allocation to their Medicaid program. In this case, if American Samoa chooses not to participate in the Exchange by 2014, the Territory will receive an additional \$18.75 million for its Medicaid program."

"Between 2004 and 2008, ASG has received an estimated \$106 million in direct and indirect federal grant funding from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. As you may know, ASG receives an additional \$23 million per year from the federal government for the operations of its local government. ASG continues to be the only State or Territory that receives federal funding for the operation of its local government and more than \$7 million per year of these operating funds, provided by the Department of Interior, are allocated for LBJ and healthcare in the Territory."

"With the hundreds of millions provided to ASG from the federal government for healthcare in American Samoa, I have every confidence that the Fono, together with the local administration, will work to establish a solid program in place for our residents who deserve affordable quality healthcare under the law."

"Again, I want to thank President Obama and those involved for making health care affordable for all Americans and for working with the Congressional Delegates to make certain that the Territories were included in this historic legislation," Faleomavaega concluded.

[Press Release, Apr. 30, 2012]

FALEOMAVAEGA STANDS WITH DEMOCRATIC COLLEAGUES TO FIGHT FOR TERRITORY'S MEDICAID FUNDING

Congressman Faleomavaega today announced that he will continue to work with his Democratic colleagues in Congress to ensure that critical funding for American Samoa's Medicaid program is not affected by Republican proposals to significantly reduce federal healthcare funding for the five U.S. Territories.

The Republican proposed cuts to American Samoa's Medicaid program originated in the House Committee on Energy and Commerce which oversees healthcare issues. The legislation, put forward by Republican Chairman Fred Upton, seeks to repeal a provision of Affordable Care Act (ACA) that provided \$6.3 billion in additional funding for Medicaid in the territories from FY 2011 to FY 2019, and increased the territories' Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) from 50% to 55%. The proposal follows the Republican's own directive in the FY 2013 budget approved by the House last month that required the Energy and Commerce Committee to submit legislation to reduce the deficit by \$96.76 billion over the next decade.

In a letter to Chairman Fred Upton, dated April 20, 2012, Congressman Faleomavaega, along with his colleagues from the U.S. Territories, Pedro Pierluisi (Puerto Rico), Donna Christensen (U.S. Virgin Islands), Madeleine Bordallo (Guam), and Gregorio "Kilili" Camacho Sablan (Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands), voiced their strong opposition to the proposed cuts. Another letter to Chairman Upton, dated April 25, 2012, from all Democratic members of the House Natural Resources Committee, led by Ranking Member Edward Markey and including Congressman Faleomavaega, denounced the Republican proposed legislation. Furthermore, Representative Donna Christensen of the U.S. Virgin Islands, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, offered an amendment to block the Republican proposal in the Committee. But the amendment was defeated on a party-line vote of 30 to 21. The bill passed in Committee on April 25, 2012 and is expected to be considered by the full House in the coming weeks.

"While I understand the need for fiscal reform and the important work we must do in Congress to reduce the deficit, I do not believe that any budget alternative should be taken out on America's most vulnerable populations," Congressman Faleomavaega stated.

"The residents of the five U.S. Territories, numbering more than 4 million, have historically received unequal treatment under the Medicaid program in comparison to the States. For example, some of the country's poorest states receive upwards of 80 percent in their federal matching requirement (FMAP) for Medicaid and do not have a mandated funding cap on their Medicaid program. The Affordable Care Act, passed in 2010 without a single Republican vote, sought to address some of these disparities. While it did not fully close the inequality gap, it did provide a major step forward for the Territories. Out of the \$6.3 billion in additional funding to the Territories, the ACA increased American Samoa's Medicaid funding to a total of \$285.5 million over the nine year period from FY 2011-FY 2019, compared to \$105 million without the legislation."

"The Affordable Care Act was a major step forward for American Samoa and the U.S. Territories, but this Republican bill only seeks to reverse our progress towards equality under the Medicaid program. If this bill were to be enacted, American Samoa's FY 2012 funding cap of approximately \$28 million will revert back to a pre-ACA ceiling of approximately \$10.6 million next year," said Congressman Faleomavaega.

"At this time, I, along with my fellow Territorial delegates will continue to work hard to ensure that this bill does not become law. It is highly unlikely that the Senate will pass or the President will sign into law such a bill that would repeal such important funding for our Territories."

"As stated in our joint Territorial letter to Chairman Upton, this proposal has sent 'a terrible message of exclusion to our constituents' by proposing to cut every single dollar of our new funding under the Affordable Care Act. The President's Administration has offered several alternatives to deficit reduction, and like my Democratic colleagues from the Territories as well as our Territorial governors, I do not believe that taking important funding away from our needy healthcare systems in the Territories is a good solution to the deficit."

"I thank my colleagues for their tireless advocacy on behalf of more than 4 million residents in the U.S. Territories, and I ensure the people of American Samoa that we

will continue to fight hard to protect the Territory's Medicaid funding," Faleomavaega concluded.

[Press Release, Jan. 13, 2014]

CONGRESSMAN FALEOMAVAEGA APPLAUDS
CMS DECISION TO INCREASE MEDICAID
FMAP FOR ELIGIBLE TERRITORIES

Congressman Faleomavaega today issued the following statement in response to a decision by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to increase the Federal Medicaid Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for eligible U.S. Territories.

"I am pleased to hear today of CMS' decision to offer each U.S. Territory the opportunity to receive increases to the federal Medicaid matching rate provided by the Affordable Care Act (ACA). CMS' announcement today provides for each eligible Territory to receive two increases to their FMAP. CMS will send a letter to Medicaid directors in the five U.S. Territories outlining the specific information needed to determine the eligibility of each Territory. According to CMS, one potential increase will be determined by whether a Territory fulfills the requirements for an 'expansion state' matching rate. The other increase will be a temporary (2 year) 2.2 percentage point increase for all expenditures in jurisdictions that do not claim any 'newly eligible' matching funds. CMS has also determined that both increases will be available to Territories that meet the criteria for 'expansion state' designation. CMS will be reaching out to each Territory similarly to each of the States and the District of Columbia.

"From the outset of negotiations leading up to the passage of the Affordable Care Act, one of the key issues for the U.S. Territories was to increase the FMAP for each Territory. Along with my colleagues from the U.S. Territories, I have continuously voiced American Samoa's desire for state-like treatment in which our FMAP is set according to per capita income to reflect our true ability to share in financing Medicaid services. The ACA increased the Territories' FMAP from 50 to 55 percent federal share. The ACA also gave American Samoa a \$180 million increase in the Territory's Medicaid statutory cap over a nine year period, from 2011 through 2019, lifting the overall cap to \$285.5 million in Medicaid funding. However, while the increase in funding caps were a victory for the Territories, the fact of the matter is, the ability of the Territories to draw down on this additional federal funding is limited because of the required FMAP.

"I thank Secretary Sebelius, Administrator Marilyn Tavenner, and their team for their work and outreach to American Samoa and our fellow Territories. While full parity by statute is still a goal to be realized for the Territories, I am pleased nonetheless that the most recent decision by CMS will provide an opportunity for Territories to receive an increased FMAP, pending eligibility."

HEATHER SCHNEIDER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Heather Schneider for receiving the 2014 City of Golden Mayor's Award of Excellence.

The City of Golden honors Heather for her dedication to supporting and improving the Golden community. She is a Golden native and mother of three young children. In addition to working part-time at an engineering firm, Heather is also a graduate of Leadership Golden, a founding member of the Golden Young Professionals, and an enormous advocate for the Golden School Foundation where she has been instrumental in helping to raise money and awareness for the needs of our public schools through marketing the Golden Gallop.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Heather Schneider for this well-deserved recognition by the City of Golden.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, December 4, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

DECEMBER 9

Time to be announced
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider pending nominations.

TBA

10 a.m.
Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine Social Security, focusing on if there is a key founda-

tion of economic security working for women.

SD-215

10:30 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism
To hold hearings to examine campus sexual assault, focusing on the roles and responsibilities of law enforcement.

SD-226

11 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development
To hold hearings to examine inequality, opportunity, and the housing market.

SD-538

2:30 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights
To hold hearings to examine the state of civil and human rights in the United States.

SD-226

DECEMBER 10

10 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, focusing on the effective enforcement and the future of derivatives regulation.

SR-328A

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine cybersecurity, focusing on enhancing coordination to protect the financial sector.

SD-538

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on African Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the Ebola epidemic, focusing on the keys to success for the international response.

SD-419

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security
To hold hearings to examine passenger rail, focusing on investing in our nation's future.

SR-253

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the President's executive action on immigration and the need to pass comprehensive reform.

SD-226

DECEMBER 11

10 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD-226

SENATE—Thursday, December 4, 2014

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Dr. Calvin V. French, Pastor Emeritus, Community of Christ Church, in Washington, DC.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Shall we pray.

Almighty God, we come as children in our Father's house, asking that we may envision the same spirit of our Founding Fathers—that we are one nation under God. May this oneness of spirit and purpose prevail that our legislation will be seamless.

The challenges we face are difficult, but we turn to You asking for wisdom to interpret rightly the signs of our times. Through our prayer, O God, in our search for understanding, we repeat our solemn oath of office: "So help me God."

We remember those who have served in this Chamber and will soon be leaving. Grant to them peace of mind, joyful hearts, and hallowed memories, reminding them that when they were in the service of their fellow beings, they have been doing Your work.

In this Advent season, may we be comforted by the words of Isaiah 9:6, "The government shall be upon His shoulders, and His name shall be called Wonderful Counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." May this counsel guide us as we do our work this day. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, December 4, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable JOHN E. WALSH, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WALSH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield to my friend, the junior Senator from Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. HARKIN. I wish to take a moment to introduce and thank our guest Chaplain today.

Dr. Calvin French is the pastor emeritus for the Community of Christ Church in Washington, DC, where he served that congregation for 30 years before retiring. He has served as a pastor for 60 years of his life, considerably more than, I would note, my 40 years in Congress.

Calvin French, Dr. French, is a native of Iowa. He holds degrees from the University of Iowa, Graceland College, and Drake University in addition to his graduate studies at Harvard and Princeton.

For the past 25 years he has represented the parent church of his denomination in governmental affairs, providing liaison service to the various agencies of the government as well as to Congress.

I personally have known Dr. French for going on almost 50 years now. When we first met in Iowa, his now deceased wife LaVon was a great friend of my wife's. They were lawyers together in Iowa. We were close family friends, and this brings back so many fond memories of our times together in Iowa and later on.

I would note that Dr. French's granddaughter Dr. Kelsey French is here in the gallery today with her husband Vince Bzdek, the news editor for the Washington Post. Their two children are also here today Zola and Xavier who is celebrating his birthday today. Xavey is 13 years old today, so he was able to be here to see his grandfather give the opening prayer of the Senate.

I also note that in 1975, when I first came to the House of Representatives, I invited Dr. French to give the open-

ing prayer in the House. So now, almost 40 years later, I am privileged to have had him here to give the closing prayer before I retire from the Senate.

Dr. French, I would say, is someone I have admired for his commitment not only to his church but the broader commitment he has had to humanity, to all that he has done to infuse—and all around him—a spirit of kindness, generosity, and a spirit of understanding that while we may be different in so many ways, we are all the same in our humanity. He is one of the most wonderful human beings I have had the privilege of knowing and being with in my lifetime.

I say to my good friend, Dr. Calvin French, thank you. Thank you for all your pastoral work. Thank you for your leadership and your guidance through the past 50 years of my life.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will proceed to executive session, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At 10 a.m. the Senate will proceed to five rollcall votes on confirmation of Franklin Orr to be Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy; Joseph Hezir to be Chief Financial Officer for the Department of Energy; and cloture on the nominations of Gregory N. Stivers to be U.S. district judge for the Western District of Kentucky; Joseph F. Leeson to be U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; and Lydia Kay Griggsby to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

There will be another series of up to six rollcall votes at 1:45 p.m.

COST OF HEALTH CARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, a brief word. I was struck this morning by looking at the newspapers and listening to the news that:

Spending on health care in the United States grew in 2013 at the lowest rate since the Federal Government began tracking it in 1960. . . .

It was the fifth straight year of exceptionally small increases in the closely watched indicator. The data defied critics who had said such growth would not continue for long once the recession ended in mid-2009.

Health care spending was up last year but only 3.6 percent. It is very remarkable.

As I indicated:

The 3.6 percent increase in 2013 is the lowest increase on record in the national health expenditures going back to 1960.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE JOHANNIS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a truly outstanding Senator, who will soon retire from this body after more than 30 years of public service.

Of course, I am speaking of Senator MIKE JOHANNIS. MIKE has had a remarkable career. He is the only current Member of this body—besides Senator ALEXANDER—who has served as Senator, Governor, and Cabinet Secretary.

Yet for all he has accomplished, MIKE isn't the flashiest Senator. He doesn't hold the most press conferences, he doesn't yell the loudest, and you never have to worry about him knocking you over to get to a TV camera, but in his steady and determined style, MIKE has proven himself a remarkably successful Member of this body.

That was true in his successful battles to defend Nebraska's rural communities against government overreach, it was true when he worked with the late Senator Byrd to sink a national energy tax that threatened his constituents, and it was true when he led the first successful legislative effort to revisit ObamaCare, working with many Democrats to repeal the so-called 1099 provision.

MIKE has never looked for drama. He is always aiming for results. So it didn't take long for people in the Senate to recognize that MIKE was more than just another freshman in the minority. He became the guy you would turn to if you wanted to get an amendment up to 60 votes.

That is truly remarkable for a first-term Senator. It is especially remarkable when we consider that MIKE came to the Senate at a time when Republicans were in the deep minority. But then again, MIKE is a very remarkable guy: county commissioner, city councilman, mayor, Governor, Secretary of Agriculture. You name it, MIKE has done it, and that was before he even set foot in the Senate.

Some think MIKE must have a secret that allows him to assemble bipartisan coalitions on conservative issues, but I don't think it is much of a secret at all. MIKE works across the aisle. He works in good faith, and he works hard. He doesn't care what party you are from and absolutely no one can outwork him.

MIKE makes sure of that by getting up earlier than anyone else. It is a

habit he learned growing up on a farm in northern Iowa. He would get up at 5 a.m. every day and then from age 4 he would work. He would shovel muck. He would fill the hog tanks. He would even deliver piglets.

The point is, MIKE developed an appreciation for hard work and responsibility at an early age. Along with his strong Catholic faith, these are the traits that still define him today, but they don't paint the whole picture, because MIKE JOHANNIS may be an accomplished man, he may be one of the smartest and most capable public servants you will ever meet, but he is absolute putty in the hands of his wife Stephanie. She is always by his side. She is his best friend, and they complement each other perfectly.

Their idea—listen to this—of a perfect night out is a night in together. They are both Husker fans and, as MIKE put it, “Steph is almost never in a bad mood.” He said: “She jumps out of bed, and she's got a big smile on her face and she thinks this is bound to be the best day of her life.”

It is a personality perfectly suited, as one can imagine, to the campaign trail, which is a good thing because the two of them have logged tens of thousands of miles together campaigning across Nebraska, usually in matching T-shirts, sometimes in a beat-up old Corolla.

They have plenty of stories from the trail, too, but one from MIKE's run for Governor stands out particularly. This is what happened: The Johannis were driving home after a long day of marching in parades in the hot sun. They passed a barn on the way, assuming it was a cattle sale. They figured they would drop in and press a few palms. Stephanie parked the car, MIKE opened the door, and dozens of well-dressed Nebraskan eyes fell on them.

The Johannis, in their sweaty T-shirts, hadn't dropped by a cattle sale; they had crashed a wedding. I will give them this, they made the best of it. MIKE ended up dancing with the bride, and of course he went on to win the election as well.

This is the sequel: Months later, at an inaugural ball in Lincoln, two uninvited guests showed up. It was, of course, the bride and her husband.

They had a simple message: “You crashed our wedding, Governor, and now we're crashing your inaugural.”

So the senior Senator from Arizona may like to brag about his Hollywood cameo with Vince Vaughn, but our colleagues know the truth. Senator MIKE JOHANNIS is the original—the original—wedding crasher.

MIKE and Stephanie certainly have traveled a long and interesting road from when they first met while serving on the Lancaster County Board in the 1980s, when MIKE would draft up walking lists on an old typewriter and they would go out and campaign door to door.

A lot has changed. For one thing, MIKE isn't a Democrat anymore. But much is the same too. MIKE still cares deeply about mental health issues. It is what brought him into politics in the first place. It is what he considers his crowning achievement as Governor. He still has loyal fans on staff who remember all of his efforts on the issue.

It is a rare thing, the loyalty MIKE inspires in people. This is the Senator with staffers who have been with him for many years, some since his days in local politics, and here is what they all say about MIKE JOHANNIS: Senator JOHANNIS is a man who cares—cares about his family, he cares about the people who work for him, and he cares about his constituents. That is why he has given his cell phone out to half of Nebraska.

He has made his mistakes, of course. As mayor of Lincoln, he had to cancel Halloween one year. But that is old news. To many Nebraskans he is still Governor, to others he is simply MIKE. But whatever Nebraskans call MIKE JOHANNIS, they respect him, and I know they are going to miss him. And so are we.

At least retirement will give MIKE more time to pursue his hobbies. We hear he is a voracious window washer. He has even been known to pull out the Windex on vacation. Whatever he does, we know this is a retirement that is well earned. He has dealt with bird flu, mad cow disease, the farm bill, deficit reduction, and just about any other issue you can think of over a long and distinguished career in public service.

We all want to thank Senator JOHANNIS for his loyal and dedicated service to the Senate and to the people of Nebraska. We wish MIKE and Stephanie the best as they look forward to their next adventure together.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to join in the remarks of the distinguished Republican leader, but add to that that Stephanie is one of the funniest people Landra and I have ever known. She has a great sense of humor. What the Republican leader laid out is perfect, except this woman has a sense of humor that is really quite remarkable.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. REID. Yes, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, just a word or two to both leaders. Thank you so much for your kind words. I also want to say thank you for mentioning my wife Stephanie. This has been a remarkable partnership for a lot of years, and I could not have done what I did without her. So thank you to Senator McCONNELL. Mr. Leader, thank you. It

has been an honor to serve in this body. I will have more to say next week in my farewell speech, but I did not want this day to go by without expressing my appreciation. Thank you.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF FRANKLIN M. ORR, JR., TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Franklin M. Orr, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The assistant majority leader.

CHICAGO NURSE CARES FOR EBOLA PATIENTS IN LIBERIA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the holiday rush is underway and millions of Americans are decorating, shopping, and preparing to spend Christmas, Hanukkah, and Kwanzaa with their loved ones. I want to draw attention to one woman from Illinois who is doing something very different.

Janet Teasley is a registered nurse in Chicago. She has volunteered to spend her holiday season in Liberia treating patients with the potentially deadly Ebola virus.

When Janet Teasley first told her family and coworkers of her plan, she says she encountered some resistance. One doctor with whom she works was only half kidding when he said he thought she was crazy. But once he realized she was serious, the doctor told Teasley he admired her. I share that admiration.

The U.S. Agency for International Development estimates that nearly 16,000 people have contracted the Ebola virus. Nearly 6,000 have died. Today, it

is estimated that 7,000 people in Liberia, where Janet Teasley is volunteering, have Ebola. She is helping some of the neediest patients in that country that has been the hardest hit by this disease.

Although Ebola has been contained so far here in the United States, the outbreak is still raging in parts of West Africa. Teasley is part of a wave of U.S. health care workers being recruited to help stop the spread of the disease in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea, and now Mali.

Teasley got involved through AmericaCares, which is one of about 150 nonprofits working with our government to recruit workers nationwide.

Teasley has been a nurse for 17 years, working in emergency care and infectious disease units, most recently at Holy Cross Hospital in Chicago—a hospital which I know well in the inner city, which serves some of the poorest families in our town.

Now she will spend 8 weeks in Buchanan, Liberia, training and then treating patients. She explains:

I came here for a purpose, and I want to see that through. . . . I honestly believe no man is an island; each man's death diminishes me. That's why I became a nurse.

Teasley's daughter Danica Miller wasn't surprised by her mom. She says for leisure, her mom doesn't read novels but pours over books about infectious diseases.

Despite her family's support, Teasley is conscious of the increased risk she faces. In fact, many of those who have fallen ill have been health care workers themselves. Teasley is just sure she is not going to be one of them. She says she is confident in herself and her team and that she will be able to come home safely.

To stop this epidemic, we need many things. First and foremost we need more people like Nurse Teasley. The Federal Government is seeking medical professionals to work in the 23 Ebola treatment units being established in Liberia. While the number of volunteers increased steadily this fall, it did drop off a bit when there was confusion over quarantine policies for returning medical workers. With time and perspective, this confusion seems to be settling. Illinois has brought its quarantine policy in line with that of the Centers for Disease Control. With a scientifically grounded and carefully measured approach, the hope is health care workers with the same passion and courage as Nurse Janet Teasley will volunteer to help those in need.

I met with Tom Frieden, Director of the CDC, a couple of weeks ago. He and members of the international public health community maintain that the way to control the spread of Ebola is to contain the virus at its source.

To prepare for the possibility of Ebola patients here in America and to

help with containment overseas, the Obama administration has requested \$6.18 billion in emergency funding, including \$1.83 billion for the CDC. I support the President.

Janet is a valuable and commendable part of this effort, and I hope people will hear her story and the stories of people like her and support the efforts of the United States in Liberia.

VOTE ON ORR NOMINATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now occurs on the Orr nomination.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Franklin M. Orr, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH S. HEZIR TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Joseph S. Hezir, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the nomination.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the nomination of Joseph S. Hezir for the position of Chief Financial Officer, CFO, at the Department of Energy, DOE. The CFO position plays an influential policy role within the DOE, overseeing all financial matters and ensuring the successful implementation of Departmentwide policies. Given that Mr. Hezir, as recently as 2 years ago, lobbied the Obama administration and Congress in favor of Yucca Mountain, an issue my State vehemently opposes and I have diligently fought to block and defund in Congress, I simply cannot support his nomination.

I have worked closely with our congressional delegation over the past 8 years to fight efforts from outsiders to force nuclear waste on the State of Nevada. That includes defunding DOE efforts to advance the project and diligently questioning all DOE and Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC, nominees on their perspective regarding long-term nuclear waste storage. The 2012 Blue Ribbon Commission Report on America's Nuclear Future provides a path forward for safe, responsible nuclear waste storage so our Nation can move beyond Yucca Mountain once and for all. My litmus test for any nominee involved in nuclear waste disposal programs is support of the consent-based approach recommended in that report.

Mr. Hezir's nomination comes before the Senate today without one hearing

in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. It is the unique responsibility we hold as United States Senators to carefully examine nominees for influential positions in the executive branch, like the CFO at the DOE—providing advice and consent. As a member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, that has jurisdiction over this position at the Department of Energy, I take this responsibility seriously and deeply regret that I was not afforded that opportunity given the importance of this position.

Nevadans have the right to be safe in their own backyards. I recognize the need to address the problem of spent nuclear fuel, but Nevada, a State without any nuclear powerplants, should not bear the sole burden of long-term storage of the Nation's nuclear waste. I have strong concerns about the high amount of uncertainty that could create a dangerous situation for the surrounding communities and environment, and I simply do not trust the Federal Government to appropriately manage the proposed Yucca Mountain facility.

Without the opportunity to carefully question Mr. Hezir in the nomination process, I can only assume he will continue his advocacy on behalf of Yucca Mountain within the DOE. For this reason, I oppose Mr. Hezir's nomination to be Chief Financial Officer at the Department of Energy and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Mr. JOHANNES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph S. Hezir, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 308 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Graham	Murray
Ayotte	Grassley	Nelson
Baldwin	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Hatch	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Hirono	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Roberts
Boxer	Inhofe	Rubio
Brown	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johanns	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kirk	Shelby
Coats	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lee	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Thune
Corker	Markey	Toomey
Cornyn	McCain	Udall (NM)
Crapo	McCaskill	Vitter
Donnelly	McConnell	Walsh
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Fischer	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Flake	Moran	Wicker
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	

NAYS—3

Barrasso	Enzi	Heller
----------	------	--------

NOT VOTING—8

Coburn	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Cochran	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Levin	

The nomination was confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the cloture vote on the Stivers nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield back the time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Gregory N. Stivers, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher Murphy, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Michael F. Bennet, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Edward J. Markey, Al Franken, Tom Harkin, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination

of Gregory N. Stivers, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 309 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murray
Ayotte	Graham	Nelson
Baldwin	Hagan	Paul
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Hirono	Roberts
Boxer	Isakson	Rubio
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Burr	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Kirk	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Chambliss	Manchin	Tester
Coats	Markey	Toomey
Collins	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	McConnell	Vitter
Donnelly	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Flake	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—24

Barrasso	Grassley	McCain
Blunt	Heitkamp	Moran
Boozman	Heller	Portman
Corker	Hoeven	Risch
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott
Crapo	Johanns	Sessions
Enzi	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Fischer	Lee	Wicker

NOT VOTING—7

Coburn	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Leahy	
Cruz	Rockefeller	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 24.

The motion is agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 309, I voted "aye." It was my intention to vote "nay." Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

NOMINATION OF GREGORY N. STIVERS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Gregory N. Stivers, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the cloture vote on the Leeson nomination.

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Michael F. Bennet, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jeff Merkley, Christopher Murphy, Edward J. Markey, Al Franken, Tom Harkin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Angus S. King, Jr.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 310 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Ayotte	Hagan	Nelson
Baldwin	Harkin	Paul
Begich	Hatch	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Isakson	Roberts
Cantwell	Kaine	Rubio
Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Levin	Schumer
Chambliss	Manchin	Shaheen
Coats	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	McCain	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Toomey
Donnelly	McConnell	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Vitter
Feinstein	Merkley	Walsh
Flake	Mikulski	Warner
Franken	Murkowski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Graham	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—26

Alexander	Enzi	Lee
Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Scott
Boxer	Hoeven	Sessions
Burr	Inhofe	Shelby
Corker	Johanns	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (SD)	Wicker
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	

NOT VOTING—8

Coburn	Kirk	Rockefeller
Cochran	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Leahy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 26.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a cloture vote on the Griggsby nomination.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert Menendez, Patty Murray, Debbie Sta-

benow, Benjamin L. Cardin, Amy Klobuchar, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Tom Udall, Mazie Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 311 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Walsh
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—36

Alexander	Grassley	Paul
Barrasso	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heller	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johanns	Sessions
Crapo	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Enzi	Lee	Thune
Fischer	McCain	Toomey
Flake	McConnell	Vitter
Graham	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—11

Burr	Cruz	Rockefeller
Chambliss	Kirk	Udall (CO)
Coburn	Landrieu	Udall (NM)
Cochran	Leahy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 36.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 1:45 p.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

LEESON NOMINATION

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise this morning to offer my support for a gentleman for whom cloture was just invoked. We are going to have the confirmation vote this afternoon. I am talking about Mr. Joseph Leeson from Pennsylvania. He has been nominated to serve as a U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

I wish to start by thanking Chairman LEAHY and Ranking Member GRASSLEY for facilitating and moving his candidacy through the process, through the committee, and Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL, our respective leaders, for bringing the nomination to the Senate floor. I appreciate that cooperation.

I should also point out that I am very grateful for the cooperation of my colleague Senator CASEY. Senator CASEY and I have spent a lot of time and energy making sure we fill the vacancies that occur on the Federal bench in Pennsylvania with absolutely the most qualified, terrific Pennsylvanians, and we have been blessed that so many wonderful Pennsylvanians have offered to serve in this role, to make this sacrifice for public service. In the 4 years I have been in the Senate, Senator CASEY and I have confirmed 13 district judges. We placed a judge in the Reading courthouse in Berks County, which had been vacant for 3 years; placed a judge in the Easton courthouse, which had been vacant for 10 years; and when Mr. Leeson is hopefully confirmed this afternoon, that will bring our total to 14.

I look forward to Joseph Leeson's speedy confirmation, and here is why. He is going to be a great Federal judge. Joe Leeson is a graduate from Catholic University, where he got his law degree. I have known Joseph Leeson certainly by his reputation for a very long time. He is a very well-respected attorney in Allentown, PA, and my family

and I live just outside Allentown and have for a long time.

Joe Leeson is a partner in Leeson & Leeson. He has very extensive trial experience. He has counseled people in accidents and injury cases. He has represented legislators and mayors. His practice includes litigation, municipal law, nonprofit, and religious law. Across the board he has a very diverse portfolio.

He has also had a long and distinguished commitment to public service. Joe Leeson has served as the Bethlehem city solicitor, as a member of the Bethlehem city council, and on the administrative board of the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference.

If confirmed, he will sit in the Allentown courthouse, and we need a Federal judge in the Allentown courthouse. We have an outstanding judge there now, but we need another because the size of the Lehigh Valley region requires that. It will be terrific to have a second Federal judge in the Allentown courthouse for what I think will be the first time.

Mr. President, I will conclude by saying there is no question in my mind that Mr. Leeson has the experience, the acumen, the temperament, and the integrity to be an outstanding Federal judge. He will be a great addition to the bench, and I urge all my colleagues to support his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

DIVIDED GOVERNMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to make some very brief remarks about divided government.

Since 1981, there have been more than 25 years in which one party controlled the White House while the other party controlled at least one Chamber of the Congress. By comparison, there have been fewer than 9 years in which one party controlled both the Presidency and all of Congress. So as we can see, divided government has been the norm and unified government—single-party government—the exception.

The truth is I suspect the American people like divided government because they realize it is another layer of checks and balances on what happens up here in Washington, DC, which are very important to making sure we get things done right and give it the kind of deliberation and thoughtful consideration they deserve, particularly if we are talking about legislating for a country of about 320 million people or so.

It also forces us to do something that maybe isn't our first instinct; that is, rather than to insist on our way, it forces us to build consensus, which is actually a good thing when we are talking about the American people.

So what has it given us in the recent past? It has given us a Republican President and a Democratic House that worked together on Social Security reform in 1983 and tax reform in 1986. Several years ago it was another Republican President and a fully Democratic Congress that worked together on landmark disability and environmental laws. In the mid-1990s, it was a Democratic President and a Republican Congress that worked together on welfare reform and balanced the budget.

This is what can happen when we have divided government and the willingness of the President and the Congress to work together to try to solve problems. We can actually do hard things—things that we could never do with a purely one-party government or the other.

Then in 2001 a Republican President and Democratic Senate worked together on education reform—No Child Left Behind. I still remember when former Governor Bush—then-President Bush as the 43rd President—worked together with Teddy Kennedy, the liberal lion of the Senate, on No Child Left Behind. It raised more than a few eyebrows back home in Texas, but that demonstrated what can happen when one side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle try to work together in the best interests of the American people.

Here is the short of it: Divided government does not translate into gridlock. It doesn't have to. It can, but it doesn't have to. We actually have another choice. Each of the four Presidents who came directly before President Obama found it possible to sign major bipartisan legislation despite having serious philosophical differences with Members of the opposing party.

I remember a conversation I had recently with one of my colleagues who was just reelected to the Senate and he is, let's say, from the other end of the political spectrum from me. He made the obvious point: I am not going to change who I am, I am not going to change what I believe in, but I am going to look for ways to legislate in the Senate.

I thought he stated it very well: I am not going to change who I am as a conservative. I am not going to do something which I would view to be unprincipled in order to get an outcome. But I do think that leaves an awful lot of room for us to work together to try to legislate in the center.

My impression is—from the Presiding Officer and others I have talked to and chatted with and seeing their reported comments—there is a big appetite on both sides of the aisle to make this place work again. I think if there is a single message that I heard from November 4, in this last election, it is that people do not want their government to not function. They may want it to function more or less or in some

areas and not the others, but they don't want it to be dysfunctional. Indeed, that makes common sense.

What remains an open question is what path the President is going to choose—whether he is actually going to work with the Republican majorities in the House and the Senate. I was somewhat encouraged the President had a meeting yesterday with the incoming majority leader Senator MCCONNELL. It was reported to me they talked about things they thought they could work on together. But we have sort of been led down this pathway before with happy talk, and then the actions did not follow the rhetoric.

Unfortunately, I think the President started off on a bad foot after this election on November 4 by issuing this Executive action order. I realize it is very controversial and we can be frustrated at times with the slow pace of actually getting things done around here. But I have expressed myself previously, and I will say it again: I think the President made a serious mistake in doing it the way he did.

No. 1, I don't think he has the authority to do it, something he himself said he didn't have 22 times in published comments, but it poisons the well at a time when I think there was a lot of hope that maybe we could turn this place around.

It is not just my view; it is the view of a number of my Democratic colleagues too. For example, after the President's Executive action on immigration, the senior Senator from Louisiana said:

We are all frustrated with our broken immigration system, but the way forward is not unilateral action by the President.

I agree with that comment.

Her sentiments were also echoed by the junior Senator from Indiana, who believes President Obama should not be making what he called "significant policy changes" on his own.

The senior Senator from Missouri said similarly, "How this is coming about makes me uncomfortable, and I think it probably makes most Missourians uncomfortable."

The reason they feel uncomfortable is that the President's Executive order represents a direct affront to the constitutional separation of powers. Even if you agree on the substance of what he did, which itself is controversial, how he did it was a direct affront to our Constitution and the separation of powers, and it is unsustainable. It provokes a response from Congress when it feels left out, and, in fact, the President is going to need Congress to work with him to fix our broken immigration system because Congress remains the possessor of the power of the purse.

The Senator from Maine put it this way. He said:

The Framers knew what they were doing, and it doesn't say if the president gets frustrated and Congress doesn't act, he gets to

do what he thinks is important for the country [on his own].

So this is not a partisan issue in the sense that Republicans and Democrats see the world through entirely different lenses. Plenty of Democrats understand that the President's action has made it significantly harder for us to get off on the right foot in the new year on a number of issues we already agree on by and large.

The junior Senator from North Dakota said the immigration order "could poison any hope of compromise or bipartisanship in the new Senate before it's even started." I agree with the sentiment. I hope she is wrong, and I hope we can prove that wrong by saying we are not going to give up and we are not going to let what the President does determine what we do. We have to do our job and we have to function, and then we are going to have to work with the President hopefully to try to move the country forward in a number of these areas.

I hope we can find a way to stop the President from acting on his own and to recommit ourselves to the rule of law and particularly the Constitution and get about the job of addressing our country's biggest challenges, such as those outlined in the comments from the senior Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, who gave a very noteworthy speech at the National Press Club recently. He mentioned issues we should be focused on, such as the needs of the middle class, stagnant wages, mass underemployment, and widespread pessimism about the future of the American dream. The last thing we need is a protracted constitutional crisis, and that is really an unfortunate distraction from what we ought to be doing together.

If we recognize these challenges and the message that was sent on November 4, we ought to be working together to address them. Because of this crisis, it will be more difficult, but we cannot give up. We need to work together to overhaul our job-training programs and give American workers relief from the burden of government that does not work in their best interests. It will be more difficult for us to pass progrowth tax and regulatory reforms, and it will be more difficult for us to do what we need to do to shore up and sustain Social Security and Medicare before they go bankrupt. We have reached this point because of yet another manufactured crisis—a crisis that was completely and totally unnecessary.

I can only hope the President will decide to reverse his desire to do everything unilaterally and to work on a more sensible course—one where he appreciates the possibilities of divided government. Based on the examples I gave earlier, there certainly is reason for hope that divided government can work and address some of our urgent needs. Unfortunately, given his record,

it is hard to be optimistic, but I am an optimist by nature, and hope springs eternal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MANUFACTURING SKILLS ACT

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I come to the floor this morning with my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator KELLY AYOTTE, to talk about what we can do together to invest in America's 21st-century manufacturing workforce. As the Presiding Officer well knows, manufacturing is one of the great areas of opportunity for meaningful bipartisan cooperation that will move our country, our economy, and our working families forward.

Although so many issues here these days seem to fall on partisan lines, Senator AYOTTE and I are here today because we have come together on a bipartisan bill called the Manufacturing Skills Act. The bill has one simple goal, which we share: to spur reforms in manufacturing skills training across our country. That is it. Our bill would create a competitive grant program to help local and State governments design and implement manufacturing job-training reforms that fit their own unique local economic needs. Once proposals come in, a Federal interagency partnership would award the five strongest State proposals and the five strongest local government proposals with funding for 3 years to implement their targeted reforms to improve their manufacturing skills training. The funding doesn't all come from the Federal Government, either. Something Senator AYOTTE and I share enthusiasm for is getting leverage for Federal investment. The local and State government must match Federal support one-to-one.

We are focusing on manufacturing specifically because it plays such a vital role in building communities and strengthening our middle class. Last year, in fact, manufacturing contributed more than \$2 trillion to our Nation's economy. In many ways manufacturing has long been the foundation of our economy. As we know, manufacturing jobs are high-quality jobs. They pay more in wages and benefits. Manufacturing is highly innovative. It is the area that invests the most in R&D of any private sector component. Over the last 3 years manufacturing has started coming back steadily and rapidly, with more than 700,000 new manufacturing jobs created in our country.

This is all good news, and I am convinced the United States is poised to

really compete in the manufacturing economy of this century. But we still face key challenges in the job market for manufacturing. There are manufacturers whom I have visited with up and down my State and whom we have heard from across the country who are ready to hire but cannot fill open positions. The problem is only expected to get worse. By 2020, by some estimates, there may be more than 875,000 unfilled manufacturing jobs. Yet there remains no focused, targeted Federal workforce development program specifically designed to strengthen manufacturing skills. I think part of the reason is we often have an outdated view of manufacturing. It conjures up outdated images of dirty factories and unsafe working conditions and lower skilled labor. That is not the manufacturing workplace of today at all.

I would be curious to hear the thoughts of my colleague from New Hampshire on how manufacturing has changed and how we can work together to strengthen the skills of manufacturing workers in Delaware, New Hampshire, and across our country.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank my colleague from Delaware. It has really been an honor to work with him on the Manufacturing Skills Act, and we share the goal to ensure that manufacturing remains vibrant and a vibrant source of jobs in our economy.

Training our workforce to have the right skills to address today's 21st-century manufacturing is quite different from yesteryear. Today as we look at manufacturing, we see the skills our workers need: critical thinking and problem-solving abilities, math and writing skills and the ability to communicate, an understanding of the manufacturing process, and an ability to engage workers in improving that process. This wasn't necessarily the case 20 or 30 years ago, but the United States is poised and has an opportunity to be the leader in advanced manufacturing.

We have a talented workforce, but our workers need the type of training that is going to address this new type of manufacturing that is focused on having the right skills and technology, use of technology and problem-solving skills that we know workers in New Hampshire and Delaware are quite capable of if we give them the tools they need.

A reality of today's world is that although our economy is bigger, we are more interconnected than ever before. Job training needs to be customized to the particular business area—the city, the State, the local economy. There is no “one size fits all” model. This is especially true in manufacturing—and I visited many manufacturers in our State—where different companies and places need workers with varying skills.

That is one of the reasons I am so enthusiastic about the Manufacturing

Skills Act that Senator COONS and I have introduced together. Rather than prescribe job-training standards or dictate reforms from Washington, our bill allows local officials, business leaders, and workers to come together in local communities to build training plans that fit their needs and help grow jobs in the community because Wilmington and Newark, DE, have very different workforce challenges, perhaps, than some areas of New Hampshire, whether it is Nashua or Concord or Berlin. We need to ensure that local officials, local employers, and the people of our States are using the grants we are able to provide under this legislation to design new training programs for those localities to really allow those workers to be trained for 21st-century manufacturing skills.

By both targeting manufacturing and giving localities the discretion to design the reforms that fit their needs, we have come together on a bill that could help our country meet some of its most critical economic challenges and opportunities.

I know Senator COONS has a strong background in manufacturing and has worked very closely with employers and workers in Delaware to hear from them about what job-training needs they have to ensure Delaware can have that 21st-century workforce. I would love to hear more about some of the challenges he has heard about from employers and workers in Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I would like to thank my colleague from New Hampshire. We are both from small States that are not nationally thought of as being leaders in manufacturing, but both New Hampshire and Delaware have deep, rich, broad manufacturing histories. Manufacturing is commonly thought of by America as being associated with Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan or Indiana, but there are dozens of companies I have visited in Delaware that are small or medium-sized, with 50 or 100 or 150 employees. Many companies are family owned, many working in particular niches of processing or manufacturing. They are profitable, growing, and looking to hire. Having visited New Hampshire as well, it also has a proud and strong history of manufacturing. Given the regional experience and the base of knowledge and expertise of Members of this body, it is my hope that we can come together with other bipartisan cosponsors to strengthen and build this bill going forward.

Before I got into public service, I spent 8 years working for a manufacturing company in Delaware, a materials-based science company that manufactures over 1,000 different products, all off the same chemical platform. One of the things I did in my work area was I visited the dozens of manufacturing facilities that either the company for which I worked directly operated or

many of our partner companies that were licensees or distributors or part of our supply chain.

The plant of today, the shop floor of today bears very little resemblance to that of previous generations. They are the location of rich innovation, an amazing amount of collaboration and teamwork where world-class, cutting-edge quality control and continuous innovation are expected, needed from our workforce, and thus investment in wages and in skills is also a critical part of our continuing to be globally competitive, as Senator AYOTTE has explained.

As the skills needed for workers vary depending on the product and market segment in the region, we also need training programs that are flexible and meet the exact needs of the region. I will give two examples. I have visited SPI Pharma in Lewes, DE, which manufactures the key component of Maalox and many other antacids, and BASF in Newport, which manufactures pigments. I hear similar challenges even though they are in different areas of manufacturing. Their specific needs are for process operators who are skilled at working at a factory where large amounts of complex suspensions—liquids—are being mixed, moved around, and fashioned into finished products. They need workers who understand programmable logic control systems and can ensure that continuous improvement in quality control is in place. They know that in order to continue to grow, to export and be globally competitive, they need to stay at the top of their game, which means investing in workers and their skills. They are struggling to find young people to replace those who are aging out of their workforces.

Our community college, Delaware Technical Community College, a national leader, is helping and is actively engaged. But as the equipment and processes of today's manufacturing plants become more advanced and computerized, they will need help in keeping up with changing technologies so the skills they train for today are the actual skills that companies, such as SPI Pharma and BASF in Delaware, need in this century.

The Manufacturing Skills Act could be a real help in Delaware to many of the manufacturers I visited, and it will allow local and State officials partnering with our schools, our Chamber leadership, and our manufacturers to build a system that fits our real needs at the local level.

I think it is exciting—whether someone is from New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Delaware or Indiana—to know we are willing to come together in a strong and bipartisan way to lay a pathway forward for America's manufacturing workforce. It gives me some reason for optimism as we begin to conclude this session of Congress and as we look forward.

I wish to close by specifically thanking Senator AYOTTE for being such a positive, forward-looking partner, not only on this bill but on many other issues we have worked on together in the years we have served so far in this body.

I would love to hear more from my colleague from New Hampshire about the manufacturing challenges New Hampshire faces and how this bill might address them and what our path forward is for this piece of legislation.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank my colleague from Delaware.

As I look at the new Congress coming in, I view our bill—the Manufacturing Skills Act—as an opportunity where we can all work together to help workers and employers across the country meet the challenges of ensuring that manufacturing continues to thrive and grow in this country. These are good-paying jobs where the workers—who are excellent and want the opportunity but just need the skills—need the type of technology training and understanding of process, such as the lean process, and how we can improve our manufacturing.

The bill Senator COONS and I worked on together will allow the local decisionmakers to put together the best training that will help create good-paying jobs, not only in Delaware, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin but across this country.

I hope we can take up this bill very early on in the next session and get behind it.

In New Hampshire, there are 66,000 jobs that are directly connected and related to manufacturing. As I have traveled to visit manufacturing employers throughout our State, I have been hearing about the same issues that my colleague from Delaware has heard; that is, that they are challenged in actually finding the right workforce for excellent-paying jobs and opportunities, but they need partnerships and help to get that trained workforce in place.

New Hampshire, similar to Delaware, has had some strong partnerships among the private sector and community colleges in my State, and we need to do more of that in the future. I believe our bill will allow those local education institutions to partner with private employers and State and local officials so the training is valuable and will ensure that everyone has a stake in the right workforce going forward.

I wish to thank some of the businesses I have had the privilege of visiting in our State. So many businesses have told me—whether it is Burndy in Littleton or Velcro in Manchester or Codet in Colebrook or Hypertherm in the Upper Valley—that our private sector is focusing on this issue, and our Manufacturing Skills Act can help companies move forward and ensure that our workers have the right skills so we can grow jobs in this country.

I thank Senator COONS for his leadership on this issue and the work he has done every single day in this body to ensure that the people of Delaware have good-paying jobs and the right workforce training. This is a goal I share with the Senator from Delaware.

I wish to also thank him for his leadership on other issues, including the protection of this Nation and many other issues he has become an expert on in this body.

I hope we can all get behind bipartisan solutions, such as that offered by my colleague from Delaware, and I hope many of our colleagues will think about joining us on this Manufacturing Skills Act. As we go into the new Congress, I hope this will be a priority for our leadership so we can bring this bill to the floor for a vote right away.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I thank my colleague from Delaware for his leadership and work on this important issue. I look forward to continuing to work on this until we get it passed.

Mr. COONS. I yield the floor.

Mr. TESTER. Are we in a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not.

POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. TESTER. I wish to address the challenges we have at the Postal Service today.

There is an old saying that when you are in a hole, stop digging. Don't make things worse. Don't shoot yourself in the foot. It is actually quite simple advice that all of us need to follow.

Here in Congress we could apply it to a lot of different issues. Our budget and the immigration system come to mind. But that hole grows faster when two parties are digging. When you have two shovels, the walls become higher, the climb out becomes more difficult, and that is what is happening right now with the Postal Service.

On one side we have the Postmaster General and Postal Service leadership actively cutting services and mail delivery standards. They think they can cut their way to fiscal solvency, and quite frankly in this case they are wrong. The answer is not more cuts. In fact, if it wasn't for the prefunding requirement for retiree health benefits, the Postal Service would have made nearly \$1 billion in 2012.

Clearly, the Postal Service doesn't need to keep shutting down facilities and slowing down delivery. What the Postal Service does need is responsible reform legislation, and that is why I am here this afternoon.

All the Postal Service is doing with its shortsighted cuts is weakening trust in the Postal Service. Essentially, Postal Service leadership is cutting the legs out from underneath themselves. They are digging the hole deeper.

But Congress is in the hole with the Postmaster General. There are a lot of folks in Congress who would love to see the Postal Service go out of business, but the Postal Service, whether in urban America or rural America, delivers the goods America needs. It delivers medicine, newspapers, equipment, letters, and even election ballots. It is a critical part of our daily lives. But the Postal Service is preparing to end overnight delivery in all but a few American cities and close 82 mail processing facilities starting in January. These facilities route mail from New York to California, from Seattle to Sarasota, from a grandmother to her grandson.

When these facilities close or consolidate, it costs thousands of jobs, and more importantly it means mail goes to the remaining facilities and it means packages have to travel longer to get to where they are going. When that happens, more folks will not get the mail when they need it. It means more delayed credit card payments. It means more needed medicine sitting in a truck for another day. Come next election it might even mean lost ballots.

The Postal Service has already stopped overnight delivery in large parts of rural America. Even 2-day delivery is now hard to come by. If the Postal Service implements its new plan in January, that will be the case almost nationwide.

Congress has the power to stop these closures, and it would make sense to keep these facilities open while we work to reform the Postal Service in a way that treats its employees and its customers and the general public fairly. But in the Senate, and in the House, too many folks have their shovels out. So far the proposals coming out of this Congress fall far short of what is needed to put the Postal Service on sound financial footing.

We are here today to urge the House of Representatives and this body, the Senate, to include a provision in the government funding bill that will keep the processing facilities open. There is no point in closing mail processing facilities while Congress works on a comprehensive postal reform bill. I know we have trouble passing responsible legislation around here, I get that, but there is painstaking—and I do mean painstaking—work going on around here to pass a Postal Service reform bill.

The bill that passed the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee earlier this year needs work—serious work. It does not preserve strong rural mail standards. It is opposed by folks in rural America, by postal unions, and by mailers. Under the bill—except in the big cities—we can kiss 1-day delivery goodbye. With the cuts it proposes, the bill fundamentally prevents the Postal Service from performing its

constitutional duty of keeping this Nation stitched together.

But along with other members of the committee, and some like-minded folks in the House, we are trying to find a way forward. We are trying to reform the Postal Service without putting the burden on rural America. A proposal I am working on will give the Postal Service the flexibility to raise new revenue while reducing the costly mandate to prefund retirement benefits. That requirement is swamping the agency's books.

Other Members of Congress are pushing to allow the Postal Service to continue its crusade against rural America. My effort, on the other hand, is a balanced solution that preserves strong rural mail standards while putting the Postal Service on the path to fiscal solvency.

We have been here long enough to know that there is no magic bullet. Congress is full of too many interests and too many constituencies, but the least we can do is to stop making things worse. There is no reason to keep digging the hole. We have evidence behind our case.

The GAO, in its analysis of past closures of the processing facilities, said the Postal Service is already unable to meet its reduced service standards—already unable to meet the standards that have already been reduced.

The Congressional Budget Office—looking at potential savings from facility closures—didn't take into account the loss of mail volume resulting from reducing the quality of service.

There are simply way, way, way too many unanswered questions about how these closures would affect mail service, and that is why a bipartisan majority of Senators, including myself, have called to stave off the closures of these processing facilities. Over 160 House Members have done the same.

A moratorium on mail processing facilities is the way to go. It will stop the bleeding and stop the digging that Congress and the Postal Service are doing right now. It will send a signal that the American people's representatives will not sit by as opponents work to privatize the Postal Service.

This is the busiest season of the year for the Postal Service. Folks send presents and cards through the mail. We hear from old friends and families whom we have not heard from in a long time. It is a busy and important time but no more critical than any other time of the Postal Service's year. Mail processing facilities don't just get used for mailing Christmas cards and presents, nor do the post offices. Reduced post office hours will affect Americans' lives as well.

Westby, MT, is in the far northeastern corner of Montana. It is along the border with North Dakota. It is a beautiful little town. The Westby Post Office is where Ken Keldsen, a veteran

in his ninth decade, goes to pick up his prescription medicine. The mail takes a little longer to get to Westby these days because the processing plant was closed last year, and the post office is open for a few less hours each day.

Ken wrote my office and told me the reduced hours make it harder for him—this veteran in northeastern Montana in his nineties—to get his medication.

Here is what it comes down to: We need a reform bill that keeps the Postal Service financially viable while maintaining strong mail service standards for people such as Ken. It is not an easy proposition. We have been working on it for quite a while now. But the calls and need for reform are stronger than ever. There is no reason to keep digging. There is still time for Congress to stop the mail processing facility closures scheduled to start in January. That will give us more time to pass good legislation that sets the Postal Service straight.

I urge my colleagues in this body to do just that because this country needs a viable Postal Service, one that the American people can trust.

It is more than just holiday cards and packages. It is about making sure payments arrive on time. It is about making sure lease agreements get to the proper people, but it is not just about these things. It is also about having faith as a nation that we as a body—as a Senate, as a House, as a Congress—can make responsible decisions to preserve what is important in this country.

There has been a lot of talk about working together and getting things done since the election. I wish it could have happened before the election, but we are where we are. We have a great opportunity to work together to keep the Postal Service solvent and keep those standards high for not only urban America but for rural America also. We need to do that today. This is an important effort.

With that, I would love to hear from the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, let me begin by thanking Senator TESTER not only for being on the floor today but for working on the issue of making sure that in 50 States in this country—in rural America and in urban America—we continue to have a Postal Service of which the American people are proud. I wish to acknowledge Senator BALDWIN, who is presiding, for her strong work on this issue, as well.

I represent one of the most rural States in America. I don't know if it is more rural than Montana, but it is very rural. Most of our people live in very small towns. The local post office is not just the place to pick up mail or to mail letters. It is a symbol of what the town is about. It is an institution that identifies the town. It is where people come together. It is a very important part of rural America.

We have been battling on this issue now for a number of years. As Senator TESTER will remember, it wasn't so many years ago when the Postmaster General came up with a proposal that would have led to the shutting down of 15,000 mostly rural post offices all over America. To my mind, that was a disastrous proposal. Many of us stood up and fought back and worked something out. While the compromise was not all that I wanted, at least it prevented the shutdown of 15,000 post offices all over this country.

Right now—and I think Senator TESTER made this point—the Postal Service has announced that beginning next month, it will be shutting down up to 82 mail processing plants. Those are the plants that move the mail along into areas all over the country. They also want to abolish overnight delivery standards and first-class mail. In the process, at a time when we need to create decent-paying jobs, this proposal would eliminate up to 15,000 good-paying, middle-class jobs at the Postal Service.

The reason Senator TESTER and I and hopefully others have come to the floor today is to send a very loud and clear message to the Postmaster General, to our colleagues here in the Senate, to our colleagues in the House, and to the President of the United States. The message is that at a time when the middle class is disappearing and the number of Americans living in poverty is almost at an alltime high, do not destroy decent-paying jobs at the Postal Service. At a time when the Postal Service is competing with the instantaneous communication of emails and of high speed Internet, do not slow down mail delivery service, but speed it up. Do not dismantle the Postal Service by shutting down up to a quarter of the mail processing plants that are left in this country.

On August 14, I was delighted to work with Senator TESTER and others on a letter to the Appropriations Committee, urging them to include language in the omnibus appropriations bill or the continuing resolution to prevent the Postal Service from making these devastating cuts and protecting these 15,000 jobs and these 82 processing plants. I am happy to say that a majority of the Members of the Senate—51 of them, including Majority Leader REID, Senator DURBIN, Senator SCHUMER, and six Republicans—Senator HATCH, Senator INHOFE, Senator HOEVEN, Senator BLUNT, Senator THUNE, and Senator COLLINS—all signed on to this letter. They understand—many of them coming from rural areas—that this is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue; this is an issue to protect mail delivery all over this country and especially in rural areas.

Shortly after we sent our letter, 160 Members of the House signed on to a similar letter calling for a 1-year moratorium to stop these mail processing

plants from closing, and 23 Republicans signed that letter as well. So we are seeing bipartisan support in the House and in the Senate saying loudly and clearly: Do not shut down 82 processing plants; do not slow down mail delivery service; do not eliminate 15,000 decent-paying jobs.

I know Senator MIKULSKI, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, wants to see this happen, but to make it happen, she needs Republican support. I very much urge my Republican colleagues to stand up for rural America, stand up for 15,000 jobs. Let's protect these 82 processing plants.

As Senator TESTER has made clear, the beauty of the Postal Service is that it provides universal service 6 days a week to every corner of America—no matter how small or how remote. It supports millions of jobs in virtually every other sector of our economy. It provides decent-paying union jobs to some 500,000 Americans, and, in fact—and I say this as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs—it is the largest single employer of veterans. Whether one is a low-income elderly woman living at the end of a dirt road in Pennsylvania or Vermont or a wealthy CEO on Wall Street, people get their mail 6 days a week.

The American people, by the way, pay for this service at a cost far, far less than anywhere else in the industrialized world. But if Congress doesn't stop the Postmaster General from making these devastating cuts, it will drive more Americans away from the Postal Service and will lead to what we call a death spiral. The quality of service deteriorates, fewer people use the Postal Service, less revenue comes in, and the process continues to deteriorate.

Despite what some in this country have been hearing in the media, and despite what some in the Postal Service have been saying, the Postal Service is not going broke. We hear that every three months—people telling us the Postal Service is going broke. That is not true. The major reason the Postal Service is in bad financial shape today is because of a mandate signed into law by President George W. Bush in December 2006, during a lameduck session of Congress, that forces the Postal Service to prefund 75 years of future retiree health benefits over a 10-year period. This burden is unprecedented in any other government agency or any private sector company in the United States of America. It is a burden that every single year costs the Postal Service \$5.5 billion, and that one provision—that one provision—is responsible for all of the financial losses posted by the Postal Service since October 2012—just that one provision.

Over the past 2 years, the Postal Service has made an operating profit of nearly \$1 billion. Let me repeat that.

Over the past 2 years, the Postal Service has made an operating profit of nearly \$1 billion, excluding this prefunding mandate that must be gotten rid of. Further, before this prefunding mandate was signed into law, the Postal Service was also profitable. In fact, from 2003 to 2006, the Postal Service made a combined profit of more than \$9 billion. So when we hear that the Postal Service is in financial difficulty, the key reason—the overwhelming reason—is this onerous, unprecedented burden of coming up with \$5.5 billion every year to pay for future health retirees.

Given the improved financial condition of the Postal Service, it makes no sense to me to close down mail plants, destroy jobs, and slow mail delivery. Our job right now is to make the Postal Service an agency that functions efficiently in the 21st century. We have to give them the tools to effectively compete. But the way we do that is not by cutting, cutting, and cutting. That is a path toward disaster.

So I hope the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives will stand together and prevent these 82 processing plants from shutting down and come up with some legislation which expands the capability of the Postal Service to compete and protects the American people who want high quality Postal Service.

With that, I yield the floor to the Senator from Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am delighted to join the senior Senator from Montana and the Senator from Vermont on this important topic.

The issue of postal processing facility closures greatly impacts my State of Wisconsin, and it greatly impact States across the country, I must say.

Since 2012 the Postal Service has closed or consolidated 141 processing facilities throughout the United States. In June the Postmaster General announced plans to consolidate up to 82 mail processing facilities, and eliminate 15,000 jobs in 2015. Four of these facilities are in the State of Wisconsin: Eau Claire, La Crosse, Madison, and Rothschild in the Wausau region of the State of Wisconsin.

When postal processing facilities close, that impacts service standards, which really boils down to the time it takes for a piece of mail to get from point A to point B. At this moment, I can't tell my constituents, my Wisconsinites, how long these delays will be because the Postal Service has yet to study this impact. These closures are set to begin within a month. So for small businesses who rely on the Postal Service to get their goods to market and for seniors such as the veteran who was described earlier by the senior Senator from Montana who gets his medicine through the mail, there is really

no way for them to know at this moment how these closures are going to affect them, and sometimes what is in the mail is a lifeline for them.

In fact, the inspector general found the Postal Service failed to follow its own rules, which require the Postal Service to study the impacts these consolidations will have on their service standards—again, the time it takes for a piece of mail to get from point A to point B. They are also supposed to inform the public of these impacts and, additionally, to allow affected communities to provide input before a final decision is made. However, this simply didn't happen. That is why I was proud to join Senator McCASKILL in a bipartisan letter to the Postmaster General requesting that the Postal Service delay these proposed closures and consolidations until they have a fair, complete, and transparent process in place.

The Postal Service exists to serve all Americans, and my constituents and the consumers who fund the Postal Service deserve to have their voices heard in this process. They are stakeholders in this process. While there are certainly process and transparency problems with these closures, another issue that concerns me is the fact that these shortsighted cuts are harming the very thing that makes the Postal Service unique. The major strength of the U.S. Postal Service is its significant network which can reach every community in America. Whether one is in an urban city such as Milwaukee, WI, or in a rural town such as Prentice, the Postal Service reaches these Wisconsin communities. But by continually chipping away at the substantial service network, the Postal Service is developing into an urban package delivery system at the expense of rural Americans and rural Wisconsinites.

Proponents of this idea of closures and consolidations say it is counterproductive to delay these closures because they should happen as soon as possible. They say Congress has failed to act and that the Postal Service has been left with no alternative but to close more processing facilities.

I agree on one point; that is, that Congress has, indeed, failed to act. We must. Congress has failed to act. I do not know how many have sort of heard this in relation to bills to try to fix problems. Have you ever seen someone present an idea and they say, look, everybody who is a stakeholder hates this so it must be a good bill?

Well, I kind of disagree with that proposition, that it has to be that way. I can tell you there is another way forward. That path involves working with, not against, Postal Service employees and customers. It relieves the Postal Service of congressionally mandated overpayments. It maintains service standards for all communities. It provides Postal Service customers with certainty on postal rates.

I am going to continue to fight on this issue. I am delighted and proud to be joining my colleagues here today on the floor to raise this immediate issue of postal process facility closures, this pending issue, but also to renew our commitment to the longer range, broader postal reform that gives our constituents, whether rural, suburban, or urban, the confidence and service they deserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

“ORION” SPACECRAFT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to share with the Senate the fact that we are about to do the first flight test of the new NASA human spacecraft, called *Orion*.

As a matter of fact, it was attempted earlier this morning. There was a launch window between 7:05 and 9:44 eastern time. In fact, a combination of some weather concerns plus some questions of valves opening on some of the fuel lines in the rocket and trying to rework those valves ultimately led to the decision to scrub the mission today.

The spacecraft looks like a capsule. If we recall the *Apollo* capsule that took us to the Moon, it carried three astronauts. It was 12 feet in diameter. *Orion* is 16.5 feet in diameter and is being designed to carry four astronauts. But it is the forerunner to the space systems that will eventually—in 20 years—carry us to the planet Mars.

It will be launched today on an existing workhorse. We have two major workhorses in our stable. The Delta—the Delta IV and this, configured with additional boosters, is called the Delta IV Heavy.

The other workhorse in the stable getting so many of our payloads into space, including our military satellites, is the Atlas V. Both of them are proven workhorses and have been almost flawless. This particular spacecraft, for its first flight test, is going up on a Delta IV Heavy.

As such, what it will do is first to put it into low Earth orbit, and from there it will be projected out 3,600 miles from the Earth and come back as if it were on a mission to the Moon or to an asteroid or coming back from Mars in a trajectory, coming through the Earth's atmosphere, creating quite a few g's and creating—at about 20,000 miles an hour as it is coming back into the Earth's atmosphere—about 4,000 degrees Fahrenheit on the heat shield.

So the flight test today is to test the structural integrity of the spacecraft as well as to test the viability of the heat shield. That has now been postponed until tomorrow. It was my expectation Senator THUNE would be able to go. As it turns out, he has to go back to South Dakota. I will be there at the Cape, and we will report on the launch later on to the Senate next week.

But it will all be done in 1 day, and it will splash down in the Pacific, somewhere in the region of the State of the Presiding Officer. They are actually going to have television coverage of the splashdown because we have a Predator that will be over the Atlantic. That is why we have to have the weather there, as well as the weather at the Cape, to be exactly right so we can record the splashdown, because this is a flight test.

We are developing a new spacecraft to take humans to missions far beyond low Earth orbit. A lot of people think the human space program was shut down after the space shuttle. No, we are just going into the new design of new spacecraft that can take us on a mission out of Earth's orbit as we explore the Earth's heavens. I will give a report to the Senate next week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

LAND CONSERVATION

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, this is a picture of Wike Brothers' Farm in Sharon, CT. Sharon is located in the very northwest portion in the great State of Connecticut. It has been an active farm held by the same family, the Wike brothers, for about 150 years. It is about 144 acres. It is a pasture now for free-range chickens, pigs, and cattle.

The farm's roadside store, which is used by people from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York—given that it sits right at the crux of those three States—sells beef, pork, sausages, eggs, apple-smoked bacon, and maple syrup, to name a few.

We are able to know, confidently, that this piece of iconic farm land that is producing for the neighboring farms and States is going to be able to continue as a farm because of something that Congress did.

Congress passed, enacted in 2006, a land conservation incentive in our Tax Code that gives a small tax incentive to farmers who decide to put a conservation easement on their land to make sure it doesn't fall into the hands of developers. Further, we provide a slightly smaller discount, a slightly smaller tax incentive to private non-farm, nonagricultural landowners who want either to donate their lands or who want also to put a conservation easement on their land to make sure that it doesn't get developed.

This has been of enormous benefit in the State of Connecticut. We have preserved 11,000 acres of land in Connecticut just since this tax incentive went on the books. That is a 45-percent increase over the previous period of time before we put that tax incentive on the books.

It is a wonderful bipartisan policy because we are able, by discounting people's taxes, to keep land as open space without it, frankly, going into the hands of public land owners, which is often met with resistance from a lot of Members from our Western States.

Land stays in the hands of the private landowner or, in this case, in the hands of the Wike brothers, who have been farming it for a century and a half. But we know, because of that conservation easement, it will be maintained as open space.

As bipartisan as that idea is, the entire genesis of land conservation is a bipartisan idea, and maybe even to an extent it is a partisan or Republican idea. It was Teddy Roosevelt who quadrupled the acreage in our national forests, invented the National Wildlife Refuge System, and proclaimed 18 national monuments. He said in 1910: “Conservation is a great moral issue, for it involves the patriotic duty of insuring the safety and continuance of the nation.”

It was Richard Nixon who created the EPA and signed into law the Clean Water Act. In 1970 he said: “Clean air, clean water, open spaces—these should once again be the birthright of every American.”

While there aren't a lot of Democrats coming to the floor and quoting Ronald Reagan, he had some very impressive things to say about this country's commitment and his movement's commitment to conservation, as well.

Ronald Reagan said:

What is a conservative after all but one who conserves, one who is committed to protecting and holding close the things by which we live. . . . And we want to protect and conserve the land on which we live—our countryside, our rivers and mountains, our plains and meadows and forests. This is our patrimony. This is what we leave to our children. And our great moral responsibility is to leave it to them either as we found it or better than we found it.

I am on the floor to speak in favor of the continuance of the land conservation tax incentive program that we hope will be in whatever tax extension deal gets passed by the Congress, as many proponents of the provision in that tax extension package would like.

It would be better if this were permanent. It is very difficult to do long-term planning for owners and operators of big farms such as the Wike Brothers' Farm if they don't know the tax incentive is going to be there for them. It is very difficult to do this retroactively, but it is important, nonetheless, to get this extended because this isn't the only property in our State that has been affected.

The Towner Hill Farm in Sherman, CT, is an 80-acre property that would not have been protected if it weren't for the Federal tax deduction which was available to the owner in 2008. He offered it to the town of Sherman at less than the value that he might have gotten at a private land sale because he knew he was going to be able to get this tax incentive. Now it is home to one of the most popular hiking areas in all of that area in Sherman, CT.

The Vanishing Geese Farm in Durham, CT, the center of the State, has a 42-acre farm that has been in the Scott family since the 1970s. They desperately wanted to continue farming, but the ability to have a conservation easement purchased from them put money in their pockets that allowed them to continue to farm but also gave them piece of mind, knowing that this piece of land that they love is going to be able to stay as open space.

Mr. Scott said, in his own colloquial way: "Having worked the land, cut my firewood from it, raised sheep on it, and hayed it, I have developed a lot of affection for it."

In regard to the donation of the easement on his family's property, he said:

I told my kids that my chest was puffed out a little more and when I walked out in the snow, it was nice to know that this land will never be developed. I feel that I've kind of kept faith with the land and with the critters on it.

This is a very important tax incentive that, as I said, has resulted in tens of thousands of acres being preserved in the State of Connecticut. It is maybe the most important legacy that we leave—to recognize that part of the true greatness of this country is the land upon which we live, the open spaces that define what it is to be an American.

I mean, the Industrial Revolution powered us to global greatness but we—maybe better than any other nation in the world—have found this miraculous way to marry together development and conservation, to decide that there are going to be places that we are going to develop for their natural resources or for their industrial capacity. But then there are going to be these magical places, like this beautiful farm in northwestern Connecticut, where agriculture is happening and which to many of us defines the character of the place in which we live—practical reasons why we should conserve a place such as the Wike Brothers' Farm to continue agriculture. But I would also argue there are spiritual reasons as well—reasons having to do with what it is to be a citizen and inhabitant of this great Nation.

Republicans and Democrats, over the course of our congressional history, have come together to protect open spaces. Since 2006 Republicans and Democrats have come together to pro-

tect this important tax incentive; 221 House Members have cosponsored the legislation and 27 Senators.

I will leave with this statement. It is a bipartisan legacy for me as well.

I ran a spirited race for the U.S. Congress in 2006, beating a 24-year incumbent, Republican Nancy Johnson. There were places where I departed from her legacy and there were places where I inherited it. Nancy Johnson was one of the authors, one of the creators, of this important conservation tax incentive. So in my corner of the world there is a legacy of standing up for it, which is why I come to the floor today.

I thank the body for the time, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, it has already started. There is being readied today a building in Crystal City, VA, to house the announced 1,000 workers who will be hired to process the unlawful Executive amnesty the President has said he intends to execute.

The President is already moving forward. He is rushing to impose his immigration views before the Congress can contain it or restrain it; before the American people fully understand what is happening; and to make it so it can't be stopped.

The President's Executive orders violate the laws of Congress—the laws that Congress has passed—in order to implement laws he wishes Congress had passed but which Congress has refused to pass. It refused in 2006, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2014.

The American people, through their congressional representatives, have considered these kinds of proposals, they evaluated them, the American people expressed their views on them, and Congress said no. The people have been clear on this issue. For decades they have pleaded, demanded, really, that this Congress create an immigration system that is lawful; that we end the lawlessness, that it be principled, that it serve the national interest, and that it serves their interest and not the special interests. But Congress and political leaders have refused to do so.

It is unfortunate to a degree I don't think I have seen on any other issue. Perhaps no other issue defines the gap between the elites in this country and middle Americans who go to work every day, who support our country,

pay our taxes, and fight our wars. Our people want our laws that are on the books now enforced. If new laws are needed, they want us to pass new laws to end this lawlessness. But this President rejects the will of the people. His policies nullify the laws we have. His policies, shockingly, direct Federal agents to ignore their oaths and not enforce the laws, which creates the lawlessness that stains our legal system in our country today and is causing so much angst out there. People are not opposed to immigration. People are frustrated that their government refuses to create a lawful system that will work and serve them.

What I want to say to my colleagues is that the President has gone even farther than that. He has gone farther than just saying: I am not going to enforce the laws, which he, as a President, the Chief Executive Officer, is required to do. He is required to execute the laws of the United States faithfully, which he is absolutely failing to do. But he is moving forward with his immigration agenda, rejected by Congress and the American people, and he is moving forward in a lot of different ways.

This was an issue in the campaign. The people heard about it just a few weeks ago and they cast their ballots. There are nine new Senators elected to this Senate, and not one of them said they supported President Obama's scheme. Not one of them. They steadfastly opposed it. So in this lameduck Congress, the attempt is being made to move this new lawless agenda forward out of fear that it might not be so popularly received next year.

Is Congress hopeless, helpless, ineffectual? Is it not able to stop this? Absolutely not. Congress has the power to control what the President does. It has the power to control what he spends money on. The President, the executive branch, cannot spend one dime that has not been approved by the U.S. Congress. He can't spend more on roads, highways, schools, defense, education, or health care that Congress has not appropriated and not approved. So Congress has a responsibility and a duty here. Congress should fund no program, should allow no Presidential expenditure to be spent on programs it deems are unworthy. It absolutely has a responsibility to ensure this President spends no money to execute policies that are plainly in violation of existing law.

This Congress has a constitutional duty, no matter what Members may feel about the substance of the issue. I have opinions on that. I oppose the President's substantive position. But as a matter of law, separation of powers, and constitutional duty, this Congress should stop the expenditure of Federal funds for projects that Congress has rejected and are not worthy of funding. Congress has deliberated

these issues. This is not something it has not considered before. It has rejected this policy.

The special interests have spent, according to one independent group, \$1.5 billion to try to ram through Congress an immigration plan the American people reject and that Congress has refused to pass. The President hasn't given up, and these special interests haven't given up, despite the election and despite the wishes of the American people. They want their policies and they are going to ram them through this Congress, if they possibly can, no matter what the people think. That is a threat to representative democracy. It is a threat to the laws of this country. And the Congress needs to say no.

Let us be specific now. People may think: Well, you may not expend money if you don't prosecute somebody. So how are we going to complain about that, Senator SESSIONS? Well, let us look at this. This is from the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service, which is charged with processing the applications of people who wish to enter the country lawfully. Broadcast on Monday, December 1—just this week—at 11:52. Subject: Today's email news.

USCIS is taking steps to open a new operational center in Crystal City, a neighborhood in Arlington, Virginia, to accommodate about 1,000 full-time, permanent Federal and contract employees in a variety of positions and grade levels. The initial workload will include cases filed as a result of the executive actions on immigration announced on November 20, 2014. Many job opportunities at the operational center will be announced in the coming days and please continue to monitor USAJOBS if you are interested.

This is just days from now.

Now let's put this little chart up. This briefly continues on what they published. This is right off their email.

Current vacancies include: Special Assistant GS-12.

Boy, a lot of people in the country would like to be a GS-12.

Arlington, Virginia, today. Special Assistant GS-15, Arlington, Virginia. Today. Chief of Staff GS-15, Arlington, Virginia. Today.

It goes on, today, today, today, today. They are rushing this through. They are determined to get this done before the American people can find out what is happening, to raise their voice, to communicate with their Members of Congress and the Senate and stop it. This is not good for this country.

You may say: Well, JEFF, surely the President hasn't overreached in these matters. But Congress has stated you cannot enter the country unlawfully. That is a fundamental principle of our immigration law that has been on the books for many years. If you enter unlawfully, you are not entitled to work in America. And if you enter unlawfully and attempt to work and someone hires you and knows that you are illegally here, the employer is subject to

criminal penalties and other penalties. That is the basic law. It has been on the books for years. The President is just wiping that off the books, colleagues.

Are we going to accept this? Are we going to allow the President to just wipe out duly passed laws to create an entirely new system of immigration that Congress refused to establish? Our laws are on the books today. He has no power to reduce and erase those laws.

How serious is this? Last night former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich—Ph.D. in history, a student of American government, author of quite a number of books—made some dramatic statements about the meaning of this Presidential action, and we should hear it, colleagues. This is the former Speaker of the House, a student of American history and government. This is what he says about what is happening today. We cannot be oblivious to this, because what happens today will set trends and policies for tomorrow. He said:

Obama funding new staff and offices without congressional approval is step toward kingship or dictatorship. He must be stopped now.

How much clearer can it be than that? He goes on to say, in another tweet here:

Congress should only approve very short spending bill to set up fight in January on Obama unconstitutional power grab. No long term CR.

Here is the third one from last night:

Our entire constitutional structure is at stake. The new Obama power grab is the greatest threat to freedom since King George Third.

Those are quotes from Newt Gingrich. I am telling you, this is not a little bitty matter, and we have to fully understand the nature of what is happening here. Congress refused to pass what the President is enacting right now by Executive order and he has no power to do it. He should not be doing it. He may well be stopped by lawsuits in years to come, but Congress has the power to stop it now. We don't have to allow money to be spent in Arlington, Crystal City, VA, to hire 1,000 people to process these applications.

Now, how are things going in our immigration system today? I wish I could report better circumstances than we have. The situation was grave even before this action. On May 20, last year, National Citizenship and Immigration Services Council president, representing thousands of USCIS workers, issued a statement.

Colleagues, we need to know what has happened. It is unbelievable.

This is a person directly engaged with the people who do the work every day, the law officers who go out there and try to adjudicate these immigration cases.

USCIS adjudications officers are pressured to rubber stamp applications instead of con-

ducting diligent case review and investigation. The culture at USCIS encourages all applications to be approved, discouraging proper investigation into red flags and discouraging the denial of any applications. USCIS has been turned into an "approval machine."

This is an absolute abdication of the responsibility the Congress and the American people have given to the President as the Chief Executive Officer and given all the way down to the lowest USCIS officer. They are not to be a rubberstamp machine. They are not to be an approval machine. They are to serve the interests of the American people. They are to evaluate applications and do so carefully and fairly and consistently. They are to investigate red flags.

What is he talking about when he says red flags? He is talking about threats, criminals, terrorists.

Even Secretary Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security, testifying a few days ago, acknowledged that of these 4 million or 5 million people who are going to be applying for legal status in America through the President's program, there is no way their applications are going to be evaluated. If they say they came to the country in 1999, nobody is going to check on that. They are not going to see if they graduated from some school or had some job somewhere and investigate it. They are simply going to act on the paperwork they have been given. And in many cases—in the bill that President Obama supported earlier last year—there would not be any face-to-face meetings. They wouldn't even go into an office and actually see the person. It would all be submitted by email and documents, which is highly risky, as the experts told us. They need to see the person because they may not be the person they say they are. They could just submit paperwork, get citizenship status, and nobody would have any idea whether they are worthy of being in the United States.

The situation is graver than a lot of people think. It is our duty to legitimately represent the people in our country who believe this system is supposed to work. They sent us here. We say we have an immigration law in America. Well, good. And then we end up here. It is not so good. It is not working at all.

What are we supposed to do? We are sorry, constituents. We are sorry you voted for us. I know we told you we wanted to do stuff to make this system better and we are going to end all this, but we will worry about that tomorrow—and we are going to do something.

For 40 years Congress and Presidents have been promising to fix this system. The problem is, the special interests have won every time. The special interests have blocked the kind of reforms that create a system that we know will serve our national interests, will be

fair to immigrants who apply, and help the American people live better lives.

To make a couple of more points. October 28 of this year, Mr. Kenneth Palinkas, the president of the association of 12,000 officers—issued this statement:

We are still the world's rubber stamp for entry into the United States—regardless of the ramifications of the constant violations to the Immigration and Nationality Act. Whether it's the failure to uphold the public charge law, the abuse of our asylum procedures, the admission of Islamist radicals, or visas for health risks, the taxpayers are being fleeced and public safety is being endangered on a daily basis.

That is what Mr. Palinkas said. Has anybody ever called him to testify and to lay out these dangers? Certainly not the U.S. Senate. President Obama has his secret meetings with businesses and activist groups—people with their big money and their contributions. He met with them all summer. Did he meet with Mr. Palinkas? No. Did he meet with the head of the ICE officers association? No. Mr. Palinkas pleaded and asked to be admitted so he could lay out the problems they face on a daily basis, and it was rejected.

Mr. Palinkas goes on to say:

I write today to warn the general public that this situation is about to get exponentially worse—and more dangerous. America dodged a bullet when the Senate immigration package S. 744 was blocked by the House. That legislation would have been a financial security catastrophe. But news reports have leaked information to the public of a USCIS management contract bid for a "surge" printing of 34 million green cards and employment authorization documents to be provided to foreign nationals, a bid that predicts the Administration's promised executive amnesty.

Think about what this officer is telling us. It is true. He goes on to say:

That is why this statement is intended for the public: If you care about your immigration security and your neighborhood security, you must act now to ensure that Congress stops this unilateral amnesty. Let your voice be heard and spread the word to your neighbors. We who serve in our nation's immigration agencies are pleading for your help—don't let this happen. Express your concern to your Senators and Congressmen before it is too late.

That was October 28 of this year. He also issued this statement on May 20 of last year:

USCIS officers who identify illegal aliens that, in accordance with law should be placed into immigration removal proceedings before a federal judge, are prevented from exercising their authority and responsibility to issue Notices to Appear.

It goes on to say:

The attitude of USCIS management—These are the political appointees, appointed by the President to execute his views of immigration.

The attitude of USCIS management is not that the Agency serves the American public or the laws of the United States, or public safety and national security, but instead that the agency serves illegal aliens and the attorneys which represent them.

What a statement. Who is the government supposed to represent? We represent the people of the United States who are lawfully here.

While we believe in treating all people with respect, we are concerned that this agency tasked with such a vital security mission is too greatly influenced by special interest groups.

Boy, that is the truth. We had in one day Microsoft—a great company—demanding that more workers be allowed to come into the country so that they can work, in the same week they announced laying off 18,000.

In September of this year, Mr. Palinkas issued this statement:

Many millions come legally to the U.S. through our wide open immigration policy every year—whether as temporary visitors, lifetime immigrants, refugees, asylum-seekers, foreign students, or recipients of our "visa waiver program" which allows people to come and go freely. Yet our government cannot effectively track these foreign visitors and immigrants. And those who defraud authorities will face no consequences at all in most cases. Our caseworkers cannot even do in-person interviews for people seeking citizenship, they cannot enforce restrictions on welfare use, and they even lack the basic office space to properly function. Applications for entry are rubber-stamped, the result of grading agents by speed rather than discretion. We've become a clearinghouse for the world.

Now that is the truth and anybody who knows what is going on in our system knows it. The President's action will beget even more lawlessness in the future. It is a statement to the world: No matter what the law says, you come to America, you get to stay. You will not be deported.

This is a recipe for disaster. It cannot work. What we need in this country, and can achieve if Congress and the President will act, is to create a lawful system and enforce the law. We need to make it a system that we can be proud of and that is fairly applied. We need a system that ends the ability of people to defraud our country and come in unlawfully, and to serve the interest of working Americans.

That is what it is all about: Are we serving their interest, or are we listening to special interests—political groups and activist groups, politicians who think they gain political advantage, and certain businesses who want more, cheaper labor? Don't we represent the vast majority of the people? Isn't there a national interest—an interest of the American people? Somebody needs to defend that interest. It has been lost in this process.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session.

NOMINATION OF GREGORY N. STIVERS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the nomination?

Hearing none, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gregory N. Stivers, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the Leeson nomination.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joseph F. Leeson, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania?

Mr. CASEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 312 Ex.]

YEAS—76

Alexander	Blumenthal	Cardin
Ayotte	Blunt	Carper
Baldwin	Boozman	Casey
Barrasso	Brown	Chambliss
Bennet	Burr	Coats

Collins	Inhofe	Pryor
Coons	Isakson	Reed
Corker	Johanns	Reid
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Risch
Crapo	Kaine	Roberts
Donnelly	King	Rubio
Durbin	Kirk	Schumer
Enzi	Klobuchar	Scott
Feinstein	Leahy	Sessions
Fischer	Lee	Shaheen
Flake	Levin	Shelby
Franken	Manchin	Tester
Graham	McCain	Thune
Grassley	McCaskill	Toomey
Hagan	McConnell	Vitter
Harkin	Merkley	Walsh
Hatch	Murkowski	Warner
Heitkamp	Murphy	Whitehouse
Heller	Nelson	Wicker
Hirono	Paul	
Hoeven	Portman	

NAYS—16

Begich	Johnson (SD)	Stabenow
Booker	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Boxer	Mikulski	Warren
Cantwell	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Sanders	
Heinrich	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—8

Coburn	Landrieu	Rockefeller
Cochran	Markey	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Moran	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I was absent from the rollcall vote on the nomination of Joseph F. Leeson, Jr. to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Had I been present, I would have opposed his nomination.

NOMINATION OF LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Griggsby nomination.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today we will vote to confirm Lydia Griggsby to serve on the Court of Federal Claims.

I thank the Majority Leader for filing cloture on her nomination. She should have been confirmed several months ago but Republicans refused to consent to a vote on her nomination for no good reason.

Lydia was nominated on April 10 of this year. She had a hearing on June 4 and was reported out of committee by a unanimous voice vote on June 12. She is completely noncontroversial and exceptionally well qualified to serve on this court.

It should not have taken 6 days, let alone 6 months, for the Senate to approve her nomination. Despite this unnecessary delay, I am pleased that we finally ended the filibuster and will confirm her today.

Lydia has served on my Judiciary Committee staff since 2006 and cur-

rently serves as my chief counsel for Privacy and Information Policy. In this position, she has worked across the aisle on important legislation to promote accountability and transparency. Before coming to the Judiciary Committee she served on the Senate Ethics Committee.

I recommended Lydia to the President for this position because I know her intellect and good judgment will make her a fine judge. Before Lydia came to work in the Senate, she served in the Justice Department and tried several matters before the Court of Federal Claims. When she is confirmed, it will most certainly be the court's gain and the Judiciary Committee's loss.

I will miss her wise counsel and I wish her all the best.

Madam President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lydia Kay Griggsby, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Baran nomination.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I know we have a lot to talk about. This will be very quick.

I want to point out that is an opening at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which is such an important agency because they work on the safety of powerplants, many of which are aging. We voted for Mr. Baran for a short-term seat. He had extensive hearings, 88 questions asked in writing. I feel very strongly that he is very suited for this position. He worked for the Energy and Commerce Committee in the House and worked in a very bipartisan fashion.

In any case, I think this is a very important position and a very qualified individual, and I urge an "aye" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move

to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Bernard Sanders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 313 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heller	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—40

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Ayotte	Graham	Portman
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Scott
Chambliss	Isakson	Sessions
Coats	Johanns	Shelby
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—7

Coburn	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Moran	
Cruz	Rockefeller	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the McFerran nomination.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Sen-

ator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 314 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Begich	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Walsh
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—42

Alexander	Flake	McConnell
Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hoeven	Roberts
Chambliss	Inhofe	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johanns	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Manchin	Vitter
Fischer	McCain	Wicker

NOT VOTING—7

Coburn	Landrieu	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Moran	
Cruz	Rockefeller	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF LAUREN MCGARITY MCFERRAN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Williams nomination.

Mr. REID. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time has been yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ellen Dudley Williams, of Maryland, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Department of Energy.

Harry Reid, Christopher Murphy, Elizabeth Warren, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Ron Wyden, Tom Harkin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Charles E. Schumer, Mazie Hirono, Amy Klobuchar, Barbara Boxer, Tammy Baldwin, Bernard Sanders, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ellen Dudley Williams, of Maryland, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Department of Energy, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 315 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Hagan	Nelson
Baldwin	Harkin	Pryor
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rockefeller
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Sanders
Boxer	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Levin	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Toomey
Collins	Markey	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCaskill	Vitter
Donnelly	Menendez	Walsh
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warren
Franken	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—34

Ayotte	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johanns	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Crapo	Kirk	Thune
Enzi	Lee	Wicker
Fischer	McCain	
Flake	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—9

Barrasso	Cruz	Moran
Coburn	Inhofe	Murphy
Cochran	Landrieu	Udall (CO)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 34.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF ELLEN DUDLEY WILLIAMS TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Ellen Dudley Williams, of Maryland, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Department of Energy.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to give my remarks while seated at my desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. For hours and hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I come today with a spirit of reflection and optimism about our future. I am also compelled towards an honest assessment of where we are as a body—of the promise of what we can achieve when we don't shy away from compromise and what we can't achieve when we refuse to compromise.

I also have very much on my mind that the job of public service is very hard work, and it is an extremely noble and honorable calling. Here in the U.S. Senate we have the unique ability and responsibility to do very big things: ignite innovation in our schools and industries, grow and protect a healthy country, foster global change borne from policies that lead the globe. At the same time, we have the opportunity to touch individual lives with case management. One on one, with casework, we often reach people in their darkest hour.

I love the Senate. I love the Senate. I love the intensity of the work, the gravity of the issues, and I love fighting for West Virginians here. I learned to love this fight, as many of you know, as a 27-year-old VISTA worker in the tiny coal community of Emmons, WV. It was a place that set my moral compass and gave me direction, where everything in my real life actually began. It is where I learned how little I knew about the problems people faced there and in other places in the country, how little I knew, and what a humbling experience that was for me.

My time there was transformative. It explains every policy I have pursued and every vote I have cast. It was where my beliefs were bolted down and where my passions met my principles. Emmons was where I came to understand that out of our everyday struggles we can enlarge ourselves. We can grow greater. Truly making a difference couldn't be an afterthought. It never could. Rather, it requires a singular focus and relentless effort. It would be hard, but the work mattered. That is the deal here.

Important undertakings can't be halfhearted. You have to commit your whole self—almost like pushing a heavy rock uphill. With both of your hands you push, because if you let up for a split second with either hand, you and the rock go tumbling backwards into the abyss. There is always so much at stake.

Even today in West Virginia too many are struggling. They are fighting to survive. I called them hardworking when I really should say hard-surviving, but they are hardworking and trying to survive. They are wary of the future. They are scared of their possibilities. Sometimes they are afraid of themselves, which is partly a tradition which says that change is bad, that strangers are bad. I was bad for quite a long time. But that is the way people are. They don't really want to change. So change comes slowly. We just simply fight twice as hard, and nothing stops us.

There is vast dignity and vast honor in helping people. You cannot let go of it. I believe genuinely in the ability of government to do good, to serve, and to right injustices. This is why the Senate must be a place in which we embrace commitment to be deliberative, passionate, and unrelenting. But it must be a place in which we are driven only by the duty and trust bestowed upon us by the people who put us here. This is where everything else should be put aside—boxed out, as it were.

Yes, politics led us here. But this is where we shed the campaign—or should—and embrace our opportunities to lead, to listen, to dig in, to bridge differences, to govern, and to truly make a difference. At our core we must be drawn to the hard, all-consuming policy work that lives in briefings, hearing rooms, and roundtables back in our States. Yet our North Star must always be the real needs of the people we serve.

So policy to me starts with listening. It is seeing the faces of our constituents—not just thinking of a policy in terms of a policy, but a policy in terms of the people whom it would affect. You see your constituents, you hear them out, and you understand their needs and their problems. You get to know them very well, especially in a small State such as West Virginia. Listening to constituents and colleagues

here alike is absolutely necessary. Good policy is born out of compromise. Compromise is not easy, but it can happen. If we truly listen to each other, it very well could.

We separate our campaign selves from our public service selves. The cruelty of perpetual campaigns destroys our ability to fulfill our oath of office. It is hard to build a working relationship in this institution without an honest and open approach with our colleagues—Republican or Democratic. But we must build that relationship because together we can do so much, and without it, we can do—as we have seen—nothing.

Listening and compromise were key to the work of the National Commission on Children in the 1990s. I was the chair of that Commission, which included a bipartisan group of government officials and appointed experts in various fields from all backgrounds. There were many of us—32—and we went all over the country for 2 years.

I can tell you that reaching consensus was tough, but we listened, we debated, and we came to trust. Even the most liberal and conservative among us knew that each of us had the best interests of our party. That was not in dispute.

While meeting in Williamsburg, VA, which was where we had been meeting at the time, I had to leave suddenly for an important Senate vote on Iraq. I handed over the gavel to our most conservative Republican Member, someone in whom I had trust. That shocked people, but it helped on the consensus.

In the end we were proud to vote 32 to 0 in support of the legislation that we put forward and our policy statement as a whole, and it included both policies. It included the creation of a new Republican child tax credit for the first time and a major expansion of the earned-income tax credit, which has lifted millions of American families out of poverty.

It worked because we listened to one another, respected one another, and we wanted to come to an agreement. It was clear, it was obvious, and there it was—32 to 0. Unbelievable, but it happened.

Is that possible these days? My answer is yes, and I believe that we can see that spirit again as we address the future of the bipartisan Children's Health Insurance Program—CHIP, the way it is known. It currently provides health care to 8.3 million children and pregnant women nationwide, and 40,000 of those are in West Virginia. CHIP is so important to me because it offers health care which is tailored to children; to wit, it has both mental and dental health care tailored to children. It is, in fact, better coverage than the Affordable Care Act provides children.

From those early days at Vista, I have seen the devastating toll that lack of medical care can extract from a

child's well-being and their health, their self-esteem—particularly their self-esteem—and even their will to succeed.

Many of you also know the names and faces of children who have gone without access to proper health care, and those are the ones we fight for. That is why CHIP has always been a bipartisan effort, driven by the needs of real kids and their families. Senators GRASSLEY and HATCH were instrumental in its creation over a period of a couple years and long arguments, and they continue to be strong advocates.

The bipartisanship program has opened doors for millions who desperately needed to get into a doctor's office and had never been able to do so and now are able to do so.

But a warning—every door that CHIP opened will be closed unless we can agree to carry CHIP funding past mid-2015, and I don't know what the prospects for that are. All I know is that if they aren't done properly, those doors close; those kids had access to doctors, but they don't anymore. That is unconscionable to me. We have to look at the faces of those children in our own States and think about that. It is those individual faces that I remember.

Remembering for whom we work is paramount. When any corporate CEO comes to my office, I show them a prized birthday gift to my four children—our four children—my wife is here—a picture of a hardworking coal miner whose face is honest but hurting and very proud. That picture means so much to me because it embodies the spirit of those whom I am here to serve, and silently reminds us of why we must work towards a common ground—why this is not about Democrats and Republicans, but it is about the people whom we are here to serve, bringing different viewpoints to what that means.

Senator MIKE ENZI and I are not on the same side of every vote—to put it mildly—but we are very, very good friends—a friendship that was made years ago when I was serving on the President's HOPE mission and he was the mayor of Gillette, WY, going slightly crazy trying to build houses for all the people moving in there through coal. He also had sideburns. I say that oftentimes—off the record.

On a gray day in January 2006, West Virginia was frozen in disbelief when we learned that 12 trapped miners were killed in Sago Mine—a mine in the north central part of the State.

In the days that followed, as we struggled to make sense of what had happened, Senator ENZI and Senator ISAKSON joined Senator Kennedy, Senator MANCHIN, and myself in West Virginia. The first two did not real merely visit—they came to understand. They came to learn. They came to share in the grief and to offer their support to the community, and you could tell that in their faces.

Together, out of tragedy—and because they were members of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—we forged a compromise on mine safety legislation that brought about, frankly, the strongest safety improvements in a generation. It was huge for us. Only 16 States mine coal, but we are one of them.

To this day, Senator ISAKSON carries a picture of one of the Sago miners. It is not in the wallet that he is carrying today, but it is in the other wallet back in Atlanta. I don't care where it is, that picture is in his wallet every single day. We knew that, as public officials, compromising and really leading, men govern—which is why we were there.

Answering the needs of our country is our responsibility, and we do the best when we work shoulder to shoulder. It was working shoulder to shoulder when we set our country on a path to future innovation.

A few years ago, America's domination in our innovation—our inventions and creative problem-solving—was eroding, and we all knew it. We needed to act. We needed to reinvigorate our leadership in those areas and to keep our jobs and our future more secure.

We answered that call with a bipartisan compromise that delivered the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act. I will never forget that. This legislation made historic investments in basic research, science, technology, engineering, and math education.

Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, who preceded JOHN THUNE on the commerce committee, Senator ALEXANDER, and I sought unanimous consent to get the bill passed—because we thought we worked out the details pretty well—and do it prior to the recess. Therefore, we had to do it by unanimous consent. But there were five objections holding the bill still.

Instead of retreating to party corners and pointing fingers, we compromised right on that center aisle—right there next to Senator COLLINS. We wound it up and down, we added a little money and we took a little bit of money off. Mostly we took several billion dollars off. We removed a couple of programs that weren't absolutely necessary to satisfy Kay Bailey or LAMAR ALEXANDER. And we had ourselves a \$44 billion bill over 5 years on which we agreed. We didn't have to have a vote. Senator Hutchison and Senator ALEXANDER tenaciously worked to clear the holds. It was absolutely beautiful. It was just beautiful—a \$44 billion program to reinvigorate our Nation, cerebrally and productively. Together we passed a bill to revive our country's flagging global performance ranking and catapult us to success. Reaching moments like those requires persistence. It demands collaboration. It demands trust and compromise, and it is so worth it.

I am driven by the process of creating policy. I love doing that. It is grinding, it is intense, it can be frustrating and sometimes heartbreaking—often heartbreaking. But when we accomplish something that is meaningful to the people who have entrusted us to represent them, there is no greater reward.

We have to know who and what we must fight for in our work and in our own personal views. We have to know and understand those who will benefit and those who will lose. And we have to be ready for it to take a long time—much longer than we thought—sometimes 5 years, sometimes 10 years. That makes no difference. You keep at it. You don't let go of it, because if you keep at it, somewhere along some combination of Senators is going to say, yeah, that is OK. And then we get ourselves a bill.

Also we keep in our souls the faces of the people we try to help, the people in my case who were all too often left behind. The Senate must face serious social and policy issues from health care to cyber security, caring for veterans coming home, building up our infrastructure, making our economy work for everyone. These are our core responsibilities. I am proud that we have made some measure of progress. While we seem right now to be at an impasse, I know the Senate will rise to the position of addressing our issues and at some point in some way it will happen. As a governing body, we must not allow recent failures to take root, to mean too much to us. We must not be focused on episodic “gotcha” issues rather than working to address broader, more systemic problem solving. No one else is going to step in to do this if we don't.

The truth was on full display a few weeks ago when the Senate failed to move forward on National Security Administration reforms necessary to uphold the mission of protecting our Nation. These are issues on which I have very strong views. I have taken very seriously my 14 years on the Intelligence Committee, as a member and as chairman, because the global threats we face increase daily as the world becomes more connected. We depend on the highly trained professionals at NSA to zero in on those threats. There are only 22 of them that make sort of final decisions. They are highly trained. They have taken the oath of office to protect our Nation.

Now I don't think we have any excuse to outsource our intelligence work to telecommunications firms. I work on the Commerce Committee. I have seen what the telecommunications companies do when they can get away with it—you know, everything from cramming to—just all kinds of not very nice things. It is the job of government to address this issue. The private sector and the free market alone cannot solve

those kinds of problems and should not. That is a government responsibility being carried out with great success.

A lot of people say, oh, what if? But the fact is nobody has ever been able to show me somebody whose privacy has been influenced or broken into by the NSA. Good, hard-working people can be destroyed by circumstances beyond their control. It is our job to not let that happen. It is our job to help to give everyone a fair shot. It is much easier to say than to do, but that is our charge.

Too many children come into a world where circumstances preclude the opportunities they should have. We cannot discount the many challenges our society still faces. It is unconscionable in a country like ours that people go without health care or go hungry or have no place to call home.

When shareholders and the free market cannot or will not solve our problems, it is government's responsibility to step in every time. People can decry government all they want, but we are here for a reason. When private companies decide there isn't enough profit to provide Internet to rural areas, then we step in and we expand broadband, allowing the E-Rate to go farther and farther out. It now covers 97 percent of all schools in the country.

Maybe the private sector decides they cannot make enough by insuring the sickest of our children. We must act. That is our core mission. It is who we are as an institution. It is who we must always be.

We have worked to give children a fair shot through the E-Rate Program which introduces the most rural classrooms and the smallest libraries to the world through the Internet, access to a foreign language class or research, but it gives every child a key to unlock their potential. It doesn't mean they will, but it means they can.

We know health care is fundamental to a fair shot as well. We cannot learn or keep a job if we are sick. But providing that care has not always been as profitable as some companies would like. So we make sure millions of Americans could have the dignity of access to health care under the Affordable Care Act.

My friend Sam is one of the faces I will never forget. When he was battling childhood leukemia and hit his lifetime insurance cap—it is a technical term for a savage consequence—his parents' insurance companies walked away from this courageous little fighter. His parents, both schoolteachers, were left with heart-wrenching decisions such as getting divorced—which they considered—so Sam could qualify for Medicaid. Well, in the end it didn't matter; Sam lost his battle with cancer. But today under the Affordable Care Act we have made sure that no insurance companies can abandon someone like Sam

when they need help the most. Health care reform will never take away the crushing agony of parents with sick kids. Heartbreaking situations like Sam's drove us to say no more, and we changed the law. Parents deserve to focus every bit of their energy fighting for their kids in every way, not fighting profit-obsessed insurance companies. So we did the right thing. We did the right thing.

Government also did the right thing when I fought for what I thought my life depended on, because it did, to pass the Coal Act of 1992, long forgotten. We had to step in and stop some coal companies from walking away from benefits which they had promised by contract to retired coal miners and their widows—folks who were mostly in their seventies and eighties. Passing the Coal Act was enormously important to our country. It not only prevented an absolute terms a national coal strike in 1993, but it delivered on the promise of lifetime health benefits earned by 200,000 retired coal miners and their widows. They would not have been taken care of if those companies had their way.

Nor can we rely on the private sector alone to take care of our veterans. It is government's duty to provide the health care they earned. We do this through community-based clinics and improved services for PTSD, traumatic brain injury, and family support. It is expensive. Senator ROB PORTMAN and I wanted to pass a bill which would cause the Department of Defense to give all people entering the military mental health screening—not when they came back from Iraq or Afghanistan or somewhere else, but before they went in, and then on an annual basis do that again to build a database, to make sure we knew that we could take care of them better when they came home.

We rightly asked the government to take on some of society's most fundamental needs. What I found in Emmons was a community of genuinely strong and incredibly hard-working people who were essentially on their own trying to survive. The free market had not made sure that communities such as Emmons had good roads or any schools or any schoolbuses or any clean drinking water or safe jobs. But from my point of view they deserved all of those. They deserved to have their shot. Working together on the needs of places such as Emmons speaks to our core human connection and to an aspiration for the greater good.

That is what drove me into public service. It was not something I could help. I just had to do it, to help people with everything that I have. Every individual in every community such as Emmons deserves to have public officials who will fight the big fight and the personal ones, the casework.

Extending a hand on those personal challenges is incredibly meaningful

work. Our constituents face these fights with Herculean courage but not always the resources to solve the problems in front of them. People like the 8-year-old who needed a bone marrow transplant, a procedure that in 1990 was considered experimental. Our office intervened. We helped that boy get that transplant and he still lives today. As a Senator, you take on those fights with the same vigor as any policy or ideological debate and you are equally proud when you win and you are equally hurt when you lose.

When I came to West Virginia 50 years ago, I was searching for a clear purpose for my life's work. I wanted the work to be really hard, and what I got was an opportunity to work really hard along with a real and utterly spiritual sense of mission. This work demands and deserves nothing less than everything that we have to give.

I will miss the Senate. Some days I don't want to leave, but it is time, which brings me to some profoundly important notes of gratitude.

To my colleagues, I say thank you.

I have mentioned some. I could mention so many. You are dedicated, you are brilliant, and you are public servants. I love you for putting up with what you have to, particularly the way elections are these days. I respect you for it so much. Thank you for fighting alongside me. Thank you for challenging me.

To my staff, a Senator is really nothing without his staff or her staff, and there is not a more committed, talented, and deeply passionate staff in the United States Senate. To my staff, you live and you breathe your work everyday. You inspire me with your endless capacity for redressing injustice and fighting for people who need you and come to you in need. You never turned a single West Virginian away. I glory in my gratitude to you.

To my family, who has sacrificed so much, I thank you. I have been selfish in my devotion to my work, and I have been vastly inept in balancing family and work. Public service is not encouraging of balance.

Sharon, you are everything—an extraordinary mother, a remarkable businesswoman, and you are a public servant. You have been a visionary in public broadcasting. Our entire Nation is indebted to your efforts to educate and inform us. The impact you continue to make on public life is truly remarkable. Any achievement I am proud of I share with you eternally.

(Applause, Senators rising)

Our children—John, Valerie, Charles, and Justin—have all been very thoughtful and endlessly supportive in my absences. Our grandchildren bring me so much joy, and I really hope to see a lot more of them.

To West Virginia, thank you for placing your faith in me—I know it was hard at first—and giving me the greatest reward: the chance to fight for

meaningful and lasting opportunity for those who were too often forgotten but absolutely deserve the best.

My fellow West Virginians, I am forever inspired by you, and I am forever transformed by you.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. There will be many remarks at the end of the year from Senators regarding JAY ROCKEFELLER, but at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

"ZERO DARK THIRTY" IG REPORTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about "Zero Dark Thirty"—not the movie but a report on the movie. The report was supposed to tell us how the movie's producers obtained top-secret information from the Federal Government, but the report never took us there.

The Department of Defense inspector general stumbled and fell and lost sight of the goal and the need for independence. People were exposed to harm, the taxpayers' money got wasted, and alleged misconduct by top officials was shielded by a policy that may have been abused. Bureaucratic bungling caused confusion, turmoil, and dissent. For certain, the whole thing was a fiasco.

The "Zero Dark Thirty" report was driven by the hemorrhage of leaks of highly classified information by senior administration officials after the Osama bin Laden raid. It was requested by the chairman of the House oversight committee, Congressman PETER KING—a very good Congressman, very good on oversight.

He read a column in the New York Times which indicated that Hollywood filmmakers "received top-level access to the most classified mission in history." Congressman KING was concerned that those disclosures could undermine our ability to successfully conduct covert operations in the future, so in August 2011 Congressman KING asked the inspectors general of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense to answer five simple questions. My focus during these remarks will be on the Department of Defense IG's investigation.

I became involved, as you might expect, after whistleblowers contacted my office in December 2012 alleging that Acting and Deputy Inspector General Lynne Halbrooks was sitting on

Congressman KING's report. They alleged that she—Ms. Halbrooks—was suppressing the report to, No. 1, protect her boss, Secretary of Defense Panetta, and other senior officials from disciplinary action or prosecution, and No. 2, to further her candidacy to be the next inspector general.

Her nomination was vetted while the investigation was in progress. The convergence of those potential conflicts of interest grabbed my attention. They needed scrutiny. The independence of the Office of Inspector General could have been jeopardized. So my staff started digging. They interviewed key witnesses and examined documents provided by whistleblowers and official sources. Here is what we have found:

On December 16, 2011, the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General announced that its investigation would begin immediately and that it was to be coordinated with the CIA inspector general. It would be conducted by the Office of Intelligence and Special Program Assessments headed by a Mr. James Ives. That investigation took a year.

A draft report was submitted for classification review on October 24, 2012. The allegations were substantiated. No. 1, senior officials, including Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, his chief of staff Jeremy Bash, and Under Secretary of Intelligence Michael Vickers, allegedly made unauthorized disclosures of highly classified information on that raid. No. 2, these alleged disclosures may have placed special operations personnel and their families in harm's way.

One month later the draft report containing those allegations was declared unclassified. A coordination package was then developed. It included a publicly releasable version, talking points for reporters, and transmittal memos to the Defense Secretary and Chairman KING.

This package was circulated internally for review and clearance. The next and final step was submission to Deputy IG Halbrooks as a request for release. Now, by normal standards, the report was ready for issue. However, there was a major foul-up—a real show stopper. The review process was bungled from start to finish.

All references to unauthorized disclosures of highly classified information by senior officials had to be stripped from the report before it could be published. This draconian measure, which gutted the report and made it unfit for publication, was mandated by a longstanding department policy. This long standing department policy was known only to the two leaders of the investigation, Deputies Halbrooks and Ives. It was their responsibility to execute it at the front end of the review.

I want to make one point crystal clear. I don't support the policy of censoring reports. It is a bad policy that

needs to be changed. My beef, though, is if that is the policy, then it should have been followed, but it wasn't followed until the last possible moment.

To make matters far worse, both Ives and Halbrooks failed to communicate the policy mandate to those who needed the information to ready the report for publication. Halbrooks and Ives kept the investigative team in the dark—like a bunch of mushrooms. So they had the mistaken notion the uncensored report was final and ready to go. This caused a great deal of turmoil.

Two factors set the stage for the bungled review process. First, the official assigned to lead the project, Mr. Ives, lacked relevant professional experience, and top management failed to actively supervise his day-to-day progress on the report to ensure that he followed established protocols. He needed guidance navigating his way through an unfamiliar process but received no guidance. Plus, his appointment was limited to 4 months on a project that took 2 years.

This was a recipe for disaster.

Second, the problem was compounded by a failure to coordinate with the CIA inspector general before the investigation got rolling. Effective coordination was essential. Congressman KING's request crossed jurisdictional lines between two powerful agencies, the CIA and the Department of Defense.

The CIA's inspector general was ultimately responsible for the alleged misconduct because it occurred while Panetta and his Chief of Staff, Jeremy Bash, were CIA employees. The fact that they had moved to the Pentagon after the investigation started was irrelevant.

This was a no-brainer, but for inexplicable reasons the Department of Defense IG tackled the Panetta-Bash allegations. This was an irresponsible and wasteful action. It took over a year of groping down blind alleys for the reality to finally sink in. By then it was way too late.

The failure of the two agencies to coordinate effectively right up front had disastrous consequence. Just as the report was reaching critical mass in late 2012, the Panetta case had to be referred back to the CIA IG for investigation. Panetta's alleged misconduct was the heart and soul of the report.

It was suddenly gone, leaving the report hollow and empty. How could all this senseless blundering happen unless it was part of a plan to slow-roll or even torpedo the report. The blundering was coupled with unexplained delays.

Between mid-December and early January, Deputy Ives finally completed the mandated substantial review, which gutted the report. However, it did not regain forward motion until after Secretary Panetta retired February 27, 2013.

Halbrooks claims she did not receive or see a draft until March 25, 2013.

Aside from a few minor edits, there is no record of significant edits between Mr. Ives' review and publication of the report. The 3-month delay in reaching her desk and subsequent delays until June remain unexplained and unaccounted for.

These facts create the perception that the review process was slowed by Halbrooks and others at her direction to shield Department of Defense officials from scrutiny. She claims her nomination was dead at that point and no longer a potential conflict, but she offers no evidence to back it up.

Moreover, this timeline fits with other relevant information. According to a whistleblower, she stated repeatedly that the report would not be issued until Panetta stepped down—and that is exactly what happened.

Finally, the bungled review process may have triggered whistleblowing. Whistleblowers thought the report was about to be issued in late 2012 when media talking points were circulated. When that didn't happen, they perceived a coverup. They contacted my office and then they leaked the report to the Project on Government Oversight, which is normally referred to around this town as POGO.

The uncensored version of the report appeared on POGO's Web site on June 4, 2013. Ten days later, the IG's office reacted by finally issuing a censored version of the report. If POGO had not acted, the report might never have seen the light of day. It might have been pigeonholed for good.

Immediately after the initial report was issued, Halbrooks launched a hunt for the mole. She wanted to know who leaked the reports to POGO. Extensive interviews were conducted and 33,269 emails were examined, but the leaker was not found.

However, during questioning, Mr. Dan Meyer, the DOD OIG Director of Whistleblowing and Transparency, admitted to giving a copy of the report to Congress. He was one of the many OIG employees who mistakenly believed the uncensored version of the report circulated in late 2012 for final review and clearance was, indeed, final.

He thought it was ready to go out the door. As the Director of Whistleblowing and Transparency, maybe he just thought he was doing his job and being—as every government official ought to be—very transparent because the public's business ought to be public. Around this town, however, that is not always the case.

Mr. Meyer's admission triggered swift and decisive action. He was accused of making false statements, placing his security clearance in jeopardy. This action had the potential of destroying his career. Now, fortunately—and this doesn't happen very often around this town—the new inspector general at the Department of Defense, Jon Rymer, intervened in Mr. Meyer's behalf and blocked those efforts.

The case against Mr. Meyer was very flimsy, though his clearance is still hanging fire. In the end, Mr. Meyer bore the brunt of blame for the POGO leak. The principal targets of the investigation—Panetta, Vickers, and Bash—skated. Mr. Meyer exposed their alleged misconduct, and yet he got hammered. Justice was turned upside down.

What happened during the 22 months between Chairman KING's request and June 2013, when the report was finally issued, is a tangled bureaucratic mess. Despite exhaustive questioning, a satisfactory explanation hasn't been given. What I have presented today is just a brief summary of the facts and analysis laid out in greater detail in a staff report that I released today.

In that report my staff identified potential red flags pertaining to the way the Office of the Inspector General handled the "Zero Dark Thirty" report. These were boiled down to nine conclusions that fell into four broad categories: No. 1, impairment of IG independence and lack of commitment to the spirit and intent of the IG act; No. 2, weak leadership; No. 3, mismanagement; and No. 4, waste of time and taxpayers' money.

The staff findings suggest that some corrective action may be justified, including an appropriate measure of accountability. If misconduct and/or mismanagement occurred, then Deputies Lynne Halbrooks and James Ives, both of whom led the "Zero Dark Thirty" project, would appear to be chiefly responsible for whatever happened.

It is also recommended that the longstanding department policy—which earlier I told you I disagreed with—of censoring sensitive information from reports not be applied to cases involving alleged misconduct by top officials because agency heads and their senior deputies should be held to a higher standard. They should be subjected to greater public scrutiny. This policy needs review and possible modification.

When all is said and done, the proof is, of course, in the pudding, as they say. What good came from this effort? Its true value is reflected in the end product, the highly sanitized report that was finally issued June 14, 2013, 6 months after it was finished. I believe that it is a second-class piece of work that is not worth the paper that it is written on.

Even Halbrooks seems to agree that the report's face value is close to zero. This is what she said during an interview with my staff. She said that once Ives removed all the derogatory information on Panetta and Vickers, the report was no longer interesting or important to me—meaning her—and it just dropped off my radar screen—and words to that effect. She was talking about the report issued June 14, 2013.

Halbrooks is correct about the value of the report, but she is dead wrong

about her responsibility as IG for the unfinished report. At that point, she appears to have lost sight of her core mission as the inspector general.

The report was about alleged misconduct by her boss, the Secretary of Defense. It was requested by the chairman of the House oversight committee, Mr. KING.

She had a solemn duty to put it back on her radar screen and keep it there—front and center—until it was fixed. Once it was ready and up to standard, she should have presented it proudly and enthusiastically to the Congress and the Secretary of Defense—and done it properly and in restricted format, if necessary.

This project was an unmitigated disaster spawned by a series of top-level missteps and blunders. All the wasted energy and blundering produced nothing better than internal confusion, turmoil, dissent, and more alleged misconduct.

Two years's worth of hard work and money was more or less poured down a rat hole. To make matters far worse, a valued employee was threatened with termination. This person has unique and unparalleled knowledge of whistleblowing and a rock-solid commitment to fair treatment of whistleblowers.

Were it not for Inspector General Rymer, he would be out on the street this very day. Halbrooks' search for the mole was misguided.

The inspector general's office needs strong leadership that has the courage to tell it like it is and to report wrongdoing promptly to agency heads and even Congress with recommendations for corrective action. When the Secretary and the Under Secretary stand accused of misconduct, as in this case, the IG should double down and ensure public accountability. Thus far in this matter there has been none because truth was hidden behind a questionable policy that may have been abused.

There is an excellent case in point from just a few years back. Deputy Secretary of Defense and CIA Director John Deutsch allegedly mishandled highly classified information and got hammered for doing so. He lost his security clearance for 6 years and came very close to prosecution. Unlike this case—the "Zero Dark Thirty" leaks—the John Deutsch matter was dealt with effectively and it was aired publicly.

The "Zero Dark Thirty" model was wasteful of the taxpayers' money, it was harmful to morale, and harmful to the perceived independence of the IG's office. It should be used as an educational tool to teach Office of Inspector General employees in any department of government how not to conduct investigations of alleged misconduct by senior officials.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

THE EXTENDERS BILL

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I would like to amplify the remarks made recently by my colleague from Utah Senator HATCH, our distinguished ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, concerning the year-end tax legislation—what is called the tax extenders bill.

Senator HATCH was entirely correct, it seems to me, when he said that getting this legislation through the Senate had been an ordeal, an unnecessary ordeal not only for the Senate but more particularly for every person in business back home in my State of Kansas and also throughout the country—Utah, Kansas, wherever in the United States. I am talking about farmers, ranchers, small business owners, manufacturers and all of their employees; in other words, the backbone of our economy.

It is a real shame that the longer term extenders deal developed by the chairmen of the tax committees and the leaders in the House and Senate—yes, you heard me right, both chairmen in the House and Senate and both leaders—have agreed that basically this deal that was reached before the Thanksgiving holiday has collapsed.

The deal included a number of very critical items, including a permanent simplification of the research credit that would help businesses plan and invest in job-creating innovation. The package also included a number of provisions for which I had worked very hard, including special depreciation and expensing rules that are very important to agriculture and small business.

The plan also included bipartisan legislation I developed with Senator SCHUMER to modify the research and development tax credit so it could be more easily used by smaller businesses, where the bulk of technological innovation occurs.

The plan also included long-term extension of legislation I have pushed to make sure smaller businesses are able to access the capital they need to grow and hire new employees.

These provisions are not giveaways. They free up capital and cash that can be invested and recycled into economic growth. That is a good thing. We should have done that. These provisions do not fit within the class warfare debate—actually, it is not a debate but rather a diversionary tactic that actually took place, that shouldn't have even been mentioned. A veto should never have even been forthcoming from the White House.

I have heard the complaint the proposal was too business focused. Since business today is mired in a swamp of regulation and guessing games and unpredictability, the focus of a so-called tax-extendors bill should have darn well been focused on business. Not every person in America works for our growing government.

The deal would have also helped individual taxpayers, from teachers taking a deduction for school supplies they purchase with their own money to help for homeowners who have defaulted on a mortgage or faced financial hardship, to deductions for college tuition and expenses. These provisions would keep more money in the pocket of taxpayers, a better place for it.

The package represented months of good-faith work by the tax committees and leadership in both Houses of Congress, something unique that we have not experienced around here for quite a while. Obviously, the deal wasn't perfect by any stretch, but it would have been a great downpayment for true tax reform. Most of all, it would have brought certainty and clarity to tax policy, something we sorely need and which is long overdue.

Let me give an example of what I mean. Earlier this week I visited with farmers in Kansas at the annual Kansas Farm Bureau meeting—about 1,000 farmers attended. One farmer, who shared his views so pretty much everybody around him could hear, told me he had recently purchased new farm equipment—combines and tractors so his family could step up work on their land, expand their operation, and he was upset. Actually, he was not upset, he was mad because, according to him, “we’ve been messing around in Washington too much with the extenders bill.” He was mad because if the equipment expensing rules aren't extended, he is out many thousands of dollars. That is just a portion of what has been spent. But that is money he would have used to buy more equipment or more land—the productive use of capital—and not some trivial amount used for a vacation or something else.

It is not just this farmer. My phone has been ringing off the hook all month with calls from farmers, ranchers, equipment dealers, and other businesses that need to know whether this will get extended, and they, too, are upset—make that mad. They are frustrated, and they need us to get to work to help them run their businesses and their lives.

Yes, even with the recent blowup, we will extend these tax provisions but only for 1 year—a month—and then we will be back at it again next year, and these folks will be in the same position, the same kind of purgatory, wondering whether we will ever come to our senses, wondering whether to buy that new tractor or buy the new production line or to hire new employees.

Every day when I visit with business owners and taxpayers in Kansas I hear over and over one simple refrain: Senator, we need certainty in the Tax Code. We need to be able to rely on a stable tax system so we can plan and grow our business. Senator Pat, the Congress needs to do something about these tax extenders.

I couldn't agree more, and I think most of us, if not all of us on the Senate Finance Committee, couldn't agree more. The lack of certainty about these tax provisions is bad for American families. It is bad for business looking to create jobs, and it is bad for our economy. It leaves businesses unable to plan ahead and invest because they are left in the dark about what tax provisions will affect their operations.

So what happened to the deal? Why are we at this point debating another kick of the can down the road? The imperial Presidency has happened. The President has decided that instituting an Executive amnesty was the best course of action before the end of the year.

President Obama's immigration grenade doomed the tax extenders deal. Real negotiations unraveled, a veto threat was issued, and the bipartisan compromises were killed. Because of President Obama's my-way-or-the-highway approach to leadership and to amnesty, Congress is now forced to once again cobble together a 1-year tax policy patch that basically nobody wants. This hurts families, job creators, farmers, ranchers, teachers—everyone who needs to plan ahead to succeed.

So instead of working with Congress to develop an immigration reform compromise, we have the most arrogant attack on the Constitution I have ever seen. Once again the President placed partisan politics above the needs of the middle class—our workers and business owners, our students, our teachers, and indeed our entire economy.

Without this unprecedented illegal Executive order, we would right now be discussing a long-term extension of these vital tax provisions. We could maybe even have voted on it as of this year—as of this week—laying a strong base for comprehensive tax reform. Instead, the President has sacrificed job-producing tax policy for the expedience of Executive action.

As I have said elsewhere, the President has seemingly no interest in a constructive working relationship with Congress. He didn't have any intention of listening to the will of the American people, and he has no respect for the constitutional boundaries of his office. This is beyond troubling, but its spillover into other areas, such as tax policy, does not bode well for the bipartisan development of policy to build the economy we so desperately need and that we were so close to achieving.

But let us be hopeful. Maybe something good will come out of this whole situation. Maybe we will recognize the level of dysfunction illustrated by the Executive order, and I hope it will point us back to regular order. It is critically important that we return to regular order in the Senate, in particular with all of the major fiscal issues we face.

Bringing the extenders package to the Finance Committee was a strong sign that we mean business and that we are ready to move on a bipartisan basis to address the fiscal issues that are facing the country. Sadly, that effort was sabotaged. Without that action, we would be moving toward a more sensible, bipartisan, progrowth extenders bill and perhaps well on our way to tax reform. That we are not is a shame. It didn't have to be this way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

TRIBUTE TO FARGO MAYOR DENNIS WALAKER

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I have a couple of things I wish to do before I assume the Chair, and I want to express my great gratitude to my friend from Massachusetts for his willingness to sit tight for a little bit.

I was sitting here thinking about the two men I want to talk about, and I was thinking about how similar they are; how different their backgrounds are but how similar their goals in life and their interests in the people they serve. It is the great irony of our democracy that regardless of where you come from, if you come to serve the public, you come to love the public, and you come to believe in the work you do and believe that every person has to be given an opportunity.

So I first want to offer my great condolences to the family of Mayor Denny Walaker from our great city of Fargo, ND. It is truly with a heavy heart I come to the floor to pay tribute to the mayor of Fargo.

Dennis Walaker—to those of us who knew him well, Denny—passed away Tuesday after a very short but aggressive fight in his battle against cancer. His passing I think shocked most of us and certainly saddened all of us.

Mayor Walaker was a giant in Fargo, not only in stature—he was a big guy—but as a leader and fighter for the city he loved. He dedicated his entire life to public service, first serving in the North Dakota Department of Transportation, later joining the city of Fargo as a civil engineer.

For 40 years, Denny has been a fixture in this growing city, from leading the city's flood fight in 1997 as chief operations manager for the city and later as mayor. One cannot think of Fargo without thinking of Mayor Walaker and seeing in every corner the impact he made, whether it was infrastructure investment improvements to providing a strong foundation for a thriving community and city, to the revitalization of the city's downtown, to his focus on those within the city who are less fortunate.

He led the city through unprecedented growth while always working diligently to make sure the region secured the long-term flood protection that was necessary to sustain that growth. He was always willing to listen

and cared deeply for all the people of the city of Fargo. The people of Fargo always came first for him, no matter what.

For many of us, Denny will always be remembered for leading the city's flood-fighting effort, particularly in 1997 and 2009 when the city of Fargo confronted a historic flood. He had keen instincts when it came to understanding and predicting the Red River and wasn't afraid to push back on the so-called experts. His calm, clear, and decisive decisionmaking in 2009 when he made the decision that the city would not evacuate when facing record-setting flood levels but would instead stay and fight together—that image of him building our city and building our community will forever be etched in the memories and the minds of those of us who knew Denny.

However, for all of the discussion about the flood fight, there is so much more Denny did in addition to his role as chief flood-fighter, but much of it was under the radar. It was away from the spotlight.

Just a few weeks ago I was with the mayor in one of his last public appearances. It was an event where we were honored for the work we had both done on affordable housing. At that event he remarked to me and the others who were there how proud he was to receive that award and how proud he was about the work he had done on affordable housing because, he told all of us, he wanted to make sure that Fargo was a city for every citizen, that every citizen in Fargo had an opportunity for a good home. He was passionate in fighting for those less fortunate, and his heart and his personality really were unmatched.

People like Mayor Walaker are the unsung heroes of our democracy. He stepped up to serve when his city needed him, and he was a friend and hero to so many.

A few weeks ago I was in Fargo for the College Game Day. Denny couldn't make it because he was recuperating from surgery at his home. I had a chance to talk to him on the phone, and I was explaining the scene for him in downtown Fargo—the part of Fargo he had revitalized and nurtured back to an incredible, healthy center of activity for that great city. I was telling him how proud he would be to see not only the citizens there enjoying themselves but also the work that had been done by the city workforce and the fact that Fargo was able to move that game day effort on such short notice. I think it really is indicative of the history of Fargo, and that history was part of the history Denny built.

He will always have a place in my heart. He will always have a place in the hearts of so many in Fargo and the surrounding areas and throughout the State of North Dakota.

I love Denny. I am pretty sure he was the only public official in North Da-

kota who had a picture of Barack Obama on his wall. He had met the President. He believed in a lot of what the President had said—obviously not on everything, but he believed in public service, and he believed in the challenges and respecting people who stepped up.

We mourn Denny's loss, but we celebrate his life as an incredible example of a leader. He was one of a kind. I offer my sincerest condolences to his wife Mary, his daughters, grandchildren, and his entire family. I also extend my sincerest condolences on the loss of a great mayor, a great public servant, and a great friend to a great city, the city of Fargo.

TRIBUTE TO JAY ROCKEFELLER

Mr. President, I have only known JAY for a couple of years. When I first started, I would go home to North Dakota and people would ask me kind of consistently: So whom do you meet? To whom do you listen? What has been a big surprise? Who are your favorite people?

This may come as a surprise because I didn't come with the idea that I would have an opportunity to work with or spend time with Senator ROCKEFELLER, but I said: The one person who impressed me the most when I first got here was Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER.

For so many of us, he is a giant—not only physically.

They would say: What about him?

One of my finest moments was watching Senator ROCKEFELLER stand and visit with BARBARA MIKULSKI. I am pretty sure she might be the shortest person in the Senate, and I am pretty sure JAY might be the tallest.

I would say: What you don't know about Senator ROCKEFELLER is that not only in intellectual stature but in physical stature he is a giant of a man.

But it is not the intellectual stature of Senator ROCKEFELLER that impressed me. It certainly wasn't his size that impressed me. It was the size of his heart and how much he cared for the people he served in West Virginia.

I had a chance this year to travel to West Virginia and spend time with the folks of his great State. As they were looking at this transition, they would tell me stories about Senator ROCKEFELLER. They would tell me stories about what he meant to them and the things he had gone out of his way to do—things that were beyond maybe even what the expectations of a populous would ever be, but JAY was there for them, and they knew that every day when he woke up, in his heart were the people of West Virginia. I think we heard that today with his floor speech, as he talked about the impact of coming to West Virginia as a young VISTA worker, the impact it had on him that changed his life and created the man we see today.

So I celebrate a Senator with an enormous intellect and an enormous

capacity for facts and data and public policy, but that wasn't what made him a great Senator. What made JAY ROCKEFELLER a great Senator was his enormous heart for the people he served.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

ENHANCED TAX INCENTIVE FOR CONSERVATION
EASEMENT DONATIONS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I begin by echoing the wonderful analysis of my colleague Senator HEITKAMP relative to how much we are all going to miss Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER. As she pointed out, he reminded us today why we all are here, and that is to try to make a difference for our constituents and for the people we serve. No one did that better than JAY ROCKEFELLER. He was always a voice for those most in need and never stopped fighting for the people he served. We will certainly miss him.

I come to the floor this afternoon to talk about a provision that I think we need to make sure is included as we continue to negotiate and debate the tax extenders package, a common-sense, bipartisan, bicameral provision that enjoys a lot of support and one that I think should be included in any reform or extension effort; that is, the enhanced tax incentive for conservation easement donations.

Conservation easements are a critical component of modern-day efforts to preserve our outdoor treasures. That is something which means a lot to us in New Hampshire, where we have so many wonderful natural resources and historic resources, and we want to try to preserve them.

One of the things that conservation easements do is provide a flexible, voluntary, nongovernmental, and non-regulatory approach to protecting our Nation's natural places. Conservation easements and tax incentives for their donations allow landowners to exchange development rights in order to protect a property's conservation values. That then allows them to pass on those conservation values to future generations. Easements keep the land in its natural state and ensure that these outdoor treasures aren't subdivided and exploited. Just as important, lands placed in conservation easements can continue to be farmed, grazed, hunted, or used for outdoor recreation and wildlife conservation. Equally important, they remain on the tax rolls, which makes a huge difference to local communities.

In 2006 Congress recognized the importance of promoting conservation easements by enacting the enhanced tax incentive for conservation easement donations. That was done with bipartisan, bicameral support because it is an idea that makes sense.

This tax incentive provided working and middle-class landowners with the

ability to donate their land for conservation as opposed to simply selling off the land to the highest bidder, allowing it to be developed and partitioned off. The great thing about this incentive is that it worked. It is directly responsible for the conservation of more than 2 million acres of our Nation's natural outdoor heritage.

Unfortunately, as with so many provisions in the tax extenders bill, this tax incentive lapsed at the end of 2013. As a result, landowners who want to donate their land for conservation but need this enhanced deduction to make it work financially are left in limbo.

Making this incentive permanent will provide much needed certainty to landowners because the decision of whether to donate conservation easements on land—and land is often a family's most valuable asset—requires careful planning and consideration, and it often takes years from the initial conversations with the landowner before conservation easement is executed. Understandably, many landowners will never begin this process without the assurance of a permanent incentive.

In New Hampshire we have seen firsthand how valuable the enhanced conservation easement tax credit is when it comes to making sure we are protecting our special outdoor places for generations to come. For example, take Henry Brooks, Jr., and his sister Linda Brown. They donated two conservation easements on about 200 acres of land in Sullivan, NH, which is down in the western part of our State in what we call the Monadnock Region, not too far from the Vermont border. The land had been in their family since the time of the town's founding—over 200 years. It is open fields with expansive views all the way to Vermont. The fields are pasture and hay lands that are used for Henry's beef cattle. The forests, streams, and wetlands also provide excellent wildlife habitat.

The enhanced conservation easement tax incentive was very persuasive in the decision to move forward and finish the project by the end of 2013. In particular, the ability to take that deduction over the course of 16 years is going to make a significant difference for Henry, who is really of modest means. As his sister Linda said, the enhanced incentive is a win-win situation.

Another example that I think is significant is the Squam Lakes watershed. The Squam watershed is renowned for its conservation ethos, and it is the only watershed that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Organizations, such as the Squam Lake Conservation Society, have used conservation easements to protect 25 percent of the watershed, and, thanks to tax deductions, 91 percent of these easements were donated. Think about that—25 percent of the watershed and 91 percent of it has been donated.

Projects like these in New Hampshire are great examples of the need to renew the enhanced conservation easement deduction. Protecting these spaces isn't just good for the environment. Certainly that is the case, but it is also critical to New Hampshire's economy, and I know that is true in other States as well. Our economy depends on tourism, on outdoor recreation. We have thousands of jobs that are created in those industries that bring millions of dollars into our State, and if we can preserve our landscape and protect our national resources, it makes a huge difference in ensuring that those industries are successful, that tourists want to continue to come and visit.

Right now we have families who are making decisions about what they are going to do about conservation easements, and they are in limbo because Congress has not yet acted on this issue. We haven't determined if we are going to pass that forward. So people don't know whether they are going to have any certainty about taking a tax deduction on a conservation easement. It is time for us to provide some certainty to encourage people to make those contributions to protect these national treasures. It is important not only in New Hampshire, I am sure it is important in North Dakota and across this country.

I urge my colleagues, as we are continuing to look at a tax extenders bill, that we support this legislation that will make smart incentives to help our local economies grow stronger and help the middle class.

Thank you very much. I hope we can make some progress on this next week. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SUMMER MERSINGER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise to recognize the end of an era in my office in Washington, DC, because at the end of the year, Summer Mersinger will be leaving my office. She has been in my office for 15 years. She comes from a small town in Central South Dakota called Onida. The town is about an hour and a half away from where I grew up. Our towns are similar in size with similar backgrounds when it comes to the area in which we were raised and growing up in Onida, SD. Obviously she had a lot of the same experiences I did growing up in a small town. She took those experiences and has used them now for the past 15 years in my office.

Before she got to my office she went to the University of Minnesota and got

her degree there in 1999, came to Washington, DC, worked as an intern, and then shortly after that became a full-time employee in my House office at the time. For the past 15 years, through thick and thin, through the ups and downs, the good days and the bad days, Summer has been the rock in our office. She has been the glue that holds things together. I have described her as the center of gravity. I have described her as a mama bear, lots of different things, but people in our office know she is the go-to person. If you want to get something done in our office, you go through Summer.

So when it comes time for her to move on to a different opportunity, obviously, it is a time that we want to recognize and pay tribute to her great service in our office. Usually around here—I think most people know this—it is the Members themselves, the Senators whose names are in the press releases, whose names get to be on the door, but it is the staff who really gets things done in the Senate, and I have been very blessed and fortunate to have people such as Summer Mersinger work in our office. I think of all the people who work in the Senate and the hard jobs they have trying to balance the hours we have to put in, the sacrifices that come with that, the time away from family, always being on call on weekends, always having to put out fires, whatever that might be—well, that is the role Summer has served in our office for a very long time.

Not only is she very skilled at what she does, but she brings so many other attributes to the job. Summer is somebody who has a powerful work ethic. She is somebody who has over the years expressed a calming demeanor in our office, as somebody who always is able to deal with people, all personalities, and somebody who most importantly has absolute integrity. Her wise counsel is something from which I have benefitted enormously over the years. One of the great attributes is she is intensely loyal when I don't deserve it. She has been somebody who has been an ally and I couldn't have a better ally than she.

So as she departs to do something else and moves on with her life, we want to wish her well. I had the opportunity to see a lot of transition and a lot of change in her life over the years from the time she started working for me, particularly when we got to the Senate. She not only worked full time but earned a law degree at the same time. She met a great guy here in Washington, got married, and has four children. At the same time she continued to work full time and handle all the difficult responsibilities that come with working and leading and running a Senate office. There aren't many people who could pull that off, and she has tirelessly dedicated herself to public service, to serving the people of South

Dakota, to serving the Senate and serving in our office. There will be a very big void indeed when she leaves.

We are grateful for that outstanding service and the time we had to work with her. I thank her for her outstanding work for the people of South Dakota and for the Senate and for our office, but more importantly for her friendship and her always wise counsel.

We will miss her, but we know that whatever she does, she will be out there making a difference because that is the kind of person she is. So we say farewell to her at the end of the year and wish her and her family well and look forward to seeing her around the neighborhood and maybe even someday back in the small town of Onida, SD.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE NOMINEE

Mr. COATS. Madam President, it is widely anticipated that the President intends to nominate Dr. Ashton Carter to be the next Secretary of Defense, perhaps as early as tomorrow, and I welcome that nomination. Should Dr. Carter take over the helm at the Defense Department, it would coincide with an ominous development on a national security issue that he and I have dealt with together in the past, and that issue is the growing danger that Iran will soon be able to develop nuclear weapons and the inability of prolonged negotiations with Iran to prevent them from doing so.

In 2008 Ash Carter and I participated in coauthoring a report by the Bipartisan Policy Center entitled "Meeting the Challenge: U.S. Policy Toward Iranian Nuclear Development." In that report we acknowledged that Iran's nuclear program would pose "the most significant strategic threat to the United States during the next administration." That group, which was co-chaired by former Senator Chuck Robb and myself, included many with long and well-respected credentials on foreign policy matters.

That report also emphasized what was at stake and what the consequences would be if Iran was allowed to achieve nuclear weapons capability. I want to quote from what we said and concluded.

A nuclear-ready or nuclear-armed Islamic Republic ruled by the clerical regime could threaten the Persian Gulf region and its vast energy resources, spark nuclear proliferation throughout the Middle East, inject additional volatility into global energy markets, embolden extremists in the region and destabilize states such as Saudi Arabia and others in the region, provide nuclear technology to other radical regimes and terrorists . . . and seek to make good on its threats to eradicate Israel.

That is why this threat has been labeled by most in the intelligence community, if not all, as the most significant long-term threat to the United States. This was written in 2008. Now, 6

years later into this current administration, we can see the truth of those judgments. Unfortunately, what we have also seen is that this administration has not dealt effectively with this growing threat.

In our Bipartisan Policy Center report Ash Carter and I called for direct negotiations with Iran, but on the condition that these negotiations were backed by strong economic sanctions and the threat of military force as a last resort if all other efforts failed to achieve the stated goal of preventing Iran from attaining the capability of producing nuclear weapons. We did not come to this conclusion easily. We debated it for months. We debated each phase of the potential negotiation with Iran through diplomacy, through the imposition of sanctions, through the potential threat of military force, and ultimately the need to use military force if we could not achieve the desired objective. We obviously made that the last resort, and only if all other efforts failed. As I said, it was written in 2008.

Most relevant at this moment was our insistence—and I quote from the report again—"that any U.S.-Iranian talks will not be open-ended, but will be limited to a predetermined time period so that Tehran does not try to 'run out the clock.'"

Our deepest concern with the failure to move forward with an ever-ratcheting and tightening combination of diplomacy, sanctions, and threat of force was that Iran would run out the clock, and in the meantime, continue to spin the centrifuges and add to those methods which were producing the ability for them to obtain nuclear weapons capability.

Now, more than 6 years later, after prolonged negotiations and yet another extension of talks without achieving the stated goal of ending the regime's quest, it is time to reassess where we currently stand.

President Obama is not only ignoring the clear and present danger of Iranian ambitions, he is abetting those ambitions by surrendering key positions first and then pursuing negotiations that confirm our weakness. For 8 years U.S. policy, backed by six United Nations Security Council resolutions, insisted that Iran abandon its program to enrich uranium because of the mortal danger that it would arm itself with nuclear weapons. That policy was discarded virtually at the start of the negotiations with Iran—a year and a half or so ago—indeed, before the negotiations began.

Although the subjects of uranium enrichment, weapons programs, inspections, and nuclear power are highly complex and the discussions have been lengthy, they all lead now to a very simple question: How much ability will Iran have to enrich uranium and how many centrifuges will it be permitted to operate in reaching its goal?

When the U.N. Security Council passed its first resolution demanding that Iran cease enriching uranium, Iran had 800 centrifuges doing that illegal work. Today, after 2 years of direct negotiations on this specific issue, Iran has 19,000 centrifuges. I will repeat that: After 2 years of direct negotiations, Iran has moved from 800 centrifuges to 19,000 centrifuges. Any negotiated agreement that gives Iran the ability to retain so much uranium capability is completely unacceptable, and the Senate should prevent such failure from being ratified or otherwise accepted by this Congress.

When it comes to negotiation strategy, we should learn from past failures. This is not the first time we have been through something like this. An instructional example comes from our experience with North Korea.

When I first served in the Senate, we were dealing with this very subject. Starting with the so-called "Agreed Framework" in 1994, we tried to resolve the North Korean nuclear problem by cycles of negotiations salted with incentives. Does that sound familiar?

At various times we have relieved international economic sanctions pressure in return for promises of improved behavior from the North Koreans. As we pursued inconsistent and diffident strategies, the North Koreans responded with bouts of hostility, cynical manipulation, and threats.

They have repeatedly tested missiles with nuclear capability, revealed a vast new uranium enrichment facility previously undetected by the International Atomic Energy Association and our own services, tested nuclear weapons, intimidated and threatened their neighbors, and continued to build their nuclear weapons arsenal.

I distinctly remember being on this floor and questioning our ability to verify that the Koreans would live up to what they promised to do, and that was to not develop nuclear weapon capability.

Oh, we have this all wired in. We have their promise. We have provided aid to them in the nature of food and in the nature of a number of financial incentives, and we have the verification procedures in place.

We know that none of that worked. We know we were rope-a-doped by the North Koreans, just as we are being rope-a-doped by the Iranians. We have a precedent on which we ought to be basing our decisions in terms of how we go forward.

Maintaining the status quo is not the way to diffuse a critical threat to our national security. This is a view, by the way, that Ash Carter has expressed emphatically and one of the major reasons why I will so strongly urge for his confirmation to be Secretary of Defense.

To the contrary, Secretary Kerry, who energetically leads the current ne-

gotiation strategy with Iran, should surely have learned from the fallacies of the North Korea agreed framework example, which was that strategy's predecessor.

When Senator Kerry and I were both in the Senate, he strongly supported the North Korea strategy and was harshly critical of the Bush administration for not doing the same.

In March 2001, then-Senator Kerry said:

The Clinton administration left a framework on the table which could, if pursued aggressively by the Bush administration, go a long way toward reducing the threat posed by North Korean missiles and missile exports . . . two days ago Secretary of State Colin Powell stated that the Bush administration would "pick up" where the Clinton administration left off.

Secretary Kerry went on to say:

Apparently not. Yesterday, President Bush told . . . President Kim . . . that the administration would not resume missile talks with North Korea any time soon. I believe this was a serious mistake in judgment.

Now, after the clear and massive failure of negotiations with North Korea, Secretary Kerry is pursuing a Groundhog Day strategy for dealing with Iran. We now know for certain that North Korea was simply using negotiations to lead us down that garden path to cynical noncompliance. So why do Secretary Kerry and President Obama continue to believe blindly in hopeful talks rather than hard-edged compulsion?

This unguided blindness leads us to a second problem: The administration has ignored not only the United Nations Security Council, but the U.S. Congress as well. The administration has been clear about its intention to circumvent congressional scrutiny and agreement of any deal because of widespread bipartisan opposition. I believe that is a serious mistake.

Any settlement of issues regarding Iran's nuclear program is of paramount importance to the security of the American people, not to mention the security and stability of the world. Any proposed agreement requires thorough review and deliberation by this Congress. An agreement on an issue of such vast significance requires a bipartisan, bicameral consensus and mutual support and agreement by both the executive and legislative branches of government. Anything less than that should not be acceptable.

This is the most significant national security issue of our age, and it is being mishandled apparently to secure a legacy for the administration. Thus, it is all the more important to assert a vigorous congressional role before we are burdened with a bad agreement that does little to prevent a nuclear Iran.

These negotiations with Iran began by yielding on the central issue. They now continue, while ignoring the proper, essential role of Congress, and it ap-

pears they are aimed at achieving a legacy for the Obama administration rather than enhancing national security.

Most serious and dangerous of all is the strategic vacuum in which these Iran negotiations are taking place. Their failure will force us to face that void, and when we do, we must then return to the world that existed before these misguided negotiations began.

We will have to renew and reinforce our efforts to impose crippling sanctions on Iran. We will have to redouble our efforts to bring our allies and friends along with us, preventing the carefully constructed international sanctions regimes from slipping. And now we must find ways to limit the damage being done by an irresponsible Russia, already signing deals with Iran worth billions of dollars.

Unfortunately, and most challenging of all, we must find a way to make the threat of using military force as a last resort credible, but that will not be easy. Our Nation is militarily, politically, economically, and emotionally exhausted by wars, and now we have been forced to embark on yet another.

Americans are justifiably repulsed by and fixated on the more immediate chaos of televised beheadings. A more abstract future threat of a nuclear Iran is beyond the horizon of most Americans, and the ayatollahs are counting on that. It is one of the many ways that the conflicts in Iraq and Syria are connected to our Iranian dilemma.

Coping with all of that at once is what leadership is all about. Four American Presidents, including our current President, have declared that a nuclear-weapons-capable Iran is unacceptable. I will repeat that: Four American Presidents, including this current President, have declared that a nuclear-weapons-capable Iran is unacceptable.

To give meaning to that repeated commitment and to do whatever is necessary to prevent Iran from getting that dangerous capability is the most urgent matter facing the United States and international security. A robust uranium-enrichment industry in Iran means a capability to produce nuclear weapons within an unacceptably brief amount of time.

The consequences of a nuclear-weapons-capable Iran are not tolerable, not acceptable, and must motivate the most powerful and effective efforts possible to prevent it from happening. That is our challenge. That is the role of the Senate. So we must insist on playing a significant role in the examination of whatever is being done and whatever might be put before us so we can examine it carefully and not repeat the mistakes of the past as we have with the North Koreans.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening Senator INHOFE and I announced that we had reached an agreement with the chairman and the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee on a new national defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2015. The text of the bill and report were published on the Web site of the House Rules Committee that evening, and on Wednesday morning we put out a press release detailing the provisions of the bill.

The bill passed the House earlier this afternoon by a vote of 300 to 119, and we expect to take it up in the Senate next week.

Our bill includes hundreds of important provisions to authorize the activities of the Department of Defense and provide for the well-being of our men in uniform and their families. The bill will enable the military services to continue paying special pays and bonuses which are needed for recruitment and retention of key personnel. It provides continued impact aid to support military families and local school districts. It strengthens survivor benefits for disabled children of servicemembers. It includes provisions addressing the employment of military spouses, job placement for veterans, and military child custody disputes. It addresses military hazing, military suicides, post-traumatic stress disorder, and mental health problems in the military. And it includes 20 provisions to continue to build on the progress we are starting to make in addressing the scourge of sexual assault in the military.

The bill provides continued funding and authorities for ongoing operations in Afghanistan and for our forces conducting operations against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, so-called ISIS. As requested by the administration, it authorizes the Department of Defense to train and equip vetted members of the moderate Syrian opposition and to train and equip national and local forces who are actively fighting ISIS in Iraq. It establishes a counterterrorism partnership fund to provide the administration new flexibility in addressing emerging terrorist threats around the world.

In addition, the bill extends the Afghanistan Special Immigrant Visa Program, providing for 4,000 new visas, and addresses a legal glitch that precluded members of the ruling parties in Kurdistan from receiving visas under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Our bill takes steps to respond to Russian aggression in Ukraine by authorizing \$1 billion for a European re-assurance initiative to enhance the U.S. military presence in Europe and build partner capacity to respond to security threats of which no less than \$75 million would be committed for activities and assistance to support Ukraine, by requiring a review of the U.S. and NATO force posture, readiness, and contingency plans in Europe, and by expressing support for both lethal and nonlethal military assistance to Ukraine.

The bill adds hundreds of millions of dollars in funding to improve the readiness of our Armed Forces across all branches—Active, Guard, and Reserve—to help blunt some of the negative effects of sequestration. It includes provisions addressing the threat of cyber warfare, providing woman-owned small businesses the same sole-source contracting authority that is already available to other categories of small businesses, expanding the No Contracting With the Enemy Act to all government agencies, and requiring governmentwide reform of information technology acquisition. And although we were unable to bring the Senate-reported bill—a bill that was reported by our committee—to the floor for amendment, we established an informal clearing process, pursuant to which we were able to clear 44 Senate amendments—roughly an equal number on each side of the aisle—and to include them in our new bill.

When the bill comes to the floor, I will have a lot more to say about some of the more difficult issues in the bill, such as provisions addressing military compensation reform, Army force structure, and Guantanamo detainees, as well as the so-called lands package that we included in our bill based on a bipartisan, bicameral request of the committees of jurisdiction.

I hope our colleagues will take the opportunity to review our bill. It is obviously a long bill. There are going to be enough days, we believe, to review the bill so our colleagues can have a fair opportunity to see what is in our bill. We are proud of the bill. We think it is a good bill. It would be the 42nd or 43rd straight year we will have passed a military authorization bill, a Defense authorization bill, if we are able to pass the bill next week.

I hope our colleagues will take the opportunity over the next few days to review the bill and hopefully give it the kind of broad support it deserves and that it received today in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business and Senators be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH IN CUSTODY REPORTING ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have long worked to pass legislation to bring additional transparency and accountability to the government. I do so again today by calling on all Senators to support the Death in Custody Reporting Act, a bill that has moved multiple times through the Senate Judiciary Committee and should pass the Senate without further delay.

This is about an open and fair government. The Death in Custody Reporting Act requires that local and Federal law enforcement officials report deaths that occur while people are held in their custody, including those that occur during arrest. Nothing more. Just yesterday the Wall Street Journal reported that hundreds of police-related deaths are unaccounted for in Federal statistics. I ask that the article, "Hundreds of Police Killings Are Uncounted in Federal Stats," be made part of the RECORD. The details of the article are unacceptable. The Justice Department should have an opportunity to analyze the data and see what we can learn from it. And the American people deserve the same.

This important opportunity for needed transparency comes at a time when many Americans are losing faith in our justice system. We are having an important conversation about the loss of human life in communities across the country. Here we have an opportunity to instill some measure of accountability, and hopefully begin to restore some measure of trust in these communities.

This legislation, sponsored by Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, overwhelmingly passed the House last year in a bipartisan vote. We reported the bill out of the Senate Judiciary Committee in a similarly strong bipartisan vote, with Ranking Member GRASSLEY speaking in strong support of the legislation. Currently, every single Senate Democrat is in support of its passage, but a handful of Senate Republicans are not yet convinced. It is my hope that they soon reconsider, and we can send this legislation to the President for signature without delay. The American people would expect as much.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 3, 2014]

HUNDREDS OF POLICE KILLINGS ARE UNCOUNTED IN FEDERAL STATS

FBI DATA DIFFERS FROM LOCAL COUNTS ON JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES

(By Rob Barry and Coulter Jones)

WASHINGTON—When 24-year-old Albert Jermaine Payton wielded a knife in front of the police in this city's southeast corner, officers opened fire and killed him.

Yet according to national statistics intended to track police killings, Mr. Payton's death in August 2012 never happened. It is one of hundreds of homicides by law-enforcement agencies between 2007 and 2012 that aren't included in records kept by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A Wall Street Journal analysis of the latest data from 105 of the country's largest police agencies found more than 550 police killings during those years were missing from the national tally or, in a few dozen cases, not attributed to the agency involved. The result: It is nearly impossible to determine how many people are killed by the police each year.

Public demands for transparency on such killings have increased since the August shooting death of 18-year-old Michael Brown by police in Ferguson, Mo. The Ferguson Police Department has reported to the FBI one justifiable homicide by police between 1976 and 2012.

Law-enforcement experts long have lamented the lack of information about killings by police. "When cops are killed, there is a very careful account and there's a national database," said Jeffrey Fagan, a law professor at Columbia University. "Why not the other side of the ledger?"

Police can use data about killings to improve tactics, particularly when dealing with people who are mentally ill, said Paco Balderrama, a spokesman for the Oklahoma City Police Department. "It's great to recognize that, because 30 years ago we used to not do that. We used to just show up and handle the situation."

Three sources of information about deaths caused by police—the FBI numbers, figures from the Centers for Disease Control and data at the Bureau of Justice Statistics—differ from one another widely in any given year or state, according to a 2012 report by David Klingler, a criminologist with the University of Missouri-St. Louis and a onetime police officer.

To analyze the accuracy of the FBI data, the Journal requested internal records on killings by officers from the nation's 110 largest police departments. One-hundred-five of them provided figures.

Those internal figures show at least 1,800 police killings in those 105 departments between 2007 and 2012, about 45% more than the FBI's tally for justifiable homicides in those departments' jurisdictions, which was 1,242, according to the Journal's analysis. Nearly all police killings are deemed by the departments or other authorities to be justifiable.

The full national scope of the underreporting can't be quantified. In the period analyzed by the Journal, 753 police entities reported about 2,400 killings by police. The large majority of the nation's roughly 18,000 law-enforcement agencies didn't report any. "Does the FBI know every agency in the U.S. that could report but has chosen not to? The answer is no," said Alexia Cooper, a statistician with the Bureau of Justice Statistics who studies the FBI's data. "What we know is that some places have chosen not to report these, for whatever reason."

FBI spokesman Stephen G. Fischer said the agency uses "established statistical methodologies and norms" when reviewing data submitted by agencies. FBI staffers check the information, then ask agencies "to correct or verify questionable data," he said.

The reports to the FBI are part of its uniform crime reporting program. Local law-enforcement agencies aren't required to participate. Some localities turn over crime statistics, but not detailed records describing each homicide, which is the only way particular kinds of killings, including those by police, are tracked by the FBI. The records, which are supposed to document every homicide, are sent from local police agencies to state reporting bodies, which forward the data to the FBI.

The Journal's analysis identified several holes in the FBI data.

Justifiable police homicides from 35 of the 105 large agencies contacted by the Journal didn't appear in the FBI records at all. Some agencies said they didn't view justifiable homicides by law-enforcement officers as events that should be reported. The Fairfax County Police Department in Virginia, for example, said it didn't consider such cases to be an "actual offense," and thus doesn't report them to the FBI.

For 28 of the remaining 70 agencies, the FBI was missing records of police killings in at least one year. Two departments said their officers didn't kill anyone during the period analyzed by the Journal.

About a dozen agencies said their police-homicides tallies didn't match the FBI's because of a quirk in the reporting requirements: Incidents are supposed to be reported by the jurisdiction where the event occurred, even if the officer involved was from elsewhere. For example, the California Highway Patrol said there were 16 instances in which one of its officers killed someone in a city or other local jurisdiction responsible for reporting the death to the FBI. In some instances reviewed by the Journal, an agency believed its officers' justifiable homicides had been reported by other departments, but they hadn't.

Also missing from the FBI data are killings involving federal officers.

Police in Washington, D.C., didn't report to the FBI details about any homicides for an entire decade beginning with 1998—the year the Washington Post found the city had one of the highest rates of officer-involved killings in the country. In 2011, the agency reported five killings by police. In 2012, the year Mr. Payton was killed, there are again no records on homicides from the agency.

D.C. Metropolitan Police Chief Cathy Lanier said she doesn't know why the agency stopped reporting the numbers in 1998. "I wasn't the chief and had no role in decision making" back then, said Ms. Lanier, who was a captain at the time. When she took over in 2007, she said, reporting the statistics "was a nightmare and a very tedious process."

Ms. Lanier said her agency resumed its reports in 2009. In 2012, the agency turned over the detailed homicide records, she said, but the data had an error in it and was rejected by the FBI. She referred questions about why the department stopped reporting homicides in 1998 to former Chief Charles H. Ramsey, now head of the Philadelphia Police Department. Mr. Ramsey declined to comment.

In recent years, police departments have tried to rely more on statistics to develop better tactics. "You want to get the data right," said Mike McCabe, the undersheriff

of the Oakland County Sheriff's Office in Michigan. It is "really important in terms of how you deploy your resources."

A total of 100 agencies provided the Journal with numbers of people killed by police each year from 2007 through 2012; five more provided statistics for some years. Several, including the police departments in New York City, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Austin, Texas, post detailed use-of-force reports online.

Five of the 110 agencies the Journal contacted, including the Michigan State Police, didn't provide internal figures. A spokeswoman for the Michigan State Police said the agency had records of police shootings, but "not in tally form."

Big increases in the numbers of officer-involved killings can be a red flag about problems inside a police department, said Mike White, a criminologist at Arizona State University. "Sometimes that can be tied to poor leadership and problems with accountability," he said.

The FBI has almost no records of police shootings from departments in three of the most populous states in the country—Florida, New York and Illinois.

In Florida, available reports from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement don't conform to FBI requirements and haven't been included in the national tally since 1996. A spokeswoman for the state agency said in an email that Florida was "unable" to meet the FBI's reporting requirements because its tracking software was outdated.

New York revamped its reporting system in 2002 and 2006, but isn't able to track information about justifiable police homicides, said a spokeswoman for the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. She said the agency was "looking to modify our technology so we can reflect these numbers."

In 1987, a commission created by then-Governor Mario Cuomo to investigate abuse of force by police found that New York's reports to the FBI were "inadequate and incomplete," and urged reforms to "hold government accountable for the use of force." The spokeswoman for the state criminal-justice agency said it isn't clear what the agency did in response back then.

Illinois only began reporting crime statistics to the FBI in 2010 and hasn't phased in the detailed homicide reports. "We cannot begin adding additional pieces because we are newcomers to the federal program," said Tern Hickman, director of the Illinois State Police's crime-reporting program. Two agencies in Illinois deliver data to the FBI: Chicago and Rockford.

In Washington, D.C., councilman Tommy Wells held two hearings this fall on police oversight. He said he was surprised that the department hadn't reported details of police killings to the FBI. "That should not be a challenge," he said.

More than two years after the knife-carrying Mr. Payton was shot and killed by D.C. police, his mother, who witnessed the killing, said she is still looking for answers. Helena Payton, 59, said her son had many interactions with local police because of what she said was his mental illness. "All the cops in the Seventh District knew him, just about," she said.

The officers who arrived that Friday afternoon in August, in response to a call from Mr. Payton's girlfriend, had never dealt with her son, she said. According to Ms. Payton, her son walked outside holding a small utility knife. As he approached the officers, they fired dozens of bullets at him, she said. He died soon after.

The U.S. attorney's office is reviewing the incident, as is customary in all police shootings in Washington. A spokesman for the office declined to comment on the status of the case. The Washington police department, citing the continuing investigation, declined to provide the officers' names, a narrative of what happened, or basic information usually included in the reports to the FBI, such as the number of officers involved in the shooting.

The officers involved are back on duty, according to D.C. authorities, but the case isn't closed.

FOIA IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Freedom of Information Act is one of our Nation's most important laws. James Madison said the people "must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives." For nearly 50 years, FOIA has given Americans a way to access government information ensuring their right to know what their government is doing. The FOIA Improvement Act advances this fundamental democratic principle. It is why I urge all Senators to support the FOIA Improvement Act of 2014, without delay.

This legislation builds on what the President laid out in his historic Executive Order in 2009 by requiring Federal agencies to adopt a "Presumption of Openness" when considering the release of government information under FOIA. Prioritizing the people's interest in what their government is doing, our bill will reduce the overuse of exemptions to withhold information where there is no foreseeable harm. It will make information available for public inspection and frequently requested documents available online. It will provide the Office of Government Information Services, OGIS, with additional independence and authority to carry out its work. I believe this legislation reaffirms the fundamental premise of FOIA, that government information belongs to all Americans.

Supporting these commonsense reforms will help open the government to the 300 million Americans it serves. The bill is supported by more than 70 public interest groups that advocate for government transparency. The Sunshine in Government Initiative, said the Leahy-Cornyn bill "strengthens government transparency by limiting the ability of agencies to hide decades old documents from the public." At the Judiciary Committee's business meeting to consider this legislation, which was reported to the full Senate with unanimous support, Ranking Member GRASSLEY said the FOIA Improvement Act "opens wide the curtains and provides more sunlight on the Federal government." Senator CORNYN, my partner for many years on government transparency, noted our bipartisan efforts "to open up the government and make it more consumer and customer friendly." I thank both Senators for their work on this legislation.

We often talk about the need for government transparency, and many also note how rare it is that Democrats and Republicans can come together on any legislation. We have accomplished both with the FOIA Improvement Act. It was drafted in a bipartisan fashion after a long and thoughtful process of consultation. This week, we can pass this bill in the Senate and send it over to the House, where I am confident that it will pass, and send it to the President to sign before the end of the year. There is no reason to delay this legislation, which has broad support from a range of stakeholders, costs very little to implement and will improve access to government for all Americans. I urge the Senate to pass the FOIA Improvement Act now, without delay.

TRIBUTES TO JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Scripture tells us that to those whom much is given, much is required. My friend, Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER, can rest well knowing that he has passed that biblical test.

JOHN DAVISON ROCKEFELLER, IV, is the eldest son of the eldest son of the eldest son of the founder of Standard Oil—America's first billionaire. Senator ROCKEFELLER grew up amid wealth in Manhattan and Westchester County, NY. He prepped at Exeter and graduated from Harvard. He was destined for a life of comfort and privilege far removed from the struggle of the poor. But this man, this ROCKEFELLER, consciously chose a different path in life. And he has spent 50 years—two-thirds of his life—working to try to make life better for people who too often have precious little.

He has been a Member of this Senate for 30 years. You can see his legacy throughout West Virginia and across America. You can see it in children who have better schools, miners who have safer working conditions and seniors who have retired with greater dignity. You can see his legacy in the 8 million American children who receive health care through CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, which JAY ROCKEFELLER authored.

You can see his formidable legacy in the additional millions of Americans who—because of the Affordable Care Act—now have reliable health insurance, many of them for the first time in their lives. No one—no one—in this Senate has worked longer than he for affordable health care for all Americans.

Unlike some Senators, JAY ROCKEFELLER did not grow up dreaming of being a Senator. As a young man at Harvard, he had planned a career in diplomacy, focusing on Asia. He even took time off from college to live for a while in Japan. But something momen-

tous happened when he graduated from college in 1961. America had just elected a hopeful, young President who made Americans believe, as Senator ROCKEFELLER would later say, "that America could achieve anything."

Senator ROCKEFELLER called his father and his Uncle Nelson, then the Governor of New York, to let them know he had switched from Rockefeller Republican to Kennedy Democrat. The family took the news surprisingly well.

Soon after, Senator ROCKEFELLER was asked by Robert Kennedy to help establish the Peace Corps; he worked for 2 years as a chief assistant to Sargent Shriver, the first Peace Corps director.

In 1964 a friend told him that he did not need to travel halfway around the world to help people in need. There were people here in America, in his friend's home State of West Virginia, living on the outskirts of hope. So JAY ROCKEFELLER asked Bobby Kennedy to send him to West Virginia as a volunteer for VISTA, the precursor to Americorps.

He planned to spend a year in West Virginia. He has never left.

At age 27, in the tiny Appalachian coal-mining town of Emmons, WV—population 346—JAY ROCKEFELLER discovered his defining purpose. He saw that people working together and a caring government could transform lives and communities for the better.

In 1966, he was elected to West Virginia's House of Delegates.

In 1968 he was running for West Virginia secretary of state when his last great hero, Bobby Kennedy, was murdered. His Uncle Nelson, Governor of New York, offered repeatedly to appoint his nephew to fill out Senator Kennedy's term in the U.S. Senate—but JAY ROCKEFELLER refused. He told his uncle that if he were going to serve in this Senate, he wanted to earn his seat.

He won that race for secretary of state and went on to serve two terms as West Virginia's Governor.

In 30 years in the U.S. Senate, Senator ROCKEFELLER has been a passionate advocate for his State, for America's children, for seniors, coal miners and others. He not only earned his seat in this body, he distinguished it with his thoughtful, compassionate, dedicated service.

Five years ago, during a late-night Senate Finance Committee markup of the bill that would become the Affordable Care Act, Senator ROCKEFELLER recalled some of the people from that little mining town of Emmons, WV, who he met 50 years ago. It was close to midnight on a Friday night. His voice broke with emotion as he spoke about the hardships and unfairness that pervaded the lives of many of the people in Emmons. He also spoke about the hope that good government programs, like Medicare and Medicaid, had brought to their lives.

He said that he had kept a journal during his VISTA years in Emmons and written detailed notes in it each night. He said that, in 43 years, he had never been able to bring himself to open that book. It was too painful to look back.

When Senator ROCKEFELLER looks back on his years in the Senate, I hope that he will feel a deserved sense of pride in the great and positive changes he helped make possible during his time here. I wish him, his wonderful and accomplished wife Sharon—the daughter of former Illinois Senator Charles Percy—and their family all the best in their future endeavors.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in his three decades in the Senate, JAY ROCKEFELLER established a strong reputation as a leader who offered innovative, common-sense solutions. He has served the people of West Virginia and of America with distinction. To me, he has been an admired colleague. He will always be a good friend.

To fully understand Senator ROCKEFELLER's dedication during his 30 years of service in the Senate, it is necessary to go back 50 years, to 1964, when he travelled to West Virginia as a VISTA volunteer. Like Maine, West Virginia is a large rural state with many low-income residents and an aging population. From strengthening our rural hospitals to fighting the scourge of prescription drug abuse, I have been fortunate to work with a leader who sees access to affordable, quality health care not as just a series of issues to address but as his life's work.

One of our greatest achievements together was the inclusion of our language in the 2003 tax bill to provide temporary, targeted fiscal relief to the States—which, at the time, were awash in red ink due to a severe economic downturn driven in large part by the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001. Senator ROCKEFELLER and I worked with then-Senator Ben Nelson on legislation to provide \$20 billion in short-term fiscal relief to States, half of which was used to provide health insurance to low-income citizens through the Medicaid program. In Senator ROCKEFELLER's words, "No government program more fully embodies our nation's tradition of community and mutual obligation than Medicaid," and he has consistently demonstrated national leadership to provide essential health care services to the most vulnerable among us.

As co-chair of the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, I have greatly appreciated Senator ROCKEFELLER's leadership on legislative initiatives to combat Alzheimer's, as well as the contributions the Blanchette Rockefeller Neurosciences Institute makes to our understanding and eventual conquest of this devastating illness.

From VISTA volunteer to governor and senator, Senator ROCKEFELLER has

devoted a half-century of intellect, energy, and compassion to others. There is no better way to sum up his contributions than the words the Senator himself chose when he announced his retirement: "Public service demands and very much deserves nothing less than every single thing that you have to bring to bear." That is precisely what Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER has given his State and our country, and I thank him for his commitment, integrity, and friendship.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, It is one of the Senate's great traditions that each retiring Senator is given some time on the floor to share with us what they have learned during their service in the Senate and their thoughts about our future as a Nation as the chapter of this great adventure in their life comes to a close. Then, we, their colleagues, take a moment to share with them what we have learned from them from their service in the Senate and what lessons we will take with us in the days and months to come from our work together here in the Capitol.

That is why I greatly appreciate having the opportunity to be here for JAY's final speech on the Senate floor. It is one of those moments that I will long remember, another moment in which JAY has not only been a witness to our Nation's history, but in this case, it's another time when he has written it with his well-chosen words.

This moment is one of those I call an instant replay memory. It means so much to me because I have known JAY ROCKEFELLER for a longer time than I have known any other member of the Senate. In fact, when we first met, serving in Washington, DC, here in the Senate, was the furthest thing from our minds.

When I first had the chance to get to know JAY he was the governor of West Virginia and I was the mayor of Gillette. Coal was a great part of the day-to-day life of my hometown and his home State and together we were serving on the Energy Council. I remember when JAY came to Gillette for a visit. I had the chance to give him a tour of the mines of the Gillette area. As we were traveling around the site JAY said to me, "You don't mine coal. You just back up the trains and load them up!" I knew immediately what point he was making about the difference between the mines of Gillette and the mines of West Virginia. While the people of my State were working to keep up coal production by removing the surface coal facing one set of hazards, West Virginia miners were heading deep into the earth to face a different kind of challenge.

Make no mistake, mining is both a difficult and a dangerous occupation for all who have dedicated their lives to working the mines. It is labor intensive and every miner who makes it down the shafts to begin work knows

there is always a chance they might not be coming home again.

It was a lesson we were reminded of in 2006 when the mine tragedies occurred at the Alma and Sago mines in West Virginia. Those were difficult days for his State. JAY's leadership came to the front as we went as a delegation to console the families of those miners from the Sago mines who had lost their lives and listened to their concerns. They shared their great loss with us, but as they did there was another message that seemed to come to us from all those with whom we spoke—"Don't let this happen to another family." It was clear. Something needed to be done to bring mine safety up to more modern standards. After meeting with the families we returned to Washington committed to get something done to honor the memory of those lost miners and make mining a safer occupation. As I thought about the beginnings of a legislative response to this issue, I remembered JAY's remarks to me that day in Gillette as he pointed out the different mining standards and the need for different approaches to mining safety. It was clear that a safety policy for our Nation's mines would have to address every facet of the industry and bring more modern technologies to accident prevention and rescue efforts.

Soon after we returned from West Virginia the entire delegation joined together to begin the work that needed to be done to minimize the danger and increase our ability to respond whenever a problem or hazard threatened the miners. The result was the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response (MINER) Act. It was the first major advance in mining safety that had been legislated in 30 years. That law will always be remembered as a part of JAY's legacy of service to the people of West Virginia. It was a change in our mining communities and businesses that will continue to have an impact in the years to come in our ability to protect the lives of miners all over this Nation. It is also a warning—as use of coal plunges, there is less incentive for safety inventors.

That is just one moment in which JAY made a difference in the present and future of our nation. If you look at JAY's impressive legislative record throughout his career you will note that he has been productive and effective in promoting his legislative agenda no matter which party was in control of the Congress. That is because JAY has always been willing to work with members from both sides of the aisle and all sides of an issue. That is why he has been able to accomplish so very much for West Virginia and the Nation.

As we have heard, JAY has quite a remarkable story to tell. It truly began years ago when a younger—but equally committed—JAY ROCKEFELLER came to

work in a small town in West Virginia as a part of the VISTA program. The plan was for him to work with the people of the area for about a year. As the old adage says so well, "God had other plans." That experience changed his life and his goals for the future. It led him to run for office and then progress in opportunity and service to the people of West Virginia as he worked his way to the United States Senate and this moment on the Senate Floor.

So, that is what I have learned from you, JAY. As I mentioned, there are times when we are sure what we want to do with our lives, but "God has other plans" which often leads to something better for us and the world around us than what we were planning on. If JAY hadn't made that decision back when he first arrived in West Virginia to do whatever he could to make life better for the people of that State it might never have been accomplished quite the way he has been able to do it. I have always suspected that God gives us all a mission in life, a chance to respond to a higher calling and make that inspired moment the beginning of our life's work. JAY ROCKEFELLER did that and that is the lesson I have learned from him.

Thanks for your service in the Senate, JAY, and for all you have done for West Virginia and our Nation. Thanks, too, for your friendship. Fortunately, you will never be more than a phone call away. Keep in touch. Your comments, suggestions and West Virginia common sense ideas will always be welcome. Diana joins in sending our best wishes to you. We will look forward to seeing you in the days and months to come.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today we honor the distinguished career of my dear friend and colleague, Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER of West Virginia.

As a young man, with all his talents—and coming from a prominent family—there were many things JAY ROCKEFELLER could have done with his life.

His choice says more about him than any speech in the Senate ever could: He chose to devote himself to serving others.

So he volunteered for the Peace Corps, and then the AmeriCorps VISTA program, which brought him to the small mining town of Emmons, WV.

That is where he discovered the purpose that would define his career—and his life.

From that day forward, he took a personal stake in the issues that affected West Virginians.

That passion became stronger as he climbed the ranks of government, from Secretary of State, to Governor, and finally to U.S. Senator. Through it all, he remained grounded by a sensibility of what was best for the people he met in Emmons—and throughout the Mountain State.

He met West Virginians who could not afford basic health care—and so Senator ROCKEFELLER became a champion for reform that made health care a right, not a privilege.

He met West Virginians who were hurt in mining accidents, or made ill from the air they breathed, and he fought for reforms that improved their safety.

He has always understood that our Nation is best when we have jobs that make the middle class strong, like manufacturing. The coal, steel and chemical industries in West Virginia have all relied on his support.

He believed that government should fight for those who were least able to fight for themselves.

This compelled him to go to work on behalf of children whose families did not qualify for Medicaid—and yet could not afford private insurance. In 1997, he was a leader in creating the Children's Health Insurance Program, known as CHIP, and ever since, those children would not be allowed to slip through the cracks in our health care system.

Senator ROCKEFELLER's impulse to speak up for those who did not have a voice led him to seek improvements for the care of foster children, working to expand incentives for parents to adopt so that foster children could have a permanent home.

On the other end of the spectrum, he was compelled to fight to keep Medicare strong, so that it had the funding it needed to make good on its promise to our Nation's seniors. He was committed to making sure that all safety net programs stayed true to their founding principles, which is why he has resisted efforts to privatize Social Security and promoted programs that increase seniors' access to affordable prescription drugs.

Even as he tackled the tough issues, Senator ROCKEFELLER's charm and sincerity were key to bridging partisan gaps and building consensus necessary to get bills passed.

Senator ROCKEFELLER leaves the Senate, after a distinguished career. Fortunately for us, his legacy of compassionate and conscientious service will endure long into the future.

I know how hard it is for Senator ROCKEFELLER to leave this Chamber. I hope he knows that it is hard for us to watch him go.

I thank Senator ROCKEFELLER, for his tireless service to this country, and for his faithful service to the people of West Virginia.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, Senator ROCKEFELLER's nearly 50 years of public service has left West Virginia and our country a better place. Whether it is promoting health care, education, economic growth, or veterans, Senator ROCKEFELLER has led the way, acting to improve the lives of hard-working Americans.

When it comes to protecting consumers and children, Senator ROCKE-

FELLER has been a legislative partner and a national leader. I want to especially point out his tireless efforts to increase educational opportunities for children around the country.

The E-Rate has proved essential and exceptional in linking up schools and libraries to the Internet. The E-Rate has democratized access to brighter futures and better technology. The E-Rate is the only technology that has been deployed as fast in poor neighborhoods as it has in rich ones.

Chairman ROCKEFELLER, your legacy will live on for decades to come. Whether in rural areas, or urban ones, affluent, or low-income communities, all corners of our great Nation will continue to feel your impact.

Finally, I want to personally thank you for your friendship throughout my tenure in Congress.

These walls will feel emptier without you next year.

I wish you, your wife Sharon, and the rest of your family many more years of fulfillment in your next endeavors.

INCITEMENT TO VIOLENCE AGAINST ISRAEL MUST BE CHALLENGED

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as we hope for peace in the Middle East, some parties in the region are making peace less likely by inciting violence against Israel. It is imperative to recognize these words and actions for the poisons they are to achieving peace. An excellent November 23, 2014, opinion piece by Jeffrey Robbins in the Boston Herald entitled "U.S. mute as Abbas incites violence" articulates why silence is the wrong response to the anti-Israeli rhetoric and ideology that encourage further violence and terror. Jeff is a former delegate from the United States to the United Nations Human Rights Commission, and I believe my colleagues and the American people would benefit from reading the entire piece, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, Nov. 23, 2014]

ROBBINS: U.S. MUTE AS ABBAS INCITES
VIOLENCE

(By Jeff Robbins)

At a meeting in Jerusalem last December, a State Department official was asked about the unremitting anti-Semitism emanating from Palestinian officials, their continuing celebration of the murderers of Israeli civilians and what the United States was doing about it. It was "a challenge," she said, adding that it was "our position" that Palestinian incitement of violence was "unhelpful" to peace. Beyond this banality, she had nothing to offer.

This week's massacre of worshippers in a Jerusalem synagogue—following the Palestinian murders of Israelis in recent days by stabbing them and by running them over—raises yet again the disquieting question: has

the Obama administration's fecklessness about confronting Palestinian incitement of terror served to enable it?

In the last few weeks alone, the Palestinian Authority has posted cartoons of an Israeli pulling down his pants and preparing to "rape" an Arab woman representing a Muslim holy site. Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas praised the Palestinian shot while attempting to assassinate an Israeli as a "martyr" who was destined for heaven. A new hit song on Palestinian social media calls for listeners to "destroy, annihilate [and] blow up" Israelis. Al-Quds University has created the "Martyr Ibrahim Al-Akhari Tournament" to honor the man who recently murdered two Israelis and injured 13 others by running them over with his car.

Despite the fact that American taxpayers provide \$500 million to the Palestinian Authority annually, the Obama administration has failed to use that leverage to pressure the recipients of American aid to stop its incitement. Though then-U.S. Sen. Hillary Clinton warned back in 2007 of the need to "stop the propaganda to which Palestinian children are being exposed," the administration has declined to demand that the Palestinians cut it out.

It is bad enough that the president has not lifted a finger to pressure the Palestinian Authority to put an end to incitement to murder. Even worse, his administration has conducted itself in a way which, however unintended it may be, has effectively green-lighted anti-Israelism of the most vicious sort—which in turn fuels the kind of violence that has left European Jews fearful for their lives and Israelis reeling.

This has included years of publicly derisive treatment of Israel that has conveyed to Israel's enemies and others that it stands alone, encouraging the conclusion that attacks on Israel—political and physical—have no consequences as far as the United States is concerned.

Earlier this month the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Martin Dempsey, told the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs that Israel deserved credit for having gone to "extraordinary lengths to limit collateral damage and civilian casualties" in trying to defend itself from Hamas rocket attacks from Gaza. Dempsey's praise placed the administration's scornful, damaging criticism of what were obviously unintended deaths of civilians in Gaza during this summer's wholly defensive war in stark relief.

Whether by giving interviews witheringly critical of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu at particularly sensitive moments or by using obscenities to castigate him, the White House has encouraged the impression that Israel is a fair target for those who wish it ill.

The administration's scornful treatment of Israel has registered deeply with Israel's enemies, who have been encouraged to believe that America's ally is being cut loose. And it has registered with particular force in the Middle East, where the intensity of anti-Semitic incitement has grown steadily.

No serious person can claim that the administration wants an upsurge of terror. But it is hard to deny that it bears a share of responsibility for it.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE ELIJAH MOMENT CAMPAIGN

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, we have recently returned from the

Thanksgiving holiday, when Americans from all walks of life come together with family and friends to express gratitude for our good fortune and great blessings. The weekend following Thanksgiving was devoted by many to holiday shopping—a good opportunity to support local businesses but also too often a spectacle of commercialization that threatens to obscure the true meaning of the holiday season.

Today, I would like to honor the work of two Connecticut community leaders for their laudable efforts to remind us of the holiday's true meaning. Rabbi Daniel Cohen of Congregation Agudath Sholom in Stamford and Pastor Greg Doll of Noroton Presbyterian Church in Darien have together launched the Elijah Moment Campaign. Named after a figure in Jewish tradition who appears spontaneously to help those in need, this interfaith campaign seeks to encourage simple acts of kindness between friends and strangers alike. Each recipient of an act of generosity goes on to "pay it forward" by helping someone else. Even seemingly minor gifts like buying a stranger's cup of coffee, as occurred en masse during a campaign-organized kindness event at a Stamford Starbucks last week, can motivate significant acts of charity and promote a prevailing spirit of benevolence.

I am grateful to Rabbi Cohen and Pastor Doll for coming together to remind us, in their words, that "an act of generosity as simple as a kind word can transform a fleeting moment into an eternal one." The simplest acts of giving highlights the strong connections we all share, even as divisive rhetoric at home and violent acts abroad threaten our solidarity and safety. I honor and admire the spirit of the Elijah Moment Campaign, and I encourage all to do the same.●

RECOGNIZING GLEN HURT

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor Glen Hurt, who will retire as the Mansfield city mayor after more than 25 years of public service to the community as a city council member and mayor.

As city mayor, Glen is credited with improving the city's fire and police departments, upgrading Mansfield's waste and sewer systems, bringing a new grocery store to the community and helping build a new city senior center in 2004. Glen's commitment to public service led him to serve on the boards of the Solid Waste District and Area Agency on Aging.

I applaud Glen for his outstanding contributions and achievements as city mayor. We are all grateful for his dedication, leadership, and eagerness to serve honorably during his years of service to the city of Mansfield and the State of Arkansas. My staff and I have enjoyed working with Mayor Hurt on

the projects important to Mansfield. I am truly grateful for his years of honorable service and dedication to community and wish him continued success in his future endeavors and many years of good health to enjoy with his granddaughters.●

TRIBUTE TO AL FELDSTEIN

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize an outstanding public servant of Western Maryland, Al Feldstein, who will be retiring at the end of this year after 42 years of public service. As Appalachian Regional Commission, ARC, State Program Manager for Maryland, Al has played a critical role in the success of countless projects and initiatives aimed at advancing economic progress and improving the lives of the residents of Maryland's three Appalachian counties. His passion for his community is boundless, and his careful stewardship of public resources has consistently set a high standard to which we can—and should—all aspire.

An exemplary leader in public service, Al's positions as grants administrator with Tri-County Council for Western Maryland and ARC State program manager at the Maryland Department of Planning enabled him to realize the importance of investing in Federal, State, private, and local economic development projects. He was committed to creating conditions for economic growth, many of which strengthened parts of the Appalachian region by constructing and improving basic public infrastructure.

Under Al's leadership, several rural counties in Western Maryland have benefited from carefully targeted ARC investments in economic development—including the financing of high-speed telecommunications infrastructure to increase local and regional connectivity and affordability. These accomplishments have leveraged far greater support for workforce development and job creation in a region that continues to battle economic distress, high unemployment rates, and severe educational disparities.

ARC's regional development roles—as advocate, knowledge builder, partner, investor, and catalyst—underlie the commission's strategy to invest in people, basic infrastructures, and job creation and retention. ARC helps create economic opportunities by making its funds available for seed capital, gap funding, and investments in innovative programs. Although the Appalachian region has not fully achieved socioeconomic parity with the rest of the Nation, greater involvement in the region—not only through funding but also public service like Al's—will continue to help Appalachia's communities take advantage of emerging economic opportunities and diversification.

Knowing that accomplishing the four goals of ARC's strategic plan requires

intense collaboration and civic engagement, Al was steadfast in working to achieve these objectives: to increase job opportunities and per capita income, strengthen the capacity of Appalachia's citizens to compete in the global economy, improve the region's infrastructure, and build the Appalachian Development Highway System.

In working to make the region more economically competitive, ARC's model of development, based on community support, creates sustainable, lifelong solutions that likewise stress the value of service at all levels. The hundreds of annual projects funded by ARC, all of which address one or more of the strategic plan's goals, further demonstrate the intrinsic significance of public service and its vital role in planning for a better future.

ARC approves funding for more than 400 projects annually throughout the 13-State region, including both highway projects and access road projects. The projects have invested funding and resources in a range of sectors that directly impact economic development in the Appalachian region, including child development, community infrastructure, transportation, arts and culture, career and technical education.

Maryland's projects have included the formation of Allegany County Connect 2 Compete, created to boost educational achievement and attainment, and increasing health-care access through Allegany County Public Health Accreditation. Another federally funded program in Maryland, HRDC Head Start Facility, provides services to low-income families with small children, promoting school readiness, health, and parent involvement in an educational environment. In Frostburg, a project called Frostburg Grows: Grow it Local Greenhouse involves conversion of unused mined land into an innovative five-acre greenhouse and shade house complex, designed to create additional job opportunities, reduce food insecurity, and provide local and healthy food to the residents of Western Maryland.

As Hillary Clinton once remarked, "Aid chases need; investment chases opportunity." Al internalized this message, focusing on the implementation and improvement of reforms to foster, protect, and fully benefit the lives of Marylanders. This dedication to public service helped define and differentiate the various communities he served, and illustrates the many, varied possibilities of public service—not limited to elected office. Serving on scores of local, State, and national committees only cemented Al's involvement in civic life.

While Al championed community involvement and public service, ARC's structure also ensures an active Federal-State-local partnership rooted in cooperation. One of ARC's guiding principles is to support inclusive local

decisionmaking, and to cultivate a collaborative problem-solving culture in which community achievements are made possible through collective efforts and investments. ARC's development of new strategic plans relies heavily on obtaining citizen input on high-priority regional issues, promoting homegrown solutions. ARC awards program grants to State and local agencies, governmental entities, local governing boards, and nonprofit organizations: targeting the region's specific needs, and executing plans that reinforce the necessity of teamwork and commitment.

Al, too, recognized the fundamental importance of working together to strengthen the capacity of interdependent elements: individual leaders, organizations, and the community as a whole. Working in tandem, broad-based leadership structures and institutions not only spur change but also encourage the establishment of new business and economic opportunities that can strengthen a community while diversifying its base.

Just as ARC's strategy creates a framework for building on past accomplishments to help move Appalachia forward, so, too, did Al bridge his vision of the rich, fruitful past with his present—capitalizing on existing assets and acknowledging the importance of public service in improving communities. I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the contributions Al made to the State of Maryland and to our Nation.●

CONGRATULATING BOB CASHELL

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Mayor Bob Cashell, of Reno, on his retirement. After serving as the mayor of Reno for 12 years, Mayor Cashell presided over his last city council meeting on November 12, 2014. It gives me great pleasure to congratulate him not only as a colleague but also as a friend on his retirement after more than 35 years of hard work and dedication to the Silver State.

A devoted husband and proud father of four, Mayor Cashell stands as a shining example of someone who has dedicated his life to serving his community. Upon graduating from the Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches, TX, with a bachelor's degree in business, Mayor Cashell moved to Reno to work as a truckdriver and salesman for a small refining company in 1961. Several years after moving to Nevada, Mayor Cashell and his colleagues were able to purchase a small casino-restaurant in 1967, which would later become known as Boomtown Casino and Hotel. His impressive business expertise has allowed him to continue on to manage and own several large properties across Nevada and the United States. Serving as the chairman of the board for his business, Cashell

Enterprises, a hotel casino and management company, he quickly became a business leader within the local gaming community. After a long and distinguished career in gaming, Mayor Cashell decided that he also wanted to pursue a new endeavor and give back to his community.

Mayor Cashell's public career began in 1979 when he ran for the University of Nevada System Board of Regents and was subsequently elected chairman by his peers. After his tenure as a respected member of the board, Mayor Cashell was then elected Lieutenant Governor for the State of Nevada in 1982. In his role as Lieutenant Governor, he was instrumental in the founding of the Nevada Commission on Economic Development and the Nevada Commission on Tourism—both of which he served on as chairman. Upon being sworn in as mayor on November 13, 2002, Mayor Cashell worked diligently to ensure the city continues to thrive and to make Reno the renowned place for gaming that it is today. His roles in establishing the Truckee River Whitewater Park, opening the Community Assistance Center for the homeless, helping to extend the Reno Bowler's Convention contract, and founding the YMCA Youth Soccer League are just a few of the accomplishments that exemplify the legacy that Mayor Cashell will leave behind upon his retirement.

His service to the Reno community goes far beyond the many positions he has held in the Silver State over the years. Mayor Cashell also served his country in the U.S. Air Force. I extend my deepest gratitude to Mayor Cashell for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication to his family and community earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. As a member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve America but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home.

I am grateful for his dedication and commitment to the people of Reno and to the State of Nevada. He personifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Mayor Cashell on his retirement, and I offer my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Nevada an even better place. I offer my best wishes to Mayor Cashell and his wife Nancy for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL CHARLES
H. JACOBY, JR.

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in a few short weeks a thoughtful and inspirational military leader will retire after serving his country proudly for 36 years. Today I recognize and commend my good friend GEN Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., of the U.S. Army for his exceptional leadership over those 36 years, most recently in his role as commander of the North American Aerospace Defense Command and United States Northern Command. It has been a tremendous pleasure to work closely with General Jacoby. I know many of my colleagues join me in congratulating him on a job well done and in wishing him well as he begins a well-deserved retirement.

General Jacoby graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1978 and received his commission into the infantry as a second lieutenant. His command experience include Commander, A Company, 2d Battalion, Airborne, 325th Infantry, 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, NC, and Operation URGENT FURY, Grenada; commander, 1st Battalion, 504th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, NC; commander, Joint Task Force-Bravo, United States Southern Command, Honduras and Operation FUERTE APOYO, Strong Support, Hurricane Mitch; commanding general, U.S. Army Alaska and deputy commander, United States Alaskan Command; and commanding general, I Corps, including a combat tour in Iraq serving as the commanding general, Multi-National Corps-Iraq. Prior to his current assignment, he served as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's director, Strategic Plans and Policy (J5) and as senior member, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations Military Staff Committee, the Joint Staff.

It was during General Jacoby's assignments as commanding general, United States Army Alaska, and deputy commander, United States Alaskan Command, that we forged an enduring friendship based on trust and mutual respect. We have worked tough issues over the years, and I have always known him to be a man of his word. He is a great friend of mine and a true friend to Alaska.

General Jacoby has served as the commander of NORAD and USNORTHCOM for the past 3½ years with great distinction. He provided inspired vision, strategic focus and priorities, consistent operational and organizational excellence, and exceptional hands-on leadership not only for the people of his two commands but also in support of the commands' many international, interagency, nongovernmental organization, State, local, and private sector partners. Further, he honed important working relationships between USNORTHCOM and the Na-

tional Guard, especially in implementation and execution of the dual status commander concept.

Perhaps most importantly, he was recognized earlier this year for his efforts to strengthen military ties between the United States and Mexico by General Salvador Cienfuegos Zepeda, Secretary of the National Defense Forces, and Admiral Vidal Francisco Soberon Sanz, Secretary of the Navy. They honored General Jacoby in a formal military ceremony attended by thousands of the Mexican military as the only U.S. military officer ever to receive the Mexican Military Merit 1st Class Award and the Mexican Naval Award, the highest awards possible for a non-Mexican, for his many contributions in support of the Mexican armed forces.

General Jacoby's unique combination of experience, charismatic leadership, and intelligence served him well as the commander during difficult times overseas and at home with some tough decisions about the future of our country. His long and distinguished record of exceptional service to our country serves as the gold standard for general officers, and we wish him and his family all the best. To this battle-hardened infantry paratrooper, we say a fond "keep your feet and knees together" as you jump into the next exciting chapter of your life.●

REMEMBERING SERGEANT FIRST
CLASS RICHARD DEMERS

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to memorialize a New Hampshire son and proud member of the United States Army, SFC Richard Louis Demers. Sergeant Demers was born in Manchester on December 31, 1966 and spent his young life there, graduating from Manchester Memorial High School in 1985. His lengthy career in the Army spanned 22 years, including a tour of duty in Iraq, as well as tours in Germany, Colorado, Texas, Hawaii and most recently Missouri.

Sergeant Demers' choice to dedicate his career to protecting our freedom and security is the essence of American patriotism. It is my hope that during this extremely difficult time, Richard's family and friends will find comfort in knowing that Americans everywhere appreciate deeply his selfless service in defense of our country.

Sergeant Demers is survived by his wife of 28 years, Karen, Gagne, Demers, of Laquey, MO; their two sons, Jonathan Demers and his wife Megan, of Georgia, and Shawn Demers and his wife Nadine, of Washington; five grandchildren; two siblings, Michelle Champagne and her husband Roland, of Allentown, NH, and David Demers and his wife, Marcia, of Florida; and many nieces and nephews. This patriot will be missed by all.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all

Americans to join me in honoring the life and service of this brave American, Richard Demers.●

REMEMBERING SERGEANT FIRST
CLASS MARK GULEZIAN

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, it is with great sadness I rise today to honor the life and service of SFC Mark Gerald Gulezian, a New Hampshire native who died on October 10. Mark was born on December 28, 1978 in Manchester, NH and was raised in nearby Londonderry, where he was a graduate of Londonderry High School. He joined the U.S. Army in 1998, and over the course of his career served two tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, in addition to a tour in Korea. Sergeant Gulezian was most recently stationed at Fort Bragg in North Carolina with the Army's distinguished 3rd Special Forces Group, Airborne.

Mark will forever be a member of the special community of Americans who bravely and selflessly vow to defend our country so that the rest of us may continue to live in peace and freedom. It is my hope that during this extremely difficult time, Mark's family and friends will find comfort in knowing that Americans everywhere deeply appreciate his commitment and service to our nation.

Mark is survived by his parents Jerry and Dotty of Londonderry, NH; his wife, Blair Anastasia Gulezian, of Raeford, NC; children Amira Gulezin and Dylan Gulezian, both of Richmond, VA; a stepson, Christopher, of Pennsylvania; his brother, Steven Gulezian of Londonderry and his girlfriend, Sara Hickey; and niece, Ambree Page "S.J." Gulezian; also his two dogs, Whiskey and Lucie. This patriot will be missed by all.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in honoring the life and service of this brave American, Mark Gulezian.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:31 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 2673. An act to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 2917. An act to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5769. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

The message further announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 669) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life, and an amendment to the title.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 4:14 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 2040. An act to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 43. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the "Richard K. Salick Post Office".

H.R. 669. An act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

H.R. 1391. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the "London Fallen Veterans Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3085. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3375. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

H.R. 3682. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1961 Premier Drive in Mankato, Minnesota, as the "Lyle C. Pearson Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 3957. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 4189. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4443. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building".

H.R. 4919. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as

the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4924. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of certain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 5069. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5106. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the "Philmore Graham Post Office Building".

H.R. 5681. An act to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5769. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2963. A bill to remove a limitation on a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to normal operation of vessels (Rept. No. 113-284).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 919, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-285).

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title and with an amended preamble:

H. Con. Res. 107. A concurrent resolution denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 578. A resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the world's poorest countries have access to vaccines and immunization through Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in

the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 586. A resolution calling on the Government of Burma to develop a non-discriminatory and comprehensive solution that addresses Rakhine State's needs for peace, security, harmony, and development under equitable and just application of the rule of law, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2140. A bill to improve the transition between experimental permits and commercial licenses for commercial reusable launch vehicles.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Jess Lippincott Baily, of Ohio, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Macedonia.

Nominee: Jess L. Baily.

Post: Macedonia

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: \$250, 6/5/07, Barak Obama.
3. Children and Spouses: Noah Baily None.
4. Parents: Oliver L. Baily: \$500, 6/29/12, Josh Mandel; \$200, 3/25/12, Josh Mandel; \$250, 5/18/12, Romney for Pres.; \$1000, 8/15/12, Romney for Pres.; \$1000, 10/12/12, Nat'l Rep. Senate Campaign Com.; \$400, 7/25/08, John McCain 08; \$1000, 10/3/08, McCain-Palin Victory Ohio; \$400, 4/1/08, Nat'l Rep. Congressional Committee.

Joan P. Baily: \$1000, 8/14/12, Romney Victory Inc; \$1000, 8/14/12, Romney for President; \$1000, 10/3/08, McCain-Palin Victory Ohio; \$500, 5/18/08, John McCain 2008.

5. Grandparents: Deceased for more than 10 years.

6. Brothers and Spouses: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Mary Baily Wieler: \$2500, 10/9/12, Romney Victory Inc; \$2500, 10/9/12, Romney for President; \$500, 7/23/12, Romney for President.

Scott A. Wieler: \$2500, 4/6/12, Romney for President.

*Robert Francis Cekuta, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Azerbaijan.

Nominee: Robert Francis Cekuta.

Post: Republic of Azerbaijan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Anne Cekuta: about \$50, 2012, Barack Obama.

3. Children and Spouses: Margaret Cekuta: about \$50, 2012, Barack Obama; Matthew Cekuta: none; Stephen Cekuta: none.

4. Parents: Dorothy Woodard, none; Francis A. Cekuta—deceased.

5. Grandparents: John Francis Moorehead—deceased; Alma Dohm Moorehead—deceased; Louis Cekuta—deceased; Agnes Moorehead—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: David M. Cekuta, about \$100, 2012, Dan Forest; about \$100, 2012, Josh Mandel; about \$400, 2012, Mitt Romney; about \$100, 2012, Scott Walker; about \$100, 2010, Sharon Angle; about \$100, 2010, Carly Fiorina; Gail Cekuta, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Nancee Cekuta, none.

*Margaret Ann Uyehara, of Ohio, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Montenegro.

Nominee: Margaret A. Uyehara.

Post: (proposed)—Montenegro.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Michael M. Uyehara, none.

3. Children and Spouses: Andrew Jameson Uyehara, none; Leilani Keiko Uyehara, none; Ryan Shizuo Uyehara, none; Christopher Mitsuo Uyehara, none; Malia Michiko Uyehara, none.

4. Parents: Peggy L. Yohner (deceased), none; Kenneth E. Yohner (deceased), none.

5. Grandparents: George Chester Bush (deceased), none; Roberta Bush (deceased), none; Frank Yohner (deceased), none; Ethel Yohner (deceased), none.

6. Brothers and Spouses: n/a.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Heidi Mangus (sister), none; Ronald Mangus (brother-in-law), none.

*Richard M. Mills, Jr., of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Armenia.

Nominee: Richard M. Mills, Jr.

Post: Ambassador to Armenia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Leigh G. Carter: none.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Richard M. Mills, none; Joanne Lloyd Mills, none.

5. Grandparents: William Lloyd—deceased (1969); Margaret Lloyd—deceased (1989); Bertha Cazes—deceased (1978); (my grandparents divorced in the 1940s and I have no information on my paternal grandfather).

6. Brothers and Spouses: Randolph Lloyd Mills, none; Sharon Mills (spouse), none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Malise Anne Fletcher, none; Keith Fletcher (divorced 2006), unknown.

*Peter Michael McKinley, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Nominee: Peter Michael McKinley.

Post: Embassy Kabul (current).

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Fatima McKinley: none.

3. Children and Spouses: Peter McKinley, none; Claire McKinley, none; Sarah McKinley, none.

4. Parents: Peter McKinley (father)—my father, who will be 88 this year, remembers giving about \$20 a year to the Republican National Committee and \$20 a year to the Connecticut Republicans. He remembers doing so each of the past four years (back to 2010). He does not keep past records. He did give \$15 to the National Republican Congressional Committee on March 28 2014; Enriqueta McKinley (mother)—deceased 2001.

5. Grandparents: Lindsay and Marjorie McKinley—deceased before 1990; Francisco and Vicenta Liano—deceased before 1960.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Brian McKinley, none; Rocio McKinley (spouse), none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Margaret McKinley, \$25, 2011, Democratic CCC; \$45, 2013, Democratic CCC; Hyde Clark (spouse), none.

*Richard Rahul Verma, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of India.

Nominee: Richard Rahul Verma.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to India.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$1000, March 12, 2012, Mark Critz for Congress; \$500, Sept 21, 2012, Obama for America; \$3000, 2011, Steptoe & Johnson PAC; \$1700, 2012, Steptoe & Johnson PAC.

2. Spouse: Melineh Verma: no contributions.

3. Children and Spouses: Zoe Verma, Dylan Verma, Lucy Verma (all minor children, no spouses)—no contributions.

4. Parents: KD Verma, \$500, March 12, 2012, Mark Critz for Congress; Savitri Verma (deceased), no contributions.

5. Grandparents: deceased in the 1970s, no contributions.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Rajiv and Indu Verma, no contributions.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Amita Verma, \$250, March 12, 2012, Mark Critz for Congress; \$35, October 21, 2012, Obama for America; \$35, November 3, 2012, Obama for America; Bill and Rita Orren, no contributions; Roma Murthy, no contributions; Bala Murthy (spouse of Roma Murthy), \$500, March 12, 2012, Mark Critz for Congress.

Foreign Service nomination of Sharon Lee Cromer.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Michael A. Lally and ending with John E. Simmons, which nominations were re-

ceived by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Andrew J. Billard and ending with Brenda Vanhorn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2014.

Isobel Coleman, of New York, to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U. N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador.

*Isobel Coleman, of New York, as an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform.

*Carol Leslie Hamilton, of California, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sixty-ninth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

*Leon Aron, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term expiring August 13, 2016.

Foreign Service nomination of James D. Lindley.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 2973. A bill to establish a grant program to allow National Laboratories to provide vouchers to small business concerns to improve commercialization of technologies developed at National Laboratories and the technology-driven economic impact of commercialization in the regions in which National Laboratories are located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2974. A bill to provide for a review of, and repeal of, the antitrust exemptions for professional sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2975. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2976. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2977. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the

regulation of patient records and certain decision support software; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 2978. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate at least one city in the United States each year as an American World War II City, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2979. A bill to extend eligibility for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home and domiciliary care for certain veterans who served in a theater of combat operations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BURR):

S. 2980. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify payment under the Medicare program for outpatient department procedures that utilize drugs as supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2981. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from mandating the deployment of vulnerabilities in data security technologies; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2982. A bill to provide for the issuance of a forever stamp to honor the sacrifices of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces who are still prisoner, missing, or unaccounted for, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2983. A bill to allow for a contract for operation of Melville Hall of United States Merchant Marine Academy after gift by United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and Foundation, Inc., for renovation of such hall and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS:

S. 2984. A bill to modify the definition of cotton futures contracts in the United States Cotton Futures Act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2985. A bill to designate a segment of Interstate Route 35 in the State of Minnesota as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 2986. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. Res. 594. A resolution celebrating the centennial year of the birth of Jan Karski and honoring his extraordinary and courageous life; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1463

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1463, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species.

S. 1739

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1739, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 2348

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2348, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 2523

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2523, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW., in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building".

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2609, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 2723

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2723, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who

are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit.

S. 2789

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2789, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 2816

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2816, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the specific exemption for professional football leagues and to provide a special rule for other professional sports leagues, and to provide an additional authorization of appropriations for the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act.

S. 2909

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2909, a bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to end extreme global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote enduring, long-term, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilient, adaptive, local capacity of vulnerable populations, and for other related purposes.

S. 2953

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2953, a bill to prohibit an alien who is a national of a country with a widespread Ebola virus outbreak from obtaining a visa and for other purposes.

S. 2963

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2963, a bill to remove a limitation on a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to normal operation of vessels.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 578, a resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the world's poorest countries have access to vaccines and immunization through Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance.

AMENDMENT NO. 3588

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3588 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. KIRK):

original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2976. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today Senator KLOBUCHAR and I are introducing legislation to clarify that commercial companies that execute swaps to manage their business risk through “centralized treasury units” are entitled to the end-user clearing exemption provided by Congress as part of the Dodd-Frank Act.

The Dodd-Frank Act requires financial entities to clear and trade their derivatives contracts on regulated exchanges. The point of this reform is to cut down on the systemic risk posed by financial speculators who invest in volatile derivatives contracts. It was not intended to restrict the ability of non-financial “end-users” to hedge commercial risks that are part of their normal business operations. For that reason, the Dodd-Frank Act provided end-users with an exemption from the act’s clearing requirements.

Many non-financial end-users use subsidiaries called “centralized treasury units” to manage their derivatives contracts. These centralized treasury units allow corporations to consolidate their hedging expertise in one subsidiary. Unfortunately, because these subsidiaries are not technically “end-users” themselves, the end-user exemption provided by Dodd-Frank does not apply to them, even though they execute derivatives for other end-users within the corporate family, and are considered a best-practice among corporate treasurers.

Our legislation fixes the end-user exemption to clarify that it applies to swaps between a centralized treasury unit and an external counterparty, so long as the swap hedges the risks of a commercial affiliate. The language of our bill is substantially the same as that of H.R. 5471, offered by Representatives MOORE, STIVERS, GIBSON, and FUDGE, that passed the House by voice vote yesterday.

I urge my colleagues to support the common sense clarification proposed in this bipartisan legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 594—CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE BIRTH OF JAN KARSKI AND HONORING HIS EXTRAORDINARY AND COURAGEOUS LIFE

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 594

Whereas Jan Karski was born on April 24, 1914, as Jan Kozielewski, in Lodz, Poland;

Whereas Jan Karski served in the Polish diplomatic service, enlisted in the military, and was serving in the Polish army when German soldiers invaded Poland in 1939;

Whereas Jan Karski was captured by the Red Army when the Soviet Union invaded Poland;

Whereas in 1940, Jan Karski escaped the horrific Katyn Massacre, in which an estimated 22,000 Poles, including 8,000 Polish military officers, were brutally slain by Soviet soldiers;

Whereas Jan Karski escaped to Warsaw and joined the Polish underground resistance movement, where he served as a courier delivering messages to the Polish government-in-exile detailing the horrific brutality of the Nazis in Warsaw;

Whereas Jan Karski risked his life on several occasions, including when he infiltrated the Warsaw ghetto and the Izbica transit camp, and provided some of the first eyewitness accounts of the Holocaust to the Polish government-in-exile, the British government, and the United States Government;

Whereas in July of 1943, Jan Karski traveled to the United States to meet with President Roosevelt to describe the horrors of the Nazi genocide he had witnessed;

Whereas Jan Karski remained dedicated throughout his life to raising global awareness of the atrocities of the Holocaust;

Whereas after World War II, Jan Karski moved to the United States and enrolled in Georgetown University, earning a Ph.D. in 1952 and teaching at the university’s Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service for 35 years until his retirement in 1984;

Whereas Jan Karski became a citizen of the United States in 1954;

Whereas Jan Karski was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2012 for his courageous efforts in uncovering the atrocities of the Holocaust and his commitment to sharing what he witnessed with the world;

Whereas the Parliament of the Republic of Poland has designated 2014 as “The Year of Jan Karski”; and

Whereas on April 1, 2014, to mark Jan Karski’s 100th birthday, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution honoring his bravery and dedication in telling the world of the atrocities that took place in Poland during the Holocaust: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates 2014 as the centennial year of the birth of Jan Karski; and

(2) honors the life and legacy of Jan Karski.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3973. Mr. REID (for Mr. MENENDEZ) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1683, to

provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign recipients, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3973. Mr. REID (for Mr. MENENDEZ) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1683, to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign recipients, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

TITLE I—TRANSFER OF EXCESS UNITED STATES NAVAL VESSELS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2013”.

SEC. 102. TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN RECIPIENTS.

(a) TRANSFERS BY GRANT TO MEXICO.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Mexico the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS CURTS (FFG-38) and USS MCCLUSKY (FFG-41) on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(b) TRANSFER BY SALE TO THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES.—The President is authorized to transfer the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS TAYLOR (FFG-50), USS GARY (FFG-51), USS CARR (FFG-52), and USS ELROD (FFG-55) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (which is the Taiwan instrumentality designated pursuant to section 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3309(a))) on a sale basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761).

(c) ALTERNATIVE TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the authority provided in subsections (a) and (b) and to transfer specific vessels to specific countries, the President is authorized to transfer any vessel named in this title to any country named in this section, subject to the same conditions that would apply for such country under this section, such that the total number of vessels transferred to such country does not exceed the total number of vessels authorized for transfer to such country by this section.

(d) GRANTS NOT COUNTED IN ANNUAL TOTAL OF TRANSFERRED EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—The value of a vessel transferred to another country on a grant basis pursuant to authority provided by subsection (a) shall not be counted against the aggregate value of excess defense articles transferred in any fiscal year under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(e) COSTS OF TRANSFERS.—Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this section shall be charged to the recipient notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)).

(f) REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the President shall require, as a condition of the transfer of a vessel under

this section, that the recipient to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that recipient, performed at a shipyard located in the United States.

(g) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer a vessel under this section shall expire at the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. ENHANCED CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF ARMS SALES, INCLUDING TO THE MIDDLE EAST.

Section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF SHIPMENT OF ARMS.—At least 30 days prior to a shipment of defense articles subject to the requirements of subsection (b) at the joint request of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the President shall provide notification of such pending shipment, in unclassified form, with a classified annex as necessary, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”

SEC. 202. INCREASE IN ANNUAL LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.

Section 516(g)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(g)(1)) is amended by striking “\$425,000,000” and inserting “\$500,000,000”.

SEC. 203. INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS AT TRAINING LOCATIONS IN SOUTHWEST ASIA.

Section 544(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347c(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The President shall report to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 656(e)) annually on the activities undertaken in the programs authorized under this subsection.”

SEC. 204. LICENSING OF CERTAIN COMMERCE-CONTROLLED ITEMS.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) LICENSING OF CERTAIN COMMERCE-CONTROLLED ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A license or other approval from the Department of State granted in accordance with this section may also authorize the export of items subject to the Export Administration Regulations if such items are to be used in or with defense articles controlled on the United States Munitions List.

“(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The following requirements shall apply with respect to a license or other approval to authorize the export of items subject to the Export Administration Regulations under paragraph (1):

“(A) Separate approval from the Department of Commerce shall not be required for such items if such items are approved for export under a Department of State license or other approval.

“(B) Such items subject to the Export Administration Regulations that are exported pursuant to a Department of State license or other approval would remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce with respect to any subsequent transactions.

“(C) The inclusion of the term ‘subject to the EAR’ or any similar term on a Depart-

ment of State license or approval shall not affect the jurisdiction with respect to such items.

“(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘Export Administration Regulations’ means—

“(A) the Export Administration Regulations as maintained and amended under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); or

“(B) any successor regulations.”

SEC. 205. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REMOVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR REMOVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President shall take such actions as may be necessary to require that, at the time of export or reexport of any major defense equipment listed on the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, the major defense equipment will not be subsequently modified so as to transform such major defense equipment into a defense article.

“(B) The President may authorize the transformation of any major defense equipment described in subparagraph (A) into a defense article if the President—

“(i) determines that such transformation is appropriate and in the national interests of the United States; and

“(ii) provides notice of such transformation to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate consistent with the notification requirements of section 36(b)(5)(A) of this Act.

“(C) In this paragraph, the term ‘defense article’ means an item designated by the President pursuant to subsection (a)(1).”

(b) NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT REMOVED FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The President shall ensure that any major defense equipment that is listed on the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, shall continue to be subject to the notification and reporting requirements of the following provisions of law:

“(A) Section 516(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(f)).

“(B) Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2415).

“(C) Section 3(d)(3)(A) of this Act.

“(D) Section 25 of this Act.

“(E) Section 36(b), (c), and (d) of this Act.”

SEC. 206. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF “SECURITY ASSISTANCE” UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.

Section 502B(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2)(C) to read as follows:

“(C) any license in effect with respect to the export to or for the armed forces, police, intelligence, or other internal security forces of a foreign country of—

“(i) defense articles or defense services under section 38 of the Armed Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778); or

“(ii) items listed under the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations;”

SEC. 207. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS OF “DEFENSE ARTICLE” AND “DEFENSE SERVICE” UNDER THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.

Section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3), by striking “includes” and inserting “means, with respect to a sale or transfer by the United States under the authority of this Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “includes” and inserting “means, with respect to a sale or transfer by the United States under the authority of this Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States.”

SEC. 208. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in sections 3(a), 3(d)(1), 3(d)(3)(A), 3(e), 5(c), 6, 21(g), 36(a), 36(b)(1), 36(b)(5)(C), 36(c)(1), 36(f), 38(f)(1), 40(f)(1), 40(g)(2)(B), 101(b), and 102(a)(2), by striking “the Speaker of the House of Representatives and” each place it appears and inserting “the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and”; and

(2) in section 21(i)(1) by inserting after “the Speaker of the House of Representatives” the following “, the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services of the House of Representatives;”

(3) in sections 25(e), 38(f)(2), 38(j)(3), and 38(j)(4)(B), by striking “International Relations” each place it appears and inserting “Foreign Affairs”; and

(4) in sections 27(f) and 62(a), by inserting after “the Speaker of the House of Representatives,” each place it appears the following: “the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;” and

(5) in section 73(e)(2), by striking “the Committee on National Security and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives” and inserting “the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives”.

(b) OTHER TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(A) in section 38—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by redesignating the second subparagraph (B) (as added by section 1255(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Public Law 100-204; 101 Stat. 1431)) as subparagraph (C);

(ii) in subsection (g)(1)(A)—

(I) in clause (xi), by striking “; or” and inserting “, or”; and

(II) in clause (xii)—

(aa) by striking “section” and inserting “sections”; and

(bb) by striking “(18 U.S.C. 175b)” and inserting “(18 U.S.C. 175c)”; and

(iii) in subsection (j)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “in” after “to”; and

(B) in section 47(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “sec. 21(a),” and inserting “section 21(a),”.

(2) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “Wherever applicable, a description” and inserting “Wherever applicable, such report shall include a description”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking “credits” and inserting “credits”.

SEC. 209. APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.

(a) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Section 12(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2411(c)) has been in effect from August 20, 2001, and continues in effect on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and notwithstanding section 20 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2419). Section 12(c)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 is a statute covered by section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—Subsection (a) terminates at the end of the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 4, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 4, 2014, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 4, 2014, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “The FANS Act: Are Sports Blackouts and Antitrust Exemptions Harming Fans, Consumers, and the Games Themselves?” The witness list is not yet available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 4, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SR-418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 4, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Theresa Harrison, a fellow in the office of Senator SCHUMER, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORLD WAR I AMERICAN VETERANS CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2366.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2366) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and any statements related to this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2366) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HONOR FLIGHT ACT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4812 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4812) to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid

upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4812) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ESTABLISHING THE LAW SCHOOL CLINIC CERTIFICATION PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5108 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5108) to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, the Senate has acted to ensure that law school students can gain valuable experience providing legal assistance to inventors before the United States Patent and Trademark Office—USPTO. This legislation is a clear win-win: students will gain tangible, hands-on experience in a vital area of the law, and inventors and small businesses will receive valuable legal assistance with their patent and trademark applications. By promoting innovation and helping creators turn their inventions into reality, the American public benefits from the results.

The USPTO plays a key role in driving the engine of our economy. Close to 600,000 patent applications and 450,000 trademark class applications are filed with the Office each year. I am proud that Vermont routinely ranks among the most innovative States that have the highest patents per capita each year. By serving America's innovators, the USPTO helps Vermonters and citizens across the country build their businesses and bring their inventions to the global marketplace.

Three years ago, Congress came together to pass the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act of 2011, the greatest transformation to our patent system in over 60 years. We worked for 6 years to pass this legislation to bring our patent system into the 21st Century. It helped simplify the process for patent approval, reduced backlogs at the USPTO, harmonized the U.S. patent system with the rest of the world, and improved patent quality.

Importantly, the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act also contained key provisions to help inventors when they appear before the USPTO; something this

law school clinic legislation builds on today. Because of the America Invents Act, the USPTO now has four satellite offices around the country to make the Office more accessible to inventors and businesses. The USPTO's pro bono program is expanding nationwide to provide resources to individuals who appear before the Office without counsel. The Patent Ombudsman for Small Businesses provides patent filing support and services.

The Law School Clinic Certification Program established by this legislation expands the USPTO's strong efforts to support inventors and small businesses, while training our next generation of lawyers in how this important agency operates. After 6 years of a successful pilot program run by the USPTO, it is time to pass this legislation and make the program permanent. Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES should be congratulated for his work on this bill in the House. I thank my fellow Senators for joining me in support of this sensible program and continuing our work to support innovators in our home States and across the Nation.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and there be no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5108) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROVIDING FOR LIMITATIONS ON THE FEES CHARGED TO PASSENGERS OF AIR CARRIERS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5462, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5462) to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5462) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NO SOCIAL SECURITY FOR NAZIS ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5739, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5739) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5739) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NAVAL VESSEL TRANSFER ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 247, S. 1683.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1683) to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign recipients, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Menendez amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; and the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3973) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 1683), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NEW MEXICO NATIVE AMERICAN WATER SETTLEMENTS TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 536, S. 1447.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1447) to make technical corrections to certain Native American water rights settlements in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets and the part of the bill intended to be inserted is shown in italics.)

S. 1447

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "New Mexico [Native American Water Settlements Technical Corrections Act"].

[SEC. 2. TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS.

[(a) TAOS PUEBLO WATER DEVELOPMENT FUND.—Section 505(f)(1) of the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3125) is amended by inserting “, including reconstruction, replacement, rehabilitation, or repair,” after “construction”].

[(b) AUTHORIZATIONS, RATIFICATIONS, CONFIRMATIONS, AND CONDITIONS PRECEDENT.—Section 509(c) of the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3128) is amended—

[(1) in paragraph (1)(A), strike “, for the period of fiscal years 2011 through 2016,”; and

[(2) in paragraph (2)(A)(i), strike “for the period of fiscal years 2011 through 2016”].

[SEC. 3. AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT.

[(a) AAMODT SETTLEMENT PUEBLOS' FUND.—Section 615(c)(7) of the Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3146) is amended—

[(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “section 617(c)(1)” and inserting “section 617(c)(1)(A)”; and

[(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “section 617(c)(1)” and inserting “section 617(c)(1)(B)”].

[(b) FUNDING.—Section 617 of the Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3146) is amended—

[(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “for the period of fiscal years 2011 through 2016,”; and

[(2) in subsection (c)(1)(A), by striking “for the period of fiscal years 2011 through 2015”].

[SEC. 4. NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT.]

Navajo Water Settlement Technical Corrections Act”.

SEC. 2. NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 10302 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 407 note; Public Law 111–11) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “Arrellano” and inserting “Arellano”; and

(2) in paragraph (27), by striking “75–185” and inserting “75–184”.

(b) DELIVERY AND USE OF NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT WATER.—Section 10603(c)(2)(A) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1385) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “Article III(c)” and inserting “Articles III(c)”; and

(2) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “Article III(c)” and inserting “Articles III(c)”.

(c) PROJECT CONTRACTS.—Section 10604(f)(1) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1391)

is amended by inserting "Project" before "water".

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 10609 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1395) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), by striking "construction or rehabilitation" each place it appears and inserting "planning, design, construction, rehabilitation,";

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking "2 percent" and inserting "4 percent"; and

(3) in subsection (f)(1), by striking "4 percent" and inserting "2 percent".

(e) AGREEMENT.—Section 10701(e) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1400) is amended in paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), and (3)(A) by striking "and Contract" each place it appears.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; the committee amendment to the title be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1447), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1447

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "New Mexico Navajo Water Settlement Technical Corrections Act".

SEC. 2. NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 10302 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 407 note; Public Law 111-11) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "Arrellano" and inserting "Arellano"; and

(2) in paragraph (27), by striking "75-185" and inserting "75-184".

(b) DELIVERY AND USE OF NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT WATER.—Section 10603(c)(2)(A) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1385) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking "Article III(c)" and inserting "Articles III(c)"; and

(2) in clause (ii)(II), by striking "Article III(c)" and inserting "Articles III(c)".

(c) PROJECT CONTRACTS.—Section 10604(f)(1) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1391) is amended by inserting "Project" before "water".

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 10609 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1395) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), by striking "construction or rehabilitation" each place it appears and inserting "planning, design, construction, rehabilitation,";

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking "2 percent" and inserting "4 percent"; and

(3) in subsection (f)(1), by striking "4 percent" and inserting "2 percent".

(e) AGREEMENT.—Section 10701(e) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1400) is amended in paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), and (3)(A) by striking "and Contract" each place it appears.

The committee amendment to the title was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.".

PROVIDING FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT OF DAVID M. RUBENSTEIN AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 45 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) providing for the reappointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 45

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of David M. Rubenstein of Maryland on May 7, 2015, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent. The reappointment is for a term of 6 years, beginning on May 8, 2015.

CONFERRING HONORARY CITIZENSHIP ON BERNARDO DE GALVEZ Y MADRID, VISCOUNT OF GALVESTON AND COUNT OF GALVEZ

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 105.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 105) conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on

Bernardo de Galvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Galvez.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 105) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 120) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 120) was agreed to.

NATIONAL FALLS PREVENTION AWARENESS DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 569 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 569) designating September 23, 2014, as "National Falls Prevention Awareness Day" to raise awareness and encourage the prevention of falls among older adults.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 569) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 18, 2014, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE BIRTH OF JAN KARSKI

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 594.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 594) celebrating the centennial year of the birth of Jan Karski and honoring his extraordinary and courageous life.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today, I join with my colleague, Mr. KIRK, in introducing a resolution honoring the heroic life of Jan Karski.

Jan Karski was born in Lodz, Poland, on April 24, 1914. He began his life of service in the Polish diplomatic service before he enlisted in the military, serving in the Polish army when German soldiers invaded Poland in 1939. He was subsequently captured and sent to a prisoner camp.

In 1940, Jan Karski fled to Warsaw and joined the Polish underground resistance movement, where he served as a courier delivering messages detailing the horrific brutality of the Nazis to the Polish government-in-exile. Mr. Karski played a key role in providing some of the first eye witness accounts of the Holocaust to governments of other nations. In July of 1943, Mr. Karski came to the U.S. and met with President Roosevelt to describe the horrors of the Nazi genocide he had witnessed. He became a U.S. citizen in 1954.

Throughout his life, Jan Karski remained committed to providing global awareness of the atrocities committed during the Holocaust. After World War II, Mr. Karski became a student at Georgetown University, where he earned a Ph.D. in 1952. He went on to teach, calling on his own experiences, at Georgetown's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service for 35 years until he retired in 1984.

Jan Karski has been honored on multiple occasions for his courageous efforts to open the world's eyes to the atrocities of the Holocaust. In 2012,

President Barack Obama posthumously awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and more recently, the Parliament of the Republic of Poland designated 2014 as "The Year of Jan Karski."

One hundred years after his birth, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the courageous life and lasting legacy of Mr. Karski, a truly honorable Polish American, by celebrating the centennial year of Jan Karski's birth.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 594) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 95-277, as amended by the appropriate provisions of Public Law 102-246, and in consultation with the Republican leader, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a five-year term: Tom Girardi of California.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, and in consultation with the chairmen of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States-China Economic Security Review Commission: Katherine Tobin of Virginia for a term beginning January 1, 2015 and expiring December 31, 2016.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, December 8, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for

their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 5:30 p.m., as provided for under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have been able, with the cooperation of the Republicans and everyone in this body, to work as if we were in tonight, tomorrow, Saturday, and Sunday. We would have used all that time that is allowed under the rules and we will end at the same place we are going to wind up on Monday.

But I alert everyone that next week could be a long, long week, spilling into the next week. We have certain imperative things we have to do. Everyone knows we have to do a spending bill. Everyone knows we have to do a defense bill. Everyone knows we are trying to do some tax extenders. We hope we can do that, but we will see, and there are other things we need to do. So everyone should be prepared. Next week isn't going to be as easy as this weekend is.

For the information of all Senators, there will be three rollcall votes at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, December 8, 2014, on confirmation of the Baran, McFerran, and Williams nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:24 p.m., adjourned until Monday, December 8, 2014, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 4, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FRANKLIN M. ORR, JR., OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.
JOSEPH S. HEZIR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

THE JUDICIARY

LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

GREGORY N. STIVERS, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY.

JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR., OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, December 4, 2014

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 4, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In the waning days of this 113th Congress, we ask Your blessing, oh Lord, upon the Members of this people's House, and most especially upon the leadership. It is on their shoulders the most important negotiations of this Congress have been placed.

They have been entrusted by their fellow Americans with the awesome privilege and responsibility of sustaining the great experiment of democratic self-government. Give them wisdom, grace, insight, and courage to forge legislation that allows us all to move forward toward an encouraging future.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PEARL HARBOR

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was a bright Sunday morning in the islands of Hawaii. America was at peace and unprepared for war. Soon the rising Sun was darkened by hundreds of Japanese planes as they strafed and bombed Pearl Harbor. The American battleships were sunk. Over 2,400 United States military were killed. Most of the United States aircraft was destroyed while still sitting on the ground. It was December 7, 1941.

But in the chaos and confusion and still in his pajamas, Army Air Corps Second Lieutenant Philip Rasmussen and three other fighter pilots took off into the blazing sky. They met 11 Japanese planes head on. Rasmussen was flying an old outdated P-36 Hawk, and he shot down one Japanese plane while enemy fighters attacked him. They shot up his plane with over 500 bullet holes, but he was still able to continue the fight and eventually safely land. Rasmussen received the Silver Star for his defense of America that day and remained in the Air Force.

As we contemplate on Pearl Harbor and those that were killed, we should remember there were a few who gallantly took to the air to fight those invaders. From the beaches of Hawaii to the beaches of Normandy, those that died and those that survived were America's Greatest Generation. We thank the good Lord that such Americans ever lived.

And that is just the way it is.

IMMIGRATION

(Mr. GUTIÉRREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues about a mom I met on Tuesday. Maria Pena is from Colombia. She has three kids, started a small business, and has lived here for 14 years, and her Congressman is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Maria's youngest is a U.S. citizen. Her employees are citizens. Maria wants to work and live legally in the U.S. but has no way to do so. She told me, "LUIS, I am too scared to leave the house unless I have to, so we drive to school, we drive to church, and we drive to the grocery store, and that is it." Maria knows anything else is too risky because any contact with the police could mean she gets deported and her family is split up.

So, today, I give thanks that Maria and her family in just a few months will sign up for that same peace of mind my family has because she will be eligible for deferred action for parents of U.S. citizens, and I will think of Maria and her children no matter how many times the Republican majority makes me vote on bills to attack the President's actions that he is taking because they will prevent American citizen children from losing their parents.

MELISSA CHANDLER MURPHY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am extremely grateful for the opportunity to recognize Melissa Chandler Murphy, deputy chief of staff and legislative director of South Carolina's Second Congressional District office. No words can express the amount of appreciation I have for Melissa for her service and compassion for the citizens of South Carolina. Melissa has served the Palmetto State with professionalism and integrity.

Nine years ago she began her career with the office as a legislative correspondent and quickly worked her way up because of her efficiency and exceptional leadership skills that she learned at Wofford College in Spartanburg. Melissa has served as a champion for constituents, going to great lengths to offer assistance to those in need.

On January 3, Melissa will begin a new chapter as she joins Congressman-elect Dave Rouzer as his chief of staff. The people of North Carolina's Seventh Congressional District are extremely fortunate to have such a dedicated woman working on their behalf with a Republican office for the first time since 1874.

With great happiness, I wish Melissa and her husband, Ryan, best wishes and continued success.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

PREVENTING EXECUTIVE OVERREACH ON IMMIGRATION ACT

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise against the poorly conceived anti-immigration bill that is being considered in the House today. The Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act would paralyze the executive order announced by the President, halting the deportation of families. Families who are working hard and playing by the rules should not be treated like felons.

I urge my colleagues to bring comprehensive immigration reform to the floor with the same expediency that they were able to bring this poorly conceived legislation to the floor today. Our economy, our national security, and our families cannot afford inaction.

Rather than keeping hardworking families together, Republicans are punishing communities by pushing irresponsible legislation like the bill that we are considering in the House today.

Like Republican Presidents before him, President Obama's actions were within the law. If they weren't, Republicans wouldn't need this slapdash bill to roll back the President's authority.

This is a soap opera, frankly, that we have seen too many times. Can we please finally change the channel and pass comprehensive immigration reform? The time is long overdue for a more family-friendly congressional show.

ABLE ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the House's work to advance H.R. 647, the Achieving a Better Life Experience, or ABLE, Act, which yesterday passed the House with broad bipartisan support.

Under the current law, individuals with disabilities face significant barriers to finding and holding employment and living independently because their access to certain safety net programs can be lost once they establish a minimum level of savings and income. The ABLE Act aims to provide families of these individuals with some peace of mind by allowing them to save for their children's long-term disability expenses in the same way that families of able-bodied children can currently save for college through popular 529 investment plans.

As a cosponsor of this legislation and having spent most of my professional career serving those facing life-changing disease and disability as a health care professional, I am proud of this bipartisan effort to empower individuals to live with greater dignity and independence.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Senate will act swiftly to pass this important legislation. These individuals and their families deserve as much.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION ACT

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4329, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 2014, which passed on Tuesday out of the House of Representatives.

Visiting the nine tribes in the district I represent, I have seen the significant challenges that tribal communities face in providing decent and affordable housing to their members, so I know how important this bill is.

One issue that I worked on very closely regards the needs of tribal veterans who disproportionately suffer from homelessness. Last year, I met a man in my district who served this Nation in uniform but was sleeping in his car. We can do better.

Last year, I joined with Representative COLE to introduce the Housing Native Heroes Act, which would expand new authorities and flexibilities to a program called the HUD-VASH program, which better addresses tribal veterans' homelessness. I am thankful to Representative PEARCE and his colleagues for working to include strong provisions in this bill to tackle homelessness among our tribal veterans.

I look forward to continuing to work to address the needs of our tribal veterans, and I urge the Senate to quickly take up and pass this bill.

PREVENTING EXECUTIVE OVERREACH ON IMMIGRATION ACT

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5759, the Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

President Obama's decision to grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants is an unconstitutional abuse of power which flaunts the rule of law and opens the door for an exponential influx of illegal immigrants.

Our Founding Fathers risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor against such acts of a monarch,

and neither President Obama nor any future President should trample upon their sacrifice.

H.R. 5759 wisely deals with our current crisis while also blocking future Presidents from this egregious abuse. Every American should be concerned by the President's unconstitutional grab of power. If the President can change this law, what prevents him from this abuse of power in other policies?

I urge all of my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican, to join me in supporting and passing this legislation. I also urge the Senate to stand up for the Constitution and swiftly pass this legislation.

This is not the only action the House will take to restrict the overreach of the President, and I am committed to continuing our efforts in the coming weeks and into the next session of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

GHOST SOLDIERS

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to bring to everyone's attention a Washington Post story this week pointing out that the Iraqi Army has 50,000 ghost soldiers. That is right, ghost soldiers, salaries being paid to soldiers that do not exist.

We have spent \$20 billion supposedly training and arming this Iraqi Army. Right now there is a request for another \$1.2 billion. The time has come to stop supporting this corrupt government. The money for the 50,000 soldiers was going into the pockets of the military and government officials.

Mr. Speaker, my friends, it is time to put an end to this. Give our taxpayers some relief. Use this money to rebuild America and recognize the fact that we have no friends in this conflict. The money, the arms that we send inevitably end up being used against us and contributing to the violence and contributing to the extension and the continuation of this tragic and senseless war and waste of human and financial resources.

It is time to put an end to it.

IRANIAN NUCLEAR SANCTIONS

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, the day following the announcement of a 7-month extension to nuclear talks, Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, did a victory lap. He said,

"In the nuclear issue, America and colonial European countries got together and did their best to bring the Islamic Republic to its knees, but they could not do so, and they will not be able to do so."

These remarks are incredibly disturbing, especially when coupled with his earlier intention of building 100,000 centrifuges. The Iranian regime is essentially bragging that they are running circles around Western negotiators by achieving sanctions relief without indicating any change in behavior.

The economic effects of tough sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table to begin with. We must continue to hold Iran's feet to the fire with economic sanctions. To do otherwise plays right into Iran's hands and may force our allies in the region, particularly Israel, to take matters into their own hands.

□ 0915

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the public lands provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act that we are considering this morning. This is important to the security of all of our country, even if there are some provisions with which I have significant disagreement.

I am pleased, while the focus is on our national security—important, especially, to families in San Antonio, whom I represent in what we know as "Military City"—that with this bill we are joining another aspect that is very important to Bexar County, which is the Alamo part of Bexar County, the Alamo City as well. This bill includes a provision that I passed here in the House on June 3 of last year to expand the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park. San Antonio has a unique collection of Spanish colonial resources, the largest of any place in the United States.

Since the House passed this legislation, it has lingered in the Senate; and now, through bipartisan agreement, we have included it in this particular piece of legislation, along with some other parks and natural resource matters. The legislation will now allow us to move forward with our World Heritage status for the Missions, and it will protect our cultural heritage and advance our economic future in San Antonio.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3979, PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5759, PREVENTING EXECUTIVE OVERREACH ON IMMIGRATION ACT OF 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5781, CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 770 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 770

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-58 modified by the amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5759) to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5781) to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question

shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. The chair of the Committee on Armed Services may insert in the Congressional Record at any time during the remainder of the second session of the 113th Congress such material as he may deem explanatory of defense authorization measures for the fiscal year 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 770 provides for the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015. It also allows for the consideration of the Executive Amnesty Prevention Act and for the California Emergency Drought Relief Act, a bill that would provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California. This combined rule is necessary because Congress is coming to a close, and we need to get our work done.

One of the outstanding items that is most important to me is the 2015 NDAA. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to stand on the House floor in May when the House passed its version of the 2015 NDAA. I was happy to highlight the inclusive and transparent process that the Armed Services Committee and the House, as a whole, took in crafting this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

We held countless hearings and heard hours of testimony from our combatant commanders. We worked a lot of late nights within the House Armed Services Committee. In the committee alone, the NDAA was amended 155 times. When the bill moved to the House floor, it was again amended, and another 160 amendments were considered.

It was careful. It was deliberate. It was an open process. It is precisely how the House and this Congress should work. When the NDAA passed this body, I was proud of what we produced, and I was really proud of the process that we took to get there.

The Senate, though, is absolutely different. As is so often the case, they didn't act. They either couldn't pass a bill, or they just chose not to; either way, it is a shame. They left us with a mess now that we have to resolve. Eventually, a final product was crafted at the last minute between House and Senate staffers.

It was not done in conference because the Senate never passed a bill. It was not done in conference because the Senate just ignored the fact that the NDAA was a priority for this country in order to make sure that we funded and equipped those soldiers and airmen and sailors and marines who fight the fight for this country. They ignored it.

When you don't get to conference, which is where you have Members argue the points of either piece of legislation—whether it is a Senate bill or a House bill—it really does a disservice to our men and women who fight for this country because they don't get to hear the arguments and they don't get to see the arguments. That is unfortunate.

We go through all of the motions. In the House, we get it right, in the House, through the appropriations process, but then again, through the process of the NDAA, we get it right. We have those hearings. We take the testimony, and we listen to those who are most affected. The Senate, I don't know what they do, but they honestly, in my estimation, didn't care enough to get it done for whatever reason.

As a member of HASC, we did an awful lot of work just to get a product to the floor, and when it left HASC, it was unanimous. When it came to the floor, there were 160 times that people had the opportunity to amend it and change it and prove it and add things that they thought were necessary for the defense of their country. Once again, the Senate just ignored that process, and that is unfortunate.

Congress, as a whole, is harmed by this process. More importantly, it is the troops who are harmed by a process that is broken. It is the troops. We are not out there in harm's way, but they are. We owe them better. I think the House has done that. I think the House has actually done everything in its power to make it right with the troops whom we put in harm's way, but the Senate doesn't seem to care, and that is troubling to me.

I am concerned about our warfighters. We are their voice. As Members of Congress, we are their voice. We are the elected Representatives of the people, but they are citizens, too, so we are representing them. We are their voice, and they need to be heard on every issue.

Unfortunately, the NDAA is not everything that everybody wants, and I get it. It is always a compromise, and I get that, but we need to show more solidarity with our warfighters, so they

know that their voice is being heard here in the Capitol. I fear that, because the Senate botched the process, their voice didn't come through as loudly as it should have.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also allows the House to consider the Executive Amnesty Prevention Act. This legislation, if enacted, would nullify the President's recent executive action.

Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the policy goal of the President's, every Member of Congress ought to be concerned about what it means when he takes that type of action, of unilaterally ignoring Congress. If you look at our article I powers, we are elected to pass laws. We are elected to do that.

The President is elected to faithfully execute the laws that are passed by Congress. It doesn't matter if the House did or did not do what the President requested. It doesn't give him the unilateral action to go ahead and say, "Do you know what? I can just do it on my own." That is what this bill addresses.

This Nation has benefited by this delicate balance that we have in our government. It benefits every day when we do things the right way. The Constitution is our guiding principle. It is our guiding document.

You just can't say, "Do you know what? I want to do it differently because I disagree with what the legislative branch is or is not doing." That is not appropriate. It is not the way the Founding Fathers crafted it.

The Executive does not have the power to write law; we do. We need to reestablish our rights as elected Representatives of the people to craft laws that affect the people of the United States of America.

It is really just beyond frustrating as all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, should be jealously guarding our article I powers because it matters not whether it is a Republican President or a Democratic President. This institution matters. Otherwise, what are we doing here? Otherwise, why are the American people voting every 2 years to send Representatives to this body to ensure that the Constitution is upheld and followed?

It is not meaningless. It is important. As I said before, the legislative versus the Executive issue shouldn't be a Democrat versus a Republican issue. It should be the fact that we should guard the rights and privileges that have been extended to us because of our being elected to this body.

I support the rule because it is important that we have a healthy debate on all of the issues that have been outlined, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr.

NUGENT) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this convoluted closed rule, which includes a huge defense bill, a partisan anti-immigrant bill, a California water bill, and, from out of nowhere, an Arizona land exchange bill all in one.

The gentleman from Florida is praising this Congress as somehow being open. The fact of the matter is this is the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. This is appalling the way this House of Representatives has been run. Routinely, important, vital issues are shut out from debate on the House floor, and what we are talking about here today is no exception.

The rule includes the FY2015 National Defense Authorization Act. I am pleased that the NDAA establishes the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, but this version of the NDAA also authorizes over \$500 billion for the Pentagon's base budget and, on top of that, includes an additional \$63.7 billion for the Pentagon slush fund to finance the continuing war in Afghanistan and the new war in Iraq and Syria against the Islamic State.

Once again, Congress is failing to do its job because, once again, this bill continues to fund two wars for years to come without Congress authorizing either one.

First, Afghanistan. We are ostensibly pulling out of Afghanistan in just 3 weeks, but, in fact, we are leaving about 10,000 troops behind for the next several years. Congress has the responsibility to authorize this new mission. We just can't continue the same-old, same-old.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert, for the RECORD, a Reuters article, entitled, "Obama Widens Post-2014 Combat Role for U.S. Forces in Afghanistan."

It doesn't sound like we are winding down anything.

[From reuters.com, Nov. 23, 2014]

OBAMA WIDENS POST-2014 COMBAT ROLE FOR U.S. FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN

(By Steve Holland and Mirwais Harooni)

President Barack Obama has approved plans to give U.S. military commanders a wider role to fight the Taliban alongside Afghan forces after the current mission ends next month, a senior administration official said.

The decision made in recent weeks extends previous plans by authorizing U.S. troops to carry out combat operations against the Taliban to protect Americans and support Afghanistan's security forces as part of the new ISAF Resolute Support mission next year.

Obama had announced in May that U.S. troop levels would be cut to 9,800 by the end of the year, by half again in 2015 and to a normal embassy presence with a security assistance office in Kabul by the end of 2016.

Under that plan, only a small contingent of 1,800 U.S. troops was limited to counter terrorism operations against remnants of al

Qaeda. The new orders will also allow operations against the Taliban.

"To the extent that Taliban members directly threaten the United States and coalition forces in Afghanistan or provide direct support to al Qaeda, we will take appropriate measures to keep Americans safe," the official said.

A report by the New York Times late on Friday said the new authorization also allows the deployment of American jets, bombers and drones.

The announcement was welcomed by Afghan police and army commanders after heavy losses against the Taliban this summer.

"This is the decision that we needed to hear . . . We could lose battles against the Taliban without direct support from American forces," said Khalil Andarabi, police chief for Wardak province, about an hour's drive from the capital and partly controlled by the Taliban.

Afghan government forces remain in control of all 34 provincial capitals but are suffering a high rate of casualties, recently described as unsustainable by a U.S. commander in Afghanistan.

More than 4,600 Afghan force members have been killed since the start of the year, 6.5 percent more than a year ago. Despite being funded with more than \$4 billion in aid this year, police and soldiers frequently complain they lack the resources to fight the Taliban on their own.

"Right now we don't have heavy weapons, artillery and air support. If Americans launch their own operations and help us, too, then we will be able to tackle Taliban," said senior police detective Asadullah Insaifi in eastern Ghazni province.

The Taliban said it is undeterred by the U.S. announcement.

"They will continue their killings, night raids and dishonor to the people of Afghanistan in 2015. It will only make us continue our jihad," Taliban spokesman Zabihullah Mujahid said.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Twice now, Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, Congressman WALTER JONES, and I have tried to offer an amendment requiring a vote next March to authorize any post-2014 deployment of U.S. troops in Afghanistan, and twice, the leadership of this House has refused to allow our amendments to come to the floor.

What is the leadership afraid of? Why do they refuse to allow a debate and a vote on authorizing America's post-2014 mission in Afghanistan? Don't we owe it to the troops who are going to be there? Don't we owe it to their families?

The gentleman from Florida talks about that we need to be the voice of our troops. Well, we are not the voice of our troops. We are ducking these important debates. It is shameful. We are letting our troops down. We are better than this, and we ought to be debating and voting on these important issues.

We are also at war against the Islamic State. On July 25, this House overwhelmingly passed a resolution that I offered that if the U.S. were involved in sustained combat operations in Iraq, Congress should vote and enact an authorization. Mr. Speaker, 370 Members of this House voted for that resolution.

Two weeks after that vote, we began bombing Iraq. We have been bombing Iraq nearly every day for the past 4½ months. We have increased the number of U.S. troops in Iraq to around 3,000. On September 22, we started bombing Syria. We have flown scores of bombing missions over Syria over the last 2 months.

We bomb Iraq and Syria as part of our coordinated military operations with the Iraqi military and Kurdish military forces. We bomb to protect infrastructure, and we bomb to target towns and camps harboring Islamic State forces. If that is not being involved in sustained combat operations, I don't know what is.

The war against ISIL began under this Congress. It has escalated under this Congress. It has expanded from Iraq to Syria and now, maybe, to Turkey under this Congress. It is the responsibility, the constitutional responsibility of this Congress, the 113th Congress, to authorize it. And yet while the bill authorizes the money to carry out this war, it does not allow us a "yes" or "no" vote on actually authorizing the war.

Now, last night in the Rules Committee, I offered amendments to limit funding for the Iraq/Syria war until Congress enacted an authorization to ensure that U.S. ground troops in Iraq would not engage in combat operations. Both were rejected. Both were rejected.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is the institutional and constitutional duty of the Congress of the United States to decide matters of war and peace. It is time for the leadership of this House to step up to the plate and bring an authorization to the floor. It is time to debate it and vote on it before the 113th Congress adjourns. No more excuses. No more whining. Just do it.

The rule also includes H.R. 5759, the Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act. Give me a break, Mr. Speaker. Give me a break. For over a year and a half, a Senate-passed bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill has been awaiting House action. All it needs is a House Republican leadership with the political backbone to take it up because we all know that the votes are there. We could pass it today or tomorrow or next week. We could put an end to all this rancor, all the nasty sound bites by simply doing what we are paid to do: debating and voting on major pieces of legislation.

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, if you don't want the Executive to take administrative action, then start acting like a real Congress. There is still time before we leave town for the holidays. Stop this farce. Take up the Senate bill, pass it, and send it to the President for signature.

Mr. Speaker, whether it comes to issues of war and peace or whether it

comes to major issues like comprehensive immigration reform, the answer is simple: all we need to do is our job.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this ridiculous triple-closed rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

I want to talk a little bit about the legislation and then the rule itself.

It is not unusual that we are at a difficult moment near the end of the session and have must-pass legislation. And the main portion of this legislation, the National Defense Authorization Act, is actually very good and very bipartisan. Frankly, it was passed out of committee with overwhelming votes from both sides of the aisle. We all know that the chairman and the ranking member, who are two of our most distinguished Members, work very well together. Like anything in a \$500 billion bill, I could quibble with this or that, but the reality is I favor the legislation. I have no problem supporting it and the rule that moves it forward.

I also want to agree with my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I have the same concerns he does about the authorization for military action. I jointly signed a letter with him to that effect. I look forward to continuing to work with him to that effect because he is precisely right that we need to address this. I think the appropriate way is a full authorization debate, not an amendment, but my friend certainly states his case eloquently.

We also have a major lands bill appropriated with this. Most of that bill is really pretty noncontroversial. Most of it went through committee or a lot of it across the floor. There are a lot of good things in there and things that I find very easy to support.

There is a particular portion, however, that I do oppose, and that is section 3003, as I recall. But it is basically a copper mining issue in southeast Arizona, where we have two Indian tribes that have sacred sites in this area, on what is now Federal land, and they have opposed this legislation.

Now, this legislation was debated on this floor in stand-alone legislation and was then pulled because the votes were not here to pass the legislation. So we are passing, by rule, a bill that the majority in this House did not support.

Fortunately, the bill is somewhat different. There are a couple of things that have been added: a consultation with the tribes in question, a stronger environmental review. Whether this is window dressing or sincere is hard to know. But I am going to urge the tribes in question to use the consultation fully and aggressively, and I am going to urge the Federal agencies that are responsible for the environmental

considerations here to be extraordinarily aggressive in their oversight. We do have a trust responsibility when it comes to sacred sites on Federal lands—or non-Federal lands, for that matter. We have a governmental responsibility.

This is a bill, remember, that did not make it across this floor, and it has never been considered by the United States Senate on the floor. Frankly, if that bill couldn't make it across this House, I very seriously doubt it would have made it across the floor in the Senate. So we really have the rules in the sense, I think, thwarting the majority opinion inside the Congress, and that is unfortunate.

However, speaking personally, when you serve as a member of the majority on the Rules Committee—and I was given extraordinary latitude last night to try to change this rule in a way that would have stripped this particular provision and did vote against the rule in committee—when you are given that responsibility, once the committee makes its decision, you also have a responsibility to accept the decision that has been made.

I also have the great privilege, on my side of the aisle, of serving as a deputy whip, and that usually requires that you support the rule, that you support your party, which is pretty routine on procedural matters on both sides of the aisle. In 12 years, I have never voted against a rule that my own party put on the floor, even if I had disagreements with it. And I do have disagreements; but in the end, I will support the rule, with reservations.

I hope that the provisions that are in the law—to be fair to the authors that have been added since that legislation—will give us some avenues, but I think we ought to reflect long and hard over using this kind of procedural mechanism in this way.

On our side of the aisle, we would like to think we are going to be a different kind of Congress and have been a different kind of Congress, and we can always play the back-and-forth. We have got plenty of gotchas for the other side in terms of how they used rules when they were in the majority. But if we are going to do things differently, it needs to start someplace. So I wanted to come down here and highlight this as, I think, a mistake but make it clear, at the end of the day, I support the rule that the committee arrived at.

I will be looking forward to working with my friend from Massachusetts on his particular concerns about authorization. I will be looking forward and really watching this issue in Arizona with a great deal of concern, and I will continue to push aggressively that we change the manner in which we operate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the American people would be better

served if we addressed our broken immigration system. And if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, the immigration reform bill.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the motion that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will make might be our last opportunity in this Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform. We have a bipartisan bill right here in the House of Representatives. It is called H.R. 15. It is almost identical to the Senate bill that passed with more than two-thirds Republicans and Democrats supporting immigration reform.

What does that mean? This is a bill that secures our border. This is a bill that creates over 200,000 jobs for American citizens. This is a bill that restores the rule of law. This is a bill that has support from the faith community, from the business community, from the labor community, from the law enforcement community. This is a bill that provides a pathway to citizenship for de facto Americans who have lived here, in some cases, for decades, for all of their adult lives. By defeating the previous question, we will have the opportunity to pass that bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is sufficient support here in this body among Democrats and Republicans to pass this bill now for immigration reform, H.R. 15, and actually solve this issue. Because, you know what? There is one thing that I think Democrats and Republicans can agree on: what the President has done with his executive actions doesn't solve the entire immigration issue. Yes, people are discussing whether they think it helps or hurts, whether they think it is illegal or legal—even though it is clearly contemplated in statute with regard to the authority given to the Secretary with regard to prioritization—but it doesn't solve it.

The President alone can't establish border security. We need an appropriation and a plan from the United States Congress—that we have in the bill that will pass if we can defeat the previous question, per the Mr. MCGOVERN's motion.

Mr. Speaker, immigration is a challenging issue for our country and is challenging for a lot of reasons. We are a nation of laws. We are also a nation of immigrants. We need to reconcile those two. We need to ensure that we have an immigration system that reflects our values as Americans, and that is good for our economy and for job creation and restores the rule of law. We can accomplish that right here, right now; send the bill back to the Senate, where I believe they will ratify it, and on to the President to address this issue once and for all, rather

than have a sideshow of a discussion about just fixing a little bit around the edges.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

□ 0945

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 2014, the House of Representatives passed a historic amendment to the fiscal year 2015 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The amendment was offered by myself and Ms. LOFGREN, along with several of our House colleagues.

Our amendment blocks government bureaucrats from performing backdoor warrantless searches of the private email content and telephone calls of U.S. citizens. The amendment also prohibits the NSA and CIA from requiring technology companies to place backdoors in their products.

Our amendment passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan and veto-proof majority of 293-123. Now, some of those who did not vote for the amendment told me that they thought the proper place for this amendment was in the NDAA, not in an appropriations act, and I tend to agree with them. I would like to see that in the NDAA, but our only opportunity was to put it into the appropriations bill.

There has been some discussion, unfortunately, of recent talk, if you will, that this amendment will be stripped from the omnibus. If that is the case, I think it does belong in the NDAA this year because this is the bill that authorizes these programs that we have heard so much about.

Americans were horrified to learn that the government was spying on them without even bothering to get a warrant, and the overwhelming number of Members who voted in favor of the Massie-Loftgren amendment did so because they listened to their constituents. I would hope we would listen to our constituents today, include provisions to reform the NSA, particularly the provision to stop the backdoor warrantless spying on Americans in this NDAA.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I urge you to include this in the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight one provision of this National Defense Authorization Act that hasn't gotten much attention but that will make an important difference in the lives of many new moms who happen to be in the military.

Over the years I am proud to have worked with my colleagues to make our military and veterans' health care programs more responsive to the

unique needs of women. Far too many barriers to optimal health care remain, and that is why I am so pleased that my TRICARE Moms Improvement Act was incorporated into this bill.

Health care providers overwhelmingly recommend that new moms exclusively breast-feed their infants. But we know that despite their good intentions, far too many women who want to breast-feed their babies find the cost of lactation supplies and the lack of support to be a barrier to that choice. And while most women covered by private insurance do have access to these services, women with TRICARE do not.

My TRICARE Moms Improvement Act included in this year's defense authorization bill would end that disparity and that discrepancy. We must do all we can to support our service-members and their families, and this is one small but meaningful way to do just that.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding and the privilege to address you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the underlying bill that we refer to around this Hill now as the Yoho bill, H.R. 5759. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida for drafting this bill. He and I are consistent in our philosophy, our constitutional understanding, and our approach.

I would say, though, that the bill moved a little bit from the time that it was first presented. It had the word "amnesty" in the title. It said, "Preventing Executive Amnesty on Immigration Act." Now it says, "Preventing Executive Overreach." This tones it down a little for me.

It also addresses the subject called prosecutorial discretion. And it says in the bill it "ought to be applied on a case-by-case basis and not to whole categories of persons." Mr. Speaker, prosecutorial discretion can only be applied on a case-by-case basis. It cannot create whole classes or categories of persons and exempt them from the application of the law.

So I want to make sure this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is clear that this bill doesn't endorse the idea that we are suggesting prosecutorial discretion is anything other than what it actually is, and that is on a case-by-case basis.

It says also:

No provision shall be interpreted or applied to authorize the executive branch to exempt categories of persons unlawfully present.

I agree with that. But:

Any action by the executive branch with the purpose of circumventing the objectives of the preceding sentence shall be null and void and without legal effect.

That is nice. This bill amounts to a resolution, a resolution of disagreement with the President. I don't think it makes it clear enough that the

President has clearly violated the Constitution of the United States. I don't want this to be in the RECORD as something that is ambiguous.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, the President knows the law. He taught the Constitution for 10 years. For 22 times he said—at least that we know of—into the public record, into the videotape, that he didn't have the authority to do what he did. And so if the President has so little respect for his own opinions, my point would be, how would he have a lot of respect for this bill? And so I encourage the gentleman. I thank him for offering it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just be clear about one thing. The President did not create this problem. The cowardice of the House Republican leadership created this crisis. Over 1½ years after the Senate passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill, this House, Mr. Speaker, has failed to bring it up and debate it. If there is a crisis of leadership, then it is here in this House.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight a significant provision in the defense authorization bill, and this is language that is based on H.R. 2015, the Las Vegas Valley Public Lands and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.

This important legislation will enact a number of land conveyances across southern Nevada, including over 400 acres for the Nellis Air Force Base used for critical training missions. In addition, the legislation will protect nearby lands that contain fossil beds dating back thousands of years to the Ice Age.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation enjoys the support of the entire Nevada delegation as well as the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, county and local officials, education institutions, local tribal governments, and area environmentalists.

For years we have been working with leadership in the House and Senate to advance this legislation, which will strengthen our national security mission at Nellis, promote economic development for southern Nevada, and preserve our national history for generations to come.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, the defense authorization bill, is now 1,648 pages, and we are being told on the floor of the House that we either vote for the whole thing

or nothing because we are not given a chance for any amendments in between. There are some hugely consequential decisions being made for our national defense in this bill on issues of war and peace.

It was just last September the President increased the number of American troops in Iraq to help train and equip the Iraqi and Kurdish forces there. Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JONES, and I have a bipartisan amendment saying that U.S. ground forces in Iraq should not be engaged in combat operations going forward. The President has asserted authority under the AUMF. That is a blank check. We don't think there should be a blank check for the executive. This body should vote to make it clear that U.S. forces can't be involved in another ground war in Iraq.

There is also a bipartisan amendment offered by Mr. DENT from Pennsylvania, myself, and others that says we should vote on the question of whether we should now arm the so-called moderate Syrian rebels for 2 years at a price of \$500 million or up. Now, whether you are for or against it, we should have a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to think it is a bad idea. We are not going to be able to successfully micromanage the Syrian civil war. The target of those forces is not ISIS. So in the process, we are actually going to be inadvertently strengthening ISIS. But whether you agree with me on that or not, for goodness' sake, we should have an amendment that has this body make a choice. That is what we are here for, I thought, making important policy decisions for the country on questions of war and peace. We owe it to our troops, and we owe it to the American people to actually debate and vote on these consequential decisions instead of a 1,600-plus page bill that comes to the floor and doesn't give us that opportunity.

So since we don't have that opportunity, I am going to vote "no" on the defense authorization bill. I don't like to do that, but it is irresponsible and reckless for this House not to vote on these important issues separately.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida—who, by the way, Mr. Speaker, has three sons who serve or who have served in the United States military—who yesterday so adequately expressed really the concerns of not only a Member of Congress, a father, a proud American, but of a man who wants and needs America to lead in this world rather than follow.

Yesterday—or it turned into last night—in the Rules Committee, we spent a good bit of time that I think, Mr. Speaker, was very thoughtful, and on a bipartisan basis. Members of this

body expressed deep and dear reservations about actually where we are as a country, where our men and women are in harm's way, the mission and the purpose of what we are attempting to accomplish overseas.

Mr. Speaker, America has adversaries and also enemies. We have people who would do terrible things not just to their own people in foreign countries, but who want to engage the United States to draw us into further conflict. The United States is without, in my opinion, and I think others', a strategic and tactical plan that would effectively be understood by Congress and the American people.

Yesterday—that turned into last night—we had Members of this body on a bipartisan basis who showed up at the Rules Committee to politely and professionally express their reservations about our funding through the National Defense Authorization Act what is considered to be a year or 2-year long process of funding without a clear mark, a clear understanding, about what we are agreeing to.

Mr. Speaker, I found myself not just agreeing with the likes of Mr. McGovern and others who spoke about a need for us to know what we are doing, but I found great confidence when we had the gentleman from Colorado, MIKE COFFMAN, who showed up and spoke about the unrelenting and unending fraud on behalf of other countries taking American tax dollars.

The problem is that we are debating this without any real discussion because our friends on the other side of this building are not willing to engage us on the issue. So we are viewing this in a difficult way today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NUGENT. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from Florida, a member of the Rules Committee.

I want to show up and to say to you, Mr. Speaker, the American people, and Members—as they are trying to prepare for what we are attempting to do today with this document—that in January there is going to be a reorganization and discussion around this exact same issue where we will have a partner in the United States Senate with thoughtful content.

Mr. Speaker, I will end here. If the Chinese, the Russians, and the Iranians can establish a policy of where they are in these dangerous areas, the United States should also. We need leadership, and it will happen starting January 5.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee. And he is correct. We were in a meeting yesterday for quite some time—over 6 hours—in the Rules Committee discussing multiple

amendments on the defense bill, on the immigration bill, and on other things as well.

□ 1000

My problem with what happened yesterday is that, after all that talk, we got nothing; not a single amendment is being made in order here. We have yet another closed process.

I appreciate the fact that the Senate can be difficult, but the Senate is not the problem when it comes to the House of Representatives debating and voting up or down on an AUMF on Iraq or Syria—or any other war for that matter. We can do that ourselves. We don't need anybody to tell us we can do it. We don't need the White House to tell us we can do it. It is our constitutional responsibility.

Yes, we had a long meeting. We had a lot of discussion. It was a spirited discussion, but at the end of it all, we got nothing. I regret that very much because the issues that we talked about last night are very, very serious, and we owe it to the American people, we owe it to the men and women who we put in harm's way to have these serious discussions, and we are not having that on the floor today.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN. I would like the RECORD to reflect my strong agreement with the views expressed by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) earlier about not having amendments in which we can fully discuss as the House the 2-year funding for the Syrian rebel army and also to make sure that we do not have combat troops actively engaged in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising right now to strongly state my deep disappointment in a version of the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange Act that was included in the National Defense Authorization.

Here is the National Defense Authorization bill, and in here are some land bills. Now, one of the land bills in particular that has been included in here is extremely controversial. It is non-germane, and it will lead to the destruction of sacred sites for two major tribal nations in our country. When it does that, when it destroys these sacred sites, it benefits a foreign-owned mining company with troubling ties to the Government of Iran.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a long list of tribal organizations and other groups who oppose this proposal because of its direct disregard for Native American sacred and cultural sites, Mr. Speaker.

TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGS OPPOSED TO H.R. 687, SE AZ LAND EXCHANGE

TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS

National Congress of American Indians—the oldest and largest organization representing tribes across the country

National Indian Gaming Association—represents 184 tribes across the country
Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona—represents 20 tribes in Arizona

Apache Coalition—represents Apache tribes in Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma
Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada—represents 27 tribes in Nevada

United South and Eastern Tribes—represents 26 tribes in Maine, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas and based in Tennessee

California Association of Tribal Governments—represents tribal governments in California

Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes—represents 35 tribes in Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa

Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Indians—represents 57 tribes located in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Southeast Alaska, Northern California, and Western Montana

All Indian Pueblo Council—represents 20 pueblos located in New Mexico and Texas

Eight Northern Indian Pueblos of New Mexico

Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association—represents 16 tribes in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska

Coalition of Large Tribes—represents 14 tribes in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Washington

Alaska Inter-Tribal Council
Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission

ALABAMA

Poarch Band of Creek Indians, Alabama

ARIZONA

San Carlos Apache Tribe, Arizona

Hopi Tribe, Arizona

Ak-Chin Indian Community, Arizona

Ft. McDowell Yavapai Nation, Arizona

White Mountain Apache Tribe, Arizona

Colorado River Indian Tribes, Arizona

Cocopah Indian Tribe, Arizona

Hopi Tribe, Arizona

Hualapai Tribe, Arizona

Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Arizona

Tohono O'odham Nation, Arizona

Quechan Indian Tribe, Arizona

Tonto Apache Tribe, Arizona

Yavapai-Apache Nation, Arizona

Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe, Arizona

Havasupai Tribe, Arizona

Ft. Mojave Indian Tribe, Arizona, California, and Nevada

Navajo Nation Council, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah

CALIFORNIA

Susanville Indian Rancheria, California

Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians, California

Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake, California

Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, California

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, California

California Valley Miwok Tribe, California

Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, California

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, California

CONNECTICUT

Mohegan Tribe, Connecticut

FLORIDA

Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida

IDAHO

Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Idaho

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Idaho

KANSAS

Kickapoo Indian Nation, Kansas

LOUISIANA
Jena Band of Choctaw Indians, Louisiana
Tunica-Biloxi Tribe, Louisiana

MAINE
Penobscot Indian Nation, Maine

MASSACHUSETTS
Aquinnah Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head, Massachusetts
Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, Massachusetts

MICHIGAN
Saginaw Chippewa Tribe, Michigan
Sault Ste. Marie Tribe, Michigan

MINNESOTA
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Minnesota
Prairie Island Indian Community, Minnesota
Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Indian Community, Minnesota

MISSISSIPPI
Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, Mississippi

NEBRASKA
Santee Sioux Tribe, Nebraska

NEVADA
Moapa Band of Paiutes, Nevada
Shoshone-Paiute Tribes, Nevada and Idaho
Walker River Paiute Tribe, Nevada

NEW MEXICO
Jicarilla Apache Nation, New Mexico
Mescalero Apache Tribe, New Mexico
Pueblo of Zuni, New Mexico
Pueblo of Tesuque, New Mexico
Pueblo of Santa Clara, New Mexico
Pueblo of Acoma, New Mexico
Pueblo of Laguna, New Mexico
Pueblo of Zuni, New Mexico

NEW YORK
Seneca Nation, New York

NORTH CAROLINA
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina

OKLAHOMA
Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma
Ft. Sill Apache Tribe, Oklahoma and New Mexico
Osage Nation, Oklahoma

OREGON
Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians
Coquille Indian Tribe, Oregon

RHODE ISLAND
Narragansett Tribe, Rhode Island

SOUTH CAROLINA
Catawba Indian Nation, South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA
Oglala Sioux Tribe, South Dakota

WASHINGTON
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Washington
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Washington
Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Washington
Quinault Indian Nation, Washington
Hoh Indian Nation, Washington
Samish Indian Nation, Washington
Suquamish Indian Tribe, Washington
Swinomish Indian Tribal Community, Washington

WISCONSIN
Bad River Band of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, Wisconsin
Ho-Chunk Nation, Wisconsin
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, Wisconsin
Oneida Nation, Wisconsin
Sokaogan Chippewa Community, Wisconsin
Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Band of Mohican Indians, Wisconsin

OTHER GROUPS OPPOSING H.R. 687/S. 339, SE AZ LAND EXCHANGE
Town of Superior
Queen Valley Golf Association, Queen Valley, Arizona
Queen Valley Homeowners Association, Queen Valley, Arizona
Peridot Strategic Tribal Empowerment Prevention Plan
Arizona Mining Reform Coalition
American Lands Access Fund
Arizona Mountaineering Club
Arizona Native Plant Society
Arizona Wildlife Federation
The American Alpine Club—Golden, CO
Center for Biological Diversity
Chiricahua-Dragoon Conservation Alliance
Comstock Residents Association—Virginia City, NV
Concerned Citizens and Retired Miners Coalition—Superior, AZ
Concerned Climbers of Arizona, LLC
Earthworks
Endangered Species Coalition
Environment America
Environment Arizona
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Friends of Ironwood Forest—Tucson, AZ
Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness
Friends of The Cloquet Valley State Forest
Friends of the Kalmiopsis—Grants Pass, OR
Friends of Queen Creek
Gila Resources Information Project
Grand Canyon Chapter—Sierra Club
Great Basin Mine Watch
Groundwater Awareness League—Green Valley, AZ
High Country Citizens' Alliance—Crested Butte, CO
Information Network for Responsible Mining—Telluride, CO
Keepers of the Water—Manistee, MI
League of Conservation Voters
Maricopa Audubon Society—Phoenix, AZ
Ministers' Conference of Winston-Salem, North Carolina & Vicinity
The Morning Star Institute—Washington, D.C.
Mount Graham Coalition—Arizona
Natural Resources Defense Council
National Wildlife Federation
Progressive National Baptist Convention
Religion and Human Rights Forum for the Preservation of Native American Sacred Sites and Rights
Rock Creek Alliance—Sandpoint, ID
San Juan Citizens Alliance—Durango, CO
Save Our Cabinets—Heron, MT
Save Our Sky Blue Waters—Minnesota
Save the Scenic Santa Ritas
Sierra Club
Sky Island Alliance
The Lands Council—Spokane, WA
Tucson Audubon Society
Water More Precious Than Gold
Western Lands Exchange Project—Seattle, WA
Wilderness Workshop
Wisconsin Resources Protection Council—Tomahawk, WI
Yuma Audubon Society

TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGS WITH RESOLUTIONS/LETTERS OPPOSING H.R. 1904 IN THE 112TH CONGRESS—SAME BILL AS H.R. 687
National Congress of American Indians
Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona
Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada
United South and Eastern Tribes
Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes
Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association—represents 16 tribes in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska

All Indian Pueblo Council
Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council, Inc.
Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Indians Association on American Indian Affairs, Maryland

ARIZONA
San Carlos Apache Tribe, Arizona
White Mountain Apache Tribe, Arizona
Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Arizona
Yavapai-Apache Nation, Arizona
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, Arizona
Ft. McDowell Yavapai Nation, Arizona
Cocopah Indian Tribe, Arizona
Hopi Tribe, Arizona
Tohono O'odham Nation, Arizona
Navajo Nation Council, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah
Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission
Dine (Navajo) Medicine Men's Association
Ft. Mojave Indian Tribe, Arizona, California, and Nevada

ALABAMA
Poarch Band of Creek Indians, Alabama

ALASKA
Sealaska Heritage Institute, Alaska

CALIFORNIA
Susanville Indian Rancheria, California
Ramona Band of Cahuilla, California
Kashia Band of Pomo Indians, California
Karuk Tribe, California

COLORADO
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Colorado
Idaho Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Idaho

MICHIGAN
Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, Michigan

NEVADA
Duckwater Shoshone Tribe, Nevada
Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Nevada
Wells Band Council, Te-Moak Tribe, Nevada

NEW MEXICO
Mescalero Apache Tribe, New Mexico
Jicarilla Apache Nation, New Mexico
Pueblo of Tesuque, New Mexico
Pueblo of Picuris, New Mexico
Pueblo of Santo Domingo, New Mexico
Pueblo of Santa Clara, New Mexico
Pueblo of Zuni, New Mexico and Arizona

WASHINGTON
Confederated Tribes and Band of the Yakama Nation, Washington
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Washington
Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Washington
Skokomish Indian Tribe, Washington
Muckleshoot Tribe, Washington
Hoh Indian Nation, Washington

WYOMING
Shoshone & Arapaho Tribes, Wyoming

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Unfortunately, the amendment to strike this provision from the bill offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), who is the cochair of the Native American Caucus along with me—a bipartisan amendment—was totally rejected by the Rules Committee; so, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

The National Defense Authorization Act should not be used as a vehicle to undermine our commitment to protecting religious liberties for tribal nations where so many of those men and women have proudly fought to serve their country, the United States of America.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. COLE really addressed the issue. In regards as to how it went down in the Rules Committee, he clearly addressed the issue on this floor in regards to his support of the rule, even though he didn't get everything that he wanted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership and for really trying at least to allow many of us with different points of view to have some input into this rule and this bill. Unfortunately, that did not happen at the Rules Committee, so of course, I rise in strong opposition to this rule to provide consideration for the National Defense Authorization Act.

While I certainly support several elements of this bill, I have grave concerns about the more than \$63 billion in funding for the overseas contingency operations fund. The OCO account remains a slush fund that allows the Pentagon to circumvent the Budget Control Act, and we still haven't received an audit from the Pentagon.

Every agency has to go through an audit process. What happened at the Pentagon—we still have not received the audit for a lot of reasons that they state, but in a bipartisan way, many of us are urging the Defense Department to come up and show us the numbers, show us what their audit will provide, so the American people know what their taxpayer dollars are paying for.

I also have grave concerns about authorizing any funding for the current war in Iraq and Syria—and, yes, that is a war that is taking place. Congress has not yet debated or authorized this new war. We see more and more troops being sent to the region; and, of course, unintended consequences could put these troops in harm's way and lead to combat operations. I don't believe the American people want to see our brave young men and women in that role.

That is why many of us have called and will call on Congress to live up to its constitutional responsibility and have a full debate on any authorization for any use of military force. We are in a war, Mr. Speaker, and each and every day we see more and more danger. We see more and more warfare take place. Enough is enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, committing the United States to yet another long-term war in the Middle East, it should never be an afterthought. What we continue to do is authorize, in a variety of bills, the continuation of a war that has not been authorized nor declared.

I know that the American people worry about the world and what is taking place. They know how dangerous the world is. We know that also, and we know that the Pentagon deserves a budget and authorizations that ensure our national security, but we also know that we have a constitutional responsibility to debate the use of force, and in fact, if we believe that that is the course of action that our country should take, then let's have an up-or-down vote.

This really should be the moment that we are debating that because, once we leave here, come January, we don't know what will happen. We don't know how far this war will have expanded, and it will continue to be an unauthorized war.

Congress and the American people deserve to understand the costs and consequences to our national security and to our domestic priorities in fighting this war.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire how many additional speakers the gentleman has?

Mr. NUGENT. I have none.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We have a couple, but they are not here yet. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that this Congress is kind of ending the way it began, under a very closed and restrictive process. As I said earlier, this is the most-closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

Routinely important issues, issues that impact not just the American people, but that impact the entire world, are denied a debate on the House floor. We are bringing up multiple bills here today all under a very closed process; yet there are some very important issues that need to be debated and to be discussed and to be voted on.

I have crumbling bridges and sewer and water systems in my district that need repair, and I can't get a penny to repair or replace them. We are told that we don't have any money, but we seem to have billions and billions of dollars to throw at these endless wars in Afghanistan and the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the November 2 New York Times editorial, "The New War's Rising Cost."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 2, 2014]

THE NEW WAR'S RISING COST

(By the Editorial Board)

The Pentagon disclosed last week that America's ever-shifting new war in the Middle East has cost taxpayers more than half a billion dollars since it began in August. Yet Congress has not bothered to hold a vote to authorize the Obama administration's decision to get into another war.

As the price tag of the military campaign in Iraq and Syria rises, it might seem reasonable to expect that Congress would have to consider the state of the effort and appropriate funding for it. Thanks to the dysfunc-

tional politics of defense budgeting, it turns out Congress won't have to—at least not anytime soon.

As of Oct. 16, the air campaign against the Islamic State, also known as ISIS, had cost \$580 million, according to the Pentagon. The military is paying for the bombing sorties using the Overseas Contingency Operations budget, a flexible fund established for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. With the Afghan war drawing to a close this year, the Obama administration had sought to cut that fund from the nearly \$85 billion appropriated for 2014 to \$59 billion for 2015. But because lawmakers were not able to pass a budget in time, the fund will continue at last year's level under a continuing resolution that ends in December and is likely to be extended until the spring.

Authorizing a new defense budget would force lawmakers to take stock of the military action that was initially billed as a limited defensive measure before the White House said that it was likely to last for years. It would also serve as an opportunity to revisit the dubious legal authority the White House is relying on.

American officials continue to be alarmingly vague about a central unanswered question about the military campaign against the Islamic State: whether it formally or implicitly represents a shift in American policy toward the government of President Bashar al-Assad of Syria. Washington has called for Mr. Assad's ouster and has provided limited support to rebel factions fighting the state. But the United States must clarify what its goals are concerning Mr. Assad, some senior administration officials believe, including Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel, as Mark Landler of The Times reported recently.

The Pentagon says the bombing campaign has dealt the Islamic State setbacks in the battlefield. But the group remains strong and continues to make inroads in key parts of Syria and Iraq. Military officials have said curiously little in recent weeks about Khorasan, a militant group they described during the early stages of the airstrikes in Syria as posing an imminent threat to the United States. The vague and at times contradictory information the government has provided about that group, and the broader strategy, shows a distressing level of improvisation.

The past few weeks have also presented reminders of the risks of the military mission. Officials at the Pentagon are worried about reports that Islamic State fighters have acquired shoulder-fired surface-to-air missiles, which could be used to bring down American aircraft. Those fighters recently took credit for shooting down an Iraqi military helicopter; the group posted online a manual instructing fighters how to use one of the missiles to bring down Apache helicopters, one of the attack aircraft the Pentagon has been using.

Congress has a responsibility to take a hard look at the long-term goal of the military mission and its projected cost. It has skirted that duty for too long.

[From Reuters.com, Nov. 23, 2014]

OBAMA WIDENS POST-2014 COMBAT ROLE FOR U.S. FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN

(By Steve Holland and Mirwais Harooni)

President Barack Obama has approved plans to give U.S. military commanders a wider role to fight the Taliban alongside Afghan forces after the current mission ends next month, a senior administration official said.

The decision made in recent weeks extends previous plans by authorizing U.S. troops to carry out combat operations against the Taliban to protect Americans and support Afghanistan's security forces as part of the new ISAF Resolute Support mission next year.

Obama had announced in May that U.S. troop levels would be cut to 9,800 by the end of the year, by half again in 2015 and to a normal embassy presence with a security assistance office in Kabul by the end of 2016.

Under that plan, only a small contingent of 1,800 U.S. troops was limited to counter terrorism operations against remnants of al Qaeda. The new orders will also allow operations against the Taliban.

"To the extent that Taliban members directly threaten the United States and coalition forces in Afghanistan or provide direct support to al Qaeda, we will take appropriate measures to keep Americans safe," the official said.

A report by the New York Times late on Friday said the new authorization also allows the deployment of American jets, bombers and drones.

The announcement was welcomed by Afghan police and army commanders after heavy losses against the Taliban this summer.

"This is the decision that we needed to hear . . . We could lose battles against the Taliban without direct support from American forces," said Khalil Andarabi, police chief for Wardak province, about an hour's drive from the capital and partly controlled by the Taliban.

Afghan government forces remain in control of all 34 provincial capitals but are suffering a high rate of casualties, recently described as unsustainable by a U.S. commander in Afghanistan.

More than 4,600 Afghan force members have been killed since the start of the year, 6.5 percent more than a year ago. Despite being funded with more than \$4 billion in aid this year, police and soldiers frequently complain they lack the resources to fight the Taliban on their own.

"Right now we don't have heavy weapons, artillery and air support. If Americans launch their own operations and help us, too, then we will be able to tackle Taliban," said senior police detective Asadullah Insaifi in eastern Ghazni province.

The Taliban said it is undeterred by the U.S. announcement.

"They will continue their killings, night raids and dishonor to the people of Afghanistan in 2015. It will only make us continue our jihad," Taliban spokesman Zabihullah Mujahid said.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We seem to have money for these other things. We heard earlier today about the fact that there are 50,000 ghost soldiers in Iraq that we are funding with our taxpayer dollars; they don't exist. Somebody is stealing that money, and where is the outrage in this Congress? Where is the outrage?

Mr. Speaker, these wars deserve a debate. They deserve our oversight. We are supposed to be a deliberative body. We should be talking about these things, and we are getting more deeply involved in another war in Iraq and in Syria. We have 3,000 troops in Iraq right now. God knows how many are going to be there when we come back in January.

By the way, there is nothing in this bill that prevents the President from

adjusting the mission of those troops, so that they are engaged in direct on-the-ground combat. It is something that we ought to be concerned about; yet we are not. We are leaving town without even talking about this stuff.

You don't need an NDAA bill to be able to debate and vote on an authorization. All we need is a Republican leadership with the backbone to bring it to the floor. This is our responsibility. This is our job. This is our constitutional responsibility; yet we are not doing anything.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to enter into the RECORD an article by FOX News political analyst Juan Williams entitled, "Congress ducks its duty on ISIS vote."

[From TheHill.com, Oct. 6, 2014]

JUAN WILLIAMS: CONGRESS DUCKS ITS DUTY ON ISIS VOTE

(By Juan Williams)

Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) said recently he would not even ask his colleagues to vote on an authorization to use military force against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) until next year, when the new Congress is seated.

Boehner told the New York Times, "Doing this with a whole group of members who are on their way out the door, I don't think that is the right way to handle this."

Then last week he changed his position, telling ABC News he is willing to call the House into session to debate the U.S. military action to destroy the terrorists. But the Speaker said it is up to President Obama to request a Congressional vote authorizing military action.

Meanwhile, the Speaker said it was wrong of President Obama to try to beat the terrorists without putting American military combat "boots on the ground" to win the current fight.

Huh? That makes no sense. When did House Republicans start taking orders from President Obama?

The hard fact is the GOP House is responsible for its own failure to act on the central question of authorizing the U.S. military to put combat boots on the ground.

"Since when do we sit around waiting, using the excuse 'He didn't ask'?" House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) asked reporters last week. "No, if you want to have an authorization that has any constraints on the president, you don't wait for him to write it."

Instead, some Republican House members are busy campaigning for reelection by appealing to voters' fears about the ISIS threat.

Rep. Doug Lamborn, a Colorado Republican, told his constituents that his fellow House Republicans are sharing political complaints about the president with commanders in charge of the military.

"A lot of us are talking to the generals behind the scenes, saying, 'Hey, if you disagree with the policy that the White House has given you, let's have a resignation,'" Rep. Lamborn said. He added that any Generals who resigned in protest would "go out in a blaze of glory."

That is an overt effort to undermine civilian control of the U.S. military, which is required by the Constitution. It is outrageous. It is a purely partisan effort to win votes by playing to extremist hatred of the president.

These right-wing attacks are coming from some of the same people who condemned

anyone in disagreement with any part of the Bush administration's foreign policy as "soft on terrorism," "unpatriotic" or worse.

Is it any wonder that Congress now has an 80 percent disapproval rating and a 12.6 approval rating, according to the latest Real Clear Politics average?

Is it any wonder that, according to a recent ABC News/Washington Post poll, 51 percent of Americans would not vote to reelect their own representative, the highest figure recorded on that question in the 25-year history of the poll?

Article I of the Constitution gives Congress, not the president, the power to declare war. However, Congress has not made a formal declaration of war since World War II.

Since then, Authorizations for Use of Military Force or "AUMFs" have become politically expedient substitutes.

Now, the current Congress is too cowardly to even vote on that kind of nominal approval. Some say the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs that gave President Bush the authority to use the military against the perpetrators of 9/11 and Saddam Hussein, respectively, are still in effect.

As my friend and Fox News Senior Judicial Analyst Judge Andrew Napolitano has noted, this is ridiculous because ISIS did not exist in 2001 and 2002, so Congress could not have intended the AUMFs to apply to the group by any stretch of the imagination.

Last week, one major Western democracy did call its legislature back from a weeks-long recess to vote on the critical, time-sensitive issue of military strikes against ISIS.

That legislative body was Britain's Parliament—not the U.S. Congress.

Congress is not absolved of responsibility just because we are in the middle of a political campaign season—especially when its members are telling us that ISIS is on the march and, in the words of Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), "we need to stop them before we all get killed here at home."

Members have a job to do right now and they are not doing it.

There are increasing signs that many Republican members in Speaker Boehner's own caucus can no longer stomach this hypocrisy and abdication of Congress' duty.

"The president should have come to Congress and still should come to Congress for authorization," Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Florida Republican who used to chair the House Foreign Affairs Committee, told BuzzFeed.

"Everybody can come back at a moment's notice. Everyone is in the districts . . . We can all go back [to D.C. for a vote] and I hope we do," she added.

"If you can't make the argument for or against an AUMF, and actually justify your vote for or against an AUMF, you have absolutely no business being in Congress," Rep. Raul Labrador, an Idaho Republican and Tea Party favorite, told the Washington Post.

"This is why we come to Congress . . . It's shameful if anyone here in Congress decides that they would rather leave it up to the president by himself to determine if we should actually be doing something in that region of the world," Labrador said.

Principled Republicans like Ros-Lehtinen and Labrador are in the minority within their party.

Their ranks may be growing, but they are still a minority.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to talk a little bit about the immigration bill. As I said before, the President didn't create this problem. Quite frankly, the House Republican

leadership created this problem. We had the Senate that acted in a good faith bipartisan manner and passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill. That was a year and a half ago.

In a year and a half, this House of Representatives has done nothing except come to the floor and demagogue the immigration issue. The debate on the other side of the aisle, quite frankly, has gotten so ugly that it is, I think, beneath the level of dignity of this House of Representatives.

We should expect better in terms of the debate on the issue of immigration. I enter into the RECORD the November 20 editorial from The New York Times, which concludes by saying:

The right will falsely label Mr. Obama's actions lawless. They are a victory for problem-solving over posturing, common sense over cruelty, and lawful order over a chaotic status quo.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 20, 2014]

AT LONG LAST, IMMIGRATION ACTION

(By the Editorial Board)

President Obama says he will speak to the nation on Thursday night about making major changes to immigration policy, including shielding several million unauthorized immigrants from deportation. He intends to do this under executive authority, because he has given up waiting for Congress to act.

The result will not be ideal, but no broad executive action on immigration was ever going to be. Only Congress can create an immigration system that rescues workers and families from unjust laws and creates legal pathways to citizenship. The best Mr. Obama can offer is a reprieve to people trapped by Congress's failures—temporary permission to live and work without fear.

But respite for as many as four million to five million people, according to some estimates, should be cause for relief and celebration. The reasons given by Mr. Obama and his aides are sound and well within the law. The executive branch has limited means to deport all 11 million people living here without authorization. It should focus on expelling serious and violent criminals, and not waste money and effort on breaking up families, and deporting those who contribute to society and whose ties to this country are deep and permanent.

Details have not been announced, but it seems that Mr. Obama's plan will protect the parents of citizens and legal permanent residents, and a larger portion of the young people called Dreamers, who came here when they were children. Other, smaller groups may qualify as well.

Mr. Obama should draw the circle of inclusion as large as possible—up to the eight million or so who might have qualified under an ambitious bipartisan bill that passed the Senate last year. But Mr. Obama, who wants to bolster his actions against legal attack, seems unlikely to include parents whose children lack citizenship or green cards. Tens of thousands of families will surely be disheartened by this exclusion and other politically motivated shortcomings—the plan is expected to bar recipients from health coverage under the Affordable Care Act, for example. Some immigrant advocacy groups have already denounced the plan as too cautious and too small.

The backlash on the right, too, is well underway, with Republican lawmakers con-

demning what they see as a tyrannical usurpation of congressional authority by “Emperor” Obama. They fail to mention, though, that new priorities will put the vast deportation machinery to better use against serious criminals, terrorists and security threats, which should be the goal of any sane law-enforcement regime. Nor did they ever complain when Mr. Obama aggressively used his executive authority to ramp up deportations to an unprecedented peak of 400,000 a year.

It has been the immigration system's retreat from sanity, of course, that made Mr. Obama's new plan necessary. Years were wasted, and countless families broken, while Mr. Obama clung to a futile strategy of luring Republicans toward a legislative deal. He has been his own worst enemy—over the years he stressed his executive impotence, telling advocates that he could not change the system on his own. This may have suited his legislative strategy, but it was not true.

It's good that Mr. Obama has finally turned the page. He plans to lead a rally in Las Vegas on Friday at a high school where he outlined his immigration agenda in January 2013. Legislative solutions are a dim hope for some future day when the Republican fever breaks. But until then, here we are.

This initiative cannot be allowed to fail for lack of support from those who accept the need for progress on immigration, however incremental. Courageous immigrant advocates, led by day laborers, Dreamers and others, have pressed a reluctant president to acknowledge the urgency of their cause—and to do something about it. The only proper motion now is forward.

The right will falsely label Mr. Obama's actions lawless. They are a victory for problem-solving over posturing, common sense over cruelty, and lawful order over a chaotic status quo.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I also enter into the RECORD a November 25 letter from 130 legal scholars on why President Obama's action is lawful and has historical precedent.

25 NOVEMBER 2014.

We write as scholars and teachers of immigration law who have reviewed the executive actions announced by the President on November 20, 2014. It is our considered view that the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and establishment of the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) programs are within the legal authority of the executive branch of the government of the United States. To explain, we cite federal statutes, regulations, and historical precedents. We do not express any views on the policy aspects of these two executive actions.

This letter updates a letter transmitted by 136 law professors to the White House on September 3, 2014, on the role of executive action in immigration law.¹ We focus on the legal basis for granting certain noncitizens in the United States “deferred action” status as a temporary reprieve from deportation. One of these programs, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), was established by executive action in June 2012. On November 20, the President announced the expansion of eligibility criteria for DACA and the creation of a new program, Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA).

PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION IN IMMIGRATION LAW ENFORCEMENT

Both November 20 executive actions relating to deferred action are exercises of prosecutorial discretion. Prosecutorial discretion refers to the authority of the Department of

Homeland Security to decide how the immigration laws should be applied.² Prosecutorial discretion is a long-accepted legal practice in practically every law enforcement context,³ unavoidable whenever the appropriated resources do not permit 100 percent enforcement. In immigration enforcement, prosecutorial discretion covers both agency decisions to refrain from acting on enforcement, like cancelling or not serving or filing a charging document or Notice to Appear with the immigration court, as well as decisions to provide a discretionary remedy like granting a stay of removal,⁴ parole,⁵ or deferred action.⁶

Prosecutorial discretion provides a temporary reprieve from deportation. Some forms of prosecutorial discretion, like deferred action, confer “lawful presence” and the ability to apply for work authorization.⁷ However, the benefits of the deferred action programs announced on November 20 are not unlimited. The DACA and DAPA programs, like any other exercise of prosecutorial discretion do not provide an independent means to obtain permanent residence in the United States, nor do they allow a noncitizen to acquire eligibility to apply for naturalization as a U.S. citizen. As the President has emphasized, only Congress can prescribe the qualifications for permanent resident status or citizenship.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND LONG-STANDING AGENCY PRACTICE

Focusing first on statutes enacted by Congress, §103(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA” or the “Act”), clearly empowers the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to make choices about immigration enforcement. That section provides: “The Secretary of Homeland Security shall be charged with the administration and enforcement of this Act and all other laws relating to the immigration and naturalization of aliens”⁸ INA §242(g) recognizes the executive branch's legal authority to exercise prosecutorial discretion, specifically by barring judicial review of three particular types of prosecutorial discretion decisions: to commence removal proceedings, to adjudicate cases, and to execute removal orders.⁹ In other sections of the Act, Congress has explicitly recognized deferred action by name, as a tool that the executive branch may use, in the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion, to protect certain victims of abuse, crime or trafficking.¹⁰ Another statutory provision, INA §274A(h)(3), recognizes executive branch authority to authorize employment for noncitizens who do not otherwise receive it automatically by virtue of their particular immigration status. This provision (and the formal regulations noted below) confer the work authorization eligibility that is part of both the DACA and DAPA programs.

Based on this statutory foundation, the application of prosecutorial discretion to individuals or groups has been part of the immigration system for many years. Long-standing provisions of the formal regulations promulgated under the Act (which have the force of law) reflect the prominence of prosecutorial discretion in immigration law. Deferred action is expressly defined in one regulation as “an act of administrative convenience to the government which gives some cases lower priority” and goes on to authorize work permits for those who receive deferred action.¹¹ Agency memoranda further reaffirm the role of prosecutorial discretion in immigration law. In 1976, President Ford's Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) General Counsel Sam Bernsen stated in

a legal opinion, “The reasons for the exercise of prosecutorial discretion are both practical and humanitarian. There simply are not enough resources to enforce all of the rules and regulations presently on the books.”¹² In 2000, a memorandum on prosecutorial discretion in immigration matters issued by INS Commissioner Doris Meissner provided that “[s]ervice officers are not only authorized by law but expected to exercise discretion in a judicious manner at all stages of the enforcement process,” and spelled out the factors that should guide those decisions.¹³ In 2011, Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the Department of Homeland Security published guidance known as the “Morton Memo,” outlining more than one dozen factors, including humanitarian factors, for employees to consider in deciding whether prosecutorial discretion should be exercised. These factors—now updated by the November 20 executive actions—include tender or elderly age, long-time lawful permanent residence, and serious health conditions.¹⁴

JUDICIAL RECOGNITION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION IN IMMIGRATION CASES

Federal courts have also explicitly recognized prosecutorial discretion in general and deferred action in particular.¹⁵ Notably, the U.S. Supreme Court noted in its *Arizona v. United States* decision in 2012: “A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. . . . Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all”¹⁶ In its 1999 decision in *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee*, the Supreme Court explicitly recognized deferred action by name. This affirmation of the role of discretion is consistent with congressional appropriations for immigration enforcement, which are at an annual level that would allow for the arrest, detention, and deportation of fewer than 4 percent of the noncitizens in the United States who lack lawful immigration status.¹⁷

Based on statutory authority, U.S. immigration agencies have a long history of exercising prosecutorial discretion for a range of reasons that include economic or humanitarian considerations, especially—albeit not only—when the noncitizens involved have strong family ties or long-term residence in the United States.¹⁸ Prosecutorial discretion, including deferred action, has been made available on both a case-by-case basis and a group basis, as are true under DACA and DAPA. But even when a program like deferred action has been aimed at a particular group of people, individuals must apply, and the agency must exercise its discretion based on the facts of each individual case. Both DACA and DAPA explicitly incorporate that requirement.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS FOR DEFERRED ACTION AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS FOR INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS

As examples of the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, numerous administrations have issued directives providing deferred action or functionally similar forms of prosecutorial discretion to groups of noncitizens, often to large groups. The administrations of Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush deferred the deportations of a then-predicted (though ultimately much lower) 1.5 million noncitizen spouses and children of immigrants who qualified for legalization under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986, authorizing work permits for the spouses.¹⁹ Presidents Reagan and

Bush took these actions, even though Congress had decided to exclude them from IRCA.²⁰ Among the many other examples of significant deferred action or similar programs are two during the George W. Bush administration: a deferred action program in 2005 for foreign academic students affected by Hurricane Katrina,²¹ and “Deferred Enforcement Departure” for certain Liberians in 2007.²² Several decades earlier, the Reagan administration issued a form of prosecutorial discretion called “Extended Voluntary Departure” in 1981 to thousands of Polish nationals.²³ The legal sources and historical examples of immigration prosecutorial discretion described above are by no means exhaustive, but they underscore the legal authority for an administration to apply prosecutorial discretion to both individuals and groups.

Some have suggested that the size of the group who may “benefit” from an act of prosecutorial discretion is relevant to its legality. We are unaware of any legal authority for such an assumption. Notably, the Reagan-Bush programs of the late 1980s and early 1990s were based on an initial estimated percentage of the unauthorized population (about 40 percent) that is comparable to the initial estimated percentage for the November 20 executive actions. The President could conceivably decide to cap the number of people who can receive prosecutorial discretion or make the conditions restrictive enough to keep the numbers small, but this would be a policy choice, not a legal issue.²⁴ For all of these reasons, the President is not “re-writing” the immigration laws, as some of his critics have suggested. He is doing precisely the opposite—exercising a discretion conferred by the immigration laws and settled general principles of enforcement discretion.

THE CONSTITUTION AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT DISCRETION

Critics have also suggested that the deferred action programs announced on November 20 violate the President’s constitutional duty to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.”²⁵ A serious legal question would therefore arise if the executive branch were to halt all immigration enforcement, or even if the Administration were to refuse to substantially spend the resources appropriated by Congress. In either of those scenarios, the justification based on resource limitations would not apply. But the Obama administration has fully utilized all the enforcement resources Congress has appropriated. It has enforced the immigration law at record levels through apprehensions, investigations, and detentions that have resulted in over two million removals.²⁶ At the same time that the President announced the November 20 executive actions that we discuss here, he also announced revised enforcement priorities to focus on removing the most serious criminal offenders and further shoring up the southern border. Nothing in the President’s actions will prevent him from continuing to remove as many violators as the resources Congress has given him permit.

Moreover, when prosecutorial discretion is exercised, particularly when the numbers are large, there is no legal barrier to formalizing that policy decision through sound procedures that include a formal application and dissemination of the relevant criteria to the officers charged with implementing the program and to the public. As DACA has shown, those kinds of procedures assure that important policy decisions are made at the leadership level, help officers to implement policy

decisions fairly and consistently, and offer the public the transparency that government priority decisions require in a democracy.²⁷

CONCLUSION

Our conclusion is that the expansion of the DACA program and the establishment of Deferred Action for Parental Accountability are legal exercises of prosecutorial discretion. Both executive actions are well within the legal authority of the executive branch of the government of the United States.

Hiroshi Motomura, Susan Westenberg Prager Professor of Law, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law*; Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, Samuel Weiss Faculty Scholar and Clinical Professor of Law, Pennsylvania State University, Dickinson School of Law*; Stephen H. Legomsky, The John S. Lehmann University Professor, Washington University School of Law*.

David Abraham, Professor of Law, University of Miami School of Law*; Raquel Aldana, Associate Dean for Faculty Scholarship, Professor of Law, University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law; Farrin R. Anello, Visiting Assistant Clinical Professor, Seton Hall University School of Law; Deborah Anker, Clinical Professor of Law, Director, Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinic, Harvard Law School.

Sabrineh Ardalan, Lecturer on Law, Harvard Law School, Assistant Director, Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinical Program; David C. Baluarte, Assistant Clinical Professor of Law, Director, Immigrant Rights Clinic, Washington and Lee University School of Law; Melynda Barnhart, Professor of Law, New York Law School; Jon Bauer, Clinical Professor of Law and Richard D. Tulisano ’69 Scholar in Human Rights, Director, Asylum and Human Rights Clinic, University of Connecticut School of Law.

Lenni B. Benson, Professor of Law, Director, Safe Passage Project, New York Law School; Jacqueline Bhabha, Professor of the Practice of Health and Human Rights, Harvard School of Public Health, Lecturer in Law, Harvard Law School; Linda Bosniak, Distinguished Professor, Rutgers University School of Law-Camden; Richard A. Boswell, Professor of Law & Associate Dean for Global Programs, U.C. Hastings College of the Law; Jason A. Cade, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Georgia Law School; Janet Calvo, Professor of Law, CUNY School of Law, New York.

Kristina M. Campbell, Associate Professor of Law, Director, Immigration and Human Rights Clinic, University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law;

Stacy Caplow, Professor of Law and Associate Dean of Professional Legal Education, Brooklyn Law School; Benjamin Casper, Visiting Associate Clinical Professor, University of Minnesota Law School; Linus Chan, Visiting Associate Professor of Clinical Law, University of Minnesota; Howard F. Chang, Earle Hepburn Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Michael J. Churgin, Raybourne Thompson Centennial Professor in Law, University of Texas at Austin.

Marisa Cianciarulo, Professor of Law, Director, Bette & Wylie Aitken Family Violence Clinic, Chapman University Dale E. Fowler School of Law; Evelyn Cruz, Clinical Professor of Law, Director, Immigration Law & Policy Clinic, Arizona State University, Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law; Ingrid Eagly, Assistant Professor of Law, UCLA School of Law; Philip Eichorn, Adjunct Professor—Immigration Law, Cleveland State—Cleveland Marshall School of Law; Bram T. Elias, Clinical Visiting Associate Professor,

University of Iowa College of Law; Stella Burch Elias, Associate Professor of Law, University of Iowa College of Law.

Jill E. Family, Professor of Law, Director, Law & Government Institute, Widener University School of Law; Niels Frenzen, Clinical Professor of Law, Gould School of Law, University of Southern California; Maryellen Fullerton, Professor of Law, Brooklyn Law School; César Cuauhtémoc García Hernández, Visiting Professor, University of Denver Sturm College of Law; Lauren Gilbert, Professor of Law, St. Thomas University School of Law; Denise L. Gilman, Clinical Professor, Co-Director, Immigration Clinic, University of Texas School of Law.

John F. Gossart, Jr., Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Baltimore School of Law, University of Maryland School of Law, United States Immigration Judge 1982-2013, retired; P. Gulasekaram, Associate Professor of Law, Santa Clara University; Anju Gupta, Associate Professor of Law, Director, Immigrant Rights Clinic, Rutgers School of Law—Newark; Susan R. Gzesh, Senior Lecturer & Executive Director, Pozen Family Center for Human Rights, University of Chicago; Jonathan Hafetz, Associate Professor of Law, Seton Hall University; Dina Francesca Haynes, Professor of Law and Director of Human Rights and Immigration Law Project, New England Law, Boston.

Susan Hazeldean, Associate Clinical Professor, Cornell Law School; Ernesto Hernández-López, Professor of Law, Fowler School of Law, Chapman University; Laura A. Hernandez, Professor, Baylor Law School; Michael Heyman, Professor of Law, John Marshall Law School; Barbara Hines, Clinical Professor of Law, Co-Director, Immigration Clinic, University of Texas School of Law; Laila L. Hlasek, Clinical Associate Professor, Boston University School of Law; Geoffrey Hoffman, Clinical Assoc. Professor, Director, Immigration Clinic, University of Houston Law Center.

Mary Holper, Associate Clinical Professor, Boston College Law School; Alan Hyde, Distinguished Professor and Sidney Reitman Scholar, Rutgers University School of Law—Newark; Kate Jastram, Lecturer in Residence, Executive Director, The Honorable G. William & Ariadna Miller Institute for Global Challenges and the Law, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law; Kit Johnson, Associate Professor of Law, University of Oklahoma College of Law; Anil Kalhan, Associate Professor of Law, Drexel University Kline School of Law; Daniel Kanstroom, Professor of Law, Dean's Research Scholar, and Director, International Human Rights Program, Boston College Law School.

Elizabeth Keyes, Assistant Professor, University of Baltimore School of Law; Kathleen Kim, Professor of Law, Loyola Law School Los Angeles; David C. Koelsch, Associate Professor, Immigration Law Clinic, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Jennifer Lee Koh, Associate Professor of Law and Director, Immigration Clinic, Western State College of Law; Kevin Lapp, Associate Professor of Law, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles; Christopher Lasch, Associate Professor of Law, University of Denver Sturm College of Law.

Jennifer J. Lee, Clinical Assistant Professor, Legal Director, Sheller Center for Social Justice, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Stephen Lee, Professor of Law, University of California, Irvine; Christine Lin, Clinical Instructor/Staff Attorney, Center for Gender & Refugee Studies, Refugee & Human Rights Clinic, University of

California, Hastings College of the Law; Beth Lyon, Professor of Law, Director, Farmworker Legal Aid Clinic, Co-Director, Community Interpreter Internship Program, Acting Director of Clinical Programs, Villanova University School of Law; Stephen Manning, Adjunct Professor of Law, Lewis & Clark College.

Lynn Marcus, Professor of the Practice, Co-Director, Immigration Law Clinic, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law; Miriam H. Marton, Director, Tulsa Immigrant Resource Network, Visiting Assistant Clinical Professor of Law, University of Tulsa College of Law; Elizabeth McCormick, Associate Clinical Professor of Law, Director, Immigrant Rights Project, Director, Clinical Education Programs, University of Tulsa College of Law; M. Isabel Medina, Ferris Family Distinguished Professor of Law, Loyola University New Orleans College of Law; Stephen Meili, Vaughan G. Papke Clinical Professor in Law, University of Minnesota Law School; Vanessa Merton, Professor of Law, Pace University School of Law.

Andrew Moore, Associate Professor of Law, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Jennifer Moore, Professor of Law, Weihofen Professorship, University of New Mexico School of Law; Daniel I. Morales, Assistant Professor of Law, DePaul University College of Law; Nancy Morawetz, Professor of Clinical Law, Co-Director, Immigrant Rights Clinic, NYU School of Law; Karen Musalo, Bank of America Foundation Chair in International Law, Professor & Director, Center for Gender & Refugee Studies, U.C. Hastings College of the Law; Alizabeth Newman, Clinic Law Professor, Immigrant & NonCitizens Rights Clinic, CUNY School of Law.

Noah Novogrodsky, Professor of Law, University of Wyoming College of Law; Fernando A. Nuñez, Visiting Assistant Professor of Law, Charlotte School of Law; Mariela Olivares, Associate Professor of Law, Howard University School of Law; Michael A. Olivas, William B. Bates Distinguished Chair in Law and Director, Institute for Higher Education Law and Governance, University of Houston Law Center; Patrick D. O'Neill, Esq., Adjunct Professor of Immigration Law, University of Puerto Rico School of Law; Sarah Paoletti, Practice Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School.

Sunita Patel, Practitioner-in-Residence, Civil Advocacy Clinic, American University, Washington College of Law; Huyen Pham, Associate Dean for Faculty Research & Development, Professor of Law, Texas A&M University School of Law; Michele R. Pistone, Professor of Law, Villanova University School of Law, Luis F.B. Plascencia, Assistant Professor, School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arizona State University; Polly J. Price, Professor of Law, Emory University School of Law; Doris Marie Provine, Professor Emerita, Justice & Social Inquiry, School of Social Transformation, Arizona State University.

Nina Rabin, Associate Clinical Professor of Law, Director, Bacon Immigration Law and Policy Program, James E. Rogers College of Law, University of Arizona; Jaya Ramji-Nogales, Professor of Law, Co-Director, Institute for International Law and Public Policy, Temple University, Beasley School of Law; Renee C. Redman, Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Connecticut School of Law; Ediberto Roman, Professor of Law & Director of Citizenship and Immigration Initiatives, Florida International University; Victor C. Romero, Maureen B. Cavanaugh Distinguished Faculty Scholar & Professor

of Law, Penn State Law; Joseph H. Rosen, Adjunct Professor, Atlanta's John Marshall Law School; Carrie Rosenbaum, Professor of Immigration Law, Golden Gate University School of Law.

Rachel E. Rosenbloom, Associate Professor, Northeastern University School of Law; Rubén G. Rumbaut, Professor of Sociology, Criminology, Law and Society, University of California, Irvine; Ted Ruthizer, Lecturer in Law, Columbia Law School; Leticia M. Saucedo, Professor of Law and Director of Clinical Legal Education, UC Davis School of Law; Heather Scavone, Assistant Professor of Law, Director of the Humanitarian Immigration Law Clinic, Elon University School of Law; Andrew I. Schoenholtz, Professor from Practice, Georgetown Law.

Philip Schrag, Delaney Family Professor of Public Interest Law, Georgetown University Law Center; Bijal Shah, Acting Assistant Professor, NYU School of Law; Ragini Shah, Clinical Professor of Law, Suffolk University Law School; Careen Shannon, Adjunct Professor of Law and Director, Immigration Law Field Clinic, Yeshiva University, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law; Anna Williams Shavers, Cline Williams Professor of Citizenship Law, University of Nebraska College of Law; Bryn Siegel, Professor, Immigration Law, Pacific Coast University School of Law; Anita Sinha, Practitioner-in-Residence, American University, Washington College of Law.

Dan R. Smulian, Associate Professor of Clinical Law, Co-Director, Safe Harbor Project, Brooklyn Law School; Gemma Solimene, Clinical Associate Professor of Law, Fordham University School of Law; Jayashri Srikantiah, Professor of Law and Director, Immigrants' Rights Clinic, Stanford Law School; Juliet Stumpf, Professor of Law, Lewis & Clark Law School; Maureen A. Sweeney, Law School Associate Professor, University of Maryland Carey School of Law; Barbara Szweda, Associate Professor, Lincoln Memorial University Duncan School of Law.

Margaret H. Taylor, Professor of Law, Wake Forest University School of Law; David Thronson, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor of Law, Michigan State University College of Law; Allison Brownell Tirres, Associate Professor & Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, DePaul University College of Law; Scott Titshaw, Associate Professor, Mercer University School of Law; Phil Torrey, Lecturer on Law, Harvard Law School, Clinical Instructor, Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinical Program, Harvard Law School; Enid Trucios-Haynes, Interim Director, Muhammad Ali Institute for Peace and Justice, Professor of Law, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law, University of Louisville;

Diane Uchimiya, Professor of Law, Director of Experiential Learning, Director of the Justice and Immigration Clinic, University of La Verne College of Law; Gloria Valencia-Weber, Professor Emerita, University of New Mexico School of Law; Sheila I. Vélez Martínez, Assistant Clinical Professor of Law, University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Alex Vernon, Acting Director of Asylum and Immigrant Rights Law Clinic, Visiting Assistant Professor of Law, Ave Maria School of Law; Rose Cuisson Villazor, Professor of Law & Martin Luther King Jr. Hall Research Scholar, University of California at Davis School of Law.

Leti Volpp, Robert D. and Leslie Kay Raven Professor of Law, University of California, Berkeley; Jonathan Weinberg, Professor of Law, Wayne State University;

Deborah M. Weissman, Reef C. Ivey II Distinguished Professor of Law, School of Law, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Lisa Weissman-Ward, Clinical Supervising Attorney & Lecturer in Law, Stanford Law School; Anna R. Welch, Associate Clinical Professor, University of Maine School of Law.

Virgil O. Wiebe, Professor of Law, Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi Director of Clinical Education, Co-Director, Interprofessional Center for Counseling and Legal Services, University of St. Thomas School of Law, Minneapolis; Michael J. Wishnie, William O. Douglas Clinical Professor of Law and Deputy Dean for Experiential Education, Yale Law School; Stephen Yale-Loehr, Adjunct Professor, Cornell University Law School; Elizabeth Lee Young, Associate Professor of Law, University of Arkansas School of Law.

ENDNOTES

¹ See Letter to the President of the United States, Executive authority to protect individuals or groups from deportation (Sep. 3, 2014), <https://pennstatelaw.psu.edu/file/Law-Professor-Letter.pdf>

² See Thomas Aleinikoff, David Martin, Hiroshi Motomura & Maryellen Fullerton, *Immigration and Citizenship: Process and Policy* 778-88 (7th ed. 2012); Stephen H. Legomsky & Cristina Rodriguez, *Immigration and Refugee Law and Policy* 629-32 (5th ed. 2009); Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, *The Role of Prosecutorial Discretion in Immigration Law*, 9 Conn. Pub. Int. L.J. 243 (2010), http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1476341.

³ Notably, in criminal law, prosecutorial discretion has existed for hundreds of years. It was a common reference point for the immigration agency in early policy documents describing prosecutorial discretion. See Doris Meissner, *Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Commissioner, Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion* 1 (Nov. 17, 2000) [hereinafter Meissner Memo], <http://www.legalactioncenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/lac/Meissner-2000-memo.pdf>; Sam Bernsen, *INS General Counsel, Legal Opinion Regarding Service Exercise of Prosecutorial Discretion* (July 15, 1976), <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/foia/prosecutorial-discretion/service-exercise-pd.pdf>. See also, e.g., Angela J. Davis, *Arbitrary Justice* (2007); Hiroshi Motomura, *Prosecutorial Discretion in Context: How Discretion is Exercised Throughout our Immigration System*, American Immigration Council 2-3 (April 2012), http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/motomura_-_discretion_in_context_04112.pdf; Stephen H. Legomsky, *Legal Authorities for DACA and Similar Programs* (Aug. 24, 2014), <http://www.washingtonpost.com/r/2010-2019/WashingtonPost/2014/11/17/Editorial-Opinion/Graphics/executive%20action%20legal%20points.pdf>.

⁴ 8 C.F.R. § 241.6.

⁵ INA § 212(d)(5).

⁶ 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(14).

⁷ Under INA § 212(a)(9)(B)(i), a person will not be deemed unlawfully present during any "period of stay authorized by the Attorney General" (now the Secretary of Homeland Security). The Department of Homeland Security has authorized such a period of stay for recipients of deferred action. See Donald Neufeld, Lori Scialabba, & Pearl Chang, *U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), Consolidation of Guidance Concerning Unlawful Presence for Purposes of Sections 212(a)(9)(B)(i) and 212(a)(9)(C)(i)(I) of the Act* (May 6, 2009), <http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Laws/Memoranda/>

Static_Files_Memoranda/2009/revision_redesign_AFM.PDF; U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, *Frequently Asked Questions* (updated June 5, 2014), <http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/consideration-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-process/frequently-asked-questions>.

⁸ INA § 103(a).

⁹ INA § 242(g); see also *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee*, 525 U.S. 471 (1999).

¹⁰ INA § 237(d)(2); 204(a)(1)(D)(i)(II,IV).

¹¹ 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(14).

¹² Bernsen, *supra* note 3.

¹³ Meissner Memo, *supra* note 3. Notably, the Meissner memorandum was a key reference point for related memoranda issued during the Bush administration, among them a 2005 memorandum from Immigration and Customs Enforcement legal head William Howard and a 2007 memorandum from ICE head Julie Myers on the use of prosecutorial discretion when making decisions about undocumented immigrants who are nursing mothers.

¹⁴ John Morton, Director, U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement, *Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion Consistent with the Civil Immigration Enforcement Priorities of the Agency for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens* (June 17, 2011), available at <http://www.ice.gov/doclib/secure-communities/pdf/prosecutorial-discretion-memo.pdf>. [hereinafter Morton Memo].

¹⁵ See e.g., *Lennon v. Immigration & Naturalization Service*, 527 F.2d 187, 191 n.5 (2d Cir. 1975); *Soon Bok Yoon v. INS*, 538 F.2d 1211, 1213 (5th Cir. 1976); *Vergel v. INS*, 536 F.2d 755 (8th Cir. 1976); *David v. INS*, 548 F.2d 219 (8th Cir. 1977); *Nicholas v. INS*, 590 F.2d 802 (9th Cir. 1979).

¹⁶ See *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012).

¹⁷ 525 U.S. 471 (1999). One source suggests that DHS has resources to remove about 400,000 or less than 4% of the total removable population. See Morton memo, *supra* note 14.

¹⁸ For example, of the 698 deferred action cases processed by Immigration and Customs Enforcement between October 1, 2011, and June 30, 2012, the most common humanitarian reasons for a grant were: Presence of a USC dependent; Presence in the United States since childhood; Primary caregiver of an individual who suffers from a serious mental or physical illness; Length of presence in the United States; and Suffering from a serious mental or medical care condition. See Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, *My Great FOIA Adventure and Discoveries of Deferred Action Cases at ICE*, 27 Geo. Immigr. L.J. 345, 356-69 (2013), http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2195758. See also, Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, *Relics of Deferred Action, The Hill* (2014), <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/civil-rights/224744-relics-of-deferred-action>.

¹⁹ See Marvinne Howe, *New Policy Aids Families of Aliens*, N.Y. Times (March 5, 1990), <http://www.nytimes.com/1990/03/05/nyregion/new-policy-aids-families-of-aliens.html>.

²⁰ See 67 Interpreter Releases 204 (Feb. 26, 1990); 67 Interpreter Releases 153 (Feb. 5, 1990). Bush's policy followed a narrower 1987 executive order by President Reagan's immigration commissioner that applied only to children. 64 Interpreter Releases 1191 (Oct. 26, 1987). Congress later in 1990 legislatively provided some of them a path to legalization. Immigration and Nationality Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-649, 301, 104 Stat. 4978, <http://www.justice.gov/eoir/IMMACT1990.pdf>.

²¹ See Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, *Response, In Defense of DACA, Deferred Action, and*

the DREAM Act, 91 Tex. L. Rev. See Also 59, n.46 (2013), http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2195735, citing Press Release, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS Announces Interim Relief for Foreign Students Adversely Impacted by Hurricane Katrina (Nov. 25, 2005), http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/files/pressrelease/F1Student_11_25_05_PR.pdf.

²² DED Granted Country-Liberia, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration, <http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/temporary-protected-status-deferred-enforced-departure/ded-granted-country-liberia/ded-granted-country-liberia> (last visited Nov. 22, 2014).

²³ Legomsky & Rodriguez, *Immigration and Refugee Law and Policy*, *supra* note 2, at 1115-17; See also David Reimers, *Still the Golden Door: The Third World Comes to America* 202 (1986).

²⁴ For a broader discussion about the relationship between class size and constitutionality, see Wadhia, *Response, In Defense of DACA, Deferred Action, and the DREAM Act*, *supra* note 20.

²⁵ U.S. Const. art. II, § 3.

²⁶ U.S. ICE, FY 2013 ICE Immigration Removals, <http://www.ice.gov/removal-statistics/> (last visited Nov. 22, 2014); Marc R. Rosenblum & Doris Meissner, *The Deportation Dilemma: Reconciling Tough and Humane Enforcement*, Migration Policy Institute (April 2014), <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/deportation-dilemma-reconciling-tough-humane-enforcement>.

²⁷ For a broader discussion of the administrative law values associated with prosecutorial discretion, see Hiroshi Motomura, *Immigration Outside the Law* 19-55, 185-92 (2014); Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, *Sharing Secrets: Examining Deferred Action and Transparency in Immigration Law*, 10 U. N. H. L. Rev. 1 (2012) (also providing a proposal for designing deferred action procedures), http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1879443.

* all institutional affiliations are for identification purposes only

Mr. MCGOVERN. I enter into the RECORD a November 29 letter to Senate and House Judiciary Committee Chairmen LEAHY and GOODLATTE and the ranking members, GRASSLEY and CONYERS, from four former INS general counsels from the George W. Bush and Clinton administrations on the President's authority to take lawful executive action on immigration.

FOUR FORMER INS/USCIS GENERAL COUNSELS ON PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO ACT ON IMMIGRATION

Nov 29, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.

We are writing as former General Counsels of the Immigration and Naturalization Service or former Chief Counsels of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. As you know, the President on November 20 announced a package of measures designed to deploy his limited immigration enforcement resources in the most effective way. These measures included an expansion of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and the creation of Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA). We take no positions on the policy judgments that those actions reflect, but we have all studied the relevant legal parameters and wish to express our collective view that the President's actions are well within his legal authority.

Some 135 law professors who currently teach or write in the area of immigration law signed a November 25, 2014 letter to the same effect. Rather than repeat the points made in that letter, we simply attach it here and go on record as stating that we agree wholeheartedly with its legal analysis and its conclusions.

Respectfully,

STEPHEN LEGOMSKY,
*The John S. Lehman
University Professor,
Washington Univer-
sity School of Law,
Former Chief Coun-
sel, U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services.*

ROXANA BACON,
*Former Chief Counsel,
U.S. Citizenship and
Immigration Serv-
ices.*

PAUL W. VIRTUE,
*Partner, Mayer Brown
LLP, Former Gen-
eral Counsel, Immi-
gration and Natu-
ralization Service.*

BO COOPER,
*Partner, Fragomen,
Del Rey, Bernsen &
Loew, Former Gen-
eral Counsel, Immi-
gration and Natu-
ralization Service.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am a very fortunate man. I am the son of immigrants. My parents came here at the ages of 17 and 18, respectively. Through the great fortune that we had, they were adjusted, and they were part of this great Nation, but since then, many more have come after.

In particular, I represent a community that is almost 69 percent Hispanic, the majority of which were born in a foreign land. The reality is that our immigration system for years has worked and has worked efficiently to make what we do better than any other nation in the world: we make Americans.

In the last decade and a half, this system has ground to a halt. In the last few years, our President has moved steadily to use his executive power to try to make the system work a little bit better. I believe that is an important step.

But we had an opportunity. We had an opportunity in this House to pass the Senate version that received 68 votes, something that would have made the system function better, brought more investment into America, more dollars into Federal revenue; yet the House punted. I am appreciative of the President's action because he is well within executive power.

If the other side does not like the President's action, they can bring up the Senate bill. There are enough votes in this House to pass it. We will have an orderly process. It is not a perfect bill, but it does do the right thing,

which fixes a broken immigration system.

I want to beg the other side to understand the implications that fighting on this issue has. This is a nation of laws, there is no question on that, but the executive has plenary authority in this area. The time has come to move, since this House would not move.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment along with extraneous material that I will offer in the RECORD if we defeat the previous question immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. That basically will be the text of H.R. 15, the Senate-passed comprehensive immigration reform bill. We could bring this issue to a close right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1015

Mr. NUGENT. If I could inquire, I thought the gentleman was closing.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is some confusion here that the gentleman may be offering to amend the rule. I am just trying to get a sense for what is going on over there before I yield back all of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, shortly, I will be offering an amendment to the rule, which is necessary to alleviate the budgetary point of order that currently lies against the defense bill. In addition to clearing a point of order, we hope it will expedite the consideration in the Senate of this critically important bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we have one additional speaker that just showed up, and so I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership, and the manager.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, have come to the floor of the House time and time again and supported our troops, supported their families, wanted them to have increased dollars in their compensation; but today I come with a heavy heart that issues of war and peace are in this bill, the authorization bill, and we have not had the time to debate this in front of the American people. Sending young men and women in the midst of a storm in war where they may lose their life, and yet this majority refuses to give us hours of time to show the American people what the commitment is, I raise a question.

And then, of course, a bill that attacks the constitutional authority of the President of the United States in an immigration bill that is closed in

falsehoods because the President is not going beyond the law; he is not changing the law. He has the authority to use his executive power for humanitarian relief, and he is saving the parents of children who are citizens.

This is a wrong rule, and I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me close by again asking my colleagues to vote against this closed rule—triple closed rule. It unfortunately has become a pattern in this Congress, the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” as well because we are talking about a defense bill, but we are not allowed to have a debate or a vote on any of these wars that we are involved in. If we truly care about our troops, if we are truly living up to our constitutional responsibilities, we ought to have a debate and a vote. We ought not to duck it. We ought not to leave town without talking about these serious issues.

On the issue of immigration, rather than this silly, petty, ugly, symbolic bill that is being brought to the floor, if my colleagues don't approve of the President's executive action, then help me defeat the previous question and we will bring up H.R. 15, the comprehensive immigration reform bill that the Senate passed in a bipartisan way, and we can get that job done and end all this nonsense and end all this rancor that we have seen unfold here in the House.

We could do better than what is on display today. I regret very much that the Republican leadership continues to insist on this closed process which stifles debate and prevents us from debating and voting on important issues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think I have made my frustrations readily clear in regards to how we got to the current NDAA. It is troubling to see how the Senate's failure to act is going to end up costing our troops. To me, it is just not right to the men and women, the 1 percent of America that put their lives on the line for this country the Senate has turned a blind eye to.

I am optimistic, though, that with the changing of the guard in January, that we are actually going to get things done. We are actually going to pass legislation to address the issues that are so confronting this Nation

that deserve to have discussions in both Houses. It is important that the Senate act. It is important that the Senate has debate. So I think that at the end of the day, in January with the changing of the guard, we are going to see a different set of facts as Congress moves forward.

I am really hopeful that Congress takes the steps, and Mr. MCGOVERN talks about it, but we need to talk about the AUMF. We need to talk about those guiding principles that set up where we are today, things that were passed long before I came to Congress, authorizations that go back 12 to 13 years ago.

The landscape has changed, and we need to absolutely have a strong and long, hard debate in regards to how we authorize the use of force in the future in specific instances, as the Constitution requires.

When we talk about the Constitution, we talk about the President just ignoring it, the administration sidestepping Congress whenever it sees fit, the use of force is one of those areas, I think. And the same with what this administration has done in the underlying bills that this bill allows us to address in the President's recent executive order. The bill reaffirms that Congress—Congress—has the power to write the immigration laws. It reaffirms that the President must enforce the laws that are currently on the books, not something that he wishes, but what is currently law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, the President's actions have gotten so out of hand that we now must pass bills to remind him of what the Constitution sets, and that is a shame. We even have to remind the President of what he, himself, has said in the past about what is the appropriate role of the office of President.

Speaking in 2011 in a Univision town hall, the President stated:

With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that is just not the case because there are laws on the books.

He also said that Congress passes the laws, and it is the executive branch's job to enforce and implement those laws, and then it is up to the judiciary to interpret those laws if there is a question.

The President even said that there are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system. That, for me, is simple enough. And the President said that: through executive order, to ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President. I didn't say that; he said that. I am not a lawyer; he is a lawyer, a constitutional lawyer.

What he hasn't said to us, the American people, is in those 22 utterances where he said those things, why hasn't he justified to the American people

that maybe he was wrong when he said that, he didn't get it right, he didn't understand. He never said anything like that. What he has done is come back and to say: Do you know what—and he said it before that—I have a pen and a phone. And he can do what he pleases.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfortunate time when we have to call the President out for not following the Constitution. This is not something that I look forward to. It is not something that I want to do. But it is so important, as I have said before, that we respect the article I power that this body has in the Constitution, that our Founding Fathers thought it was so important that there be a separation of powers so that there was no monarchy, so there was no one person that can call all the shots. They sought it because they needed to because of what the impression is that they left that they were under.

We are merely standing up for our rights as citizens of the United States, as I believe we should be enforcing the constitutional requirements, that founding document. Maybe I am wrong, but I don't think so. I have been wrong in the past, but on this particular issue, the Constitution is the document that we should live by. The Constitution sets forth the operation of this government, not by whim and not by decree, but by law. We are a nation of laws.

You have heard me talk about the NDAA, and I will say this to Mr. MCGOVERN as it relates to authorization of military force. I agree wholeheartedly that we need to have a separate debate. We need to have it when we have a partner across the other side of the Capitol that will join in that debate about what we should be doing with the use of force and what we do as it relates to our men and women that serve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the checks and balances our Founders so thoughtfully crafted.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NUGENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, insert before the period "and the amendment specified in section 5 of this resolution".

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows: Strike section 3096 and insert the following: "SEC. 3096. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.

"For payments in lieu of taxes under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, which shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior—

"(1) \$33,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

"(2) \$37,000,000 to be available for obligation and payment beginning on October 1, 2015.

Funds available for obligation and payment under paragraph (2) shall be paid in October 2015."

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 770 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN FROM MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15 as specified in section 5 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a

vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Report 113-646, the report to accompany H. Res. 770, the special rule that governed consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979, as well as H.R. 5759 and H.R. 5781, contained an error in the description of the motion that was the subject of Rules Committee record vote No. 198.

The description of the motion should have read as follows:

Motion by Ms. SLAUGHTER to amend the rule for the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3979 to make in order and provide the appropriate waivers for amendment #5 to Rules Committee Print 113-58, offered by Rep. COFFMAN (CO), which prohibits U.S. funds from being used to pay the salaries of the Iraqi security forces or to provide weapons or equipment to the Iraqi security forces. Defeated: 3-7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the

previous question on the amendment and on the resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the amendment, if ordered, adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and adopting H. Res. 758.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 191, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—227

Amash	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Petri
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Barletta	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Barr	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barton	Hanna	Posey
Benishek	Harper	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Harris	Reed
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reichert
Black	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Boustany	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Brat	Holding	Roby
Bridenstine	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Hurt	Rokita
Burgess	Issa	Rooney
Byrne	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Campbell	Jolly	Rothfus
Capito	Jones	Royce
Carter	Jordan	Runyan
Cassidy	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Scalise
Coffman	Kingston	Schock
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	LaMalfa	Sessions
Cook	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cotton	Lance	Shuster
Cramer	Lankford	Simpson
Crawford	Latham	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Latta	Smith (NE)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Long	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Southerland
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Dent	Lummis	Stivers
DeSantis	Marchant	Stockman
DesJarlais	Marino	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Terry
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McCauley	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Tiberi
Ellmers	McHenry	Tipton
Farenthold	McKeon	Turner
Fincher	McKinley	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Valadao
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Wagner
Fleming	Meadows	Walberg
Flores	Meehan	Walden
Forbes	Messer	Walorski
Fortenberry	Mica	Weber (TX)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Westmoreland
Gardner	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Noem	Wittman
Gibson	Nugent	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Womack
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Woodall
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoder
Gosar	Palazzo	Yoho
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Granger	Pearce	Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Adams	Bass	Bera (CA)
Barber	Beatty	Bishop (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Becerra	Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer	Higgins	Pascarell
Bonamici	Himes	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Payne
Braley (IA)	Holt	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Honda	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Peters (CA)
Bustos	Hoyer	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Huffman	Peterson
Capps	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Carney	Jeffries	Polis
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Kaptur	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rahall
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Chu	Kennedy	Richmond
Ciциlline	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Ruiz
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Langevin	T.
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Costa	Levin	Schiff
Courtney	Lewis	Schneider
Crowley	Lipinski	Schrader
Cuellar	Loebach	Schwartz
Cummings	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Serrano
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
DeGette	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
DeLauro	(NM)	Sinema
DelBene	Lynch	Sires
Deutch	Maffei	Slattery
Dingell	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Carolyn	Speier
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Matheson	Takano
Engel	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Enyart	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McDermott	Titus
Esty	McGovern	Tierney
Farr	McIntyre	Titus
Fattah	McNerney	Tonko
Foster	Meeks	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Van Hollen
Fudge	Michaud	Vargas
Gabbard	Miller, George	Veasey
Garamendi	Moore	Vela
Garcia	Moran	Visclosky
Grayson	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Green, Al	Nadler	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Schultz
Grijalva	Neal	Waters
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Waxman
Hahn	Norcross	Welch
Hanabusa	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Hastings (FL)	Owens	Yarmuth
Heck (WA)	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—16

Aderholt	Duckworth	Miller, Gary
Bishop (UT)	Gallego	Negrete McLeod
Capuano	Hall	Rush
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Velázquez
Coble	McAllister	
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1052

Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HOYER, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. WALZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STEWART changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—232

Amash	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Barber	Grimm	Pitts
Barletta	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hanna	Pompeo
Barton	Harper	Posey
Benishek	Harris	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Reed
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Black	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Blackburn	Hensarling	Ribble
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Holding	Rigell
Brat	Hudson	Roby
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Issa	Rokita
Burgess	Jenkins	Rooney
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Camp	Jolly	Ross
Campbell	Jordan	Rothfus
Capito	Joyce	Royce
Carter	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Cassidy	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	King (NY)	Salmon
Chaffetz	Kingston	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Coffman	Kirkpatrick	Schock
Cole	Kline	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lamborn	Sessions
Cook	Lance	Shimkus
Costa	Lankford	Shuster
Cotton	Latham	Simpson
Cramer	Latta	Smith (MO)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Long	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Stewart
Denham	Marchant	Stivers
Dent	Marino	Stockman
DeSantis	Massie	Stutzman
DesJarlais	McAllister	Terry
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McCaul	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Tipton
Ellmers	McIntyre	Turner
Farenthold	McKeon	Upton
Fincher	McKinley	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Wagner
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walberg
Fleming	Meadows	Walden
Flores	Meehan	Walorski
Forbes	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Mica	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Whitfield
Gardner	Mulvaney	Williams
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gibbs	Noem	Wolf
Gibson	Nugent	Womack
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Woodall
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Yoder
Goodlatte	Olson	Yoho
Gosar	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Granger	Pearce	

NOES—191

Adams	Gutiérrez	Owens
Barrow (GA)	Hahn	Pallone
Bass	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Beatty	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Heck (WA)	Payne
Bera (CA)	Higgins	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Peters (CA)
Blumenauer	Holt	Peters (MI)
Bonamici	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Horsford	Pocan
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Polis
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Quigley
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Butterfield	Jeffries	Rangel
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jones	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Keating	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kildee	T.
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kind	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Schakowsky
Clay	Langevin	Schiff
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Connolly	Levin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lewis	Scott, David
Cooper	Lipinski	Serrano
Courtney	Loebbsack	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Sherman
Cummings	Lowe	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Slaughter
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
DeGette	(NM)	Speier
Delaney	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Maffei	Takano
DelBene	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Doggett	Matheson	Titus
Edwards	Matsui	Tonko
Ellison	McCollum	Tsongas
Engel	McDermott	Van Hollen
Enyart	McGovern	Vargas
Eshoo	McNerney	Veasey
Esty	Meeks	Vela
Farr	Meng	Velázquez
Fattah	Michaud	Visclosky
Foster	Miller, George	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Wasserman
Fudge	Moran	Schultz
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Garamendi	Nadler	Waxman
Garcia	Napolitano	Welch
Grayson	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Nolan	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Norcross	
Grijalva	O'Rourke	

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt	Doyle	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Duckworth	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Gallego	Negrete McLeod
Coble	Hall	

□ 1101

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING THE ACTIONS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 758) strongly condemning the actions of the Russian Federation, under President Vladimir

Putin, which has carried out a policy of aggression against neighboring countries aimed at political and economic domination, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 10, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

YEAS—411

Adams	Cook	Green, Gene
Amodei	Costa	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Cotton	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Courtney	Grijalva
Barber	Cramer	Grimm
Barletta	Crawford	Guthrie
Barr	Crenshaw	Gutiérrez
Barrow (GA)	Crowley	Hahn
Barton	Cuellar	Hanabusa
Bass	Culberson	Hanna
Beatty	Cummings	Harper
Becerra	Daines	Harris
Benishek	Davis (CA)	Hartzler
Bentivolio	Davis, Danny	Hastings (VA)
Bera (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Heck (WA)
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hensarling
Bishop (NY)	Delaney	Herrera Beutler
Black	DeLauro	Higgins
Blackburn	DelBene	Himes
Blumenauer	Denham	Hinojosa
Bonamici	Dent	Holding
Boustany	DeSantis	Holt
Brady (PA)	DesJarlais	Honda
Brady (TX)	Deutch	Horsford
Braley (IA)	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Brat	Dingell	Hudson
Bridenstine	Doggett	Huelskamp
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Huffman
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Broun (GA)	Edwards	Hultgren
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Hunter
Brownley (CA)	Ellmers	Hurt
Buchanan	Engel	Israel
Bucshon	Enyart	Issa
Burgess	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Bustos	Esty	Jeffries
Butterfield	Farenthold	Jenkins
Byrne	Farr	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Fattah	Johnson (OH)
Camp	Fincher	Johnson, E. B.
Campbell	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Capito	Fleischmann	Jolly
Capps	Fleming	Jordan
Cárdenas	Flores	Joyce
Carney	Forbes	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Keating
Carter	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Cassidy	Frankel (FL)	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Kildee
Castro (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Kilmer
Chabot	Fudge	Kind
Chaffetz	Gabbard	King (IA)
Chu	Garamendi	King (NY)
Cicilline	Garcia	Kingston
Clark (MA)	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Garrett	Kirkpatrick
Clawson (FL)	Gerlach	Kline
Clay	Gibbs	Kuster
Cleaver	Gibson	Labrador
Clyburn	Gingrey (GA)	LaMalfa
Coffman	Gohmert	Lamborn
Cohen	Goodlatte	Lance
Cole	Gosar	Langevin
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Lankford
Collins (NY)	Granger	Larsen (WA)
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Graves (MO)	Latham
Conyers	Green, Al	Latta

Lee (CA)	Paulsen	Sewell (AL)
Levin	Payne	Shea-Porter
Lewis	Pearce	Sherman
Lipinski	Pelosi	Shimkus
LoBiondo	Perlmutter	Shuster
Loeback	Perry	Simpson
Lofgren	Peters (CA)	Sinema
Long	Peters (MI)	Sires
Lowenthal	Peterson	Slaughter
Lowey	Petri	Smith (MO)
Lucas	Pingree (ME)	Smith (NE)
Luetkemeyer	Pittenger	Smith (NJ)
Lujan Grisham	Pitts	Smith (TX)
(NM)	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Poe (TX)	Southerland
(NM)	Polis	Speier
Lummis	Pompeo	Stewart
Lynch	Posey	Stivers
Maffei	Price (GA)	Stockman
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Stutzman
Carolyn	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
Maloney, Sean	Rahall	Takano
Marchant	Rangel	Terry
Marino	Reed	Thompson (CA)
Matheson	Reichert	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Renacci	Thompson (PA)
McAllister	Ribble	Thornberry
McCarthy (CA)	Rice (SC)	Tiberi
McCaul	Richmond	Tierney
McClintock	Rigell	Tipton
McCollum	Roby	Titus
McGovern	Roe (TN)	Tonko
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Tsongas
McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Turner
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Upton
McKinley	Rokita	Valadao
McMorris	Rooney	Van Hollen
Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen	Vargas
McNerney	Roskam	Veasey
Meehan	Ross	Vela
Meeks	Rothfus	Velázquez
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Messer	Royce	Wagner
Mica	Ruiz	Walberg
Michaud	Runyan	Walden
Miller (FL)	Ruppersberger	Walorski
Miller (MI)	Rush	Walz
Moore	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Moran	Ryan (WI)	Schultz
Mullin	Salmon	Waters
Mulvaney	Sánchez, Linda	Waxman
Murphy (FL)	T.	Weber (TX)
Murphy (PA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Webster (FL)
Nadler	Sanford	Welch
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Wenstrup
Neal	Scalise	Westmoreland
Neugebauer	Schakowsky	Whitfield
Noem	Schiff	Williams
Nolan	Schneider	Wilson (FL)
Norcross	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Nugent	Schrader	Wittman
Nunes	Schwartz	Wolf
Nunnelee	Schweikert	Womack
Olson	Scott (VA)	Woodall
Owens	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Palazzo	Scott, David	Yoder
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
Pascarell	Serrano	Young (AK)
Pastor (AZ)	Sessions	Young (IN)

NAYS—10

Amash	Jones	O'Rourke
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Rohrabacher
Grayson	McDermott	
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Doyle	Meadows
Bishop (UT)	Duckworth	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Gallego	Negrete McLeod
Coble	Hall	
Cooper	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1110

Ms. SPEIER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE ADOPTION OF MOTION TO CONCUR IN SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3979, PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979 with an amendment may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUBMISSION OF MATERIAL EXPLANATORY OF THE AMENDMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE AMENDMENT OF THE SENATE TO H.R. 3979

Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 770, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services submitted explanatory material relating to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 3979.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY MR. McKEON, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES REGARDING THE HOUSE AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT ON H.R. 3979, PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

The following consists of the explanatory material to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

Section 5 of the Act specifies that this explanatory statement shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of this legislation as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

In this joint explanatory statement, the provisions of H.R. 4435, the House-passed version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, are generally referred to as "the House bill." The provisions of S. 2410, the Senate Committee on Armed Services committee-reported version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, are generally referred to as "the Senate committee-reported bill." Senate amendments included in the agreements are identified by Senate amendment numbers. The final form of the agreements reached during negotiations between the House and the Senate are referred to as "the agreement."

Compliance with rules of the House of Representatives and Senate regarding earmarks and congressionally directed spending items

Consistent with the intent of clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and Rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, neither the bill text reflected in the agreement nor the accompanying joint explanatory statement contains any congressional earmarks, congressionally-directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits, as defined in such rules.

Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget implication

The administration's budget request for national defense discretionary programs within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives for fiscal year 2015 was \$577.1 billion. Of this amount, \$495.5 billion was requested for base Department of Defense (DOD) programs, \$63.7 billion was requested for overseas contingency operations (OCO), and \$17.9 billion was requested for national security programs in the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB). The budget request incorporates the amendments submitted to Congress on June 26, 2014 and November 10, 2014.

The bill authorizes \$577.1 billion in fiscal year 2015, including \$495.9 billion for base DOD programs, \$63.7 billion for OCO, and \$17.5 billion for national security programs in the DOE and the DNFSB.

The two tables preceding the detailed program adjustments in Division D of this joint explanatory statement summarize the direct discretionary authorizations in the agreement and the equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2015 defense programs. The first table summarizes the agreement on authorizations within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees. The second table details the budget authority implication of the discretionary authorizations in the agreement when accounting for national defense items that are not in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees.

Budgetary effects of this Act (sec. 4)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 4) that would require the budgetary effects of this Act be determined in accordance with the procedures established in title I of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139).

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

BUDGET ITEMS

Navy enterprise information technology

The budget request included \$87.2 million in Other Procurement, Navy Line 161 for enterprise information technology (IT).

The House bill would approve the budget request.

The Senate committee-reported bill would decrease that line item by \$15.0 million to reflect concerns about the continued investment of funds into legacy IT infrastructure. The agreement authorizes the budget request for this item.

We note that much of this funding is supporting procurements related to the sustainment of legacy Navy IT systems located outside the continental United States (OCONUS). We understand that these procurements are necessary to provide technical upgrades to sustain these networks as the Navy determines how to converge all of its networks as part of a future Naval Networking Environment. The investment required by this funding would bring the OCONUS networks up to a standard that could support a transition to the Next Generation Enterprise Network contract in the future, which would also align Navy networks in a way that would support the enterprise-wide push to standardize capabilities in the Joint Information Environment framework. We note that this set of hardware and

network systems transitions entail additional cost, technical risk, and potentially operational risk to deployed forces, which could have been avoided with better planning for and more strategic funding of the systems. We expect the Navy, as well as the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer, to ensure that all Department of Navy and Department of Defense enterprise IT system efforts have robust planning related to and funding dedicated for the maintenance and sustainment of legacy systems, and to ensure that systems meet requirements and reflect modern state-of-the-art IT systems, to the maximum extent practicable and that this is documented in the programs' acquisition strategy documentation. This should apply to both Major Automated Information Systems (MAIS) and non-MAIS efforts.

Ejection seat safety and reliability improvement program

The amended budget request included no funds for the procurement of modernized and upgraded ejection seats for Department of the Air Force fighter and bomber aircraft.

The House bill would increase the budget request by a total of \$10.5 million, of which \$3.5 million is for initial qualification of upgraded ejection seats in the Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDT&E, AF) account, and \$7.0 million is for initial installation of upgraded ejection seats in the Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) account.

The Senate committee-reported bill approved the budget request.

We recommend an additional increase of \$6.0 million ejection seat programs, including \$3.5 million in RDT&E, AF, and \$2.5 million in APAF.

Section 146(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) required a report by the Secretary of the Air Force on various aspects of the health and safety risks associated with ejection seats. The report confirmed that, with increased use of helmet-mounted devices, the risks of death or serious injury increases, and increases even more for lighter aircrew.

In response to a requirement to analyze initiatives to decrease the risk of death or serious injury during an ejection sequence, the report indicated that, although the Air Force had spent \$25.8 million for investments in safety improvements for existing seats, the Air Force had stopped short of final qualification testing.

The report also referred to an Air Force analysis of alternatives (AoA) that the Air Force had conducted in 2010 that supported: "(a) an improved ejection seat solution with an expanded anthropometric envelope that would match the current pilot population to increase safety; and (b) a design that reduces aircraft life cycle costs."

We believe that the Air Force should review and update, as necessary, the 2010 AoA, and establish a program for increasing the ejection safety and reliability of the Air Force's fighter and bomber aircraft.

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 101) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for procurement for the Army, the Navy and Marine Corps, the Air Force, and defense-wide activities, as specified in the funding table in section 4101.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 101).

The agreement includes this provision.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Plan on modernization of UH-60A aircraft of Army National Guard (sec. 111)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 112) that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report on plans for the modernization of UH-60A helicopters in the Army National Guard.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Construction of San Antonio class amphibious ship (sec. 121)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 122) that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract during fiscal year 2015 for the procurement of one San Antonio-class amphibious ship using incremental funding.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 123) that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer funds available in the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN), or other Navy procurement account for either or both of the following purposes:

(1) Up to \$650.0 million to conduct a refueling and complex overhaul of the USS George Washington (CVN-73).

(2) Up to \$650.0 million to build a San Antonio-class amphibious ship.

The Senate provision would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to use incremental funding for a San Antonio-class ship if additional funds are made available in fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes the House provision. The agreement also provides full funding for the fiscal year 2015 requirements for conducting a refueling and complex overhaul of the USS George Washington (CVN-73), and provides authorization for \$800.0 million for the San Antonio-class amphibious ship program elsewhere in this Act.

Limitation on availability of funds for mission modules for Littoral Combat Ship (sec. 122)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 125) that would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from obligating any funds for the procurement of mission modules for the Littoral Combat Ship until the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees each of the following:

(1) The Milestone B program goals for cost, schedule, and performance for each increment.

(2) Certification by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) with respect to the total number for each module type that is required to perform all necessary operational testing.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would clarify that the Milestone B goals and DOT&E certification would be with regard to each mission module, rather than with each increment of capability for each mission module.

Extension of limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship (sec. 123)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 126) that would amend section 124(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 to extend the prohibition on spending in section 124 to include fiscal year 2015. Section 124 prevents using funds available in fiscal year 2014 for construction or advanced procurement of materials for the Littoral Combat Ships designated as LCS-25

or LCS-26 until the Secretary of the Navy submits certain reports and information to the congressional defense committees.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Report on test evaluation master plan for Littoral Combat Ship seaframes and mission modules (sec. 124)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 122) that would require the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to submit a report on the test and evaluation master plan for the seaframes and mission modules for the Littoral Combat Ship program.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Airborne electronic attack capabilities (sec. 125)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 121) would direct the Secretary of the Navy to take whatever steps the Secretary deems appropriate and are available to the Navy to ensure that the Navy retains the option of buying more EA-18G aircraft, if further analysis of whether to expand the airborne electronic attack (AEA) force structure indicates the Navy should include more EA-18G aircraft in carrier air wings. The provision would also authorize the Navy, subject to appropriation, to use \$75.0 million in funds authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2014 for advance procurement funds of F/A-18 E/F aircraft for the purpose of retaining such an option. The Senate committee-reported bill also recommended an increase of \$25.0 million in section 4101 for those purposes.

The House bill contained no similar provision. The House bill recommended an increase of \$450.0 million in section 4101 to purchase additional EA-18G aircraft.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would exclude language regarding the use of prior year funds. We also include a recommendation for additional funding for EA-18G aircraft elsewhere in this Act.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of MQ-1 Predator aircraft (sec. 131)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 131) that would prohibit the Department of Defense from using fiscal year 2015 funds to retire MQ-1 Predator aircraft.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from retiring any MQ-1 aircraft, unless an MQ-1 aircraft has been damaged and it is not economically viable to repair the aircraft, as determined by the Secretary.

Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of U-2 aircraft (sec. 132)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 133) that would prohibit the Department of Defense from obligating or expending funds to make significant changes to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage U-2 aircraft.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of A-10 aircraft (sec. 133)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 132) that would prohibit obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2015 funds to retire

A-10 aircraft. The provision would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study evaluating Air Force aircraft used, as of the date of the study, to conduct close-air support missions.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 134) that would prohibit obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2015 funds to make significant changes to manning levels with respect to any A-10 aircraft squadrons, or to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any A-10 aircraft.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would allow the Secretary of Defense to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to move up to 36 A-10 in the active component primary aircraft inventory (PAI) status to back up flying status, or back up aircraft inventory (BAI) status, for the duration of fiscal year 2015, 30 days after certifying to the congressional defense committees that he has:

(1) Received the results of an independent assessment by the Director of the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation of alternative ways to provide manpower to maintain the Air Force fighter fleet and field Joint Strike Fighter aircraft in fiscal year 2015; and

(2) Determined, after giving consideration to such analysis, that moving active component aircraft in PAI status to BAI status is needed to avoid:

(a) Significantly degrading the readiness of the Air Force fighter fleet; or

(b) Significantly delaying the planned fielding of F-35 aircraft.

The agreement also includes the requirement that the Comptroller General conduct the study of close-air support missions as was included in the House provision.

If the Secretary of Defense makes the certification and allows the Secretary of the Air Force to transfer A-10 aircraft from PAI to BAI status, we direct the Secretary of Defense to reprogram any money freed up as a result of reduced flying hours or reduced numbers of maintenance personnel for the A-10 aircraft to other higher priority Department of Defense programs.

Prohibition on cancellation or modification of avionics modernization program for C-130 aircraft (sec. 134)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 131) that would prevent the Department of Defense from using Air Force funds in fiscal year 2015 to:

(1) Take any action to cancel or modify the avionics modernization program (AMP) of record for C-130 aircraft; or

(2) Initiate an alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program for C-130 aircraft that is designed or intended to replace the avionics modernization program described in paragraph (1).

The provision would prevent the Air Force from obligating more than 75 percent of the funds for operation and maintenance of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force until 15 days after the Secretary of the Air Force has certified that she has obligated funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 2015 for the AMP program of record for C-130 aircraft.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3588) contained a provision that would allow the Air Force to use programs in addition to the AMP for C-130 aircraft to modernize such aircraft.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would permit the Air Force to make modifications to C-130 aircraft, such as Automatic Dependent Surveillance Broadcast-Out (ADSB-Out) or the communication, navigation, surveillance and air traffic management (CNS/ATM) program, that would be required to operate without restriction in airspace controlled by the Federal Aviation Administration or other national aviation authority in foreign countries, upon a certification by the Secretary of Defense that such modification is required to operate without restriction in such airspace. The provision would also prevent the Air Force from obligating more than 85 percent of the funds for operation and maintenance of the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force until 15 days after the Secretary of the Air Force has certified that she has obligated funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 2015 for the AMP program of record for C-130 aircraft.

We are specifically directing the Secretary of the Air Force not to transfer or repurpose funds authorized and appropriated for the AMP program to execute such additional modernizations unless the modifications are included as part of the AMP program of record.

Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Air Force aircraft (sec. 135)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 132) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to analyze the recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force, and submit a report on implementation of the Commission's recommendations, covering not less than 80 percent of the Air Force missions and aircraft. The provision would also prevent the Secretary from retiring any aircraft until 60 days after submitting the report.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System aircraft (sec. 136)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 135) that would prohibit the Department of Defense (DOD) from retiring more than four E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft, or disestablishing any AWACS units of the active or reserve components, until a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees a report consisting of:

(1) A certification that the Secretary is able to meet all priority requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands relating to such aircraft with a planned force of 24 such aircraft; and

(2) A detailed explanation how the Secretary will meet such requirements with such planned force.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 136) that would prohibit DOD from obligating or expending funds to make significant changes to manning levels with respect to any AWACS aircraft, or to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any AWACS aircraft.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Limitation on availability of funds for divestment or transfer of KC-10 aircraft (sec. 137)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 134) that would prohibit the Department of Defense from obligating or expending funds

to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, KC-10 aircraft.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would prevent retirement until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed divestment or transfer.

Limitation on availability of funds for transfer of Air Force C-130H and C-130J aircraft (sec. 138)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1049) that would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from removing C-130 aircraft from a unit of the regular or reserve components of the Air Force that is tasked with the modular airborne firefighting system (MAFFS) mission, or from a unit that is formally associated with a unit that has the MAFFS mission, until the Secretary of the Air Force certified that MAFFS mission would not be negatively affected by the removal of such aircraft. The House bill also contained a provision (sec. 1067) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on the 5-year plan for the force structure laydown of tactical airlift aircraft within 60 days of enactment of this Act and would prevent the Air Force from implementing any movements of such aircraft until the Secretary had briefed the congressional defense committee.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 133) that would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from implementing any transfers of C-130H or C-130J aircraft until 60 days after the Secretary submits a report on the costs and benefits of such a transfer, and would require the Comptroller General to submit to the congressional defense committees a sufficiency review of the Secretary's report, including any findings and recommendations relating to such review, within 45 days after the Secretary submits a report on such transfers.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary to submit a 5-year plan for basing C-130H and C-130J aircraft, and would require that, for units with special capabilities such as the MAFFS mission, a certification that those special missions would not be negatively affected by the proposed transfers before making the transfers.

We do not intend that the prohibition on transfer of C-130 aircraft apply to movements of aircraft associated with normal Air Force management of the C-130 fleet, such as transferring aircraft between units and depots in conjunction with conducting regular maintenance or upgrades of the aircraft.

Limitation on availability of funds for transfer of Air Force KC-135 tankers (sec. 139)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 135) that would delay the Air Force's plan to transfer KC-135 aircraft from Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, pending a report on the costs and benefits of that transfer.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Report on C-130 aircraft (sec. 140)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1067) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on the 5-year plan for the force structure laydown of tactical airlift aircraft within 60 days of enactment of this Act and would prevent the Air

Force from implementing any movements of such aircraft until the Secretary briefs the congressional defense committee.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 138) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a fielding plan for C-130 aircraft within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Elsewhere in this Act, the agreement also includes a temporary prohibition on moving C-130 aircraft to another location until the Department meets certain reporting requirements.

Report on status of F-16 aircraft (sec. 141)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 139) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to report on the status and location, and any plans to change during the period of the future years defense program the status or locations, of all F-16 aircraft in the Air Force inventory.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Report on options to modernize or replace T-1A aircraft (sec. 142)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1090C) that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force should formally assess the operational feasibility, costs, potential savings, and readiness implications of utilizing contractor-owned, contractor-operated, very light jet aircraft for interim flight instruction until a permanent replacement for the T-1A enters service.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 140) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the options for replacing or upgrading the T-1A aircraft's capability, to include options of leased aircraft or services, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Report on status of air-launched cruise missile capabilities (sec. 143)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 137) that required a report on the existing air-launched cruise missile system (AGM-86) and the plan for the replacement of the system referred to as the long-range standoff missile.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would change the report due date from 180 days after date of enactment to 120 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SUBTITLE E—DEFENSE-WIDE, JOINT, AND
MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Additional oversight requirements for the undersea mobility acquisition program of the United States Special Operations Command (sec. 151)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 123) that would modify the current oversight requirements for the undersea mobility acquisition program of U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM), and require the Secretary of the Navy to review a transition plan for the undersea mobility capabilities developed by the Commander, SOCOM. This section would also repeal section 144 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would modify the requirements of section 144 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) and require the Commander, SOCOM, to provide the congressional defense committees with a technology roadmap for undersea mobility capabilities.

Plan for modernization or replacement of digital avionics equipment (sec. 152)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3568) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to the congressional defense committees for the modernization or replacement of digital avionics equipment, including use of commercial-off-the-shelf digital avionics equipment, to meet the Federal Aviation Administration's NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would clarify that the Secretary's report should address potential modernization or replacement of equipment.

Comptroller General report on F-35 aircraft acquisition program (sec. 153)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 141) that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an annual report on the cost, schedule, and performance of the F-35 aircraft acquisition program. The reporting requirement would end at the point when the F-35 enters into full-rate production.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Limitation on availability of funds for Airborne Reconnaissance Low aircraft

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 111) that would prohibit the Army from obligating or expended any fiscal year 2015 funds on the modernization of the communications intelligence subsystem of the Airborne Reconnaissance Low program until the Secretary of the Army submitted a report on that subsystem.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We remain concerned in regards to the Army's overall signals intelligence modernization plan. Therefore, we direct the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 15, 2015. The report, at a minimum, should:

- (1) Specify which subsystem will be used to modernize such aircraft;
- (2) Explain how such subsystem was selected;
- (3) Identify the alternatives to such subsystem that the Secretary considered during such selection; and
- (4) Detail how such subsystem will be integrated into the signals intelligence modernization plan for the Army.

Limitation on availability of funds for moored training ship program

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 124) that would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from obligating more than 80 percent of the funds for the moored training ship program until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense certified that:

(1) The Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has reviewed and approved the need for two additional moored training ships;

(2) The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation has reviewed and certified the cost estimates of the moored training ship program; and

(3) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics has reviewed and approved the budget, schedule, and construction plans for such two additional moored training ships.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Multiyear procurement authority for Tomahawk block IV missiles

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 121) that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into one or more multiyear contracts for the procurement of Tomahawk block IV missiles.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We believe that the Department should review its overall missile portfolio and propose more economical procurement strategies in the fiscal year 2016 budget request, including the use of multiyear procurements, block buys, and contracts with one or more years of priced options.

Procurement of advanced threat emitters

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3575) contained a provision that would express the sense of Congress on the procurement of advanced threat emitters, their importance in providing vital electronic warfare training, and need for the Air Force to prioritize its acquisition.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We recognize the Joint Threat Emitter system provides vital electronic warfare training for combat aircrews by simulating the multiple threat scenarios of a hostile integrated air defense system. We also note that the system of threat emitters currently in use on U.S. military ranges has deficiencies. These deficiencies place our forces at risk and could jeopardize mission success. We believe the Department of Defense and the services should consider prioritizing and accelerating the acquisition and fielding of a modernized system of threat emitters beyond the level requested in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget.

Sense of Congress regarding the OCONUS basing of the F-35A

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 142) that would express the sense of Congress, regarding the Outside the Continental United States (OCONUS) basing of the F-35A, that the Secretary of the Air Force should place emphasis on the benefits derived from sites that:

- (1) Are capable of hosting fighter-based bilateral and multilateral training opportunities with international partners;
- (2) Have sufficient airspace and range capabilities and capacity to meet the training requirements;
- (3) Have existing facilities to support personnel, operations, and logistics associated with the flying mission;
- (4) Have limited encroachment that would adversely impact training or operations; and

(5) Minimize the overall construction and operational costs.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We are aware that the Air Force uses a deliberate strategic basing process to make its basing decisions. In October 2013, the Air Force announced the list of bases in the Pacific Air Force command being considered to beddown the first F-35A squadrons OCONUS. In August 2014, the Air Force announced that the Secretary of the Air Force had chosen Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska as the preferred alternative to host the first F-35A squadrons in the Pacific Air Forces area of responsibility.

We support the Air Force's strategic basing process and believe that it provides a thorough, consistent, and transparent process for basing decisions. When the Air Force is evaluating candidate bases for new units and missions, we believe that the Air Force should use criteria-based analysis and military judgment at each location, to include enterprise, mission, capacity, costs and environment. For different circumstances, such as OCONUS basing, the Air Force may also need to include additional criteria, such as notification of a host nation partner.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST,
AND EVALUATION
BUDGET ITEMS

Strategic Capabilities Office

The budget request included \$250.0 million in research, development, test and evaluation, defense-wide for the activities of the Strategic Capabilities Office (SCO).

The House bill would decrease funding for SCO by \$30.0 million.

The Senate committee-reported bill would decrease funding for SCO by \$15.0 million.

The agreement reduces the budget request for SCO by \$10.0 in PE 63289D8Z and \$20.0 million in PE 64250D8Z.

We are aware of and supportive of the valuable work that the SCO has been conducting. Though the efforts of SCO are still in early stages and have only recently begun to produce some tangible capabilities, we see promising concepts being supported by investment. We do have concerns that SCO projects are being scaled at a rate that is not commensurate with the results that have been shown so far. We believe that the SCO could benefit from senior level guidance and oversight to ensure that promising ideas are more closely tied to the needs, requirements and priorities of the combatant commands. Additionally, for those programs in Advanced Capability and Prototyping (6.4) budget activity, we also believe the programs need to have an estimated cost to field the capability, if the demonstration proves successful, to support transition planning activities.

We also believe that senior level involvement is necessary to help coordinate SCO efforts with other research and development activities of the Department of Defense (DOD), especially within the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). In a budget constrained environment, better coordination of SCO efforts with the entire research and development enterprise, including the various communities of interest established by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, will enhance SCO's effectiveness by leveraging the funding and expertise of the entire of the research enterprise.

Additionally, we understand that leadership within DOD is looking at establishing a charter for, and changing the organizational reporting structure of, the SCO. We believe that DOD should examine a range of options to determine where to position and how to resource the office. We fully expect DOD to inform the congressional defense committees on any significant changes to SCO before any changes are formalized.

High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System

The budget request included \$386.9 million in PE 63766E for network-centric warfare technology.

The House bill would approve the budget request.

The Senate committee-reported bill would decrease funding for the High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System (HELLADS) within that line item by \$20.0 million.

The agreement authorizes the budget request for this item.

We note that the HELLADS has been funded by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) for over 10 years, with over \$200 million expended to date. We note that a planned fiscal year 2015 technology demonstration will mark the end of DARPA's investment in technical development. We are concerned that the program still has no identified commitments for a transition pathway to a service program for further development or demonstration. At this point, we believe that even a successful demonstration of HELLADS capabilities in fiscal year 2015 is not likely to result in any meaningful transition of the capability to a service program. Therefore, we direct the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, acting through the congressionally-mandated Joint Technology Office for High Energy Lasers, to review current DARPA-service plans for transition of the HELLADS capabilities and provide a report on the plans, schedules, and identified resources to support integration and transition into any service-led directed energy efforts, no later than March 1, 2015.

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF
APPROPRIATIONS

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 201) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the funding table in section 4201.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 201).

The agreement includes this provision.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS,
RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Modification of authority for prizes for advanced technology achievements (sec. 211)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 211) that would modify the authority of the Secretary of Defense to hold prize and challenge competitions to spur advanced technology achievements.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

In the recently announced "Better Buying Power (BBP) 3.0" initiative, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics Frank Kendall called for improved communication between industry and the government in order to increase the productivity of both government and industry research efforts, including Independent Research and Development performed by industry. We recognize the merits of such a sug-

gestion, as well as the challenges in developing an effective communications process that is able to be adaptive enough to protect intellectual property and data rights, and protect both industry and government partners from bid protests when informed interest shifts to informed acquisition.

We note that prize authority has historically been used to good effect at aligning the government's technology and research goals with the resources, ambition, and innovation of the private sector. From the Longitude Prize in 1714 that resulted in improved ship navigation capabilities, to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Grand Challenge in 2005 which resulted in demonstrating autonomous ground vehicle navigation, government prize authority has demonstrated the ability to bring together government and industry funding, technology and expertise to produce revolutionary new technological capabilities. While we do not believe that such prizes can replace the kind of coordination and dialogue sought in BBP 3.0, it is an important tool in the toolbox for demonstrating the benefits of such a process for both the government and industry.

Modification of Manufacturing Technology Program (sec. 212)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 212) that would clarify that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics or his designees should conduct oversight of the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel, which coordinates manufacturing technology and research programs for the Department of Defense. Further, the provision reduces the frequency of mandated updates to the Manufacturing Technology program's strategic plan, to better synchronize this effort with the Quadrennial Defense Review process.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

We intend that the next strategic plan be developed in coordination with the Quadrennial Defense Review currently scheduled for 2018.

Revision of requirement for acquisition programs to maintain defense research facility records (sec. 213)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 222) that would modify the requirements to subsection (b) of section 2364 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the need for acquisition programs to maintain a record of all issue papers from a defense research facility related to said acquisition programs.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 806).

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Treatment by Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center of significant modifications to test and evaluation facilities and resources (sec. 214)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 214) that would direct the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Test Resource Management Center (TRMC) to report on significant reductions or consolidations of major test facilities.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision which would modify the authorities and duties of the Director, TRMC, to review and report on significant expansion, divestment, consolidation or curtailment of activities within the test and evaluation facilities and resources of the Major Range and Test Facility Base.

Revision to the service requirement under the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation defense education program (sec. 215)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 221) that would modify the options for the service obligation requirement within the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) program to also include employment with a public or private sector entity or organization outside the Department of Defense (DOD), if the Secretary of Defense determines that the employment would provide a benefit to the Department of Defense (DOD).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment to clarify that the Secretary should make significant efforts to place SMART scholars into DOD positions, prior to placement in non-DOD positions.

Limitation on availability of funds for armored multi-purpose vehicle program (sec. 216)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 212) that would limit the availability of funds for the armored multi-purpose vehicle until the Secretary of the Army submits a report on plans for the replacement of M113 armored personnel carriers in formations outside of its combat brigades.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Limitation on availability of funds for Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike system (sec. 217)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 213) prevent obligation of any Navy research and development funds for the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) to award a contract for the air vehicle segment until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report that: (1) certifies that a review of the requirements for air vehicle segments of the unmanned carrier-launched surveillance and strike system is complete; and (2) includes the results of such review.

The House report accompanying H.R. 4435 (H. Rept. 113-446) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 indicated that the current UCLASS air vehicle segment requirements would not address the emerging anti-access/area denial (A2/AD) challenges to U.S. power projection that originally motivated creation of what became the Navy UCLASS program. In particular, the House report indicated that a disproportionate emphasis in the requirements on unrefueled endurance to enable continuous intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) support to the carrier strike group (CSG), would result in an aircraft with too little survivability and too small an internal weapons payload capability.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would require the Navy to submit a report with the budget for fiscal year 2017 that would:

(1) Identify the cost and performance trade-offs the Navy made in arriving at the set of requirements for the UCLASS air vehicle segment to include strike capability in an A2/AD environment;

(2) Address the derivation of requirements for the overall composition of the future carrier air wing, including any contribution to CSG ISR capability from non-carrier air wing forces, such as the MQ-4C Triton;

(3) Specify how the Navy derived the plan for achieving the best mix of capabilities for the CSG air wing to conduct representative joint ISR-strike campaigns in the 2030 timeframe, including how the UCLASS, F-35C, EA-18G, and the aircraft that is proposed to replace the F/A-18E/F (FA-XX) would contribute to overall capability, including in an A2/AD threat environment;

(4) Define the UCLASS program's acquisition strategy, and provide the justification for any tailoring of that strategy that deviates from that of a traditional program, consistent with DoDI 5000.02 policy; and

(5) Establish a formal acquisition program cost and schedule baseline, to allow the Navy to track unit costs, and provide regular reports to Congress on cost, schedule and performance progress.

We believe that the Secretary of Defense may submit a report that certifies the current set of requirements and can proceed with the current program, or could decide to revisit the current UCLASS requirements and conduct another review of costs and capabilities. The Navy may have made an appropriate set of trade-offs between costs and capabilities in deriving a set of requirements for UCLASS, but those trade-offs should be evaluated in the context of the overall CSG capability, not on the basis of individual capabilities of weapons systems or an unconstrained budget.

Limitation on Availability of Funds for airborne reconnaissance systems (sec. 218)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 214) that would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized by this Act to not more than 25 percent for the imaging and targeting support of airborne reconnaissance systems, until the Secretary of the Air Force delivers a report to the appropriate congressional committees. The elements of the report would include a detailed plan regarding the use of such funds for fiscal year 2015, and a strategic plan for the funding of advanced airborne reconnaissance technologies supporting manned and unmanned systems.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would modify the reporting requirement for the use of funds for fiscal year 2015.

We believe the plan should identify the activities and projects that the Air Force is investing in. We note the restriction on funds only applies to the funds for the imaging and targeting support project within Program Element 35206F. We believe the strategic plan should identify the broad objectives that the project should be focused on accomplishing over the course of the future year defense program, and may be provided to the appropriate Congressional committees in the form of a briefing.

Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems aircraft (sec. 219)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 213) that would prohibit the Air Force from retiring or preparing to retire operational Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft until the Secretary of the Air Force submits a report detailing various aspects of the Air Force's plan to replace the current JSTARS aircraft, including an assessment of the cost and schedule of developing and fielding a new aircraft and radar system employing mature technology to replace the current JSTARS aircraft.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would clarify that the assessment of cost and schedule of developing and fielding a new aircraft and radar system would be for a program that would deliver two replacement aircraft to the JSTARS aircraft operating base by fiscal year 2019.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS

Reduction in frequency of reporting by Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering (sec. 221)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 222) that would reduce the reporting requirement related to the systems engineering activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Independent assessment of interagency bio-defense research and development (sec. 222)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3435) contained a provision that would require a study of bureaucratic and policy barriers to the efficient execution of interagency research and development activities related to biodefense.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Briefing on modeling and simulation technological and industrial base in support of requirements of Department of Defense (sec. 223)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3848) contained a provision that would direct an independent study of the United States modeling and simulation industrial base.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives that updates the report on the Department of Defense Modeling and Simulation (M&S) Technological and Industrial Base that was submitted to Congress on March 11, 2011. This report was required by section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) and describes current and planned efforts to support and enhance the defense M&S technological and industrial base.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Modification to requirement for contractor cost-sharing in pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of certain defense systems (sec. 231)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 223) that would amend section 243(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) by striking "at least one half of the cost of such activities" and inserting "an appropriate share of the cost of such activities, as determined by the Secretary."

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 233).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Pilot program on assignment to Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency of private sector personnel with critical research and development expertise (sec. 232)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 231) that would authorize the Director of the Defense Advanced

Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to carry out a pilot program to employ up to 5 individuals employed by the private sector on rotational assignments to lead research or development projects of the Agency.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that authorizes the pilot program with additional guidance to manage potential conflicts of interest that may arise during execution.

Pilot program on enhancement of preparation of dependents of members of Armed Forces for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (sec. 233)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 222) that would authorize a pilot program to enhance the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) educational opportunities for children of servicemembers.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment to clarify the types of students, teachers, and classrooms on which the authorized activities may focus.

We believe there is a national security imperative to support the development of a strong, vibrant STEM workforce that can support Department of Defense (DOD) needs. A Council on Foreign Relations report from March 2012 titled “U.S. Education Reform and National Security”, states the U.S. “shortage of skilled human capital both inflates personnel costs and strains the military’s ability to develop and deploy technologies that can deter sophisticated adversaries.” It further states, “Many U.S. generals caution that too many new enlistees cannot read training manuals for technologically sophisticated equipment. A former head of the Army’s Training and Doctrine Command said that the lack of fully qualified young people was “an imminent and menacing threat to our national security.”

DOD has a critical requirement to maintain an experienced, high quality, technical workforce. To achieve this, it is necessary to engage at the earliest stages of the STEM pipeline. We note that some research indicates that achieving certain math skills by the eighth grade is a critical determinant for success in STEM fields. For that reason, the committee believes that it is important for DOD to support K–12 STEM education programs, as that supports an increased pipeline of qualified individuals that may pursue university degrees in STEM fields. Excellence in STEM fields is important for the general economic health and competitiveness of the nation, but due to the special security requirements of DOD employees, we believe that DOD’s STEM workforce needs are especially acute and will only continue to grow in the future.

Additionally, we note that DOD has a responsibility to ensure proper education is available to military children, and that it is in DOD’s interest to promote education programs that benefit both military children and our future national security workforce. We believe that this provision’s focus on the communities support for the children of military dependents also increases the likelihood that such STEM-enabled students will go on to national security careers, including military service.

Sense of Congress on helicopter health and usage monitoring system of the Army (sec. 234)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number

3567) contained a provision that would express the sense of the Senate on helicopter health and usage monitoring systems.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Preliminary design review of presidential aircraft recapitalization program

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 211) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to complete a preliminary design review of the presidential aircraft recapitalization (PAR) program prior to receiving a milestone B approval from the Milestone Decision Authority.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We understand that the Air Force plans to develop the PAR acquisition strategy, complete milestone B documentation, continue market research, and develop the Systems Requirements Document through fiscal year 2015. We expect the Air Force to lockdown requirements prior to contract award to ensure the technical integrity of the PAR program prior to Milestone B and to minimize long-term program risks.

Report on thermal injury prevention

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1068) that would require a report on prevention of thermal injuries to occupants of military vehicles that result from over matching ballistic threats.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We are interested to learn how the Army is aggressively investigating innovative technologies to prevent or mitigate the risks of thermal injury to occupants of combat and tactical vehicles that can result from over matching ballistic threats. Accordingly, we direct the Secretary of the Army to provide, not later than March 31, 2015, a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on the Army’s related technology research and development plans and investment strategies for thermal injury prevention, as well as occupant centric survivability systems in current and future combat and tactical vehicles.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

BUDGET ITEM

Special Operations Forces suicide prevention initiatives

The budget request included \$67.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, defense-wide, to support the United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM) Preservation of the Force and Families (POTFF) program.

The House bill would transfer \$23.3 million to the Defense Health Program’s SOCOM Behavioral Health and Warrior Care Management Program.

The Senate committee-reported bill would approve the budget request.

The agreement includes a transfer of \$14.8 million to the SOCOM Behavioral Health and Warrior Care Management Program for additional behavioral health programs and a transfer of \$4.0 million to the Defense Suicide Prevention Office to implement recommendations that result from a review of Department of Defense (DOD) efforts to prevent suicide among members of Special Operations Forces (SOF) and their families, as directed elsewhere in this Act. In addition,

the agreement includes the full requested amount of \$7.2 million for the Psychological Performance Program within POTFF.

We recognize the tremendous sacrifices made by the men and women within SOF and their families after more than 12 years of war. We note with concern that suicide rates for SOF have continued to increase since calendar year 2010, and that for the past 2 years, suicide rates within SOF have surpassed those of the military services.

We support the efforts of SOCOM to improve training and awareness related to suicide and plans to expand a pilot peer-to-peer training program. We also support the many service-provided and DOD-wide suicide prevention programs that SOCOM has utilized. While DOD, SOCOM, and the services have taken positive action to address SOF suicide rates, we believe that more must be done to reinforce targeted suicide prevention efforts in addition to holistic SOF resiliency programs.

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 301)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 301) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4301.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 301).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

SUBTITLE B—ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Elimination of fiscal year limitation on prohibition of payment of fines and penalties from the Environmental Restoration Account, Defense (sec. 311)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 311) that would eliminate the fiscal year limitations on the prohibition of paying fines and penalties from the Environmental Restoration Account, defense, unless the fine or penalty arose out of an activity funded by that account or was specifically authorized by law.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Nothing in this provision should be construed to change the Department of Defense’s obligations to pay penalties or fines, and to do so in a timely fashion.

Method of funding for cooperative agreements under the Sikes Act (sec. 312)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 311) that would amend subsection (b) of section 103a of the Sikes Act (section 670c–1 of title 16, United States Code) to allow for lump sum payments for cooperative agreements to cover the future costs of activities provided for under the agreements.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the provision.

Report on prohibition of disposal of waste in open-air burn pits (sec. 313)

The House bill included a provision (Sec. 312) that would require the combatant commanders to submit a biannual certification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that covered waste under the jurisdiction of the commander has not been disposed of in violation of the regulations set forth in section 317 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law

111-84). This section also prescribes additional details required in instances of non-compliance.

The Senate committee-reported bill did not contain a similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees regarding the Department of Defense's (DOD) compliance with applicable Public Law and DOD instructions regarding the disposal of covered waste in burn pits. The provision also requires the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment of the report submitted by the Secretary.

We note with concern that there are a number of instances where compliance with the DOD instructions and public law, with respect to the disposal of covered waste in burn pits, has been called into question. It is our expectation that the Secretary will use this report as an opportunity to address any gaps and take required action, as necessary and appropriate, to ensure education of and strict compliance with the prohibitions on the disposal of covered waste in burn pits.

Business case analysis of any plan to design, refurbish, or construct a biofuel refinery (sec. 314)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 317) that would require the Department of Defense to obtain a congressional authorization before entering into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuels refinery.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that no later than 30 days before entering into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishment, or construction of a biofuels refinery, the Secretary of Defense or service secretary concerned, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a business case analysis regarding their intended plan.

Environmental restoration at former Naval Air Station Chincoteague, Virginia (sec. 315)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 320) that would permit the Secretary of Defense to undertake an environmental restoration project at Wallops Flight Facility, Virginia.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 312).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We note that the Wallops Flight Facility, Virginia includes the Naval Aviation Ordnance Test Station, Virginia. We also note that the Secretary of Defense may undertake this environmental restoration project at Wallops Flight Facility, Virginia, with regard to pollutants or contaminants that are solely attributable to Department of Defense activities while the property was under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy.

Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of drop-in fuels (sec. 316)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 313) that would prohibit Department of Defense (DOD) funds to be used for bulk purchases of drop-in fuel for operational purposes, unless the cost of that drop-in fuel is cost competitive with traditional fuel, subject to a national security waiver.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment that would factor in the fully-burdened cost of fuel.

We note that this provision adds a 30 day notice to the congressional defense committees prior to the purchase of bulk drop-in fuels for operational purposes, if the fully-burdened delivered cost is 10 percent over the fully-burdened market price of traditional fuels available for the same purpose. We also note that large-scale demonstrations count as operational purposes and are covered under this limitation. We expect DOD to not use a unique federal subsidy to buy or purchase down the cost of fuel so it falls below the 10 percent threshold.

Decontamination of a portion of former bombardment area on island of Culebra, Puerto Rico (sec. 317)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2818) that would express the sense of Congress that the statutory prohibition on environmental remediation on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico is a unique anomaly and would lift the statutory restriction for environmental remediation for areas having regular public access by amending section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-166).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 316) that would express the sense of Congress that certain portions of the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico should be available for safe public recreational use and would lift the statutory restriction for environmental remediation for certain identified areas by amending section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-166), as well as modifying the restrictions contained within the quitclaim deed.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Alternative fuel automobiles (sec. 318)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (3911) contained a provision that would create incentives for the development of alternative dual-fuel vehicles.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with modifying amendments.

SUBTITLE C—LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT

Modification of quarterly readiness reporting requirement (sec. 321)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 322) that would amend section 482 of title 10, United States Code, to update and streamline the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress (QRRC).

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We expect the timeliness and delivery of the QRRC to Congress to improve significantly given the efficiencies included in the bill. We note that the executive summaries and narratives—which are derived from the massive data inputs submitted by the military services, defense agencies, and combatant commands—currently captured in the QRRC are very helpful in the exercise of congressional oversight responsibilities.

We strongly urge the Department of Defense (DOD) to move the information captured in Supplement Two of the QRRC to Annex B in order to avoid duplication and maximize efficiency. We also strongly urge DOD to remove Supplement One from future QRRCs as the information therein is readily available in the public domain.

Additional requirement for strategic policy on prepositioning of materiel and equipment (sec. 322)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 321) that would amend the strategic policy

on prepositioned materiel and equipment required by section 2229(a) of title 10, United States Code, to ensure newly established crisis response elements are considered when developing goals, assessing challenges, and synchronizing requirements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Elimination of authority of Secretary of the Army to abolish arsenals (sec. 323)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 323) that would amend section 4532 of title 10, United States Code, the Arsenal Act, and eliminate the ability of the Secretary of the Army to abolish any U.S. arsenal considered to be unnecessary.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would eliminate the ability of the Secretary of the Army to abolish any U.S. arsenal considered to be unnecessary.

We note that it shall be the goal of the Secretary of the Army, in managing the workload of the arsenals, to maintain critical capabilities and ensure cost efficiency and technical competence in peacetime, while preserving the ability to provide an effective and timely response to mobilizations, national defense contingency situations, and other emergent requirements.

We also note that the critical capabilities needed by the Army are currently reflected in the Report to Congress on Critical Manufacturing Capabilities and Capacities dated August 2013. We recognize that they may change over time.

Modification of annual reporting requirement related to prepositioning of materiel and equipment (sec. 324)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 322) that would modify the yearly reporting requirement in section 321 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to continue through 2017, for a total of four reports over 4 years.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 321) that would amend section 2229(cc) of title 10, United States Code to sunset after 3 years the Comptroller General of the United States' annual review of the Department of Defense's progress in implementing its strategic policy and plan for its prepositioned stocks.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Repeal of annual report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums (sec. 331)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 331) that would repeal section 489 of title 10, United States Code, which requires the Secretary of Defense to submit annually to Congress a report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 331).

The agreement includes this provision.

Army assessment of regionally aligned forces (sec. 332)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 333) that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report on the activities, lessons learned, and future plans for regionally aligned forces.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would clarify the required elements of the report.

SUBTITLE E—LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY

Limitation on authority to enter into a contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul of the F117 engine (sec. 341)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 341) that would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from entering into a subsequent contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, and overhaul of the F117 engine until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics certifies that the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of the Air Force has structured the contract in such a way that provides the Secretary required insight into all aspects of F117 component and subcomponent historical usage, cost, service-life, and supply chain management data sufficient to determine that the Secretary is paying a fair and reasonable price for F117 sustainment as compared to the PW2000 commercial-derivative sustainment price in the private sector. This provision would also allow the Secretary to waive this limitation if the Secretary determines such waiver is in the interests of national security.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would modify the basis upon which the Under Secretary would certify that the Secretary of the Air Force has obtained data sufficient to determine that the Secretary of the Air Force is paying a fair and reasonable price for F117 sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul as compared to the PW2000 commercial-derivative engine sustainment price for sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul in the private sector.

Limitation on establishment of regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers (sec. 342)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 342) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized for fiscal year 2015 to establish Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers (RSCC) by U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM).

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

We note that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) included a similar prohibition and required the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report on the purpose, cost, and the authorities necessary for the establishment of RSCCs. While the required report was submitted on April 16, 2014, it left a number of questions unanswered related to the long-term funding required to support RSCCs in each geographic combatant command (GCC); the relative funding that would be provided by SOCOM, the GCCs, and the host nation or other participating nations; and coordination with other engagement activities conducted by the GCCs and the Department of State. Additionally, the report states that “[p]roviding confirmed and sustained out-year support is critical to realizing the full potential of an RSCC.” However, the report also identifies additional legislative authorities that would need to be addressed for such “confirmed and sustained” support to occur while indicating “there are currently no plans to seek these additional authorities.”

We believe issues related to funding and authorities need to be resolved before RSCCs are established. We also believe that SOCOM should focus its efforts and resources on supporting regional special operations engagement activities that are hosted in and led by partner nations. For example, we understand that Colombia is working to establish the Centro Regional de Estudios Avanzados de Seguridad (CREAS), that will, among other things, bring together regional special operations forces for educational, training, and other events. We note that the provision described above would not prohibit support to host-nation established regional special operations coordination activities, like CREAS, provided they are consistent with broader military-to-military objectives and coordinated with the Department of State and relevant country teams.

Limitation on transfer of MC-12 aircraft to United States Special Operations Command (sec. 343)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 341) that would prohibit the transfer of MC-12 aircraft from the Air Force to U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) for manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance until the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, in coordination with the Commander, SOCOM, provides the congressional defense committees with an analysis and justification for such a transfer.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We note that elsewhere in this Act the Department of Defense is provided the authority to use the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund (CTPF) to enhance counterterrorism activities undertaken by the U.S. Armed Forces, including government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) capabilities. We believe that the CTPF would be an appropriate source of funding to support additional GOCO operation of MC-12 aircraft in direct support of the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements of U.S. Special Operations Forces.

Further, we note that the budget request included funding in Operation and Maintenance, defense-wide and Procurement, defense-wide to support up to 13 aircraft to be flown by the Air National Guard in support of SOCOM aviation foreign internal defense and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions. We note that the limitation included in this provision and the reduction in funding for MC-12 modifications contained elsewhere in the bill do not apply to up to 13 aircraft to be flown by the Air National Guard in support of SOCOM.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Clarification of authority relating to provision of installation-support services through intergovernmental support agreements (sec. 351)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 351) that would transfer and redesignate section 2336 of title 10, United States Code, to chapter 159 of such title. This section would also define an intergovernmental support agreement and provide other technical changes.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3831) contained a similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would make clear that the secretary concerned may enter

into an intergovernmental support agreement notwithstanding any other provision of law governing the award of federal government contracts for goods and services and that any contract awarded by the Federal Government or a state or local government for installation-support services under an intergovernmental support agreement must be awarded on a competitive basis.

Management of conventional ammunition inventory (sec. 352)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 353) that would designate an authoritative database on conventional ammunition and broaden the existing military service annual reporting requirements on conventional ammunition.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1066) that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the management of the conventional ammunition demilitarization stockpile of the Department of Defense (DOD) no later than April 30, 2015.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would combine the two provisions.

We note that the preferred authoritative source of data for tracking conventional ammunition inventories across DOD is the National Level Ammunition Capability (NLAC). We also expect DOD to issue guidance that ensures NLAC collects and is responsible for disseminating accurate data in cooperation with other service ammunition systems.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Increase in funding for civil military programs

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 302) that would increase funding for civil military programs by \$55.0 million over the budget request.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Exclusions from definition of ‘chemical substance’ under Toxic Substances Control Act and report on lead ammunition

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 313) that would amend section 3(2)(B)(v) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2602(2)(B)(v)) and require a report on costs related to non-lead alternatives for small arms.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Exemption of Department of Defense from alternative fuel procurement requirement

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 314) that would amend section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-140) to exempt the Department of Defense from the requirements related to contracts for alternative or synthetic fuel in that section.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the House provision.

Study on implementation of requirements for consideration of fuel logistics support requirements in planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 314) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, on the implementation of

section 332 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (P.L. 110-417).

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the Senate provision.

We direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, regarding how the Department of Defense (DOD) is considering the operational impact of energy logistics through energy supportability analysis, including but not limited to those factors in section 332 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (P.L. 110-417).

We note that the report shall describe actions to date to consider energy logistics support in the planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes, including the following elements: (1) A description of the process DOD is using to ensure energy supportability has been analyzed and considered during the requirements development and acquisition process; (2) An assessment of how well the Services are implementing the energy supportability analysis; (3) An assessment of how well the Services have incorporated energy into their planning processes; (4) An assessment of the extent to which the energy security requirements of DOD are enhanced by incorporation of section 332 in the requirements and acquisition processes; and (5) recommendations for improvements to section 332 that would enhance energy security and capability.

Comptroller General study of Department of Defense research and development projects and investments to increase energy security and meet energy goals requirements

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 315) that would direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of Department of Defense (DOD) research and development projects and investments to increase energy security and meet renewable energy goals.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the provision.

We direct the Comptroller General to conduct a review of the current DOD Annual Energy Management Report. At a minimum, the review shall identify key gaps and shortfalls, if any, in the report. The review shall also include a determination of how the DOD has determined the costs and benefits of a sample of five renewable energy projects per Service where the (1) generating capacity of the projects is over one megawatt; (2) projected life cycle costs of the projects as compared to power generation from conventional sources; and (3) ensured energy security at energy-remote installations in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The term "energy-remote military installations" means military installations not connected to an extensive electrical grid. The Comptroller General shall report to the congressional defense committees no later than one year after enactment of this Act.

Congressional notice of bulk purchase of alternative fuels for operational use

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 315) that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees 60 days before the bulk purchase of alternative fuels intended for operational use.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the House provision.

Limitation on procurement of biofuels

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 316) that would limit the Department of Defense's ability to purchase or produce biofuels until the earlier of either the date on which the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112-25) is no longer in effect, or the date on which the cost of biofuel is equal to the cost of conventional fuels. This section would provide an exception for biofuel test and certification and research and development.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the House provision.

Off-installation Department of Defense natural resources projects compliance with integrated natural resource management plans

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 318) that would amend the Sikes Act (section 670c-1 of title 16, United States Code) to require that funds for the maintenance and improvement of natural resources located off of a military installation or State-owned National Guard installation only be used pursuant to an approved integrated natural resources management plan.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Recommendation on Air Force energy conservation measures

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 319) that would recommend the Secretary of the Air Force take action on energy conservation measures.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Air Force has undertaken a number of initiatives aimed at improving installation energy efficiency. For example, the Air Force has used the Energy Conservation Investment Program, Energy Savings Performance Contracts, and technologies developed through Installation Energy Test Bed to help meet their facility energy goals and mandates. We encourage the Air Force to continue to make cost-effective investments that enhance combat capability and demonstrate a return on investment.

Prohibition on use of funds to implement certain climate change assessments and reports

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 320A) that would prohibit funds authorized by the fiscal year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act to be used to implement the United States Global Change Research Program National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nation's Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, or the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order No. 12866.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on enduring requirements and activities currently funded through amounts authorized to be appropriated for Overseas Contingency Operations

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 332) that would require a report on enduring requirements and activities currently funded

through amounts authorized to be appropriated for Overseas Contingency Operations.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on impacts of funding reductions on military readiness

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 334) that would require the Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to report to the congressional defense committees the readiness and cost impacts of the reductions in operation and maintenance funding.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the House provision.

We direct the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to report or present a briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the readiness and cost impacts, both immediate and long-term, for the military services, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Defense Agencies, of the reductions in funding required in section 4301 of this Act. The report shall include, but isn't limited to, reductions in contracts for other services, impacts to training and operations, contracts for facility sustainment, restoration, and modernization, base operations, and any other mission execution and effectiveness concerns.

Limitation on furlough of certain working-capital fund employees

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 342) that would: limit the non-disciplinary furlough of working-capital fund (WCF) employees as long as funds are available to pay for the work performed; require 45 days advance congressional notification of furloughs; and require Secretarial certification that workload will not be transferred to any other sector of the workforce.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We remain concerned about the negative effect furloughs of WCF employees have on military readiness. The furlough of WCF employees when monies and workload are available only delays delivery times and raises rates, costing the taxpayer and reducing military readiness. We understand that the Department of Defense (DOD) faced budget cuts of \$37.0 billion in 2013 due to sequestration, and that as part of its response, it furloughed all civilian employees. These furloughs may have increased costs over the longer-term and caused schedule delays, which negatively affected readiness. Therefore, we urge the Secretary of Defense to consider both the short- and long-term readiness impacts of these furloughs in making management decisions concerning the DOD workforce. Finally, we expect the Secretary to manage future budgets carefully, and to weigh all competing variables when making workforce decisions.

Revised policy on ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 352) that would amend section 352 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (P.L. 113-66) that established a policy that the Secretary of Defense shall eliminate the development and fielding of Armed Forces-specific combat and camouflage utility uniforms and families of uniforms for specific

combat environments to be used by all members of the Armed Forces.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the Senate provision.

We note that the guidance for the military services and combatant commands required by section 351 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (P.L. 113-66) to implement this policy is late and has not yet been delivered. We also note that the implementation plan is also late and necessary to ensure proper implementation of the Department of Defense's guidance to establish and publish joint combat uniform standards and performance criteria.

Sense of Congress on access to training ranges within United States Pacific Command area of responsibility

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 352) that would express the sense of Congress regarding access to training ranges within U.S. Pacific Command's (PACOM) area of responsibility (AOR).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the provision.

We note that access to military training ranges is an essential component of military readiness and that such access is critical to maintaining the technical and operational superiority of the Armed Forces. The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review states that United States forces in the Asia-Pacific region "will resume regular bilateral and multilateral training exercises, pursue increased training opportunities to improve capabilities and capacity of partner nations, as well as support humanitarian, disaster relief, counterterrorism, and other operations that contribute to the stability of the region." While training ranges exist within PACOM's AOR, we note that the tyranny of distance in the Asia-Pacific region presents a number of challenges, including the transportation of equipment and personnel to the various training ranges. We believe the Department of Defense should take appropriate action to ensure that members of the Armed Forces continue to have reliable access to military training ranges and take appropriate steps to improve accessibility to military training areas within PACOM's AOR.

Southern sea otter military readiness areas

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 353) that would have

created southern sea otter military readiness areas and repealed Public Law 99-625 (16 U.S.C. 1536 note).

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL
AUTHORIZATIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 401) that would authorize the following end strengths for active-duty personnel of the Armed Forces as of September 30, 2015: Army, 490,000; Navy, 323,600; Marine Corps, 184,100; and Air Force, 311,220.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 401) that would authorize active-duty end strength for the Air Force of 310,900.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would authorize active-duty end strength for the Air Force of 312,980.

End strength levels for the active forces for fiscal year 2015 are set forth in the following table:

Service	FY 2014 Authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 Request	FY 2014 Authorized
Army	520,000	490,000	490,000	0	–30,000
Navy	323,600	323,600	323,600	0	0
Marine Corps	190,200	184,100	184,100	0	–6,100
Air Force	327,600	310,900	312,980	2,080	–14,620
DOD Total	1,361,400	1,308,600	1,310,680	2,080	–50,720

Revisions in permanent active duty end strength minimum levels (sec. 402)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 402) that would establish the following minimum end strengths for Active-Duty per-

sonnel as of September 30, 2015: Army, 490,000; Navy, 323,600; Marine Corps, 184,100; and Air Force 310,900.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Minimum end strength levels for Active-Duty personnel for fiscal year 2015 are set forth in the following table:

Service	FY 2014 Minimum	FY 2015	Change from
		Recommendation	FY 2014
Army	510,000	490,000	–20,000
Navy	323,600	323,600	0
Marine Corps	188,000	184,100	–3,900
Air Force	327,600	310,900	–16,700
DOD Total	1,349,200	1,308,600	–40,600

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 411) that would authorize the following end strengths for Selected Reserve personnel, including the end strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves, as of September 30, 2015: the Army National Guard

of the United States, 350,200; the Army Reserve, 202,000; the Navy Reserve, 57,300; the Marine Corps Reserve, 39,200; the Air National Guard of the United States, 105,000; the Air Force Reserve, 67,100; and the Coast Guard Reserve, 7,000.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision that would au-

thorize end strength for the Coast Guard Reserve of 9,000 (sec. 411).

The agreement includes the House provision.

End strength levels for the Selected Reserve for fiscal year 2015 are set forth in the following table:

Service	FY 2014 Authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 Request	FY 2014 Authorized
Army National Guard	354,200	350,200	350,200	0	–4,000
Army Reserve	205,000	202,000	202,000	0	–3,000
Navy Reserve	59,100	57,300	57,300	0	–1,800
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,200	39,200	0	–400
Air National Guard	105,400	105,000	105,000	0	–400
Air Force Reserve	70,400	67,100	67,100	0	–3,300
DOD Total	833,700	833,700	820,800	0	–12,900
Coast Guard Reserve	9,000	7,000	7,000	0	–2,000

End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 412) that would authorize the following end strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in

support of the reserve components as of September 30, 2015: the Army National Guard of the United States, 31,385; the Army Reserve, 16,261; the Navy Reserve, 9,973; the Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261; the Air National Guard

of the United States, 14,704; and the Air Force Reserve, 2,830.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 412).

The agreement includes this provision.

End strength levels for reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves for fiscal year 2015 are set forth in the following table:

Service	FY 2014 Authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 Request	FY 2014 Authorized
Army National Guard	32,060	31,385	31,385	0	— 675
Army Reserve	16,261	16,261	16,261	0	0
Navy Reserve	10,159	9,973	9,973	0	— 186
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	14,734	14,704	14,704	0	— 30
Air Force Reserve	2,911	2,830	2,830	0	— 81
DOD Total	78,386	77,414	77,414	0	— 972

End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 413) that would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2015: the Army Na-

tional Guard of the United States, 27,210; the Army Reserve, 7,895; the Air National Guard of the United States, 21,792; and the Air Force Reserve, 9,789.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 413).

The agreement includes this provision.

End strength levels for military technicians (dual status) for fiscal year 2015 are set forth in the following table:

Service	FY 2014 Authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 Request	FY 2014 Authorized
Army National Guard	27,210	27,210	27,210	0	0
Army Reserve	8,395	7,895	7,895	0	— 500
Air National Guard	21,875	21,792	21,792	0	— 83
Air Force Reserve	10,429	9,789	9,789	0	— 640
DOD Total	67,909	66,686	66,686	0	— 1,223

Fiscal year 2015 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 414) that would establish the following personnel limits for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status

technicians as of September 30, 2015: the Army National Guard of the United States, 1,600; the Air National Guard of the United States, 350; the Army Reserve, 595; and the Air Force Reserve, 90.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 414).

The agreement includes this provision.

Personnel limitations for non-dual status technicians for fiscal year 2015 are set forth in the following table:

Service	FY 2014 Authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 Request	FY 2014 Authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 415) that would authorize the maximum number of reserve component personnel who

may be on Active Duty or full-time National Guard duty under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, during fiscal year 2015 to provide operational support.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 415).

The agreement includes this provision.

The maximum number of reserve component personnel who may be on Active Duty or full-time National Guard duty under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, during fiscal year 2015 is set forth in the following table:

Service	FY 2014 Authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 Request	FY 2014 Authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Military personnel (sec. 421)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 421) that would authorize appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in the funding table in section 4401 of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 421).

The agreement includes this provision.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Authority to limit consideration for early retirement by selective retirement boards to particular warrant officer year groups and specialties (sec. 501)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 501) that would amend section 581 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to establish selection objectives, by year group or specialty, or any combination thereof, for selection boards considering warrant officers for selective retirement.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 504).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Authority for three-month deferral of retirement for officers selected for selective early retirement (sec. 502)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 501) that would amend sections 581 and 638 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the date by which warrant officers and regular officers on the Active-Duty list who have been selected for selective early retirement must retire.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Repeal of limits on percentage of officers who may be recommended for discharge during a fiscal year under enhanced selective discharge authority (sec. 503)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 502) that would amend section 638a of title 10, United States Code, by deleting the limitation on the total number of officers that a selection board may recommend for early discharge under enhanced selective discharge authority.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 502).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Reports on number and assignment of enlisted aides for officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps (sec. 504)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 505) that would amend section 981 of title 10, United States Code, to reduce the total number of enlisted members that may be assigned or otherwise detailed to duty as enlisted aides on the personal staff of officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would amend section 981 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives specifying the number of enlisted aides authorized and allocated for general officers and flag officers of the Army, Navy Air Force, Marine Corps, and joint pool, and to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 2015, a report on the duties of enlisted aides, the procedures for allocating authorized enlisted aides, and a billet-by-billet justification for the authorization and assignment of each enlisted aide to each general officer and flag officer position as of September 30, 2014. The provision would also require the Comptroller General to review the June 30, 2015, report and submit a report on the results of this review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than 180 days after the Secretary of Defense submits the report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Repeal of requirement for submission to Congress of annual reports on joint officer management and promotion policy objectives for joint officers (sec. 505)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 503) that would repeal section 667 and amend section 662(b) of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement that the Secretary of Defense submit annual reports to Congress on joint officer management and promotion policy objectives for joint officers.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 505).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Options for Phase II of joint professional military education (sec. 506)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 504) that would amend section 2154 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a senior level service course of at least ten months

that has been designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense as a joint professional military education (JPME) course to meet the requirements for Phase II JPME instruction.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Elimination of requirement that a qualified aviator or naval flight officer be in command of an inactivated nuclear-powered aircraft carrier before decommissioning (sec. 507)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1023) that would amend section 5942(a) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that a qualified aviator or naval flight officer serve as commanding officer of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier that has been inactivated during the limited period between the inactivation and permanent decommissioning prior to disposal.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 503).

The agreement includes this provision.

Required consideration of certain elements of command climate in performance appraisals of commanding officers (sec. 508)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 506) that would require service secretaries to ensure that the performance appraisal of commanding officers indicates the extent to which the commanding officer has or has not established a command climate in which all allegations of sexual assault are properly managed and fairly evaluated, and a victim of criminal activity, including sexual assault, can report the criminal activity without fear of retaliation, including ostracism and group pressure from other members of the command.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 545(c)) that would also require that service secretaries ensure that performance appraisals of all servicemembers include an assessment of the extent to which the servicemember supports the sexual assault prevention and response program of that service.

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Retention on the Reserve active-status list following nonselection for promotion of certain health professions officers and first lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade) pursuing baccalaureate degrees (sec. 511)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 511) that would amend section 14701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize consideration for continuation on the reserve active-status list of first lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) health professions officers who have twice failed of selection for promotion to the next higher grade. The provision would also require service secretaries to retain on the reserve active-status list health professions officers who would otherwise be required to be removed from the reserve active-status list until the officer has completed his or her service obligation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 511).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Consultation with Chief of the National Guard Bureau in selection of directors and deputy directors, Army National Guard and Air National Guard (sec. 512)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 512) that would amend section 10506(a) of

title 10, United States Code, to require that general officers assigned to the National Guard Bureau as Director, Army National Guard, Deputy Director, Army National Guard, Director Air National Guard, and Deputy Director, Air National Guard, be recommended by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, in consultation with the secretary of the service concerned.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require that these general officers be selected by the secretary of the service concerned after consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

Centralized database of information on military technician positions (sec. 513)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 512) that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain a centralized database of military technician positions within the Department of Defense.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary, by no later than September 1, 2015, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing the progress made in establishing this database.

Report on management of personnel records of members of the National Guard (sec. 514)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 583) that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report regarding the management of personnel records of members of the National Guard.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 1, 2015, on the management of personnel records of members of the National Guard of the United States.

SUBTITLE C—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

Enhancement of participation of mental health professionals in boards for correction of military records and boards for review of discharge or dismissal of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 521)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 529) that would amend section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, to require that any medical advisory opinion issued to a board for correction of military records regarding a servicemember or former servicemember who was diagnosed while serving in the military as experiencing a mental health disorder include the opinion of a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist if the individual's request for correction of records relates to a mental health disorder.

The provision would also amend section 1553 of title 10, United States Code, to require boards for review of discharge or dismissal:

(1) To include a member who is a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with training on mental health issues connected with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury, when the board considers a request for review of a discharge or dismissal by a former servicemember who was diagnosed as experiencing post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as a consequence of a deployment in support of a contingency operation; and

(2) To include a member who is a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with special training on mental health disorders, when the board considers a request for review of a discharge or dismissal by a former servicemember who was diagnosed while serving in the military as experiencing a mental health disorder.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 521).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Extension of authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 522)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 523) that would amend section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417), as amended by section 531 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), by extending the authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to December 31, 2019, and adjusting interim and final report due dates to reflect this extension.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 522) that would extend program authority to December 31, 2018, with a deadline to return all participants to Active Duty by no later than December 31, 2021, and by requiring certain additional elements of information in the final reports.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would extend the program authority to December 31, 2019, and adjust the interim and final report due dates to reflect this extension.

Provision of information to members of the Armed Forces on privacy rights relating to receipt of mental health services (sec. 523)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 524) that would require the secretaries of the military departments to provide information regarding privacy rights to a servicemember who is seeking and receiving mental health services. This information would be required to be provided to servicemembers during initial and basic training, and to other servicemembers as the Secretary of Defense deems appropriate.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Removal of artificial barriers to the service of women in the Armed Forces (sec. 524)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 527) that would require the Secretary of Defense to direct the service secretaries to validate gender-neutral occupational standards that are consistent with section 543 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160), that accurately predict performance of actual, regular, and recurring duties of a military occupation, and that are applied equitably to measure individual capabilities. The provision would also require the Secretary to direct service secretaries to ensure that properly designed and fitted combat equipment is available to and distributed to female members of the Armed Forces. Finally, the provision would require the Comptroller General of the United States to review military service outreach programs and recruitment efforts focused on accessing women into the Armed Forces and to report to Congress on the results of this review.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 523) that would express the sense of the Senate concerning the development of validated gender-neutral oc-

cupational standards pursuant to the ongoing process of reviewing and opening positions and occupations to women that are currently closed to them.

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

SUBTITLE D—MILITARY JUSTICE, INCLUDING SEXUAL ASSAULT AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

Technical revisions and clarifications of certain provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 relating to the military justice system (sec. 531)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 549) that would make technical and clarifying corrections to various provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) relating to the military justice system.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical and clarifying amendment.

Ordering of depositions under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 532)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 541) that would amend Article 49 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (10 U.S.C. 849) to authorize the court-martial convening authority or the military judge to order a deposition only if the party requesting the deposition demonstrates that, due to exceptional circumstances, it is in the interest of justice that the testimony of the prospective witness be taken and preserved for use at an Article 32, UCMJ, preliminary hearing or a court-martial.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Access to Special Victims' Counsel (sec. 533)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 544) that would amend section 1044e of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the assistance of Special Victims' Counsel for a member of a reserve component who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense and who is not otherwise eligible for military legal assistance under section 1044 of this title.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3744) contained a similar provision clarifying that members of a reserve component who are not otherwise eligible for military legal assistance are eligible for assistance of a Special Victims' Counsel when the members are a victim of an alleged sex-related offense during a period in which the individual served on Active Duty, full-time National Guard duty, or Inactive-Duty training, or when the circumstances of the alleged sex-related offense have a nexus to the military service of the victim.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill.

Enhancement of victims' rights in connection with prosecution of certain sex-related offenses (sec. 534)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 534) that would amend section 1044e of title 10, United States Code, to require service secretaries to establish a procedure to ensure that a victim of an alleged sex-related offense is consulted regarding the victim's preference regarding prosecution by military or civil authorities, and would authorize

Special Victims' Counsel to provide legal consultation regarding the advantages and disadvantages of prosecution by court-martial or by a civilian court with jurisdiction over the offense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 545) and a provision (sec. 543) that would require that the Manual for Courts-Martial be modified to provide that when a victim of an alleged sex-related offense has a right to be heard in connection with the prosecution of such offense, the victim may exercise that right through counsel, including through a Special Victims' Counsel, and require service secretaries to establish policies and procedures to ensure that counsel for the victim of an alleged sex-related offense, including a Special Victims' Counsel, is provided prompt and adequate notice of the scheduling of any hearing, trial, or other proceeding in connection with the prosecution of the offense to permit such counsel the opportunity to prepare for the proceeding.

The agreement includes the Senate provisions with an amendment that would (1) require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process to ensure consultation with the victim of an alleged sex-related offense that occurs in the United States to solicit the victim's preference regarding whether the offense should be prosecuted by court-martial or in a civilian court with jurisdiction over the offense; (2) require the convening authority to consider the victim's preference; (3) require the convening authority to ensure that the civilian authority with jurisdiction over the offense is notified of a victim's preference for civilian prosecution; and (4) require the convening authority to ensure that the victim is informed if the convening authority learns of any decision by the civilian authority to prosecute or not prosecute the offense in civilian court.

Enforcement of crime victims' rights related to protections afforded by certain Military Rules of Evidence (sec. 535)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 535) that would amend Article 6b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (section 806b of title 10, United States Code) to authorize a victim of an offense under the UCMJ who believes that a court-martial ruling violates the victim's rights afforded by Military Rule of Evidence (MRE) 513, relating to the psychotherapist-patient privilege, or MRE 412, relating to the admission of evidence regarding a victim's sexual background, to petition the Court of Criminal Appeals for a writ of mandamus to require the court-martial to comply with the MRE.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Modification of military rules of evidence relating to admissibility of general military character toward probability of innocence (sec. 536)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 537) that would require the Secretary of Defense to modify the Military Rules of Evidence to clarify that the general military character of an accused is not admissible for the purpose of showing the probability of innocence of the accused, except when evidence of a trait of the military character of an accused is relevant to an element of an offense for which the accused has been charged.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 545(g)).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Modification of Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence, relating to the privilege against disclosure of communications between psychotherapists and patients (sec. 537)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 539) that would eliminate the “constitutionally required” exception to the psychotherapist-patient privilege in Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 542).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Modification of Department of Defense policy on retention of evidence in a sexual assault case to permit return of personal property upon completion of related proceedings (sec. 538)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 540) that would amend section 586 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) to authorize the return to the rightful owner of personal property retained as evidence in connection with an incident of sexual assault involving a servicemember after the conclusion of all legal, adverse action, and administrative proceedings related to the sexual assault.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 547).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Requirements relating to sexual assault forensic examiners for the Armed Forces (sec. 539)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3731) contained a provision that would authorize physicians, nurse practitioners, nurse midwives, physician assistants, and registered nurses to be assigned to duty as a sexual assault forensic examiner (SAFE) for the Armed Forces; require service secretaries to ensure the availability of an adequate number of sexual assault forensic examiners for the Armed Forces; and require service secretaries to establish and maintain a training and certification program for sexual assault forensic examiners.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Modification of term of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (sec. 540)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 554) that would amend section 942 of title 10, United States Code, to modify the statutory termination date of the term of office of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to better align the termination date with the starting date of the Court’s annual term.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Review of decisions not to refer charges of certain sex-related offenses for trial by court-martial if requested by chief prosecutor (sec. 541)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 546) that would amend section 1744 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to require that in any case where a convening authority decides not to refer a charge of a sex-related offense to trial by court-martial and the chief prosecutor of the service concerned requests review of the decision, the service secretary must review

the decision as a superior authority authorized to exercise general court-martial convening authority.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Analysis and assessment of disposition of most serious offenses identified in unrestricted reports on sexual assaults in annual reports on sexual assaults in the Armed Forces (sec. 542)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 551) that would amend section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) to require that the Department of Defense Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military include an analysis and assessment of the disposition of the most serious offenses identified in unrestricted reports of sexual assault.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Plan for limited use of certain information on sexual assaults in restricted reports by military criminal investigative organizations (sec. 543)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 548) that would require the Secretary of Defense to issue policies and procedures for the inclusion of certain information obtained from restricted and unrestricted reports of sexual assault, including known information about the alleged assailant, in a sexual assault database.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan that will allow an individual who files a restricted report on an incident of sexual assault to elect to permit a military criminal investigative organization, on a confidential basis and without affecting the restricted nature of the report, to access certain information of the alleged perpetrator if available, for the purpose of identifying individuals who are suspected of perpetrating multiple sexual assaults.

Improved Department of Defense information reporting and collection of domestic violence incidents involving members of the Armed Forces (sec. 544)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 531) that would require the Secretary of Defense, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, to develop a comprehensive management plan to address deficiencies in the reporting of incidents of domestic violence involving members of the Armed Forces.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 556) that would amend section 543(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 11-383) to remove the requirement that data concerning domestic violence incidents be recorded in the Defense Incident Based Reporting System.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would include the Senate provision to remove the requirement that data concerning domestic violence incidents be recorded in the Defense Incident Based Reporting System.

Additional duties for judicial proceedings panel (sec. 545)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 532) that would require the independent panel established by the Secretary of Defense under section 576(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) (judicial proceedings panel) to conduct a review and assessment of the impact of the use of mental health records by the defense during court-martial proceedings and related preliminary hearings and the use of mental health records in civilian criminal legal proceedings in order to identify any significant discrepancies between the two legal systems.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces (sec. 546)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 552) that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain a Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces to advise the Secretary on the investigation, prosecution, and defense of rape, forcible sodomy, sexual assault, and other sexual misconduct in the Armed Forces and to submit a report on an annual basis to the Secretary and to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would (1) require the Secretary to establish the Advisory Committee not later than 30 days before the termination date of the independent panel established by the Secretary under section 576(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), known as the “judicial proceedings panel” and (2) clarify the duties of the Advisory Committee.

Confidential review of characterization of terms of discharge of members of the Armed Forces who are victims of sexual offenses (sec. 547)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 538) that would require each service secretary to establish a confidential process by which an individual who was the victim of a sex-related offense during military service may appeal, through boards for the correction of military records of the military department concerned, the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of the individual from the military on the grounds that the terms or characterization were adversely affected by the individual being the victim of such an offense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 545(e)).

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE E—MEMBER EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND TRANSITION

Enhancement of authority to assist members of the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials (sec. 551)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 531) that would amend section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service of the Navy, to carry out a program to enable members of

the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials while they are serving that relate to training and skills acquired during military service.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with a technical amendment.

Applicability of sexual assault prevention and response and related military justice enhancements to military service academies (sec. 552)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 553) that would require the secretary of the military department concerned and, in the case of the Coast Guard Academy, the secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, to ensure that the sexual assault prevention and response and related reforms contained in title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) apply to the military service academies.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 550).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Authorized duration of foreign and cultural exchange activities at military service academies (sec. 553)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 551) that would amend sections 4345a, 6957b, and 9345a of title 10, United States Code, to extend the period that foreign exchange personnel are authorized to attend the U.S. Military Academy, the Naval Academy, or the Air Force Academy when the service secretary determines that the attendance of such persons contributes significantly to the development of foreign language, cross-cultural interactions and understanding, and cultural immersion of cadets or midshipmen, from 2 weeks to 4 weeks.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 534).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Enhancement of authority to accept support for Air Force Academy athletic programs (sec. 554)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 554) that would amend section 9362 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to:

(1) Accept funds, supplies, equipment, and services for the support of the athletic programs of the Air Force Academy (Academy);

(2) Charge fees for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy and accept and retain fees for services and other benefits provided incident to the operation of its athletic programs;

(3) Enter into leases or licenses for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy; and

(4) Enter into contracts and cooperative agreements for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy. The provision would also authorize the corporation established to support the athletic programs of the Academy to enter into licensing, marketing, and sponsorship agreements relating to trademarks and service marks identifying the Academy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 581).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Pilot program to assist members of the Armed Forces in obtaining post-service employment (sec. 555)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 552) that would require the Secretary of De-

fense to conduct a pilot program to enhance Department of Defense efforts to provide job placement assistance and related employment services to eligible members of the Armed Forces. The authority to conduct a pilot program under this provision would expire September 30, 2018.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would authorize, but not require, the Secretary to conduct the pilot program described above, and would authorize out of amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for Operation and Maintenance up to \$35.0 million per year to be used to pay costs incurred under the pilot program.

Plan for education of members of the Armed Forces on cyber matters (sec. 556)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3823) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the secretaries of the military departments, to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a plan for the education of officers and enlisted members of the Armed Forces relating to cyber security and cyber activities of the Department of Defense.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit the plan to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Enhancement of information provided to members of the Armed Forces and veterans regarding use of post-9/11 educational assistance and federal financial aid through transition assistance program (sec. 557)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 533) that would require the Secretary of Defense, by no later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, to provide additional information to servicemembers in the transition assistance program concerning certain education benefits available to them, and to ensure that the higher education component of the transition assistance program is available to members of the Armed Forces on an Internet web site of the Department of Defense.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would make various technical changes, and that would strike paragraph (a)(2)(B) related to information required from the Federal Trade Commission, paragraph (a)(3) related to accessibility requirements, and paragraph (c) related to certificates of entitlement to tuition assistance.

Procedures for provision of certain information to state veterans agencies to facilitate the transition of members of the Armed Forces from military service to civilian life (sec. 558)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 596) that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing specified information on servicemembers who are separating from the military to state veterans agencies as a means of facilitating the transition of the members of the military from military service to civilian life.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number

3729) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop procedures to share specified information on servicemembers who are separating from the military with state veterans agencies in electronic data format as a means of facilitating the transition of members of the military from military service to civilian life.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE F—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION AND MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS

Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 561)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 561) that would authorize \$25.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, defense-wide, for continuation of the Department of Defense (DOD) assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by enrollment of dependent children of military members and DOD civilian employees.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 571).

The agreement includes this provision.

Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 562)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 572) that would authorize \$5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, defense-wide, for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), using the formula set forth in section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-398), for continuation of Department of Defense assistance to local educational agencies that benefit eligible dependents with severe disabilities.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Amendments to the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012 (sec. 563)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 565) that would amend section 563(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) to extend, by 3 years, the effective date of the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012. In addition, the provision would amend Public Law 112-239 by including a method to calculate the taxable value of eligible federal property that is within the boundaries of two or more local educational agencies.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 573) that would amend section 563(c) of Public Law 112-239 to extend the program modifications contained in that section by an additional 3 years.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Authority to employ non-United States citizens as teachers in Department of Defense overseas dependents' school system (sec. 564)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 562) that would amend section 2(2)(A) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (20 U.S.C. 901(2)(A)) to authorize employment of local nationals who are not U.S. citizens to teach host nation language courses in the Defense Dependents' Overseas Education System, if a citizen of the United States is not available.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 574) that would amend 20 U.S.C. 901(2)(A) to authorize employment of local nationals who are not U.S.

citizens to teach host nation language courses in the Defense Dependents' Overseas Education System.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Inclusion of domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools among functions of Advisory Council on Dependents' Education (sec. 565)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 563) that would amend section 1411 of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 929) to include in the functions of the Advisory Council on Dependents' Education the responsibility to provide advice and information on the Department of Defense's domestic dependent elementary and secondary school system.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 575).

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Protection of child custody arrangements for parents who are members of the Armed Forces (sec. 566)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 547) that would amend title II of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 521 et seq.) to provide that if a court renders a temporary custody order based solely on the deployment or anticipated deployment of a servicemember, the court shall require the reinstatement of the prior custody order upon the return of the servicemember from deployment, unless the court finds that reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child. The provision would also prohibit a court from considering the absence of a servicemember by reason of deployment, or the possibility of deployment, as the sole factor in determining the best interest of the child.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require that temporary custody orders for custodial responsibility for a child based solely on a deployment or anticipated deployment of a servicemember parent expire not later than the period justified by the deployment of the servicemember.

Improved consistency in data collection and reporting in Armed Forces suicide prevention efforts (sec. 567)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 546) that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy for a standard method of collecting, reporting, and assessing suicide data involving members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, including reserve components. The Secretary would be required, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit the policy to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 513) that would require the Secretary to prescribe a policy for the development of a standard method for collecting, reporting, and assessing suicide data and suicide attempt data involving members of the National Guard and Reserves, and to submit the policy to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill also contained a provision (sec. 576) that would require the Secretary to direct the service secretaries to develop and implement a pro-

gram to track, retain, and analyze information on deaths that are reported as suicides involving dependents of members of the regular and reserve components of each respective military service and to submit a report on the programs developed to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy for the development of a standard method for collecting, reporting, and assessing information regarding any suicide or attempted suicide involving Active-Duty servicemembers or members of the reserve components, and any death that is reported as a suicide involving a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces. The Secretary would be required to submit the policy to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 180 days of the date of the enactment of this Act. In addition, the secretaries of the military departments would be required to implement the policy not later than 180 days after the date of the submittal of the Secretary's policy.

Improved data collection related to efforts to reduce underemployment of spouses of members of the Armed Forces and close the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts (sec. 568)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 548) that would express the sense of Congress regarding military spouse unemployment and underemployment, as well as the need to close the wage gap that exists between military spouses and their civilian counterparts. The provision would also require the Secretary to collect data to evaluate the effectiveness of military spouse employment programs. Finally, the provision would require a report on the effectiveness of military spouse employment programs within 1 year of the enactment of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would strike the findings and sense of Congress contained in the provision.

SUBTITLE G—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Medals for members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who were killed or wounded in an attack by a foreign terrorist organization (sec. 571)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 571) that would add a new section 1129a to title 10, United States Code, to require that the Secretary concerned treat attacks inspired or motivated by a foreign terrorist organization as an attack by an international terrorist organization for the purpose of awarding the Purple Heart in certain circumstances. The provision would be retroactive to September 11, 2001, and would require the secretaries concerned to review each death or wounding of a member of the Armed Forces since that date to determine if the award of the Purple Heart would be appropriate under this revised standard.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 561) that would clarify that such an attack is considered to be an attack by a foreign terrorist organization if (a) the individual or entity making the attack was in communication with the foreign terrorist organization before the attack, and (b) the attack was in-

spired or motivated by the foreign terrorist organization.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

We note that under this revised standard for the award of the Purple Heart, the secretary concerned still retains the responsibility for making certain factual determinations prior to making the award. In considering the circumstances surrounding the November 5, 2009, shooting at Fort Hood, we believe servicemembers killed and wounded in that attack meet the revised criteria contained in this section.

Authorization for award of the Medal of Honor to members of the Armed Forces for acts of valor during World War I (sec. 572)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3812) contained a provision that would authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to William Shemin for acts of valor during World War I.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Henry Johnson for acts of valor during World War I.

SUBTITLE H—MISCELLANEOUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Review and report on military programs and controls regarding professionalism (sec. 581)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 526) that would require the Secretary of Defense to communicate with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives regarding the mission, goals, and metrics for the Senior Advisor on Professionalism.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a preliminary review of the effectiveness of current programs and controls of the Department of Defense and the military departments regarding the professionalism of members of the Armed Forces, and to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than September 1, 2015, a report containing recommendations to strengthen professionalism programs in the Department of Defense.

We commend the Department of Defense for establishing the position of Senior Advisor on Professionalism to enhance professionalism programs in the Department of Defense.

Review and report on prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces (sec. 582)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 581) that would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, to conduct a review of Department of Defense (DOD) efforts regarding the prevention of suicide among members of U.S. Special Operations Forces (SOF) and their dependents. The report would be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require

the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, to conduct a review of DOD efforts regarding the prevention of suicide among members of U.S. SOF and their dependents. The report would be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Review and report on provision of job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members of the reserve components (sec. 583)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 553) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to enhance the efforts of the Department of Defense (DOD) to provide job placement services directly to members of the National Guard and Reserves.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary to review the feasibility of improving DOD efforts to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members in the National Guard and Reserves, and to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by no later than April 15, 2015, on the results of this review.

Report on foreign language, regional expertise, and culture considerations in overseas military operations (sec. 584)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 584) that would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a study on the integration of gender into the planning and execution of foreign operations of the Armed Forces and report to the congressional defense committees on the results of that study.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a detailed report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on how foreign language, regional expertise, and cultural considerations, including gender-based considerations in the context of foreign cultural norms, factor into the planning and execution of overseas operations and missions of the Armed Forces.

Deadline for submission of report containing results of review of Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity role in sexual harassment cases (sec. 585)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 585) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 1, 2015, a report containing the results of the review of the role of the Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity in sexual harassment cases conducted pursuant to section 1735 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 555).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the report to be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than April 1, 2015.

Independent assessment of risk and resiliency of United States Special Operations Forces and effectiveness of the Preservation of the Force and Families and Human Performance Programs (sec. 586)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 587) that would require the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health to conduct a study of the risk and resiliency of the U.S. Special Operations Forces and effectiveness of the U.S. Special Operations Command's (SOCOM) Preservation of the Force and Families Program (POTFF) on reducing risk and increasing resiliency.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would direct the Secretary of Defense to commission an independent study of the mental, behavioral, and psychological health challenges facing U.S. Special Operations Forces and the effectiveness of SOCOM's POTFF in addressing such issues.

We note that other federal agencies, including the National Institute of Mental Health, have relevant experience in assessing the mental, behavioral, and psychological health challenges facing members of the U.S. military and we believe such organizations may be able to provide valuable contributions to the assessment directed by this provision.

Comptroller General report on hazing in the Armed Forces (sec. 587)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 586) that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to designated congressional committees, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, a report on the policies to prevent hazing and systems initiated to track incidents of hazing in each of the Armed Forces. The provision would also require service secretaries to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report containing an update to the hazing reports required by section 534 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment that would require only the report by the Comptroller General.

Comptroller General report on impact of certain mental and physical trauma on discharges from military service for misconduct (sec. 588)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 524) that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress on the impact of mental and physical trauma relating to Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), traumatic brain injury, behavioral health matters not related to PTSD, and other neurological combat traumas on the discharge of servicemembers for misconduct.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Comptroller General to submit the report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

SUBTITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

Inspection of outpatient residential facilities occupied by recovering service members (sec. 591)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 591) that would modify the current reporting

requirement for inspections of outpatient residential facilities occupied by recovering servicemembers from an annual basis to at least once every 2 years.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Designation of voter assistance offices (sec. 592)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1072) that would amend section 1566a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize, but not require, service secretaries to designate offices on military installations to provide absent uniformed services voters and their family members with voting information and assistance.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would amend section 1566a of title 10, United States Code, to require service secretaries to designate offices on installations under their jurisdiction, or at such installations as the secretary concerned shall determine are best located to provide access to voter assistance services for all covered individuals in a particular location, to provide absent uniformed services voters and their family members with voting information and assistance. The provision would also require service secretaries to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives with notice of any decision to close a previously designated voter assistance office.

Repeal of electronic voting demonstration project (sec. 593)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1076) that would repeal section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107) that requires the Secretary of Defense to carry out an electronic voting demonstration project.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Authority for removal from national cemeteries of remains of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces who have no known next of kin (sec. 594)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 594) that would amend section 1488 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to authorize the removal of the remains of a member of the Armed Forces who has no known next of kin and is buried in an Army National Military Cemetery from the Army National Military Cemetery for transfer to any other cemetery. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to authorize the removal of the remains of a member of the Armed Forces who has no known next of kin and is buried in a cemetery of the National Cemetery System from that cemetery for transfer to any Army National Military Cemetery.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require that this provision apply only to the remains of a member of the Armed Forces who has been awarded the Medal of Honor, and that the individual seeking the removal of the remains to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Army that the member of the Armed Forces concerned has no known next of kin or other person who is interested in maintaining the place of burial, and to undertake full responsibility for all expenses of

the removal of the remains and the reburial of the remains at another cemetery.

Sense of Congress regarding leaving no member of the Armed Forces unaccounted for during the drawdown of United States forces in Afghanistan (sec. 595)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 593) that would express the sense of Congress that abandoning search efforts for members of the Armed Forces who are missing or captured is unacceptable; that the United States has a responsibility to deployed servicemembers, including to never leave behind a fallen comrade; and that while the United States redeploys from Afghanistan, it must fulfill these promises.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the provision with an amendment that would express the sense of Congress that the United States should undertake every reasonable effort to search for and repatriate members of the Armed Forces who are missing and to repatriate such members who are captured.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Deferred retirement of chaplains

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 507) that would amend section 1253 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to defer the mandatory retirement for age of chaplains serving in a general or flag officer grade if the secretary determines that the deferral is in the best interest of the military department concerned.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We encourage the service secretaries to make liberal use of the authority contained in section 1251 of title 10, United States Code, to defer the mandatory retirement age of chaplains in grades below brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half), in the case of an officer in the Navy, when the deferral is in the best interest of the military department concerned.

Compliance with efficiencies directive

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 508) that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the number of flag officers and generals are reduced to comply with the Department of Defense efficiencies directive dated March 14, 2011.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

National Guard civil and defense support activities and related matters

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 513) that would amend chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the use of the National Guard to provide assistance to support firefighting operations, missions, or activities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Electronic tracking of certain reserve duty

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 514) that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an electronic means by which members of the Ready Reserve could track Active-Duty service performed under certain mobilization authorities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Office of Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 514) that would increase funding for the Office of Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve by \$4.0 million above the budget request.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

National Guard cyber protection teams

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 515) that would require a report within 90 days of enactment of this Act from the Chief of the National Guard Bureau on the progress of the Army National Guard to establish 10 Cyber Protection Teams.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that a similar reporting requirement is mandated elsewhere in this report.

Procedures for judicial review of military personnel decisions relating to correction of military records

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 521) that would amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to establish procedures for judicial review of certain final decisions regarding correction of military records.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Additional required elements of transition assistance program

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 522) that would add to required transition assistance program elements information on certain education and other benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Protection of the religious freedom of military chaplains to close a prayer outside of a religious service according to the traditions, expressions, and religious exercises of the endorsing faith group

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 525) that would amend sections 3547, 4337, 6031, and 8547 of title 10, United States Code, to codify the prerogative of military service chaplains to close a prayer offered outside of a religious service according to the traditions, expressions, and religious exercises of the chaplain's endorsing faith group.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Senate on upgrade of characterization of discharge of certain Vietnam era members of the armed forces

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 525) that would express the sense of the Senate that Boards for Correction of Military Records, when considering a request for correction of a less-than-honorable discharge issued to a service member who served during the Vietnam era, should take into account whether the veteran was diagnosed with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as a result of such service.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Secretary of Defense issued supplemental guidance on September 3, 2014, directing Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records to fully and carefully consider every petition by veterans for upgrade of their military discharge based on PTSD.

Revised regulations for religious freedom

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 528) that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force to revise Department of Defense Instruction 1300.17 and Air Force Instruction 1-1, respectively, to ensure those instructions reflect protections of religious expression contained in section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-81), as amended by section 532 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Preliminary mental health assessments

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 530) that would require the secretaries of each of the military departments to provide any individual enlisting in or being commissioned as an officer in an armed force with a mental health assessment prior to enlistment or commissioning.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Availability of additional leave for members of the Armed Forces in connection with the birth of a child

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 530A) that would require that servicemembers giving birth receive 42 days of convalescent leave and, at the discretion of the member, an additional 42 days of unpaid leave, in connection with the birth.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Authority for Joint Special Operations University to award degrees

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 532) that would authorize the Joint Special Operations University to confer appropriate degrees upon certain graduates.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Minimum confinement period required for conviction of certain sex-related offenses committed by members of the Armed Forces

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 536) that would amend Article 56 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 856 of title 10, United States Code) to require that the sentence of a member convicted by court-martial of specified sex-related offenses include confinement for 2 years or more, except as provided in Article 60 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 860 of title 10 United States Code).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Establishment of phone service for prompt reporting of hazing involving a member of the Armed Forces

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 540A) that would require service secretaries

to develop and implement a phone service through which an individual can anonymously call to report incidents of hazing.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Additional enhancements of military department actions on sexual assault prevention and response

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 545(d)) that would include in the 8-day incident report of an unrestricted report of sexual assault a review of the most recent climate assessments of the command or unit of a suspect and the command or unit of the victim, and an assessment of whether another command climate assessment should be conducted.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We believe that it is good practice to review command climate surveys of the units of the victim and of the suspect whenever there is an unrestricted report of sexual assault. The survey of the unit of the victim should be reviewed to ensure that the command climate is conducive to caring for the victim, and the climate of the unit of the suspect should be reviewed to determine whether the command climate contributed to the alleged sexual assault.

Collaboration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice in efforts to prevent and respond to sexual assault

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 553) that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General to jointly develop a strategic framework for ongoing collaboration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice in their efforts to prevent and respond to sexual assault.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on tuition assistance

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 555) that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report on the Army's policy that soldiers serve for a period of 1 year after the completion of certain initial training requirements before they would be eligible for tuition assistance benefits.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Support for efforts to improve academic achievement and transition of military dependent students

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 564) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide grants to non-profit organizations that provide services to improve the academic achievement of military dependent students, to include those non-profit organizations whose programs focus on improving the civic responsibility of students and their understanding of the Federal Government through direct exposure to the operations of the Federal Government.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Retroactive award of Army Combat Action Badge

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 572) that would authorize the Secretary of

the Army to award the Army Combat Action Badge to a person who, while a member of the Army, participated in combat during which the person personally engaged, or was personally engaged by, the enemy at any time during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on September 18, 2001, if the Secretary determines that the person has not been previously recognized in an appropriate manner for such participation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

On March 20, 2014, the Secretary of Defense directed a comprehensive review of the Department of Defense's military decorations and awards program to ensure that it provides avenues to appropriately recognize the service, sacrifices, and actions of military personnel. We request that this comprehensive review include a review of the proposal for the retroactive award of the Army Combat Action Badge.

Report on Navy review, findings, and actions pertaining to Medal of Honor nomination of Marine Corps Sergeant Rafael Peralta

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 573) that would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report describing the Navy's review, findings, and actions pertaining to the Medal of Honor nomination of Marine Corps Sergeant Rafael Peralta not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Recognition of Wereth massacre of 11 African-American soldiers of the United States Army during the Battle of the Bulge

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 574) that would recognize the dedicated service and ultimate sacrifice on behalf of the United States of the 11 African-American soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion of the United States Army who were massacred in Wereth, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge on December 17, 1944.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that this is the 70th anniversary of the massacre during the Battle of the Bulge, at Wereth, Belgium, and commend the dedicated service and recognize the ultimate sacrifice of these courageous men.

Report on Army review, findings, and actions pertaining to Medal of Honor nomination of Captain William L. Albracht

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 575) that would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct a review of the initial review, findings, and actions undertaken by the Army in connection with the Medal of Honor nomination of Captain William L. Albracht and to submit a report describing the results of the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Inspector General of the Department of Defense review of separation of members of the Armed Forces who made unrestricted reports of sexual assault

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 582) that would require the Inspector General

of the Department of Defense (DOD) to conduct a review to: (1) identify all members of the Armed Forces who, since January 1, 2002, were separated from the Armed Forces after making an unrestricted report of sexual assault; (2) determine the circumstances of and grounds for each such separation; and (3) if an identified servicemember was separated on the grounds of having a personality or adjustment disorder, determine whether the separation was carried out in compliance with DOD instructions, regulations, directives, and policies.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Working group on Integrated Disability Evaluation System

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 592) that would establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee a working group to carry out a 3-year pilot program to evaluate and reform the Integrated Disability Evaluation System.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Access of congressional caseworkers to information about Department of Veterans Affairs casework brokered to other offices of the Department

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 595) that would provide that if Department of Veterans Affairs casework is brokered out to another office of the Department from its original submission site, a caseworker in a congressional office may contact the brokered office to receive an update on the constituent's case, and the Department would be required to update the congressional staffer regardless of thoughts on jurisdiction.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress regarding the recovery of the remains of certain members of the Armed Forces killed in Thurston Island, Antarctica

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 597) that would express the sense of Congress that the remains of servicemembers killed at Thurston Island, Antarctica should be recovered and repatriated.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Name of the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic, Marina, California

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 598) that would designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic in Marina, California as the Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress regarding preservation of Second Amendment rights of Active Duty military personnel stationed or residing in the District of Columbia

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 599) that would express the sense of Congress that Active-Duty military personnel who are stationed or residing in the District of Columbia should be permitted to exercise fully

their rights under the Second Amendment of the Constitution of the United States and, therefore, should be exempt from the District of Columbia's restrictions on the possession of firearms.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER
PERSONNEL BENEFITS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

No fiscal year 2015 increase in basic pay for general and flag officers (sec. 601)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 602) that would freeze the monthly basic pay for all general and flag officers, including for those whose monthly basic pay is limited to the rate of pay for level II of the Executive Schedule.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 601(c)).

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing under certain circumstances (sec. 602)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 601) that would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the rate of basic allowance for housing in areas impacted by natural disasters or experiencing a sudden influx of personnel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 604).

The agreement includes this provision.

Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau and Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau among senior members of the Armed Forces for purposes of pay and allowances (sec. 603)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 602) that would provide pay parity for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The provision would also provide pay parity for the senior enlisted advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau with the senior enlisted advisors of the Armed Forces. The changes made by this provision would be prospective to the date of enactment of this Act.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Modification of computation of basic allowance for housing inside the United States (sec. 604)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 603) that would amend section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, to revise the method by which the monthly amount of the basic allowance for housing (BAH) is determined by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to reduce the monthly amount by up to 5 percent of the national average for housing for a given pay grade and dependency status.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would authorize the Secretary to reduce the monthly amount of BAH by up to 1 percent of the national average for housing for a given pay grade and dependency status. Servicemembers would not see any reduction in their BAH until they undergo a permanent change of duty station. This provision would not apply to veterans benefits paid under title 38, United States Code. This provision

would require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay the appropriate veterans benefits under title 38, United States Code, as the Secretary would otherwise have issued those benefits without regard to changes made to the BAH under this section.

We note that while the Department of Defense (DOD) legislative proposal included proposed changes to BAH that would have been implemented over the next 3 years, this agreement includes those changes to BAH that the committees understand would have been implemented by DOD in 2015. By adopting changes to BAH beginning in the first year of the proposal, the agreement preserves the option for Congress to achieve the full savings requested by DOD.

This approach does not constitute a rejection of the administration proposal, which was endorsed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Rather, consideration of further changes to BAH in fiscal years 2016, 2017, and beyond is deferred until after the committees receive the report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, which is due in February 2015. The two committees commit to consider proposed changes to BAH that are included in the fiscal year 2016 budget request as part of the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

We note that if sequestration-level budgets remain in effect for fiscal year 2016 and beyond, DOD will need to make painful cuts and achieve substantial savings across its entire budget in order to avoid an unacceptable reduction in readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States. The Chiefs have urged us to take all action necessary, including compensation adjustments, to avoid such readiness impacts.

The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives intend to work with the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives next year in an effort to harmonize BAH rates paid by the Department of Defense and by the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND
INCENTIVE PAYS

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 611) that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, travel expenses for certain Inactive-Duty training, and income replacement for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for Active Duty service.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 611) that would also extend for 1 year the authority to pay the contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

The agreement includes the House provision.

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 612) that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate access-

sion bonus, education loan repayment for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 612).

The agreement includes this provision.

One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 613) that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 613).

The agreement includes this provision.

One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 614) that would extend for 1 year the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers, special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions, and the contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen enrolled in the Senior Officers' Training Corps. The provision would also extend for 1 year the authority to pay hazardous duty pay, assignment or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 614) that did not include the extension of the contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen as that extension was contained elsewhere in the Senate committee-reported bill.

The agreement includes the House provision.

One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 615) that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, the assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus, the foreign language proficiency incentive pay for certain members of precommissioning programs, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between armed forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 615).

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE C—DISABILITY PAY, RETIRED PAY,
AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Earlier determination of dependent status with respect to transitional compensation for dependents of certain members separated for dependent abuse (sec. 621)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 545) that would amend section 1059 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the date on which a dependent child's status is determined for the purposes of transitional compensation under that section, in the case of a member being administratively separated, is the date on which the separation action is commenced. This aligns the dependent status determination with the date on which transitional compensation payments begin under that section in these cases.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 624).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Modification of determination of retired pay base for officers retired in general and flag officer grades (sec. 622)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 622) that would amend section 1407a of title 10, United States Code, to reinstate the cap on retired pay of general and flag officers at the monthly equivalent of level II of the Executive Schedule, as otherwise provided for in section 203(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code. The provision would ensure the equitable treatment of the service of general and flag officers who are retired after December 31, 2014.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with numerous technical amendments and an amendment to ensure equitable treatment of general and flag officers who are retired under chapter 1223 of title 10, United States Code, but who are transferred to the retired reserve prior to December 31, 2014.

Inapplicability of reduced annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62 under the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 who first become members prior to January 1, 2016 (sec. 623)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 621) that would amend subparagraph (G) of section 1401a(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to exempt those who first join military service prior to January 1, 2016, from the reduced cost of living adjustment (COLA) applicable to military retired pay made by section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67), as amended by section 2 of Public Law 113-82. Under current law, this reduced COLA is inapplicable to members who first join prior to January 1, 2014.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with a technical amendment.

Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for special needs trusts established for the benefit of dependent children incapable of self-support (sec. 624)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 625) that would amend sections 1448, 1450, and 1455 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the payment of the Survivor Benefit Plan annuity to a special needs trust created under subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 1396p(d)(4) of title 42, United States Code, for the sole benefit of a disabled dependent child incapable of self-support because of mental or physical incapacity.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with a technical amendment.

The report required on page 584 of the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) is no longer required.

Modification of per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service to reduce eligibility age for retirement for non-regular service (sec. 625)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 623) that would amend section 12731(f)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that qualifying days of service under that section to reduce the age at which a servicemember may receive reserve retired pay may be accumulated between 2 consecutive fiscal years, effective after the date of enactment of this Act.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would apply the change in law to service performed after September 30, 2014.

SUBTITLE D—COMMISSARY AND NON-APPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

Procurement of brand-name and other commercial items for resale by commissary stores (sec. 631)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 631) that would amend section 2484 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to purchase any commercial item, including brand-name and generic items, for resale in, at, or by commissary stores without using full and open competition procurement procedures.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Authority of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to enter into contracts with other Federal agencies and instrumentalities to provide and obtain certain goods and services (sec. 632)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 631) that would amend section 2492 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Department of Defense (DOD) authority to provide or obtain food services beneficial to the efficient management and operation of the dining facilities on military installations offering food services to servicemembers.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

This change to section 2942 of title 10 and the implementation of the food transformation program should not result in the loss of employment pursuant to the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.).

However, we are concerned with the lack of regulatory guidance on the application of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.) and Randolph-Sheppard Act (20 U.S.C. 107 et seq.) to military dining facilities. We previously sought to resolve this long-standing issue by requiring a Joint Policy Statement in section 848 of Public Law 109-163 and enacting a permanent "no-poaching" provision in section 856 of Public Law 109-364. However, without complementary regulations to implement the Joint Policy Statement, confusion remains on when to

apply the two acts, particularly with regard to new contracts that are not covered by section 856 of Public Law 109-364.

Pursuant to the Joint Policy Statement, the Randolph-Sheppard Act applies to contracts for the operation of a military dining facility, or full food services, and the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act applies to contracts and subcontracts for dining support services, or dining facility attendant services, for the operation of a military dining facility.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe implementing regulations for the application of the two acts to military dining facilities. Such regulations shall implement the Joint Policy Statement and specifically address DOD contracts that are not covered by section 856 of Public Law 109-364.

Competitive pricing of legal consumer tobacco products sold in Department of Defense retail stores (sec. 633)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 633) that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries from taking any action to implement any new policy that would limit, restrict, or ban the sale of any legal consumer product category sold as of January 1, 2014, in the defense commissary system or exchange stores system on any military installation, domestically or overseas, or on any Department of Defense vessel at sea.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations regarding the pricing of tobacco and tobacco-related products sold in an outlet of the defense retail systems inside the United States, including territories and possessions of the United States, to prohibit the sale of a product at a price below the most competitive price for that product in the local community. The provision would also require the regulations to direct that the price of these products sold in an outlet of the defense retail systems outside of the United States shall be within the range of prices established for the product in outlets of the defense retail systems inside the United States.

Review of management, food, and pricing options for defense commissary system (sec. 634)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 632) that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review, utilizing the services of an independent organization experienced in grocery retail analysis, of the defense commissary system. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the review not later than February 1, 2015.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3866) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the impact that eliminating or reducing the commissary subsidy would have on eligible beneficiaries.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review, utilizing the services of an independent organization experienced in grocery retail analysis, of the defense commissary system

to include the impact that eliminating or reducing the commissary subsidy would have on eligible beneficiaries. The amendment would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the review not later than September 1, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Fiscal year 2015 increase in military basic pay

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 601(a) and (b)) that would authorize an across-the-board pay raise for members of the uniformed services of 1 percent effective January 1, 2015.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the President has exercised his authority under section 1009(e) of title 37, United States Code, to implement an alternative across-the-board pay raise for members of the uniformed services for calendar year 2015 of 1 percent rather than the 1.8 percent that would otherwise be required under subsection (a) of section 1009.

Authority to enter into contracts for the provision of relocation services

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 621) that would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to authorize base commanders to enter into contracts with appropriate entities for the provision of relocation services to servicemembers.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Transportation on military aircraft on a space-available basis for disabled veterans with a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 622) that would amend section 2641b of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to provide space-available travel on military aircraft to veterans with service-connected, permanent disabilities rated as total.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Prohibition on the use of funds to close commissary stores

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 634) that would prohibit the use of funds to close any commissary stores.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Anonymous survey of members of the Armed Forces regarding their preferences for military pay and benefits

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 641) that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out an anonymous survey of random servicemembers regarding military pay and benefits.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Availability for purchase of Department of Veterans Affairs memorial headstones and markers for members of reserve components who performed certain training

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 642) that would require the Secretary of Vet-

erans Affairs to make memorial headstones and markers available for purchase by members of reserve components who performed certain training.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—TRICARE AND OTHER HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Mental health assessments for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 701)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 701) that would amend section 1074m of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to provide person-to-person mental health screenings once during each 180-day period in which a servicemember is deployed.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 701) that would require the Secretary to provide a person-to-person mental health assessment for Active Duty and Selected Reserve members each year. The Secretary may provide such assessments in conjunction with annual periodic health assessments or pre- or post-deployment health assessments. In addition, the provision would require the Secretary to submit an annual report on the tools and processes used to provide the assessments.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary to provide a person-to-person mental health assessment for Active Duty and Selected Reserve members each year (such assessments may be provided in conjunction with annual periodic health assessments or pre- or post-deployment health assessments) and to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the tools and processes used to provide the assessments. The amendment would also require the Secretary, through 2018, to provide person-to-person mental health screenings once during each 180-day period in which a member is deployed.

Modifications of cost-sharing and other requirements for the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program (sec. 702)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 702) that would amend section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, to modify the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program by specifying that non-formulary prescriptions would be available through the national mail-order pharmacy program, establishing prescription copayments from 2015 through 2024, and requiring that non-generic prescription maintenance medications be refilled through military treatment facility pharmacies or the national mail-order pharmacy program.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make the provision specifying that non-formulary prescriptions would be available through the national mail-order pharmacy program and the provision requiring that non-generic prescription maintenance medications be refilled through military treatment facility pharmacies or the national mail-order pharmacy program beginning on October 1, 2015. The agreement also modifies prescription copayments beginning in 2015.

We note that while the Department of Defense (DOD) legislative proposal included proposed changes to the TRICARE pharmaceutical co-pays for fiscal years 2015 through

2024, this agreement includes changes beginning in fiscal year 2015. By adopting co-payment changes beginning the first year of the proposal, the agreement preserves the option for Congress to achieve most of the savings requested by DOD.

This approach does not constitute a rejection of the DOD proposal, which was endorsed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Rather, consideration of further changes to co-pays is deferred until after the committees receive the report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, which is due in February 2015. The two committees commit to consider proposed changes to co-pays that are included in the FY 2016 budget request as part of the consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

We note that if sequestration-level budgets remain in effect for Fiscal Year 2016 and beyond, DOD will need to make painful cuts and achieve substantial savings across its entire budget in order to avoid an unacceptable reduction in readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Elimination of inpatient day limits and other limits in provision of mental health services (sec. 703)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 703) that would amend section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, to remove limits on inpatient mental health services, removing a potential barrier to receipt of mental health care that does not exist for other medical and surgical care.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Authority for provisional TRICARE coverage for emerging health care services and supplies (sec. 704)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 705) that would amend section 1073 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide provisional coverage or authorization for coverage for certain health care products and services that do not meet the hierarchy of reliable evidence as prescribed in federal regulations for the TRICARE program.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would amend chapter 55 of Title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, to provide provisional coverage for the provision of a service or supply if the Secretary determines that such service or supply is widely recognized in the United States as being safe and effective.

Clarification of provision of food to former members and dependents not receiving inpatient care in military medical treatment facilities (sec. 705)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 702) that would amend section 1078b of title 10, United States Code, to allow former members and their dependents to receive food and beverages at no cost for those who are receiving certain outpatient care in military medical treatment facilities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Availability of breastfeeding support, supplies, and counseling under the TRICARE program (sec. 706)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 703) that would amend section 1079 of title 10,

United States Code, to authorize breastfeeding support, supplies, and counseling during pregnancy and the postpartum period as a covered benefit for TRICARE beneficiaries.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 704).

The agreement includes this provision.

SUBTITLE B—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

Provision of notice of change to TRICARE benefits (sec. 711)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 715) that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide TRICARE beneficiaries and providers with written notice if any significant changes are made in policy regarding services provided under the TRICARE program or in payment rates of more than 20 percent.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide TRICARE beneficiaries with notice if any significant changes are made in the structure of or benefits provided under the TRICARE program or in beneficiary cost-share rates of more than 20 percent.

Surveys on continued viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra (sec. 712)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 712) that would change the frequency of the reports of the reviews submitted to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States regarding the processes, procedures, and analysis used by the Department of Defense (DOD) to determine the adequacy of the number of health care providers who accept TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra. The Comptroller General would report on reviews during 2017, 2020, and at such other times as requested by the Comptroller General or the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 707) that would repeal the requirement for ongoing Comptroller General review of the processes, procedures, and analysis used by DOD to determine health care and mental health care provider acceptance of the TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra benefit.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would change the frequency of the reports of the reviews submitted to Congress by the Comptroller General regarding the processes, procedures, and analysis used by DOD to determine the adequacy of the number of health care providers who accept TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra. The Comptroller General would report on reviews during 2017 and 2020 only.

Review of military health system modernization study (sec. 713)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 714) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the Military Medical Treatment Facility Modernization Study directed by the Resource Management Decision of the Department of Defense (DOD) MP-D-01. The report would include the study data, for a 12-year period, used by the Secretary and the results of the study with regard to recommendations to restructure or realign military medical treatment facilities. Further, the provision would require the Comptroller General of the United States, not later than 180 days after the Secretary submits the report required, to sub-

mit a report to the congressional defense committees on the report submitted by the Secretary of Defense, to include an assessment of the study methodology and data used by the Secretary. The Secretary would be prohibited from realigning or restructuring a military medical treatment facility until 120 days following the date the Comptroller General is required to submit the report.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 736) that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report assessing the Military Health System Modernization Study of DOD to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number SA3901) contained a provision that would include in the Senate provision Comptroller General report elements requiring the Comptroller General, with respect to each military medical treatment facility covered by the modernization study, to assess whether the Secretary of Defense consulted with the appropriate training directorate, training and doctrine command, and forces command of the military department concerned with respect to the frequency of high-tempo, live-fire military operations at such training centers; and assess the capacity of each medical facility in the surrounding area of a major military training center to treat battlefield related injuries, including whether such facility has a helipad capable of receiving medical evacuation airlift patients arriving from the primary evacuation aircraft platform used by such training center.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the Military Medical Treatment Facility Modernization Study directed by the Resource Management Decision of DOD MP-D-01. The report would include the study data, for a 6-year period, used by the Secretary and the results of the study with regard to recommendations to restructure or realign military medical treatment facilities, as well as assessments of whether the military medical treatment facilities included in the modernization study have a helipad capable of receiving medical evacuation airlift patients arriving on the primary evacuation aircraft platform for the military installation served; and whether the Secretary consulted with the appropriate training directorate, training and doctrine command, and forces command of the military department concerned with respect to the frequency of high-tempo, live-fire military operations, and treating battlefield-like injuries, at locations that serve as military training centers. Further, the provision would require the Comptroller General of the United States, not later than 180 days after the Secretary submits the report required, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the report submitted by the Secretary of Defense, to include an assessment of the study methodology and data used by the Secretary. The Secretary would be prohibited from realigning or restructuring a military medical treatment facility based on the modernization study until 90 days following the date the Comptroller General is required to submit the report.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Designation and responsibilities of senior medical advisor for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 721)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 722) that would amend section 1513A of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 413a) to make technical corrections regarding the designation of the Senior Medical Advisor for the Retirement Home to reflect the disestablishment of the TRICARE Management Activity and creation of the new Defense Health Agency. The provision would also replace the reference to the health care standards of the Department of Veterans Affairs with the more appropriate nationally recognized health care standards and requirements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1424).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Extension of authority for joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (sec. 722)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 721) that would amend section 1704(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) to extend the termination date of the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund from September 30, 2015, to September 30, 2016.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 722).

The agreement includes this provision.

Report on status of reductions in TRICARE Prime service areas (sec. 723)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 726) that would amend section 732 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), as amended by section 701 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), to require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of reducing the availability of TRICARE Prime in regions where it has been reduced.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 706) that would require the Secretary, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the status of the reduction of TRICARE Prime service areas conducted by the Department of Defense.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would amend section 732 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 1079a note) to require the Secretary, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the status of reducing the availability of TRICARE Prime in regions where it has been reduced.

Extension of authority to provide rehabilitation and vocational benefits to members of the Armed Forces with severe injuries or illnesses (sec. 724)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3833) contained a provision that would amend section 1631(b)(2) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110-181) to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of

Veterans Affairs to provide rehabilitation and vocational benefits to members of the Armed Forces with severe injuries or illnesses.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Acquisition strategy for health care professional staffing services (sec. 725)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 724) that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and carry out an acquisition strategy with respect to entering into contracts for the services of health care professional staff at military medical treatment facilities. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a report on the status of implementing the acquisition strategy not later than April 1, 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 723) that would require the Secretary to develop a Department of Defense-wide strategy for contracting for health care professionals for the Department of Defense. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a report on the strategy not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary to develop and carry out an acquisition strategy with respect to entering into contracts for the services of health care professional staff at military medical treatment facilities. The amendment would also require the Secretary to submit a report on the status of implementing the acquisition strategy not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Pilot program on medication therapy management under TRICARE program (sec. 726)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 725) that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program for at least 2 years at not less than three locations to evaluate the feasibility and desirability of including medication therapy management as part of the TRICARE program. The program would be focused on improving patient medication use and outcomes using best commercial practices in medication therapy management and would quantify effectiveness by measuring patient medication use and outcomes as well as health care costs. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit a report on the results of the pilot program to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 months after the program commences.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 724) that would require the Secretary to carry out a program of comprehensive, uniform medication management in military medical treatment facilities and to submit a report describing this program to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The agreement includes the House provision.

We note that although the requirement is to carry out the pilot program at two military treatment facilities and one additional point of service, we expect the Secretary to utilize prescription drug data from all three points of service (military treatment facility, mail order, and retail) in order to provide an accurate assessment.

Antimicrobial stewardship program at medical facilities of the Department of Defense (sec. 727)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number

3392) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out an antimicrobial stewardship program at Department of Defense (DOD) medical facilities. In carrying out the program, the Secretary would be required to: develop a consistent manner to collect and analyze data on antibiotic usage, health issues related to antibiotic usage such as *Clostridium difficile* infections, and antimicrobial resistance trends; provide data on antibiotic usage and antimicrobial resistance trends at DOD medical facilities to the National Healthcare Safety Network of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and submit to the congressional defense committees a strategy for carrying out the program.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out an antimicrobial stewardship program at DOD medical facilities. In carrying out the program, the Secretary would be required to: develop a consistent manner to collect and analyze data on antibiotic usage, health issues related to antibiotic usage, and antimicrobial resistance trends, and submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan for carrying out the program.

Report on improvements in the identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces (sec. 728)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 732) that would require the secretaries of the military departments, not less than once each year, to contract with a third-party unaffiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Department of Defense to conduct an evaluation of the mental health care and suicide prevention programs carried out by each secretary.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 733) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report evaluating the tools, processes, and best practices to improve the identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces. The provision would also authorize the Secretary, in conducting the evaluation, to consult with an advisory council composed of: behavioral health officers of the Public Health Service; mental health and other health providers who serve service members in the active duty and reserve components; the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs; the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs; the secretaries of the military departments; the Chief of the National Guard Bureau; the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; the Secretary of Health and Human Services; the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; the Administrator of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; the Director of the National Institutes of Health; and the President of the Institute of Medicine.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report evaluating the tools, processes, and best practices to improve the

identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces.

Report on efforts to treat infertility of military families (sec. 729)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 734) that would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the steps the Secretary is taking to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and their dependents have access to reproductive counseling and a full spectrum of treatments for infertility, including in vitro fertilization.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report assessing the access of members of the Armed Forces and their dependents to reproductive counseling and treatments for infertility.

Report on implementation of recommendations of Institute of Medicine on improvements to certain resilience and prevention programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 730)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 734) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of implementing the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine (IOM) regarding improvements to programs of the Department of Defense (DOD) intended to strengthen the mental, emotional, and behavioral abilities associated with managing adversity, adapting to change, recovering, and learning in connection with military service. The report would be required to include the DOD's assessment of the IOM report's findings and recommendations, the DOD's actions taken to implement the report's recommendations, and for any recommendations not implemented, the rationale for not implementing those recommendations.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of implementing the recommendations of the IOM regarding improvements to programs of DOD intended to strengthen the mental, emotional, and behavioral abilities associated with managing adversity, adapting to change, recovering, and learning in connection with military service.

Comptroller General report on transition of care for post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury (sec. 731)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 727) that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that assesses the transition of care for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) or traumatic brain injury (TBI). The report would be due not later than April 1, 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Comptroller General to submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that assesses the transition of care for PTSD or TBI, not later than September 1, 2015.

Comptroller General report on mental health stigma reduction efforts in the Department of Defense (sec. 732)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3387) contained a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out a review of the policies, procedures, and programs of the Department of Defense to reduce the stigma associated with mental health treatment for members of the Armed Forces and deployed civilian employees of the Department of Defense. The report would be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2016.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the report to be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2016.

Comptroller General report on women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries (sec. 733)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3811) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, on women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces on Active Duty and other covered beneficiaries. The provision would also require the Comptroller General of the United States, not later than 180 days after the submittal of the Secretary's report, to submit to Congress a report providing an assessment of the Secretary's report.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Comptroller General to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on women's health care services for members of the armed forces serving on Active Duty and other covered beneficiaries.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Behavioral health treatment of developmental disabilities under the TRICARE program

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 704) that would amend section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize behavioral health treatment, including applied behavior analysis (ABA) therapy, for all developmental disabilities as defined by section 15002(8) of title 42, United States Code, including autism spectrum disorders, when prescribed by a physician or psychologist to be covered under the basic TRICARE program for certain beneficiaries.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that in July of this year the Department of Defense consolidated its three preexisting programs that provided ABA therapy for beneficiaries with autism spectrum disorder into its TRICARE Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration program. This consolidation included a pilot program mandated by Congress in section 705 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), which provided an ABA therapy reinforcement benefit for family members of retirees. The Department of Defense is required to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives with a report on the results of that pilot program, to include recommendations with regard to beneficiary cost-shares for the benefit. This report is expected in early 2015.

Cooperative health care agreements between the military departments and non-military health care entities

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 711) that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to establish cooperative health care agreements between military installations and local or regional non-military health care entities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Limitation on transfer or elimination of graduate medical education billets

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 713) that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from transferring or eliminating a graduate medical education billet from a military medical treatment facility unless the Secretary conducts a review of at least 2 years of the implementation of the reform of the administration of the Military Health System, examines recruiting and retention of medical professionals with regard to the Department of Defense's graduate medical education programs, determines the assignment of such billets, and certifies to the congressional defense committees that any proposed transfer of a billet meets the needs of the military departments and patients.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund matters

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 721) that would amend sections 1111, 1113, 1115, and 1116 of title 10, United States Code, to modify the method by which the Federal Government makes accrual payments into the Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (Fund), by changing from a lump sum Treasury payment at the beginning of a fiscal year to monthly payments by the military services out of military personnel accounts, and would authorize the Secretary of Defense to change the actuarial determination required by section 1115 of title 10, United States Code, in the event Congress enacts significant benefit changes after such determination was made.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

For the last several years, the Department of Defense (DOD) has proposed legislation that, if enacted, would reduce its annual contribution to the Fund. These proposals have come as part of the administration's budget submission, and DOD continues to assume

discretionary savings in its budget that are tied to enactment of these proposals, despite the fact that (1) there is no guarantee that Congress will support the proposals, and (2) even if Congress were to support such proposals, the timing of the annual contribution to the Fund precludes DOD from realizing discretionary savings in the year of execution, unless the annual defense bill is passed and signed by the President prior to October 1st. We find this practice of assuming savings disingenuous at worst, and short-sighted and impractical at best.

Until a method is devised for DOD to realize year-of-execution savings with respect to its contributions to the Fund, we strongly urge DOD to cease its practice of assuming year-of-execution discretionary savings from legislative proposals that effect outlays from the Fund. Such practice leaves DOD with military personnel funding shortfalls even if Congress supports legislative proposals that yield short-term discretionary savings.

Research regarding Alzheimer's disease

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 723) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation activities with respect to Alzheimer's disease.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Briefing on hospitals in arrears in payments to Department of Defense

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 728) that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a briefing on the process used by the Defense Health Agency (DHA) to collect payments from non-Department of Defense (DOD) hospitals.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We direct the Secretary of Defense to provide, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the process used by DHA to collect payments from non-DOD hospitals, to include a list of each hospital that is more than 90 days in arrears in payments to the Secretary, including the amount of arrears by 30-day increments for each such hospital.

Research regarding breast cancer

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 729) that would require the Secretary of Defense to implement the recommendations of the Interagency Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Coordinating Committee (IBCERCC) to prioritize prevention and increase the study of chemical and physical factors in breast cancer.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program (BCRP) has implemented recommendations of the IBCERCC and has prioritized primary prevention as one of the BCRP's ten overarching challenges. In addition, the study of chemical and physical factors in primary prevention is one of several recommendations made by the IBCERCC to address the primary prevention of breast cancer. The intent of the program is to enable researchers to submit proposals that address any of the overarching challenges.

Sense of Congress regarding access to mental health services by members of the armed forces

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 730) that would express the sense of Congress that servicemembers should have adequate access to the mental health care and support that they need, that public-private mental health partnerships can provide the Department of Defense (DOD) with enhanced capability to treat servicemembers, and that DOD should fully implement the pilot program authorized under section 706 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Evaluation of wounded warrior care and transition program

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 731) that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a private organization to evaluate the wounded warrior care and transition program of the Department of Defense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on military family planning programs of the Department of Defense

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 731) that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive study of the access of servicemembers and certain military dependents to methods of contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration, contraception counseling, and related education, and to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report of the findings of this study no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Interagency working group on the provision of mental health services to members of the National Guard and the Reserves

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 732) that would require the Secretary of Defense to convene an interagency working group to review and recommend collaborative approaches to improving the provision of mental health services to members of the National Guard and Reserves and to submit a report on the findings and recommendations of the interagency working group to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Primary blast injury research

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 733) that would require the Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury Research Program, a congressionally directed medical research program, to conduct a study on blast injury mechanics.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on Department of Defense support of members of the armed forces who experience traumatic injury as a result of vaccinations required by the Department

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 735) that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the secretaries of the military departments, to report on the adequacy and effectiveness of the policies, procedures, and systems of the Department of Defense (DOD) in providing support to servicemembers who experience traumatic injury as a result of a vaccination required by DOD.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress on use of hyperbaric oxygen therapy to treat traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 735) that would express the sense of Congress that hyperbaric oxygen therapy can be used to treat servicemembers for traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder and that the Secretary of Defense should increase awareness among servicemembers and military doctors of hyperbaric oxygen therapy treatments.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS
SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Modular open systems approaches in acquisition programs (sec. 801)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 801) that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to adopt an open systems approach to Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Automated Information Systems, and to other programs the primary purpose of which is the acquisition of an information technology (IT) system, entering the acquisition process after January 1, 2016. The committee believes that a comprehensive open systems approach is an important component of IT acquisition reform.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

The provision requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to develop standards and define architectures necessary to enable open systems approaches in key mission areas of DOD.

The Under Secretary is further required to review and update guidance to ensure that acquisition programs use open system approaches in the product design and acquisition of information technology systems to the maximum extent practicable and to detail in the contract file reasons why any system is not an open system.

Finally, the provision requires the Under Secretary to identify legacy information technology systems that are not utilizing an open systems approach and outline a process for potential conversion to an open systems approach.

Recharacterization of changes to Major Automated Information System programs (sec. 802)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 802) that would modify requirements applicable to a Major Auto-

mated Information System program that fails to achieve a full deployment decision within 5 years after the Milestone A decision or selection of the preferred alternative for the program.

In lieu of a critical change report, failure to achieve a full deployment decision within 5 years would be determined to be a significant change with the attendant notification to the congressional defense committees required for all significant changes.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Amendments relating to defense business systems (sec. 803)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 803) that would require business process reengineering (BPR) before milestone decisions for the Major Automated Information System program.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We continue to be concerned that BPR is not being conducted rigorously enough, or documented well enough, to drive successful information technology acquisition outcomes.

We believe that the Department of Defense (DOD) is too often lackadaisical in its attempts at BPR or the results are misaligned to the budgeting, requirements and acquisition processes to have any significant effect on the outcome. BPR must happen early and upfront, well before the requirements and acquisition community get involved in order to inform their work.

As we have observed, and as industry has indicated to us as part of our acquisition improvement efforts, it is important to clearly articulate the desired outcomes of information technology (IT) system acquisitions with input from the user community. That should happen after business processes have been analyzed, and if necessary restructured, to ensure the way an organization does business drives the system, not the other way around. Aligning the IT acquisition strategy to the mission goals of the organization is necessary to get the maximum return-on-investment from a system, but that cannot happen without leadership to drive and enforce organizational change.

We believe that the requirement to do formal process mapping as part of the milestone decision approval process will help, but is only one step, in a larger effort to improve the information technology management of DOD.

We believe there are a number of ways that DOD could improve BPR. For example, expanding the investment review process for IT systems and empowering the Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) to conduct BPR for other IT mission areas within DOD warrants consideration in the future.

Additionally, we believe that the process improvement officers of DOD and the military departments should work with their respective Chief Information Officers to create metrics to track progress and BPR, as well as meeting the other strategic management objectives of DOD.

We note that there are many scientific and technical personnel within DOD's research, development, test and evaluation community that could be more actively engaged to create a rigorous, scientific process for conducting BPR.

Report on implementation of acquisition process for information technology systems (sec. 804)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 805) that would require the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, & Logistics) to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the implementation of the acquisition process for information technology detailing the applicable implementing regulations, instructions, or policies.

The report shall also explain any legislative criteria not yet implemented and a schedule for implementing such criteria along with any proposed deviations.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

We are concerned with the Department of Defense's (DOD) ability to effectively acquire information technology (IT) resources. We believe that part of the challenge that DOD faces is in its reliance on processes that are too heavily focused on the acquisition of militarily unique hardware systems. We recognize that the paradigm for IT acquisition is rooted more firmly in the commercial marketplace. As a consumer of commercially developed solutions, rather than a generator of unique requirements, DOD follows commercial trends more often than it leads them.

Unfortunately, we believe that DOD has not done enough to come to terms with this trend, choosing instead to act as though it has the same power to influence computing and electronics markets as it did for most of the 20th century. Though numerous studies have indicated a need to change acquisition processes within DOD to adjust to the reality of 21st century commercial IT markets, DOD has made little progress. Ideas such as agile development, the use of clear requirements tied to software development timelines, rethinking the processes for capital planning and investment, and the application of system audits and risk management to enhance outcomes are prevalent within the commercial sector, but often face resistance and hostility from government program managers and contracting officers.

Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 111-84) authorized DOD to implement a new acquisition process for IT systems, but to date, we have seen little tangible action to take advantage of those new authorities. We believe that DOD needs to do more to show tangible progress in its efforts at improving IT acquisition, especially as software-intensive IT systems continue to become more prominent components of U.S. military capability.

SUBTITLE B—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

Extension and modification of contract authority for advanced component development and prototype units (sec. 811)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 802) that would extend existing statutory authority under subsection (b)(4) of section 819 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) until September 30, 2019.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 822).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Amendments relating to authority of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 812)

The House bill included a provision (section 803) which would amend section 845(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160) to broaden the definition for the types of efforts for which other transactions authority might be used by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

The Senate committee-reported bill included no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that makes technical changes to the use of other transactions authority.

Extension of limitation on aggregate annual amount available for contract services (sec. 813)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 804) that would extend for 1 year the cap on the aggregate annual amount spent on contracts for services through fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

We note that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has stated that the military departments and defense agencies generally have not developed plans to use the inventory of contracted services, mandated since 2008 in section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, to facilitate the Department of Defense's (DOD) strategic workforce planning, workforce mix, budget decision-making processes, and contract execution and oversight.

Further, GAO found that components may not have fully identified, as required by section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, all instances in which contractors are providing services that are inherently governmental, closely associated with inherently governmental functions, staff augmentation, or personal services, the latter of which we note are prohibited by law.

According to GAO, a key factor inhibiting the components' inventory review is a lack of accurate and reliable data, which we note the inventory could provide if the components were to implement DOD-wide a common data system based on the Army's existing system as directed by existing DOD guidance.

In the absence of a plan of action with milestones and timeframes to establish a common data system to collect contractor manpower data, we are leaving the caps on contractor spending in place for fiscal year 2015.

Improvement in defense design-build construction process (sec. 814)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 805) that would amend section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, and section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, by limiting the maximum number specified in the solicitation for a design-build contract. Additionally, this provision would require the head of an agency awarding a contract pursuant to this provision to provide a report to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would limit application of the provision to section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, and, for contracts greater than \$4.0 million, limit the maximum number of offerors specified in the

solicitation for a two-phase design-build contract, unless a higher number is approved by the head of a contracting activity.

Permanent authority for use of simplified acquisition procedures for certain commercial items (sec. 815)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 806) that would make the authority for use of simplified acquisition procedures for certain commercial items permanent.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Restatement and revision of requirements applicable to multiyear defense acquisitions to be specifically authorized by law (sec. 816)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 821) that would clarify and reorganize the reporting and certification requirements of the Department of Defense when requesting specific authorization for multiyear contract authority.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment clarifying when certain cost estimates should be performed.

Sourcing requirements related to avoiding counterfeit electronic parts (sec. 817)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 824) that would clarify sourcing requirements related to avoiding counterfeit electronic parts.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Amendments to Proof of Concept Commercialization Pilot Program (sec. 818)

The House bill included a provision (section 829) which would modify the Small Business Act (section 638 of title 15, United States Code) to require each agency carrying out a Small Business Technology Transfer program to support innovative approaches to technology transfer at institutions of higher education, based on the pilot program established under section 5127 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81).

The Senate committee-reported bill included no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that makes technical amendments to section 1603 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), which provides authority for the DOD to fund commercialization proof of concept centers.

We note that there is commercialization potential in the research activities ongoing in universities, small businesses, and defense labs. Transition of promising research results into fielded defense systems or commercially successful enterprises is a benefit to both DOD and the nation as a whole.

We note that the Senate committee-reported Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (H.R. 4870 and Senate report 113-211) encouraged DOD to expand efforts at commercialization of technologies, especially those derived from research at the DOD laboratories. We encourage the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to work with the Congress to identify appropriate funding to support the commercialization activities envisioned in that bill, as well as those authorized by this provision.

SUBTITLE C—INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS

Temporary extension of and amendments to test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans (sec. 821)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 811) that would modify and extend the test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans authorized by section 402 of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-574).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 823).

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Plan for improving data on bundled or consolidated contracts (sec. 822)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 813) that would amend section 644 of title 15, United States Code, by requiring the Small Business Administration to work with other agencies to create and implement a data quality improvement plan to promote greater accuracy, transparency, and accountability in the reporting of contract bundling and consolidation.

The committee recognizes that properly labeling a contract as bundled or consolidated is important to small business competition, as the process of contract labeling triggers a series of reviews and mitigation steps that promote opportunities for small business.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

We direct the Comptroller General of the United States to assess whether contracts are being identified properly as bundled or consolidated. The review shall examine a statistically significant sample of contracts awarded by the Departments of Defense (DOD), Energy, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Veterans Affairs, the General Services Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Small Business Administration with values above \$10.0 million in sectors 23, 33, 54, and 56 as defined by the North American Industry Classification System.

Not later than October 1, 2015, the Comptroller General shall provide an interim briefing to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, and the House Committee on Small Business with a summary of findings, including an assessment of (1) the quality of data reported pertaining to contract bundling and consolidation, and (2) interim recommendations, if any, to improve current data collection and dissemination on contract bundling and consolidation.

In the final report, the Comptroller General shall evaluate (1) the pros and cons of implementing government-wide the "Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS) Contract Reporting Data Improvement Plan" published by DOD on January 12, 2010; (2) the plan proposed by the Small Business Administration under this section; and (3) whether other alternatives should be considered to improve reporting of bundled and consolidated contracts without requiring modification to FPDS.

Finally, the Comptroller General shall examine whether government-wide strategic sourcing vehicles are reducing the number of companies, including small business concerns, that are actively participating in the federal procurement system as prime con-

tractors, and whether this reduction poses substantial risk to the industrial base.

The final report shall be delivered to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, and the House Committee on Small Business not later than October 1, 2017.

Authority to provide education to small businesses on certain requirements of Arms Export Control Act (sec. 823)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 814) that would amend section 21(c)(1) of the Small Business Act (section 648(c)(1) of title 15, United States Code) by including a requirement that applicants receiving grants pursuant to that section shall also assist small businesses by providing, where appropriate, education on the requirements applicable to small businesses under the regulations issued pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act (chapter 39 of title 22, United States Code) and on compliance with those requirements. The provision would also amend section 2418 of title 10, United States Code, by expanding the Procurement Technical Assistance Program to assist small business concerns with education related to export controls.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Matters relating to reverse auctions (sec. 824)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 815) that would amend the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631) to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for procurement of certain goods and services if the contract is awarded using a Small Business Act procurement authority.

It would also limit the use of reverse auctions in cases where only one offer was received or where offerors do not have the ability to submit revised bids throughout the course of the auction.

The section further clarified that the desire to use a reverse auction does not obviate federal agencies from the obligation to use a Small Business Act procurement authority.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

We note that in conducting reverse auctions, buyers have the ability to cancel an auction at any time before the auction closes or to make the decision not to make any award after the auction closes with proper justification in accordance with the terms and conditions of the solicitation and all applicable regulations.

The agreement also prohibits the use of reverse auctions for military construction projects that require a specific congressional authorization.

Sole source contracts for small business concerns owned and controlled by women (sec. 825)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 827) that would allow for sole source contracting to certain women owned small businesses.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE D—FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION REFORM

Chief Information Officer authority enhancements (sec. 831)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5101) that would strengthen various agencies' Chief Information Officer positions.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Enhanced transparency and improved risk management in information technology investments (sec. 832)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5505) that would enhance transparency in information technology investments.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement contains the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Portfolio review (sec. 833)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5301) that would inventory information technology software assets.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement contains the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Federal data center consolidation initiative (sec. 834)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5203) that would provide for the consolidation of federal data centers.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

We believe that the Department of Defense (DOD) has made significant strides in consolidating its data center infrastructure, by maturing its process for evaluating data centers as well as finding opportunities to leverage commercial cloud computing capabilities. However, as both savings and efficiencies from data center consolidation reach a point of diminishing returns, we believe that DOD can continue to make further progress by also integrating efforts to assess the applications that run on this infrastructure to determine which require dedicated servers and which can potentially be migrated to virtualized or cloud environments.

We believe that software application rationalization and consolidation is a natural extension of, and next step in, data center consolidation. Reducing the data center footprint eliminates unneeded infrastructure, but software application rationalization is needed to more efficiently utilize the infrastructure that remains, and to better determine if any further data center consolidation may or may not be warranted.

Therefore, we direct the Chief Information Office of DOD, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers of the military departments, to carry out an assessment to identify and prioritize the software applications in use throughout DOD that should be considered for migration to a cloud computing environment and to submit a report on the results of the assessment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by December 15, 2015. This assessment should include the following:

(1) Whether each of the software applications used by DOD can be readily transitioned to a cloud computing environment with minimal additional investment of developmental funding;

(2) If a software application used by DOD cannot be readily transitioned to a cloud computing environment, the cost and time required to enable, either by modification or replacement, the operation of the software application in a cloud computing environment;

(3) Whether it would be cost-effective to enable, either by modification or replacement, the operation of a software application in a cloud computing environment;

(4) A list of software applications used by DOD that should be enabled, either by modification or replacement, to operate in a cloud computing environment, listed in the order of priority by which they should be enabled, and a schedule for such modification or replacement; and

(5) An estimate of the cloud computing workload needs of DOD time-phased across the future years defense plan to inform DOD's cloud computing needs under the Joint Information Environment initiative that might be satisfied by government-owned and -operated or commercial cloud computing solutions.

Expansion of training and use of information technology cadres (sec. 835)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5411) that would require a 5-year strategic plan to develop, strengthen, and solidify information technology acquisition cadres.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Maximizing the benefit of the Federal strategic sourcing initiative (sec. 836)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5501) that would require regulations to maximize the benefit of the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Governmentwide software purchasing program (sec. 837)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5502) that would require the creation of a strategic sourcing initiative for software.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE E—NEVER CONTRACT WITH THE ENEMY

Prohibition on providing funds to the enemy (sec. 841)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3743B) contained a provision that would provide the authority to terminate or void a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement when it is found that funds received under that contract, grant, or cooperative agreement are being provided directly or indirectly to a person or entity that is actively opposing United States or coalition forces involved in a contingency operation in which members of the Armed Forces are actively engaged in hostilities.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Additional access to records (sec. 842)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3743C) contained a provision that would allow the head of an executive agency to examine the records of a contractor, recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement to the extent necessary to ensure that funds, including goods and services, available under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement are not provided directly or indirectly to a person or entity that is actively opposing United States or coalition forces involved in a contingency operation in which members of the Armed Forces are actively engaged in hostilities.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Definitions (sec. 843)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3743D) contained a provision that would provide certain definitions.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Rapid acquisition and deployment procedures for United States Special Operations Command (sec. 851)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 807) that would require procedures for the rapid acquisition and deployment of items for the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) that are currently under development by the Department of Defense (DOD) or available from the commercial sector and are urgently needed to avoid significant risk or loss of life or mission failure, or needed to avoid collateral damage where no collateral damage is necessary for mission success.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would authorize the establishment of procedures for rapid acquisition and deployment of items for SOCOM that are currently under development by DOD or available from the commercial sector and are urgently needed to avoid significant risk or loss of life or mission failure, or needed to avoid collateral damage where no collateral damage is necessary for mission success.

The provision would also require the Commander, SOCOM, in instances where an item has identified deficiencies, to make the determination that deployment of such an item is acceptable for reasons of national security.

The provision would also make clear the SOCOM Commander may not use the authority under this provision at the same time as the Commander uses the authority under section 806 of Public Law 107-314.

The agreement also includes amendments to the provision that would require congressional notifications be made before such rapid acquisition procedures go into effect and after such use of rapid acquisition procedures are used to ensure robust congressional oversight of this authority.

Consideration of corrosion control in preliminary design review (sec. 852)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 808) that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to ensure that Department of Defense (DOD) Instruction 5000.02 and other applicable guidance require full consideration during preliminary design review of metals, materials, and technologies that effectively prevent or control corrosion over the life cycle of the product.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

We expect the relevant instruction and regulations called for in this provision to be tailored to apply only to products likely to corrode and not to every item or system purchased by the DOD.

Program manager development report (sec. 853)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 841) that would re-

quire the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive strategy for enhancing the role of Department of Defense program managers in developing and carrying out defense acquisition programs.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Operational metrics for Joint Information Environment and supporting activities (sec. 854)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 821) that would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a review of the Air Force Network-Centric Solutions II contract and provide a certification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the contract is effective in delivering information technology capabilities for the joint force.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

We remain concerned by the lack of clarity about the activities supporting the Joint Information Environment (JIE), including the programs of records, and other non-materiel aspects, that would contribute to the JIE vision.

In the case of some of the programs that we believe contribute to JIE, like the Air Force's Network Centric Solutions II contract, Navy's Next Generation Enterprise Network, or the Army's Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization program, there are measures of performance driven by the information technology community, but not ones that can be clearly tied to operational outcomes for the warfighting community.

As the JIE evolves into a seamless network to support warfighting functions, as well as business and support processes, we believe that the Department of Defense (DOD) needs metrics that can be tied to the operational customer in ways that can demonstrate effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction.

Therefore, we direct the DOD Chief Information Officer, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the guidance and metrics required by this section within 210 days of the enactment of this Act.

Compliance with requirements for senior Department of Defense officials seeking employment with defense contractors (sec. 855)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 823) that would amend section 847 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) to require the Secretary of Defense to designate an official of the Department of Defense (DOD) to ensure compliance with the requirements of that section and would require that, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, such official shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on DOD's efforts to ensure compliance with the requirements of section 847.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

We note a lack of clarity in the lines of supervision for purposes of monitoring compliance with section 847 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181).

We therefore direct DOD to review those lines of supervision and to submit a report

on its findings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, no later than March 31, 2015.

The report shall identify each supervisory component by office and by position and describe the reporting relationships between each of DOD's 17 Designated Agency Ethics Officials and each of the various components in their respective chains of supervision as they relate to section 847 compliance.

Enhancement of whistleblower protection for employees of grantees (sec. 856)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 826) that would enhance the whistleblower protections for employees of grantees.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Prohibition on reimbursement of contractors for congressional investigations and inquiries (sec. 857)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 827) that would prohibit reimbursement of costs incurred by a contractor in connection with a congressional investigation or inquiry into an issue that is the subject matter of a proceeding resulting in a disposition.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Requirement to provide photovoltaic devices from United States sources (sec. 858)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 829) that would provide additional acquisition opportunities for the Department of Defense with respect to photovoltaic devices.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Reimbursement of Department of Defense for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers (sec. 859)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 862) that would provide for the reimbursement to the Department of Defense for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Three-year extension of authority for Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (sec. 860)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 863) that would reauthorize the Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund for three more years.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Extension to United States Transportation Command of authorities relating to prohibition on contracting with the enemy

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 801) that would amend section 831(i)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to add U.S. Transportation Command to the list of covered combatant commands.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 861).

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the extension to U.S. Transportation Command of authorities relating to prohibition on contracting with the enemy was included in another provision of this agreement.

Governance of Joint Information Environment

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 804) that would require the Secretary of Defense to install a stronger management element and set of controls on the Joint Information Environment (JIE) initiative, including by requiring the assignment of an experienced coordinator under the Chief Information Officer (CIO) to oversee the JIE migration, the establishment of a team of experts to support the coordinator, and modifications to the JIE Executive Committee and its working groups to ensure better representation of those who must use the JIE to execute warfighting missions and those who must defend the JIE from cyber attacks.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We are encouraged that the newly appointed CIO has the necessary support from the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the intent, to impose greater discipline over the JIE migration, bolster the planning and engineering resources devoted to the initiative, and to ensure that the needs of the operational forces receive all due consideration alongside communications and computing efficiencies and cost savings.

We direct that the CIO be prepared to brief the congressional defense committees at regular intervals on the measures taken to achieve these improvements, including defining what JIE encompasses, and the "as is" condition and the "to be" architecture; developing an integrated master schedule and cost estimates; and tracking compliance with objectives, schedules, and costs.

In addition, we direct the CIO to identify and prioritize the applications in use in the Department of Defense (DOD) that the CIO assesses are candidates for migration to a cloud computing environment, and to determine which applications can and cannot, without modification or replacement, be shifted to a cloud computing environment, along with a time-phased plan to either modify or replace those applications that are not cloud-compatible. We note that a significant percentage of DOD computing applications cannot be virtualized or otherwise are not cloud-compatible, and that the cost and time required to modify such applications are substantial. Without an understanding of what applications can be readily migrated, and a plan to modify or replace those that cannot, neither DOD nor potential commercial cloud providers will be able to plan effectively. The CIO should complete this tasking, and be prepared to share the results with the congressional defense committees, within 270 days of the enactment of this Act.

Improving opportunities for service-disabled veteran-owned small business

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 812) that would amend section 657 of title 15, United States Code, by consolidating the verification and appeals processes for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Small Business Administration (SBA), and by moving the processes and resources of the SDVOSB verification programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs to the SBA.

The provision would also allow the surviving spouse of a service-disabled veteran who acquires an ownership right in a small business concern to be treated as if the surviving spouse were that veteran for the purpose of maintaining the status of the small business as a small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that in the case of a transfer of ownership resulting from the death of a service-disabled veteran to a surviving spouse altering the status of the small business as a SDVOSB, we believe the small business concern can continue to perform existing contracts along with any remaining options to those contracts under existing law.

Improving Federal Surety Bonds

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 816) that would amend section 411(c)(1) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-699) by raising the guarantee rate on the Small Business Administration's preferred security bond program from 70 percent to 90 percent.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Publication of required justification that consolidation of contract requirements

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 817) that would require publication of certain justification and approval documents.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Small business prime and subcontract participation goals raised; accounting of subcontracting

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 818) that would raise the goals for small business subcontracting.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Small business cyber education

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 819) that would allow the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to promote an outreach and education program to assist small businesses in understanding the cyber threat and in defending their networks and intellectual property.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We recognize the challenges faced by small business, both in protecting their own networks and intellectual property, and also in developing effective capabilities to address cyber security needs. As noted in the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3304, we recognize the challenges that the defense acquisition system can pose for small businesses, but the purpose of the small and disadvantaged businesses offices established in each of the services is to handle the whole gamut of small business issues.

We are aware of the activities the Department of Defense (DOD) has instituted in order to improve small business access to threat information and best practices pertaining to cyber security. Last year, DOD briefed the Armed Services Committees of

the Senate and House of Representatives on plans to support cyber education activities for small business through the existing small business program. We recognize that this is a work in progress, and that an ongoing assessment of those efforts should be commenced in order to determine the effectiveness of those efforts.

Therefore, we direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives by November 1, 2015 on the DOD's outreach and education to assist small businesses in understanding cyber threats. This report should address the following:

(1) An assessment of the planning being done to integrate cyber education and outreach into the programs of the offices of small and disadvantaged businesses of DOD and the military services;

(2) The capabilities of these offices to support small businesses in preparing plans for the protection of their corporate networks and intellectual property; and

(3) Development of metrics to determine the performance and effectiveness of those programs and planning activities.

Procurement of personal protective equipment

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 824) that would require the Secretary of Defense to use best value tradeoff source selection methods to the maximum extent practicable when procuring an item of personal protective equipment (PPE) or critical safety items. PPE items include, but are not limited to, body armor components, combat helmets, combat protective eyewear, environmental and fire resistant clothing, footwear, organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE), and other items as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that PPE such as body armor, helmets, specialized clothing and footwear as well as other OCIE items are specifically designed to meet challenging military requirements and specifications.

These PPE items are usually not commercial off-the-shelf products, but are frequently highly engineered, critical life-saving equipment items designed and manufactured to meet rigorous performance standards, first article testing and stringent production quality requirements.

We remain committed to providing the warfighter with the best equipment possible and encourage the Department of Defense to use proper source selection methods to fulfill these requirements. In cases where offerors have widely diverse technical qualifications and are expected to provide products that differ significantly in performance characteristics, source selection criteria should not be solely based on cost in the procurement of OCIE and PPE.

Authority for Defense Contract Audit Agency to interview contractor employees in connection with examination of contractor records

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 825) that would amend subsection (a)(1) of section 2313 of title 10, United States Code, to grant the Defense Contract Audit Agency specific authority to interview contractor employees similar to the authority granted to the Comptroller General of the United States in subsection (c)(1) of that same section.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We believe that under the authorities provided by section 2313 of title 10, United States Code, Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) officials have the authority to interview contractor employees during the course of an audit if such an interview is required to complete the audit.

We therefore encourage contractors to make available for interview the employees associated with matters related to an audit conducted in accordance with section 2313.

We also note that failure to provide reasonable access to interview employees associated with matters under review during an audit could result in a qualified audit opinion.

Prohibition on funds for contracts violating Executive Order No. 11246

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 825) that would prohibit funding authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to be used to enter into any contract with any entity if such contract would violate Executive Order No. 11246 (relating to non-retaliation for disclosure of compensation information), as amended by the announcement of the President on April 8, 2014.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Requirement for policies and standard checklist in procurement of services

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 826) that would amend section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to implement a standard checklist to be used for new contract approval for services or exercising an option under an existing contract for services. The checklist required would be modeled on the policy and checklist relating to services contract approval form (dated August 2012) established and in use by the Department of the Army. Finally, the provision would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the standard checklist for each of fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the provision.

We direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the senior acquisition executive for the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force, no later than March 30, 2015, to issue to the Defense agencies and the military services, respectively, policies implementing a standard checklist to be completed before the issuance of a solicitation for any new contract for services or exercising an option under an existing contract for services, including services provided under a contract for goods.

We recommend that the Under Secretary and the senior acquisition executives, to the extent practicable, model their policies and checklists on the policy and checklist relating to services contract approval currently used by the Department of the Army.

We also direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the Defense agencies' and military services' implementation of a standard checklist by January 30, 2016.

Debarment required of persons convicted of fraudulent use of 'made in America' labels

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 828) that would debar people convicted of the fraudulent use of "Made in America" labels.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Requirement to buy American flags from domestic sources

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 830) that would require the purchase of American flags from domestic sources.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that flags of the United States procured by the Department of Defense are procured in accordance with section 2533a(b)(1)(D) of title 10, United States Code.

Tenure and accountability of program managers for program development periods

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 842) that would require the Secretary of Defense to revise Department of Defense (DOD) guidance for defense acquisition programs to address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program development period of defense acquisition programs.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that we require the Secretary of Defense to provide recommendations on program manager tenure as part of an overarching review of program manager development elsewhere in this Act.

We express our intent to address program manager tenure in next year's National Defense Authorization Act in the context of a larger DOD acquisition reform effort.

Tenure and accountability of program managers for program execution periods

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 843) that would address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program execution period.

The provision would require each such program manager to enter into a performance agreement with the milestone decision authority (MDA) that establishes the expected parameters of performance, including the commitment of the MDA that adequate funding and resources are available and will be provided, and assurance of the program manager that the parameters are achievable.

The provision would also require that program managers be given authority comparable to the authority given to private sector program managers and that they be assigned to a program until the delivery of the first production units, with a narrow waiver authority.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that we require the Secretary of Defense to provide recommendations on program manager tenure as part of an overarching review of program manager development elsewhere in this Act.

We express our intent to address program manager tenure in next year's National Defense Authorization Act in the context of a larger Department of Defense acquisition reform effort.

Removal of requirements related to waiver of preliminary design review and post-preliminary design review before Milestone B

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 844) that would add an alternative to one of the certification requirements established by section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, for major defense acquisition programs entering the acquisition system at Milestone B.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Short title

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5001) that would provide a short title to the provisions contained in title L of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Table of contents

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5002) that would provide a table of contents for title L of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Definitions

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5003) that would provide for definition of terms contained in title L of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Lead coordination role of Chief Information Officers Council

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5102) that would provide a lead coordination role to the Chief Information Officers Council.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Reports by Government Accountability Office

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5103) that would require certain reports by the Government Accountability Office.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Purpose

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5201) that would state the purpose of title LII of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Definitions

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5202) that would provide definitions of terms in title LII of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Performance requirements related to data center consolidation

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5204) that would require certain performance requirements related to data center consolidation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Cost savings related to data center optimization

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5205) that would require the tracking of costs resulting from implementation of the Federal Data Center Optimization Initiative.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Reporting requirements to Congress and the Federal Chief Information Officer

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5206) that would require certain reports to Congress and the Federal Chief Information Officer.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Website consolidation and transparency

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5302) that would require the elimination or consolidation of websites found to be duplicative or overlapping.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Transition to the cloud

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5303) that would express the sense of Congress that transition to cloud computing offers significant potential benefits for the implementation of Federal information technology projects in terms of flexibility, cost, and operational benefits.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Elimination of unnecessary duplication of contracts by requiring business case analysis

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5304) that would require a business case analysis before issuance of a solicitation for certain contracts.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Plan on strengthening program and project management performance

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5412) that would require a plan to strengthen program and project management performance.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Personnel awards for excellence in the acquisition information systems and information technology

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5413) that would provide authority for awards for excellence in the acquisition of information systems and information technology.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Promoting transparency of blanket purchase agreements

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5503) that would promote the transparency of blanket purchase agreements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Additional source selection technique in solicitations

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5504) that would allow for additional source selection techniques in certain solicitations.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Enhanced communication between government and industry

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5506) that would enhance communication between government and industry.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Clarification of current law with respect to technology neutrality in acquisition of software

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5507) that would clarify current law with respect to technology neutrality in acquisition of software.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

No additional funds authorized

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 5508) that would limit the availability of funds to implement and provisions in title L of this Act to funds otherwise authorized or appropriated.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Short title

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3743A) contained a provision that would provide a short title.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT
SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MANAGEMENT

Reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and related matters (sec. 901)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 908) that would incorporate a proposal from the Department of Defense to make several amendments to title 10, United States Code, relating to the organization and management of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 901) that would combine the Deputy Chief Management Officer position and the Chief Information Officer position into the Chief Management Officer position, redesignate the Deputy Secretary of Defense as the Chief Operating Officer, eliminate the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense title except for Principal Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense established by law, and redesignate the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations, Energy, and Environment.

Additionally, this proposal seeks to make changes to Chapter 4 of title 10, United States Code, in order to streamline the establishment provisions for certain officials

and ensure that policymaking requirements are provided for separately from establishment provisions and to make other clerical and conforming changes.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would combine the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Chief Information Officer position into a new Under Secretary of Defense position placed in the order of precedence before the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics.

This change would not take place until the next administration, however, to allow for leadership continuity in the Department of Defense through the current administration's term in office.

The provision also combines the operational energy and installations and environment functions under one Assistant Secretary of Defense, and we direct the combined organization to equally prioritize both functions. Additionally, the provision added a new report requirement to accompany the budget certification, or if the budget is not certified, there are separate reporting details. Such report shall include an appendix prepared by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as well as a separate appendix prepared by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. We expect that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics will address operational energy as an element of the acquisition posture statement, when presented to Congress.

Section 902 of Public Law 110-417 created the Operational Energy position in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, which became the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy, Plans, and Programs with the intent to inform senior-level decision-makers of the strategic implications of operational energy requirements on the battlefield.

We recognize and commend the Assistant Secretary for the progress and improvements made since enactment of section 902, including streamlining operational energy requirements, establishing policies, and extending combat capability and operational reach by changing the culture and improving acquisition and sustainment processes.

We believe that consideration of operational energy demands and planning for energy consumption on the battlefield are of tactical and strategic significance.

Therefore, we direct the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the full intent of section 902 of Public Law 110-417 is carried forward in any reorganization of personnel or responsibilities related to operational energy, plans and programs.

Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (sec. 902)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 902) that would amend section 138 of title 10, United States Code, to redesignate the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, whose principal duty would be the overall supervision of manpower and reserve affairs of the Department of Defense.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Requirement for assessment of options to modify the number of combatant commands (sec. 903)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 906) that would require the Secretary of De-

fense to develop a non-binding plan to reduce the number of geographic combatant commands to no more than four by the end of fiscal year 2020 and submit a report to Congress within 180 days of enactment of this Act on the plan, the feasibility and risks of the plan, and any recommendations to implement the plan the Secretary considers appropriate.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Office of Net Assessment (sec. 904)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 907) that would establish an Office of Net Assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment on the establishment of such an office.

We note that the current Office of Net Assessment has provided the Secretary of Defense with the primary support needed to meet the requirements of section 113(i) of title 10, United States Code, directing the Secretary to conduct a net assessment and submit an annual report to Congress. Support for the Secretary's statutory responsibility for a net assessment remains the primary purpose of such an office.

Periodic review of Department of Defense management headquarters (sec. 905)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 909) that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan and submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act to implement a periodic review and analysis of the Department of Defense personnel requirements for management headquarters and submit the required plan to the congressional defense committee.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Modifications of biennial strategic workforce plan relating to senior management, functional, and technical workforces of the Department of Defense (sec. 911)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 911) that would amend section 115b of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a biennial strategic workforce plan that addresses the shaping and improvement of the senior management workforce of the Department of Defense and includes an assessment of the senior functional and technical workforce of the Department within the appropriate functional community. The provision would also add a requirement that the strategic workforce plan include an assessment of the workforce of the Department comprising highly qualified experts.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1102).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Repeal of extension of Comptroller General report on inventory (sec. 912)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 912) that would repeal an extension of a Comptroller General of the United States report on contract inventory.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 809).

The agreement includes the provision.

Extension of authority to waive reimbursement of costs of activities for nongovernmental personnel at Department of Defense regional centers for security studies (sec. 913)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 921) that would amend section 941(b)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (10 U.S.C. 184) by extending for 5 years the authority of the Secretary of Defense to waive the reimbursement of costs for certain nongovernmental personnel at the Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1046).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Pilot program to establish Government lodging program (sec. 914)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 922) that would amend section 5911 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a government lodging program and to require its use by servicemembers and Department of Defense (DOD) civilians performing official travel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1083) that would also require the Secretary to report to appropriate congressional committees within 18 months on the DOD's implementation of this program and savings achieved.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would establish a pilot program authorizing the Secretary of Defense to institute a government lodging program to provide government or commercial lodging for DOD employees or members of the uniformed services under the Secretary's jurisdiction performing duty on official travel. The provision would authorize the Secretary to require such travelers to occupy adequate quarters on a rental basis when available. The provision would also require an initial report within 6 months of enactment of this Act outlining facets of the pilot program established by the Secretary, as well as annual reports to be submitted with annual budget requests, with a final report to be submitted with the budget request for fiscal year 2019. The authority to conduct a pilot program under this provision would expire on December 31, 2019.

Single standard mileage reimbursement rate for privately owned automobiles of Government employees and members of the uniformed services (sec. 915)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 923) that would establish as the mileage reimbursement rate for federal employees and members of the uniformed services using privately owned automobiles for government travel the single standard mileage reimbursement rate established by the Internal Revenue Service for use by taxpayers in computing the deductible costs of operating their automobiles for business purposes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Modifications to requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing (sec. 916)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 925) that would amend chapter 76 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a defense agency within the Department of Defense, headed by a director, to have responsibility over the Prisoner of War/Missing in Action accounting community. The provision would create a new section 1501a of title 10, United

States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into public-private partnerships for the purposes of facilitating the accounting of missing persons. The provision would require the Secretary to assign or detail to the defense agency a full-time senior medical examiner to provide medical oversight of the identification process, establish identification and laboratory policy, and advise the director on forensic scientific disciplines. Finally, the provision would require the Secretary to establish and maintain a single centralized database and case management system containing information on all missing persons for whom a file has been established.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 911).

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3706) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on policies and proposals for providing access to information and documents to the next of kin of missing service personnel.

The agreement includes the Senate provision and the proposed amendment number 3706.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 901) that would redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, and redesignate the position of the Secretary of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Additional responsibility for Director of Operational Test and Evaluation

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 902) which would require the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to consider potential increases in program cost estimates and delays in schedule estimates when implementing the policies, procedures, and activities related to operational test and evaluation. In addition, the provision requires the Director to take appropriate action to ensure operational test and evaluation activities do not unnecessarily impede program schedules or increase program costs.

The report accompanying the House bill also directed the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the operational test and evaluation processes and activities of the Department of Defense and to report the results of that review to the congressional defense committees not later than March 15, 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 845) requiring the Comptroller General to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on disputes between the Office of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation and the acquisition community over testing requirements for major weapon systems.

The agreement does not include these provisions.

We believe that in order to control the cost of defense acquisitions, each element of the acquisition system is responsible for considering the potential increases in acquisition program cost estimates or delays in schedule estimates when implementing that element's

policies, procedures, and activities. This includes the budget, requirements, acquisition, and operational test communities. Each of these organizations should take appropriate action to balance its responsibilities with the need to avoid unnecessarily increasing program costs or impeding program schedules.

Accordingly, the Comptroller General is directed to inform the congressional defense committees, not later than March 15, 2015, on the results of its review of cases in which the program office believes that the Director has required testing above the agreed to plan.

Requirement for congressional briefing before divesting of Defense Finance and Accounting Service functions

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 904) that would prohibit the transfer of financial management functions out of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) until the Secretary of Defense provides a briefing to the congressional defense committees on a transfer plan and certifies the transfer would reduce costs, increase efficiencies, maintain the timeline for auditability of financial statements, and maintain the roles and missions of DFAS.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

As noted in Senate report accompanying S. 2410 (S. Rept. 113-176), the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller, as directed by the Secretary of the Army, conducted a doctrine, organization, training, material, leadership, personnel, and facilities review of all Department of the Army financial management processes, policies, organization, and workforce composition.

Known as the Army Financial Management Optimization (AFMO) initiative, the AFMO Task Force made numerous recommendations, including a plan to "consolidate selected financial management activities" into "Command-Aligned Hubs" (CAH).

A pilot program to test this CAH approach began October 1, 2014. While we applaud the Army's efforts, as the Army works to reduce costs and achieve auditable financial statements, it is important that the evaluation of any financial management-focused program whose aim is optimization, consolidation, or streamlining, initiated by the military departments, services, or defense agencies, be analyzed not just from a service perspective but also from a DOD-wide perspective.

We therefore endorse the Senate committee's direction to the Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) of the Department of Defense to conduct a review of the CAH pilot program for any DOD-wide impacts and direct that the DCMO's review be expanded to any similar financial management-focused initiatives by other military departments, services, or defense agencies in fiscal year 2015 for similar impacts. The DCMO shall report findings of the review to the congressional defense committees within 120 days of completion of any pilot program.

Furthermore, the centralized financial management provided by the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) is important to the auditability, cost effectiveness, and efficiency of each military department, service, and the defense agencies.

We therefore direct the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to conduct a review of any proposal initiated in this fiscal year, or resulting from a pilot program initiated in this fiscal year, to permanently transfer functions from DFAS to another DOD entity

and to assess, at a minimum, the impacts on cost, auditability, DFAS capabilities, and the ability of DFAS to maintain DOD-wide services. The Comptroller shall report findings to the congressional defense committees prior to any proposed transfer.

Combatant command efficiency plan

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 905) that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to combine the back office functions of two or more combatant commands and to submit a report on the plan to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This section would define the term "back office function" as those including, but not limited to, the administrative and support functions of a headquarters of a combatant command. This section would also limit fiscal year 2015 funds for the headquarters of the Joint Chiefs of Staff until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, provides the briefing on combatant command headquarters personnel and resource requirements that was directed in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the underlying House provision was incorporated into another section of this Act.

Report related to nuclear forces, deterrence, nonproliferation, and terrorism

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 910) that would require that not later than 90 days after the date of enactment the Secretary provide a report to the congressional defense committees discussing how the Department of Defense (DOD) will manage its mission with respect to issues related to nuclear forces, deterrence, nonproliferation, and terrorism.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that this provision was included in the House bill out of concern that the reorganization of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy which abolished the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs, would result in less senior-level attention to nuclear forces, deterrence, nonproliferation, and terrorism. In this most recent reorganization, these subject areas are now transferred to the Assistant Secretaries of Defense for Strategy, Plans and Capabilities and Homeland Defense.

Section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-417) noted similar concern regarding a lack of focus on strategic and nuclear weapons policy shortly after the 2007 unauthorized transfer of nuclear weapons from Minot Air Force Base, and recommended that the Secretary of Defense should consider establishing a position, at the level of Assistant Secretary of Defense or Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to hold primary responsibility for the strategic and nuclear weapons policy of DOD.

We understand that this recent reorganization was part of a larger effort to obtain efficiencies across the DOD but we remain concerned that appropriate focus should be kept on the topics of nuclear forces, deterrence, nonproliferation, and terrorism to avoid a

repeat of past mistakes, such as at Minot Air Force Base in 2007.

We request a report no later than 90 days after the date of enactment to the congressional defense committees on how the Secretary of Defense, through the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, shall manage an appropriate focus on the missions associated with nuclear forces, deterrence, non-proliferation, and terrorism.

Assignment of certain new requirements based on determinations of cost-efficiency

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 913) that would require that when assigning a new Department of Defense work requirement to military or civilian personnel, or to a contractor, the assignment shall be made based on a determination of which workforce can perform the work in the most cost-efficient manner except in cases where the new requirement is inherently governmental, closely associated with inherently governmental functions, critical, or required by law to be performed by military personnel or civilian personnel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Prohibition on conversion of functions performed by civilian or contractor personnel to performance by military personnel

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 914) that would clarify when military personnel can be used to perform functions that are currently being performed by civilian or contractor personnel and would codify relevant Department of Defense instructions and policies.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Notification of compliance with section relating to procurement of services

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 915) that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure compliance with existing law regarding appropriate manpower performance and provide written notification of compliance to the congressional defense committees. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of such a notification and report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of the provision of such a notification.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Public release by Inspectors General of reports of misconduct

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 924) that would amend sections 141, 3020, 5020, and 8020 of title 10, United States Code, to require Department of Defense and military department Inspectors General to publicly release reports of administrative investigation that confirm misconduct of any member of the Senior Executive Service, political appointee, or commissioned officer in the Armed Forces in pay grades O-6 or above.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

General transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1001) that would provide the Department of

Defense (DOD) with \$4.0 billion of general transfer authority in fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1001) that would provide DOD with \$5.0 billion of general transfer authority in fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment to provide DOD with \$4.5 billion in general transfer authority in fiscal year 2015.

Authority to transfer funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to sustain nuclear weapons modernization and naval reactors (sec. 1002)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1003) that would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to transfer up to \$150.0 million to the nuclear weapons and naval reactor programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) if the amount authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the weapons activities of the NNSA is less than \$8.7 billion (the amount specified for fiscal year 2015 in the report required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84)).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Reporting of balances carried forward by the Department of Defense at the end of each fiscal year (sec. 1003)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3835) contained a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to submit to Congress, and publish on DOD's website, an annual report on balances carried forward by DOD at the end of each fiscal year.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Extension of authority to support unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1011)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1011) that would extend, by 1 year, support to the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia originally authorized by section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), and most recently amended by section 1011 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1011).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would extend the underlying authority and associated notification requirement for 2 fiscal years.

Extension and modification of authority of Department of Defense to provide support for counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies (sec. 1012)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1012) that would extend, by 3 years, the authority of the Department of Defense (DOD) to provide additional support for counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies originally authorized by section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510), and most recently amended by section 1005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1014) that would amend section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510), as most recently amended by section 1005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), to authorize DOD to provide additional support for activities of other governmental agencies to counter transnational organized crime (TOC) in addition to its counterdrug activities. The provision would also extend the underlying authority through the end of fiscal year 2020 and reduce the dollar threshold for a notification on facilities projects to the congressional defense committees.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would modify the length of the extension of the underlying authority to 3 fiscal years, provide a definition of transnational organized crime, and other conforming modifications.

Availability of funds for additional support for counterdrug activities of certain foreign governments (sec. 1013)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1013) that would amend section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), as most recently amended by section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66). Specifically, the provision would extend the Department of Defense's (DOD) authority to provide additional support for counterdrug activities of certain foreign governments through fiscal year 2020, as well as increase the cap on the limitation on obligations from \$100.0 million to \$125.0 million per fiscal year.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would strike the proposed extension of the underlying authority.

Extension and modification of authority for joint task forces supporting law enforcement agencies conducting activities to counter transnational organized crime to support law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities (sec. 1014)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1012) that would amend section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136), as most recently amended by section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), to: (1) Extend the underlying authority through fiscal year 2020; (2) Expand the scope of the Department of Defense (DOD) authority to provide support to U.S. law enforcement agencies for counterterrorism purposes when a nexus exists between drug trafficking or transnational organized crime (TOC) and a foreign terrorist organization; (3) Make a series of technical modifications; and (4) Expand the authority of DOD to support counter illicit trafficking activities in certain circumstances.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment to include the extension of the underlying authority; expansion of the scope of the authority to provide support to U.S. law enforcement agencies for counterterrorism and TOC when a drug trafficking nexus exists; and a series of technical changes.

Sense of Congress regarding security in the Western Hemisphere (sec. 1015)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1015) that would express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should continue to support programs that combat illicit networking in the United Mexican States and Central America.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical and clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Definition of combatant and support vessel for purposes of the annual plan and certification relating to budgeting for construction of naval vessels (sec. 1021)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1021) that would define the term “combatant and support vessel” that is used to prepare the Department of the Navy’s 30-year ship-building plan.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund (sec. 1022)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1022) that would create a National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund to manage the obligation and expenditures for the advanced procurement or construction of nuclear-powered strategic ballistic missile submarines. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to \$3.5 billion to the Fund from unobligated balances from fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1002) that would create a fund to manage the construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of strategic missile submarines.

The agreement includes a provision that would create a National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund to manage the construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of strategic missile submarines. The provision would also authorize the transfer of unobligated balances as proposed in the House bill.

Limitation on use of funds for inactivation of U.S.S. George Washington (sec. 1023)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1024) that would prohibit spending more than 50 percent of the funds authorized and appropriated for the Office of the Secretary of Defense until the Secretary of Defense obligates funds for commencing, planning, and buying long lead time materials for the refueling and complex overhaul of the USS George Washington (CVN-73).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1021) that would prohibit spending any funds for inactivation of the USS George Washington unless such tasks are identical to tasks that would be necessary to conduct a refueling and complex overhaul of the vessel.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

We note that the administration did not include a budget request to support the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of the USS George Washington (CVN-73) in fiscal year 2015. In a report to Congress titled “Estimated Impacts of Sequestration-Level Funding” dated April 2014, the Department of Defense indicated that “if Congress acts to support outyear funding at the PB15 level, the additional \$6.3B necessary to retain CVN 73 would be reflected in next year’s budget.”

Consistent with section 5062 of title 10, United States Code, and multiple testimonies from the combatant commanders, we believe that Congress has been unambiguous about the support of 11 operational aircraft carriers and have provided sufficient authorization of appropriations in this Act to maintain this carrier force structure. We fully anticipate that the administration will support a budget request for fiscal year 2016 that is consistent with title 10, United States Code.

Sense of Congress recognizing the anniversary of the sinking of U.S.S. Thresher (sec. 1024)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1025) that would express the sense of Congress in recognition of the anniversary of the sinking of the USS Thresher.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Pilot program for sustainment of Littoral Combat Ships on extended deployments (sec. 1025)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1023) that would provide additional flexibility for the Secretary of the Navy to maintain Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) by allowing government personnel or U.S. contractor personnel to conduct corrective and preventive maintenance on an LCS vessel regardless of the ship’s location.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would allow the Secretary of the Navy to establish a pilot program for conducting corrective and preventive maintenance or repair on LCS vessels operating on extended deployment, performed by United States Government personnel or United States contractor personnel. The Secretary would also be required to prepare a report 120 days after completion of this LCS sustainment pilot program and submit that report to the congressional defense committees.

Availability of funds for retirement or inactivation of Ticonderoga class cruisers or dock landing ships (sec. 1026)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1026) that would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the retirement, inactivation, or storage of Ticonderoga-class cruisers and Whidbey Island-class amphibious ships. This section would also require the modernization of two Ticonderoga-class cruisers to begin in fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1022) that would establish rules under which the Navy could use resources in the Ship, Modernization, Operations, and Sustainment Fund (SMOSF) to implement a plan to: (1) Retain 11 Ticonderoga-class cruisers and nine Whidbey Island-class and Harpers Ferry-class dock landing ships in active service; (2) Temporarily inactivate 11 Ticonderoga-class cruisers and three Whidbey Island-class dock landing ships; (3) Modernize the inactivated ships during the period of their inactivation; and (4) Reactivate those ships to replace cruisers and dock landing ships retiring at the end of their expected service lives.

The agreement contains the House provision with an amendment that would direct Navy to induct two cruisers for modernization with fiscal year 2015 funds. The provision would also establish rules under which the Navy could use resources in the SMOSF account to modernize and retain the cruisers and dock landing ships.

We are specifically not prohibiting the Navy from assigning crews to other duties ashore during the duration of the modernization. The Navy has previously modernized a number of ship classes that resulted in significant time out of service for individual vessels. In those instances, the Navy made substantial but temporary reductions in the crew size. We believe that the temporary reductions should be commensurate with the period of the availability. We direct the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that the Navy does adequate planning and preparation to ensure that the crews for cruisers and dock landing ships emerging from a SMOSF-funded modernization period are ready when the ship is delivered from modernization activities and returned to the fleet. We also expect the Secretary to ensure that these ships are maintained in the inventory until the end their expected service lives, excluding time spent in a phased modernization status.

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Extension of authority to make rewards for combating terrorism (sec. 1031)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1031) that would extend the authority through fiscal year 2015 for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. Armed Forces conducted outside the United States against international terrorism or providing such information or assistance that is beneficial to force protection associated with such an operation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Prohibition on use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1032)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1032) that would prohibit the use of funds available to the Department of Defense (DOD) through December 31, 2015, to modify or construct any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house detainees transferred from the U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for purposes of detaining or imprisoning such detainees under DOD custody or control unless authorized by Congress.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment to extend an identical prohibition contained in section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) by 1 year through December 31, 2015.

Prohibition on the use of funds for the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1033)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1033) that would prohibit the use of funds available to the Department of Defense to transfer or release any detainee at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions through December 31, 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment to extend an identical prohibition contained in section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act or

Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), by 1 year through December 31, 2015.

SUBTITLE E—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Modification of Department of Defense authority for humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance programs (sec. 1041)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1041) that would modify the reporting requirements and definitions contained in section 407 of title 10, United States Code, regarding humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1201) that would modify the definitions contained in section 407 of title 10, United States Code, regarding humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Airlift service (sec. 1042)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 822) that would amend chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section that would require transportation of passengers or property by Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF)-eligible aircraft obtained by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department through a contract for airlift service to be provided only by a covered air carrier.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would conform the provision to language on the same matter contained in title 49, United States Code.

As operations in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility draw down, there will be reduced demand for airlift.

The CRAF program was created to ensure the nation can address airlift requirements despite fluctuations in requirements over time. During this transition back to pre-1990 levels of demand for airlift services, we believe it is imperative to maintain both organic and commercial capacities to meet operational demands and unknown future requirements.

Therefore, we direct the Department of Defense (DOD) to work closely with CRAF program partners to ensure that DOD establishes “appropriate levels for peacetime cargo airlift augmentation in order to promote the effectiveness of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet and provide training within the military aircraft system,” as directed in the National Airlift Policy.

Authority to accept certain voluntary legal support services (sec. 1043)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1042) that would amend section 1588 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to accept voluntary legal support services provided by law students or persons studying to be a paralegal, when such services are provided under the direct supervision of an attorney through internship and externship programs approved by the secretary concerned.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1043) that would authorize service secretaries to accept voluntary legal support services provided by law students through internship and externship programs approved by the secretary concerned.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Expansion of authority for Secretary of Defense to use the Department of Defense reimbursement rates for transportation services provided to certain non-Department of Defense entities (sec. 1044)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1043) that would amend section 2642 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to provide transportation services beyond other Federal agencies to include: (1) State, local, and tribal agencies (including any organizations composed of State, local, and tribal agencies); and (2) Defense contractors, when those contractors are transporting supplies for, or destined for, a Department of Defense entity.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1084).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Repeal of authority relating to use of military installations by Civil Reserve Air Fleet contractors (sec. 1045)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1044) that would repeal section 9513 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the use of military installations by commercial air carriers doing business with the Department of Defense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 351).

The agreement includes this provision.

Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau among leadership of the Department of Defense provided physical protection and personal security (sec. 1046)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1044) that would amend section 1074 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) to include the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as one of the specified persons in the Department of Defense who, by nature of their positions, requires continuous security and protection.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Inclusion of regional organizations in authority for assignment of civilian employees of the Department of Defense as advisors to foreign ministries of defense (sec. 1047)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1045) that would amend section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-84), as most recently amended by section 1094 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), to expand the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide Department of Defense (DOD) advisors to regional organizations.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We are concerned about the implementation of the Ministry of Defense Advisors (MODA) program, specifically the process through which nations and activities are proposed and prioritized and how civilian personnel are selected. We also encourage the Secretary to keep the congressional defense committees informed of the MODA program as it is further institutionalized as one of DOD's Defense Institution Building activities.

Report and limitation on availability of funds for aviation foreign internal defense program (sec. 1048)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1045) that would prohibit U.S. Special Oper-

ations Command from obligating any funds available for fiscal year 2015 for the Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program until the Secretary of Defense provides a certification to the congressional defense committees that validates program requirements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would fence 50 percent of the funds made available for Procurement, defense-wide, to support the fixed-wing aviation foreign internal defense program until the Secretary provides the congressional defense committees with the required report and certification.

Modifications to OH-58D Kiowa Warrior aircraft (sec. 1049)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1051) that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to obligate funds for the modification of OH-58D Kiowa Warrior helicopters.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE F—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Protection of top-tier defense-critical infrastructure from electromagnetic pulse (sec. 1051)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1061) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a certification by June 2015 that all defense mission-critical infrastructure of the Department of Defense that requires protection from the adverse effects of man-made or naturally occurring electromagnetic pulse (EMP) that receives power from non-military power sources, is protected from such effects.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report by June 2015 whether such top-tier defense-critical infrastructure that requires EMP protection is protected from EMP. The provision would also require that, if any such infrastructure is not protected against EMP, the report shall describe what actions would be required to achieve such protection.

Response of the Department of Defense to compromises of classified information (sec. 1052)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1062) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on actions taken by the Secretary regarding significant compromises of classified information. The report would include a description of any changes to Department of Defense (DOD) policies or guidance relating to significant compromises of classified information, an overview of mitigation efforts, a description of the resources dedicated to efforts relating to such compromises, a description of the Secretary's plan to continue evaluating and mitigating any damages, and a general description and estimate of the cost associated with mitigating such compromises. This section would also require updates to the initial report on a semiannual basis during calendar years 2015-18.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision, but the classified annex to the Senate report accompanying S. 2410 (S. Rept. 113-176) of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 also included direction for DOD on this issue.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would sunset

the reporting requirement after 2016 and require quarterly updates rather than semi-annual reporting. However, we understand that the Information Review Task Force, within the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Mitigation Oversight Task Force, within the Joint Staff, are already producing quarterly reports regarding the disclosure and mitigation measures. Providing the Mitigation Oversight Task Force and Information Review Task Force reports to the appropriate congressional committees, will be considered sufficient to answer the requirements of this provision, assuming that all the elements of the provision are addressed.

Study on joint analytic capability of the Department of Defense (sec. 1053)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1064) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to undertake an independent assessment of the joint analytic capabilities of the Department of Defense to support strategy, plans, and force development and their links to resource decisions.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Business case analysis of the creation of an active duty association for the 168th Air Refueling Wing (sec. 1054)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1065) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a business case analysis of the creation of an active association with the 168th Air Refueling Wing.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Reports on recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force (sec. 1055)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1061) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit annual reports for each fiscal year from 2016 through 2019 on how the Air Force is implementing the recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Report on protection of military installations (sec. 1056)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1042) that would allow the Secretary of Defense to designate personnel to engage in activities to protect the buildings, grounds, persons, and property that are under the jurisdiction, custody or control of the Department of Defense (DOD). The provision would also allow the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations, including traffic regulations, for the same purpose.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to the Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Judiciary, and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the House Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs a report, coordinated with the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of Homeland Security, that identifies the issues, shortfalls and gaps in authorities for the protection of military installations by the three agencies con-

cerned, and the risks associated with those issues, shortfalls, and gaps. The report would also provide a description of specific examples of incidents that illustrate those concerns. The agreement also seeks a recommendation for legislation that fulfills DOD's requirements and addresses the concerns of the three agencies.

We encourage the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work collaboratively in drafting the report and to make it a priority to ensure the security of U.S. military installations.

Comptroller General briefing and report on Army and Army National Guard force structure changes (sec. 1057)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1050) that would prohibit, during fiscal year 2015, reductions of Active Duty Army and Army National Guard end strength and transferring AH-64 attack helicopters from the National Guard to the Active Duty Army. The provision would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on its review of Department of Defense and Department of the Army analysis and plans for force structure and mix changes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would clarify the elements of the required Comptroller General assessment. The agreement would also strike the limitations on end strength reductions and the transfer of National Guard helicopters because these limitations are addressed elsewhere in this Act.

Improving analytic support to systems acquisition and allocation of acquisition, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets (sec. 1058)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1063) that would require the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (VCJCS), in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD (AT&L)), and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE), to conduct an assessment of the operations research tools, processes, and capabilities used to support the analysis of requirements for new systems acquisitions and the analysis, validation, and prioritization of requirements for the allocation of existing intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets to the combatant commands. The provision would require the VCJCS, the USD (AT&L), and the Director of CAPE to brief Congress on the results of this assessment within 180 days of enactment of the Act.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to review and issue or revise guidance to components of the Department of Defense (DOD) to improve the application of operations research and systems analysis to: (1) the requirements process for acquisition of major defense acquisition programs and major automated information systems; and (2) the allocation of ISR systems to the combatant commands. The provision would also require the Secretary to brief Congress on issued or revised guidance not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

The Secretary's review should include (but not be limited to) the following elements:

(1) The quality and degree of standardization of the data and supporting analysis sub-

mitted by the combatant commands for the allocation of ISR assets;

(2) The extent to which DOD uses operations research and systems analysis (ORSA) to support deliberations by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council in vetting requirements from the military services and the combatant commands for new acquisition programs and ISR allocations in the Global Force Management Allocation Plan (GFMAP);

(3) The ORSA resources available to the Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment Directorate of the Joint Staff, the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and the Joint Functional Component Command for ISR to support requirements analysis;

(4) The extent to which ORSA methods are applied to analyzing the results of the employment of ISR assets to inform decisions on future GFMAP allocations; and

(5) The standardization of reporting to a common database of ISR systems performance, including a minimum set of metrics describing mission execution for all ISR support to the combatant commands.

Review of United States military strategy and the force posture of allies and partners in the United States Pacific Command area of responsibility (sec. 1059)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1064) that would require the Secretary of Defense to commission an independent review of the U.S. Asia-Pacific region rebalance.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with minor amendments.

Repeal of certain reporting requirements relating to the Department of Defense (sec. 1060)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1067) that would repeal or modify a number of reporting requirements that have been included in law in past years.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3830) contained a provision that would repeal additional reporting requirements included in law in past years.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal two reporting requirements and section 354 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) to repeal one reporting requirement.

Repeal of requirement for Comptroller General of the United States annual reviews and report on pilot program on commercial fee-for-service air refueling support for the Air Force (sec. 1061)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1068) that would repeal the requirement for a Comptroller General review of a pilot program on commercial fee-for-service air refueling support for the Air Force. Since enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-81), the pilot program has yet to be used.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Report on additional matters in connection with report on the force structure of the United States Army (sec. 1062)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number

3900) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to provide an update with respect to the report of the Secretary on the force structure of the Army submitted under section 1066 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239).

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with a clarifying amendment.

We direct the Chief of Staff of the Army to provide, not later than March 15, 2015, a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives containing an assessment of an alternative force structure methodology for organizing the Army. The briefing should include an assessment of the methodology as a construct for organizing the Army to meet operational requirements consistent with defense strategic guidance and projected budget constraints.

Certification for realignment of forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores (sec. 1063)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1048) that would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from reducing force structure at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, Portugal, until: (1) The Secretary of Defense concludes the European Infrastructure Consolidation Assessment (EICA); (2) The Secretary includes within that assessment an analysis of how the use and force structure of the Lajes Air Force Base is in keeping with the goals of the U.S.-Portugal Permanent Bilateral Commission; and (3) The congressional defense committees are briefed on the assessment's results.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require that prior to any action to realign forces at the Lajes Air Force Base, the Secretary of Defense must certify to the congressional defense committees that: (1) The action is supported by a EICA; and (2) The Secretary has determined, based on an analysis of operational requirements, that the Lajes Air Force Base is not an optimal location for U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) or U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM).

We direct the Secretary to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees at the time the certification is made pursuant to this section on the required force structure at Lajes Air Force Base. The briefing should include at a minimum:

(1) A detailed description and justification of the planned force structure at the Lajes Air Force Base;

(2) A copy of the Department of Defense (DOD) analysis of operational requirements for the use of Lajes Air Force Base, including an explanation of how this analysis supports DOD's conclusion regarding Lajes' potential use by components of SOCOM and AFRICOM;

(3) A discussion of:

(A) the purpose, goals, and activities of the United States-Portugal Permanent Bilateral Commission,

(B) what role, if any, United States forces at the Lajes Air Force Base should play in promoting the goals of the Commission, and

(C) how the reduction in force structure at Lajes Air Force Base will impact the goals of the commission and the bilateral cooperation between the two countries in the fight against terrorism.

(4) An evaluation of the possible costs and collateral military impacts associated with a closure of Lajes Air Force Base.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Technical and clerical amendments (sec. 1071)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1071) that would make technical and clerical corrections to title 10, United States Code, and various National Defense Authorization Acts.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1086).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would make additional technical and clerical corrections to existing law.

Reform of quadrennial defense review (sec. 1072)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1077) that would substantially modify section 118 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the timing, analysis, structure, review, and submission of a new Defense Strategy Review.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with amendments that clarify the elements of the Defense Strategy Review and duties of the National Defense Panel.

Biennial surveys of Department of Defense civilian employees on workplace and gender relations matters (sec. 1073)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1081) that would amend chapter 23 of title 10, United States Code, to require biennial surveys of civilian employees of the Department of Defense (DOD) to solicit information on gender issues, including issues relating to gender-based assault, harassment, and discrimination, and the climate in the DOD for forming professional relationships between male and female employees of the DOD. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the feasibility of conducting similar surveys of military dependents and DOD contractors.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

We expect DOD to implement this provision through available information technology. Further, we direct the Secretary to inform the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on actions taken to address findings of the biennial surveys.

Revision to statute of limitations for aviation insurance claims (sec. 1074)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1073) that would amend section 44309 of title 49, United States Code, by clarifying that the claimant for civil actions must present a claim to the Secretary of Transportation and have it denied before instituting a civil action against the United States. Additionally, this section would clarify that an insurance claim must be made within 2 years of the loss, or for an insurance claim made by a person with whom the insured has no privity of contract, the earlier of either 60 days after final judgment by a court or 6 years after the date of the loss.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Pilot program for the Human Terrain System (sec. 1075)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1074) that would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct a pilot program to use Human Terrain System assets in the U.S.

Pacific Command area of responsibility to support Phase 0 shaping operations and to support the theater security cooperation plans of the geographic combatant commander.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would provide the Secretary of the Army some flexibility in the establishment of the Human Terrain System pilot program.

Should the pilot program under this authority be carried out, we direct the Secretary of the Army to brief the congressional defense committees on the milestones, metrics, deliverables, and resources needed to execute the program. The brief should include an assessment of the value of the program in comparison to the various other analytic tools and techniques that are at the disposal of the military.

Clarification of policies on management of special use airspace of Department of Defense (sec. 1076)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1075) that would allow the Secretary of Defense to enter into a memorandum of understanding with a non-Department of Defense (DOD) entity that is engaged in the test range program authorized under section 332(c) of the Federal Aviation Administration Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-95). Such entity would be allowed access to non-regulatory special use airspace if such access is used by the entity as part of such test range program and such access would not interfere with the activities of the Secretary or otherwise interrupt or delay missions or training of the DOD.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision. A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3578) contained a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to authorize use by another department or agency of the Federal government of special use airspace at a DOD installation if such use would support or benefit DOD, or support some national security interest. Access could not be granted if the use of airspace would interfere with the assigned mission of the commander of the installation.

The agreement contains the House provision with an amendment that would direct DOD to issue guidance clarifying policies on the appropriate management of special use airspace within DOD, and on policies governing access by users from outside the DOD to special use airspace managed by DOD. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to issue such guidance within 90 days of enactment of this Act, and to provide the congressional defense committees a briefing on such guidance within 120 days of enactment of this Act.

The Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) noted that: (1) developing established procedures to integrate unmanned aircraft systems into the National Airspace System will be very important in allowing both DOD and non-DOD entities to train with and operate unmanned aircraft systems on a routine basis; and (2) developing these procedures could include the use of FAA-designated DOD non-regulatory special use airspace.

Subsequently, DOD released guidance to the Services and DOD components to prescribe guidelines for local commanders to grant access to special use airspace. DOD officials assure us that their guidance was not

intended to prevent local commanders from exercising authority to allow access within the DOD guidelines. Nevertheless, we understand that local commanders have interpreted the DOD guidelines as either allowing or preventing the local installation commander from negotiating a memorandum of understanding (MOU) under which access to special use airspace could be granted.

The provision would direct the Secretary of Defense to move expeditiously to correct such misunderstandings of the guidelines on access to special use airspace, including the authority of local commanders to enter into a memorandum of understanding for the use of special use airspace by any department or agency of the Federal Government, or state governments, to include those engaged in the Federal Aviation Administration test range program, participating in the Robotic Aircraft for Public Safety program, or participating in other activities of a similar nature.

Department of Defense policies on community involvement in Department community outreach events (sec. 1077)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 354) that would authorize service secretaries to enter into a contract or agreement with a non-federal civic organization to conduct or support an air show or open house to feature any unit, aircraft, vessel, equipment, or servicemembers under the jurisdiction of the secretary, and would authorize the secretary to charge or authorize a nominal admission fee to attend a military air show or open house.

The House bill also contained a provision (sec. 355) to amend section 974 of title 10, United States Code, to require the secretary concerned to accept contributions of money, personal property, or services on the condition that such money, property, or services be used for the benefit of a military musical unit under the jurisdiction of the Secretary.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1065) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the policies of the Department of Defense (DOD) on the involvement of non-federal entities in DOD community outreach events that feature any unit, aircraft, vessel, equipment, or members of the Armed Forces.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, a report on the policies of DOD on the involvement of non-federal entities in DOD community outreach events (including air shows, parades, open houses, and performances by military musical units) that feature any unit, aircraft, vessel, equipment, or members of the Armed Forces in order to increase the involvement of non-federal entities in such events.

Notification of foreign threats to information technology systems impacting national security (sec. 1078)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1083) that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification of each instance in which the Secretary or the Director determine through analysis or reporting that an information technology or telecommunications component from a company suspected of being influenced by a foreign country, or a suspected affiliate of such a company, is competing for or has been

awarded a contract to include the technology of such company or such affiliate into a covered network. Each notification would be required to include:

(1) A description of each such instance, including an identification of the company of interest and the network affected;

(2) An analysis of the potential risks and the actions that can be taken to mitigate such risks; and

(3) A description of any follow up or other response actions to be taken.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would limit the application of the provision to the Secretary of Defense and the reportable instances to threats to information technology or network components by an agent of a foreign power in which compromises would pose a significant risk to the programs and operations of the Department of Defense. In addition, the Secretary of Defense would be required to work with other appropriate government agencies to develop a plan to respond to the reported instance. The provision makes clear that the Secretary shall use existing authorities and open source information to make determinations regarding reportable instances.

Pilot program to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans (sec. 1079)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1085) that would require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a pilot program to award grants to qualified non-profit organizations to rehabilitate and modify the primary residence of eligible veterans.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would limit the use of funds under this program to those veterans who the Secretary determines are residing in, and reasonably intend to continue residing in, a primary residence owned by such veterans or family members. The amendment would also strike language in the underlying Senate provision that would have required the Secretary to adhere to certain preferences in awarding grants under the pilot program, and would have limited qualified organizations to those possessing certain expertise or other criteria.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Repeal of limitation on Inspector General audits of certain financial statements

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1002) that would repeal the limitation on Inspector General audits of certain financial statements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of the Senate on sequestration

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1003) pertaining to sequestration.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Management of Defense information systems

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1004) that would amend section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, to expand certification requirements, investment review processing and enterprise architecture re-

quirements from defense business systems to all defense information technology systems.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Elsewhere in this report, we have expressed our concerns over the Department of Defense's (DOD) ability to effectively and efficiently acquire the information technology systems it will need. While part of that challenge is in the acquisition process, we also recognize that a significant problem in DOD's larger management and oversight for IT investments. For example, in our discussions with industry on acquisition improvement, we received suggestions for improving the requirements generation and validation process, as well as aligning IT outcomes with the strategic goals of the organization. These things require a robust management process, and should inform acquisition, not the other way around.

We believe that DOD has a valuable process established in section 2222 of title 10, United States Code for dealing with defense business systems. We see value in having that process expanded to each of the various IT mission areas, especially the processes that conduct business process reengineering (BPR) prior to making acquisition decisions. Currently, the Deputy Chief Management Officer is focused on business systems, but we think their role could be extended to apply process improvement and BPR techniques to DOD's other IT mission areas as well.

We recognize it may be premature at this point, though, to make such significant changes. We understand DOD is reviewing its internal processes, and new leadership is looking to mold the organization in a way to achieve its strategic goals. We look forward to seeing how these efforts progress, and will consider if similar actions that were proposed by the House bill may be warranted in the future.

Report on auditable financial statements

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1005) that would require a report on auditable financial statements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Department of Defense (DOD) provides progress reports on each service and defense agency as part of its semi-annual report on the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan, required by section 1003(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (P.L. 111-84).

We also note that DOD posts its semi-annual reports on the FIAR plan electronically on a website for public review.

Report on implementing audit reporting requirements

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1006) that would require a report on implementing certain audit reporting requirements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Department of Defense (DOD) did not validate its statement of budgetary resources as ready for audit by September 30, 2014, as required by section 1005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112-239).

We expect that DOD will explain why this objective was not achieved, describe any factors which may have impeded achievement

of the objective, and detail a remedial plan through which DOD will address any such impediments and proceed to validate its statement of budgetary resources as ready for audit.

We expect that DOD will include this information in its next semi-annual report on the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan, required by section 1003(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (P.L. 111-84).

We also note that DOD posts its semi-annual reports on the FIAR plan electronically on a web site for public review.

Submittal of biannual reports on use of funds in the drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide account on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1013) that would amend section 1009(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) to add the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate as recipients of a biannual report on the use of funds in the drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide account.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

The Secretary of Defense may, upon request, provide a copy of this report to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

National Guard drug interdiction and counter-drug activities

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1014) that would amend section 112 of title 32, United States Code, adding the operations and activities provided by the National Guard Counter-drug Training Centers within the United States for federal, state, and local law enforcement to the items for which the Secretary of Defense may provide funds to the governor of a state who submits to the Secretary a state drug interdiction and counter-drug activities plan.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note the role of the National Guard Counter-drug mission in ensuring the security of the U.S. Homeland. As part of that mission, the National Guard Counter-drug Schools continue to play an important role in training and educating local, state, and federal law enforcement and other entities on counter-drug-related matters. We recognize the benefits of maintaining and supporting the National Guard counterdrug strategy.

Prohibition on use of funds for certain permitting activities under the Sunken Military Craft Act

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1027) that would prohibit the Executive Branch from spending any funds to issue a regulation for permitting activities set forth in section 1403 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Limitation on the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1031) that would provide an exception to the annual prohibition on the transfer or release of detainees held at U.S. Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (GTMO) to the United States if the Secretary of Defense submits a detailed plan to close the GTMO detention facility to the appropriate congressional committees and Congress fails to enact a joint resolution of disapproval under expedited procedures. The provision would authorize the Secretary, if a joint resolution of disapproval is not enacted, to transfer Guantanamo detainees to custody in the United States for detention, trial, and incarceration.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on facilitation of transfer overseas of certain individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1032) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on impediments to the transfer of Guantanamo detainees overseas and actions that have been taken, or are planned to be taken, to overcome such impediments and facilitate overseas transfers.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1033) that would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at the Guantanamo detention facility (GTMO) to a Department of Defense medical facility in the United States for the sole purpose of providing emergency or critical medical care if such treatment is not available at GTMO and is necessary to prevent death or imminent serious injury or harm to the detainee's health.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Prohibition on the use of funds for recreational facilities for individuals detained at Guantanamo

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1034) that would prohibit the use of Department of Defense funds to provide additional or upgraded recreational facilities for individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Prohibition on transfer or release to Yemen of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1034) that would prohibit using funds available to the Department of Defense to transfer, release, or otherwise assist in the transfer or release, of

any individual held at the Guantanamo detention facility to Yemen during the period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act and ending on December 31, 2015.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Reduction in Department of Defense civilian personnel and review of certain headquarters spending

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1041) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on Department of Defense (DOD) civilian positions, including the number of civilian positions created between September 11, 2001, and December 31, 2013, as a result of military to civilian conversions, the number of positions created as temporary positions that are being converted back to military positions, and the number of civilian positions that have been or are being eliminated.

The provision would also express the sense of Congress that the number of civilian positions should be reduced simultaneously with, and by the same percentages, as the corresponding reductions in military end strengths.

The provision would also require the Secretary to review spending on headquarters in commands below major command with the objective of reducing such spending by not less than 10 percent.

The provision would also require the updating of various DOD instructions and regulations to improve tracking and reporting headquarters personnel and resources.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We direct the Secretary of Defense not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) The total number of civilian positions created in the DOD between September 11, 2001, and December 31, 2013, as a result of conversions of support functions from performance by military personnel to performance by civilian personnel, set forth separately by the number of each of administrative, technical, and medical positions;

(2) The total number of civilian positions created as described in paragraph (1) that were created as temporary positions and are now being converted back to military positions; and

(3) The total number of civilian positions created as described in paragraph (1) that have been or are being eliminated.

Submittal of procedures and report relating to sensitive military operations

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1046) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise available for fiscal year 2015 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict until the congressional defense committees receive the procedures required by section 130f(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, and the report required by section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Limitation on use of Russian-flagged airlift aircraft to support the airlift movement requirements of the United States Transportation Command

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1047) that would allow the use of Russian-flagged airlift aircraft to support airlift movement requirements of U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) only after the Commander, U.S. Transportation Command certified to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, for each manifested cargo mission, that utilizing Russian-flagged airlift aircraft is the only means available to TRANSCOM to execute that particular manifested cargo delivery mission.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Prohibition on use of drones to kill United States citizens

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1052) that would prohibit any officer, employee, detailee, or contractor of the Department of Defense to use a drone to kill a U.S. citizen.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report and briefing to Congress on procurement and inspection of armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles to transport civilian employees of the Department of Defense

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1063) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report and detailed briefing on the Department of Defense's policies and procedures for procuring and inspecting armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles for transporting civilian employees of the Department.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 30, 2015, a report on the Department of Defense's policies and procedures for procuring and inspecting upon delivery armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles for transporting civilian employees.

The report shall include: (1) a description of the Department's current policies and procedures for procuring and inspecting upon delivery, armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles for transporting civilian employees in hostile or potentially hostile locations overseas; (2) recommendations for any changes to such policies and procedures that the Secretary determines would increase the safety of civilian employees in hostile or potentially hostile locations overseas, including a cost benefit analysis regarding the reasonableness of such recommendations; and (3) any other relevant matter the Under Secretary determines appropriate.

Report on long-term costs of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1066) that would require a report on long-term costs of operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Provision of annual voter assistance

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1071) that would amend chapter 80 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to develop an online system to provide annual voting assistance to Active-Duty servicemembers.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sale or donation of excess personal property for border security activities

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1072) that would amend section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, to include "border security" as one of the law enforcement activities for which Department of Defense (DOD) excess property may be transferred to federal and state agencies.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that, under section 2576a, DOD already has the authority to provide excess personal property to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) for border security since it is a law enforcement activity, and that DOD has already been providing such equipment to CBP.

Sense of Congress on the life and achievements of Dr. James R. Schlesinger

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1076) that would state the sense of Congress on the life and achievements of Dr. James R. Schlesinger.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that Dr. Schlesinger served the United States with distinction in a variety of senior government positions, including as Secretary of Defense, Director of Central Intelligence, Secretary of Energy, and Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. In recognition of Dr. Schlesinger's lifetime of distinguished service and achievement, the Senate passed Senate Resolution 472 on June 11, 2014.

Resubmission of 2014 quadrennial defense review

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1078) that would require the Secretary of Defense to resubmit the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress regarding counter-improvised explosive devices

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1079) that would express the sense of the Congress on the need to remain dedicated to retaining knowledge, technological expertise, as well as the lessons learned from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, regarding counter-improvised explosive device tactics, techniques, and procedures.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1525).

The agreement does not include the provision.

We note that the threat posed by improvised explosive devices remains significant and the Department needs to continue to advance efforts to defeat these devices, train

the force to counter them, and attack the facilitation networks that bring these devices into the various theaters where U.S. and friendly forces operate. We also expect the Department of Defense to work to consolidate the lessons learned by U.S. forces from more than a decade at war.

Enhancing presence and capabilities and readiness posture of United States military in Europe

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1080) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan recommending actions and resources to enhance the capabilities and capacities of U.S. Armed Forces in Europe to counter the conventional, unconventional and subversive activities of the Russian Federation in the U.S. European Command's area of responsibility and to respond under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision. We note that a provision requiring a security strategy for Europe is included under another title of the Act.

Determination and disclosure of transportation costs incurred by the Secretary of Defense for congressional trips outside the United States

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1081) that would require the Secretary of Defense to determine the cost of the transportation provided in the case of a trip taken by a member, officer, or employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives in carrying out official duties outside the United States for which the Department of Defense provides transportation and to provide a written statement of the cost not later than 10 days after completion of the trip to the member, officer, or employee involved and to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We support public disclosure of official travel by members, officers, and employees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. To this end, we note that section 1754(b) of title 22, United States Code, contains reporting and disclosure requirements for congressional travel outside the United States, including a requirement for reports to be open to public inspection and published in the Congressional Record. We recognize there are circumstances under which transportation provided by the Department of Defense best meets the needs of congressional delegations, ranging from protecting the safety and security of the delegations, expediency, and accessing destinations that have little or no commercial air service. We further note that the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives each maintain policies and processes to provide further oversight of travel requests by members and employees of the committees.

Improvement of financial literacy

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1082) that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a training program to increase and improve financial literacy training for incoming and outgoing military personnel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Transfer of administration of Ocean Research Advisory Panel from Department of the Navy to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1082) that would transfer the responsibility of the administration of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel from the Department of the Navy to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We recommend that the Department of Defense, in coordination with other appropriate organizations, examine the funding, management, functions, and administration of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel to ensure that this activity is being executed in the most effective and efficient manner.

Annual report on performance of regional offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1084) that would amend section 7734 of title 38, United States Code, to include in the annual report on the quality of services provided by the Veterans Benefits Administration, a report on the performance of any regional office that fails to meet its administrative goals.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress regarding the transfer of used military equipment to federal, state, and local agencies

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1085) that would express the sense of Congress regarding the transfer of used military equipment to federal, state, and local agencies.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Methods for validating certain service considered to be active service by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1086) that would specify methods for validating certain service of coastwise merchant seamen considered to be active service by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Cost of wars

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1087) that would require the Secretary of Defense to post on the public web site of the Department of Defense the costs of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Observance of Veterans Day

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1088) that would amend Chapter 1 of title 36, United States Code, to require the President to issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe 2 minutes of silence on Veterans Day in honor of the service and sacrifice of veterans throughout the history of the Nation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Findings; sense of Congress

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1089) that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should order that the names of the 74 military personnel lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans on June 3, 1969, be added to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We recommend that the names of the 74 military personnel lost aboard the USS Frank E. Evans on June 3, 1969, be added to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial if adequate funds are available to pay for adding the names and there is sufficient space available on the Memorial to accommodate the additional names.

Review of operation of certain ships during the Vietnam Era

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1090) that would require the Secretary of Defense to review, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the logs of each Navy ship known to have operated in the waters near Vietnam during the Vietnam Era to determine whether the ship operated in the territorial waters of the Republic of Vietnam during that period, and, for each ship that operated in these waters during that time, the date or dates that the ship so operated and the distance from the shore of the location where the ship operated. The Secretary of Defense would be required to provide this determination and information to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1062).

The agreement includes does not include these provisions.

We note that the Department of Veterans Affairs maintains a publicly available Internet list of ships which, during the Vietnam War, experienced possible exposure to Agent Orange based on military records, and which, as of January 2014, included 308 United States Navy and Coast Guard ships associated with military service and possible exposure to Agent Orange based on military records. We further note that the number of ships on this list is likely to increase as Department of Veterans Affairs continues to determine qualifying service in Vietnam for veterans who file a claim for compensation benefits.

Sense of Congress recognizing the 70th anniversary of the Allied amphibious landing on D-Day, June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1090A) that would express the sense of Congress that would recognize the 70th anniversary of the Allied amphibious landing on D-Day, June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France, during World War II and would request the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and programs to honor the sacrifices of their fellow countrymen to liberate Europe.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Transportation of supplies to members of the armed forces from nonprofit organizations

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1090B) that would amend chapter 20, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transport, on a space available basis and without charge, supplies that have

been furnished by a nonprofit organization and that are intended for distribution to members of the Armed Forces.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

The Secretary of Defense informed us that he has the authority to accept donations and gifts for the benefit of our Armed Forces, but that the Department of Defense has very limited resources to receive, screen, and transport donations and gifts.

Findings and purposes

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1701) that would discuss the findings of Congress leading up to the establishment of an advisory panel on Department of Defense audit readiness. In addition, this provision discusses the purposes of the panel: to actively monitor the Department of Defense's audit readiness and audit work and to report on problems that need to be resolved with the intention to shed light on the best, most efficient path forward to meet the 2017 and 2019 deadlines relating to auditability.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Comptroller General oversight of Department of Defense audit readiness

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1702) that would establish the advisory panel on Department of Defense audit readiness, describe the process for the selection of members to the panel, identify the period of appointment, and describe meeting requirements of the panel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Duties of the Advisory Panel

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1703) that would define the duties of the Advisory Panel. The Panel would identify, review, and evaluate the work of the Department of Defense regarding auditability. The Panel would submit to congressional defense committees semi-annual reports on the findings and recommendations of the Panel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Powers of the Advisory Panel

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1704) that would provide the authority for the advisory panel to hold hearings and receive information directly from the Department of Defense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Advisory Panel personnel matters

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1705) that would require members of the Advisory Panel to serve without compensation for such service. This section would also provide authority for travel expenses and staff to support the Advisory Panel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Termination of the Advisory Panel

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1706) that would terminate the Advisory Panel on April 30, 2019.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

One-year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on pay for federal civilian employees working overseas (sec. 1101)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1101) that would authorize the head of an executive agency to waive limitations on the aggregate of basic and premium pay payable through calendar year 2015 to an employee who performs work in an overseas location that is in the area of responsibility of the Commander, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), or a location that was formerly in CENTCOM but has been moved to an area of responsibility of the Commander, U.S. Africa Command, in support of a contingency operation or an operation in response to a declared emergency. The amount payable may not exceed the total annual compensation payable to the Vice President under section 104 of title 3, United States Code.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1103).

The agreement includes the House provision.

One-year extension of discretionary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to personnel on official duty in a combat zone (sec. 1102)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1102) that would authorize temporary discretionary authority to federal agencies to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities comparable to those provided to members of the foreign service to an agency's civilian employees on official duty in a combat zone. This authority would expire at the end of fiscal year 2016.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Revision to list of science and technology reinvention laboratories (sec. 1103)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1103) that would amend the list of Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories to include the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences and the Space and Missile Defense Command Technical Center.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Extension and modification of experimental program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1104)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1104) that would remove the sunset date and annual reporting requirement for section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261) which provides authority that is used by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and other agencies to hire world-class technical experts to serve as research and development program managers.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1104) that would make technical modifications to the same section.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Temporary authorities for certain positions at Department of Defense research and engineering facilities (sec. 1105)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1105) that would modify section 1107 of the

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to establish a pilot program providing direct hiring authority to the laboratory director of specified laboratories for certain students enrolled in scientific, technical, engineering, or mathematics (STEM) programs at institutions of higher education on a temporary or term basis.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that establishes a pilot program for direct hire authority for STEM students on a temporary or term basis, for up to three percent of the laboratory's scientific and engineering workforce.

Rate of overtime pay for Department of the Navy employees performing work aboard or dockside in support of the nuclear aircraft carrier forward deployed in Japan (sec. 1106)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1108) that would amend section 5542(a)(6)(B) of title 5, United States Code, to extend for 1 year the authority for a civilian employee of the Department of the Navy who is assigned to temporary duty to perform work aboard, or dockside in direct support of, the nuclear aircraft carrier that is forward deployed in Japan to receive overtime pay.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would limit the amount the Secretary of the Navy may pay under this section to \$250,000 in fiscal year 2015 until the Director of the Office of Personnel Management submits the report required in section 1105(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383).

Extension of part-time reemployment authority (sec. 1107)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1109) that would extend for 5 years the authority of federal agencies to reemploy retired federal civilian employees under limited conditions, without offset of annuity against salary, for certain specified purposes.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3890) contained a similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would extend through December 31, 2019 the authority of federal agencies to reemploy retired federal civilian employees under limited conditions, without offset of annuity against salary, for certain specified purposes.

Personnel authorities for civilian personnel for the United States Cyber Command and the cyber component headquarters of the military departments (sec. 1108)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1104) that would express the sense of the Senate that enhanced personnel authorities are needed for hiring, compensating, and promoting civilian personnel supporting U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM), perhaps modeled on the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) established in sections 1601 through 1607 of title 10, United States Code. The provision also would require the Principal Cyber Advisor, within 180 days of enactment, to provide recommendations to the Secretary of Defense to improve the support provided by CYBERCOM's executive agent, the Department of the Air Force, in the area of civilian personnel, both through administrative actions and legislation.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would extend the Principal Cyber Advisor's recommendations to the Secretary to include the civilian personnel of the cyber component headquarters of the military departments.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Judicial review of Merit Systems Protection Board decisions relating to whistleblowers

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1106) that would amend section 7703 of title 5, United States Code, to extend by 3 years a pilot provision of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act (Public Law 101-12) to allow whistleblowers to appeal cases from the Merit Systems Protection Board to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that this provision was enacted in the All Circuit Review Extension Act (Public Law 113-170).

Pay parity for Department of Defense employees employed at joint bases

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1107) that would require that when the constituent installations of a joint military installation are not located within the same pay locality, all Department of Defense employees of the joint military installation receive locality pay at a percentage equal to that which is payable to the constituent installation receiving the highest locality pay.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Modification and extension of Global Security Contingency Fund (sec. 1201)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1201) that would extend for 1 year the authority under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) for the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF). The provision would also modify the GSCF authority to allow funds to be used for small-scale construction as part of foreign capacity-building activities under the program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1205) that would extend the GSCF authority for 2 years and make a clarifying amendment.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would extend the GSCF authority for 2 years and make a clarifying amendment.

We expect that any small-scale military construction projects authorized under this section would be a supporting, logical component of a comprehensive GSCF program, and not a stand-alone project.

Notice to Congress on certain assistance under authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1202)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1202) that would amend section 1204(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to include the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives as recipients of information required by the provision.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Enhanced authority for provision of support to foreign military liaison officers of foreign countries while assigned to the Department of Defense (sec. 1203)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1203) that would amend section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide administrative and support services, to include certain training programs, for liaison officers of a foreign country, while such liaison officers are assigned temporarily to the headquarters of a combatant command, component command, or subordinate operational command of the United States. This section would further amend section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, to include a limitation on the authorized number of liaison officers and amount of unreimbursed support for travel, subsistence, and medical care expenses per fiscal year for any such liaison officer. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees an annual report on January 31 of each year from 2016–18 on the summary of expenses incurred by the United States for liaison officers of a developing country, and include the Department of Defense's definition of a "developing country" as used for the purposes of this authority.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1263).

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Prohibition on use of funds for assistance to units of foreign security forces that have committed a gross violation of human rights (sec. 1204)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1202) that would amend chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, to include a limitation on the use of funds for training, equipment, or other assistance for the members of a unit of a foreign security force if the Secretary of Defense has credible information that such unit has committed a gross violation of human rights.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical changes and incorporate the requirement to submit an annual report from section 1204 of H.R. 4435, "Annual Report on Human Rights Vetting and Verification Procedures of the Department of Defense" into the Senate provision.

Codification and enhancement of authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces (sec. 1205)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1205) that would codify in title 10, United States Code, the authority for the Secretary of Defense to conduct a program to train and equip certain foreign security forces to build their capacity to conduct counterterrorism operations and stability operations under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as amended (the "section 1206 authority"). The provision would also modify the limitations on the amount of funds that could be used under the section 1206 authority.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a number of technical and clarifying amendments.

We expect that any small-scale military construction projects authorized under this section would be a supporting, logical component of a comprehensive section 1206 program, and not a stand-alone project.

Training of security forces and associated security ministries of foreign countries to promote respect for the rule of law and human rights (sec. 1206)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1204) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct human rights training of security forces and associated ministries of foreign countries. The provision would require that the activities conducted pursuant to this section have the concurrence of the Secretary of State and the provision would define the activities considered to be human rights training.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide the Committees on Armed Services and Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate a briefing on the initial implementation activities associated with this new authority and other related matters deemed appropriate by the Secretary of Defense.

Cross servicing agreements for loan of personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment in coalition operations (sec. 1207)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1207) that would codify in title 10, United States Code, an authority for the Secretary of Defense to enter into arrangements under acquisition and cross servicing agreements (ACSA) to loan equipment for personnel protection and personnel survivability. The provision would authorize such loans to coalition forces for their use in coalition operations with the United States as part of a contingency operation or a peacekeeping operation under the United Nations Charter or another international agreement. The provision would also include a waiver of the requirement to reimburse the United States for the loss of such equipment in the event it is damaged or destroyed during combat operations for which the equipment was loaned.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would provide statutory authority through the end of fiscal year 2019 for the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to enter into arrangements to use ACSAs to loan personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment to coalition forces participating in such coalition operations with the United States. The agreement would also authorize the loaning of such equipment in connection with the training of coalition forces to be deployed to those operations.

We note that a similar authority to loan personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment under ACSAs to allies and other partners has made an important contribution to coalition operations in Afghanistan. The Department of Defense has interpreted this temporary authority narrowly, and we urge the Department to take a similar approach in the implementation of any program under this section.

Extension and modification of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism (sec. 1208)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1241) that would extend through 2017 the au-

thority for support of special operations to combat terrorism pursuant to section 1208 of the Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1208) that would extend the authority through fiscal year 2016, and increase the annual cap on the authority from \$50.0 million to \$60.0 million.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would extend the authority through fiscal year 2017 and increase the annual cap on the authority from \$50.0 million to \$75.0 million.

Authority to provide assistance to the vetted Syrian opposition (sec. 1209)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1209) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide equipment, supplies, training, and defense services to assist the vetted elements of the Syrian opposition for the purposes of: (1) Defending the Syrian people from the attacks of the Syrian regime; (2) Protecting the United States, our friends and allies, and the Syrian people from terrorist elements; and (3) Promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria. The provision would also establish requirements for an element of the Syrian opposition to be deemed vetted, permit the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to third countries for purposes of the provision of training and equipment, and provide the authority to accept contributions from other nations. The Secretary of State's concurrence would be required to conduct activities under this authority.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We note that the agreement includes language similar to the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113–164) to provide assistance to the appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition.

Additionally, we note that sustainment, at a minimum, includes the provision of logistics, intelligence, communications, and other enabling support necessary to maintain operations in support of the mission; supply of food, fuel, arms, munitions, and equipment; maintenance of equipment; and repair and renovation of facilities.

Provision of logistic support for the conveyance of certain defense articles to foreign forces training with the United States Armed Forces (sec. 1210)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 323) that would authorize a 2-year pilot program for the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$10.0 million in funds to provide logistic support for the transfer of excess defense articles to allied forces participating with U.S. armed forces in bilateral or multilateral training activities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$10.0 million in each of fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to provide logistic support for the transfer of excess defense articles in Afghanistan to the military forces of countries with which the U.S. Armed Forces plan to conduct bilateral or multilateral training overseas during those fiscal years.

Biennial report on programs carried out by the Department of Defense to provide training, equipment, or other assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces (sec. 1211)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1211) that would require a biennial report to Congress in fiscal years 2016, 2018, and 2020 on the Department of Defense programs to provide training, equipment, or other security assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with technical and clarifying amendments.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO
AFGHANISTAN, PAKISTAN, AND IRAQ

Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan (sec. 1221)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1211) that would extend for 1 year the authority under section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as amended, for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) in Afghanistan.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1221).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would limit the total funds available for the CERP program in fiscal year 2015 to \$10.0 million and make other technical and clarifying amendments.

Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1222)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1212) that would extend through fiscal year 2015 the authority under section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended, for the Secretary of Defense to reimburse coalition nations for support provided to the United States for military operations in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and make certain technical amendments.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1224) that would extend for 1 year the authority under section 1233 of Public Law 110–181, as amended. The Senate provision would limit overall funds available under this section in fiscal year 2015 to \$1.2 billion and of those funds, no more than \$900.0 million would be available for Pakistan. The provision would also extend certain notification and certification requirements relating to any payments under this section to Pakistan. In addition, the provision would limit the Secretary from waiving the certification requirements with regard to \$300.0 million of the \$900.0 million authorized for Pakistan unless the Secretary can make certain additional certifications regarding Pakistan's military operations in North Waziristan.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would expand the authority under section 1233 of Public Law 110–181 to allow the Secretary of Defense to reimburse coalition nations for support provided to U.S. military operations in Iraq or in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. The amendment to the Senate provision would also increase the amount of funding authorized under this section for Pakistan to \$1.0 billion. The amendment would clarify the additional certification requirements that the Secretary would need to make to invoke the waiver with regard to the full amount of funding authorized under this section for Pakistan.

One-year extension of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations (sec. 1223)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1213) that would extend certain authorities for the support of coalition forces participating with the United States in military operations in Afghanistan. The provision would extend current authorities to (1) provide coalition forces with logistical support under section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181); and (2) use acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend those forces certain military equipment for personnel protection.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1225) that would extend the authority under section 1234 of Public Law 110–181 to provide logistical support to coalition forces participating with the United States in military operations in Afghanistan.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would expand this authority to allow the provision of logistical support to such coalition forces in Afghanistan and Iraq.

United States plan for sustaining the Afghanistan National Security Forces through the end of fiscal year 2017 (sec. 1224)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1216) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing a detailed plan for the sustainment of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) through fiscal year 2018.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the report to contain a detailed plan for sustaining the ANSF through fiscal year 2017 and additional clarifying amendments.

Semiannual report on enhancing security and stability in Afghanistan (sec. 1225)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1227) that would require a semi-annual report to the appropriate committees of Congress on enhancing the strategic partnership between the United States and Afghanistan, including efforts to build and sustain the Afghan National Security Forces.

The House bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1214).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment clarifying the information to be included in the report and making other technical amendments.

We note that the House provision is addressed elsewhere in this report.

Sense of Congress on stability and sovereignty of Afghanistan (sec. 1226)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1217) that would express the sense of Congress regarding the continuing U.S. national security interest in Afghanistan after 2014 and support for Afghan National Security Forces.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Extension of Afghan Special Immigrant Program (sec. 1227)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1218) that would authorize a certain number of visas for principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant visa status in accordance with section 602(b)(3) of the Afghan

Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101). This section would also extend the period in which the principal alien must be employed by or on behalf of the U.S. Government in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to December 31, 2015. Additionally, this section would extend the period in which the principal alien must apply to the Chief of Mission in Afghanistan to September 30, 2015. The authorization in this section would terminate on September 30, 2016.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1230).

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Independent assessment of United States efforts against al-Qaeda (sec. 1228)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1219) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct an independent assessment related to U.S. efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

We expect the Department to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the process for developing the independent assessment report, including an estimate of the cost of preparing such an assessment.

Sense of Congress on security of Afghan women (sec. 1229)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1220) that would express the sense of Congress regarding the importance of the security and civic participation of women for the development and national security of Afghanistan and the need to increase the number of women in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF).

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3715) contained a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to support the meaningful inclusion of women in the political, economic, and security transition process in Afghanistan. The Senate provision would also require a report on the security of Afghan women and girls, including information on the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

We note that elsewhere in this Act, the Secretary of Defense is required to report to the appropriate committees of Congress on efforts by the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF.

Review process for use of United States funds for construction projects in Afghanistan that cannot be physically accessed by United States Government personnel (sec. 1230)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1220B) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2015 Department of Defense (DOD) funds for construction projects in Afghanistan in excess of \$500,000 that cannot be audited and physically inspected. The provision included authority to waive the prohibition if, prior to the obligation of funds for the project, a plan is submitted to the relevant congressional committees for the monitoring of the use of such funds to ensure they are used for their intended purpose and to mitigate waste, fraud and abuse.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1226).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2015 DOD funds for construction projects in Afghanistan in excess of \$1 million that cannot be authorized and physically inspected by U.S. Government personnel or their designated representatives. The provision would allow for this prohibition to be waived if the Secretary of Defense or the Commander of U.S. Forces in Afghanistan submits to the relevant congressional committee a report containing (1) a detailed plan for the monitoring of the funds for the project, and (2) certain specific determinations regarding the project's contribution to U.S. national security, its coordination with the Government of Afghanistan and other implementing partners, and its sustainability.

Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan (sec. 1231)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1222) that would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to transfer to the Afghan security forces defense articles being drawn down in Afghanistan, and to provide defense services in connection with such transfers, under section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239).

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

One-year extension of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan (sec. 1232)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1223) that would extend for 1 year the authority under section 1216 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383), as amended, for the Secretary of Defense to use funds to support the reintegration of former insurgent fighters into Afghan society. The provision would allow the use of up to \$15.0 million in fiscal year 2015 for reintegration purposes.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would allow the use of up to \$5.0 million in Department of Defense (DOD) funds for reintegration purposes. We note that the United States continues to support a political reconciliation process that is Afghan-owned and Afghan-led. We encourage the transition of reintegration efforts from the Department of Defense to the appropriate institutions of the Government of Afghanistan, and accordingly expect that there will not be a need for this DOD reintegration authority after fiscal year 2015.

Clearance of unexploded ordnance on former United States training ranges in Afghanistan (sec. 1233)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1229) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$125.0 million of Department of Defense (DOD) funds in each of fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to conduct surface clearance of unexploded ordnance at closed training ranges used by the U.S. Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would clarify

that the DOD is authorized to use up to a total of \$250.0 million in DOD funds through September 30, 2016, to conduct both surface and subsurface clearance of unexploded ordnance under this section.

Report on impact of end of major combat operations in Afghanistan on authority to use military force (sec. 1234)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1241) that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the impact, if any, of the end of major combat operations in Afghanistan on the authority to use military force against al Qaeda, the Taliban and associated forces under the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force or any other available legal authority.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Report on bilateral security cooperation with Pakistan (sec. 1235)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1228) that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a detailed report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the nature and extent of bilateral security cooperation between the United States and Pakistan.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical and clarifying amendment.

Authority to provide assistance to counter the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (sec. 1236)

Following passage of the House bill and the Senate committee-reported bill, the administration submitted to the congressional defense committees a legislative proposal that would authorize to be appropriated to the Iraq Train and Equip Fund up to \$1.6 billion to provide assistance to military and other security forces of or associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces, with a national mission, to counter the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

The agreement includes the proposal for the Iraq Train and Equip Fund with certain technical and clarifying amendments. Assistance under this section would be restricted to no more than 25 percent of the amounts authorized until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits a report on the plan for providing such assistance and re-training and re-equipping the Iraqi Security Forces, and the President submits a report on how such assistance fits within a broader regional strategy.

We note the significant contribution that Kurdish security forces have made to countering ISIL's advance. We understand that the administration's plan includes assistance to train and equip 3 brigades of Kurdish peshmerga. Accordingly, we expect that a significant portion of the assistance under this authority will be provided to meet the requirements of the Kurdish security forces and urge the Secretary of Defense to ensure that such assistance is delivered in a timely manner to such forces. We further expect the Secretary of Defense to keep the congressional defense committees fully informed as this plan is developed and implemented, including any arrangements to ensure that such assistance for Kurdish security forces is promptly delivered to those forces.

The provision is also amended to add local security forces with a national security mission to the list of forces authorized to receive assistance under this section. We believe that, for purposes of this section, local security forces should include local forces that are committed to protecting highly vulnerable ethnic and religious minority communities in the Nineveh Plain and elsewhere from the ISIL threat.

We note that among the lessons learned from the execution of previous large-scale train-and-equip funds in Iraq and Afghanistan has been the need for high-level oversight and requirements coordination, such as through the Afghanistan Requirements Oversight Council (AROC), to ensure that significant expenditures from the fund are aligned with validated requirements and subject to adequate oversight. We expect that the Department of Defense (DOD) will utilize a mechanism and procedures similar to the AROC in carrying out the program under the ITEF. Therefore, we direct the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the procedures and mechanism DOD will use to ensure that major expenditures from the fund are made only pursuant to an appropriately validated need and subject to adequate monitoring and evaluation.

Extension and modification of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1237)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1243) that would extend through fiscal year 2015 the authority under section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), as amended, for the use of Department of Defense funds to support the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC-I). The provision would also clarify the kinds of training activities that the OSC-I is authorized to conduct in support of the Iraqi Ministry of Defense and the Counterterrorism Service.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1231).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would authorize the use of up to \$140.0 million to support OSC-I operations and activities during fiscal year 2015.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Limitation on military cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation (sec. 1241)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1221) that would prohibit the use of Department of Defense (DOD) funds for fiscal year 2015 for bilateral military-to-military contact or cooperation between the Governments of the United States and the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Defense makes certain specified certifications to the appropriate congressional committees regarding Russia's actions in Ukraine, its compliance with its arms control obligations, and its foreign military sales or transfers.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1242(e)).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would prohibit the use of DOD funds for fiscal year 2015 for bilateral military-to-military cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies that Russia has ceased its occupation of Ukrainian territory and its aggressive activities that threaten Ukraine and

North Atlantic Treaty Organization members. The amendment authorizes the Secretary of Defense to waive the prohibition if the Secretary determines that doing so is in the U.S. national security interest and the Secretary provides prior notification to the appropriate committees of Congress, including certain specified information.

Notification and assessment of proposal to modify or introduce new aircraft or sensors for flight by the Russian Federation under Open Skies Treaty (sec. 1242)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1222) that would limit the use of funds to authorize or permit a certification by the United States of a proposal by the Russian Federation to change any sensor package on a Russian Open Skies aircraft, unless certain specified conditions are met.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would require the President, not later than 30 days after the Russian Federation provides notification to all States Parties to the Open Skies Treaty (Treaty) of its intention to seek certification to change, modify, or introduce a new aircraft or sensor under the Treaty, to notify the appropriate committees of Congress and provide the relevant details of the Russian proposal. The provision would also require, not later than 30 days prior to the date of intended approval of certification of such aircraft or sensor by the United States, the Director of National Intelligence, jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an assessment of the national security implications for the United States of any new aircraft or sensor proposed to be deployed by the Russian Federation under the Treaty. Further, the provision would require that any such assessment include a description of any plans by the United States to mitigate any negative effect of the proposed new Russian sensor or aircraft on the national security of the United States, including an analysis of the costs and effectiveness of any such plans.

In any case where an assessment of national security implications is prepared in response to this provision, we expect the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to take into account the views of the relevant regional and functional combatant commander on the security implications of a proposed Russian change in aircraft or sensor for Open Skies overflights in their assigned area of responsibility. We note that the Department of Defense committed to provide information concerning the views of relevant regional and functional combatant commanders relating to proposals under the Treaty to the committees in November 2014.

Limitations on providing certain missile defense information to the Russian Federation (sec. 1243)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1223) that would extend by 1 year the limitations in section 1246(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) on providing certain missile defense information to the Russian Federation. The provision would also place limitations on providing information to the Russian Federation concerning the velocity at burnout of United States missile defense interceptors or targets.

The Senate committee-reported bill included a similar provision (sec. 1266).

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Report on non-compliance by the Russian Federation with its obligations under the INF Treaty (sec. 1244)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1225) that would require the President to submit a report to Congress on the status of efforts to hold the Russian Federation accountable for its violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, and on the President's assessment as to whether it remains in the national security interests of the United States to remain a party to the INF Treaty and related treaties while the Russian Federation is in non-compliance with the INF Treaty.

The Senate committee-passed bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would require the President to submit, not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, a report to the appropriate congressional committees on Russian non-compliance with the INF Treaty, including elements set forth in section 1061 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66). It would also require the Department of State, jointly with the Department of Defense and other appropriate agencies, to brief the appropriate congressional committees at the time of submission of the report, and every 6 months thereafter until the Russian Federation returns to compliance with its obligations under the INF Treaty, on the status of efforts to resolve U.S. concerns about Russian INF noncompliance. Finally, in the event the President determines that Russia has deployed, or intends to deploy, systems that violate the INF Treaty, it would require the President to notify Congress promptly of such a determination, and any plans to respond to such deployments.

Annual report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation (sec. 1245)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1227) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a detailed report to the specified congressional committees annually through 2021 on the current and future military power of the Russian Federation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1243).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a detailed report to the appropriate congressional committees annually through 2018 on the security and military strategies, priorities, and capabilities of the Russian Federation.

We expect the Secretary of Defense to consult closely with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State throughout the preparation of the report required under this section, including to avoid duplicative reporting.

Prohibition on use of funds to enter into contracts or other agreements with Rosoboronexport (sec. 1246)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1229) that would prohibit the use of Department of Defense (DOD) funds to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, to make a grant to, or to provide a loan or loan guarantee to the Russian state corporation Rosoboronexport. The provision included a national security waiver of this prohibition if the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees certain detailed certifications.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1267).

The agreement includes the House provision with technical and clarifying amendments. The amendment would include a limited waiver of the prohibition with respect to contracting for spare parts or other activities related to the maintenance of helicopters operated by the Afghan National Security Forces or otherwise operated by DOD only if the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a detailed certification that the waiver is in the U.S. national security interest, based on certain determinations by the Commander of U.S. forces in Afghanistan and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

Report on the New START Treaty (sec. 1247)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1230A) that would limit the availability of fiscal year 2015 funds for implementation of the New START Treaty unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the Russian Federation has met a number of specified conditions.

The Senate committee-reported bill included no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report stating the reasons continued implementation of the New START Treaty is in the national security interests of the United States.

SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region (sec. 1251)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1231) that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and other heads of federal departments and agencies, to develop a strategy to prioritize U.S. interests in the U.S. Pacific Command area of responsibility, as well as an implementation plan to support the strategy.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would narrow the scope of the strategy to defense issues and remove the implementation plan requirement.

The Defense Intelligence Agency should conduct the appropriate defense intelligence assessments focused on the matters included in subsection (a)(2)(B) to inform the strategy.

Modifications to annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China (sec. 1252)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1232) that would amend subsection (b) of section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) to modify the annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Military-to-military engagement with the Government of Burma (sec. 1253)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1233) that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual report to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House on the goals and objectives guiding

military-to-military engagement between the United States and the Union of Burma, with a 5-year sunset.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1210) that would require a certification of certain steps by the Government of Burma to improve conditions before security assistance would be authorized under this Act. The provision also contained exceptions to that limitation for human rights and disaster relief training, as well as a report requirement on the strategy and plans for military-to-military engagement between the U.S. Armed Forces and the Burma military.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would remove the certification requirement, combine the reporting requirements from both provisions, and authorize the human rights and disaster relief training contained within the Senate provision with clarifying modifications. The agreement also provides that no Department of Defense assistance to the Government of Burma is authorized by this Act except as provided in this section. If a decision is made to engage in one of the authorized activities enumerated in subsection (a), we expect the Secretary of Defense to provide written notification to the Secretary of State.

We note that there remains significant progress to be made on: establishing civilian oversight of the Burma military, implementing human rights reform in the Burma military, and terminating military relations with North Korea. We also note that the Government of Burma must take significant steps toward establishing a transparent and inclusive process to amend the constitution of Burma, including the full participation of the political opposition and all ethnic minority groups in that process.

Report on Department of Defense munitions strategy of the United States Pacific Command (sec. 1254)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1234) that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a report on the munitions strategy of United States Pacific Command.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Missile defense cooperation in Northeast Asia (sec. 1255)

The House bill included a provision (sec. 1235) that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment to identify opportunities for increasing missile defense cooperation among the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, and to evaluate options for short-range missile, rocket, and artillery defense capabilities to address threats from the Korean Peninsula. The provision would also require the Secretary to brief Congress on the assessment.

The Senate committee-reported bill included no such provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

We note that missile defense cooperation with allies in Asia could be bilateral, trilateral, or multilateral.

Sense of Congress and report on Taiwan and its contribution to regional peace and stability (sec. 1256)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1236) that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Represent-

atives a report on the maritime capabilities of Taiwan. The provision also would express the sense of Congress that the United States should consider opportunities to help enhance the maritime capabilities of Taiwan.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would expand the report to the self-defense capabilities of Taiwan and express a sense of Congress that reaffirms U.S. security commitments under the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8). *Independent assessment of the ability of the Department of Defense to counter anti-access and area-denial strategies, capabilities, and other key technologies of potential adversaries (sec. 1257)*

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 221) that would require the Secretary of Defense to task the Defense Science Board or other independent group to examine the potential specific challenges to U.S. military technological superiority within the next 10 years, and the specific planned responses by the Department of Defense (DOD) to meet these challenges.

The House bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1237) that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with an independent entity to conduct an assessment of anti-access and area-denial (A2AD) strategies and capabilities that pose a threat to security in the Asia-Pacific region and strategies to mitigate such threats.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to task an independent entity to conduct an assessment of the ability of the DOD to counter A2AD strategies, capabilities, and other key technologies that could be implemented by potential adversaries.

In the annual report to Congress on "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2014," the Department of Defense notes that China continues to sustain investments in key anti-access and area denial capabilities to deter or counter third-party intervention in the region. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics has warned that America's "technological superiority is not assured," and that "the Department of Defense is being challenged in ways that I have not seen for decades, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region." We share this concern and believe that an independent assessment could help focus the Department's investments and strategic thinking on these challenges.

We remain concerned by questions regarding the relative U.S. advantages in technological capabilities, which could be undercut as advanced technologies continue to proliferate. The potential for greater technological parity among adversaries carries the risk of U.S. military forces operating without the traditional level of overmatch needed to succeed swiftly in a contingency, which raises further questions about the impact that the loss of technological superiority would have on the freedom of U.S. action in securing national security objectives. These questions merit examination in the assessment.

Elsewhere in this Act, we require the Secretary of Defense to report on the Department's munitions strategy for United States Pacific Command, based on a provision in the House bill (sec. 1234). However, we believe that some of the reporting elements contained in the House bill would be better suited to this independent assessment. These

include assessing other countries' munitions programs, capabilities, and technologies that could challenge U.S. deployed forces and military systems, and providing recommendations for how the United States can counter these challenges or restore, maintain, or expand U.S. military technological advantages in munitions.

We expect, as part of the information, data, resources, and analyses provided to the independent entity, the Department also provide a baseline description of the counter-A2AD policies, strategies, force posture, programs, capabilities, systems and technologies that are currently in place or funded.

Sense of Congress reaffirming security cooperation with Japan and the Republic of Korea (sec. 1258)

The House bill contained provisions (sec. 1238 and 1239) that would express the sense of Congress to reaffirm the U.S. security commitment to Japan and the Republic of Korea.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a merger of the two House provisions with clarifying amendments.

Report on maritime security strategy in the Asia-Pacific region (sec. 1259)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1245) that would require the President to submit to the congressional defense committees a report that outlines the strategy of the Department of Defense with regard to maritime security in the South China Sea and East China Sea. The provision would also require an annual briefing on the military to military engagement with the People's Republic of China.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We direct that, not later than March 15, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall provide the congressional defense committees a briefing (in classified form, if appropriate) on the following:

(1) An assessment of the military to military engagements between the United States and the People's Republic of China in the previous 12 months, before March 15, 2015, including an assessment of the success of such engagements in meeting the objectives of the Commander of the United States Pacific Command for such engagements; and

(2) A detailed description of all planned and potential military to military engagements between the United States and the People's Republic of China for the next 12 months, after March 15, 2015, including the objectives of such engagements.

Sense of Congress on Taiwan maritime capabilities and exercise participation (sec. 1259A)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1212) that would express the sense of the Senate that both Taiwan and the People's Republic of China should be afforded the opportunity to participate in the humanitarian assistance and disaster relief portions of future multilateral exercises.

The House bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1236).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would incorporate a section of the sense of Congress from the House provision.

Modification of matters for discussion in annual reports of United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission (sec. 1259B)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1244) that would revise and update the matters for discussion of the annual report of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

One-year extension of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1261)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1242) that would extend by 1 year the authority for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities pursuant to subsection (h) of section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1264).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Modification of national security planning guidance to deny safe havens to al-Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates (sec. 1262)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1244) that would modify section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) by requiring the President to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the required national security planning guidance, including any updates to such guidance, to deny safe havens to al Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates not later than October 1, 2014. Additionally, this section would add an element to the required guidance that would describe the feasibility, resourcing, authorities required, and potential benefit of conducting multilateral training and equipping of military forces in relevant countries.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Enhanced authority to acquire goods and services of Djibouti in support of Department of Defense activities in United States Africa Command area of responsibility (sec. 1263)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1245) that would provide the Secretary of Defense with an enhanced authority to acquire products and services produced in the Republic of Djibouti in support of Department of Defense (DOD) activities in the U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) area of responsibility. The Secretary would be required to make a determination that: (1) The product or service is to be used only in support of DOD activities in AFRICOM; (2) The limit on competition or preference for Djiboutian products or services is vital to the national security interest of the United States; (3) The Djiboutian product or service is of equivalent quality to that which would have been otherwise acquired; and (4) The limitation or preference will not adversely affect U.S. military or stability operations in AFRICOM or the U.S. industrial base. The authority

provided in this section would terminate on September 30, 2018.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 828) that would provide DOD missions in Africa with a limited procurement authority giving a preference to products and services produced in Africa.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Should the Secretary secure additional long-term agreements that provide for basing arrangements to support U.S. military operations, particularly counterterrorism operations, support to U.S. Department of State evacuation requirements, or force protection operational requirement of AFRICOM, we will consider a comparable acquisition preference.

Treatment of the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan under the Immigration and Nationality Act (sec. 1264)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1249) that would authorize the Secretary of State, after consulting with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consulting with the Secretary of State and Attorney General, to exclude the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP) and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) from the definition of a terrorist organization under section 212(a)(3)(B)(vi)(III) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(vi)(III)) for the purposes of issuing a temporary visa to a member of the KDP and PUK.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1261).

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical and clarifying amendment.

Prohibition on integration of missile defense systems of China into missile defense systems of United States and sense of Congress concerning integration of missile defense systems of Russia into missile defense systems of NATO (sec. 1265)

The House Bill included a provision (sec. 1250) that would limit the availability of fiscal year 2015 funds to integrate missile defense systems of China into missile defense systems of the United States. It would also limit the availability of funds to integrate missile defense systems of Russia into missile defense systems of the United States if such integration would undermine the security of the United States or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), unless the Secretary of Defense could certify that Russia had met certain specified conditions.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3704) contained a provision that would limit the availability of fiscal year 2015 funds to integrate missile defense systems of China into missile defense systems of the United States.

The agreement includes a provision that would limit the availability of fiscal year 2015 funds to integrate missile defense systems of China into missile defense systems of the United States, and would express the sense of Congress that missile defense systems of Russia should not be integrated into missile defense systems of NATO if such integration undermines the security of the United States or NATO, respectively.

Limitation on availability of funds to implement the Arms Trade Treaty (sec. 1266)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1253) that would limit the Department of Defense's ability to implement the Arms Trade

Treaty while also permitting the Department to assist foreign governments in bringing their laws and regulations to a level equal to that of the United States'.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the provision. A nearly identical provision was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

Notification and review of potentially significant arms control noncompliance (sec. 1267)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1262) that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the President if the Secretary has substantial reason to believe that there is a potentially significant case of foreign noncompliance with an arms control treaty to which the United States is a party. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit notice to certain Senate committees not later than 30 days after such notification to the President.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the President if, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense has substantial reason to believe that there is a case of foreign activity that would pose a significant threat to United States national security interests and that may be inconsistent with an arms control treaty to which the United States is a party, and such case is not included in the most recent annual arms control compliance report, or is significantly different from a case included in such report. If the President receives such a notification from the Secretary of Defense, the provision would require the President to promptly refer the matter to the Secretary of State to arrange for an inter-agency review of the case to assess whether it constitutes a significant case of arms control non-compliance. Not later than 60 days after the President makes such a referral, the provision would also require the Secretary of State to submit to the appropriate congressional committees the results of the inter-agency assessment.

Inter-European Air Forces Academy (sec. 1268)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1265) that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to operate the Inter-European Air Forces Academy (the "Academy") to provide military education and training to military personnel of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members and countries participating in the NATO Partnership for Peace program. The authority would extend through September 30, 2017.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment and an amendment that would provide authority to the Secretary of the Air Force to operate the Academy through September 30, 2019.

Department of Defense support to security of United States diplomatic facilities (sec. 1269)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1261) that would express a sense of Congress on the force structure and force posture of U.S. Africa Command within the context of so-called "New Normal" and its general mission requirements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would incorporate additional reporting requirements related to the Marine Security Guard Program and the security of high-threat, high-risk diplomatic facilities. Further, the agreement requires an assessment of the effectiveness of Department of Defense-provided Security Augmentation Units utilized during the previous year or those utilized as of the date of this Act to improve security at high-threat, high-risk facilities as well as an evaluation of any impediments to the effectiveness of such units. We expect this assessment will analyze the integration of such units into relevant policies, plans, and reviews, to include, but not be limited to, vulnerability assessments, waiver mitigation requirements, and emergency action plans.

Information on sanctioned persons and businesses through the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (sec. 1270)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1262) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, that would require a list of Department of Defense contractors that have conducted significant transactions with Iran.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would amend section 2313(c) of title 41, United States Code, to direct Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) of the Department of the Treasury to ensure that persons designated on OFAC certain lists are included in a database (known as the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System).

Reports on nuclear program of Iran (sec. 1271)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1263) that would require the President to submit a report to Congress, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the interim agreement related to the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear program, including a verification of whether Iran is complying with such agreement and an assessment of the overall state of Iran's nuclear program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Sense of Congress on defense modernization by NATO countries (sec. 1272)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1296) that would express the sense of Congress that the defense modernization program of Poland presents an important opportunity for strengthening the U.S.-Poland bilateral relationship.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would express the sense of Congress that the United States should work with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members as they seek to modernize their defense capabilities to encourage them to procure defense systems, including air and missile defense systems, that are interoperable with NATO defense systems and help fill critical NATO shortfalls.

We agree with the NATO Wales Summit Declaration, issued by heads of state on September 5, 2014, that it is important that the

NATO member states "reverse the trend in declining defence budgets, to make the most effective use of our funds and to further a more balanced sharing of costs and responsibilities."

We, therefore, support NATO member states like the Republic of Poland that are planning to invest significantly in the modernization of their defense capabilities, including Poland's decision to procure air and missile defense systems for the Polish Army by 2022. We understand Poland's overall investment plan will bring it above the 2 percent of gross domestic product pledge for NATO members' national defense spending, which was reaffirmed by NATO in Wales. We believe these are important investments that could contribute to key alliance security commitments.

We direct the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, on the benefits to the security of the Alliance that would result from the procurement of interoperable American air and missile defense technology by NATO members.

Report on protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict (sec. 1273)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1269) that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on efforts of the Department of Defense to protect cultural property abroad, including activities undertaken pursuant to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with technical and clarifying amendments.

United States strategy and plans for enhancing security and stability in Europe (sec. 1274)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1242) that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy for enhancing security and stability in Europe.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the force posture, readiness, and responsiveness of U.S. forces and the forces of other North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members in Europe, and the contingency plans for those U.S. forces, to ensure they are appropriate to meet the obligation of collective self-defense under the North Atlantic Treaty. The amendment would also require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress on a strategy and plans for enhancing security and stability in Europe. The report would include a plan for reassuring NATO members regarding the U.S. and NATO commitments to collective self-defense under the North Atlantic Treaty, and a plan on enhancing U.S. security cooperation with NATO partner nations.

We expect that at the time the report required under this section is submitted, the Department of Defense will brief the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the findings of the review, including those relating to U.S.

contingency plans. We also expect the Secretary of Defense, in developing the plan on enhancing U.S. security cooperation with NATO partner nations, to take into consideration a partner nation's commitment to upholding and enhancing regional security and stability.

Report on military assistance to Ukraine (sec. 1275)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1246) that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees semi-annually through January 31, 2017, on U.S. military assistance to Ukraine.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would express the sense of Congress regarding the provision of nonlethal and lethal U.S. military assistance to Ukraine to the extent such assistance is defensive and non-provocative. The agreement also includes a technical amendment to the reporting requirement in the Senate provision.

Sense of Congress on efforts to remove Joseph Kony from the battlefield and end the atrocities of the Lord's Resistance Army (sec. 1276)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3577) contained a provision that would express the sense of Congress regarding current efforts to remove Joseph Kony and his top commanders and to express the continued support of Operation Observant Compass.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Extension of annual reports on the military power of Iran (sec. 1277)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3740) contained a provision that would amend section 1245(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) by extending the requirement to submit a report on the military power of Iran from December 31, 2014, to December 31, 2016.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Report and strategy regarding North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel (sec. 1278)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1251) that would make a series of findings, express the sense of Congress, require a determination, and require the submission of a report regarding the individuals responsible for the attack against United States personnel in Benghazi, Libya and a counterterrorism strategy related to North Africa.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on Department of Defense efforts to hold the individuals responsible for the attack against U.S. personnel in Benghazi, Libya accountable and require the President to submit a report on various security-related matters in North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel.

Rule of construction (sec. 1279)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1254) stating that nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against Syria or Iran.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would retain the reference to Iran and delete the reference to Syria.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION(S) NOT ADOPTED

Annual report on human rights vetting and verification procedures of the Department of Defense

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1204) that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to Congress an annual report on human rights vetting and verification procedures of the Department of Defense. This report shall be submitted at the same time the budget of the President is submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that this annual reporting requirement was incorporated to a provision codifying the so-called "Leahy human rights vetting" requirement into title 10 United States Code.

Use of acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend certain military equipment to certain foreign forces for personnel protection and survivability

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1206) that would provide a 1-year extension of the authority under section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), as amended, for the Secretary of Defense to use the established procedures under acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend certain equipment for personnel protection to coalition partner forces in Afghanistan.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on progress toward security and stability in Afghanistan under Operation Resolute Support

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1214) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees providing detailed information on the progress toward security and stability in Afghanistan under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization mission known as Operation Resolute Support.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1227).

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Senate committee-reported provision, with certain clarifying amendments, is included in another section of this title, and contains a number of the reporting requirements under the House provision.

Requirement to withhold Department of Defense assistance to Afghanistan in amount equivalent to 150 percent of all taxes assessed by Afghanistan to extent such taxes are not reimbursed by Afghanistan

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1215) that would require the withholding of Department of Defense (DOD) fiscal year 2015 funds appropriated for assistance to the Government of Afghanistan in an amount equivalent to 150 percent of the aggregate taxes assessed by Afghanistan on DOD-provided assistance during fiscal year 2014.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Limitation on funds to establish permanent military installations or bases in Afghanistan

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1220A) that would prohibit establishing military installations or bases for the purpose of permanently stationing United States Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Actions to support human rights, participation, prevention of violence, existing frameworks, and security and mobility with respect to women and girls in Afghanistan

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1220C) that would express the sense of Congress in support of the meaningful inclusion of women in conflict prevention, management, and resolution, and of the security of Afghan women and girls during the security transition in Afghanistan.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that another provision elsewhere in this Act expresses the sense of Congress regarding the importance of Afghan women's security and civic participation for Afghanistan's development and national security.

Sense of Congress relating to Dr. Shakil Afridi

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1220D) that would express the sense of Congress regarding Pakistani physician Dr. Shakil Afridi and calling on the Government of Pakistan to release him immediately from prison.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note the contributions of Dr. Afridi to efforts to locate Osama bin Laden. We are concerned about Dr. Afridi's continuing incarceration and urge the Government of Pakistan to release him immediately.

Limitation on availability of funds to transfer missile defense information to the Russian Federation

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1224) that would limit the availability of funds to transfer missile defense information to the Russian Federation unless the President submits certain reports on U.S.-Russian discussions on missile defense matters.

The Senate committee-reported bill included no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Missile Defense Agency and the Department of Defense have, respectively, briefed the committees on the substance of previous discussions with the Russian Federation on U.S. missile defense capabilities, when those discussions were still taking place, and those briefings included materials that were shared with the Russian Federation. The Department of State has provided similar briefings to the committees, and has assured the committees no similar materials were shared with the Russian Federation, and, thus, were not at issue to be made available to the committees as a part of our oversight responsibilities.

Sense of Congress regarding Russian aggression toward Ukraine

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1226) that would express the sense of Congress regarding Russian aggression towards Ukraine.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Plan to reduce Russian Federation nuclear force dependencies on Ukraine

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1228) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a plan for working with the Government of Ukraine to reduce Russia's dependence on Ukraine for support of Russia's SS-18 intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

The Senate committee-reported bill included no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the House provision.

We note that, since the House bill provision was written, press reports indicate that Russia is no longer depending on Ukraine to support the SS-18 ICBM, which was originally designed and built by the Yuzhnoye Design Bureau that is in Ukraine.

Requirements relating to certain defense transfers to the Russian Federation

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1230) that would establish a U.S. policy of opposing transfers of defense articles or defense services from any North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member country to Russia while Russia occupies the territory of Ukraine or a NATO member country.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress on future of NATO and enlargement initiatives

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1240) that would express the sense of Congress on initiatives for the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the success of NATO's Open-Door Policy.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that at the NATO Summit in Wales in September 2014, Alliance members reaffirmed their commitment to the Open-Door Policy, declaring "NATO's door will remain open to all European democracies which share the values of our Alliance, which are willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, which are in a position to further the principles of the Treaty, and whose inclusion will contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area. We reaffirm our strong commitment to the Euro-Atlantic integration of the partners that aspire to join the Alliance, judging each on its own merits."

We also note that provisions relating to U.S. and NATO efforts to reassure NATO member countries, particularly in Eastern Europe, are included in another section of this title.

Sale of F-16 aircraft to Taiwan

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1240A) that would require the sale of no fewer than 66 F-16 C/D aircraft to Taiwan.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Strategic framework for United States security force assistance and cooperation in the European and Eurasian regions

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1246) that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of

State, to develop a strategic framework for U.S. security force assistance and cooperation in Europe and Eurasia and submit a detailed report on that strategic framework to the appropriate congressional committees.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that elsewhere in this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, is required to submit to the appropriate committees a strategy and plans for enhancing security and stability in Europe.

Requirement of Department of Defense to continue implementation of United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally and participation in interagency working group

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1247) that would express the sense of Congress that combating violence against women and girls worldwide is critical to promoting regional and global stability and achieving sustainable peace and security. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on efforts by the Department of Defense (DOD) relating to its participation in the interagency working group to implement the U.S. Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally, and to continue implementing the strategy as appropriate.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We encourage the DOD to support the continued implementation of the U.S. Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally and to participate in the interagency working group. Gender-based violence impacts security and stability worldwide and as such, the United States must continue to lead the global effort to actively address it. We direct the Secretary of Defense or his designee(s) to brief the appropriate congressional committees on efforts by the DOD relating to its participation in the working group not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Department of Defense situational awareness of economic and financial activity

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1248) that would set forth a number of findings and require the Secretary of Defense to take such steps as necessary to improve the situational awareness capabilities of the Department of Defense (DOD) regarding legal and licit business transactions of adversaries and potential adversaries, and to improve the ability of DOD to translate such capabilities into certain activities of DOD.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We recognize that foreign and non-state adversaries, as well as potential adversaries may use legal activities within global economic and financial systems as strategic tools to meet their objectives. We note that several organizations within the U.S. government maintain situational awareness of such activities, to include the Department of Treasury, the Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and DOD. We encourage the Secretary of Defense to leverage interagency

efforts to improve the DOD's own awareness of such activities, and to incorporate relevant findings into the DOD's activities and policies.

War Powers of Congress

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1252) that would express the sense of Congress relating to the importance of observance of the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93-148) and state that nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any use of military force.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Combating crime through intelligence capabilities

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1255) that would authorize the supply of intelligence resources to the Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF-S) in coordination with U.S. Southern Command to combat crime.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the United States Southern Command's JIATF-S and its associated personnel and platforms continues to accomplish a great deal with its limited resources in their mission of countering illicit drug trafficking and disruption of transnational criminal organizations.

Statement of policy [on counternarcotics]

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1256) that would make a statement of U.S. policy with respect to the Western Hemisphere.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Declaration of policy regarding Israel's lawful exercise of self-defense

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1257) that would declare Congress' support for Israel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Statement of policy and report on the inherent right of Israel to self-defense

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1258) that would establish United States policy with respect to Israel and require the President to submit a report to Congress on a variety of matters relating to Israel.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress on United States presence and cooperation in the Arabian Gulf region to deter Iran

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1264) that would express the sense of Congress on the U.S. forward presence and cooperation in the region of the Arabian Gulf in order to deter the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We believe that the United States should maintain a robust forward presence and posture in order to support United States allies and partners in the Arabian Gulf region and

to support our national security interests therein. There are key strategic United States facilities in the Arabian Gulf region that are used to deter regional aggressors and to enable ongoing military operations in the region, including ongoing operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria. These facilities should be sustained given their strategic and operational importance. Additionally, the United States should seek ways to support and enable the security posture of GCC countries in the Arabian Gulf region.

Report on Accountability for Crimes Against Humanity in Nigeria

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1266) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress regarding the naval capabilities of the Russian Federation

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1267) that would express the sense of Congress regarding the sale of two French Mistral class warships to Russia.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on collective and national security implications of Central Asian and South Caucasus energy development

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1268) that would require that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the implications of new energy resource development and distribution networks in areas around the Caspian Sea for energy security strategies of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committee not later than June 30, 2015, on an energy security strategy in the U.S. European Command (EUCOM) area of responsibility (AOR), including how energy security concerns are incorporated into EUCOM's operations and plans. The report should include a description of (1) the energy vulnerabilities of U.S. forces and NATO member forces within the EUCOM AOR; (2) efforts to promote the ability of U.S. forces and NATO member forces to operate throughout the EUCOM AOR with secure energy supply and distribution networks; (3) EUCOM's relationship and interaction with the NATO Energy Security Center of Excellence; (4) the impact of recent disputes between the Russia Federation and intermediate transit states on the energy security of U.S. forces and NATO member forces in the EUCOM AOR; (5) the impact on military readiness of U.S. forces and NATO member forces if energy supplies or distribution networks are disrupted; and (6) NATO and U.S. plans to mitigate the risks of potential energy vulnerabilities. The report may be submitted in unclassified form but with a classified annex. We encourage the Secretary of Defense to consult with other appropriate U.S. government agencies in the preparation of the report.

Sense of Congress on Nigeria and Boko Haram

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1270) that would express the sense of Congress about the security situation in Nigeria and the threat posed by Boko Haram.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Recognition of victims of Soviet Communist and Nazi regimes

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1271) that would support the designation of "Black Ribbon Day" to recognize the victims of the Soviet Communism and Nazi regimes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report relating to rescue efforts in Nigerian kidnapping

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1272) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report relating to efforts to rescue the so-called Chibok Girls in Nigeria.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION
SUBTITLE A—FUNDS*Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds (sec. 1301)*

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1301) that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs, define the funds as authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act, and authorize CTR funds to be available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

The House bill contained no similar provision (sec. 1301).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Funding Allocations (sec. 1302)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1302) that would authorize \$365,088,000, the amount of the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. This provision would authorize specific amounts for each CTR program element, requires notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2015 funds for a purpose other than a purpose listed in the provision, and would require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2015 funds in excess of the specific amount authorized for each CTR program element.

The House reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1302) funding the program at \$365,108,000.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment to the funding of the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program increasing the amount to \$256,762,000 from \$256,742,000.

SUBTITLE B—CONSOLIDATION AND MODERNIZATION OF STATUTES RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM

Short Title (sec. 1311)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1311) that would state the title of a consolidation and modernization of statutes related to the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat reduction Program.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Definitions (sec. 1312)

The agreement includes a section which provides definitions applicable to the provisions in subtitle B of title XIII of this Act.

PART I—PROGRAM AUTHORITIES

Authority to carry out Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (sec. 1321)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1321) that would authorize the activities of the Cooperative Threat Reduction program. Activities in subsection (a) would require concurrence of the Secretary of State or other appropriate agency head under section 1322 or 1323.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with technical and conforming amendments, as well as a provision granting an exception for notification of obligations which have already been reported in prior notifications to the congressional defense committees.

Use of funds for certain emergent threats or opportunities (sec. 1322)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1322) that would permit the obligation and expenditure of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds that will permit the United States to resolve critical emerging proliferation threats or take advantage of opportunities to achieve longstanding non-proliferation goals with a requirement that such activities will be completed in a short period of time with congressional notification occurring within 10 days of such obligation.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require congressional notification at the time the Secretary of Defense obligates the funding and that such activities will be completed in 5 years.

Authority for urgent threat reduction activities under Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (sec. 1323)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1323) that would authorize the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to obligate and expend not more than 15 percent of available funds in governed areas if the Secretary of Defense determines that the proliferation threat must be addressed urgently in such areas, certain provisions of law impede the ability to address the urgent proliferation threat, and it is necessary to obligate or expend funds to address the proliferation threat. The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, must notify Congress within 15 days of when such funds are first obligated. The provision also authorizes the obligation and expenditure of funds for urgent proliferation threats in an ungoverned area or an area that is not governed by an effective governmental authority. Such determination shall be made by the President with congressional notification within 15 days of when the funds are first obligated.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require notification for proliferation threats in governed and ungoverned areas at the time the

funding is first obligated. The agreement also includes technical and clarifying amendments to the provision.

Use of funds for unspecified purposes or for increased amounts (sec. 1324)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1324) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to obligate or expend Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for purposes other than specified or in excess of the specified amounts, if the Secretary determines that such obligation or expenditure is necessary to protect or support the interests of the United States and submits to the congressional defense committees a notification justifying such obligation or expenditure and a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date of such notification.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

Use of contributions to Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (sec. 1325)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1325) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements to receive contributions for activities under the Cooperative Threat Reduction program with a notice to congressional defense committees within 30 days after receiving such contribution, with a 15-day notice and wait before expending such funds.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

We note that implementation plans consistent with subparagraph (f) that were submitted under the prior provisions of law are henceforth superseded with the enactment of this section. We direct the Secretary to submit a revised plan consistent with subsection (f) as found in this section.

PART II—RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Prohibition on use of funds for specified purposes (sec. 1331)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1331) that would prohibit the use of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for peacekeeping-related activities, housing, environmental restoration, job retraining, and defense conversion. The provision further prohibits funding for eliminating conventional weapons unless they can be reasonably used or adapted for use to deliver chemical, nuclear or biological weapons.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

Requirement for on-site managers (sec. 1332)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1332) that would require, before obligating any Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for a project in the former Soviet Union or a project that involves dismantlement, destruction, storage or construction of a facility or for which the total program funding exceeds \$50,000,000, that there shall be appointed an on-site manager from employees of the Federal Government.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

Limitation on use of funds until certain permits obtained (sec. 1333)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1333) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to seek to obtain all permits required for construction of a project in states of the former Soviet Union before obligating significant amounts of program funding for that phase of the project.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require seeking all permits before obligating 40 percent of the total costs of that phase of the project. The agreement also includes an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

Limitation on availability of funds for Cooperative Threat Reduction activities with Russian Federation (sec. 1334)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1303) that would limit Cooperative Threat Reduction funding in fiscal year 2015 to the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that Russia is respecting the sovereignty of Ukrainian territory, no longer acting inconsistently with the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and in compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. The provisions would also include a waiver for the Secretary of Defense, pending a notification, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the appropriate congressional committees that such contact or cooperation is in the national security interest of the United States and a period of 30 days has elapsed following the notification.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would prohibit funding for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs in Russia beyond fiscal year 2015 without specific authorization from Congress.

We support threat reduction programs and understand the importance of the Cooper-

ative Threat Reduction (CTR) program, but we also believe that the traditional manner in which the program's activities have been carried out in the Russian Federation is no longer necessary and no longer sustainable. While there still may be areas of technical cooperation that are of mutual benefit, such as the successful cooperative effort to rid Syria of chemical weapons and materials, this work in the future should be focused on specific threats, and not just a continuation of effort. Moreover, the CTR program may not be the most appropriate mechanism under which future cooperative work in Russia is conducted. The United States relationship with Russia has changed fundamentally and the CTR work in the Russian Federation is concluding. We believe that securing and destroying nuclear weapons and nuclear material is now a Russian responsibility and one that the United States should no longer fund without Russian cooperation. Any work proposed by the Department under CTR in the future with the Russian Federation will be carefully reviewed and subject to specific authorization.

PART III—RECURRING CERTIFICATIONS AND REPORTS

Annual certifications on use of facilities being constructed for Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction projects or activities (sec. 1341)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1341) that would require annual certification to the congressional defense committees for each facility of a project or activity under the program for which construction occurred during the preceding fiscal year, whether the facility will be used for its intended purpose by the state of the former Soviet Union where it is constructed, whether the government of such state remains committed to the use of such facility for its intended purpose, and whether the actions needed to ensure security at the facility have been taken.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would replace "state of the former Soviet Union" with "foreign country." The agreement also includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

Requirement to submit summary of amounts requested by project category (sec. 1342)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1342) that would re-

quire, in the annual report and budget submission for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, a descriptive summary of the amounts requested for each project category for the current and following fiscal year and a descriptive summary for each project category of the amounts obligated and expended in the prior fiscal year and the current fiscal year.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

Reports on activities and assistance under Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (sec. 1343)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1343) that would require an annual report on activities carried out under the Cooperative Threat Reduction program to be submitted not later than the first Monday in February.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

Metrics for Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (sec. 1344)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1344) that would require the Department of Defense to implement metrics to measure the effectiveness of Cooperative Threat Reduction program activities.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

PART IV—REPEALS AND TRANSITION PROVISIONS

Repeals (sec. 1351)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1351) that would repeal certain provisions of law related to Cooperative Threat Reduction.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision as well as two tables showing the source law and disposition of law repealed in this section.

TABLE NO. 1—SOURCE LAW

Section #	Source section	Heading
1311	[None]	Short title [of new CTR Act].
1312	[Various]	Definitions.
1321	(a) Sec. 1501 of P.L. 104–201, NDAA FY 1997 (50 U.S.C. 2362 note) (b) [New] (c) Sec. 1308(b) of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5963(b)) (d) Sec. 212(b) [2d sent.] of P.L. 102–228, Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2551 note) (e) Sec. 221(c) of P.L. 102–228, Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2551 note) (f) Sec. 1306(a) of P.L. 111–84, NDAA FY 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note) (g) Sec. 1205 of P.L. 104–106, NDAA FY 1996 (22 U.S.C. 5955 note).	Authority to Carry out Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.
1322	Sec. 1308 of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5963)	Funds for Certain Emergent Threats or Opportunities.
1323	Sec. 1305 of P.L. 111–84, NDAA FY 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5965)	Authority for Urgent Threat Reduction Activities Under Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.
1324	Recurring annual NDAA provisions [sec. 1302(b) & (c)]	Use of Funds for Unspecified Purposes or For Increased Amounts.
1325	Sec. 1303 of P.L. 111–84, NDAA FY 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Use of contributions to Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.
1331	(a) Sec. 1303(a) & (b) of P.L. 106–65, NDAA FY 2000; (b) Sec. 1303 of P.L. 106–398, NDAA FY 2001 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note).	Prohibition on Use of Funds for Specified Purposes.
1332	Sec. 1305 of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5961)	Requirement for On-Site Managers.
1333	Sec. 1303 of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5960)	Limitation on Use of Funds Until Certain Permits Obtained.
1334	[none]	Limitation on availability of funds for Cooperative Threat Reduction activities with Russian Federation.
1341	Sec. 1307 of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5962)	Annual Certifications on use of Facilities Being Constructed for Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Projects or Activities.
1342	Sec. 1307 of P.L. 105–261, NDAA FY 1999 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Requirement to Submit Summary of Amounts Requested by Project Category.
1343	Sec. 1308 of P.L. 106–398, NDAA FY 2001 (22 U.S.C. 5959)	Reports on Activities and Assistance under Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.
1344	Sec. 1304 of P.L. 111–84, NDAA FY 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5964)	Metrics for Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

TABLE NO. 2—DISPOSITION OF LAW REPEALED

DISPOSITION OF PROVISIONS OF LAW REPEALED BY SECTION 1351		
Section	Heading	Disposition
Sec. 212 of P.L. 102–228, Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2551 note)	Authority for program to facilitate Soviet weapons destruction	(a) Obsolete (“President” replaced by “Secretary of Defense” in later law). (b) [1st sent.] Rendered obsolete by later law (see sec. 1501 of P.L. 104–201). (b) [2nd sent.] Reenacted in sec. 1321(d).
Sec. 221 of P.L. 102–228, Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2551 note)	Administration of nuclear threat reduction programs	(a) Expired. (b) Specific identification of SecDef as executive agent is no longer required due to later law. (c) Reenacted in sec. 1321(e). (d) Obsolete. (e) Expired.
Sec. 222 of P.L. 102–228, Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2551 note)	Repayment arrangements	Obsolete.
Sec. 231 of P.L. 102–228, Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2551 note)	Prior notice of obligations to Congress	Superseded by sec. 1205 of P.L. 104–106.
Sec. 1412 of the Former Soviet Union Demilitarization Act (P.L. 102–484; 22 U.S.C. 5902).	Authority for programs to facilitate demilitarization	(a) Obsolete. (b) Rendered obsolete by later law (see sec. 1501 of P.L. 104–201). (c) Precatory; not recommended for re-enactment. (d) Superseded by sec. 1203(d) of P.L. 103–160, which was repealed by P.L. 110–181 sec. 1304(a)(2).
Sec. 1431 of the Former Soviet Union Demilitarization Act (P.L. 102–484; 22 U.S.C. 5921).	Prior notice to Congress of obligation of funds	(a) Superseded by sec. 1205 of P.L. 104–106. (b) Obsolete.
Sec. 1203 of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (P.L. 103–160; 22 U.S.C. 5952). ..	Authority for programs to facilitate cooperative threat reduction	(a) Obsolete (“President” replaced by “Secretary of Defense” in later law). (b) Rendered obsolete by later law (see sec. 1501 of P.L. 104–201). (c) Precatory; not recommended for re-enactment.
Sec. 1204 of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (P.L. 103–160; 22 U.S.C. 5953). ..	Demilitarization Enterprise Fund	Obsolete.
Sec. 1206 of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (P.L. 103–160; 22 U.S.C. 5955). ..	Prior notice to Congress of obligation of funds	(a) Superseded by sec. 1205 of P.L. 104–106. (b) Expired.
Sec. 1208 of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (P.L. 103–160; 22 U.S.C. 5957). ..	Appropriate congressional committees defined	Obsolete (used committee lists found in later law).
Sec. 1205 of P.L. 104–106, NDAA FY 1996 (22 U.S.C. 5955 note)	Prior notice to Congress of obligation of funds	Reenacted in part in sec. 1321(g).
Sec. 1501 of P.L. 104–201, NDAA FY 1997 (50 U.S.C. 2362 note)	Specification of cooperative threat reduction programs	Reenacted in sec. 1321.
Sec. 1307 of P.L. 105–261, NDAA FY 1999 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Requirement to submit summary of amounts requested by project category	Reenacted in sec. 1342.
Sec. 1303 of P.L. 106–65, NDAA FY 2000 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Prohibition on use of funds for specified purposes	Reenacted in sec. 1331.
Sec. 1303 of P.L. 106–398, NDAA FY 2001 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Prohibition on use of funds for elimination of conventional weapons	Reenacted in sec. 1331.
Sec. 1304 of P.L. 106–398, NDAA FY 2001	Limitation on use of funds for fissile material storage facility	Obsolete.
Sec. 1306 of P.L. 106–398, NDAA FY 2001	Agreement on nuclear weapons storage sites	Obsolete.
Sec. 1308 of P.L. 106–398, NDAA FY 2001 (22 U.S.C. 5959)	Reports on activities and assistance under cooperative threat reduction programs	Reenacted in sec. 1343.
Sec. 1304 of P.L. 107–107, NDAA FY 2002 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Requirement to consider use of revenue generated by activities carried out under cooperative threat reduction programs	Precatory; not recommended for re-enactment.
Sec. 1305 of P.L. 107–314, NDAA FY 2003 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Prohibition against use of funds for second wing of fissile material storage facility	Obsolete.
Sec. 1306 of P.L. 107–314, NDAA FY 2003 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Limited Waiver of Restrictions on Use of Funds for Threat Reduction in States of the Former Soviet Union	Obsolete.
Sec. 1303 of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5960)	Limitation on use of funds until certain permits obtained	Reenacted in sec. 1333.
Sec. 1305 of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5961)	Requirement for on-site managers	Reenacted in sec. 1332.
Sec. 1307 of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5962)	Annual certifications on use of facilities being constructed for cooperative threat reduction projects or activities	Reenacted in sec. 1341.
Sec. 1308 of P.L. 108–136, NDAA FY 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5963)	Authority to use cooperative threat reduction funds outside the former Soviet Union	(a) Reenacted with clarifications in sec. 1322. (b) Reenacted in sec. 1321(c). (c) Reenacted in sec. 1322(b). (d) Obsolete.
Sec. 1303 of P.L. 111–84, NDAA FY 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Utilization of contributions to the cooperative threat reduction program	(c)–(f) Reenacted in sec. 1325.
Sec. 1304 of P.L. 111–84, NDAA FY 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5964)	Metrics for the cooperative threat reduction program	(a) Reenacted in sec. 1344. (b), (c), (d) Expired. (e) Reenacted in sec. 1312.
Sec. 1305 of P.L. 111–84, NDAA FY 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5965)	Cooperative threat reduction program authority for urgent threat reduction activities	(a), (b) Reenacted in sec. 1323. (c) Reenacted in sec. 1312.
Sec. 1306 of P.L. 111–84, NDAA FY 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5952 note)	Cooperative threat reduction defense and military contacts program	Reenacted in sec. 1321(a)(6) & (f).

Transition provisions (sec. 1352)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1352) that would transition any determinations based on prior Cooperative Threat Reduction authorities to the provisions herein upon date of enactment while ensuring authorized funding remains available for obligation.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make technical and clarifying changes to the provision.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

Working capital funds (sec. 1401)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1401) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Armed Forces and agencies of the Department of Defense for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 1401).

The agreement includes this provision.

Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1402)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1402) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense for chemical agents and munitions destruction, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1402).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1403)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1403) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 1403).

The agreement includes this provision.

Defense Inspector General (sec. 1404)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1404) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense for the Office of the Inspector General, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 1404).

The agreement includes this provision.

Defense Health Program (sec. 1405)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1405) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 1405).

The agreement includes this provision.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Authority for transfer of funds to joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, Illinois (sec. 1411)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1421) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer \$146.9 million from the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs

Medical Facility Demonstration Fund to be used for operations of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, Illinois.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1421).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1412)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1422) that would authorize \$63.4 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 1423).

The agreement includes this provision.

Comptroller General of the United States report on Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, North Chicago, Illinois (sec. 1413)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1422) that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, North Chicago, Illinois, demonstration project not later than 120 days after the date that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submit to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives their evaluation report on this demonstration project.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Report on development of secure supply of rare earth materials

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1411) that would direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, on the supply of rare earth materials extracted, processed, and refined from secure sources of supply to develop and produce advanced technologies in support of requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD).

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the Senate provision. We direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, on the supply of rare earth materials extracted, processed, and refined from secure sources of supply to develop and produce advanced technologies in support of requirements of the DOD. The report shall include, at a minimum, an assessment of: (1) DOD's identification and plans to mitigate any national security risks resulting from its rare earth materials dependency; (2) actions that DOD has taken to identify gaps in a secured supply chain for rare earth materials, associated challenges to include technical hurdles and intellectual property concerns, and mitigation plans to obtain secure sources of supply; (3) DOD's short and long-term requirements determination for processes for specific quantities of rare earth materials related to the National Defense Stockpile, including DOD assessments; and (4) recommendations on the potential role of the Federal Government in the development of secure sources of supply. The report may include a classified annex.

Revisions to previously authorized disposals from the National Defense Stockpile

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1411) that would authorize revisions on limitations in asset sales contained in section 3303(a)(7) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (P.L. 105-261), as most recently amended by section 1412(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (P.L. 110-417), to increase the Department of Defense's stockpile commodity disposal authority by \$50.0 million, and extend this authority from 2016 to 2019.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the House provision.

We encourage the Defense Logistics Agency to continue the planned upgrade of the beryllium stockpile held in the National Defense Stockpile.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

BUDGET ITEM

National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment

The amended budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained no funding for a National Guard and Reserve Equipment account.

The House bill contained \$250.0 million for a National Guard and Reserve Equipment account.

The Senate committee-reported bill would provide no funding for a National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment account.

The agreement includes \$1.25 billion for a National Guard and Reserve Equipment account in section 4102 of this Act. Given the uncertainty of the current and projected fiscal environment, the availability of equipment needed to sustain and modernize the National Guard and Reserve Components as an operational reserve and for their domestic support missions, to include legacy aircraft as part of the Aerospace Control Alert (ACA) mission, remains a concern. We believe, therefore, additional funds are necessary to reduce high priority operational and dual-use equipment shortfalls. Accordingly, we expect these funds to be used for the purposes of, but not limited to, meeting the fiscal year 2015 unfunded equipment priorities of the Reserve Components as reported to Congress under section 10543(c) of title 10, United States Code. The funds may also be used by the National Guard and Reserve Components for the procurement of: aircraft, including associated replacements or upgrades for avionics, radars, and fuel tanks; tactical missiles; wheeled and tracked combat and tactical vehicles, including associated replacements or upgrades for mobility, survivability, and lethality, such as weapons stations; ammunition; small arms; tactical radios; non-system training devices; command, control, and logistics automation systems; shelters, and other critical dual-use items.

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Purpose (sec. 1501)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1501) stating the purpose of the title.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained an identical provision (sec. 1501).

The agreement includes this provision.

Procurement (sec. 1502)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1502) authorizing additional appropriations for procurement accounts for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and defense-wide activities.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a similar provision (sec. 1502).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Research, development, test and evaluation (sec. 1503)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a provision (sec. 1503) authorizing additional appropriations for the Department of Defense for research, development, test and evaluation.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Operation and maintenance (sec. 1504)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1503) authorizing additional appropriations for the use of the Armed Forces and other agencies of the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a similar provision (sec. 1504).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Military personnel (sec. 1505)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1504) authorizing additional appropriations for the use of the Armed Forces and other agencies of the Department of Defense for military personnel.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a similar provision (sec. 1505).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Other appropriations (secs. 1506–1509)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1505) authorizing additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program, Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, defense-wide, and National Guard and Reserve Equipment.

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained similar provisions (secs. 1506, 1507, 1508 and 1509).

The agreement includes the Senate provisions.

Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (sec. 1510)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3835) contained a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

European Reassurance Initiative (sec. 1511)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3835) contained a provision that would authorize appropriations for the European Reassurance Initiative.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

SUBTITLE B—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1521)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1511) stating that the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 1511).

The agreement includes this provision.

Special transfer authority (sec. 1522)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1512) that would provide the Department of Defense (DOD) with \$3.0 billion of special transfer authority in fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1512) that would provide DOD with \$4.0 billion of special transfer authority in fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment to provide DOD with \$3.5 billion in special transfer authority in fiscal year 2015.

SUBTITLE C—LIMITATIONS, REPORTS, AND OTHER MATTERS

Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (sec. 1531)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1523) that would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2015 Department of Defense (DOD) funds for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) until all prior-year funds for the AIF have been obligated or expended.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1524) that would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2015 DOD funds for the AIF.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1532)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1521) that would continue existing limitations under section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008

(Public Law 110-181), as amended, on the use of funds in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1523).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would also extend the authority under subsection 1531(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to accept certain equipment procured using ASFF funds and to treat such equipment as Department of Defense stocks. The agreement would condition the acceptance of equipment procured with ASFF funds authorized under this Act on: (1) the Secretary of Defense submitting to the congressional defense committees a detailed report on the equipment procurement process in Afghanistan; and (2) the Commander, U.S. Forces Afghanistan making certain determinations regarding the equipment to be accepted under this authority. These determinations would be provided to the congressional defense committees as part of the quarterly reports on the exercise of this authority.

In extending the authority under subsection 1531(d) of Public Law 113-66, we expect that this authority will be utilized only in limited circumstances and should not be broadly available for accepting equipment that has been damaged after it was transferred to the Afghan security forces.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1533)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1522) that would authorize various transfer authorities, reporting requirements, and other associated activities for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat Fund, as managed by the Joint IED Defeat Organization.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1522) that would authorize the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund and would thereby provide the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) with the authority to investigate, develop, and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel, and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices for Operation Enduring Freedom or any successor operation to that operation. The provision would also extend JIEDDO's authority with respect to homemade explosives, and would sunset this authority on December 31, 2015. The provision would also direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to present to the congressional defense committees a plan to consolidate any enduring functions of the stated organizations, capabilities, and funding into an appropriate organization identified as part of that review.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (sec. 1534)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a provision that would authorize the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

European Reassurance Initiative (sec. 1535)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a provision (sec. 1527) that would specify the purposes for which

amounts authorized to be appropriated for the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI) could be used and provide other limitations on the use of such funds.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment clarifying that for fiscal year 2015 \$1.0 billion is authorized to be appropriated in Overseas Contingency Operations funds for the ERI. The amendment would also provide that of these funds not less than \$75.0 million would be available for programs, activities, and assistance to support Ukraine, and not less than \$30.0 million would be available for programs and activities to build the capacity of European allies and partner nations. Amounts specified for the ERI fund would be available for the purposes of ERI through September 30, 2016.

We are deeply concerned about the ongoing violations of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity and note that a provision in another section of this title expresses the sense of Congress in support of providing Ukraine military assistance, both non-lethal and lethal assistance, that is defensive and non-provocative.

We are also concerned about the potential spread of the unconventional and hybrid warfare tactics used by Russia in Ukraine to other countries in the region, potentially including the Baltic countries, Moldova, and Georgia. We urge the Secretary of Defense to devote the appropriate level of planning and resources, including resources under the ERI, to countering the threat posed by these unconventional and hybrid warfare tactics.

Plan for transition of funding of United States Special Operations Command from supplemental funding for overseas contingency operations to recurring funding for future-years defense programs (sec. 1536)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1521) that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees, as part of the fiscal year 2016 budget request, with a plan to fully transition appropriate U.S. Special Operations Command funding from the Overseas Contingency Operations budget to the base budget over the future years defense program to maintain critical and enduring special operations capabilities.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION NOT ADOPTED

Codification of Office and Management and Budget criteria

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1524) that would require the Secretary of Defense to implement specified criteria in requests for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the criteria for OCO funding requests developed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for deciding whether funding for programs properly belongs in the base or OCO requests have not been updated in over 4 years. While these criteria have been somewhat successful in delineating between these two sources of funding and have facilitated OCO funding requests for the Department of Defense (DOD), there have been significant fact-of-life world events which dictate a need to re-examine and update those criteria. It is also unclear how the

guidance is applied to DOD reprogramming requests submitted to Congress for emergent requirements. OMB should ensure the criteria remain relevant and adaptable for evaluating DOD budget and reprogramming requests. We encourage DOD to evaluate the OCO criteria on a regular basis to ensure proper delineation of base and OCO budget requests. We would expect OMB to update the OCO criteria in time to support the FY 2016 budget submission.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

SUBTITLE A—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Department of Defense Space Security and Defense Program (sec. 1601)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1601) that states a sense of Congress that critical U.S. space systems face a growing foreign threat, that both the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the Russian Federation are developing capabilities to disrupt the use of space by the United States during a conflict, and that a fully developed, multifaceted approach is needed to deter and defeat any adversary's acts of aggression in outer space. The provision directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that assesses the ability of the Department of Defense to deter and defeat any adversary's act of aggression in outer space. In addition, this section would direct the Secretary, acting through the Office of Net Assessment, to conduct a study and provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act of potential alternate defense and deterrent strategies in response to the existing and projected counterspace capabilities of PRC and the Russian Federation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Evolved expendable launch vehicle notification (sec. 1602)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1602) that would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to provide certain congressional committees with notification of each change to the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) acquisition plan and schedule as compared to the plan and schedule included in the budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2015. The notification would include an identification of the change, a national security rationale for the change, the impact of the change on the EELV block buy contract, the impact of the change on the opportunities for competition for certified EELV launch providers, and the costs or savings of the change. The notification requirement would apply to fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the notification be sent to the appropriate congressional committees at the time of the budget submission for fiscal year 2016 and 2017, and it would not require such notification if no change has occurred relative to the fiscal year 2015 budget submission.

Satellite communications responsibilities of Executive Agent for Space (sec. 1603)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1603) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to revise Department of Defense (DOD)

directives and guidance for the DOD Executive Agent (EA) for Space, with respect to the development of space strategies, architectures and programs for satellite communications.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would add coordination with the commanders of the combatant commands.

We direct the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees, within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, on DOD's satellite communications organization structure. The report shall include a review of the efficiency and effectiveness of the DOD's current satellite communications organizational structure. It shall also include a recommendation to strengthen the DOD's leadership and acquisition structure of satellite communications in a manner which improves strategic planning and lowers costs through more efficient acquisition approaches to meet the DOD's related requirements.

Specifically, the Secretary shall assess the merits and challenges of designating the Commander of the Air Force Space Command's Space and Missile Systems Center as the DOD's single acquisition agent for wideband satellite communications not later than fiscal year 2017. If the Secretary disagrees with this proposition the report must demonstrate and give a plan to implement an organization structure that brings coherency to the satellite communications acquisition process. The acquisition of commercial satellite communications is currently at best ad hoc, expensive, and reliant on Overseas Contingency Operations funding with little long-term planning, and is not strategically and efficiently aligned with the acquisition of military wideband satellite communications.

Rocket propulsion system development program (sec. 1604)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1604) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a next-generation liquid rocket engine authorized at \$220.0 million for fiscal year 2015. In carrying out the program, the Secretary would be required to coordinate with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to the extent practicable. The provision also contained a sense of Congress that the engine be made in the United States, meet the requirements of the national security space community, developed not later than 2019 using full and open competition, and available for purchase by all space launch providers of the United States.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1629) that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a program plan for the production of a liquid rocket engine to support national security launch missions by no later than 2019.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a rocket propulsion system that is made in the United States, is developed no later than 2019 using full and open competition, meets the requirements of the national security space community, and is available for purchase by all space launch providers of the United States.

We note that this provision is not an authorization of funds for the development of a new launch vehicle. This provision is for the development of a rocket propulsion system to replace non-allied space launch engines by 2019.

The Secretary should coordinate with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to the extent practicable, to ensure that the rocket propulsion system developed under subsection meets objectives that are common to both the national security space community and the civil space program of the United States.

Pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite communication services (sec. 1605)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1605) that would allow the Secretary of Defense to develop and execute a pilot program to examine the feasibility of expanding the use of working capital funds to acquire commercial satellite communications services to meet Department of Defense requirements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment that would change the report due date from 150 days after enactment to 90 days. It also changes the budgetary authority from commercial satellite communications to satellite communications, and makes other administrative modifications.

Update of National Security Space Strategy to include space control and space superiority strategy (sec. 1606)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1606) that would extend the analysis required by section 911(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) through fiscal year 2030.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1621) that would direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to update the space control and space superiority strategy pursuant to the Space Posture Review conducted under section 913 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would extend the analysis required by section 911(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) through fiscal year 2030, and make other clarifying changes.

Allocation of funds for the Space Security and Defense Program; report on space control (sec. 1607)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1622) that would require a preponderance of the funds used within the Space Security and Defense Program be allocated to offensive space control and active defense strategies with a statement on the use of such funds at the time of the President's budget submission to Congress.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would change the word "preponderance" to "majority," require the development of the capabilities in addition to strategies, require a review of the appropriate types of funding for the program, and sunset the provision in 5 years from the date of enactment of this Act.

Prohibition on contracting with Russian suppliers of rocket engines for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program (sec. 1608)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1623) that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from entering into a new contract or renewing a current contract for space launch activities from any

person if that person purchases supplies critical for space launch activities covered by the contract from a Russian entity. The provision contained a waiver from the prohibition for U.S. national security interests and if space launch services and capabilities could not be obtained at a fair and reasonable price without the purchase of supplies critical for space launch activities from a Russian entity.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from awarding or renewing a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities under the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program if the contract carries out such activities using rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation. The provision includes the waiver from the Senate provision. The provision exempts the placement of orders or the exercise of options under contract FA8811-13-C-0003, awarded on December 18, 2013, or unless the Secretary, upon advice of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the offeror of a contract has provided sufficient documentation to conclusively demonstrate that prior to February 1, 2014, the offeror had either fully paid for or entered into a legally binding commitment for rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russia Federation.

Assessment of evolved expendable launch vehicle program (sec. 1609)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1624) that would require the Government Accountability Office to assess the advisability of the Secretary of Defense to require that launch providers establish or maintain business systems complying with the data requirements and cost accounting standards of the Department of Defense, including certified cost or price data.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision, with a modification to the date the report is due.

Competitive procedures required to launch payload for mission number five of the Operationally Responsive Space Program (sec. 1610)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1627) that would require competitive procedures be used to launch the payload for the Operationally Responsive Space program mission number five.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Availability of additional rocket cores pursuant to competitive procedures (sec. 1611)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1626) that would, based upon the Fiscal Year 2015 National Security Space Launch Forecast, require the Secretary of Defense to make available during fiscal year 2015 one additional rocket core for open competition. The provision also requires that between fiscal years 2015 and 2017, one additional competitive rocket core shall be made available unless the Secretary determines that there is no practicable way to implement this requirement while remaining in compliance with the terms and conditions of the 36 rocket core

block buy under the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program. Upon making such a determination, the Secretary shall certify within 45 days that there is no practicable way to add the second additional rocket core for open competition as well as describing the basis for such a determination and providing both to the congressional defense committees. A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3824) contained a provision that would make technical and conforming changes.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with technical and conforming amendments.

Limitations on availability of funds for weather satellite follow-on system and Defense Meteorological Satellite program (sec. 1612)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 215) that would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to place the last remaining satellite of the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) on the launch manifest for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program. Additionally, this section would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to establish an additional launch, for acquisition in fiscal year 2015, under the EELV program, using full and open competition among certified providers. The House bill would also fence 75 percent of the funds for the weather satellite follow-on system until the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees the plan to meet the meteorological and oceanographic collection requirements validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1628) that would prohibit funding the storage of the last DMSP unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense (DOD) intends to launch the satellite, will have sufficient funding to do so in the future years defense program, and that storing the satellite until a launch in 2020 is the most cost-effective approach to meeting the requirements of DOD.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that removes both the direction to launch the DMSP satellite and the addition of a competition launch. The agreement would limit 50 percent of the funds for the follow-on weather satellite until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a plan to meet the meteorological and oceanographic collection requirements of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, including the requirements of the combatant commands, military departments and agencies of the DOD. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) shall review the plan and the Analysis of Alternatives to determine if it meets best practices and fully addresses the concerns of the acquisition, operational and user communities, including how DOD assessed and dealt with cost, schedule and risks posed by each alternative considered.

The agreement also includes a prohibition on storage of DMSP, unless the Secretary of Defense intends to launch the satellite and that storing the satellite until the anticipated launch is the most cost-effective approach to meeting the requirements of DOD. If the Secretary of Defense decides not to launch the satellite, the Secretary of Defense must certify that the related requirements of the DOD will be met. The agreement also includes a review of the certification report by GAO.

Limitation on availability of funds for space-based infrared systems space data exploitation (sec. 1613)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 216) that would limit obligation or expenditure of funds authorized by this Act to not more than 50 percent for the data exploitation under the Space-Based Infrared Systems (SBIRS) space modernization initiative, which funds modernization and evolution of technologies to meet the SBIRS mission, until the Secretary of the Air Force delivers a certification to the congressional defense committees that the limited funds available for this effort will be used in support of data exploitation of the current SBIRS program of record, including the scanning and staring sensor; or that the data from the current SBIRS program of record, including the scanning and staring sensor, is being fully exploited and no further efforts are warranted.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of the Air Force make the certification as the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space.

We direct the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct an overhead persistent infrared assessment. Such assessment shall include input from the Joint Staff and each of the combatant commands, including the component commands, detailing how they currently integrate, and plan to integrate, the use of overhead persistent infrared capabilities to pursue their assigned mission areas. Such assessment shall be delivered to the congressional defense committees in the form of a report by April 1, 2015.

Limitations on availability of funds for hosted payload and wide field of view testbed of the space-based infrared systems (sec. 1614)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 217) that would limit 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for hosted payloads and wide field of view testbed alternative approaches to the Space-Based Infrared Systems (SBIRS) program of record until completion and briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the analysis of alternatives (AOA).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would release 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated upon completion and submittal of the AOA to the appropriate congressional committees, with the remaining 25 percent to be released 30 days after receiving the briefing as described in the House provision.

We direct the U.S. Comptroller General of the United States to review the AOA for SBIRS to determine the extent that the Department met AOA best practices and fully addressed the concerns of the acquisition, operational, and user communities. Further, the Comptroller General shall review how the Department identified the requirements and assessed and addressed the cost, schedule, and risks posed for each alternative in the AOA. The Comptroller General shall provide the results of the review to the appropriate congressional committees within 180 days from receipt of the AOA, and also provide an interim briefing within 90 days.

Limitations on availability of funds for protected tactical demonstration and protected military satellite communications testbed of the advanced extremely high frequency program (sec. 1615)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 218) that would limit 50 percent of the funds

authorized to be appropriated by this Act for the protected tactical demonstration and protected military satellite communications testbed alternative approaches to the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) program of record until completion and briefing to the congressional defense committees on the analysis of alternatives (AOA).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would release 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated upon completion and submittal of the AOA with the remaining 25 percent released 30 days after receiving the briefing as described in the House provision. The agreement also includes other clarifying amendments that make clear the restriction is not intended to limit technology insertions to current satellite communication programs of record.

We direct the Comptroller General of the United States to review the reliability of the MILSTAR system, including terminals and maintenance and its effect on readiness as well as the phasing of the AEHF and Family of Advanced Beyond the line of sight Terminals (FAB-T) system to determine whether there will be a timely replacement of the MILSTAR system so as to not further degrade reliability and readiness of the existing communications architecture. The Comptroller General shall present an initial assessment to the congressional defense committees in the form of a briefing no later than March 31, 2015, with a final briefing no later than September 30, 2015.

We also direct the Comptroller General to review the AOA for AEHF to determine the extent that the Department of Defense (DOD) met AOA best practices and fully addressed the concerns of the acquisition, operational, and user communities. Further, the Comptroller General shall review how DOD identified the requirements and assessed and addressed the cost, schedule, and risks posed for each alternative in the AOA. The Comptroller General shall provide the results of the review to the congressional defense committees within 180 days from receipt of the AOA, and also provide an interim briefing within 90 days.

Study of space situational awareness architecture (sec. 1616)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1630) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to task the Defense Science Board to assess the architecture of the ground and space sensors used for space situational awareness (SSA) for both defensive and offensive space operations over a 5-, 10-, and 20-year budget plan. The assessment shall also include ground systems to task the sensors and process the data.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the report to have an unclassified summary and a classified appendix, as required.

Briefing on range support for launches in support of national security (sec. 1617)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3899) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the requirements and investments needed to modernize Department of Defense space launch facilities and supporting infrastructure at Cape Canaveral Air

Force Station and Vandenberg Air Force Base.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with technical and clarifying amendments.

We expect the Secretary to leverage, update, and expand on the previous space launch infrastructure briefing provided to Congress in March 2014.

SUBTITLE B—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities Executive Agent (sec. 1621)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1614) that would establish an executive agent for the Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities (TENCAP) program. The executive agent would report directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, and would be responsible for working with the combatant commands, military services, and intelligence community to develop methods to increase warfighter effectiveness through the exploitation of national capabilities and to promote cross-domain integration of such capabilities into military operations, training, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance activities. The provision also would require the TENCAP executive agent to provide an annual briefing to the congressional defense and intelligence committees for fiscal years 2016-20 on the investments, activities, challenges, and opportunities in carrying out the TENCAP program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would make technical and conforming changes regarding the designation of a TENCAP executive agent. We agree that the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence should designate a TENCAP executive agent through the use of an existing billet. We do not intend to create new standalone positions to support this function.

One-year extension of report on imagery intelligence and geospatial information support provided to regional organizations and security alliances (sec. 1622)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1613) that would extend an existing reporting requirement by 1 year, regarding sharing of imagery intelligence and geospatial information to regional organizations and security alliances.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Extension of Secretary of Defense authority to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities (sec. 1623)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1651) that would amend 431(a) of title 10, United States Code, to change the current sunset date from December 31, 2015, to December 31, 2017.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Extension of authority relating to jurisdiction over Department of Defense facilities for intelligence collection or special operations activities abroad (sec. 1624)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1653) that would amend section 926(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Pub-

lic Law 112-81) to extend the sunset dates in the provision in paragraph (1) by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2017”; and by striking “fiscal year 2016” and inserting “fiscal year 2018.”

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Assessment and limitation on availability of funds for intelligence activities and programs of United States Special Operations Command and special operations forces (sec. 1625)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1611) that would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, and the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, to submit an assessment to the appropriate congressional committees on the intelligence activities and programs of the U.S. Special Operations Forces and U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM). This section would also limit 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 of SOCOM Major Force Program-11 procurement, defense-wide, and research, development, testing, and evaluation, defense-wide, until such assessment is received.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would modify the reporting requirements and the limitation on funds and add a requirement that the Comptroller General of the United States provide review and provide an assessment of the required report.

Annual briefing on the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements of the combatant commands (sec. 1626)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1612) that would direct the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide briefings to the congressional defense and intelligence committees on the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements of each of the combatant commands. The provision would also provide specific guidance for what information should be included in the annual briefing. The provision would further require that the Chairman provide the briefing with the budget submission each year, from fiscal year 2016-20.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Prohibition on National Intelligence Program consolidation (sec. 1627)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1616) that would prohibit amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense (DOD) to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2015, to execute:

(1) the separation of the National Intelligence Program (NIP) budget from the DOD budget;

(2) the consolidation of the NIP budget within DOD; or

(3) the establishment of a new appropriations account or appropriations account structure for the NIP budget.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Personnel security and insider threat (sec. 1628)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1654) that would re-

quire the Secretary of Defense to establish an interim continuous evaluation (CE) system for personnel security; use this interim system to develop policies and procedures for an objective system; engineer CE systems to interface with an automated insider threat detection and prevention system; acquire CE capabilities competitively based on advanced commercial technology; establish a multidisciplinary team to support the development of an automated insider threat capability; and create an executive committee of senior officials to ensure that the insider threat program is appropriately coordinated and resourced.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary to report to Congress on the Department's plans to address the elements contained in the provision.

We also note that the study by the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation (CAPE) of the Office of Personnel Management's personnel investigation service for the Department of Defense made a number of recommendations for additional phases of CAPE's assessment. We endorse the CAPE recommendations for Phase 2A and 2B actions, specifically: improvements to workflow scheduling, limiting investigations to those requiring access to classified information; establishing a business practice working group to achieve efficiencies (such as cost savings from economies of scale); the efficacy of information technology investments, quality control practices, enhancing competition; and rationalizing the mix of government and contract investigators.

Migration of Distributed Common Ground System of Department of the Army to an open system architecture (sec. 1629)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1655) that would require the Secretary of the Army, within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act, to migrate the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS), including the so-called Red Disk or any successor to Red Disk under development at the Army Intelligence and Security Command, to an open systems architecture. The provision would require that the DCGS open systems architecture be compliant with the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise open architecture.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

SUBTITLE C—CYBERSPACE-RELATED MATTERS
Budgeting and accounting for cyber mission forces (sec. 1631)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1643) that would require that the Secretary of Defense, for fiscal year 2017 and every succeeding year, for the President's annual budget submission and supporting documents, to develop a major force program (MFP) category and program elements for the Department of Defense (DOD) future years defense program for the training, arming, and equipping of the cyber mission forces. The provision would also require the Secretary to assess the feasibility and advisability of establishing a general fund transfer account to execute the funds programmed in the MFP and provide a recommendation to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2015.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We note that for several years, as the importance of cyber operations investments has grown, the congressional defense committees have been urging DOD to improve how it categorizes and displays its budget justification documentation. In embarking on the process of developing a major force program, we believe it is important for DOD to adopt a taxonomy that remains consistent over several years. We understand that the Department is responding to budget guidance from the Office of Management and Budget, as well as changing priorities from new leadership, but these fluctuations in taxonomy result in an inconsistent and moving baseline that masks real annual changes in budget and execution levels.

Reporting on cyber incidents with respect to networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors (sec. 1632)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1645) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures for designating contractors as “operationally critical contractors,” notifying such contractors that they have been designated, and requiring designated contractors to report successful penetrations of their computer networks by known or suspected advanced persistent threat actors. The provision narrowly defines an operationally critical contractor as a company designated by the Secretary as a critical source of supply for airlift, sealift, intermodal transportation services, or logistical support that is essential to mobilization, deployment, or sustainment in a contingency operation.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We fully share the concern of industry and the Department of Defense (DOD) about harmonizing reporting on cyber intrusions to eliminate redundant reporting. We direct the Secretary to ensure that contractor reporting to DOD, and the dissemination of such reporting, is coordinated with reporting to the Director of National Intelligence and other government agencies.

Executive agents for cyber test and training ranges (sec. 1633)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1621) that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an executive agent to coordinate and oversee the management of the various cyber and information technology test and training ranges being developed and deployed by the Department of Defense (DOD).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would make technical changes and require the Secretary to designate two cyber range executive agents from among existing DOD personnel, one for test ranges and one for training ranges; and to consult with the Principal Cyber Advisor in designating the executive agents. The amendment also would require the executive agents, in consultation with the DOD Chief Information Officer, to jointly designate a standard language from among existing open source candidates for expressing cyber event and threat data in machine-readable form for use in the Joint Information Environment and the range environment.

We note that for several years, the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives have expressed

concerns over how the DOD has managed its cyber range resources. While we recognize that DOD has developed and maintained a core set of capabilities, we have observed first-hand that the lack of coordination of those capabilities has left DOD in a situation where the current ranges do not support the tools and capabilities that cyber operators would use in the real world. Unlike in live training for kinetic operations, in cyberspace, we do not train like we fight. We believe that the integrated plan required by these executive agents is a necessary tool to create standardization between training and operational tools, as well as to ensure that DOD is investing in adequate range resources to meet unit-level training requirements for the force structure being defined by U.S. Cyber Command.

One reason that we have tasked these executive agents to designate a standard language for cyber event and threat data reporting is to better ensure that there is standardization of these capabilities across the range and operational networks. Not only is this a fundamental capabilities needed by cyber forces, it would also set a valuable precedent for ensuring that the capabilities that are used on live, operational networks are the same tools that would be used in a test or training environment. We firmly believe that any standard designated by these executive agents should swiftly be transitioned to use on the operational networks of the Joint Information Environment.

In designating the two required executive agents, we believe that the Secretary should consider two important factors. First, the Test Resource Management Center (TRMC) already fills a similar role for the test range complex, and would make a logical choice to take on the responsibilities for the test range executive agent. Second, we believe that the training range executive agent should be the responsibility of one of the military departments, since they have the operational imperative to maintain training readiness, as well as the resources to sustain and upgrade training range capabilities over time.

Cyberspace mapping (sec. 1634)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1641) that would require the Secretary of Defense, within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act, to designate a network or network segment within the Department of Defense (DOD) to support the execution of a pilot program to demonstrate large-scale cyberspace mapping technology, as approved by the Cyber Investment Management Board (CIMB). The provision also would require the Principal Cyber Advisor, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, to recommend policy to the Secretary of Defense regarding the mapping of cyberspace to support the missions of U.S. Cyber Command.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Review of cross domain solution policy and requirement for cross domain solution strategy (sec. 1635)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1642) that would require the Secretary of Defense to review the policies of the Department of Defense, and develop a strategy concerning the procurement, approval, and use of capabilities to transmit information across networks and systems at different security classification levels.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Requirement for strategy to develop and deploy decryption service for the Joint Information Environment (sec. 1636)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1614) that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy for a decryption service for the Joint Information Environment. The provision would require the strategy for the decryption and re-encryption of communications to enable the inspection of communications content to detect cyber threats and insider threat activity. That strategy would include a requirements definition document, an architecture, a concept of operations, a cost estimate, and an assessment of the security benefit of such a service. The provision would require a briefing on the strategy to be provided to the congressional defense and intelligence committees by October 1, 2015.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Actions to address economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace (sec. 1637)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3377) contained a provision that would require the President to report annually to appropriate congressional committees on countries that engage in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to U.S. trade secrets or proprietary information, and on the types of technologies and intellectual property such countries target, what they have succeeded in stealing, and, where known, the incorporation of such stolen property in articles, products, or services. The report also would include the actions the President has taken to diminish such espionage, and the progress made towards that goal.

The provision would authorize the President, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of each person determined to be knowingly engaged in such espionage, if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a U.S. person.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We urge the President in implementing this provision to harmonize the required reporting on industrial or economic espionage through cyberspace with related reporting, including the biennial report on the threat to U.S. industry from foreign economic collection and industrial espionage required by section 809(b) of Public Law 103-359.

Sense of Congress regarding role of reserve components in defense of United States against cyber attacks (sec. 1638)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1622) that would express the sense of Congress that the National Guard has a valuable role to play in defending the United States against cyber attacks.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would recognize the important capabilities and role of all the reserve components.

We are aware that the Army National Guard is pursuing a decision to establish ten

Cyber Protection Teams (CPTs), independent of the plans by U.S. Cyber Command to establish 68 CPTs within the active component. While we support a role for the reserve components in Department of Defense planning and organization to deal with cyber threats, we are concerned that such plans are not adequately synchronized with overall planning in this space. In particular, we are concerned about potentially creating parallel structures, personnel and training pathways, and authorities for such forces.

Therefore, we direct the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, on the progress made by the Army National Guard to establish ten CPTs to support preparations to respond to emergencies involving an attack or natural disaster impacting computer networks. The report shall include the following:

- (1) A timeframe for when stationing of the CPTs will be finalized.
- (2) A timeframe for activation of the CPTs and whether the teams will be activated at the same time or staggered over time.
- (3) A description of manning and basing requirements.
- (4) The number and location of nominations received for a CPT and the activation date estimate provided in each nomination.
- (5) An assessment of the range of stated cost projections included in the nominations.
- (6) An assessment of any identified patterns regarding ease or difficulty of staffing individuals with required credentials within particular regions.
- (7) Any additional information deemed relevant by the Secretary.

Sense of Congress on the future of the Internet and the .MIL top-level domain (sec. 1639)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1090E) that would prohibit the transfer of the responsibilities of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) for Internet domain name system functions until the Comptroller General of the United States submits a report to Congress, within 1 year of the date on which NTIA receives a proposal for the transfer of such responsibilities to the Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1646) that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should:

- (1) Advise the President to transfer the remaining role of the United States Government in the functions of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) to a global multi-stakeholder community only if the President is confident that the .mil top level domain and the Internet protocol address numbers used exclusively by the Department of Defense (DOD) for national security will remain exclusively used by DOD; and
- (2) Take all necessary steps to sustain the successful stewardship and good standing of the Internet root zone servers managed by DOD components.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would clarify how the Secretary should provide advice in the process, as well as ensure active participation in all transition planning and accountability stress testing.

We understand that the arcane and esoteric process for governing the Internet is not conducive to quick or easy understanding by decisionmakers not intimately involved in the process. We fear that the lack of understanding breeds concerns that

at face value appear warranted, but upon closer examination may not be valid, or may be easily mitigated. We believe that some improved confidence building measures and transparency over the negotiations process would be helpful in dispelling any misconceptions about the process.

Therefore, we direct the Secretary to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on the transition process no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act. This report should explain DOD's role in the negotiations process, any issues or concerns about the status of negotiations, and any observations related to the accountability stress testing currently underway. Furthermore, we encourage DOD and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to provide regular briefings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, as well as other congressional committees, on the status of transition planning and accountability stress testing.

SUBTITLE D—NUCLEAR FORCES

Preparation of annual budget request regarding nuclear weapons (sec. 1641)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1631) that would amend section 179 of title 10, United States Code, and add a new requirement regarding annual transfers to the Department of Energy (DOE) from the Department of Defense's (DOD) budget authority. Prior to making such transfers, the Secretary of Defense must enter into a memorandum of agreement with the Secretary of Energy as to how the funds will be obligated and expended within the Weapons Activities budget of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that includes a waiver to the certification requirement if the Secretary of Defense determines such waiver is in the national security interest and provides a copy of the agreement between the Secretaries of Defense and Energy describing how the Secretary of Energy will obligate or expend any amounts covered by the transfer of the budget authority to the DOE and an explanation of why the Secretary was not able to certify the previous year's DOD-to-NNSA budget transfers complied with previous DOD-DOE Secretaries' agreements.

Improvement to biennial assessment on delivery platforms for nuclear weapons and the nuclear command and control system (sec. 1642)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1637) that would amend section 492(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to add “, and the ability to meet operational availability requirements for” after “military effectiveness of”.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Congressional Budget Office review of cost estimates for nuclear weapons (sec. 1643)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1640) that would amend 1041(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) to require the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis regarding the 10-year cost of nuclear weapons programs.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 1602) that

would amend section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) to require the CBO to submit such a report 120 days after submission of the report required by section 1043 for an odd-numbered fiscal year.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the CBO report to be submitted by July 1 of each year in which the President submits a report under section 1043 for an odd-numbered fiscal year. The amendment would also require the CBO report to include an estimate of the relative percentage of total defense spending represented by nuclear weapons funding during the 10-year period. Finally, the amendment would require the Director of the CBO to submit a letter to the congressional defense committees if the Director determines a report under section 1043 for an even-numbered fiscal year contains a significant change.

We expect the Director to use their best judgment regarding whether any changes are significant enough to warrant submission of a letter.

Retention of missile silos (sec. 1644)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1634) that would require the Secretary of Defense to preserve each intercontinental ballistic missile silo that contains a deployed missile as of the date of the enactment of this Act in, at a minimum, a warm status that enables such silo to remain a fully functioning element of the interconnected and redundant command and control system of the missile field and be made fully operational with a deployed missile.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would make the requirement effective during the period in which the New START Treaty (as defined by section 494 (a)(2)(D) of title 10, United States Code) is in effect. The amendment also includes a rule of construction that would enable the Department of Defense to place a silo offline temporarily to perform maintenance activities.

We intend that this provision would require the Secretary to maintain the pertinent silos in a condition that permits them to be returned to operational alert status.

Procurement authority for certain parts of intercontinental ballistic missile fuzes (sec. 1645)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1601) that would give authority to procure commercial parts for intercontinental ballistic missile fuses, notwithstanding 10 United States Code 1502(a), for fiscal year 2015.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Assessment of nuclear weapon secondary requirement (sec. 1646)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1634) that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to assess the annual nuclear weapon secondary production requirement needed to sustain a safe, secure, reliable, and effective nuclear deterrent. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit a report on this assessment to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This report would be in unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary, and would be required to include an explanation of the rationale and assumptions that led to the current 50-to-80 per year secondary production

requirement, including the factors considered in determining such requirement, and an analysis of whether there are any changes to the 50-to-80 per year secondary production requirement, including the reasons for any such changes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the report 120 days after the date of enactment.

Certification on nuclear force structure (sec. 1647)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1635) that would require that, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, jointly certify that the plan for implementation of the New START Treaty announced on April 8, 2014, will enable the United States to meet its obligations under such treaty in a manner that ensures the nuclear forces of the United States are capable, survivable, and balanced; and maintain strategic stability, deterrence and extended deterrence, and allied assurance.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Advance notice and reports on B61 life extension program (sec. 1648)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1604) that would require the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command to provide the congressional defense committees with separate reports in advance of any decision to reduce the scope of the B61 Life Extension Program below the level proposed in the fiscal year 2015 Stockpile Stewardship Management Plan.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a minor amendments.

Notification and report concerning removal or consolidation of dual-capable aircraft from Europe (sec. 1649)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1639) that would limit fiscal year 2015 funding for the Department of Defense to consolidate or remove dual-capable aircraft (unless being replaced by F-35 aircraft) from the area of responsibility (AOR) of the U.S. European Command (EUCOM) until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the armed forces of the Russian Federation are no longer occupying Ukrainian territory, the Russian Federation is no longer violating the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty, and the Russian Federation is in compliance with the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty. The provision contained a waiver for national security including a certification that such consolidation is consistent with the 2012 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Deterrence and Defense Posture Review concerning reciprocal non-strategic nuclear weapons reductions by the Russian Federation and an unclassified report explaining why such certification cannot be made with a 30-day wait period. The provision required a report on the cost and burden sharing arrangements of the forward deployed nuclear weapons in place with the NATO and any recommendations for changes to the current arrangement.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require,

90 days before the date on which the Secretary of Defense removes or consolidates United States dual capable aircraft from the EUCOM AOR, the Secretary to congressional defense committees and include a report on how such removal or consolidation is in the national security interests of the United States and NATO and whether the proposed consolidation or removal is affected by the armed forces of the Russian Federation occupying Ukrainian territory, the Russian Federation deploying or preparing to deploy nuclear weapons to Ukrainian territory, the Russian Federation not complying with the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty, and the Russian Federation not complying with the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty.

Reports on installation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems at headquarters of United States Strategic Command (sec. 1650)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1603) that would require the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) to submit an annual report on the installation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems as part of the replacement of the STRATCOM headquarters. The requirement for an annual report would terminate at such time as when the Commander, STRATCOM certifies to the congressional defense committees that all milestones have been completed, and the headquarters building is a fully functioning node in the overall NC3 architecture.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) shall review the existing milestones and scope of the effort and provide a technical briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2014, as to whether the scope of the current effort is complete, fully integrated, and meets accepted programmatic planning practices.

GAO shall review the report submitted each year and provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on whether the installation is meeting projected milestones and costs and whether there are outstanding programmatic or technical issues that must be addressed to meet these milestones so that the building can become an operational hub in the overall NC3 network.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Report on plans for response of Department of Defense to INF Treaty violation (sec. 1651)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1644) that would require the Missile Defense Agency to develop a plan to test, by 2016, the capability of the Aegis Ashore missile defense system to counter intermediate-range ground-launched cruise missiles. It would also require, if Russia is not in compliance with the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty as of the date of enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense to develop a plan for the research and development of intermediate-range ballistic and cruise missiles.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing any steps being taken or planned to be taken by the Department of Defense in response to Russian actions in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty. The report would include a description of any plans to conduct research, development, testing or deployment of potential future United States military capa-

bilities, including activities to modify, test, or deploy existing military systems, to deter or defend against the threat of Russian INF-range systems, should such systems be deployed.

Statement of policy on the nuclear triad (sec. 1652)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1636) that contained a series of findings on the nuclear triad and a statement that it is the policy of the United States to operate and sustain a triad of nuclear delivery platforms consisting of heavy bombers armed with nuclear gravity bombs and air launched cruise missiles, land based intercontinental ballistic missiles which can carry independently targeted reentry vehicles, ballistic missile submarines and forward deployed dual capable fighter bomber aircraft and nuclear weapons, as well as to ensure that members of the Armed Forces that operate and maintain these systems have sufficient training and resources to execute their nuclear mission.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that strikes the findings.

Sense of Congress on deterrence and defense posture of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (sec. 1653)

The Senate committee-reported bill included a provision (sec. 1605) that would express the sense of Congress that the United States reaffirms and remains committed to the policies enumerated in the Deterrence and Defense Posture Review of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), dated May 20, 2012.

The House Bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would include policies enumerated in the NATO Wales Summit Declaration of September 2014.

SUBTITLE E—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Availability of funds for Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system (sec. 1661)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1613) that would authorize fiscal year 2015 Department of Defense funds to be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system, including for co-production of Iron Dome parts and components in the United States by United States industry. The provision would also require that the funds authorized for Iron Dome be subject to the terms, conditions and co-production targets specified for fiscal year 2015 in the "Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement," signed March 5, 2014. The provision would also authorize a portion of the funds to be used for several other U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, if the Government of Israel determines that it is a higher priority for its national security.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Department of Defense, prior to the initial obligation of the authorized funds, to certify that the U.S.-Israeli Iron Dome agreement is being successfully implemented, and to describe any risks relating to implementation of the agreement.

Testing and assessment of missile defense systems prior to production and deployment (sec. 1662)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1615) that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that, prior to making a final production decision for, and prior to operational deployment of, a new or substantially upgraded interceptor or weapon system of the Ballistic Missile Defense System, sufficient and operationally realistic testing of the system is conducted, and the testing results demonstrate a high probability that the system will work in an operationally effective manner. The provision would also require the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to provide an assessment to the Secretary of the sufficiency and results of the testing.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Acquisition plan for re-designed exo-atmospheric kill vehicle (sec. 1663)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1614) that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a rigorous acquisition plan for the re-design of the Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system, subject to approval by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. It would also require the Department of Defense, after such approval, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the acquisition plan and how it will meet specified objectives.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Study on testing program of ground-based midcourse missile defense system (sec. 1664)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1645) that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an arrangement with a Federally Funded Research and Development Center to conduct a study of the testing program for the ground-based midcourse missile defense system, and to submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the study.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Sense of Congress and report on homeland ballistic missile defense (sec. 1665)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1611) that would express the sense of Congress concerning the importance of defending the United States Homeland against the threat of limited ballistic missile defense attack, and the need to improve the current capability of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system. The provision would also require the Department of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the status of efforts to improve the homeland ballistic missile defense capability of the United States.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We direct that, not later than 60 days after submission of the report required by the provision, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees providing its views on the report. We further direct that,

as soon as practicable after the briefing has been provided, the GAO submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the views provided in the briefing.

Sense of Congress and report on regional ballistic missile defense (sec. 1666)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1612) that would express the sense of the Congress on the importance of the United States and its allies and partners improving their regional ballistic missile defense capabilities, and would require the Department of Defense to submit a report on the status of efforts to improve such capabilities in Europe, the Middle East, and the Asia-Pacific region.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We direct that, not later than 60 days after submission of the report required by this provision, the General Accounting Office provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees providing its views on the report. We further direct that, as soon as practicable after the briefing has been provided, the GAO submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the views provided in the briefing.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Air Force intelligence organization

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1615) that would express the sense of Congress that the Air Force National Air and Space Intelligence Center provides indispensable intelligence support, and should remain organizationally aligned to the Headquarters Air Staff with reporting through the Vice Chief of Staff. In addition, this section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees a strategic plan for the intelligence organization of the Air Force, which includes maintaining the National Air and Space Intelligence Center alignment to the Headquarters Air Staff.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the House provision. We did not recommend including this provision, since the Air Force has provided the plan the House provision would have required and has decided to maintain the National Air and Space Intelligence Center directly aligned to the Headquarters Air Staff. However, we will continue to monitor the Air Force's implementation of its plan.

Authority for Secretary of Defense to engage in commercial activities as security for military operations abroad

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1652) that would amend subsections 431 through 437 of title 10, United States Code, to: (1) Allow the Secretary of Defense to employ commercial activities as security for military operations, in addition to existing authority for using such activities for intelligence operations; (2) Direct that reports of audits on commercial activities used as security for intelligence operations as reported to the congressional defense and intelligence committees, and reports on audits of commercial activities used as security for military operations, are reported to the congressional defense committees only; and (3) Make conforming changes throughout these subsections.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision. We believe that this could be a useful

authority, but would have to receive better answers from the Department of Defense (DOD) to questions that were raised after DOD requested this authority. We would re-evaluate this request in the future if DOD continues to identify a need for the authority.

Budget increase for Aegis ballistic missile defense

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1646) that would authorize an increase of \$99.0 million for procurement of Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) interceptors for the Aegis ballistic missile defense system.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Funding authorization levels for procurement of SM-3 interceptors are included in the procurement funding table in section 4101 of this Act.

Director of National Intelligence certification with respect to the mission analysis for cyber operations of Department of Defense

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1623) that would amend section 933 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to require the Director of National Intelligence to certify that the recommendations of the cyber mission analysis report by the Secretary of Defense required by section 933 are consistent with the cyber operations capability needs of the United States.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Secretary's cyber mission analysis report did not include a certification that the Red Team personnel and capacity in the Air National Guard are no longer required by the Department of Defense, and may not be reduced or reassigned without such a certification.

Independent review of the personnel reliability program of the Department of Defense and the human reliability program of the Department of Energy

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1632) that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an independent review of the Personnel Reliability Program (PRP) of the Department of Defense and the Human Reliability Program of the Department of Energy.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision. We note that the Department of Defense is currently reviewing its PRP as part of a broader assessment of needs within its nuclear enterprise. We expect this review will offer significant recommendations for modernizing PRP to make it both more effective and more efficient. We further expect that the Department of Energy will apply lessons learned from the Department of Defense's review to its own, similar program. We will continue close oversight of this matter.

Integrated plan on space launch activities of the federal government

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3814) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and

Space Administration to jointly, in coordination with the National Security Council, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the heads of other appropriate agencies of the Federal Government, develop a plan to achieve the effective planning, coordination, and execution for the civil and national security space launch activities of the Federal Government in order to ensure that the mission needs of the United States of reliable, timely, and affordable access to space for all agencies are met in a cost-effective manner.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We direct the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the heads of other appropriate agencies of the Federal Government, to identify and assess opportunities for coordination among Federal agencies in space launch acquisition efforts, and provide a summary of the lessons learned by the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration regarding their launch service programs. The results of the study shall be provided to the appropriate congressional committees in the form of a briefing no later than December 31, 2015.

Furthermore, we direct the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to assess the results of the study as presented in the briefing to Congress, as well as update the related space launch findings and recommendations reported in the 2012 GAO Annual Report titled "Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue." The GAO shall provide the results of the assessment within 90 days of receiving the briefing provided to Congress.

Reports and briefings of Strategic Advisory Group

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1638) that would require the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command to provide to the congressional defense committees a copy of each briefing and report prepared by his Strategic Advisory Group, including any subgroup thereof and any successor advisory group, provided to him in the previous year.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision. We are aware that the Commander wrote to the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee on May 19, 2014 and committed to providing the committees with briefings on the materials provided to him by the Strategic Advisory Group. We believe this will be a useful arrangement for the oversight function of the committees. We also believe that, from time to time, it may be necessary to receive copies of these reports, and we look forward to working with the Commander in the event the committees believe that it is necessary. With this understanding, we choose not to adopt section 1638 of the House bill at this time.

Report on governance and corruption in the Russian Federation

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1617) that would direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report on the status of governance and corruption in the Russian Federation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on reliance of Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program on foreign manufacturers

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1625) that would require the Government Accountability Office to submit, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, a report on risks of reliance on foreign manufacturers to the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We agree that the RAND study "U.S. Space Launch Capability—An Assessment of the Use of Foreign Components", (December 2013), as required by section 916 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) obviates the need for an additional study at this time.

Sense of Congress on procurement and deployment of capability enhancement II exo-atmospheric kill vehicle

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1642) that would express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense (DOD) should not procure an additional Capability Enhancement-II (CE-II) exo-atmospheric kill vehicle for deployment on Ground-Based Interceptors of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system until a successful operationally realistic intercept flight test of the CE-II has occurred.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that, after the House bill was passed, a successful intercept flight test of the GMD system, using an upgraded version of the CE-II kill vehicle, took place on June 22, 2014. This successful flight test result allowed DOD to resume assembly and delivery of GBIs with upgraded CE-II kill vehicles for deployment.

Sense of the Senate on resolution limits on commercial space imagery

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1631) that would express the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should support the relaxation of panchromatic, spectral, and infrared imagery resolution limits on the sale of commercial space imagery. The provision would also require the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to provide a recommendation to Congress by April 1, 2015, on the design and development of a flexible and dynamic capability to control the collection and sale of commercial space imagery to protect national security.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We direct the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to brief the congressional defense and intelligence committees on the progress achieved in developing a flexible and dynamic capability to control the collection and sale of commercial space imagery to protect national security.

Theater air and missile defense of allies of the United States

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1641) that would require the operational deployment of the Aegis Ashore missile defense system in Poland by December 31, 2016, and would require the deployment of either the Patriot short-range missile defense system or the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

terminal missile defense system in Poland by the end of 2014.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that a separate provision, described elsewhere in this report, relates to regional missile defense capabilities of the United States and its allies and partners in several combatant command areas of responsibility.

TITLE XVII—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY

National commission on the future of the Army (secs. 1701–1712)

The House bill contained a provision (secs. 1095–1099A) that would establish a National Commission on the Future of the Army to conduct a comprehensive review of the Army's size, structure, and force mix.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (secs. 1701–1709).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with amendments that would clarify the limitations on the authority of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army with respect to the transfer of AH-64 Apache attack helicopters from the Army National Guard (ARNG) to the regular Army. The agreement also includes amendments that would clarify the duties of such a commission.

We expect the Army and ARNG to immediately proceed with appropriate planning and preparation activities for the transfer of up to 48 AH-64 Apache aircraft prior to March 31, 2016. Such preparations should include all necessary personnel and materiel-related actions required to facilitate such transfers. We also expect the Army and ARNG to continue the planning necessary for the potential implementation of the rest of the Army's Aviation Restructure Initiative so that disruptions to the readiness of the Army and ARNG are minimized in the event that Congress approves additional elements of the Army's plan beyond March 31, 2016.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary and explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense. It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing as well as military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that fund military construction, environmental cleanup, and other activities required to implement the decisions of the base closure rounds.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ADOPTED

Short title (sec. 2001)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2001) that would designate division B of this Act as the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2001).

The agreement includes this provision.

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2002) that would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVII shall expire on October 1, 2017, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for

military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision.

This agreement includes the provision with a technical amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION NOT ADOPTED

Effective date

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2003) that would provide that titles XXI through XXVII of this Act take effect on October 1, 2014, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$539.4 million for military construction and \$429.6 million for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes authorization of appropriations of \$543.4 million for military construction and \$429.6 million for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2015.

The budget request included \$96.0 million for the third of six planned phases of construction of a Command and Control Facility at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. We understand that all six phases are necessary to provide for a complete facility that meets the requirements of U.S. Army Pacific. Furthermore, we understand that combining the remaining four phases into a single authorized project would save the Army significant military construction funding and accelerate facility construction by up to 4 years.

Therefore, the agreement includes authorization of \$311.4 million for the remaining four phases of the Command and Control Facility at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. This authorization assumes at least 10 percent savings will be achieved through construction and contracting efficiencies. Consistent with these efficiencies, the agreement includes an authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2015 of \$85.0 million for the first increment of this project.

We believe that it is inappropriate to phase, rather than increment, large military construction projects when each distinct phase does not fully meet the requirements of the user and direct the Army to refrain from requesting similarly phased projects in the future.

We recognize that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and note that the Army's military construction request for fiscal year 2015 is 52 percent less than what was requested for fiscal year 2014. Therefore, the agreement includes authorization of \$15.0 million for a Consolidated Shipping Center at Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, \$46.0 million for a Simulations Center at Fort Hood, Texas, and \$86.0 million for Phase 3 of the Individual Training Barracks Complex at Fort Lee, Virginia, the Army's top unfunded military construction priorities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ADOPTED

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2101) that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Army for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2101).

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2102) that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2102).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2103)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2103) that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Army for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2103).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project (sec. 2104)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2104) that would modify an authority provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2104).

The agreement includes this provision.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2105)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2105) that would modify the authorization contained in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of previously authorized construction projects.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2105).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2106)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2106) that would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2106).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2107)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2107) that would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2107).

The agreement includes this provision.

Limitation on construction of cadet barracks at United States Military Academy, New York (sec. 2108)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 2108) that would require the Secretary of the Army to certify to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary intends to award a contract for the renovation of MacArthur Long Bar-

racks concurrent with assuming beneficial occupancy of the renovated MacArthur Short Barracks before obligating or expending funds for construction of increment 3 of the Cadet Barracks at the United States Military Academy, New York.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Limitation on funding for family housing construction at Camp Walker, Republic of Korea (sec. 2109)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 2109) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized for construction of military family housing units at Camp Walker, Republic of Korea (ROK), until 30 days following the delivery of a report to the congressional defense committees validating on-post housing requirements in the ROK, including Camp Walker and Camp Humphries, and a plan for meeting such requirements.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$1.02 billion for military construction and \$370.4 million for family housing for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes authorization of appropriations of \$993.2 million for military construction and \$370.4 million for family housing for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2015.

The budget request included \$120.1 million for a Center for Cyber Studies Building in Annapolis, Maryland. We understand the Navy would be unable to expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, the agreement includes a \$90.1 million reduction.

We recognize that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and note that the Navy's military construction request for fiscal year 2015 is 40 percent less than what was requested for fiscal year 2014. Therefore, the agreement includes authorization of \$13.8 million for a Regional Ship Maintenance Support Facility at Bangor, Washington, and \$50.7 million for a Radio Battalion Complex at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, the top unfunded military construction priorities of the Navy and Marine Corps, respectively.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ADOPTED

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2201) that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Navy for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2201).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2202) that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2202).

The agreement includes this provision.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2203) that would authorize funding for fiscal

year 2015 to improve existing Navy family housing.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2203).

The agreement includes this provision.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2204) that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Navy for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2204).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2205)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2205) that would modify the authority provided by section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of previously authorized construction projects.

The Senate bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2205).

The agreement includes this provision.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project (sec. 2206)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2206) that would modify the authority provided by section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2206).

The agreement includes this provision.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects (sec. 2207)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2207) that would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2207).

The agreement includes this provision.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2208)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2208) that would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$811.7 million for military construction and \$327.7 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes authorization of appropriations of \$846.2 million for military construction and \$327.7 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2015.

We recognize that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and note that the Air Force's military construction request for fiscal year 2015 is 30 percent less

than what was requested for fiscal year 2014. Therefore, the agreement includes authorization of \$34.4 million for a Corrosion Control and Composite Repair Shop at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, the Air Force's top unfunded military construction priority.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ADOPTED

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2301) that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Air Force for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2301).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2302)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2302) that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing of the Air Force for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2302).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2008 project (sec. 2303)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2303) that would modify the authority provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-81) and authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2303).

The agreement includes this provision.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2304)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2305) that would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2304).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2305)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2306) that would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2305).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would remove one of the projects that was to be extended.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION NOT ADOPTED

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2304) that would modify the authorization contained in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 992) to allow the Secretary of the Air Force to construct listed facilities at any suitable location in the Northern Mariana Islands.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Air Force is currently conducting an environmental impact study to "improve an existing airport or airports and associated infrastructure in the Mariana Islands in support of expanding mission requirements and to achieve divert capabilities in the western Pacific." If necessary, upon issuing a Record of Decision, we would welcome a legislative proposal from the Secretary of the Air Force to modify the scope or location for the project as currently authorized by section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66).

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$2.06 billion for military construction for the defense agencies, \$150.0 million for energy conservation projects, \$38.7 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and \$61.1 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes authorization of appropriations of \$1.96 billion for military construction, \$150.0 million for energy conservation projects, \$38.7 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and \$61.1 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2015.

The budget request included \$259.7 million for the Medical Center Replacement at Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany. We understand the Department of Defense would be unable to expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, the agreement includes a \$70.0 million reduction.

The budget request included \$9.0 million for Contingency Construction. In light of unobligated balances in the Contingency Construction account from previous years, the agreement includes a \$9.0 million reduction.

The budget request included \$24.4 million for Planning and Design. In light of unobligated balances in the Planning and Design account from previous years, the agreement includes a \$20.0 million reduction.

SUBTITLE A—DEFENSE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2401) that would authorize military construction projects for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2401).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2402) that would authorize energy conservation projects for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2402).

The agreement contains the House provision with an amendment that would make technical changes and strike subsection (c) titled "Limitation on Set-Aside of Facilities Restoration and Modernization Program Funds for Energy Projects."

We believe that facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization (SRM) projects funded by operation and maintenance accounts, including energy projects, should not be set aside and should compete equally when determining SRM priorities at military installations.

Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2403) that would authorize appropriations for the construction and family housing projects of the defense agencies for fiscal year 2015. This provision would also provide an overall limitation on the cost of the fiscal year 2015 military construction and family housing projects authorized for the defense agencies. The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2403).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects (sec. 2404)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2404) that would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2404).

The agreement includes this provision.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2405)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2405) that would extend authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2405).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Limitation on project authorization to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 projects pending submission of report (sec. 2406)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2406) that would restrict the obligation of funds for certain military construction projects to support the U.S. Special operations Command (USSOCOM) human performance initiative, until the Secretary of Defense submits a report on this program required by the Joint Explanatory Statement to Accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) and a report on the review of Department of Defense efforts regarding the prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents required elsewhere in this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment eliminating the condition that the Secretary submit the report required by the Joint Explanatory Statement to Accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) since the report has now been submitted to the congressional defense committees.

SUBTITLE B—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION AUTHORIZATIONS

Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide (sec. 2411)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2411) that would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for the chemical demilitarization program for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2411).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 project (sec. 2412)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2412) that would modify the authority pro-

vided by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-65), as amended.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a nearly identical provision (sec. 2412).

The agreement includes the House provision.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$199.7 million for military construction in fiscal year 2015 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

The agreement includes authorization of appropriations of \$174.7 million for military construction in fiscal year 2015 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

We understand that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program has expended prior year funds more slowly than anticipated and does not require the full requested amount for fiscal year 2015. Therefore, the agreement includes a \$25.0 million reduction.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ADOPTED

Authorization NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2501) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 2501).

The agreement includes this provision.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2502) that would authorize the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2502).

The agreement includes the House provision.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$426.5 million for military construction in fiscal year 2015 for facilities for the guard and reserve components.

The agreement includes authorization of appropriations of \$532.1 million for military construction in fiscal year 2015 for facilities for the guard and reserve components.

We recognize that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes that the Department's military construction request for the guard and reserve components for fiscal year 2015 is 38 percent less than what was requested for fiscal year 2014. Therefore, the agreement includes authorization of \$5.0 million for a Readiness Center in Alamogordo, New Mexico; \$19.0 million for Enlisted Barracks at Yakima, Washington; \$10.8 million for a Vehicle Maintenance Shop in Dagsboro, Delaware; \$13.2 million for a Consolidated Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility at Fort Smith Municipal

Airport, Arkansas; \$25.0 million for an Army Reserve Center in Riverside, California; \$26.0 million for an Army Reserve Center in Arlington Heights, Illinois; \$9.3 million for an Army Reserve Center in Starkville, Mississippi; \$47.9 million for a Joint Reserve Intelligence Center in Everett, Washington; and \$14.5 million for a Guardian Angel Operations Facility at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona. Each of these projects were identified as the top unfunded military construction priorities of the respective guard and reserve components.

SUBTITLE A—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2601) that would authorize military construction projects for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2601).

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2602) that would authorize military construction projects for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2602).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2603) that would authorize military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2603).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2604) that would authorize military construction projects for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2604).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2605) that would authorize military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2605).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2606) that would authorize appropriations for the reserve component military construction projects for fiscal year 2015. This provision would also provide an overall limitation on the cost of the fiscal year 2015 military construction projects authorized for the reserve components.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2606).

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2611)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2611) that would modify the authorization contained in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81) to allow the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of previously authorized construction projects and extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2611) that would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2612)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2612) that would modify the authority provided by section 2601 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-293) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project.

The Senate committee-reported bill included a similar provision (sec. 2612). A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3881) contained a provision that would modify the location for a previously authorized project from Tustin, California, to the vicinity of Tustin, California, as requested by the Army.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that incorporates Senate Amendment 3881.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project (sec. 2613)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3692) contained a provision that would modify the authorization for a Cyber/ISR facility at Martin State Airport, Maryland.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 projects (sec. 2614)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2613) that would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2613). A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3798) contained a provision that would extend an additional project at Fort Story, Virginia, until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later, as requested by the Army.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment incorporating Senate Amendment 3798.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested \$270.1 million for the ongoing cost of envi-

ronmental remediation and other activities necessary to continue implementation of the 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005 Base Realignment and Closure rounds.

The agreement includes the requested amount.

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account (sec. 2701)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2701) that would authorize appropriations for ongoing activities that are required for base realignment and closure activities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2701).

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE B—PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL BRAC ROUND

Prohibition on conducting additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round (sec. 2711)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2711) that would affirm congressional intent to reject the budget request to authorize another Base Realignment and Closure round in 2017.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2702).

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Modification of property disposal procedures under base realignment and closure process (sec. 2721)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2722) that would authorize the local government, in whose jurisdiction the military installation is wholly located, to be recognized as the local reuse authority for purposes of managing Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) reuse planning. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees as to excess BRAC property that has not been declared surplus by the Federal Government.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

HUBZones

The Senate committee-reported bill included a provision (sec. 2703) that would modify section 632 of title 15, United States Code, to expand the area around former military installations closed under the Base Realignment and Closure process that can be considered for purposes of satisfying employee residency requirements under the HUBZone program and would extend the period of applicability from 5 to 8 years.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Force-structure plans and infrastructure inventory and assessment of infrastructure necessary to support the force structure

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2721) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report as part of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in support of the President's budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 that details multiple 20-year force structure plans and a comprehensive inventory of

worldwide infrastructure. The report would also compare these two items to determine categories of excess in the Department of Defense infrastructure. The Secretary of Defense would also certify whether the need exists for the closure or realignment of additional military installations and whether the Secretary anticipates that each base closure and realignment recommendation would result in annual net savings for each of the military departments within 6 years after the initiation of the additional round of closures and realignments.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that a provision elsewhere in this Act makes clear that nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. We also note that the Department of Defense and Military Departments have provided testimony about the current estimates of excess infrastructure capacity associated with military installations. However, those estimates are based on outdated data from the analysis done in support of the 2005 BRAC round. The Department of Defense and military departments have also stated that overall force structure reductions may generate additional excess infrastructure capacity. However, we are aware that the military departments are implementing installation management methods that may serve to diminish excess infrastructure capacity.

Due to the force structure changes and infrastructure investments and management strategies that have occurred since the 2005 BRAC round, we believe that excess infrastructure capacity assessments should be based on current infrastructure data and informed by current force structure projections. We believe the Department of Defense has the authority to provide such an updated analysis but to date has not provided such an assessment.

Final settlement of claims regarding caretaker agreement for former Defense Depot Ogden, Utah

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2723) that would limit any further claim adjudication associated with a caretaker agreement between the City of Ogden, Utah, the Ogden Local Redevelopment Authority, and the Department of the Army. This limitation would be conditioned on a release of claims against the United States by the City of Ogden and the Ogden Local Redevelopment Authority.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Congressional notification of construction projects, land acquisitions, and defense access road projects conducted under authorities other than a Military Construction Authorization Act (sec. 2801)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2801) that would amend section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that certain military construction projects, land acquisitions, and defense-access roads projects must be specifically authorized in a Military Construction Authorization Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would instead modify section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Secretary concerned notify the congressional defense committees at least 15 days prior to the initiation of any construction, land acquisition, or defense-access road project by a military department, Defense Agency, or Department of Defense Field Activity on a military installation that will be carried out pursuant to a provision of law other than a Military Construction Authorization Act.

Modification of authority to carry out unspecified minor military construction (sec. 2802)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2802) that would modify section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, by increasing the threshold associated with operation and maintenance funding for minor military construction purposes from \$750,000 to \$1.0 million. This section would also unify the threshold for application of unspecified minor construction from \$2.0 million to \$3.0 million. Finally, this section would authorize the Secretary concerned to make adjustments to the general authority to match area cost factors.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2803) that would increase the maximum amount of unspecified minor military construction funding that can be used to correct facility deficiencies that threaten the life, safety, or health of personnel from \$3.0 million to \$4.0 million. The committee recommended an increase in this threshold to reflect its view that life, safety, and health deficiencies are at least equal to, if not more important than, laboratory revitalization for which the unspecified minor military construction threshold is \$4.0 million.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would remove the authorization to make adjustments to the general authority to match area cost factors and add the Senate provision increasing the threshold for projects designed to correct facility deficiencies that threaten the life, safety, or health of personnel.

Clarification of authorized use of payments-in-kind and in-kind contributions (sec. 2803)

The Senate committee-reported bill included a provision (sec. 2801) that would clarify the requirement of section 2687(a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 2807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), that military construction projects built with in-kind payments or in-kind contributions required by bilateral agreements be specifically authorized by law.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would make the provision effective beginning on the later of September 30, 2016, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017. The provision would also exempt military construction projects funded with payments-in-kind or in-kind contributions that were the subject of negotiation between the United States and a host country as of the date of enactment of this Act. Lastly, the provision would require, until the effective date, notification to the congressional defense committees at least 30 days prior to initiating any military construction project built for Department of Defense personnel outside the United States using payments-in-kind or in-kind contributions and make other conforming changes.

Use of one-step turn-key contractor selection procedures for additional facility projects (sec. 2804)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2803) that would modify section 2862 of title 10, United States Code, by expanding the existing authority to use turn-key selection procedures for military construction projects to include certain repair projects and facility construction associated with authorized security assistance activities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Limitations on military construction in European Command area of responsibility and European Reassurance Initiative (sec. 2805)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2804) that would extend the prohibition previously included in section 2809 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66) on awarding a contract for any new military construction and family housing project, with certain exceptions, in the U.S. European Command area of responsibility until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the installations and specific military construction requirements authorized in the Act have been examined as part of the ongoing European Infrastructure Consolidation Assessment, have been determined to be of an enduring nature, and most effectively meet military requirements at the authorized location.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2805).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that, for projects authorized in title XXIX of this Act to support the European Reassurance Initiative, would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a military construction project data sheet and certification that a pre-financing statement for eligible projects has been submitted through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program to the congressional defense committees prior to awarding a contract in connection with any such project.

Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2806)

The Senate committee-reported bill included a provision (sec. 2804) that would extend the contingency construction authority contained in section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108-136), as amended, for an additional year.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Application of residential building construction standards (sec. 2807)

The Senate committee-reported bill included a provision (sec. 2802) that would allow for residential buildings designed and constructed using funds authorized by this Act to meet an above code green building standard or rating system to use the ICC 700 National Green Building Standard, the LEED Green Building Standard System, or an equivalent protocol.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would further modify the list of above code green building

standard or rating systems that may be used by the Department of Defense (DOD).

We are concerned that the DOD may not be considering all appropriate voluntary consensus green building systems or standards, as defined in the Office of Management and Budget Circular Number A-119, and their associated certification systems, when performing the renovation or construction of residential buildings. We believe that DOD should consider all appropriate voluntary consensus green building systems or standards and, in doing so, should focus on energy savings and cost-efficiency, using a comprehensive approach that factors in all facets of a green building including costs for certification and overall compliance when determining which green building standard or rating system to use. DOD should also consider using third party verification to ensure design and construction meet the requirements for certification, and include user training and education to ensure the building is operated efficiently.

Limitation on construction of new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 2808)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 2806) that would limit funding authorized by the bill for new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that any new construction of facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, have enduring military value independent of a high-value detention mission.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

We note that the Department of Defense has previously determined that all new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, authorized by this Act have enduring military value independent of a high-value detention mission.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Renewals, extensions, and succeeding leases for financial institutions operating on military installations (sec. 2811)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2812) that would authorize the Secretary concerned to enter into a sole source renewal, extension, or succeeding lease for a financial institution operating on a military installation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2812).

The agreement includes the House provision.

Deposit of reimbursed funds to cover administrative expenses relating to certain real property transactions (sec. 2812)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2814) that would amend section 2695 of title 10, United States Code, and would provide flexibility to ensure that reimbursements eventually received by the military departments are not expired at the time of reimbursement. This section would provide for the merger of the reimbursed funds with those in the current appropriation, fund, or account used by the military departments for payment of administrative transaction-related expenses. Finally, this section would authorize the military departments to use operation and maintenance appropriations to pay for administrative expenses needed to complete other real property transactions.

The Senate committee-reported bill included a similar provision (sec. 2811).

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATED TO ASIA-PACIFIC MILITARY REALIGNMENT

Realignment of Marine Corps forces in Asia-Pacific region (sec. 2821)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2831) that would amend section 2822 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66) and strike certain restrictions limiting the movement of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam.

The Senate bill contained a related provision (sec. 2821) that would extend the prohibition on funds for construction activities to implement the realignment of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam until certain conditions are met.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would remove the prohibition on construction activities to implement the realignment of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam and replace it with an overall cost cap on such construction, reflecting the July 2014 Master Plan for Guam, subject to inflation and changes in costs to comply with changes in law. The provision would also continue restrictions on the development of public infrastructure on Guam unless a grant, transfer, cooperative agreement, or supplemental funding for the development of public infrastructure is specifically authorized by law and would be used to carry out a project included in the report of the Economic Adjustment Committee required by section 2831(d) of the National Defense Authorization act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

Establishment of surface danger zone, Ritidian Unit, Guam National Wildlife Refuge (sec. 2822)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2832) that would allow the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the establishment and operation of a surface danger zone in the Ritidian Unit, Guam, to accommodate a live-fire training range on Andersen Air Force Base-Northwest Field and provide for the management of the adjacent Guam National Wildlife Refuge property.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Land conveyance, Gordo Army Reserve Center, Gordo, Alabama (sec. 2831)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3908) contained a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, approximately 3.79 acres in Gordo, Alabama, for the purpose of permitting the Town to use the parcel for municipal government purposes.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Land conveyance, West Nome Tank Farm, Nome, Alaska (sec. 2832)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3889) contained a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, approximately 7 acres known as the West Nome Tank Farm in Nome, Alaska, for municipal purposes.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Land conveyance, former Air Force Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point, Norwalk, California (sec. 2833)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2849) that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, approximately 15 acres to the City of Norwalk, California, from the former Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point for public purposes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Transfer of administrative jurisdiction and alternative land conveyance authority, former Walter Reed Army Hospital, District of Columbia (sec. 2834)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2842) that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, Army property at the former Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Children's National Medical Center for medical research purposes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement contains the House provision with an amendment that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Army property at the former Walter Reed Army Medical Center to the Department of State. Furthermore, should the authorized conveyance to the Department of State not occur, the amendment would allow the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, certain property to an authorized recipient for the purpose of permitting the recipient to use the property for the protection of public health, including research.

We note that the Army and Department of State have been pursuing an interagency transfer of property and facilities at the former Walter Reed Army Medical Center since April 2006 and we encourage both agencies to work together to conclude negotiations expeditiously. If the Army pursues the alternative conveyance authority provided by this section, we believe such a conveyance should be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the disposal process of real property for public health, including research, as found in section 550 of title 40, United States Code.

Land conveyance, former Lynn Haven fuel depot, Lynn Haven, Florida (sec. 2835)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3842) contained a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey approximately 144 acres at the former Lynn Haven Fuel Depot in Bay County, Florida, for fair market value.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

Transfers of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Frank D. Merrill and Lake Lanier, Georgia (sec. 2836)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2843) that would require the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange lands located Camp Frank D. Merrill in Dahlonga, Georgia, currently under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, for certain lands adjacent to Lake Lanier, Georgia, currently under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2833).

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Land conveyance, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii (sec. 2837)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2844) that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, to the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation certain properties for public purposes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2831).

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Modification of conditions on land conveyance, Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois (sec. 2838)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2845) that would make technical corrections to a conveyance originally authorized by section 2922(c)(2) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104-106).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Gruber, Oklahoma (sec. 2839)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2847) that would require the Secretary of the Army to perform a business case analysis to assess the requirements associated with reacquiring the former Camp Gruber, Oklahoma. If the Secretary determined that a reversion of the former Camp Gruber is needed for national defense purposes, the Secretary would exercise the reversionary rights and request the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife to reconvey Camp Gruber to the United States. The Secretary would then convey, without consideration, the former Camp Gruber to the Oklahoma Military Department for military maneuver space.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2834) that would provide for the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of property at Camp Gruber, Oklahoma, to the Department of the Army for the purpose of military training if the Secretary of the Army determines that such property is needed for national defense purposes.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Conveyance, Joint Base Charleston, South Carolina (sec. 2840)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3942) contained a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey approximately 53 acres at Joint Base Charleston, South Carolina, to the City of Hanahan for the purpose of accommodating the City's recreation needs.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Land exchanges, Arlington County, Virginia (sec. 2841)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 2832) that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to exchange real property with Arlington County, Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Virginia, for purposes of expanding the contiguous land available to Arlington National Cemetery.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment.

We believe that any use of land exchanged by the Army with Arlington County, Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Virginia should be compatible with a location immediately adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery, one of our Nation's most sacred shrines.

SUBTITLE E—MILITARY MEMORIALS,
MONUMENTS, AND MUSEUMS

Acceptance of in-kind gifts on behalf of Heritage Center for the National Museum of the United States Army (sec. 2851)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3915) contained a provision that would amend section 4772 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accept funds and in-kind gifts, including services, construction materials, and equipment used in construction, for the Heritage Center for the National Museum of the United States Army from the Army Historical Foundation and industry donors. The provision would also remove the \$250,000 limit on the value of gifts that may be accepted by the Commander of the United States Army Center of Military History.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that would retain the \$250,000 limit on the value of gifts that may be accepted by the Commander of the United States Army Center of Military History. We note that the Secretary of the Army has authority to accept gifts of a value greater than \$250,000.

Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial, San Diego, California (sec. 2852)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2841) that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, certain Department of the Navy property to the Mount Soledad Veterans Memorial Association in San Diego, California, for public purposes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to convey the Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial in San Diego, California, to the Mount Soledad Veterans Memorial Association for consideration that reasonably reflects the price paid by the United States to purchase the Memorial pursuant to Public Law 109-272, the condition that the property be accepted "as is", the condition that the Memorial be used and maintained as a veterans memorial in perpetuity, and other factors. The provision would also provide for the United States, at its election, to exercise reversionary rights to the Memorial if the Secretary of Defense determines that it is ever put to a use other than as a veterans memorial. Exercise of any reversionary rights would be temporary and solely for the purpose of conveying, as expeditiously as practicable, the Memorial to another entity subject to the same conditions in this provision.

Establishment of memorial to the victims of the shooting at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013 (sec. 2853)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2861) that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a memorial at the Washington Navy Yard in the District of Columbia dedicated to the victims of the shooting attack that occurred on September 16, 2013.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 2841).

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Prior to establishment of the memorial authorized under this section, we direct the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees detailing, at a minimum, the design, specific location, and funding dedicated to the construction and long-term maintenance of the memorial.

SUBTITLE F—DESIGNATIONS

Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (sec. 2861)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2862) that would redesignate the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies at Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies", and make other conforming changes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Report on physical security at Department of Defense facilities (sec. 2871)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3569) contained a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a summary of the actions taken by the Department of Defense to respond to the recommendations resulting from the reviews of security standards following the November 2009 shootings at Fort Hood, Texas, and the September 2013 shootings at the Washington Navy Yard, District of Columbia.

The House bill included no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Report on prevalence of black mold in buildings located on military installations

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2805) that would require the Secretary of Defense to report on the prevalence of black mold in buildings located on military installations and add affected buildings to the appropriate branch's construction priority list for building replacement or renovation.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that indoor exposure to mold can cause a variety of negative health impacts, including allergic reactions. We encourage the Department of Defense and the military departments to continue taking cost-effective, timely, and appropriate actions to prevent the formation of, and remediate reported cases of, indoor mold in facilities located on military installations.

Consultation requirement in connection with Department of Defense major land acquisitions

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2811) that would require consultation by the Secretary concerned with the chief executive officer of the state or territory as to the location of any proposed major land acquisition.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Arsenal installation reutilization authority

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2813) that would modify section 2667 of title

10, United States Code, to provide authorities to lease real or personal property contained in such section to the commander of military manufacturing arsenals or, if part of a larger military installation, the installation commander for the purposes of leveraging private investment at military manufacturing arsenals through long-term facility use contracts, property management contracts, leases or other such agreements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Special easement acquisition authority, Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2815) that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to use the authorities provided by sections 2664 and 2684(a) of title 10, United States Code, to acquire from willing sellers easements and other interests in real property in the vicinity of the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Kauai, Hawaii.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Department of Defense and the military departments have authorities under sections 2664 and 2684(a) of title 10, United States Code, to enter into agreements with or acquire from willing sellers easements and other interests in real property in the vicinity of military installations and range facilities. In instances where a military installation or range facility is subject to encroachment or other restrictions that may directly or indirectly restrict, impede, or otherwise interfere with current or anticipated military training, testing, or operations, we believe the Department of Defense and military departments should consider the authorities of sections 2664 and 2684(a) of title 10, United States Code, as a possible means to alleviate adverse impacts to military missions.

Sense of Congress on national security and public lands

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2817) that would express the sense of Congress that national defense should be the top priority for all aspects of the Federal Government, and that national security functions, such as military training and exercises, should be the top priority, particularly with regard to the use of land owned by the United States.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

The Department of Defense regularly uses federal land owned by the U.S. Government for military training, including to prepare U.S. forces deploying overseas for the terrain and climate they will encounter, as well as for testing of new military technologies. We note that such access to U.S. federal lands facilitates military preparedness and advances the technological edge of our forces. Therefore, we believe such activities should be given priority consideration with regard to the use of land owned by the United States.

Indemnification of transferees of property at military installations closed since October 24, 1988, that remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2819) that would provide additional liability protections to former military installations

closed outside of the Base Realignment and Closure process.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Land conveyance, Robert H. Dietz Army Reserve Center, Kingston, New York

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2846) that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the City of Kingston, New York, certain properties for public purposes.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Redesignation of Pohakuloa Training Area in Hawaii as the Pohakuloa Training Center

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2863) that would change the designation of the Pohakuloa Training Area in Hawaii to the Pohakuloa Training Center.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not contain this provision.

Additional withdrawal and reservation of public land to support White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2941) that would amend section 2951 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66) and extend the withdrawal and reservation of public land at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, to include Federal lands located beneath the boundaries of the Special Use Airspace designated as R-5107C and R-5107H.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that on June 4, 2014, the Secretary of Defense proposed mitigation measures that, if adopted, are intended to address the Department of Defense's (DOD) concerns with potential impacts to military operations by the SunZia Southwest Transmission project (SunZia). Most notably, the Secretary proposed the burial of a total of approximately five miles, in up to three separate segments, of the SunZia project transmission line along the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) preferred alternative route (PAR) north of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), within an area known as the Northern Extension Area (NEA). We further note that the Secretary's proposed mitigation plan was accepted by SunZia on July 27, 2014, and is now being reviewed by BLM in the context of an Environmental Assessment that we anticipate will be completed in February 2015.

As we noted in the Joint Explanatory Statement to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), we expressed our expectation that DOD concerns would be addressed by the executive branch prior to the conclusion of the environmental review process to preserve the critical testing and training capabilities of WSMR. We continue to have concerns about the impact the SunZia project may have on these capabilities. We are specifically concerned that the mitigation measures proposed by the Secretary of Defense are intended to address existing and expected test profiles, but may not be sufficient to provide for future training and testing requirements at WSMR.

Therefore, we direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional

defense committees, concurrent with the completion of the BLM Environmental Assessment, that assesses the potential impact of the SunZia project on the future training and testing capabilities of WSMR to respond to potential future threats. The report shall include, at a minimum, an explanation of the Secretary's proposed mitigation plan, including:

(1) How the proposed mitigation plan addresses concerns identified in the "Technical Working Group Report for the SunZia Transmission Line Project" dated August 7, 2013, including the following specific excerpts:

(a) Line Burial—"The distance required for line burial is 35 miles. This is the minimum distance necessary to prevent impairment of the Nation's unique capabilities to test DOD weapon systems in this location."

(b) Electromagnetic Interference (EMI)—"Introduction of the 500 kV overhead transmission lines in the NEA would raise the background noise level and create a heat signature that would be detected during infrared (IR) sensor testing. At present, there is very limited EMI interference within the NEA."

(c) Test mission profiles—"The above-ground construction and introduction of the SunZia transmission line along the FEIS [Final Environmental Impact Statement] PAR places an obstruction in the path of low-level flyers, thus jeopardizing the effective conduct of testing. Targets flying critical low-level profiles would have to "pop up" from those flight levels to avoid transmission lines. The FAA [Federal Aviation Administration] requires a 500 foot buffer above structures for safety considerations. Such a "pop up" would prematurely provide identification and targeting and thus disrupt and invalidate the test mission profile because of the change in the observed background clutter."

(d) Multiple Simultaneous Engagement (MSE) of Aerial Targets—"The most stressing and complex test missions involve MSE of aerial targets in a single presentation. This requirement alone mandates the 35-mile underground installation of the transmission line to ensure that incoming targets are in the proper alignment to the background clutter for a realistic presentation."

(2) How the SunZia project and proposed mitigation plan could impact future training and testing events at WSMR;

(3) An identification of any additional mitigation measures that may be necessary in the future to protect the unique capabilities of WSMR should new training or testing requirements arise; and

(4) An assessment by the Secretary of the DOD Clearinghouse process as it relates to the SunZia project, including:

(a) The extent to which the DOD Clearinghouse identified and communicated potential negative impacts of the SunZia project to WSMR in a timely manner; and

(b) Any legislative or policy changes the Secretary would recommend to improve the ability of DOD Clearinghouse to advocate for and protect DOD equities.

(5) Any other matters the Secretary deems appropriate.

We note that the report required above is not intended to, in any way, delay the completion of the BLM Environmental Assessment associated with the SunZia Southwest Transmission project.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$220.4 mil-

lion for military construction for Overseas Contingency Operations for fiscal year 2015.

The agreement includes the requested amount.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition project (sec. 2901)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a provision that would authorize up to \$163.0 million of amounts authorized for the European Reassurance Initiative to be used for military construction, subject to several restrictions.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would specifically authorize military construction projects for the Army in support of the European Reassurance Initiative.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2902)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a provision that would authorize up to \$163.0 million of amounts authorized for the European Reassurance Initiative to be used for military construction, subject to several restrictions.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would specifically authorize military construction projects for the Air Force in support of the European Reassurance Initiative.

Authorized Defense Agency construction and land acquisition project (sec. 2903)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a provision that would authorize a military construction project for the National Security Agency for Overseas Contingency Operations for fiscal year 2015.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 2904)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3875) contained a provision that would authorize appropriations for military construction for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for Overseas Contingency Operations for fiscal year 2015.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical amendment.

TITLE XXX—NATURAL RESOURCES RELATED GENERAL PROVISIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ADOPTED

Summary

The House bill contained the following provisions:

Sec. 1091. Short title.

Sec. 1092. Designation of National World War I Museum and Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri.

Sec. 1093. Redesignation of Pershing Park in the District of Columbia as the National World War I Memorial and enhancement of commemorative work.

Sec. 1094. Additional amendments to World War I Centennial Commission Act.

Sec. 2848. Land conveyance, Hanford Site, Washington.

Sec. 2866. Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

Sec. 2867. Ensuring public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument.

Sec. 2901. Transfer of Administrative jurisdiction, Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada.

Sec. 2902. Water Rights.

Sec. 2903. Withdrawal.

Sec. 2931. Withdrawal and reservation of public land for Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California.

Proposed amendments to the Senate committee-reported bill contained the following provisions:

Amendment number 3393. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Baraboo, WI.

Amendment number 3902. Land conveyance, Wainwright, Alaska.

The agreement includes the following provisions:

Sec. 3001. Land conveyance, Wainwright, Alaska.

Sec. 3002. Sealaska land entitlement finalization.

Sec. 3003. Southeast Arizona land exchange and conservation.

Sec. 3004. Land exchange, Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, Arizona, and Bureau of Land Management land in Riverside County, California.

Sec. 3005. Special rules for Inyo National Forest, California, land exchange.

Sec. 3006. Land exchange, Trinity Public Utilities District, Trinity County, California, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service.

Sec. 3007. Idaho County, Idaho, shooting range land conveyance.

Sec. 3008. School District 318, Minnesota, land exchange.

Sec. 3009. Northern Nevada land conveyances.

Sec. 3010. San Juan County, New Mexico, Federal land conveyance.

Sec. 3011. Land conveyance, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Utah.

Sec. 3012. Conveyance of certain land to the city of Fruit Heights, Utah.

Sec. 3013. Land conveyance, Hanford Site, Washington.

Sec. 3014. Ranch A Wyoming consolidation and management improvement.

Sec. 3021. Bureau of Land Management permit processing.

Sec. 3022. Internet-based onshore oil and gas lease sales.

Sec. 3023. Grazing permits and leases.

Sec. 3024. Cabin user and transfer fees.

Sec. 3030. Addition of Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light to the Apostle Islands National Seashore.

Sec. 3031. Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park.

Sec. 3032. Coltsville National Historical Park.

Sec. 3033. First State National Historical Park.

Sec. 3034. Gettysburg National Military Park.

Sec. 3035. Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park, Maryland.

Sec. 3036. Harriet Tubman National Historical Park, Auburn, New York.

Sec. 3037. Hinchliffe Stadium addition to Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park.

Sec. 3038. Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site.

Sec. 3039. Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

Sec. 3040. North Cascades National Park and Stephen Mather Wilderness.

Sec. 3041. Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve.

Sec. 3042. San Antonio Missions National Historical Park.

Sec. 3043. Valles Caldera National Preserve, New Mexico.

Sec. 3044. Vicksburg National Military Park.

Sec. 3050. Revolutionary War and War of 1812 American battlefield protection program.

Sec. 3051. Special resource studies.

Sec. 3052. National heritage areas and corridors.

Sec. 3053. National historic site support facility improvements.

Sec. 3054. National Park System donor acknowledgment.

Sec. 3055. Coin to commemorate 100th anniversary of the National Park Service.

Sec. 3056. Commission to study the potential creation of a National Women's History Museum.

Sec. 3057. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Sec. 3060. Alpine Lakes Wilderness additions and Pratt and Middle Fork Snoqualmie Rivers protection.

Sec. 3061. Columbine-Hondo Wilderness.

Sec. 3062. Hermosa Creek watershed protection.

Sec. 3063. North Fork Federal lands withdrawal area.

Sec. 3064. Pine Forest Range Wilderness.

Sec. 3065. Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area and wilderness additions.

Sec. 3066. Wovoka Wilderness.

Sec. 3067. Withdrawal area related to Wovoka Wilderness.

Sec. 3068. Withdrawal and reservation of additional public land for Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California.

Sec. 3071. Illabot Creek, Washington, wild and scenic river.

Sec. 3072. Missisquoi and Trout wild and scenic rivers, Vermont.

Sec. 3073. White Clay Creek wild and scenic river expansion.

Sec. 3074. Studies of wild and scenic rivers.

Sec. 3077. Land taken into trust for benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

Sec. 3078. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Baraboo, Wisconsin.

Sec. 3081. Ensuring public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument.

Sec. 3082. Anchorage, Alaska, conveyance of reversionary interests.

Sec. 3083. Release of property interests in Bureau of Land Management land conveyed to the State of Oregon for establishment of Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center.

Sec. 3087. Bureau of Reclamation hydro-power development.

Sec. 3088. Toledo Bend Hydroelectric Project.

Sec. 3089. East Bench Irrigation District contract extension.

Sec. 3091. Commemoration of centennial of World War I.

Sec. 3092. Miscellaneous issues related to Las Vegas valley public land and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.

Sec. 3093. National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial.

Sec. 3094. Extension of legislative authority for establishment of commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams.

Sec. 3095. Refinancing of Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction loan.

Sec. 3096. Payments in lieu of taxes.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

National security considerations for inclusion of Federal property on National Register of Historic Places or designation as National Historic Landmark under the National Historic Preservation Act

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2816) that would prohibit the designation of Federal property as a National Historic Landmark or for nomination to the World Heritage List if the head of the agency managing the Federal property objects to such inclusion or designation for reasons of national security. This section would also authorize the expedited removal of Federal property listed on the National Register of Historic Places if the managing agency of that Federal property submits a request to the Secretary of the Interior for such removal for reasons of national security.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Designation of Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial in Riverside, California

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2864) that would authorize the designation of a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Renaming site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2865) that would modify the name of the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers Aviation Center, Dayton, Ohio, to the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers National Museum, Dayton, Ohio.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Redesignation of Johnson Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area, California

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2911) that would rename the Johnson Valley Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area in California as the Johnson Valley National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Elimination of termination date for public land withdrawals and reservations under Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 2921) that would extend the public lands withdrawn for military purposes listed in the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title 30 of Public Law 106-65) until the secretary of the military department concerned determines a military purpose does not exist, or the Secretary of the Interior permanently transfers the administrative jurisdiction to the secretary of the military department concerned.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZA-
TIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Overview

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2015, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons activities; nuclear nonproliferation activities; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental cleanup and other operating expenses. This title authorizes appropriations in five categories: (1) National Nuclear Security Administration; (2) Defense environmental cleanup; (3) Other defense activities; (4) Defense nuclear waste disposal; and (5) Energy security and assurance.

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
AUTHORIZATIONS

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 3101) that would authorize appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2015, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and Federal Salaries and Expenses (formerly known as the Office of the Administrator), at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act. This section would also authorize several new plant projects for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The House reported bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3102) that would authorize appropriations for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2015, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act. This section would also authorize several new plant projects for defense environmental cleanup.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 3102).

The agreement includes this provision.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3103) that would authorize appropriations for other defense activities for fiscal year 2015, including funds for Health, Safety, and Security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy, as identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 3103).

The agreement includes this provision.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS,
RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Design and use of prototypes of nuclear weapons for intelligence purposes (sec. 3111)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3111) that would update section 3115 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) to provide for the design and use of prototypes of nuclear weapons to further intelligence estimates with respect to foreign nuclear weapons activities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would permit

the Secretary of Energy to submit his views of the programmatic plan for such activities as developed by the National Nuclear Security Administration laboratories.

Plutonium pit production capacity (sec. 3112)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3112) that would add a new section to title 42 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521) to require the Secretary of Energy to ensure that the nuclear security enterprise produces at least 30 war reserve pits during 2023, at least 50 war reserve pits during 2026, and, during a pilot period of at least 90 days during 2027, demonstrates the capability to produce war reserve pits at a rate sufficient to produce 80 pits per year. The Secretary of Energy would be required to certify to the congressional defense committees and the Secretary of Defense, by March 1 of each year until 2027, that the programs and budget of the Department of Energy will meet these pit production milestones.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that, in addition to striking the findings, would require initial production of qualification pits in 2021, production of not less than 10 war reserve pits during 2024, production of not less than 20 war reserve pits during 2025, production of not less than 30 war reserve pits during 2026, and a pilot production period during 2027 that demonstrates the capability to produce 80 pits per year. The agreement provides the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense the authority to delay the requirement for the pilot demonstration in 2027 no more than two years to 2029. If the Secretaries jointly delay the pilot demonstration, they must submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the justification for the proposed delay, the impacts of the proposed delay on stockpile stewardship, nuclear modernization, life extension programs, future stockpile strategy, and dismantlement efforts, as well as their assessment regarding whether the delay is consistent with national policy regarding creation of a responsive nuclear infrastructure. The Commander, U.S. Strategic Command would also be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the potential risks of the proposed delay in meeting nuclear deterrence requirements and national requirements related to creation of a responsive nuclear infrastructure.

Life-cycle cost estimates of certain atomic energy defense capital assets (sec. 3113)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 3111) that would amend the Atomic Energy Defense Act to require that, under Department of Energy Order 413.3, an independent life-cycle cost estimate is conducted prior to certain atomic energy defense capital asset projects that have achieved critical decision 2 in the acquisition process. The provision clarifies that this requirement applies only to atomic energy defense capital assets where the total project cost exceeds \$100.0 million and where the purpose of the capital asset is to perform a limited-life, single-purpose mission.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes Senate provision. We note that this requirement applies only to single-purpose, limited-life facilities such as the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility in South Carolina and the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant in Washington. It is not intended to be applied to multi-mission, long-life facilities such as the Uranium

Capabilities Replacement Project in Tennessee or the replacement facilities for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research facility in New Mexico. We believe this provision will help reduce the likelihood of large and unexpected increases in life-cycle cost estimates late in the acquisition process for these types of facilities.

Expansion of requirement for independent cost estimates on life extension programs and new nuclear facilities (sec. 3114)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 3112) that would require independent cost estimates earlier in the acquisition process for life extension programs and new nuclear facilities.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require an independent cost review at the completion of phase 6.2.

We believe that, in the early stages of concept definition, there are often many options still under consideration and it would not be cost effective to perform a full independent cost estimate for each option. A less formal independent cost review at phase 6.2 has been determined to give sufficient cost guidance to determine which options should proceed further in the acquisition process.

Definition of baseline and threshold for stockpile life extension project (sec. 3115)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3114) that would amend section 4713 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2753) to clarify that the cost and schedule baseline of a nuclear stockpile life extension project established pursuant to such section shall be the cost and schedule contained in the weapon design and cost report that was required prior to the project entering into the development engineering phase. This section would also lower the threshold for congressional notification on costs per warhead exceeding the baseline from 200 percent to 150 percent.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would clarify that the cost and schedule baseline for a stockpile life extension project would be the cost and schedule described in the first Selected Acquisition Report submitted under section 4217(a) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2537(a)).

Authorized personnel levels of National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3116)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3114) that would amend section 3241A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a) to require that, by October 1, 2015, the total number of employees within the Office of the Administrator may not exceed 1,650.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would limit the number of employees to 1,690.

Cost estimation and program evaluation by National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3117)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3131) that would amend section 3221(h) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2411) to clarify that the term "Administration," with respect to any authority, duty, or responsibility provided by section 3211, does not include the Office of Naval Reactors.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Cost containment for Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project (sec. 3118)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3113) that would amend section 3123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), as amended by section 3126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-966), to clarify that the Secretary of Energy may adjust the statutory cost cap of \$4.2 billion for Phase I of the Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project (UCRP) if, by March 15, 2015, the Secretary of Energy submits to the congressional defense committees a detailed justification for such adjustment.

This provision would also require the Secretary of Energy to certify to the congressional defense committees and the Secretary of Defense by March 1 of each year through 2025, that Phase I of the UCRP will meet the cost cap of \$4.2 billion (as adjusted) and that the UCRP will enable uranium operations in building 9212 of the Y-12 National Security Complex to cease by 2025, while uranium operations begin in a new facility constructed under the UCRP by 2025.

The provision would further require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Navy to jointly submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, on implementation of section 3123(e) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), as amended.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 3113) that would require, before beginning construction of the replacement for building 9212, the technologies (or their substitutes) that are to go into the replacement building have a technology readiness level of at least seven. Technologies (or their substitutes) that were in building 9212 that do not go into the replacement building are also to have a technology readiness level of at least seven.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that combines the two provisions while striking the sense of Congress in the House provision.

Production of nuclear warhead for long-range standoff weapon (sec. 3119)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3116) that would require the Secretary of Energy to deliver a first production unit for a nuclear warhead for the long-range standoff weapon not later than September 30, 2025. This provision would also require the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to jointly develop a plan to carry out this mandate and require the Secretaries to submit this plan to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would provide the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, the ability to defer the first production unit date by up to 1 year if the Commander certifies to the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council and the congressional defense committees that the delay is in the interest of national security and does not negatively affect the ability of the Commander to meet nuclear assurance and deterrence requirements.

Disposition of weapons-usable plutonium (sec. 3120)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3117) that would require the Secretary of Energy to specifically carry out construction and program support activities with fiscal year 2015 funds authorized for the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility (MFFF). For construction and program support activities. Program support activities are defined as those activities in support of the design, long-lead equipment, procurement, and site preparation for the MFFF.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would clarify project support activities.

Limitation on availability of funds for Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security (sec. 3121)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3118) that would limit the availability of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Office of the Administrator to not more than 75 percent of the above until several statutorily required reports are submitted to certain congressional committees in 2015. These include:

- (1) The report on stockpile assessments required under section 4205(f)(2) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2525(f)(2));
- (2) The Secretary of Energy's portion of the report required by section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81);
- (3) The annual assessment required under section 3122 of Public Law 112-81; and (4) The detailed report on the stockpile stewardship, management, and infrastructure plan required by section 4203(b) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523(b)).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Limitation on availability of funds for non-proliferation activities between the United States and the Russian Federation (sec. 3122)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3120) that would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2015 funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) for any contact, cooperation, or transfer of technology between the United States and the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the Russian Federation is respecting the sovereignty of Ukrainian territory, is no longer acting inconsistently with the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and is in compliance with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that unless specifically authorized by Congress, International Material Protection, Control and Accounting activities in the Russian Federation, except those associated with the Plutonium Management and Disposition agreement, shall be completed no later than fiscal year 2018. In addition, the amendment prohibits any fiscal year 2015 funding for the transfer of Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System technology from the United States to the Russian Federation.

We note that the Material Protection, Control and Accounting activities in the Russian Federation has secured nuclear material facilities in Russia since the breakup of the Soviet Union. Assisting Russia in securing nuclear materials has been in the national security interests of the United States. However, given that that the majority of work has been completed at facilities over the past 20 years, we believe that physical work on this program should be completed no later than fiscal year 2018. We understand that this is also the target timeframe for completion set by the NNSA. This does not rule out continued exchange of best practices in physical security in such areas as insider threat, developments in security technology, as well as other appropriate compensatory measures or other areas of mutual benefit in securing nuclear material. If areas of concern emerge that require additional physical security work in Russia after fiscal year 2018, and that work is of benefit to the security interests of the United States, it can be part of an annual budget request which can be reviewed by the congressional defense committees. We understand that Rosatom is evaluating the ongoing work with the NNSA and expects to be promptly informed of any change in status of the relationship between Rosatom and the NNSA.

We believe that the NNSA should not be providing Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System (MILES) technology. We understand MILES technology is a tactical force-on-force trainer employed by the U.S. military and believe it is inappropriate to be providing military-grade technology to the Russian Federation at a time when Russia has exercised aggressive actions towards U.S. partners and allies.

Identification of amounts required for uranium technology sustainment in budget materials for fiscal year 2016 (sec. 3123)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 3116) that would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to include in the fiscal year 2016 budget request a uranium sustainment budget line for technology development past technology readiness level five so that plant-directed research and development (R&D) at facilities such as Y-12 can concentrate on projects involving technology readiness level four and below.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

SUBTITLE C—PLANS AND REPORTS
Analysis and report on W88 Alt 370 program high explosives options (sec. 3131)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3132) that would require the Secretary of the Navy, the Administrator for Nuclear Security, and the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council to submit a joint report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the W88 Alt 370 nuclear warhead program. The report would be required to contain analysis of the costs, benefits, risks, and feasibility of both including and not including a refresh of the conventional high explosives of the W88 warhead as part of the W88 Alt 370 program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Analysis of existing facilities and sense of Congress with respect to plutonium strategy (sec. 3132)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3133) that would require the Administrator

for Nuclear Security to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act containing an analysis of using or modifying existing facilities across the nuclear security enterprise to support the plutonium strategy of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Administrator to include, as part of the Administrator's planned analysis of alternatives for Critical Decision 1 of the plutonium strategy, an analysis of using or modifying existing facilities of the nuclear security enterprise. The Administrator would be required to submit the analysis to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of completing it. The amendment would also add a sense of Congress regarding the commitments made by the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council on July 25, 2014, regarding a strategy to carry out a modular building strategy for plutonium capabilities.

Plan for verification and monitoring of proliferation of nuclear weapons and fissile material (sec. 3133)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3134) that would require the President, in consultation with the Secretaries of State, Homeland Security and Energy as well as the Director of National Intelligence, to develop an interagency plan for verification and monitoring related to the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons, components of such weapons and fissile material. Such plan would be due to the appropriate congressional committees no later than September 1, 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Comments of Administrator for Nuclear Security and Chairman of Nuclear Weapons Council on final report of Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 3134)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 3115) that would require the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to respond within 90 days to the findings of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise, created in section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112-239), which shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would also require separate comments on the advisory panel's report from the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council. The amendment would also clarify that comments are required only on the advisory panel's final report and that such comments are due 90 days after enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Establishment of Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health; Extension of Authority of Office of Ombudsman for Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program (sec. 3141)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 1090D) that would state a sense of Congress that the President should establish a federal advisory board for part E of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 3114) that would create an advisory board reporting to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Program on toxic substances and worker health.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would ensure the advisory board functions only in an advisory capacity pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. 2(b)(6)). The amendment also includes modifications to ensure the advisory board's members, staff, and contractors do not have a conflict of interest and permits the Secretary of Labor to employ outside contractors to support the work of the board. The amendment would also clarify that the advisory board provides advice to the Secretary of Labor instead of the President and that the appointments to the board should reflect a balance of perspectives from the scientific, medical, and claimant communities.

We note that "claimant communities" should be interpreted to include a mixture of the legal, worker, worker families, worker advocate, and other relevant communities as the President determines appropriate. The amendment would also extend the authority for the Office of the Ombudsman in the Department of Labor to 2019.

We further note that the Secretary shall ensure the Board is provided the necessary support for the Board to perform its functions, including program review and audit functions as appropriate, and that the Department of Labor will consult the Board regarding the need for and selection of outside technical support, experts and contractors, consistent with the process and support used by the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker found in section 7384o of title 42, United States Code, and consistent with federal acquisition laws.

Technical corrections to Atomic Energy Defense Act (sec. 3142)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3141) that would make technical corrections to the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment making additional technical corrections.

Technical corrections to National Nuclear Security Administration Act (sec. 3143)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3142) that would make technical corrections to section 3220 (50 U.S.C. 2410) and section 3236 (50 U.S.C. 2426) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Technology Commercialization Fund (sec. 3144)

A proposed amendment to the Senate committee-reported bill (amendment number 3510) contained a provision that would amend section 1001(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391(e)) by inserting after "fiscal year" the phrase "based on future planned activities and the amount of the appropriations for the fiscal year."

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Additional limitation on availability of funds for Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3119) that would limit the availability of

funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Office of the Administrator to not more than 90 percent until the date on which the Administrator for Nuclear Security submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the efficiencies proposed by the 2012 Joint Department of Energy/Department of Defense Study on Potential NNSA Management and Work Force Prioritization Efficiencies.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We believe NNSA and the Department of Energy must undertake robust and continuing efforts to find cost savings and cost avoidances that enable NNSA to work more efficiently and effectively. In the Conference Report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (House Report 112-706), we expressed concern that the rise to unprecedented levels of the cost of major stockpile and infrastructure modernization projects leading to slippages in project schedules could undermine the credibility of the nation's nuclear deterrent. We also noted that administrative costs and bureaucracy within the NNSA and the nuclear security enterprise must be reduced and the enterprise must be refocused on accomplishing its mission effectively and efficiently, as well as safely and securely. We remain concerned about these longstanding challenges.

In the context of these concerns, we appreciate the letter of November 4, 2014 from the NNSA Administrator to the House Armed Services Committee, committing to continue efforts to make the nuclear enterprise more efficient. We believe this process to seek efficiencies and productivity gains, proposed by the Administrator in this letter, to be a small but hopeful step in the right direction. We therefore endorse this proposal and direct the Administrator for Nuclear Security, consistent with his commitment, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2015, on the actions, initiatives, and pilot programs the Administrator will undertake in the remainder of fiscal year 2015 to realize efficiencies within NNSA and the nuclear security enterprise. This report should include specific opportunities identified by the NNSA laboratories and plants and measures to eliminate or streamline burdensome and ineffective transactional oversight.

We further direct the Administrator to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by November 15, 2015, containing the Administrator's assessment of whether the actions, initiatives, and pilot programs previously identified by the Administrator were successful.

Budget increase for defense environmental cleanup

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3143) that would increase the Department of Energy Environmental Management program by \$20.0 million for defense environmental cleanup offset by an identical amount from the inertial confinement and fusion program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Energy Security and Assurance

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3104) that would authorize appropriations for

energy security and assurance programs for fiscal year 2015, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Limitation on availability of funds for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities at sites in the Russian Federation

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3121) that would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2015 funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for any defense nuclear nonproliferation activities at sites in the Russian Federation until at least 30 days have elapsed following the date that the Secretary of Energy certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such sites are not actively engaged in Russian nuclear weapons, intelligence, or defense activities. The prohibition includes a waiver for the President to submit a notification that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States, that none of the funds will be contributed to Russia's nuclear weapons program, and that a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date of the notification.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Authorization (sec. 3201)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3201) that would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2015.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 3201).

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would authorize \$29.15 million.

Inspector General of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3202)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3202) that would amend section 322 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286k(a)) to mandate that the Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall serve as the Inspector General of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, in accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Number of employees of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3203)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3203) that would amend section 313(b)(1)(A) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286b(b)(1)(A)) to limit the number of full-time employees of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board to 120.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would limit the number of employees to 130.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 3401)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3401) that would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the purpose of carrying out activities under chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the naval petroleum reserves.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Authorization of appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal year 2015 (sec. 3501)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3501) that would authorize appropriations for the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation for those activities of the Maritime Administration associated with maintaining national defense sealift.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

Floating dry docks (sec. 3502)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3502) that would limit the application of section 55102 of title 46, United States Code, to Drydock-17 (formerly known as USN-YFD-17) in the waters of the State of Alabama.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 1024) that would enable the Secretary of the Navy to authorize shipbuilding or ship repair contractors owning U.S.-built dry docks, tugboats, and towing vessels to engage in limited coastwise trade for purposes of performing a shipbuilding or ship repair contract entered into with the Department of the Navy.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would limit the application of section 55102 of title 46, United States Code, and extend the exemption to cover any floating drydock if the movement occurs within 5 nautical miles of the shipyard or affiliate that owns and operates such floating dry dock, and the floating dry dock:

(1) Is being used to launch or raise a vessel in connection with the construction, maintenance, or repair of that vessel;

(2) Is owned and operated by—

(a) A shipyard located in the United States that is an eligible owner specified under section 12103(b) of this title; or

(b) An affiliate of such a shipyard; and

(3) Was owned or contracted for purchase by such shipyard or affiliate prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sense of Congress on the role of domestic maritime industry in national security (sec. 3503)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 3503) that would express the sense of Congress that coastwise trade laws promote a strong domestic trade maritime industry, which supports the national security and economic vitality of the United States and the efficient operation of the U.S. transportation system.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

United States Merchant Marine Academy Board of Visitors (sec. 3504)

The Senate passed a bill (S. 2076), the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Board of Visitors Enhancement Act.

Neither the House bill nor the Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate bill with a clarifying amendment.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 4001)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 4001) that would provide for the authorization of projects, programs, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 4001).

The agreement includes the House provision.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
National Defense Funding, Base Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Title I—Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,102,685	96,426	5,199,111
Missile Procurement, Army	1,017,483		1,017,483
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,471,438	258,111	1,729,549
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,031,477	–20,000	1,011,477
Other Procurement, Army	4,893,634	–195,341	4,698,293
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	115,058	–115,058	0

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	13,074,317	230,288	13,304,605
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,217,945	54,211	3,272,156
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	771,945	-9,638	762,307
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	14,400,625	1,254,010	15,654,635
Other Procurement, Navy	5,975,828	258,015	6,233,843
Procurement, Marine Corps	983,352	-35,741	947,611
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,542,571	128,900	11,671,471
Missile Procurement, Air Force	4,690,506	-57,900	4,632,606
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	677,400		677,400
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,566,018	-14,289	16,551,729
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,221,437	-186,352	4,035,085
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	20,000	-20,000	0
Prior Year Rescissions	-265,685	265,685	0
Subtotal, Title I—Procurement	89,508,034	1,891,327	91,399,361
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	6,593,898	18,417	6,612,315
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	16,266,335	-84,243	16,182,092
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	23,739,892	137,144	23,877,036
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	16,766,084	221,000	16,987,084
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	167,738		167,738
Subtotal, Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	63,533,947	292,318	63,826,265
Title III—Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	33,240,148	-196,400	33,043,748
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,490,569	-8,800	2,481,769
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	6,030,773	4,200	6,034,973
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	39,025,857	-40,852	38,985,005
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,909,487	15,050	5,924,537
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,007,100	15,027	1,022,127
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	268,582	3,900	272,482
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	35,331,193	54,622	35,385,815
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,015,842	5,000	3,020,842
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,392,859	5,000	6,397,859
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	31,198,232	-22,144	31,176,088
US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense	13,723		13,723
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid	100,000		100,000
Cooperative Threat Reduction	365,108		365,108
Defense Acquisition Development Workforce Fund	212,875	-129,841	83,034
Environmental Restoration, Army	201,560		201,560
Environmental Restoration, Navy	277,294		277,294
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	408,716		408,716
Environmental Restoration, Defense	8,547		8,547
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Sites	208,353		208,353
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	5,000	-5,000	0
Support Of International Sporting Competitions, Defense	10,000	-4,300	5,700
Subtotal, Title III—Operation and Maintenance	165,721,818	-304,538	165,417,280
Title IV—Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	128,957,593	-477,985	128,479,608
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	6,236,092		6,236,092
Subtotal, Title IV—Military Personnel	135,193,685	-477,985	134,715,700
Title XIV—Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	13,727		13,727
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	61,717		61,717
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	44,293		44,293
Working Capital Fund, DECA	1,114,731	100,000	1,214,731
Defense Health Program	31,833,061	-1,148,615	30,684,446
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction	828,868		828,868
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	820,687		820,687
Office of the Inspector General	311,830		311,830

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Subtotal, Title XIV—Other Authorizations	35,028,914	-1,048,615	33,980,299
Total, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations	488,986,398	352,507	489,338,905
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Military Construction			
Army	539,427	4,000	543,427
Navy	1,018,772	-25,573	993,199
Air Force	811,774	34,400	846,174
Defense-Wide	2,061,890	-99,000	1,962,890
Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense	38,715		38,715
NATO Security Investment Program	199,700	-25,000	174,700
Army National Guard	126,920	7,000	133,920
Army Reserve	103,946	25,000	128,946
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	51,528	47,869	99,397
Air National Guard	94,663	11,200	105,863
Air Force Reserve	49,492	14,500	63,992
Subtotal, Military Construction	5,096,827	-5,604	5,091,223
Family Housing			
Construction, Army	78,609		78,609
Operation & Maintenance, Army	350,976		350,976
Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	16,412		16,412
Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps	354,029		354,029
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	327,747		327,747
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	61,100		61,100
Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,662		1,662
Subtotal, Family Housing	1,190,535	0	1,190,535
Base Realignment and Closure			
Base Realignment and Closure—Army	84,417		84,417
Base Realignment and Closure—Navy	94,692		94,692
Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force	90,976		90,976
Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure	270,085	0	270,085
Total, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations	6,557,447	-5,604	6,551,843
Total, 051, Department of Defense-Military	495,543,845	346,903	495,890,748
Function 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations			
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health		2,000	2,000
Nuclear Energy	104,000	0	104,000
Weapons Activities	8,314,902	-104,342	8,210,560
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,555,156	219,602	1,774,758
Naval Reactors	1,377,100	0	1,377,100
Office of the Administrator	410,842	-23,979	386,863
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,327,538	-443,000	4,884,538
Other Defense Activities	753,000	1,000	754,000
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	17,842,538	-348,719	17,493,819
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	30,150		30,150
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	30,150	0	30,150
Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations	17,872,688	-348,719	17,523,969
Subtotal, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	17,872,688	-348,719	17,523,969

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Total, National Defense Funding, Base Budget Request	513,416,533	–1,816	513,414,717
National Defense Funding, OCO Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	36,000		36,000
Missile Procurement, Army	32,136		32,136
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	140,905		140,905
Other Procurement, Army	778,583		778,583
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	379,000	65,463	444,463
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	196,247		196,247
Weapons Procurement, Navy	66,785		66,785
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	154,519		154,519
Other Procurement, Navy	306,768	550	307,318
Procurement, Marine Corps	53,589		53,589
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	646,219		646,219
Missile Procurement, Air Force	136,189		136,189
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	219,785		219,785
Other Procurement, Air Force	3,430,774		3,430,774
Procurement, Defense-Wide	227,886	356,672	584,558
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	50,000	–50,000	0
National Guard & Reserve Equipment	0	1,250,000	1,250,000
Prior Year Rescissions	–117,000	117,000	0
Subtotal, Procurement	6,738,385	1,739,685	8,478,070
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	4,500		4,500
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	36,020		36,020
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	14,706		14,706
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	281,447	5,200	286,647
Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	336,673	5,200	341,873
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	17,135,276	540,494	17,675,770
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	41,532		41,532
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	76,461	50,800	127,261
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	4,109,333		4,109,333
Iraq Train & Equip Fund	1,618,000		1,618,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	5,599,868	278,270	5,878,138
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	1,487,774	23,210	1,510,984
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	45,876		45,876
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	10,540		10,540
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	9,109,193	253,140	9,362,333
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	77,794		77,794
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	20,300	2,300	22,600
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	6,171,425	163,815	6,335,240
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	45,503,372	1,312,029	46,815,401
Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	5,536,340	1,500	5,537,840
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	58,728		58,728
Subtotal, Military Personnel	5,595,068	1,500	5,596,568
Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	5,000		5,000
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	86,350		86,350
Defense Health Program	300,531		300,531
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	189,000	20,000	209,000
Office of the Inspector General	7,968		7,968

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund	4,000,000	–2,700,000	1,300,000
European Reassurance Initiative	925,000	–554,287	370,713
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	5,513,849	–3,234,287	2,279,562
Military Construction			
Army	0	37,000	37,000
Air Force	0	121,560	121,560
Defense-Wide	46,000	15,850	61,850
Subtotal, Military Construction	46,000	174,410	220,410
Total, National Defense Funding, OCO Budget Request	63,733,347	–1,463	63,731,884
Total, National Defense	577,149,880	–3,279	577,146,601
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV—Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	63,400		63,400
Title XIV—Cemeterial Expenses, Army (Function 700)	45,800	16,081	61,881
Title XXXIV—Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (Function 270)	19,950		19,950
Title XXXV—Maritime Administration (Function 400)	148,400		148,400
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADD)			
Title X—General Transfer Authority	[5,000,000]	[–500,000]	[4,500,000]
Title XV—Special Transfer Authority	[4,000,000]	[–500,000]	[3,500,000]
MEMORANDUM: DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS NOT UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE (NON-ADD)			
Defense Production Act	[21,638]		[21,638]

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	495,543,845	346,903	496,586,255
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	17,872,688	–348,719	17,523,969
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)—BASE BILL	513,416,533	–1,816	513,414,717
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	63,733,347	–1,463	61,656,832
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	577,149,880	–3,279	577,146,601
Base National Defense Discretionary Programs that are Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Do Not Require Additional Authorization			
Defense Production Act Purchases	22,000		22,000
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	8,000		8,000
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	31,000		31,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	61,000		61,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	100,000		100,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	100,000		100,000
Other Discretionary Programs	7,681,000		7,681,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	7,681,000		7,681,000
Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)	7,842,000		7,842,000
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary			
Department of Defense—Military (051)	559,338,192	345,440	559,683,632
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	17,972,688	–348,719	17,623,969
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,681,000		7,681,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary	584,991,880	–3,279	584,988,601
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	6,399,000		6,399,000

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,107,000		1,107,000
Offsetting receipts	–1,591,000		–1,591,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	5,915,000		5,915,000
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,180,000		1,180,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	1,180,000		1,180,000
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	59,000		59,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	514,000		514,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	573,000		573,000
Total National Defense Mandatory (050)	7,668,000		7,668,000

Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory

Department of Defense—Military (051)	565,253,192	345,440	565,598,632
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,152,688	–348,719	18,803,969
Defense-Related Activities (054)	8,254,000		8,254,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory	592,659,880	–3,279	592,656,601

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY										
	FIXED WING										
002	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	1	13,617	1	13,617	1	13,617			1	13,617
003	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	16	185,090	16	109,790	16	185,090		–48,800	16	136,290
	Program decrease				[–75,300]				[–48,800]		
004	MQ–1 UAV	19	190,581	19	239,581	19	190,581		49,000	19	239,581
	Extended range modifications Per Army UFR				[49,000]				[49,000]		
005	RQ–11 (RAVEN)		3,964		3,964		3,964				3,964
	ROTARY										
006	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	55	416,617	55	416,617	90	612,617			55	416,617
	Risk reduction for buy of LUH to meet Army training fleet plans.					[35]	[196,000]				
007	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	25	494,009	25	494,009	25	494,009			25	494,009
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		157,338		157,338		157,338				157,338
012	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	79	1,237,001	85	1,335,401	87	1,382,001	6	103,026	85	1,340,027
	ARNG Modernization–6 additional UH–60M aircraft			[6]	[98,400]	[8]	[145,000]	[6]	[103,026]		
013	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		132,138		132,138		132,138				132,138
014	CH–47 HELICOPTER	32	892,504	32	892,504	32	892,504			32	892,504
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		102,361		102,361		102,361				102,361
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT										
016	MQ–1 PAYLOAD (MIP)	2	26,913	2	26,913	2	26,913			2	26,913
018	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		14,182		14,182		14,182				14,182
019	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		131,892		131,892		131,892				131,892
020	AH–64 MODS		181,869		181,869		181,869				181,869
021	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		32,092		32,092		32,092				32,092
022	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		15,029		15,029		15,029				15,029
023	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		76,515		83,315		76,515				76,515
	ARNG Modernization-UH–60A to UH–60L conversions ..				[6,800]						
025	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN		114,182		114,182		114,182				114,182
026	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE		115,795		115,795		115,795				115,795
027	GATM ROLLUP		54,277		54,277		54,277				54,277
028	RQ–7 UAV MODS		125,380		125,380		125,380				125,380
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS										
029	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		66,450		98,850		74,250		32,400		98,850
	Army requested realignment				[32,400]		[7,800]		[32,400]		
030	SURVIVABILITY CM				7,800		7,800		7,800		7,800
	Army requested realignment				[7,800]		[7,800]		[7,800]		
031	CMWS		107,364		60,364		60,164		–47,000		60,364
	Army requested reduction				[–47,000]		[–47,200]		[–47,000]		
	OTHER SUPPORT										
032	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,847		6,847		6,847				6,847
033	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		29,231		29,231		29,231				29,231
034	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		48,081		48,081		48,081				48,081
035	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		127,232		127,232		127,232				127,232
036	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,203		1,203		1,203				1,203
037	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	387	2,931	387	2,931	387	2,931			387	2,931

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	616	5,102,685	622	5,174,785	659	5,412,085	6	96,426	622	5,199,111
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY										
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM										
002	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD)		110,300		110,300		110,300				110,300
003	MSE MISSILE	70	384,605	70	384,605	70	384,605			70	384,605
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM										
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		4,452		4,452		4,452				4,452
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS										
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	338	77,668	338	77,668	338	77,668			338	77,668
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,008	50,368	1,008	50,368	1,008	50,368			1,008	50,368
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,984		19,984		19,984				19,984
008	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	534	127,145	534	127,145	534	127,145			534	127,145
009	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,994	21,274	2,994	21,274	2,994	21,274			2,994	21,274
	MODIFICATIONS										
012	PATRIOT MODS		131,838		131,838		131,838				131,838
013	STINGER MODS		1,355		1,355		1,355				1,355
014	AVENGER MODS		5,611		5,611		5,611				5,611
015	ITAS/TOW MODS		19,676		19,676		19,676				19,676
016	MLRS MODS		10,380		10,380		10,380				10,380
017	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		6,008		6,008		6,008				6,008
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
018	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		36,930		36,930		36,930				36,930
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES										
019	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,657		3,657		3,657				3,657
020	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES)		1,522		1,522		1,522				1,522
021	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		4,710		4,710		4,710				4,710
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	4,944	1,017,483	4,944	1,017,483	4,944	1,017,483			4,944	1,017,483
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY										
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
001	STRYKER VEHICLE		385,110		385,110		385,110		50,000		435,110
	Unfunded requirement—fourth DVH brigade set								[50,000]		
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES										
002	STRYKER (MOD)		39,683		89,683		39,683				39,683
	Unfunded requirement—Fourth DVH Brigade Set				[50,000]						
003	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		26,759		26,759		26,759				26,759
004	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		107,506		107,506		144,506		37,000		144,506
	Army unfunded priority and industrial base risk mitigation.						[37,000]		[37,000]		
005	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		45,411		45,411		45,411				45,411
006	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	18	247,400	18	247,400	18	247,400			18	247,400
007	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	15	50,451	15	50,451	15	126,364		75,913	15	126,364
	Army unfunded priority and industrial base risk mitigation.						[75,913]		[75,913]		
008	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)		2,473		2,473		2,473				2,473
009	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	7	36,583	7	36,583	7	36,583			7	36,583
010	M88 FOV MODS		1,975		73,975		1,975				1,975
	Unfunded requirement—Industrial Base Initiative				[72,000]						
011	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	8	49,462	8	49,462	8	8,262		−15,100	8	34,362
	Early to need						[−41,200]		[−15,100]		
012	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		237,023		237,023		261,023				237,023
	Army unfunded priority and industrial base risk mitigation.						[24,000]				
013	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM				120,000				120,000		120,000
	Industrial Base initiative				[120,000]				[120,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES										
014	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		6,478		6,478		6,478				6,478
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES										
016	MORTAR SYSTEMS		5,012		5,012		5,012				5,012
017	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	8,959	28,390	8,959	28,390	8,959	28,390			8,959	28,390
018	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM		148		148		148				148
019	CARBINE	38,234	29,366	38,234	20,616	38,234	20,616		−8,750	38,234	20,616
	Army requested realignment				[−8,750]		[−8,750]		[−8,750]		
021	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION		8,409		8,409		8,409				8,409
022	HANDGUN	4,811	3,957	4,811	1,957	4,811	3,957			4,811	3,957
	Funding ahead of need				[−2,000]						
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH										
024	M777 MODS		18,166		18,166		18,166				18,166
025	M4 CARBINE MODS		3,446		6,446		6,446		3,000		6,446
	Army requested realignment				[3,000]		[3,000]		[3,000]		
026	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		25,296		25,296		25,296				25,296
027	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		5,546		5,546		5,546				5,546
028	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		4,635		2,635		2,635		−2,000		2,635
	Army requested realignment				[−2,000]		[−2,000]		[−2,000]		
029	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		4,079		4,079		4,079				4,079
030	M119 MODIFICATIONS		72,718		72,718		72,718				72,718

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
031	M16 RIFLE MODS		1,952						-1,952		0
	At Army request transfer to WTCV 31 and RDTEA 70 and 86.				[-1,952]		[-1,952]		[-1,952]		
032	MORTAR MODIFICATION		8,903		8,903		8,903				8,903
033	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,089		2,089		2,089				2,089
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES										
034	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,005		2,005		2,005				2,005
035	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		8,911		8,911		8,911				8,911
036	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		414		414		414				414
037	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		1,682		1,682		1,682				1,682
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	52,052	1,471,438	52,052	1,701,736	52,052	1,557,449		258,111	52,052	1,729,549
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY										
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION										
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		34,943		34,943		34,943				34,943
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		12,418		12,418		12,418				12,418
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		9,655		8,155		8,155				9,655
	Funding ahead of need				[-1,500]						
	Program decrease—ahead of need								[-1,500]		
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		29,304		29,304		29,304				29,304
006	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		8,181		8,181		8,181				8,181
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		52,667		52,667		52,667				52,667
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		40,904		40,904		39,004				40,904
	Program decrease—ahead of need								[-1,900]		
	MORTAR AMMUNITION										
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		41,742		41,742		41,742				41,742
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		42,433		42,433		42,433				42,433
011	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		39,365		39,365		39,365				39,365
	TANK AMMUNITION										
012	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES		101,900		101,900		101,900				101,900
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION										
013	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES		37,455		37,455		37,455				37,455
014	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		47,023		47,023		47,023				47,023
015	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	416	35,672	416	35,672	416	35,672			416	35,672
016	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL		94,010		74,010		79,010		-20,000		74,010
	Precision Guided Kits Schedule Delay				[-20,000]		[-15,000]		[-20,000]		
	ROCKETS										
019	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		945		945		945				945
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		27,286		27,286		27,286				27,286
	OTHER AMMUNITION										
021	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		22,899		22,899		22,899				22,899
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		22,751		22,751		22,751				22,751
023	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		7,082		7,082		7,082				7,082
024	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		11,638		11,638		11,638				11,638
	MISCELLANEOUS										
025	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		3,594		3,594		3,594				3,594
027	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		5,430		5,430		5,430				5,430
028	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (AMMO)		8,337		8,337		8,337				8,337
029	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		14,906		14,906		14,906				14,906
030	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		14,349		14,349		14,349				14,349
031	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		111		111		111				111
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT										
032	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		148,092		146,192		148,092				148,092
	Unjustified request				[-1,900]						
033	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION		113,881		113,881		113,881				113,881
034	ARMS INITIATIVE		2,504		2,504		2,504				2,504
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	416	1,031,477	416	1,008,077	416	1,013,077		-20,000	416	1,011,477
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY										
	TACTICAL VEHICLES										
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		7,987		7,987		7,987				7,987
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	1	160	1	160	1	160			1	160
004	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	176	164,615	176	164,615	176	164,615			176	164,615
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)						50,000		50,000		50,000
	Additional FMTVs — Industrial Base initiative						[50,000]		[50,000]		
006	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP	19	8,415	19	8,415	19	8,415			19	8,415
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	444	28,425	444	78,425	444	28,425		50,000	444	78,425
	Additional HEMTT ESP Vehicles-Industrial Base initiative.								[50,000]		
008	PLS ESP	198	89,263	198	89,263	198	89,263			198	89,263
013	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	735	38,226	735	38,226	735	38,226			735	38,226
014	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	768	91,173	768	83,173	768	91,173		-8,000	768	83,173
	Early to need				[-8,000]				[-8,000]		
015	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS	1	14,731	1	14,731	1	14,731			1	14,731
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES										
016	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	1	175	1	175	1	175			1	175
017	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	25	1,338	25	1,338	25	1,338			25	1,338

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
018	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		11,101		11,101		11,101				11,101
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS										
019	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	1,280	763,087	1,280	638,087	1,280	638,087		−125,000	1,280	638,087
	Point of Presence (POP) and Soldier Network Extension (SNE) delay.				[−125,000]		[−125,000]		[−125,000]		
020	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	69	21,157	69	21,157	69	21,157			69	21,157
021	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY		7,915		7,915		7,915				7,915
022	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		5,440		5,440		5,440				5,440
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS										
023	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	18	118,085	18	118,085	18	118,085			18	118,085
024	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS	21	13,999	21	13,999	21	13,999			21	13,999
025	SHF TERM		6,494		6,494		6,494				6,494
026	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		1,635		1,635		1,635				1,635
027	SMART-T (SPACE)		13,554		13,554		13,554				13,554
028	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS		18,899		18,899		18,899				18,899
029	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		2,849		2,849		2,849				2,849
030	ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC)		100,000		100,000		100,000				100,000
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS										
033	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	2,674	175,711	2,674	125,711	2,674	87,711		−50,000	2,674	125,711
	Unobligated balances				[−50,000]		[−88,000]		[−50,000]		
034	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVIR)		9,692		4,692		1,692		−5,000		4,692
	Unobligated balances				[−5,000]		[−8,000]		[−5,000]		
035	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)	620	17,136	620	17,136	620	17,136			620	17,136
037	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	3,081	22,099	3,081	22,099	3,081	22,099			3,081	22,099
038	TRACTOR DESK		3,724		3,724		3,724				3,724
039	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		969		969		969				969
040	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		294		294		294				294
041	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM	8,344	24,354	8,344	24,354	8,344	24,354			8,344	24,354
042	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE		17,445		17,445		17,445				17,445
043	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		1,028		1,028		1,028				1,028
044	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE	974	22,614	974	22,614	974	22,614			974	22,614
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM										
046	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,519		1,519		1,519				1,519
047	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	305	12,478	305	12,478	305	12,478			305	12,478
	INFORMATION SECURITY										
050	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		2,113		2,113		2,113				2,113
051	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	2,750	69,646	2,750	69,646	2,750	69,646			2,750	69,646
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS										
052	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		28,913		28,913		28,913				28,913
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS										
053	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		97,091		97,091		97,091				97,091
054	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		246		246		246				246
055	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		5,362		5,362		5,362				5,362
056	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		79,965		79,965		79,965				79,965
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)										
060	JTT/CIBS-M		870		870		870				870
061	PROPHET GROUND	11	55,896	11	55,896	11	55,896			11	55,896
063	DCGS-A (MIP)	2,423	128,207	2,423	128,207	2,423	128,207			2,423	128,207
064	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTGS)	2	5,286	2	5,286	2	5,286			2	5,286
065	TROJAN (MIP)		12,614		12,614		12,614				12,614
066	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		3,901		3,901		3,901				3,901
067	CI HUMINT AUTO REPTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	358	7,392	358	7,392	358	7,392			358	7,392
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)										
068	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	3	24,828	3	24,828	3	24,828			3	24,828
070	AIR VIGILANCE (AV)		7,000		7,000		7,000				7,000
072	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		1,285		1,285		1,285				1,285
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)										
075	SENTINEL MODS	81	44,305	81	44,305	81	44,305			81	44,305
076	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	9,700	160,901	9,700	160,901	9,700	160,901			9,700	160,901
078	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	1,935	18,520	1,935	18,520	1,935	18,520			1,935	18,520
080	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS	173	68,296	173	68,296	173	68,296			173	68,296
081	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS)	1,716	49,205	1,716	34,205	1,716	37,205		−15,000	1,716	34,205
	Early to need				[−15,000]		[−12,000]		[−15,000]		
082	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	137	4,896	137	4,896	137	4,896			137	4,896
083	PROFILER		3,115		3,115		3,115				3,115
084	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		4,186		4,186		4,186				4,186
085	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	2,622	97,892	2,622	87,892	2,622	87,892		−10,000	2,622	87,892
	Schedule delay				[−10,000]		[−10,000]		[−10,000]		
086	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS)	41	27,450	41	27,450	41	27,450			41	27,450
087	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	34	14,085	34	14,085	34	14,085			34	14,085
088	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	255	29,040	255	29,040	255	29,040			255	29,040
089	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	13	209,050	13	159,050	13	128,650		−50,000	13	159,050
	Excessive LRIP/concurrency costs				[−50,000]		[−80,400]		[−50,000]		
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS										
092	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		13,823		13,823		13,823				13,823
095	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	5	27,374	5	27,374	5	27,374			5	27,374
097	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		2,508		2,508		2,508				2,508

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
099	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		21,524		21,524		21,524				21,524
100	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	3,748	95,455	3,748	95,455	3,748	95,455			3,748	95,455
101	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)		118,600		118,600		118,600				118,600
102	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP)		32,970		32,970		32,970				32,970
104	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	56	10,113	56	10,113	56	10,113			56	10,113
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION										
105	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		9,015		9,015		9,015				9,015
106	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		155,223		155,223		140,223		−2,941		152,282
	Reduce IT procurement						[−15,000]		[−2,941]		
107	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM		16,581		16,581		16,581				16,581
108	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)		65,252		65,252		65,252				65,252
110	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		17,631		17,631		17,631				17,631
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)										
112	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	51	5,437	51	5,437	51	5,437			51	5,437
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT										
113	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		426		426		426				426
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS										
114A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,707		3,707		3,707				3,707
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT										
115	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)		937		937		937				937
116	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)		1,930		1,930		1,930				1,930
117	CBRN DEFENSE	14,506	17,468	14,506	17,468	14,506	17,468			14,506	17,468
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT										
119	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	6	5,442	6	5,442	6	5,442			6	5,442
120	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP		11,013		11,013		11,013				11,013
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT										
121	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)		37,649		33,249		37,649		−4,400		33,249
	Early to need				[−4,400]				[−4,400]		
122	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS)	84	18,545	84	18,545	84	18,545			84	18,545
123	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)	1	4,701	1	4,701	1	4,701			1	4,701
124	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION		6,346		6,346		6,346				6,346
125	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	133	15,856	133	15,856	133	15,856			133	15,856
126	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS		4,485		4,485		4,485				4,485
127	< \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	92	4,938	92	4,938	92	4,938			92	4,938
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
128	HEATERS AND ECU'S	628	9,235	628	9,235	628	9,235			628	9,235
130	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	1	1,677	1	1,677	1	1,677			1	1,677
131	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	12,273	16,728	12,273	16,728	12,273	16,728			12,273	16,728
132	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	3,581	84,761	3,581	84,761	3,581	84,761			3,581	84,761
134	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	141	15,179	141	15,179	141	15,179			141	15,179
135	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	1,386	28,194	1,386	28,194	1,386	28,194			1,386	28,194
137	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	336	41,967	336	41,967	336	41,967			336	41,967

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
166	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		5,726		5,726		5,726				5,726
167	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	1,657	37,482	1,657	37,482	1,657	37,482			1,657	37,482
168	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	415	16,061	415	16,061	415	16,061			415	16,061
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
170	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,380		2,380		2,380				2,380
171	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		30,686		30,686		30,686				30,686
172	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		1,008		1,008		1,008				1,008
173	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	3,209	98,559	3,209	83,559	3,209	80,559		-15,000	3,209	83,559
	Early to need—watercraft C4ISR				[-15,000]		[-18,000]		[-15,000]		
174	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		1,697		1,697		1,697				1,697
175	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		25,394		25,394		25,394				25,394
176	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	963	12,975	963	12,975	963	12,975			963	12,975
	OPA2										
180	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	11	50,032	11	50,032	11	50,032			11	50,032
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	94,760	4,893,634	94,760	4,701,234	94,760	4,537,234		-195,341	94,760	4,698,293
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND										
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE										
004	OPERATIONS		115,058						-115,058		0
	Transfer of JIEDDO to Overseas Contingency Operations.				[-65,558]				[-65,463]		
	Unjustified request				[-49,500]		[-115,058]		[-49,595]		
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND ..		115,058						-115,058		0
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY										
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT										
001	EA-18G		43,547	5	493,547		68,547		450,000		493,547
	Additional EA-18G aircraft			[5]	[450,000]				[450,000]		
	Preserve option of buying more EA-18G aircraft						[25,000]				
005	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	2	610,652	2	610,652	2	610,652			2	610,652
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		29,400		29,400		29,400				29,400
007	JSF STOVL	6	1,200,410	6	1,200,410	6	1,200,410			6	1,200,410
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		143,885		143,885		143,885				143,885
009	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	19	1,487,000	19	1,487,000	19	1,487,000			19	1,487,000
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		45,920		45,920		45,920				45,920
011	H-1 UPGRADES (UH-1Y/AH-1Z)	26	778,757	26	778,757	26	778,757			26	778,757
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		80,926		80,926		80,926		-5,300		75,626
	Advance procurement efficiencies								[-5,300]		
013	MH-60S (MYP)	8	210,209	8	210,209	8	210,209			8	210,209
015	MH-60R (MYP)	29	933,882	29	880,482	29	933,882		-55,000	29	878,882
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)				[-53,400]				[-53,400]		
	Shutdown funding ahead of need								[-1,600]		
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		106,686		106,686		106,686				106,686
017	P-8A POSEIDON	8	2,003,327	8	2,003,327	8	2,003,327		-17,400	8	1,985,927
	Anticipated unit price savings								[-11,300]		
	Unjustified growth—production engineering support ..								[-6,100]		
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		48,457		48,457		48,457				48,457
019	E-2D ADV HAWKEYE	4	819,870	4	819,870	4	819,870			4	819,870
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		225,765		225,765		225,765				225,765
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
023	KC-130J	1	92,290	1	92,290	1	92,290			1	92,290
026	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		37,445		37,445		37,445				37,445
027	MQ-8 UAV		40,663		40,663		40,663				40,663
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT										
029	EA-6 SERIES		10,993		10,993		10,993				10,993
030	AEA SYSTEMS		34,768		34,768		34,768				34,768
031	AV-8 SERIES		65,472		65,472		65,472				65,472
032	ADVERSARY		8,418		8,418		8,418				8,418
033	F-18 SERIES		679,177		679,177		679,177				679,177
034	H-46 SERIES		480		480		480				480
036	H-53 SERIES		38,159		38,159		38,159				38,159
037	SH-60 SERIES		108,850		108,850		108,850				108,850
038	H-1 SERIES		45,033		45,033		45,033				45,033
039	EP-3 SERIES		32,890		50,890		52,890				32,890
	Obsolescence issues				[5,000]						
	SIGINT Architecture Modernization Common Configuration.				[13,000]						
	SPIRAL 3 & ELINT KITS						[20,000]				
040	P-3 SERIES		2,823		2,823		2,823				2,823
041	E-2 SERIES		21,208		21,208		21,208				21,208
042	TRAINER A/C SERIES		12,608		12,608		12,608				12,608
044	C-130 SERIES		40,378		40,378		40,378				40,378
045	FEWSG		640		640		640				640
046	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		4,635		4,635		4,635				4,635
047	E-6 SERIES		212,876		212,876		212,876				212,876
048	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		71,328		71,328		71,328				71,328
049	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		21,317		21,317		21,317				21,317

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
050	T-45 SERIES		90,052		90,052		90,052				90,052
051	POWER PLANT CHANGES		19,094		19,094		19,094				19,094
052	JPATS SERIES		1,085		1,085		1,085				1,085
054	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		155,644		155,644		155,644				155,644
055	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		157,531		157,531		157,531				157,531
056	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		1,958		1,958		1,958				1,958
057	ID SYSTEMS		38,880		38,880		38,880				38,880
058	P-8 SERIES		29,797		29,797		29,797				29,797
059	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		14,770		14,770		14,770				14,770
060	MQ-8 SERIES		8,741		8,741		8,741				8,741
061	RQ-7 SERIES		2,542		2,542		2,542				2,542
062	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		135,584		135,584		135,584				135,584
063	F-35 STOVL SERIES		285,968		285,968		285,968				285,968
064	F-35 CV SERIES		20,502		20,502		20,502				20,502
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
065	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,229,651		1,226,651		1,194,651		-122,145		1,107,506
	Reduce rate of growth in replenishment spares				[-3,000]		[-35,000]		[-122,145]		
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES										
066	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		418,355		418,355		418,355		-19,867		398,488
	Unobligated balances								[-19,867]		
067	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		23,843		23,843		23,843				23,843
068	WAR CONSUMABLES		15,939		15,939		15,939				15,939
069	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		5,630		5,630		5,630				5,630
070	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		65,839		65,839		65,839				65,839
071	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,768		1,768		1,768				1,768
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	103	13,074,317	108	13,485,917	103	13,084,317		230,288	103	13,304,605
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY										
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES										
001	TRIDENT II MODS		1,190,455		1,190,455		1,201,455		-5,000		1,185,455
	Additional FCET						[11,000]				
	Guidance hardware cost growth								[-5,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES										
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		5,671		5,671		5,671				5,671
	STRATEGIC MISSILES										
003	TOMAHAWK	100	194,258	196	276,258	200	276,258	96	82,000	196	276,258
	Minimum sustaining rate increase			[96]	[82,000]	[100]	[82,000]	[96]	[82,000]		
	TACTICAL MISSILES										
004	AMRAAM		32,165		22,165		32,165		-10,000		22,165
	Program decrease				[-10,000]				[-10,000]		
005	SIDEWINDER	167	73,928	167	73,928	167	73,928		-1,980	167	71,948
	Block II AUR cost growth								[-1,980]		
006	JSOW	200	130,759	200	130,759	200	130,759		-2,559	200	128,200
	AUR cost growth								[-2,559]		
007	STANDARD MISSILE	110	445,836	110	445,836	110	445,836		-1,000	110	444,836
	Installation, checkout, and training growth								[-1,000]		
008	RAM	90	80,792	90	80,792	90	80,792			90	80,792
011	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	14	1,810	14	1,810	14	1,810			14	1,810
012	AERIAL TARGETS		48,046		48,046		48,046				48,046
013	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,295		3,295		3,295				3,295
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES										
014	ESSM	104	119,434	104	119,434	104	119,434			104	119,434
015	HARM MODS		111,739		111,739		111,739		-5,250		106,489
	AUR kit cost growth								[-3,250]		
	Tooling and test equipment growth								[-2,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES										
016	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,531		2,531		2,531				2,531
017	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		208,700		199,700		208,700		-2,000		206,700
	Excess to need				[-9,000]				[-2,000]		
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
018	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		73,211		73,211		73,211				73,211
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP										
019	SSTD		6,562		6,562		6,562				6,562
020	MK-48 TORPEDO		14,153		14,153		14,153				14,153
021	ASW TARGETS		2,515		2,515		2,515				2,515
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP										
022	MK-54 TORPEDO MODS		98,928		98,928		98,928				98,928
023	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		46,893		46,893		46,893				46,893
024	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		6,966		6,966		6,966				6,966
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
025	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		52,670		52,670		52,670				52,670
026	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		3,795		3,795		3,795				3,795
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION										
027	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,692		3,692		3,692				3,692
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS										
028	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		13,240		13,240		13,240				13,240
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS										

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
029	CIWS MODS		75,108		75,108		75,108				75,108
030	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		18,948		18,948		18,948				18,948
031	GUN MOUNT MODS		62,651		62,651		62,651				62,651
033	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		15,006		15,006		15,006				15,006
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
035	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		74,188		74,188		74,188				74,188
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	785	3,217,945	881	3,280,945	885	3,310,945	96	54,211	881	3,272,156
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC										
	NAVY AMMUNITION										
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		107,069		107,069		107,069				107,069
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		70,396		70,396		70,396				70,396
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		20,284		20,284		20,284				20,284
004	PRACTICE BOMBS		26,701		26,701		26,701				26,701
005	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		53,866		53,866		53,866				53,866
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		59,294		59,294		59,294				59,294
007	JATOS		2,766		2,766		2,766				2,766
008	LRLAP 6" LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE		113,092		113,092		113,092				113,092
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		35,702		35,702		35,702				35,702
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		36,475		36,475		36,475				26,837
	MK-296 57MM contract delay								-9,638 [-9,638]		
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		43,906		43,906		43,906				43,906
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		51,535		51,535		51,535				51,535
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		11,652		11,652		11,652				11,652
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		4,473		4,473		4,473				4,473
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION										
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		31,708		31,708		31,708				31,708
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		692		692		692				692
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES		13,630		13,630		13,630				13,630
018	60MM, ALL TYPES		2,261		2,261		2,261				2,261
019	81MM, ALL TYPES		1,496		1,496		1,496				1,496
020	120MM, ALL TYPES		14,855		14,855		14,855				14,855
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		4,000		4,000		4,000				4,000
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		16,853		16,853		16,853				16,853
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		14,772		14,772		14,772				14,772
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES		9,972		9,972		9,972				9,972
027	NON LETHALS		998		998		998				998
028	AMMO MODERNIZATION		12,319		12,319		12,319				12,319
029	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		11,178		11,178		11,178				11,178
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		771,945		771,945		771,945		-9,638		762,307
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY										
	OTHER WARSHIPS										
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000				1,300,000
002	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,553,254	2	3,553,254	2	3,553,254			2	3,553,254
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		2,330,325		2,330,325		2,330,325				2,330,325
004	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS			1	483,600		46,000	1	483,600	1	483,600
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)			[1]	[483,600]			[1]	[483,600]		
	Transfer from OMN, line 360						[46,000]				
006	DDG 1000		419,532		365,532						419,532
	DDG-1000				[-54,000]						
007	DDG-51	2	2,671,415	2	2,671,415	2	2,671,415			2	2,671,415
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		134,039		134,039		134,039				134,039
009	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	3	1,427,049	2	977,049	3	1,427,049			3	1,427,049
	Reduction of 1 LCS			[-1]	[-450,000]						
009A	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				100,000						0
	Program requirement				[100,000]						
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS										
010	LPD-17		12,565	1	812,565		12,565	1	800,000	1	812,565
	Incremental funding for LPD-28			[1]	[800,000]			[1]	[800,000]		
014	LHA REPLACEMENT ADVANCE PROCURMENT (CY)		29,093		29,093		29,093				29,093
015	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL		4,590		4,590		4,590				0
	Program closeout ahead of need								-4,590 [-4,590]		
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST										
016	MOORED TRAINING SHIP	1	737,268	1	517,268	1	737,268			1	737,268
	Moored Training Ship				[-220,000]						
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		64,388		64,388		64,388				64,388
018	OUTFITTING		546,104		546,104		546,104				521,104
	Early to need								-25,000 [-25,000]		
019	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR	2	123,233	2	123,233	2	123,233			2	123,233
020	LCAC SLEP	2	40,485	2	40,485	4	85,485			2	40,485
	At USMC request transfer from RTEN 53					[2]	[45,000]				
021	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		1,007,285		1,007,285		1,007,285				1,007,285
	UNDISTRIBUTED										
022	UNDISTRIBUTED				-15,000						0
	Program decrease				[-15,000]						
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	12	14,400,625	13	15,045,225	14	14,491,625	2	1,254,010	14	15,654,635

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY										
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT										
001	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		7,822		7,822		7,822				7,822
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		2,155		2,155		2,155				2,155
003	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)		22,704		15,704		22,704		-3,426		19,278
	Excess installation funding								[-1,926]		
	Hybrid Electric Drive				[-7,000]						
	Modification funding ahead of need								[-1,500]		
	GENERATORS										
004	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E		29,120		22,120		29,120		-2,456		26,664
	Surface Combatant HM&E				[-7,000]				[-2,456]		
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT										
005	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		45,431		45,431		45,431		-537		44,894
	AN/WSN-9 procurement ahead of need								[-537]		
	PERISCOPES										
006	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		60,970		52,670		60,970		-3,749		57,221
	Excess installation funding								[-649]		
	Interim contractor support carryover								[-3,100]		
	Submarine Periscopes and Imaging Equipment				[-8,300]						
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT										
007	DDG MOD		338,569		338,569		338,569				338,569
008	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		15,486		15,486		15,486				15,486
009	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		2,219		2,219		2,219				2,219
010	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE		17,928		17,928		17,928				17,928
011	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM		22,025		22,025		22,025				22,025
012	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		12,607		12,607		12,607				12,607
013	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		16,492		16,492		16,492				16,492
014	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		74,129		74,129		74,129				74,129
015	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		36,206		36,206		36,206				36,206
016	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		37,352		37,352		37,352				37,352
017	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		49,095		49,095		49,095		-4,533		44,562
	HM&E mechanical modifications ahead of need								[-2,778]		
	SWAN CANES procurement ahead of need								[-1,755]		
018	ELECTRONIC DRY AIR		2,996		2,996		2,996				2,996
019	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		11,558		11,558		11,558				11,558
020	DSSP EQUIPMENT		5,518		5,518		5,518				5,518
022	LCAC		7,158		7,158		7,158				7,158
023	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS		58,783		53,783		58,783		-5,000		53,783
	MK-18 UUV retrofit kits and ancillary equipment contract delay				[-5,000]				[-5,000]		
024	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		68,748		68,748		68,748				68,748
025	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		2,937		2,937		2,937				2,937
026	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		8,385		8,385		8,385				8,385
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT										
027	REACTOR POWER UNITS				298,200				298,200		298,200
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)				[298,200]				[298,200]		
028	REACTOR COMPONENTS		288,822		288,822		288,822				288,822
	OCEAN ENGINEERING										
029	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		10,572		10,572		10,572				10,572
	SMALL BOATS										
030	STANDARD BOATS		129,784		80,784		129,784		-3,339		126,445
	7M RIB contract delay								[-772]		
	Large force protection boat contract delay								[-791]		
	Medium workboat contract delay								[-1,776]		
	Standard Boats				[-49,000]						
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT										
031	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		17,152		17,152		17,152				17,152
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT										
032	OPERATING FORCES IPE		39,409		39,409		39,409				39,409
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT										
033	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		118,129		118,129		118,129				118,129
034	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT		37,413		37,413		37,413		-3,596		33,817
	MPCE cost growth								[-1,026]		
	SUW support and shipping container cost growth								[-2,570]		
035	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES		15,270		15,270		15,270				15,270
036	LCS ASW MISSION MODULES		2,729		2,729		2,729				2,729
037	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES		44,208		44,208		44,208		-4,511		39,697
	Gun module cost growth								[-3,080]		
	Maritime security module cost growth								[-1,431]		
038	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)		42,276		42,276		42,276				42,276
	SHIP SONARS										
040	SPQ-9B RADAR		28,007		28,007		28,007				28,007
041	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		79,802		79,802		79,802				79,802
042	SSN ACOUSTICS		165,655		165,655		165,655				165,655
043	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,487		9,487		9,487				9,487
044	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		11,621		11,621		11,621				11,621

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										
046	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		24,221		24,221		24,221				24,221
047	SSTD		12,051		12,051		12,051				12,051
048	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		170,831		170,831		170,831				170,831
049	SURTASS		9,619		9,619		9,619				9,619
050	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNAISSANCE FORCE		14,390		14,390		14,390				14,390
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT										
051	AN/SQ-32		214,582		214,582		214,582				214,582
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT										
052	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		124,862		124,862		124,862				124,862
053	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)		164		164		164				164
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT										
054	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		45,362		45,362		45,362				45,362
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										
055	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		33,939		33,939		33,939				33,939
056	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)		324		324		324				324
057	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)		18,192		18,192		18,192				18,192
058	ATDLS		16,768		16,768		16,768				16,768
059	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)		5,219		5,219		5,219				5,219
060	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		42,108		42,108		42,108				41,499
	AN/SQ-32 integration cost growth								-609		
									[-609]		
062	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		15,232		15,232		15,232				15,232
063	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE		4,524		4,524		4,524				4,524
064	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		6,382		6,382		6,382				6,382
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT										
065	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		46,122		46,122		46,122				44,058
	BFTT installation kit cost growth								-2,064		
									[-2,064]		
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										
066	MATCALS		16,999		16,999		16,999				16,999
067	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		9,366		9,366		9,366				9,366
068	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM		21,357		21,357		21,357				21,357
069	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM		26,639		26,639		26,639				26,639
070	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS		9,214		9,214		9,214				9,214
071	LANDING SYSTEMS		13,902		13,902		13,902				13,902
072	ID SYSTEMS		34,901		34,901		34,901				34,901
073	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		13,950		13,950		13,950				13,950
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT										
074	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL		1,205		1,205		1,205				1,205
075	MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM		3,447		3,447		3,447				3,447
076	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS		16,766		16,766		16,766				16,766
077	DCGS-N		23,649		23,649		23,649				23,649
078	CANES		357,589		357,589		357,589				357,589
079	RADIAC		8,343		8,343		8,343				8,343
080	CANES-INTELL		65,015		65,015		65,015				65,015
081	GPEE		6,284		6,284		6,284				6,284
082	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,016		4,016		4,016				4,016
083	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		4,113		4,113		4,113				4,113
084	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		45,053		45,053		45,053				45,053
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS										
085	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS		14,410		14,410		14,410				14,410
086	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		20,830		20,830		20,830				20,830
088	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M		14,145		14,145		14,145				14,145
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS										
089	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		11,057		11,057		11,057				11,057
090	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		67,852		67,852		67,852				67,852
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS										
091	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		13,218		13,268		13,218				13,218
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)				[50]						
092	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)		272,076		272,076		272,076				272,076
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS										
093	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		4,369		4,369		4,369				4,369
094	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,402		1,402		1,402				1,402
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT										
095	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		110,766		110,766		110,766				110,766
096	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM		979		979		979				979
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT										
097	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		11,502		11,502		11,502				11,502
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT										
098	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		2,967		2,967		2,967				2,967
	SONOBUOYS										
100	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES		182,946		182,946		182,946				182,946
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
101	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		47,944		47,944		47,944				47,944
103	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		76,683		76,683		76,683				76,683
106	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		12,575		12,875		12,575		300		12,875
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)				[300]				[300]		
107	DCRS/DPL		1,415		1,415		1,415				1,415

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT (In Thousands of Dollars)											
Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
109	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		23,152		23,152		23,152				23,152
114	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		52,555		52,555		52,555				52,555
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT										
115	SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		5,572		5,572		5,572				5,572
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT										
118	SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		165,769		165,769		165,769				165,769
123	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		61,462		61,462		61,462				61,462
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
126	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP		229,832		229,832		229,832				229,832
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
127	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		66,020		66,020		66,020		-5,216		60,804
	688 T104 installation cost growth								[-5,216]		
128	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,559		7,559		7,559				7,559
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
132	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		20,619		20,619		20,619				20,619
133	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		11,251		11,251		11,251				11,251
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE										
137	TRAINING DEVICE MODS		84,080		84,080		84,080				84,080
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
138	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,282		2,282		2,282				2,282
139	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		547		547		547				547
140	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		8,949		8,949		8,949				8,949
141	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		14,621		14,621		14,621				14,621
142	TACTICAL VEHICLES		957		957		957				957
143	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		8,187		8,187		8,187				8,187
144	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		2,942		2,942		2,942				2,942
145	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION		17,592		17,592		17,592		-1,449		16,143
	Emergency response truck cost growth								[-1,449]		
146	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,177		1,177		1,177				1,177
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
147	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		10,937		10,937		10,937				10,937
148	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		10,374		10,374		10,374				10,374
149	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,668		5,668		5,668				5,668
150	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		90,921		90,921		90,921				90,921
	TRAINING DEVICES										
151	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		22,046		22,046		22,046				22,046
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
152	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,208		24,208		24,208				24,208
153	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		874		874		874				874
154	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,634		2,634		2,634				2,

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		9,178		9,178		9,178				9,178
015	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C		12,272		12,272		12,272				12,272
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT										
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		30,591		30,591		30,591				30,591
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)										
017	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,385		2,385		2,385				2,385
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)										
019	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		4,205		4,205		4,205				4,205
020	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		8,002		8,002		8,002				8,002
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										
021	RADAR SYSTEMS		19,595		19,595		19,595		-220		19,375
	Sustainment—unjustified growth								[-220]		
022	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	2	89,230	2	89,230	2	89,230			2	89,230
023	RQ-21 UAS	3	70,565	3	70,565	3	70,565			3	70,565
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										
024	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		11,860		11,860		11,860				11,860
025	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		44,340		44,340		44,340		-1,790		42,550
	Unjustified program growth								[-1,790]		
028	RQ-11 UAV		2,737		2,737		2,737				2,737
030	DCGS-MC		20,620		20,620		20,620				20,620
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)										
031	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		9,798		9,798		9,798				9,798
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)										
032	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN)		2,073		2,073		2,073				2,073
033	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		33,570		33,570		33,570				33,570
034	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		38,186		38,186		38,186				38,186
035	RADIO SYSTEMS		64,494		64,494		64,494				64,494
036	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		72,956		72,956		72,956		-8,631		64,325
	Unjustified program growth								[-8,631]		
037	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		43,317		43,317		43,317				43,317
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS										
037A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,498		2,498		2,498				2,498
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES										
038	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		332		332		332				332
039	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		11,035		11,035		11,035				11,035
	TACTICAL VEHICLES										
040	5/4T TRUCK HMMV (MYP)		57,255		37,255		57,255		-20,000		37,255
	Early to need				[-20,000]				[-20,000]		
041	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		938		938		938				938
044	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	7	7,500	7	7,500	7	7,500			7	7,500
045	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		10,179		10,179		10,179				10,179
	OTHER SUPPORT										
046	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		11,023		11,023		11,023				11,023
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT										
047	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		994		994		994				994
048	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		1,256		1,256		1,256				1,256
049	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		3,750		3,750		3,750				3,750
050	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		8,985		8,985		11,885				8,985
	USMC unfunded priority						[2,900]				
051	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,418		4,418		4,418				4,418
052	EOD SYSTEMS		6,528		6,528		6,528				6,528
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT										
053	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		26,510		26,510		26,510				26,510
054	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		1,910		1,910		1,910				1,910
055	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		8,807		8,807		8,807				8,807
056	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		128		128		128				128
	GENERAL PROPERTY										
058	TRAINING DEVICES		3,412		3,412		3,412				3,412
059	CONTAINER FAMILY		1,662		1,662		1,662				1,662
060	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		3,669		3,669		3,669				3,669
	OTHER SUPPORT										
062	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		4,272		4,272		4,272				4,272
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		16,210		16,210		16,210				16,210
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	12	983,352	12	958,252	12	986,252		-35,741	12	947,611
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE										
	TACTICAL FORCES										
001	F-35	26	3,553,046	26	3,553,046	26	3,553,046			26	3,553,046
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		291,880		291,880		291,880				291,880
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT										
003	KC-46A TANKER	7	1,582,685	6	1,356,585	7	1,582,685			7	1,582,685
	LRIP 1 Ramp Rate			[-1]	[-226,100]						
	OTHER AIRLIFT										
004	C-130J	7	482,396	7	482,396	7	482,396			7	482,396
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		140,000		140,000		140,000				140,000
006	HC-130J	4	332,024	4	332,024	4	332,024			4	332,024

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		50,000		50,000		50,000				50,000
008	MC-130J	2	190,971	2	190,971	2	190,971			2	190,971
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		80,000		80,000		80,000				80,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT										
012	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	6	2,562	6	2,562	6	2,562			6	2,562
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
013	TARGET DRONES	37	98,576	37	98,576	37	98,576			37	98,576
016	RQ-4		54,475		44,475		44,475		-10,000		44,475
	MPRTIP Sensor Trainer reduction				[-10,000]		[-10,000]		[-10,000]		
017	AC-130J		1		1		1				1
018	MQ-9	12	240,218	20	360,218	12	202,418		98,000	12	338,218
	Program increase			[8]	[120,000]				[120,000]		
	Use available prior year funds for FY 15 requirements						[-37,800]		[-22,000]		
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT										
020	B-2A		23,865		23,865		23,865				23,865
021	B-1B		140,252		140,252		140,252				140,252
022	B-52		180,148		180,148		180,148				180,148
023	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		13,159		13,159		13,159				13,159
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT										
025	F-15		387,314		387,314		387,314				387,314
026	F-16		12,336		12,336		12,336				12,336
027	F-22A		180,207		180,207		180,207				180,207
028	F-35 MODIFICATIONS		187,646		187,646		187,646				187,646
029	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		28,500		28,500		28,500				28,500
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT										
030	C-5		14,731		14,731		14,731				14,731
031	C-5M		331,466		281,466				-50,000		281,466
	Program execution delay				[-50,000]		[-50,000]		[-50,000]		
033	C-17A		127,494		127,494		127,494				127,494
034	C-21		264		264		264				264
035	C-32A		8,767		8,767		8,767				8,767
036	C-37A		18,457		18,457		18,457				18,457
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT										
038	GLIDER MODS		132		132		132				132
039	T-6		14,486		14,486		14,486				14,486
040	T-1		7,650		7,650		7,650				7,650
041	T-38		34,845		34,845		34,845				34,845
	OTHER AIRCRAFT										
042	U-2 MODS						64,300				0
	Keep U-2 rather than enhance Global Hawk Block 30					</					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
074	B-2A		44,793		44,793		44,793				44,793
075	B-52		5,249		5,249		5,249				5,249
077	C-17A		20,110		15,110		20,110				20,110
	Program execution delay				[-5,000]						
078	CV-22 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		16,931		16,931		16,931				16,931
080	C-135		4,414		4,414		4,414				4,414
081	F-15		1,122		1,122		1,122				1,122
082	F-16		10,994		10,994		10,994				10,994
083	F-22A		5,929		5,929		5,929				5,929
084	OTHER AIRCRAFT		27		27		27				27
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS										
085	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		21,363		21,363		21,363				21,363
	WAR CONSUMABLES										
086	WAR CONSUMABLES		82,906		82,906		82,906				82,906
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES										
087	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		1,007,276		1,007,276		1,007,276				1,007,276
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS										
087A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		69,380		69,380		69,380				69,380
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	101	11,542,571	108	11,419,900	101	11,526,671		128,900	101	11,671,471
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE										
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC										
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		80,187		80,187		80,187				80,187
	TACTICAL										
003	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE	224	337,438	224	337,438	224	337,438			224	337,438
004	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	303	132,995	303	132,995	303	132,995			303	132,995
005	AMRAAM	200	329,600	200	329,600	200	329,600			200	329,600
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	283	33,878	283	33,878	283	33,878			283	33,878
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	246	70,578	246	70,578	246	18,047		-20,000	246	50,578
	Delay in Milestone C and contract award						[-52,531]		[-20,000]		
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES										
008	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS/POL PREVENTION		749		749		749				749
	CLASS IV										
009	MM III MODIFICATIONS		28,477		28,477		28,477				28,477
010	AGM-65D MAVERICK		276		276		276				276
011	AGM-88A HARM		297		297		297				297
012	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		16,083		16,083		16,083				16,083
013	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB		6,924		6,924		6,924				6,924
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
014	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		87,366		87,366		87,366				87,366
	SPACE PROGRAMS										
015	ADVANCED EHF		298,890		298,890		298,890				298,890
016	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		38,971		35,971		38,971		-2,900		36,071
	Unjustified growth				[-3,000]				[-2,900]		
017	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	1	235,397	1	235,397	1	235,397			1	235,397
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		57,000		57,000		57,000				57,000
019	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		16,201		16,201		16,201				16,201
020	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		52,090		52,090		52,090				52,090
021	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		87,000		87,000						87,000
	Program decrease						[-87,000]				
022	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH (INFRAST.)		750,143		750,143		750,143		-35,000		715,143
	Excess growth								[-35,000]		
023	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	3	630,903	3	765,903	3	630,903			3	630,903
	DMSP 20 launch/Additional competition launch				[135,000]						
024	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)		450,884		450,884		450,884				450,884
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS										
028	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		60,179		60,179		60,179				60,179
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS										
	UNDISTRIBUTED										
028A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		888,000		888,000		888,000				888,000
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	1,260	4,690,506	1,260	4,822,506	1,260	4,550,975		-57,900	1,260	4,632,606
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE										
	ROCKETS										
001	ROCKETS		4,696		4,696		4,696				4,696
	CARTRIDGES										
002	CARTRIDGES		133,271		133,271		133,271				133,271
	BOMBS										
003	PRACTICE BOMBS		31,998		31,998		31,998				31,998
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		148,614		148,614		157,414				148,614
	Readiness funding increase—PACOM unfunded priority list.						[8,800]				
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,973	101,400	2,973	101,400	2,973	101,400			2,973	101,400
	OTHER ITEMS										
006	CAD/PAD		29,989		29,989		29,989				29,989
007	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		6,925		6,925		6,925				6,925
008	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		494		494		494				494

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
009	MODIFICATIONS		1,610		1,610		1,610				1,610
010	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		4,237		4,237		4,237				4,237
	FLARES										
011	FLARES		86,101		86,101		86,101				86,101
	FUZES										
012	FUZES		103,417		103,417		103,417				103,417
	SMALL ARMS										
013	SMALL ARMS		24,648		24,648		24,648				24,648
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	2,973	677,400	2,973	677,400	2,973	686,200			2,973	677,400
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE										
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES										
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		6,528		2,528		6,528				6,528
	Program reduction				[-4,000]						
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES										
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		7,639		2,639		7,639				7,639
	Program reduction				[-5,000]						
003	CAP VEHICLES		961		961		961				961
004	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		11,027		5,027		11,027				11,027
	Program reduction				[-6,000]						
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES										
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		4,447		4,447		4,447				4,447
006	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		693		693		693				693
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT										
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		10,152		10,152		10,152				10,152
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT										
008	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		15,108		5,108		15,108				15,108
	Program reduction				[-10,000]						
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT										
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP		10,212		6,212		10,212				10,212
	Program reduction				[-4,000]						
010	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		57,049		32,049		57,049				57,049
	Program reduction				[-25,000]						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)										
011	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		106,182		106,182		106,182		-2,089		104,093
	VACM modernization devices unit cost growth								[-2,089]		
012	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		1,363		1,363		1,363				1,363
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS										
013	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,832		2,832		2,832				2,832
014	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		32,329		32,329		29,329				32,329
	NCCT						[-3,000]				
016	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		15,649		15,649		15,649				15,649
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS										
017	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		42,200		42,200		42,200		-12,200		30,000
	D-ILS program restructure funds early to need								[-12,200]		
018	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		6,333		6,333		6,333				6,333
019	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED		2,708		2,708		2,708				2,708
020	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS		50,033		40,033		50,033				50,033
	Program reduction				[-10,000]						
021	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		16,348		16,348		16,348				16,348
022	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		139,984		139,984		139,984				139,984
023	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		20,101		20,101		20,101				20,101
026	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN)		9,060		9,060		9,060				9,060
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS										
027	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		39,100		39,100		39,100				39,100
028	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		19,010		19,010		19,010				19,010
029	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		11,462		11,462		11,462				11,462
030	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		37,426		37,426		37,426				37,426
031	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		26,634		26,634		26,634				26,634
032	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N		1,289		1,289		1,289				1,289
033	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		11,508		11,508		11,508				11,508
034	GCSS-AF FOS		3,670		3,670		3,670				3,670
035	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM		15,298		15,298		15,298				15,298
036	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		9,565		9,565		9,565				9,565
037	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS		25,772		25,772		25,772				25,772
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS										
038	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS		81,286		112,586		112,586		31,300		112,586
	Air Force requested program transfer from AFNET				[31,300]		[31,300]		[31,300]		
039	AFNET		122,228		90,928		90,928		-31,300		90,928
	Air Force requested program transfer to BITI				[-31,300]		[-31,300]		[-31,300]		
041	USCENTCOM		16,342		16,342		16,342				16,342
	SPACE PROGRAMS										
042	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS		60,230		60,230		60,230				60,230
043	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		26,100		26,100		26,100				26,100
044	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		2,075		2,075		2,075				2,075
045	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE		4,656		4,656		4,656				4,656
046	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE		54,630		54,630		54,630				54,630

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
047	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		69,713	69,713		69,713					69,713
048	MILSATCOM SPACE		41,355	41,355		41,355					41,355
049	SPACE MODS SPACE		31,722	31,722		31,722					31,722
050	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM		61,603	61,603		61,603					61,603
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE										
051	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		50,335	50,335		50,335					50,335
053	RADIO EQUIPMENT		14,846	14,846		14,846					14,846
054	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		3,635	3,635		3,635					3,635
055	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		79,607	79,607		79,607					79,607
	MODIFICATIONS										
056	COMM ELECT MODS		105,398	105,398		105,398					105,398
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP										
057	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		12,577	12,577		12,577					12,577
058	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		31,209	31,209		31,209					31,209
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ										
059	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		7,670	7,670		7,670					7,670
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT										
060	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		14,125	14,125		37,725					14,125
	ICBM training equipment					[23,600]					
061	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		16,744	16,744		16,744					16,744
062	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT		2,495	2,495		2,495					2,495
063	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		10,573	10,573		10,573					10,573
064	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		5,462	5,462		5,462					5,462
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS										
066	DARP RC135		24,710	24,710		24,710					24,710
067	DCGS-AF		206,743	206,743		206,743					206,743
069	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		537,370	537,370		537,370					537,370
070	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		77,898	77,898		77,898					77,898
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS										
	UNDISTRIBUTED										
070A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		13,990,196	13,990,196		13,990,196					13,990,196
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS										
072	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		32,813	32,813		32,813					32,813
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		16,566,018	16,502,018		16,586,618		-14,289			16,551,729
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE										
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA										
001	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		1,594	1,594		1,594					1,594
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA										
002	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		4,325	4,325		4,325					4,325
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA										
003	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		17,268	17,268		17,268					17,268
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA										
008	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		10,491	10,491		10,491					10,491
010	TELEPORT PROGRAM		80,622	80,622		80,622					80,622
011	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		14,147	14,147		14,147					14,147
012	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		1,921	1,921		1,921					1,921
013	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		80,144	80,144		80,144					80,144
015	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		8,755	8,755		8,755					8,755
016	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY		33,737	33,737		33,737					33,737
017	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE		32,544	32,544		32,544					32,544
018	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT		13,300	13,300		13,300					13,300
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA										
020	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		7,436	7,436		7,436					7,436
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT										
021	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	11,640	3	11,640	3	11,640			3	11,640
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA										
022	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,269	1,269		1,269					1,269
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS										
024	VEHICLES		1,500	1,500		1,500					1,500
025	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		1,039	1,039		1,039					1,039
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY										
026	VEHICLES	1	50	1	50	1	50			1	50
027	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	7,639	3	7,639	3	7,639			3	7,639
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY										
028	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		68,880	68,880		68,880		-68,880			0
	Transfer to line 30 for All Up Round procurement							[-68,880]			
029	THAAD	31	464,424	31	464,424	31	464,424			31	464,424
030	AEGIS BMD	30	435,430	30	534,430	30	435,430		99,000	30	534,430
	Program increase				[99,000]				[99,000]		
031	BMDS AN/TPY-2 RADARS		48,140		48,140		48,140				48,140
032	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III		225,774		225,774		225,774				225,774
034	IRON DOME	1	175,972	1	351,972			-1	-175,972		0
	Program increase for Iron Dome				[176,000]				[175,000]		
	Realignment of Iron Dome to Overseas Contingency Operations.							[-1]	[-350,972]		
	Transfer to RDTE, Defense-Wide Line 96					[-1]	[-175,972]				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		House Authorized		Senate Authorized		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA										
041	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		3,448		3,448		3,448				3,448
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD										
042	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		43,708		43,708		43,708				43,708
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS										
044	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		10,783		10,783		10,783				10,783
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS										
046	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		29,599		29,599		29,599				29,599
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS										
046A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		540,894		540,894		540,894				540,894
	AVIATION PROGRAMS										
047	MC-12		40,500		40,500				-40,500		0
	Unjustified Request						[-40,500]		[-40,500]		
048	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		112,226		112,226		112,226				112,226
049	MH-60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		3,021		3,021		3,021				3,021
050	NON-STANDARD AVIATION		48,200		48,200		48,200				48,200
052	MH-47 CHINOOK		22,230		22,230		22,230				22,230
053	RQ-11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		6,397		6,397		6,397				6,397
054	CV-22 MODIFICATION		25,578		25,578		25,578				25,578
056	MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		15,651		15,651		21,351				15,651
	Capability Improvements						[5,700]				
057	STUASLO		1,500		1,500		1,500				1,500
058	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE		145,929		145,929		145,929				145,929
059	AC/MC-130J		65,130		65,130		65,130				65,130
061	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		39,563		39,563		39,563				39,563
	SHIPBUILDING										
063	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS		25,459		25,459		25,459				25,459
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS										
065	ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M		144,336		144,336		144,336				144,336
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS										
068	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		81,001		81,001		81,001				81,001
070	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS		17,323		13,423		17,323				17,323
	Reduction of PED Ground Systems				[-3,900]						
071	OTHER ITEMS <\$5M		84,852		84,852		84,852				84,852
072	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		51,937		51,937		51,937				51,937
074	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		31,017		31,017		31,017				31,017
075	TACTICAL VEHICLES		63,134		63,134		63,134				63,134
076	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M		192,448		192,448		192,448				192,448
078	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS		19,984		19,984		19,984				19,984
081	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES		5,044		5,044		5,044				5,044
082	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE		38,126		38,126		38,126				38,126
088	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		243,849		243,849		243,849				243,849
	CBDP										
095	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS		170,137		170,137		170,137				170,137
096	CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION		150,392		150,392		150,392				150,392
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	69	4,221,437	69	4,492,537	68	4,010,665	-1	-186,352	68	4,035,085
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND										
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND										
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		20,000				20,000		-20,000		0
	Unjustified request				[-20,000]				[-20,000]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND ...		20,000				20,000		-20,000		0
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS										
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS										
010	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS		-265,685						265,685		0
	Denied Prior Year Rescission request				[265,685]		[265,685]		[265,685]		
	TOTAL PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS		-265,685						265,685		0
	UNDISTRIBUTED GENERAL PROVISIONS										
	UNDISTRIBUTED GENERAL PROVISIONS										
010	UNDISTRIBUTED GENERAL PROVISIONS				-265,685						0
	Undistributed FY15 reduction				[-265,685]						
	TOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED GENERAL PROVISIONS				-265,685						0
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	158,103	89,508,034	158,218	90,992,403	158,247	89,524,369	103	1,891,327	158,206	91,399,361

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
003	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	2	36,000			2	36,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	2	36,000			2	36,000
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	159	32,136			159	32,136
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	159	32,136			159	32,136
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		35,000				35,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		5,000				5,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
013	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES		10,000				10,000
014	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		15,000				15,000
	ROCKETS						
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		66,905				66,905
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
021	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		3,000				3,000
022	GRENADERS, ALL TYPES		1,000				1,000
023	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		5,000				5,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		140,905				140,905
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	286	95,624			286	95,624
008	PLS ESP		60,300				60,300
010	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	473	192,620			473	192,620
015	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		197,000				197,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
063	DCGS-A (MIP)		63,831				63,831
065A	TROJAN SPIRIT—TERMINALS (TIARA)		2,600				2,600
067	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		6,910				6,910
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
071	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE		32,083				32,083
072	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		47,535				47,535
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
114A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,000				1,000
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
133	FORCE PROVIDER		51,500				51,500
135	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM		2,580				2,580
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
170	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		25,000				25,000
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	759	778,583			759	778,583
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK		189,700				189,700
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		94,600				94,600
	FORCE TRAINING						
003	TRAIN THE FORCE		15,700				15,700
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
004	OPERATIONS		79,000		65,463		144,463
	Transfer from Base				[65,463]		
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		379,000		65,463		444,463
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
011	H-1 UPGRADES (UH-1Y/AH-1Z)	1	30,000			1	30,000
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
027	MQ-8 UAV	2	40,888			2	40,888
028A	STUASLO UAV	3	55,000			3	55,000
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
039	EP-3 SERIES		34,955				34,955
049	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		2,548				2,548
054	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		31,920				31,920
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
067	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		936				936
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	6	196,247			6	196,247
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
003	TOMAHAWK	47	45,500			47	45,500

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
010	LASER MAVERICK		16,485				16,485
011	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	40	4,800			40	4,800
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	87	66,785			87	66,785
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		7,596				7,596
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		8,862				8,862
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		3,473				3,473
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		29,376				29,376
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		3,919				3,919
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		3,561				3,561
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		2,913				2,913
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		2,764				2,764
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		9,475				9,475
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		8,843				8,843
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES		7,098				7,098
018	60MM, ALL TYPES		5,935				5,935
019	81MM, ALL TYPES		9,318				9,318
020	120MM, ALL TYPES		6,921				6,921
022	GRENADERS, ALL TYPES		3,218				3,218
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		7,642				7,642
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		30,289				30,289
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		1,255				1,255
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES		2,061				2,061
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		154,519				154,519
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
023	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS		8,210				8,210
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
078	CANES				400		400
	ERI: Information Sharing with Coalition Partners				[400]		
084	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		5,870				5,870
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
088	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M		1,100				1,100
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
132	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		207,860				207,860
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
138	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,063				1,063
139	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		152				152
142	TACTICAL VEHICLES		26,300				26,300
145	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION		3,300				3,300
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
152	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		10,745				10,745
157	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,331				3,331
158	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		35,923		150		36,073
	ERI: Black Sea Information Sharing Initiatives				[150]		
159	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		514				514
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
164A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,400				2,400
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		306,768		550		307,318
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	OTHER SUPPORT						
007	MODIFICATION KITS	1	3,190			1	3,190
	GUIDED MISSILES						
010	JAVELIN	90	17,100			90	17,100
	OTHER SUPPORT						
013	MODIFICATION KITS		13,500				13,500
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		980				980
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
019	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		996				996
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
025	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,450				1,450
028	RQ-11 UAV		1,740				1,740
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
031	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		134				134
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
036	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		3,119				3,119
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
042	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		584				584
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
052	EOD SYSTEMS		5,566				5,566

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
055	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		3,230				3,230
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
058	TRAINING DEVICES		2,000				2,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	91	53,589			91	53,589
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
004	C-130J	1	70,000			1	70,000
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
018	MQ-9	12	192,000			12	192,000
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
021	B-1B		91,879				91,879
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
050	C-130		47,840				47,840
051	C-130J MODS		18,000				18,000
053	COMPASS CALL MODS		24,800				24,800
063	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS		44,300				44,300
064	OTHER AIRCRAFT		111,990				111,990
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
070	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		45,410				45,410
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	13	646,219			13	646,219
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL						
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	1,073	125,469			1,073	125,469
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	268	10,720			268	10,720
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	1,341	136,189			1,341	136,189
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	CARTRIDGES						
002	CARTRIDGES		2,469				2,469
	BOMBS						
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		56,293				56,293
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	4,027	117,039			4,027	117,039
	FLARES						
011	FLARES		19,136				19,136
	FUZES						
012	FUZES		24,848				24,848
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	4,027	219,785			4,027	219,785
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES						
004	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		3,000				3,000
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
006	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		1,878				1,878
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
008	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		5,131				5,131
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP		1,734				1,734
010	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		22,000				22,000
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
027	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		3,857				3,857
033	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		900				900
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
048	MILSATCOM SPACE		19,547				19,547
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
055	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		1,970				1,970
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP						
057	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		765				765
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
060	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		2,030				2,030
061	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		99,590				99,590
063	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		107,361				107,361
064	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION		10,975				10,975
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
070	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		6,100				6,100
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
070A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,143,936				3,143,936
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		3,430,774				3,430,774
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
010	TELEPORT PROGRAM		4,330				4,330
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY						
034	IRON DOME			1	350,972	1	350,972

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Agreement Change		Agreement Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Realignment of Iron Dome to Overseas Contingency Operations			[1]	[350,972]		
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
046A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		65,829				65,829
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
056	MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE				5,700		5,700
	MQ-9 Capability Enhancements				[5,700]		
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
065	ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M		28,873				28,873
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
068	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		13,549				13,549
071	OTHER ITEMS <\$5M		32,773				32,773
076	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M		78,357				78,357
088	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		4,175				4,175
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		227,886	1	356,672	1	584,558
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		50,000		-50,000		0
	Program decrease				[-50,000]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		50,000		-50,000		0
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
007	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT				1,250,000		1,250,000
	Program increase				[1,250,000]		
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT				1,250,000		1,250,000
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS						
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS						
010	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS		-117,000		117,000		0
	Denied Prior Year Rescission request				[117,000]		
	TOTAL PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS		-117,000		117,000		0
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	6,485	6,738,385	1	1,739,685	6,486	8,478,070

**TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	13,464	13,464	13,464		13,464
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	238,167	238,167	238,167		238,167
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	69,808	69,808	89,808	20,000	89,808
		Basic research program increase			[20,000]	[20,000]	
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	102,737	102,737	102,737		102,737
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	424,176	424,176	444,176	20,000	444,176
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	28,006	28,006	28,006		28,006
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	33,515	33,515	33,515		33,515
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	16,358	16,358	16,358		16,358
008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	63,433	63,433	63,433		63,433
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,502	18,502	18,502		18,502
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	46,194	46,194	46,194		46,194
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	28,528	28,528	28,528		28,528
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	27,435	27,435	27,435		27,435
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	72,883	72,883	72,883		72,883
014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	85,597	85,597	85,597		85,597
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,971	3,971	3,971		3,971
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,853	6,853	6,853		6,853
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	38,069	38,069	38,069		38,069
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	56,435	56,435	56,435		56,435

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	38,445	38,445	38,445		38,445
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	25,939	25,939	25,939		25,939
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	23,783	23,783	23,783		23,783
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	15,659	15,659	15,659		15,659
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	33,817	33,817	33,817		33,817
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	10,764	10,764	10,764		10,764
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	63,311	63,311	63,311		63,311
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	23,295	23,295	23,295		23,295
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	25,751	28,330	25,751	2,579	28,330
		Joint Service Combat Feeding Technology		[2,579]		[2,579]	
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	76,068	76,068	76,068		76,068
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	862,611	865,190	862,611	2,579	865,190
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT							
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	65,139	65,813	65,139	674	65,813
		Joint Service Combat Feeding Tech Demo		[674]		[674]	
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	67,291	67,291	67,291		67,291
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	88,990	88,990	88,990		88,990
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,931	57,931	57,931		57,931
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	110,031	110,031	110,031		110,031
034	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,883	6,883	6,883		6,883
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,580	13,580	13,580		13,580
036	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,871	44,871	44,871		44,871
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	7,492	7,492	7,492		7,492
038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	16,749	16,749	16,749		16,749
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	14,483	14,483	14,483		14,483
041	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,270	24,270	24,270		24,270
042	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	3,440	3,440	3,440		3,440
043	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,406	2,406	2,406		2,406
044	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,057	26,057	26,057		26,057
045	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,957	44,957	44,957		44,957
046	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	11,105	11,105	11,105		11,105
047	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	181,609	181,609	181,609		181,609
048	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,074	13,074	13,074		13,074
049	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,321	7,321	7,321		7,321
050	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,138	44,138	44,138		44,138
051	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	9,197	9,197	9,197		9,197
052	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	17,613	17,613	17,613		17,613
053	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	39,164	39,164	39,164		39,164
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	917,791	918,465	917,791	674	918,465
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES							
054	0603305A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	12,797	12,797	12,797		12,797
055	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	13,999	13,999	13,999		13,999
058	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	29,334	29,334	29,334		29,334
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	9,602	11,189	9,602	1,400	11,002
		Food Advanced Development		[1,587]		[1,400]	
061	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	8,953	8,953	8,953		8,953
062	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,052	3,052	3,052		3,052
063	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	7,830	7,830	7,830		7,830
065	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,954	2,954	2,954		2,954
067	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	13,386	13,386	13,386		13,386
069	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	23,659	23,659	23,659		23,659
070	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	6,830	9,830	9,830	3,000	9,830
		Army requested realignment—Caliber Config Study		[3,000]	[3,000]	[3,000]	
072	0604100A	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	9,913	9,913	9,913		9,913
073	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	74,740	74,740	74,740		74,740
074	0604120A	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT)	9,930	9,930	9,930		9,930
076	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2—INTERCEPT (IFPC2).	96,177	71,177	66,177	–25,000	71,177
		Program delay and funds requested early to need		[–25,000]	[–30,000]	[–25,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	323,156	302,743	296,156	–20,600	302,556

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION							
079	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	37,246	37,246	37,246		37,246
081	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	6,002	6,002	6,002		6,002
082	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	9,832	9,832	9,832		9,832
083	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVr)	9,730	9,730	9,730		9,730
084	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	5,532	5,532	5,532		5,532
085	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	19,929	19,929	19,929		19,929
086	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	27,884	34,586	29,586	6,702	34,586
		Army requested realignment		[6,702]	[6,702]	[6,702]	
		Only for XM25 CDEWS under execution of prior years funds			[-5,000]		
087	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	210	210	210		210
088	0604611A	JAVELIN	4,166	4,166	4,166		4,166
089	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	12,913	12,913	12,913		12,913
090	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	16,764	16,764	16,764		16,764
091	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	6,770	6,770	6,770		6,770
092	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	65,333	65,333	65,333		65,333
093	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	1,335	1,897	1,335	562	1,897
		Military Subsistence Systems		[562]		[562]	
094	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	8,945	8,945	8,945		8,945
096	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	15,906	15,906	15,906		15,906
097	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,394	4,394	4,394		4,394
098	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	11,084	11,084	11,084		11,084
099	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	10,027	10,027	10,027		10,027
100	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	42,430	42,430	42,430		42,430
101	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	105,279	105,279	105,279		105,279
102	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	15,006	15,006	15,006		15,006
103	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	24,581	24,581	24,581		24,581
104	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	4,433	4,433	4,433		4,433
105	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT— ENG DEV.	30,397	30,397	30,397		30,397
106	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	57,705	57,705	57,705		57,705
108	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	29,683	29,683	29,683		29,683
109	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	5,224	5,224	5,224		5,224
111	0604823A	FIREFINDER	37,492	37,492	37,492		37,492
112	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	6,157	6,157	6,157		6,157
113	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	1,912	1,912	1,912		1,912
116	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	69,761	69,761	69,761		69,761
117	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	138,465	138,465	138,465		138,465
118	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	92,353	92,353	92,353		92,353
119	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	8,440	8,440	8,440		8,440
120	0605031A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN)	17,999	17,999	17,999		17,999
121	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM)	145,409	145,409	145,409		145,409
122	0605350A	WIN-T INCREMENT 3—FULL NETWORKING	113,210	113,210	113,210		113,210
123	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	6,882	6,882	6,882		6,882
124	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	83,838	83,838	83,838		83,838
125	0605456A	PAC-3/MSE MISSILE	35,009	35,009	35,009		35,009
126	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	142,584	142,584	142,584		142,584
127	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	49,160	49,160	49,160		49,160
128	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	17,748	17,748	17,748		17,748
129	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	15,212	15,212	15,212		15,212
130	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFAC- TURING DEVELOPMENT PH.	45,718	45,718	45,718		45,718
131	0605830A	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,041	10,041	10,041		10,041
132	0210609A	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	83,300	83,300	83,300		83,300
133	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	983	983	983		983
134	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	8,961	8,961	8,961		8,961
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	1,719,374	1,726,638	1,721,076	7,264	1,726,638
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT							
135	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	18,062	18,062	18,062		18,062
136	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,040	10,040	10,040		10,040
137	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	60,317	60,317	60,317		60,317
138	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,612	20,612	20,612		20,612

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
139	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	176,041	176,041	187,041		176,041
		Additional SSA operations (STRATCOM unfunded priority)			[11,000]		
140	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	19,439	19,439	19,439		19,439
142	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	275,025	275,025	275,025		275,025
143	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	45,596	45,596	45,596		45,596
144	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	33,295	33,295	33,295		33,295
145	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,700	4,700	4,700		4,700
146	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,413	6,413	6,413		6,413
147	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	20,746	20,746	20,746		20,746
148	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	7,015	7,015	7,015		7,015
149	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	49,221	49,221	49,221		49,221
150	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	55,039	55,039	55,039		55,039
151	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	1,125	1,125	1,125		1,125
152	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	64,169	64,169	64,169		64,169
153	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	32,319	32,319	32,319		32,319
154	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	49,052	49,052	49,052		49,052
155	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	2,612	2,612	2,612		2,612
156	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	49,592	49,592	49,592		49,592
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	1,000,430	1,000,430	1,011,430		1,000,430
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
158	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	17,112	17,112	17,112		17,112
159	0607141A	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION	3,654	3,654	3,654		3,654
160	0607664A	BIOMETRIC ENABLING CAPABILITY (BEC)	1,332	1,332	1,332		1,332
161	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	152,991	152,991	152,991		152,991
162	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	54,076	29,076	54,076	-12,500	41,576
		Funding ahead of need		[-25,000]		[-12,500]	
163	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	22,374	22,374	22,374		22,374
164	0203728A	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOCs)	24,371	24,371	24,371		24,371
165	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	295,177	321,177	295,177	26,000	321,177
		Stryker ECP risk mitigation		[26,000]		[26,000]	
166	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	45,092	45,092	45,092		45,092
167	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	264,887	264,887	264,887		264,887
168	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	381	381	381		381
169	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	10,912	10,912	10,912		10,912
170	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	5,115	5,115	5,115		5,115
171	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	49,848	44,848	49,848	-5,000	44,848
		Contract delay for ATACMS		[-5,000]		[-5,000]	
172	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	22,691	22,691	22,691		22,691
173	0205402A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	4,364	4,364	4,364		4,364
174	0205410A	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	834	834	834		834
175	0205412A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	280	280	280		280
176	0205456A	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM	78,758	78,758	78,758		78,758
177	0205778A	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS)	45,377	45,377	45,377		45,377
178	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	10,209	10,209	10,209		10,209
181	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	12,525	12,525	12,525		12,525
182	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	14,175	14,175	14,175		14,175
183	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	4,527	4,527	4,527		4,527
184	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	11,011	11,011	11,011		11,011
185	0303150A	WMMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	2,151	2,151	2,151		2,151
187	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	22,870	22,870	22,870		22,870
188	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	20,155	20,155	20,155		20,155
189	0305219A	MQ-1C GRAY EAGLE UAS	46,472	46,472	46,472		46,472
191	0305233A	RQ-7 UAV	16,389	16,389	16,389		16,389
192	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	1,974	1,974	1,974		1,974
193	0310349A	WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING	3,249	3,249	3,249		3,249
194	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	76,225	76,225	76,225		76,225
194A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,802	4,802	4,802		4,802
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,346,360	1,342,360	1,346,360	8,500	1,354,860
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	6,593,898	6,580,002	6,599,600	18,417	6,612,315

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY							
BASIC RESEARCH							
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	113,908	118,908	133,908	20,000	133,908
		Basic research program increase		[5,000]	[20,000]	[20,000]	
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,734	18,734	18,734		18,734
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	443,697	443,697	443,697		443,697
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	576,339	581,339	596,339	20,000	596,339
APPLIED RESEARCH							
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	95,753	95,753	95,753		95,753
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	139,496	139,496	139,496		139,496
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	45,831	45,831	45,831		45,831
007	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	43,541	43,541	43,541		43,541
008	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	46,923	46,923	46,923		46,923
009	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	107,872	107,872	107,872		107,872
010	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,388	65,388	45,388	20,000	65,388
		Service Life extension for the AGOR ships		[20,000]		[20,000]	
011	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	5,887	5,887	5,887		5,887
012	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	86,880	86,880	86,880		86,880
013	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	170,786	170,786	170,786		170,786
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	32,526	32,526	32,526		32,526
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	820,883	840,883	820,883	20,000	840,883
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT							
015	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,734	37,734	37,734		37,734
016	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,831	25,831	25,831		25,831
017	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,623	64,623	64,623		64,623
018	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	128,397	128,397	128,397		128,397
019	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,506	11,506	11,506		11,506
020	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	256,144	256,144	256,144		256,144
021	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,838	4,838	4,838		4,838
022	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,985	9,985	9,985		9,985
023	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	53,956	53,956	53,956		53,956
024	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,000	2,000	2,000		2,000
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	595,014	595,014	595,014		595,014
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES							
025	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	40,429	40,429	40,429		40,429
026	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	4,325	4,325	4,325		4,325
027	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	2,991	2,991	2,991		2,991
028	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	12,651	12,651	12,651		12,651
029	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,782	7,782	7,782		7,782
030	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	5,275	5,275	5,275		5,275
031	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,646	1,646	1,646		1,646
032	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	100,349	100,349	100,349		100,349
033	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	52,781	52,781	52,781		52,781
034	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,959	5,959	5,959		5,959
035	0603525N	PILOT FISH	148,865	148,865	148,865		148,865
036	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	25,365	25,365	25,365		25,365
037	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	80,477	80,477	80,477		80,477
038	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	669	669	669		669
039	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	1,060	1,060	1,060		1,060
040	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	70,551	70,551	70,551		70,551
041	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	8,044	8,044	8,044		8,044
042	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	17,864	17,864	17,864		17,864
043	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	23,716	23,716	23,716	-3,305	20,411
		CSC contract award delay				[-3,305]	
044	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	499,961	499,961	499,961		499,961
045	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	21,026	21,026	21,026		21,026
046	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	542,700	542,700	542,700		542,700
047	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	88,734	88,734	88,734		88,734
048	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	20,881	20,881	20,881		20,881
049	0603595N	OHIO REPLACEMENT	849,277	849,277	849,277		849,277

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
050	0603596N	LCS MISSION MODULES	196,948	196,948	196,948	-23,600	173,348
		Program execution				[-23,600]	
051	0603597N	AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST (ATRT)	8,115	8,115	8,115		8,115
052	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	7,603	7,603	7,603		7,603
053	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	105,749	190,849	38,049		105,749
		Acceleration of the ACV Increment 1.1 Program		[85,100]			
		At USMC request transfer to OMMC 130			[-15,700]		
		At USMC request transfer to RD TEN 183			[-7,000]		
		At USMC request transfer to SCN 20			[-45,000]		
054	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,342	1,342	1,342		1,342
055	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	21,399	21,399	21,399		21,399
056	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	43,578	43,578	43,578	-1,000	42,578
		Common array block antenna program growth				[-1,000]	
057	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,764	7,764	7,764		7,764
058	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	13,200	13,200	13,200		13,200
059	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	69,415	69,415	69,415		69,415
060	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	2,588	2,588	2,588		2,588
061	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	176,301	176,301	176,301		176,301
062	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,873	3,873	3,873		3,873
063	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	376,028	376,028	376,028		376,028
064	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	272,096	272,096	272,096		272,096
065	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	42,233	42,233	42,233		42,233
066	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	46,504	46,504	46,504		46,504
067	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	25,109	25,109	25,109		25,109
068	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,659	9,659	9,659		9,659
069	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	318	318	318		318
070	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	40,912	40,912	40,912		40,912
071	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	54,896	27,896	54,896	-13,000	41,896
		Program delay		[-27,000]		[-13,000]	
073	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	58,696	58,696	58,696		58,696
074	0604112N	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80)	43,613	43,613	43,613		43,613
075	0604122N	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	21,110	21,110	21,110		21,110
076	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	5,657	5,657	5,657		5,657
077	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	8,033	8,033	8,033	-2,110	5,923
		Unjustified request for test assets				[-2,110]	
078	0604454N	LX (R)	36,859	36,859	36,859		36,859
079	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	15,227	15,227	15,227		15,227
081	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	22,393	22,393	22,393		22,393
082	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	202,939	202,939			202,939
		Halt program pending analysis demonstrating need			[-202,939]		
083	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH.	11,450	11,450	11,450		11,450
084	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	6,495	6,495	6,495		6,495
085	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	332	332	332		332
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	4,591,812	4,649,912	4,321,173	-43,015	4,548,797
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
086	0603208N	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	25,153	25,153	25,153		25,153
087	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	46,154	46,154	46,154		46,154
088	0604214N	AV-8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	25,372	25,372	25,372		25,372
089	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	53,712	53,712	53,712		53,712
090	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	11,434	11,434	11,434		11,434
091	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	2,164	2,164	2,164		2,164
092	0604221N	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,710	1,710	1,710		1,710
093	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	9,094	9,094	9,094		9,094
094	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	70,248	70,248	70,248	-8,108	62,140
		64-bit architecture phasing				[-3,000]	
		Program execution				[-5,108]	
095	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	193,200	193,200	193,200		193,200
096	0604245N	H-1 UPGRADES	44,115	44,115	44,115		44,115

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
097	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	23,227	23,227	23,227		23,227
098	0604262N	V-22A	61,249	61,249	61,249		61,249
099	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	15,014	15,014	15,014		15,014
100	0604269N	EA-18	18,730	18,730	18,730		18,730
101	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	28,742	28,742	28,742		28,742
102	0604273N	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	388,086	388,086	388,086		388,086
103	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	246,856	246,856	246,856		246,856
104	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	7,106	7,106	7,106		7,106
105	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	189,112	189,112	189,112		189,112
106	0604311N	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	376	376	376		376
107	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	71,849	71,849	71,849	-10,000	61,849
		Small diameter bomb II integration program growth				[-10,000]	
108	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	53,198	53,198	53,198		53,198
109	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	38,941	38,941	38,941		38,941
110	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION.	7,832	7,832	7,832		7,832
111	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING.	15,263	15,263	15,263		15,263
112	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM.	403,017	200,017	403,017		403,017
		Program delay		[-203,000]			
113	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	20,409	20,409	20,409		20,409
114	0604503N	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	71,565	71,565	71,565		71,565
115	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	29,037	29,037	29,037		29,037
116	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	122,083	122,083	122,083		122,083
118	0604522N	ADVANCED MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM	144,706	144,706	144,706		144,706
119	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	72,695	72,695	72,695		72,695
120	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	38,985	38,985	38,985		38,985
121	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	48,470	48,470	48,470		48,470
122	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,935	3,935	3,935		3,935
123	0604580N	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM)	132,602	132,602	132,602		132,602
124	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	19,067	19,067	19,067	-5,000	14,067
		Mine Development program growth				[-5,000]	
125	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	25,280	25,280	25,280		25,280
126	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,985	8,985	8,985		8,985
127	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	7,669	7,669	7,669		7,669
128	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	4,400	4,400	4,400		4,400
129	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	56,889	56,889	56,889		56,889
130	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	96,937	96,937	96,937		96,937
131	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	134,564	134,564	134,564	-13,225	121,339
		SEWIP block 3 preliminary design contract delay				[-13,225]	
132	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	200	200	200		200
133	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	8,287	8,287	8,287		8,287
134	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	29,504	29,504	29,504		29,504
135	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	513,021	513,021	513,021		513,021
136	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	516,456	516,456	516,456		516,456
137	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,887	2,887	2,887		2,887
138	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	66,317	66,317	66,317		66,317
139	0605212N	CH-53K RDTE	573,187	573,187	573,187		573,187
140	0605220N	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC)	67,815	67,815	67,815		67,815
141	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	6,300	6,300	6,300		6,300
142	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	308,037	323,037	308,037	11,000	319,037
		Spiral 2 government systems engineering program growth				[-4,000]	
		Wideband Communication Development		[15,000]		[15,000]	
143	0204202N	DDG-1000	202,522	202,522	202,522		202,522
144	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	1,011	1,011	1,011		1,011
145	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	10,357	10,357	10,357		10,357
146	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	23,975	23,975	23,975		23,975
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	5,419,108	5,231,108	5,419,108	-25,333	5,393,775
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
147	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	45,272	45,272	45,272		45,272
148	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	79,718	79,718	79,718	-10,000	69,718

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
		GQM-173A program delay				[-10,000]	
149	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	123,993	123,993	123,993		123,993
150	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	4,960	4,960	4,960		4,960
151	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	8,296	8,296	8,296		8,296
152	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	45,752	45,752	45,752		45,752
154	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	876	876	876		876
155	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	72,070	72,070	72,070		72,070
156	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,237	3,237	3,237		3,237
157	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	73,033	73,033	73,033		73,033
158	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	138,304	138,304	138,304		138,304
159	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	336,286	336,286	336,286		336,286
160	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	16,658	16,658	16,658		16,658
161	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,505	2,505	2,505		2,505
162	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	8,325	8,325	8,325		8,325
163	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	17,866	17,866	17,866		17,866
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	977,151	977,151	977,151	-10,000	967,151
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
168	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT.	35,949	35,949	35,949		35,949
169	0604766M	MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS	215	215	215		215
170	0605525N	CARRIER ONBOARD DELIVERY (COD) FOLLOW ON	8,873	8,873	8,873		8,873
172	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	96,943	96,943	96,943		96,943
173	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	30,057	30,057	30,057		30,057
174	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	4,509	4,509	4,509		4,509
175	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	13,676	13,676	13,676		13,676
176	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	12,480	12,480	12,480		12,480
177	0204136N	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	76,216	76,216	76,216		76,216
179	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	27,281	27,281	27,281		27,281
180	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	2,878	2,878	2,878		2,878
181	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	32,385	32,385	32,385		32,385
182	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	39,371	39,371	39,371		39,371
183	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	4,609	4,609	11,609		4,609
		At USMC request transfer from RDTEN 53			[7,000]		
184	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	99,106	89,106	99,106	-7,000	92,106
		Unjustified cost growth		[-10,000]		[-7,000]	
185	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	39,922	39,922	39,922		39,922
186	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,157	1,157	1,157		1,157
187	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	22,067	22,067	22,067		22,067
188	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	17,420	17,420	17,420		17,420
189	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	151,208	151,208	151,208		151,208
190	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	26,366	26,366	26,366		26,366
191	0205632N	MK-48 ADCAP	25,952	25,952	25,952		25,952
192	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	106,936	106,936	106,936		106,936
194	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	104,023	104,023	104,023		104,023
195	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	77,398	77,398	77,398		77,398
196	0206335M	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S)	32,495	32,495	32,495		32,495
197	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	156,626	156,626	156,626		156,626
198	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	20,999	20,999	20,999		20,999
199	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	14,179	14,179	14,179		14,179
200	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	47,258	47,258	47,258		47,258
201	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	10,210	10,210	10,210		10,210
206	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	41,829	41,829	41,829		41,829
207	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	22,780	22,780	22,780		22,780
208	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,053	23,053	23,053		23,053
209	0303150M	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	296	296	296		296
212	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	359	359	359		359
213	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	6,166	6,166	6,166		6,166
214	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,505	8,505	8,505		8,505
216	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	11,613	11,613	11,613		11,613
217	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	18,146	18,146	18,146		18,146
218	0305220N	RQ-4 UAV	498,003	530,403	498,003	-35,000	463,003
		Milestone C delay				[-35,000]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
		Triton Sensor Development Acceleration		[32,400]			
219	0305231N	MQ-8 UAV	47,294	47,294	47,294		47,294
220	0305232M	RQ-11 UAV	718	718	718		718
221	0305233N	RQ-7 UAV	851	851	851		851
222	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASLO)	4,813	4,813	4,813		4,813
223	0305239M	RQ-21A	8,192	8,192	8,192		8,192
224	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	22,559	22,559	22,559	-3,895	18,664
		Program execution				[-3,895]	
225	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)	2,000	2,000	2,000		2,000
226	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	4,719	4,719	4,719		4,719
227	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	21,168	21,168	21,168		21,168
228	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	37,169	37,169	37,169		37,169
229	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	4,347	4,347	4,347		4,347
229A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,162,684	1,162,684	1,162,684		1,162,684
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,286,028	3,308,428	3,293,028	-45,895	3,240,133
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	16,266,335	16,183,835	16,022,696	-84,243	16,182,092
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	314,482	314,482	314,482		314,482
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	127,079	127,079	147,079	20,000	147,079
		Basic research program increase			[20,000]	[20,000]	
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	12,929	12,929	12,929		12,929
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	454,490	454,490	474,490	20,000	474,490
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	105,680	105,680	105,680		105,680
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	105,747	105,747	105,747		105,747
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	81,957	81,957	81,957		81,957
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	172,550	369,550	172,550		172,550
		RD-180 replacement		[220,000]			
		Reduction for liquid engine combustion technologies and advanced liquid engine technologies.		[-23,000]			
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	118,343	118,343	118,343		118,343
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	98,229	98,229	98,229		98,229
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	87,387	87,387	87,387		87,387
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	125,955	125,955	125,955		125,955
012	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	147,789	147,789	147,789		147,789
013	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	37,496	37,496	37,496		37,496
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	1,081,133	1,278,133	1,081,133		1,081,133
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
014	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	32,177	42,177	32,177	10,000	42,177
		Metals Affordability Initiative		[10,000]		[10,000]	
015	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	15,800	15,800	15,800		15,800
016	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	34,420	34,420	34,420		34,420
017	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	91,062	91,062	91,062		91,062
018	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	124,236	124,236	124,236		124,236
019	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	47,602	47,602	47,602		47,602
020	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	69,026	69,026	69,026		69,026
021	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	14,031	14,031	14,031		14,031
022	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	21,788	21,788	21,788		21,788
023	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	42,046	42,046	42,046		42,046
024	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	23,542	33,542	23,542		23,542
		Program increase		[10,000]			
025	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	42,772	42,772	42,772		42,772
026	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	35,315	35,315	35,315		35,315
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	593,817	613,817	593,817	10,000	603,817
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
027	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,408	5,408	5,408		5,408
031	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	6,075	6,075	6,075		6,075

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
032	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	10,980	10,980	10,980		10,980
033	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,392	2,392	2,392		2,392
034	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	833	833	833		833
035	0603830F	SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM	32,313	32,313	32,313		32,313
037	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	30,885	30,885	30,885		30,885
039	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL	1,798	1,798	1,798		1,798
040	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	913,728	913,728	913,728		913,728
042	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,669	2,669	2,669		2,669
045	0604422F	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON	39,901	5,001	39,901		39,901
		Realigned to DMSP-20 launch		[-34,900]			
049	0604800F	F-35—EMD	4,976	4,976	4,976	-4,976	0
		Transfer F-35 EMD: Air Force requested to line #75				[-4,976]	
050	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE		30,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
		Program Increase		[30,000]	[20,000]	[20,000]	
051	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	59,004	59,004	59,004		59,004
054	0207110F	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE	15,722	15,722	15,722		15,722
055	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	88,825	88,825	88,825		88,825
056	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	156,659	156,659	156,659		156,659
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	1,372,168	1,367,268	1,392,168	15,024	1,387,192
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION					
059	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	13,324	13,324	13,324		13,324
060	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,965	1,965	1,965		1,965
061	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	39,110	39,110	39,110		39,110
062	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,926	3,926	3,926		3,926
063	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	68,759	68,759	68,759		68,759
064	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	23,746	23,746	23,746		23,746
065	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	9,462	19,462	9,462		9,462
		Program increase		[10,000]			
066	0604426F	SPACE FENCE	214,131	214,131	214,131	-14,000	200,131
		Program delay				[-14,000]	
067	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	30,687	30,687	30,687		30,687
068	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	319,501	319,501	311,501	-8,000	311,501
		Hosted payload demonstration			[-5,000]		
		Upgrade mobile ground units (STRATCOM unfunded priority)			[5,000]		
		Wide field of view test bed			[-8,000]	[-8,000]	
069	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	31,112	31,112	31,112		31,112
070	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,543	2,543	2,543		2,543
071	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	46,340	46,340	46,340		46,340
072	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	8,854	8,854	8,854		8,854
073	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	10,129	10,129	10,129		10,129
075	0604800F	F-35—EMD	563,037	563,037	563,037	4,976	568,013
		Transfer F-35 EMD: Air Force requested from line #49				[4,976]	
077	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD ...			100,000	220,000	220,000
		Rocket propulsion system			[100,000]	[220,000]	
078	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	4,938	4,938	4,938	-1,500	3,438
		Execution adjustment				[-1,500]	
079	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	59,826	59,826	59,826		59,826
080	0605030F	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	78	78	78		78
081	0605213F	F-22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	173,647	173,647	173,647		173,647
082	0605214F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	5,332	5,332	5,332		5,332
083	0605221F	KC-46	776,937	776,937	776,937		776,937
084	0605223F	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING	8,201	8,201	8,201		8,201
086	0605278F	HC/MC-130 RECAP RDT&E	7,497	7,497	7,497		7,497
087	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	314,378	314,378	298,378		314,378
		Protected tactical demonstration			[-7,000]		
		Satellite contractor support			[-9,000]		
088	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	103,552	103,552	103,552		103,552
089	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	31,425	31,425	31,425		31,425
090	0605458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E	85,938	85,938	85,938		85,938
091	0605931F	B-2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	98,768	98,768	98,768		98,768
092	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	198,357	198,357	198,357		198,357
094	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	8,831	8,831	8,831		8,831

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
095	0307581F	NEXTGEN JSTARS	73,088	73,088	10,000		73,088
		Integrate existng technology in replacement			[-63,088]		
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	3,337,419	3,347,419	3,350,331	201,476	3,538,895
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
097	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,418	24,418	24,418		24,418
098	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	47,232	47,232	47,232		47,232
099	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	30,443	30,443	30,443		30,443
101	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	12,266	12,266	12,266		12,266
102	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	689,509	689,509	689,509		689,509
103	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	34,364	34,364	34,364		34,364
104	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	21,161	21,161	21,161		21,161
105	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	46,955	46,955	46,955		46,955
106	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	32,965	32,965	32,965		32,965
107	0606017F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	13,850	13,850	13,850		13,850
108	0606116F	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT	19,512	19,512	19,512		19,512
110	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	181,727	181,727	181,727	-3,927	177,800
		Personnel costs excess to need				[-3,927]	
111	0308602F	ENTPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS)	4,938	4,938	4,938		4,938
112	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	18,644	18,644	18,644		18,644
113	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,425	1,425	1,425		1,425
114	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,790	3,790	3,790		3,790
114A	XXXXXXF	EJECTION SEAT RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		3,500		3,500	3,500
		Initial Aircraft Qualification		[3,500]		[3,500]	
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	1,183,199	1,186,699	1,183,199	-427	1,182,772
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
115	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	299,760	299,760	299,760		299,760
116	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE		2,000		2,000	2,000
		Implementation of the Secretary's Cruise Missile Defense Program		[2,000]		[2,000]	
118	0604618F	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,469	2,469	2,469		2,469
119	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	90,218	90,218	60,218	-30,000	60,218
		Delayed contract award			[-30,000]	[-30,000]	
120	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	34,815	34,815	34,815		34,815
122	0101113F	B-52 SQUADRONS	55,457	55,457	55,457		55,457
123	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	450	450	450		450
124	0101126F	B-1B SQUADRONS	5,353	5,353	5,353	-1,000	4,353
		Execution adjustment				[-1,000]	
125	0101127F	B-2 SQUADRONS	131,580	102,180	131,580	-20,000	111,580
		Flexible Strike execution delay		[-29,400]		[-20,000]	
126	0101213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	139,109	139,109	139,109		139,109
127	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	35,603	35,603	35,603		35,603
128	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	32	32	32		32
130	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,522	1,522	1,522		1,522
131	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	3,134	3,134	3,134		3,134
133	0205219F	MQ-9 UAV	170,396	170,396	170,396		170,396
136	0207133F	F-16 SQUADRONS	133,105	133,105	133,105		133,105
137	0207134F	F-15E SQUADRONS	261,969	261,969	261,969	-10,000	251,969
		Execution adjustment				[-10,000]	
138	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,831	14,831	14,831		14,831
139	0207138F	F-22A SQUADRONS	156,962	156,962	156,962	-5,000	151,962
		Unjustified increase— laboratory test and operations				[-5,000]	
140	0207142F	F-35 SQUADRONS	43,666	43,666	43,666		43,666
141	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	29,739	29,739	29,739		29,739
142	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	82,195	82,195	82,195		82,195
144	0207171F	F-15 EPAWSS	68,944	53,444	49,444	-15,500	53,444
		Delays in pre-EMD phase		[-15,500]	[-19,500]	[-15,500]	
145	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	5,095	5,095	5,095		5,095
146	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	883	883	883		883
147	0207247F	AF TENCAP	5,812	15,812	5,812		5,812

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
		Program increase		[10,000]			
148	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,081	1,081	1,081		1,081
149	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	14,411	14,411	14,411		14,411
150	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	109,664	109,664	109,664		109,664
151	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	15,897	15,897	15,897		15,897
152	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	41,066	41,066	41,066		41,066
153	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	552	552	552		552
154	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	180,804	180,804	180,804		180,804
155	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	3,754	3,754	3,754		3,754
157	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	7,891	7,891	7,891		7,891
158	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	5,891	5,891	5,891		5,891
159	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,782	1,782	1,782		1,782
161	0207452F	DCAPES	821	821	821		821
163	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	23,844	23,844	23,844		23,844
164	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	16,723	16,723	16,723		16,723
165	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,956	5,956	5,956		5,956
166	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,457	4,457	4,457		4,457
167	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	60,679	60,679	60,679		60,679
169	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	67,057	67,057	67,057		67,057
170	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	13,355	13,355	13,355		13,355
171	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	5,576	5,576	5,576		5,576
179	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	12,218	12,218	12,218		12,218
180	0302015F	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	28,778	28,778	28,778	-5,800	22,978
		Low Frequency Transmit System—delay to contract award				[-5,800]	
181	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	81,035	81,035	81,035		81,035
182	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	70,497	70,497	70,497		70,497
183	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	692	692	692		692
185	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	55,208	55,208	55,208		55,208
187	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	106,786	106,786	76,086		106,786
		ASIP 2C			[-30,700]		
190	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,157	4,157	4,157		4,157
193	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	20,806	20,806	20,806		20,806
194	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	25,102	25,102	25,102		25,102
195	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS) ..	23,516	23,516	23,516		23,516
196	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	8,639	8,639	8,639		8,639
199	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	498	498	498		498
200	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	13,222	13,222	13,222		13,222
201	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	360	360	360		360
206	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,674	3,674	3,674		3,674
207	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT ..	2,480	2,480	2,480		2,480
208	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	8,592	8,592	8,592		8,592
209	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	13,462	13,462	13,462		13,462
210	0305202F	DRAGON U-2	5,511	5,511	11,311		5,511
		Keep U-2 rather than enhance Global Hawk Block 30			[5,800]		
212	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	28,113	38,113	28,113	10,000	38,113
		Per Air Force UFR		[10,000]		[10,000]	
213	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,516	13,516	13,516		13,516
214	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	27,265	27,265	27,265		27,265
215	0305219F	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	1,378	1,378	1,378		1,378
216	0305220F	RQ-4 UAV	244,514	244,514	108,514		244,514
		Keep U-2 rather than enhance Global Hawk Block 30			[-136,000]		
217	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	11,096	11,096	2,296		11,096
		NCCT			[-8,800]		
218	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK (CDL)	36,137	36,137	36,137		36,137
219	0305238F	NATO AGS	232,851	232,851	232,851		232,851
220	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	20,218	20,218	20,218		20,218
221	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	212,571	212,571	212,571		212,571
222	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	73,779	73,779	73,779		73,779
223	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	4,102	4,102	4,102		4,102
225	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	20,468	20,468	20,468		20,468
226	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	11,596	11,596	11,596		11,596

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
227	0306250F	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,938	4,938	4,938		4,938
228	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	1,212	1,212	1,212		1,212
230	0401119F	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	38,773	38,773	38,773		38,773
231	0401130F	C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	83,773	83,773	83,773		83,773
232	0401132F	C-130J PROGRAM	26,715	26,715	26,715		26,715
233	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	5,172	5,172	5,172		5,172
234	0401219F	KC-10S	2,714	2,714	2,714		2,714
235	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	27,784	27,784	27,784		27,784
236	0401318F	CV-22	38,719	38,719	38,719		38,719
237	0401319F	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)	11,006	11,006	11,006		11,006
238	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	8,405	8,405	8,405		8,405
239	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,407	1,407	1,407		1,407
241	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	109,685	109,685	97,185		109,685
		Reduce unjustified program growth			[-12,500]		
242	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,209	16,209	16,209		16,209
243	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	987	987	987		987
244	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	126	126	126		126
245	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	2,603	2,603	2,603		2,603
246	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	1,589	1,589	1,589		1,589
247	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	5,026	5,026	5,026		5,026
248	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,394	1,394	1,394		1,394
249	0901279F	FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE	3,798	3,798	3,798		3,798
250	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	107,314	107,314	107,314	-4,629	102,685
		Defense Enterprise Accounting Management System Increment 2.				[-4,629]	
250A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,441,120	11,363,920	11,392,474	-29,000	11,412,120
		Classified program increase		[25,000]			
		Classified program reduction		[-102,200]	[-48,646]	[-29,000]	
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	15,717,666	15,617,566	15,437,320	-108,929	15,608,737
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	23,739,892	23,865,392	23,512,458	137,144	23,877,036
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW					
		BASIC RESEARCH					
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	37,778	37,778	37,778		37,778
002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	312,146	312,146	332,146	20,000	332,146
		Basic research program increase			[20,000]	[20,000]	
003	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	44,564	34,564	34,564	-10,000	34,564
		National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowship program.		[-10,000]	[-10,000]	[-10,000]	
004	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	49,848	49,848	49,848		49,848
005	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	45,488	55,488	55,488	10,000	55,488
		Military Child STEM Education programs		[10,000]	[10,000]	[10,000]	
006	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS.	24,412	34,412	34,412	10,000	34,412
		Program increase		[10,000]	[10,000]	[10,000]	
007	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	48,261	48,261	48,261		48,261
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	562,497	572,497	592,497	30,000	592,497
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
008	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	20,065	20,065	20,065		20,065
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	112,242	112,242	112,242		112,242
011	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,875	51,875	51,875		51,875
012	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	41,965	41,965	31,965		41,965
		Program reduction			[-10,000]		
013	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	334,407	334,407	334,407		334,407
015	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	44,825	44,825	44,825		44,825
016	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	226,317	226,317	226,317		226,317
018	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	15,000	15,000	7,500		15,000
		Program reduction			[-7,500]		
020	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	305,484	305,484	305,484		305,484
021	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	160,389	160,389	160,389		160,389
022	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	179,203	179,203	179,203		179,203

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
023	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	151,737	151,737	151,737		151,737
024	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	9,156	9,156	9,156		9,156
025	1160401BB	SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	39,750	39,750	39,750		39,750
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	1,692,415	1,692,415	1,674,915		1,692,415
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT					
026	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	26,688	26,688	26,688		26,688
027	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,682	8,682	8,682		8,682
028	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	69,675	89,675	69,675	20,000	89,675
		Program emphasis for CT and Irregular Warfare Programs		[20,000]		[20,000]	
029	0603133D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	30,000	24,000	20,000	–6,000	24,000
		Program decrease		[–6,000]	[–10,000]	[–6,000]	
030	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT.	283,694	283,694	283,694		283,694
032	0603176C	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	8,470	8,470	8,470		8,470
033	0603177C	DISCRIMINATION SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	45,110	45,110	45,110	–2,000	43,110
		Unjustified growth				[–2,000]	
034	0603178C	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	14,068	27,416	14,068		14,068
		MDA DE Ballistic Missile Kill Capability Development		[13,348]			
035	0603179C	ADVANCED C4ISR	15,329	15,329	15,329		15,329
036	0603180C	ADVANCED RESEARCH	16,584	16,584	16,584		16,584
037	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	19,335	19,335	19,335		19,335
038	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY.	2,544	2,544	2,544		2,544
039	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	51,033	51,033	51,033		51,033
040	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	129,723	129,723	129,723		129,723
041	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	179,883	179,883	179,883		179,883
042	0603288D8Z	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS	12,000	12,000	4,500		12,000
		Program reduction			[–7,500]		
043	0603289D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS	60,000	50,000	45,000	–10,000	50,000
		Program reduction		[–10,000]	[–15,000]	[–10,000]	
044	0603294C	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	25,639	25,639	25,639		25,639
045	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT.	132,674	132,674	132,674		132,674
046	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	10,965	10,965	10,965		10,965
047	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	131,960	121,960	111,960	–10,000	121,960
		Program reduction		[–10,000]	[–20,000]	[–10,000]	
052	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.	91,095	91,095	91,095		91,095
053	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	33,706	33,706	33,706		33,706
054	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	16,836	16,836	16,836		16,836
055	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	29,683	29,683	29,683		29,683
056	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	57,796	57,796	57,796		57,796
057	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	72,144	72,144	72,144		72,144
058	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,405	7,405	7,405		7,405
059	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	92,246	92,246	92,246		92,246
060	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	243,265	243,265	243,265		243,265
062	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	386,926	386,926	366,926		386,926
		Program reduction			[–20,000]		
063	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	312,821	312,821	312,821		312,821
064	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,692	10,692	10,692		10,692
065	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	15,776	15,776	15,776		15,776
066	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	69,319	64,319	69,319	–5,000	64,319
		Program decrease		[–5,000]		[–5,000]	
068	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	3,000	3,000	3,000		3,000
071	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	81,148	81,148	81,148		81,148
072	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	31,800	31,800	31,800		31,800
073	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	46,066	46,066	46,066		46,066
074	1160402BB	SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	57,622	57,622	57,622		57,622
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,933,402	2,935,750	2,860,902	–13,000	2,920,402

ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
077	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P.	41,072	41,072	41,072		41,072
079	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	90,558	90,558	90,558		90,558
080	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM	15,518	15,518	19,518	4,000	19,518
		Continue important test programs			[4,000]	[4,000]	
081	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	51,462	51,462	51,462		51,462
082	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	299,598	299,598	284,598	-6,800	292,798
		THAAD 2.0 early to need			[-15,000]	[-6,800]	
083	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,003,768	1,043,768	1,033,768	40,000	1,043,768
		GMD reliability and maintenance improvements		[40,000]	[30,000]	[40,000]	
084	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	179,236	179,236	179,236		179,236
085	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	392,893	392,893	392,893		392,893
086	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	410,863	410,863	410,863		410,863
087	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	310,261	310,261	310,261		310,261
088	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	929,208	929,208	929,208		929,208
089	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	31,346	31,346	31,346		31,346
090	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	6,389	6,389	6,389		6,389
091	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI.	443,484	443,484	443,484	-12,000	431,484
		Spiral 8.2-3—unjustified growth without baseline				[-12,000]	
092	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	46,387	46,387	46,387		46,387
093	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	58,530	58,530	58,530		58,530
094	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	16,199	16,199	16,199		16,199
095	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	64,409	64,409	64,409		64,409
096	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	96,803	268,803	447,775	173,800	270,603
		Program increase for Israeli Cooperative Programs		[172,000]	[175,000]	[173,800]	
		Transfer from Procurement, Defense-Wide Line 34			[175,972]		
097	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	386,482	386,482	386,482	-20,000	366,482
		Test efficiencies				[-20,000]	
098	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	485,294	485,294	485,294		485,294
099	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	10,194	10,194	10,194		10,194
100	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	10,139	10,139	10,139		10,139
101	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	2,907	2,907	7,907	5,000	7,907
		Program increase			[5,000]	[5,000]	
102	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	190,000	170,000	190,000	-20,000	170,000
		Program decrease		[-20,000]		[-20,000]	
103	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT.	3,702	3,702	3,702		3,702
104	0604445J	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	53,000	53,000	53,000		53,000
106	0604775D8Z	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM			75,000	75,000	75,000
		Program increase			[75,000]	[75,000]	
107	0604787J	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	7,002	7,002	7,002		7,002
108	0604828J	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	7,102	7,102	7,102		7,102
109	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM-3 (LBSM3)	123,444	123,444	123,444		123,444
110	0604881C	AEGIS SM-3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	263,695	263,695	263,695		263,695
113	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	12,500	12,500	12,500		12,500
114	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	2,656	2,656	2,656		2,656
115	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	961	961	961		961
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTO-TYPES.	6,047,062	6,239,062	6,497,034	239,000	6,286,062
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION					
116	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD.	7,936	7,936	7,936		7,936
117	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	70,762	70,762	70,762		70,762
118	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	345,883	345,883	335,883		345,883
		Program under-execution			[-10,000]		
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	25,459	25,459	25,459		25,459
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	17,562	17,562	17,562		17,562
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	6,887	6,887	6,887		6,887
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,530	12,530	12,530		12,530
123	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	286	286	286		286
124	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	3,244	3,244	3,244		3,244

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
125	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	6,500	6,500	6,500		6,500
126	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	15,326	15,326	15,326		15,326
127	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	19,351	19,351	19,351		19,351
128	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INITIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	41,465	41,465	41,465		41,465
129	0605090S	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS)	10,135	10,135	10,135		10,135
130	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	9,546	9,546	9,546		9,546
131	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	14,241	14,241	14,241		14,241
132	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	3,660	3,660	3,660		3,660
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	610,773	610,773	600,773		610,773
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
133	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	5,616	5,616	5,616		5,616
134	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	3,092	3,092	3,092		3,092
135	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	254,503	254,503	254,503		254,503
136	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	21,661	21,661	21,661		21,661
138	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	27,162	27,162	27,162		27,162
139	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	24,501	24,501	24,501		24,501
142	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	43,176	43,176	43,176		43,176
145	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	44,246	44,246	44,246		44,246
146	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	2,665	2,665	2,665		2,665
147	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS—PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,366	4,366	4,366		4,366
148	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	27,901	27,901	27,901		27,901
149	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	2,855	2,855	2,855		2,855
150	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	105,944	105,944	105,944		105,944
156	0605502KA	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	400	400	400		400
159	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	1,634	1,634	1,634		1,634
160	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	12,105	12,105	7,355		12,105
		Program reduction			[-4,750]		
161	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	50,389	50,389	50,389		50,389
162	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	8,452	8,452	8,452		8,452
163	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	15,187	19,187	15,187	4,000	19,187
		Program increase		[4,000]		[4,000]	
164	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	71,362	71,362	71,362		71,362
165	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,100	4,100	4,100		4,100
166	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	1,956	1,956	1,956		1,956
167	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	10,321	10,321	10,321		10,321
170	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	11,552	11,552	11,552		11,552
172	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	6,748	6,748	6,748		6,748
174	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	44,005	44,005	40,005		44,005
		Program decrease—historical under-execution			[-4,000]		
175	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	36,998	36,998	36,998		36,998
176	0901598D8W	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS WHS	612	612	612		612
177A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	44,367	44,367	44,367		44,367
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	887,876	891,876	879,126	4,000	891,876
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT					
178	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	3,988	3,988	3,988		3,988
179	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA.	1,750	1,750	1,750		1,750
180	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHAIS)	286	286	286		286
181	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	14,778	14,778	14,778		14,778
182	0607310D8Z	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	2,953	2,953	2,953		2,953
183	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS)	10,350	10,350	10,350		10,350
184	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	28,496	28,496	28,496		28,496
185	0607828J	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	11,968	11,968	11,968		11,968
186	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	1,842	1,842	1,842		1,842
187	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	63,558	63,558	63,558		63,558

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
189	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	3,931	3,931	3,931		3,931
193	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	924	924	924		924
194	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	9,657	9,657	9,657		9,657
195	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	25,355	25,355	25,355		25,355
196	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	12,671	12,671	12,671		12,671
197	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	222	222	222		222
198	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	32,698	32,698	32,698		32,698
199	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	11,304	11,304	11,304		11,304
200	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	125,854	145,854	155,854	30,000	155,854
		Accelerate SHARKSEER deployment		[20,000]	[30,000]	[30,000]	
201	0303140K	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM			12,600		0
		Cyber Situational Awareness			[9,400]		
		Transfer from line 212 (PE 0305103K)			[3,200]		
202	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	33,793	33,793	33,793		33,793
203	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	13,423	13,423	13,423		13,423
204	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	3,774	3,774	3,774		3,774
205	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	951	951	951		951
206	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	2,697	2,697	2,697		2,697
208	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	19,294	19,294	19,294		19,294
212	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	3,234	3,234	34		3,234
		Transfer to line 201 (PE 0303140K)			[-3,200]		
213	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	8,846	8,846	8,846		8,846
217	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	7,065	7,065	7,065		7,065
218	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	23,984	23,984	23,984		23,984
221	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,286	5,286	5,286		5,286
224	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,400	3,400	3,400		3,400
229	0305327V	INSIDER THREAT	8,670	8,670	8,670		8,670
230	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,110	2,110	2,110		2,110
239	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	22,366	22,366	22,366		22,366
240	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,574	1,574	1,574		1,574
241	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	4,409	4,409	4,409		4,409
242	1105219BB	MQ-9 UAV	9,702	9,702	14,902		9,702
		Capability Improvements			[5,200]		
243	1105232BB	RQ-11 UAV	259	259	259		259
245	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	164,233	164,233	164,233		164,233
247	1160405BB	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	9,490	9,490	9,490		9,490
248	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	75,253	75,253	75,253		75,253
252	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	24,661	24,661	24,661		24,661
253	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	20,908	20,908	20,908		20,908
259	1160480BB	SO F TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,672	3,672	3,672		3,672
262	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	57,905	57,905	57,905		57,905
264	1160489BB	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,788	3,788	3,788		3,788
265	1160490BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	16,225	16,225	16,225		16,225
265A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,118,502	3,113,502	3,118,502		3,118,502
		Classified adjustment		[-5,000]			
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	4,032,059	4,047,059	4,076,659	30,000	4,062,059
		UNDISTRIBUTED					
266	9999999999	UNDISTRIBUTED				-69,000	-69,000
		DARPA undistributed reduction				[-69,000]	
		SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED				-69,000	-69,000
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	16,766,084	16,989,432	17,181,906	221,000	16,987,084
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE MANAGEMENT SUPPORT					
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	74,583	74,583	74,583		74,583
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	45,142	45,142	45,142		45,142
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	48,013	53,013	48,013		48,013
		Information Assurance Testing and Exercises		[5,000]			
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	167,738	172,738	167,738		167,738

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	167,738	172,738	167,738		167,738
		TOTAL RDT&E	63,533,947	63,791,399	63,484,398	292,318	63,826,265

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY					
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES					
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY			4,500		4,500
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			4,500		4,500
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			4,500		4,500
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY					
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
225	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)			940		940
229A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			35,080		35,080
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			36,020		36,020
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			36,020		36,020
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF					
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT					
250A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			14,706		14,706
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			14,706		14,706
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			14,706		14,706
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW					
		APPLIED RESEARCH					
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY			112,000		112,000
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH			112,000		112,000
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT					
242	1105219BB	MQ-9 UAV				5,200	5,200
		MQ-9 enhancements				[5,200]	
248	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS			6,000		6,000
265A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			163,447		163,447
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			169,447	5,200	174,647
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			281,447	5,200	286,647
		TOTAL RDT&E			336,673	5,200	341,873

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY					
	OPERATING FORCES					
010	MANEUVER UNITS	969,281	1,069,281	969,281		969,281
	Restore Critical Operations Tempo		[100,000]			
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	61,990	61,990	61,990		61,990

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	450,987	450,487	450,987		450,987
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–500]			
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	545,773	543,773	545,773		545,773
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–1,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–1,000]			
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,057,453	1,046,453	1,057,453		1,057,453
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–10,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–1,000]			
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,409,347	1,547,947	1,409,347		1,409,347
	Restore Critical Aviation Readiness		[100,000]			
	UH–60A to UH–60L Conversions/ARNG Modernization		[38,600]			
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,592,334	3,567,334	3,592,334	–68,000	3,524,334
	Fully fund two Combat Training Center rotations—Army requested transfer to OM,ARNG and MP,ARNG				[–68,000]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–19,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–5,500]			
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	411,388	411,388	411,388		411,388
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,001,232	1,100,732	1,186,832		1,001,232
	Readiness funding increase			[185,600]		
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–500]			
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[100,000]			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,428,972	7,346,972	7,428,972		7,428,972
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–27,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–55,000]			
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,066,434	1,976,434	2,179,434	88,000	2,154,434
	Facilities Sustainment			[18,750]	[18,750]	
	Readiness funding increase—fully funds 6% CIP			[94,250]	[94,250]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–7,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–58,000]			
	Transfer to Arlington National Cemetery		[–25,000]		[–25,000]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	411,863	411,363	411,863		411,863
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–500]			
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	179,399	178,899	179,399		179,399
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–500]			
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	432,281	429,781	432,281		432,281
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–2,500]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	20,018,734	20,142,834	20,317,334	20,000	20,038,734
MOBILIZATION						
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	316,776	315,776	316,776		316,776
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–500]			
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	187,609	186,109	187,609		187,609
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–1,500]			
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,463	86,463	6,463	80,000	86,463
	Industrial Base Initiative-Body Armor		[80,000]		[80,000]	
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	510,848	588,348	510,848	80,000	590,848
TRAINING AND RECRUITING						
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	124,766	123,766	124,766		124,766
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–1,000]			
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	51,968	51,468	51,968		51,968
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–500]			
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	43,735	43,735	43,735		43,735
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	456,563	456,063	456,563		456,563
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–500]			
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	886,529	876,029	886,529		886,529
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–8,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–2,000]			
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	890,070	890,070	890,070		890,070
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	193,291	190,291	193,291		193,291
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[–2,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[–500]			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	552,359	551,359	552,359		552,359
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−500]			
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	466,927	461,427	466,927		466,927
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−5,500]			
300	EXAMINING	194,588	194,588	194,588		194,588
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	205,782	197,782	205,782		205,782
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−8,000]			
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	150,571	149,071	150,571		150,571
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,500]			
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	169,784	162,784	169,784		169,784
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−7,000]			
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	4,386,933	4,348,433	4,386,933		4,386,933
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES					
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	541,877	541,877	541,877		541,877
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	722,291	722,291	722,291		722,291
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	602,034	604,034	602,034		602,034
	Corrosion Mitigation Activities		[5,000]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−2,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−500]			
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	422,277	419,777	422,277		422,277
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−2,000]			
390	ADMINISTRATION	405,442	404,942	405,442		405,442
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,624,742	1,622,742	1,624,742		1,624,742
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−1,500]			
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	289,771	289,271	289,771		289,771
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	390,924	385,424	390,924		390,924
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−5,500]			
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,118,540	1,117,040	1,118,540		1,118,540
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,500]			
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	241,234	239,734	241,234		241,234
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,500]			
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	243,509	242,509	243,509		243,509
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,000]			
460	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS	200,615	199,115	200,615		200,615
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,500]			
470	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	462,591	462,091	462,591		462,591
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	27,375	27,375	27,375		27,375
520A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,030,411	1,029,411	1,030,411		1,030,411
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−500]			
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	8,323,633	8,307,633	8,323,633		8,323,633
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
530	UNDISTRIBUTED		−513,700	−320,000	−296,400	−296,400
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[−48,900]	[−48,900]	[−48,900]	
	Program decrease—overestimate of civilian personnel		[−80,000]	[−250,000]	[−247,500]	
	Training program to increase and improve financial literacy training for incoming and outgoing military personnel		[2,500]			
	Travel savings			[−21,100]		
	Unobligated balances		[−387,300]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		−513,700	−320,000	−296,400	−296,400
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	33,240,148	32,873,548	33,218,748	−196,400	33,043,748
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES OPERATING FORCES					

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	15,200	15,200	15,200		15,200
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	502,664	532,164	502,664		502,664
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Restore Critical Operations Tempo		[30,000]			
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	107,489	107,489	107,489		107,489
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	543,989	543,989	543,989		543,989
060	AVIATION ASSETS	72,963	72,963	72,963		72,963
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	360,082	358,082	360,082		360,082
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−500]			
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	72,491	72,491	72,491		72,491
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	58,873	93,873	73,873		58,873
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[35,000]	[15,000]		
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	388,961	386,461	388,961		388,961
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−2,500]			
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	228,597	219,097	233,597	5,000	233,597
	Facilities Sustainment			[5,000]	[5,000]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−9,000]			
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	39,590	39,590	39,590		39,590
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	2,390,899	2,441,399	2,410,899	5,000	2,395,899
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES						
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,608	10,608	10,608		10,608
140	ADMINISTRATION	18,587	18,587	18,587		18,587
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	6,681	6,681	6,681		6,681
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	9,192	9,192	9,192		9,192
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	54,602	54,102	54,602		54,602
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	99,670	99,170	99,670		99,670
UNDISTRIBUTED						
180	UNDISTRIBUTED		−38,700		−13,800	−13,800
	Overestimation of civilian FTE targets				[−13,800]	
	Unobligated balances		[−38,700]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		−38,700		−13,800	−13,800
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	2,490,569	2,501,869	2,510,569	−8,800	2,481,769
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG						
OPERATING FORCES						
010	MANEUVER UNITS	660,648	909,748	683,648	23,000	683,648
	National Guard combat training center rotations activities		[70,000]			
	National Guard critical operations tempo activities		[99,600]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Restore Critical Operations Tempo		[80,000]			
	Transfer funding for 2 CTC rotations			[23,000]	[23,000]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	165,942	165,942	165,942		165,942
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	733,800	733,800	733,800		733,800
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	83,084	83,084	83,084		83,084
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	22,005	22,005	22,005		22,005
060	AVIATION ASSETS	920,085	920,085	920,085		920,085
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	680,887	673,887	680,887		680,887
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−5,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−2,000]			
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	69,726	69,726	69,726		69,726
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	138,263	185,863	138,263		138,263
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−1,500]			
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[49,600]			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	804,517	792,017	804,517	−10,000	794,517
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−2,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−10,000]			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
	Remove one-time fiscal year 2014 funding increase				[−10,000]	
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	490,205	471,705	495,205	5,000	495,205
	Facilities Sustainment			[5,000]	[5,000]	
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−18,500]			
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	872,140	871,140	872,140		872,140
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,000]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	5,641,302	5,899,002	5,669,302	18,000	5,659,302
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES						
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	6,690	6,690	6,690		6,690
140	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	1,765	1,765	1,765		1,765
150	ADMINISTRATION	63,075	65,075	63,075		63,075
	National Guard State Partnership Program		[2,000]			
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	37,372	37,372	37,372		37,372
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	6,484	6,484	6,484		6,484
180	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	274,085	269,585	260,285	−13,800	260,285
	Program decrease for advertising			[−13,800]	[−13,800]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−4,500]			
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	389,471	386,971	375,671	−13,800	375,671
UNDISTRIBUTED						
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		−72,400			0
	Unobligated balances		[−72,400]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		−72,400			0
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	6,030,773	6,213,573	6,044,973	4,200	6,034,973
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY						
OPERATING FORCES						
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,947,202	5,002,202	4,947,202		4,947,202
	FHP Unit Level Maintenance		[56,000]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,000]			
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,647,943	1,659,443	1,647,943		1,647,943
	FHP Unit Level Maintenance		[12,000]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	37,050	37,050	37,050		37,050
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	96,139	95,639	96,139		96,139
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	363,763	362,763	363,763		363,763
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,000]			
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	814,770	935,870	923,670	10,100	824,870
	Aviation Depot Maintenance		[111,000]	[108,900]		
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[10,100]		[10,100]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	36,494	36,494	36,494		36,494
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	350,641	473,141	350,641		350,641
	Aviation Logistics		[123,000]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,865,379	3,959,879	3,865,379		3,865,379
	CLF steaming days		[13,000]			
	Corrosion Mitigation Activities		[5,000]			
	Joint High Speed Vessel Operations		[10,000]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−5,500]			
	T-AKES to Full Operational Status		[72,000]			
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	711,243	709,743	711,243		711,243
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−1,000]			
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,296,408	5,327,608	5,296,408	33,700	5,330,108
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[33,700]		[33,700]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−2,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−500]			
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,339,077	1,335,877	1,339,077	300	1,339,377
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[300]		[300]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−3,500]			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	708,634	706,634	708,634		708,634
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-2,000]			
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	91,599	91,099	91,599		91,599
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	207,038	206,538	207,038		207,038
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
160	WARFARE TACTICS	432,715	431,715	432,715		432,715
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	338,116	337,616	338,116		338,116
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	892,316	891,316	892,316		892,316
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	128,486	128,486	128,486		128,486
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,472	2,472	2,472		2,472
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	101,200	100,700	101,200		101,200
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	188,920	186,420	188,920		188,920
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-2,500]			
230	CRUISE MISSILE	109,911	109,911	109,911		109,911
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,172,823	1,172,823	1,174,123		1,172,823
	Additional FCET			[1,300]		
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	104,139	104,139	104,139		104,139
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	490,911	490,411	490,911		490,911
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	324,861	323,861	324,861		324,861
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
290	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	936,743	934,243	936,743		936,743
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-2,500]			
300	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,483,495	1,422,995	1,587,495	104,000	1,587,495
	Facilities Sustainment			[18,750]	[18,750]	
	Readiness funding increase—fully funds 6% CIP			[85,250]	[85,250]	
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-60,500]			
310	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,398,667	4,364,167	4,398,667		4,398,667
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-34,500]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	31,619,155	31,941,255	31,833,355	148,100	31,767,255
MOBILIZATION						
320	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	526,926	526,926	526,926		526,926
330	READY RESERVE FORCE	195	195	195		195
340	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,704	6,704	6,704		6,704
350	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	251,538	205,538	205,538	-46,000	205,538
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[-46,000]	[-46,000]	[-46,000]	
360	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	124,323	124,323	124,323		124,323
370	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,323	2,323	2,323		2,323
380	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	20,333	20,333	20,333		20,333
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	932,342	886,342	886,342	-46,000	886,342
TRAINING AND RECRUITING						
390	OFFICER ACQUISITION	156,214	155,714	156,214		156,214
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
400	RECRUIT TRAINING	8,863	8,963	8,863	100	8,963
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[100]		[100]	
410	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	148,150	148,150	148,150		148,150
420	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	601,501	604,201	601,501	7,200	608,701
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[7,200]		[7,200]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-4,500]			
430	FLIGHT TRAINING	8,239	8,239	8,239		8,239
440	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	164,214	165,362	164,214	1,000	165,214
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[1,000]		[1,000]	
	Naval Sea Cadets		[1,148]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
450	TRAINING SUPPORT	182,619	183,019	182,619	900	183,519
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[900]		[900]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
460	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	230,589	230,089	230,589	1,148	231,737
	Naval Sea Cadet Corps				[1,148]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
470	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	115,595	114,095	115,595		115,595
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,500]			
480	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	79,606	79,106	79,606		79,606
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
490	JUNIOR ROTC	41,664	39,664	41,664		41,664
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−2,000]			
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	1,737,254	1,736,602	1,737,254	10,348	1,747,602
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES					
500	ADMINISTRATION	858,871	852,871	858,871		858,871
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−6,000]			
510	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	12,807	12,807	12,807		12,807
520	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	119,863	119,863	119,863		119,863
530	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	356,113	353,013	356,113	900	357,013
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[900]		[900]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−4,000]			
540	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	255,605	255,105	255,605		255,605
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
550	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	339,802	337,802	339,802		339,802
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−2,000]			
570	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	172,203	172,203	172,203		172,203
590	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	283,621	282,621	283,621		283,621
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−500]			
600	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,111,464	1,110,464	1,111,464		1,111,464
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−500]			
610	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	43,232	43,232	43,232		43,232
620	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	25,689	25,689	25,689		25,689
630	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	73,159	72,659	73,159		73,159
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
640	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	548,640	548,140	548,640		548,640
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
700	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,713	4,713	4,713		4,713
720A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	531,324	530,324	531,324		531,324
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−500]			
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	4,737,106	4,721,506	4,737,106	900	4,738,006
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
730	UNDISTRIBUTED		−400,400	−88,700	−154,200	−154,200
	Civilian personnel underexecution		[−80,000]		[−80,000]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[−74,200]	[−74,200]	[−74,200]	
	Training program to increase and improve financial literacy training for incoming and outgoing military personnel		[2,500]			
	Travel savings			[−14,500]		
	Unobligated balances		[−248,700]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		−400,400	−88,700	−154,200	−154,200
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	39,025,857	38,885,305	39,105,357	−40,852	38,985,005
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS					
	OPERATING FORCES					
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	905,744	944,044	939,544	33,800	939,544
	Corrosion Mitigation Activities		[5,000]			
	Crisis Response Operations Unfunded Requirement		[33,800]	[33,800]	[33,800]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	921,543	920,543	921,543		921,543
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-500]			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	229,058	280,058	229,058		229,058
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[51,000]			
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	87,660	87,660	87,660		87,660
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	573,926	556,926	592,676	18,750	592,676
	Facilities Sustainment			[18,750]	[18,750]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-16,000]			
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,983,118	1,977,618	1,983,118		1,983,118
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-4,000]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	4,701,049	4,766,849	4,753,599	52,550	4,753,599
TRAINING AND RECRUITING						
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	18,227	18,227	18,227		18,227
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	948	948	948		948
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	98,448	98,448	98,448		98,448
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	42,305	42,305	42,305		42,305
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	330,156	328,156	330,156		330,156
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-1,500]			
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	161,752	161,752	161,752		161,752
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	19,137	18,637	34,837		19,137
	At USMC request transfer from RDTEN 53			[15,700]		
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,277	23,277	23,277		23,277
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	694,250	691,750	709,950		694,250
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES						
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	36,359	36,359	36,359		36,359
160	ADMINISTRATION	362,608	352,508	353,415	-9,100	353,508
	Marine Museum Unjustified Growth		[-9,100]	[-9,193]	[-9,100]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	70,515	70,515	70,515		70,515
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	44,706	44,706	44,706		44,706
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	514,188	504,088	504,995	-9,100	505,088
UNDISTRIBUTED						
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		-107,400	-33,200	-28,400	-28,400
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[-28,400]	[-28,400]	[-28,400]	
	Training program to increase and improve financial literacy training for incoming and outgoing military personnel		[2,500]			
	Travel savings			[-4,800]		
	Unobligated balances		[-81,500]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-107,400	-33,200	-28,400	-28,400
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	5,909,487	5,855,287	5,935,344	15,050	5,924,537
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES						
OPERATING FORCES						
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	565,842	573,742	565,842	7,900	573,742
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[7,900]		[7,900]	
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	5,948	5,948	5,948		5,948
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	82,636	84,936	82,636	2,300	84,936
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[2,300]		[2,300]	
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	353	353	353		353
060	AVIATION LOGISTICS	7,007	7,007	7,007		7,007
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	8,190	8,190	8,190		8,190
080	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	556	556	556		556
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,571	4,571	4,571		4,571
100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	14,472	14,472	14,472		14,472
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	119,056	119,056	119,056		119,056
120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	1,852	1,852	1,852		1,852

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
130	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	25,354	25,354	25,354		25,354
140	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	48,271	46,271	53,271	4,827	53,098
	Facilities Sustainment			[5,000]	[4,827]	
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-2,000]			
150	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	101,921	101,421	101,921		101,921
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-500]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	986,029	993,729	991,029	15,027	1,001,056
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES					
160	ADMINISTRATION	1,520	1,520	1,520		1,520
170	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	12,998	12,998	12,998		12,998
180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,395	3,395	3,395		3,395
190	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,158	3,158	3,158		3,158
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	21,071	21,071	21,071		21,071
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
210	UNDISTRIBUTED		-10,500			0
	Unobligated balances		[-10,500]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-10,500			0
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	1,007,100	1,004,300	1,012,100	15,027	1,022,127
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE					
	OPERATING FORCES					
010	OPERATING FORCES	93,093	93,093	93,093		93,093
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,377	18,377	18,377		18,377
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	29,232	27,732	34,232	3,900	33,132
	Facilities Sustainment			[5,000]	[3,900]	
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-1,500]			
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	106,447	105,447	106,447		106,447
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-1,000]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	247,149	244,649	252,149	3,900	251,049
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES					
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	914	914	914		914
060	ADMINISTRATION	11,831	11,831	11,831		11,831
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,688	8,688	8,688		8,688
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	21,433	21,433	21,433		21,433
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
080	UNDISTRIBUTED		-100			0
	Unobligated balances		[-100]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-100			0
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	268,582	265,982	273,582	3,900	272,482
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE					
	OPERATING FORCES					
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,163,457	3,256,557	3,163,457	8,600	3,172,057
	Corrosion Prevention		[5,000]			
	Cyber Weapon System Ops		[50,000]			
	Cyberspace Defense Weapon System and Cyber Mission Forces		[30,000]			
	Nuclear Force Improvement Program—Security Forces		[8,600]		[8,600]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,694,339	1,686,339	1,694,339		1,694,339
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-8,000]			
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,579,178	1,574,678	1,579,178		1,579,178
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-2,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-2,500]			
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,119,522	6,111,522	6,119,522	-91,122	6,028,400
	RC/OC-135 Contractor Logistics Support Unjustified Growth		[-8,000]		[-8,000]	
	Unjustified program growth				[-83,122]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,453,589	1,447,989	1,472,339	22,150	1,475,739

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
	Facilities Sustainment			[18,750]	[18,750]	
	Nuclear Force Improvement Program—Installation Surety		[3,400]		[3,400]	
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-9,000]			
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,599,419	2,587,419	2,599,419	-10,000	2,589,419
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-2,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-10,000]			
	Remove one-time fiscal year 2014 funding increase				[-10,000]	
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	908,790	919,861	908,790		908,790
	Program increase		[14,571]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-2,000]			
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	856,306	862,906	856,306	9,600	865,906
	Nuclear Force Improvement Program—ICBM Training Hardware		[9,600]		[9,600]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-3,000]			
090	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	800,689	800,189	792,689		800,689
	RC-135			[-8,000]		
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	282,710	282,710	282,710		282,710
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	397,818	397,318	397,818		397,818
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	871,840	884,440	860,840	-11,000	860,840
	PACOM Prepositioned Munition Shortfall Mitigation		[19,100]			
	Program decrease—classified program			[-11,000]	[-11,000]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-6,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-500]			
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	237,348	237,348	217,348		237,348
	Program decrease—JECC			[-20,000]		
130A	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM			34,600	34,600	34,600
	Retain current AWACS fleet			[34,600]	[34,600]	
130B	A-10 FLYING HOURS			188,400	188,400	188,400
	Retain current A-10 fleet			[188,400]	[188,400]	
130C	A-10 WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUSTAINMENT			68,100	68,100	68,100
	Retain current A-10 fleet			[68,100]	[68,100]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	20,965,005	21,049,276	21,235,855	219,328	21,184,333
	MOBILIZATION					
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,968,810	1,966,310	1,968,810		1,968,810
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-2,500]			
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	139,743	139,243	139,743	-14,073	125,670
	Inflation pricing requested as program growth				[-14,073]	
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-500]			
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,534,560	1,534,560	1,534,560		1,534,560
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	173,627	171,627	173,627		173,627
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-2,000]			
180	BASE SUPPORT	688,801	686,301	688,801		688,801
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-2,000]			
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	4,505,541	4,498,041	4,505,541	-14,073	4,491,468
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	82,396	82,396	82,396		82,396
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	19,852	19,852	19,852		19,852
210	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	76,134	73,134	76,134		76,134
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-3,000]			
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	212,226	208,726	212,226		212,226
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-3,500]			
230	BASE SUPPORT	759,809	754,309	759,809		759,809
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-4,500]			
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	356,157	356,157	356,157		356,157
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	697,594	694,594	697,594		697,594
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-2,500]			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	219,441	218,441	219,441		219,441
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	91,001	91,001	91,001		91,001
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	316,688	316,688	316,688		316,688
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	73,920	73,920	73,920		73,920
300	EXAMINING	3,121	3,121	3,121		3,121
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	181,718	174,218	181,718		181,718
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-7,500]			
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	147,667	147,167	147,667		147,667
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
330	JUNIOR ROTC	63,250	60,250	63,250		63,250
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-3,000]			
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	3,300,974	3,273,974	3,300,974		3,300,974
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES					
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,003,513	1,044,013	1,013,813	-6,134	997,379
	Inflation pricing requested as program growth				[-6,134]	
	Readiness funding increase—PACOM unfunded priority list			[10,300]		
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-500]			
	SDT Program		[41,000]			
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	843,449	841,449	843,449	-7,239	836,210
	Defense Finance and Accounting Services rate adjustment requested as program growth				[-7,239]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-2,000]			
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	78,126	78,126	78,126		78,126
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	247,677	244,177	247,677		247,677
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-3,500]			
380	BASE SUPPORT	1,103,442	1,096,442	1,103,442		1,103,442
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-5,500]			
390	ADMINISTRATION	597,234	596,234	597,234		597,234
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-500]			
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	506,840	506,840	506,840		506,840
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	892,256	889,256	892,256		892,256
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-2,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-1,000]			
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL	24,981	24,981	24,981		24,981
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	92,419	91,919	92,419		92,419
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
450A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,169,736	1,159,236	1,164,376	-5,360	1,164,376
	Classified adjustment			[-5,360]	[-5,360]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-9,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-1,000]			
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	6,559,673	6,572,673	6,564,613	-18,733	6,540,940
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
460	UNDISTRIBUTED		-240,400	-69,200	-131,900	-131,900
	Civilian personnel underexecution		[-80,000]		[-80,000]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[-51,900]	[-51,900]	[-51,900]	
	Readiness support		[221,500]			
	Training program to increase and improve financial literacy training for incoming and outgoing military personnel		[2,500]			
	Travel savings			[-17,300]		
	Unobligated balances		[-332,500]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-240,400	-69,200	-131,900	-131,900
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	35,331,193	35,153,564	35,537,783	54,622	35,385,815
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE					
	OPERATING FORCES					
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,719,467	1,719,467	1,719,467		1,719,467
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	211,132	211,132	211,132		211,132

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	530,301	530,301	530,301		530,301
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	85,672	84,672	90,672	5,000	90,672
	Facilities Sustainment			[5,000]	[5,000]	
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−1,000]			
050	BASE SUPPORT	367,966	365,466	367,966		367,966
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−2,500]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	2,914,538	2,911,038	2,919,538	5,000	2,919,538
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES						
060	ADMINISTRATION	59,899	59,899	59,899		59,899
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,509	14,509	14,509		14,509
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	20,345	20,345	20,345		20,345
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,551	6,551	6,551		6,551
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	101,304	101,304	101,304		101,304
UNDISTRIBUTED						
110	UNDISTRIBUTED		−13,400			0
	Unobligated balances		[−13,400]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		−13,400			0
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	3,015,842	2,998,942	3,020,842	5,000	3,020,842
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG						
OPERATING FORCES						
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,367,729	3,366,729	3,367,729		3,367,729
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,000]			
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	718,295	717,295	718,295		718,295
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,000]			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,528,695	1,528,695	1,528,695		1,528,695
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	137,604	133,604	142,604	5,000	142,604
	Facilities Sustainment			[5,000]	[5,000]	
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−4,000]			
050	BASE SUPPORT	581,536	569,036	581,536		581,536
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−12,500]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	6,333,859	6,315,359	6,338,859	5,000	6,338,859
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES						
060	ADMINISTRATION	27,812	27,812	27,812		27,812
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	31,188	30,688	31,188		31,188
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−500]			
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	59,000	58,500	59,000		59,000
UNDISTRIBUTED						
080	UNDISTRIBUTED		−800			0
	Unobligated balances		[−800]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		−800			0
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	6,392,859	6,373,059	6,397,859	5,000	6,397,859
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE						
OPERATING FORCES						
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	462,107	460,607	462,107		462,107
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−1,500]			
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	4,762,245	4,707,945	4,811,845	8,702	4,770,947
	MSV—USSOCOM Maritime Support Vessel		[−20,300]		[−20,298]	
	NCR—USSOCOM National Capitol Region Office		[−5,000]	[−5,000]	[−5,000]	
	POTFF—Human Performance		[−23,300]			
	POTFF—transfer to DHP				[−14,800]	
	POTFF—transfer to DHRA for Office Suicide Prevention				[−4,000]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[−26,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[−5,000]			
	RSCC—Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers		[−3,600]	[−1,800]	[−3,600]	
	UFR Flying Hours		[31,460]	[36,400]	[36,400]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
	UFR Unit Readiness Training			[20,000]	[20,000]	
	USSOCOM Joint Special Operations University		[-2,560]			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	5,224,352	5,168,552	5,273,952	8,702	5,233,054
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING					
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	135,437	135,437	135,437		135,437
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	80,082	80,082	80,082		80,082
050	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING	371,620	371,620	371,620		371,620
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	587,139	587,139	587,139		587,139
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	119,888	195,888	144,888	56,000	175,888
	STARBASE		[21,000]	[25,000]	[25,000]	
	Youth Challenge		[55,000]		[31,000]	
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	556,493	556,493	556,493		556,493
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,340,374	1,339,874	1,340,374	-40,500	1,299,874
	Civilian personnel compensation—justification does not match summary of price and program changes				[-20,500]	
	Civilian personnel compensation hiring lag				[-20,000]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
100	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	633,300	613,300	633,300	2,770	636,070
	Civilian personnel compensation hiring lag				[-1,230]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-20,000]			
	Suicide Prevention—transfer from SOCOM				[4,000]	
110	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,263,678	1,258,678	1,263,678		1,263,678
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-4,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-1,000]			
130	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	26,710	26,710	26,710		26,710
140	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	381,470	380,470	394,170	12,700	394,170
	PTAP funding increase			[12,700]	[12,700]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
150	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	194,520	183,020	194,520		194,520
	Program decrease		[-10,000]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,500]			
160	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	21,485	21,485	21,485		21,485
170	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	544,786	523,786	537,786	7,600	552,386
	Global Security Contingency Fund		[-30,000]			
	Program decrease—Combatting terrorism fellowship			[-7,000]	[-2,400]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
	Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership For Peace		[10,000]		[10,000]	
180	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	527,812	527,312	527,812		527,812
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
200	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	32,787	32,787	32,787		32,787
230	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,566,424	2,551,924	2,596,424		2,566,424
	Disability Impact Aid			[5,000]		
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-6,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-8,500]			
	Supplemental Impact Aid			[25,000]		
240	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	416,644	415,144	416,644		416,644
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-500]			
260	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	186,987	106,391	106,387	-80,596	106,391
	Office of Economic Adjustment		[-80,596]	[-80,600]	[-80,596]	
265	OFFICE OF NET ASSESSMENT		18,944		18,944	18,944
	Program increase		[10,000]		[10,000]	
	Transfer from line 270		[8,944]		[8,944]	
270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,891,163	1,715,419	1,882,363	-17,744	1,873,419
	BRAC 2015 Round Planning and Analyses		[-4,800]		[-4,800]	
	Corrosion Prevention Program Office		[5,000]			
	DOD Rewards Program Underexecution		[-4,000]		[-4,000]	
	Program decrease		[-75,000]			
	Program decrease—BRAC 2015			[-4,800]		
	Program decrease for DOD rewards program			[-4,000]		

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-51,500]			
	Reduction in service contracts for facilities maintenance		[-36,500]			
	Transfer funding for Office of Net Assessment to line 265		[-8,944]		[-8,944]	
280	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES	87,915	87,915	87,915		87,915
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	610,982	609,982	610,982	-2,520	608,462
	Civilian personnel compensation hiring lag				[-2,520]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-1,000]			
290A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,983,323	13,987,323	14,024,923		13,983,323
	Additional AFRICOM ISR Support			[60,000]		
	Classified adjustment		[10,000]			
	DCS			[-18,400]		
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-6,000]			
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	25,386,741	25,152,845	25,399,641	-43,346	25,343,395
UNDISTRIBUTED						
300	UNDISTRIBUTED		-280,400	-29,800	12,500	12,500
	Blue water review			[5,000]		
	Civilian personnel underexecution		[-75,000]			
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[-17,500]	[-17,500]	[-17,500]	
	Impact Aid		[25,000]		[25,000]	
	Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities				[5,000]	
	Travel savings			[-17,300]		
	Unobligated balances		[-212,900]			
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-280,400	-29,800	12,500	12,500
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	31,198,232	30,628,136	31,230,932	-22,144	31,176,088
MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS						
MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS						
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,723	13,723	13,723		13,723
020	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	100,000	104,500	100,000		100,000
	Humanitarian Mine Action		[5,000]			
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
030	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	365,108	354,608	365,108		365,108
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-10,500]			
040	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	212,875	209,375	212,875	-129,841	83,034
	Program decrease				[-129,841]	
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-3,500]			
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	201,560	201,560	201,560		201,560
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	277,294	277,294	277,294		277,294
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	408,716	408,716	408,716		408,716
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	8,547	8,547	8,547		8,547
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	208,353	208,353	208,353		208,353
100	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000		5,000	-5,000	0
	Program decrease		[-5,000]		[-5,000]	
110	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFENSE	10,000	5,200	5,700	-4,300	5,700
	Reduction in contracts for Other Services		[-500]			
	Unjustified program increase		[-4,300]	[-4,300]	[-4,300]	
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	1,811,176	1,791,876	1,806,876	-139,141	1,672,035
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	1,811,176	1,791,876	1,806,876	-139,141	1,672,035
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	165,721,818	164,545,441	166,094,965	-304,538	165,417,280

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY				
OPERATING FORCES				

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
010	MANEUVER UNITS	77,419	110,000	187,419
	ERI: Armored Brigade Combat Team Presence		[110,000]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	3,827		3,827
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	22,353		22,353
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,405,102		1,405,102
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	452,332	15,000	467,332
	ERI: Increased Global Response Force Exercises		[15,000]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	47,522		47,522
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,050,683	96,500	1,147,183
	ERI: Increase Range Capacities and Operation, and Upgrade Training Sites		[96,500]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	166,725		166,725
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	87,636	185,600	273,236
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[185,600]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	291,977		291,977
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	7,316,967	90,294	7,407,261
	ERI: NATO Exercises		[13,100]	
	ERI: Strengthen the Capacity of NATO and NATO Partners		[3,000]	
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15–02 reprogramming		[74,194]	
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	10,000		10,000
160	RESET	2,861,655		2,861,655
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	13,794,198	497,394	14,291,592
	MOBILIZATION			
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS		59,000	59,000
	ERI: Armored Brigade Combat Team presence		[40,000]	
	ERI: Army Prepo Infrastructure Projects		[19,000]	
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION		59,000	59,000
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	1,806,267		1,806,267
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	45,537		45,537
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	32,264		32,264
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	98,171		98,171
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	99,694		99,694
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	137,053		137,053
520A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,122,092	–15,900	1,106,192
	Program decrease		[–15,900]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	3,341,078	–15,900	3,325,178
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	17,135,276	540,494	17,675,770
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	4,285		4,285
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,428		1,428
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	699		699
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	35,120		35,120
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	41,532		41,532
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	41,532		41,532
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	12,593	1,200	13,793
	ERI: Leverage State Partnership Program		[1,200]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	647		647
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	6,670		6,670
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	664		664
060	AVIATION ASSETS	22,485		22,485
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	14,560		14,560
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE		49,600	49,600
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[49,600]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	13,923		13,923

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	4,601		4,601
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	76,143	50,800	126,943
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	ADMINISTRATION	318		318
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	318		318
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	76,461	50,800	127,261
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND			
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			
010	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	2,915,747		2,915,747
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	2,915,747		2,915,747
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
020	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	1,161,733		1,161,733
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	1,161,733		1,161,733
	DETAINEE OPS			
030	IRAQ TRAINING FACILITY	31,853		31,853
	SUBTOTAL DETAINEE OPS	31,853		31,853
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	4,109,333		4,109,333
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
010	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	1,618,000		1,618,000
	SUBTOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	1,618,000		1,618,000
	TOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	1,618,000		1,618,000
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	573,123	3,000	576,123
	ERI: Seabreeze and European Multinational Exercises		[3,000]	
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,600		2,600
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	22,035		22,035
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	192,411	111,000	303,411
	Aviation Depot Maintenance		[111,000]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,116		1,116
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	33,900		33,900
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,153,500	4,950	1,158,450
	ERI: Black Sea Multinational Exercises		[4,950]	
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	20,068		20,068
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,922,829	150,000	2,072,829
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[150,000]	
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	31,303		31,303
160	WARFARE TACTICS	26,229		26,229
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	20,398		20,398
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	676,555	9,120	685,675
	ERI: BALTOPS Multinational Exercises		[500]	
	ERI: Black Sea Information Sharing Initiatives		[620]	
	ERI: EUCOM Information Sharing Initiatives		[8,000]	
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	10,662		10,662
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	90,684		90,684
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	233,696		233,696
300	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	16,220	200	16,420
	ERI: European Multinational Exercise Infrastructure Support		[200]	
310	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	88,688		88,688
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	5,116,017	278,270	5,394,287
	MOBILIZATION			
360	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	5,307		5,307
380	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	213,319		213,319

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	218,626		218,626
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
420	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	48,270		48,270
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	48,270		48,270
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
500	ADMINISTRATION	2,464		2,464
510	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	520		520
530	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,205		5,205
540	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,439		1,439
570	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	186,318		186,318
590	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	1,350		1,350
600	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	11,811		11,811
640	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,468		1,468
720A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,380		6,380
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	216,955		216,955
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	5,599,868	278,270	5,878,138
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	477,406	13,210	490,616
	ERI: BALTOPS Multinational Exercises		[1,500]	
	ERI: Black Sea Rotational Force Increased Presence		[8,910]	
	ERI: Cold Response Multinational Exercises		[800]	
	ERI: NATO Multinational Exercises		[2,000]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	353,334		353,334
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	426,720	10,000	436,720
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[10,000]	
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	12,036		12,036
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	1,269,496	23,210	1,292,706
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	52,106		52,106
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	52,106		52,106
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	162,980		162,980
160	ADMINISTRATION	1,322		1,322
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,870		1,870
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	166,172		166,172
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	1,487,774	23,210	1,510,984
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	16,133		16,133
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,150		6,150
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	12,475		12,475
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,700		2,700
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	8,418		8,418
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	45,876		45,876
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	45,876		45,876
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	9,740		9,740
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	800		800
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	10,540		10,540
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	10,540		10,540

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE				
OPERATING FORCES				
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,352,604	67,330	1,419,934
	ERI: Baltic Air Policing		[10,000]	
	ERI: Eastern European Countries Exercise Support		[2,300]	
	ERI: Retain Air Superiority Presence		[55,000]	
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15–02 reprogramming		[30]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	893,939	4,400	898,339
	ERI: Baltic Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance		[4,400]	
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	8,785		8,785
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,146,099		1,146,099
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	78,000	27,890	105,890
	ERI: Improve Airfield Infrastructure		[9,890]	
	ERI: Improve Support Infrastructure		[400]	
	ERI: Improve Weapons Storage Facilities		[17,600]	
060	BASE SUPPORT	1,226,834		1,226,834
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	92,109		92,109
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	168,269		168,269
090	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	26,337		26,337
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	852		852
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	4,942		4,942
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	99,400	168	99,568
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15–02 reprogramming		[168]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	5,098,170	99,788	5,197,958
MOBILIZATION				
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,894,280	2,600	2,896,880
	ERI: Persistent MAF Capability		[2,000]	
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15–02 reprogramming		[600]	
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	138,043		138,043
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	437,279	160,000	597,279
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[160,000]	
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,801		2,801
180	BASE SUPPORT	15,370		15,370
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	3,487,773	162,600	3,650,373
TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	39		39
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	432		432
230	BASE SUPPORT	1,617		1,617
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	2,145		2,145
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	163		163
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	4,396		4,396
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES				
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	85,016		85,016
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	934		934
380	BASE SUPPORT	6,923		6,923
390	ADMINISTRATION	151		151
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	162,106	2,250	164,356
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15–02 reprogramming		[2,250]	
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	246,256		246,256
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	60		60
450A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	17,408	–11,498	5,910
	Program decrease		[–11,498]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	518,854	–9,248	509,606
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	9,109,193	253,140	9,362,333
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE				
OPERATING FORCES				
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	72,575		72,575

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
050	BASE SUPPORT	5,219		5,219
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	77,794		77,794
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	77,794		77,794
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS		2,300	2,300
	ERI: Eastern European Countries Exercise Support		[2,000]	
	ERI: Leverage State Partnership Program		[300]	
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	20,300		20,300
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	20,300	2,300	22,600
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	20,300	2,300	22,600
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF		100	100
	ERI: EUCOM Support to NATO Exercises in Chairman's Joint Exercise Program		[100]	
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	2,490,648	158,315	2,648,963
	ERI: Increased Partnership Activities in Central and Eastern Europe		[10,557]	
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15–02 reprogramming		[147,758]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	2,490,648	158,415	2,649,063
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	22,847		22,847
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	21,516		21,516
110	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	36,416		36,416
130	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	105,000		105,000
150	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	6,251		6,251
170	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,660,000		1,660,000
230	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	93,000		93,000
270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	115,664	10,000	125,664
	ERI: Intelligence and Warning		[10,000]	
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	2,424		2,424
290A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,617,659	–4,600	1,613,059
	Program decrease		[–4,600]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	3,680,777	5,400	3,686,177
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	6,171,425	163,815	6,335,240
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	45,503,372	1,312,029	46,815,401

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	128,957,593	129,007,023	128,910,683	–477,985	128,479,608
AGR Pay and Allowance—projected underexecution				[–84,500]	
Air Force airborne warning and control system personnel		[12,200]			
CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[48,000]		[48,000]	
Foreign Currency adjustments		[–193,200]			
Inactive Duty Training—projected underexecution				[–79,000]	
Increase state ESGR personnel			[4,000]		
Individual Clothing and Uniform Allowance—excess to requirement				[–10,000]	
Lower than budgeted average strength levels				[–66,500]	
Military Personnel Historical Underexecution			[–761,610]	[–628,000]	
Non-Prior Service Enlistment Bonus—excess to requirement				[–4,000]	

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Operational training excess to requirement				[-3,000]	
Operational travel excess to requirement				[-10,800]	
Readiness funding increase—CTC rotations for Army National Guard			[45,000]		
Recalculation from CPI-1 to CPI		[534,900]		[215,300]	
Reduction in meals-ready-to-eat			[-20,000]		
Restore assumed savings for TRICARE consolidation			[78,000]		
Restore lost savings relating to retiree COLA			[500,000]		
Retain current A-10 fleet			[82,800]	[74,615]	
Retain current AWACS fleet			[24,900]	[24,900]	
Special training and exercises for National Guard State Partnership Program		[8,000]			
Transfer funding for 2 CTC rotations: Army-requested from line 121, O&M Army				[45,000]	
Unobligated balances		[-360,470]			
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	6,236,092	6,237,092	6,236,092		6,236,092
CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[1,000]			
Total, Military Personnel	135,193,685	135,244,115	135,146,775	-477,985	134,715,700

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.
SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	5,536,340	1,500	5,537,840
ERI: Strengthen the Capacity of NATO and NATO Partners		[1,500]	
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	58,728		58,728
Total, Military Personnel Appropriations	5,595,068	1,500	5,596,568

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.
SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY					
PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	13,727	13,727	13,727		13,727
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	13,727	13,727	13,727		13,727
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE					
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (MEDICAL/DENTAL)	61,717	61,717	61,717		61,717
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	61,717	61,717	61,717		61,717
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE					
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	44,293	44,293	39,293		44,293
Program decrease—MREs			[-5,000]		
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	44,293	44,293	39,293		44,293
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA					
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,114,731	1,214,731	1,314,731	100,000	1,214,731
Restore Commissary Reduction		[100,000]	[200,000]	[100,000]	
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,114,731	1,214,731	1,314,731	100,000	1,214,731
NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND					
NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND			100,000		

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
National Sea-based Deterrence Fund			[100,000]		
TOTAL NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND			100,000		
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION					
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	222,728	222,728	222,728		222,728
RDT&E	595,913	595,913	595,913		595,913
PROCUREMENT	10,227	10,227	10,227		10,227
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	828,868	828,868	828,868		828,868
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF					
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	719,096	719,096	739,096		719,096
Additional SOUTHCOM ISR Support			[20,000]		
DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	101,591	101,591	101,591		101,591
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	820,687	820,687	840,687		820,687
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	310,830	310,830	310,830		310,830
PROCUREMENT	1,000	1,000	1,000		1,000
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	311,830	311,830	311,830		311,830
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM					
IN-HOUSE CARE	8,799,086	8,860,686	8,769,086	50,085	8,849,171
Implementation of Benefit Reform Proposal		[−53,700]	[−30,000]	[−56,715]	
Restoration of MHS Modernization		[92,000]		[92,000]	
USSOCOM Behavioral Health and Warrior Care Management Program		[23,300]		[14,800]	
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	15,412,599	15,374,599	15,354,599	−1,095,000	14,317,599
Behavioral health treatment of TRICARE beneficiaries		[20,000]			
Historical underexecution				[−855,000]	
Implementation of Benefit Reform Proposal		[−58,000]	[−58,000]	[−58,000]	
Pharmaceutical drugs—excess growth				[−182,000]	
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,462,096	2,462,096	2,462,096	−103,700	2,358,396
Historical underexecution				[−100,000]	
Travel excess growth				[−3,700]	
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,557,347	1,557,347	1,557,347		1,557,347
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	366,223	366,223	366,223		366,223
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	750,866	750,866	750,866		750,866
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,683,694	1,683,694	1,683,694		1,683,694
R&D UNDISTRIBUTED					
R&D RESEARCH	10,317	20,317	10,317		10,317
Surgical Critical Care Research		[10,000]			
R&D EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	49,015	49,015	49,015		49,015
R&D ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	226,410	226,410	226,410		226,410
R&D DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	97,787	97,787	97,787		97,787
R&D ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	217,898	217,898	217,898		217,898
R&D MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	38,075	38,075	38,075		38,075
R&D CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	15,092	15,092	15,092		15,092
UNDISTRIBUTED					
PROC INITIAL OUTFITTING	13,057	13,057	13,057		13,057
PROC REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	283,030	283,030	283,030		283,030
PROC THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM	3,145	3,145	3,145		3,145
PROC IEHR	9,181	9,181	9,181		9,181
UNDISTRIBUTED	−161,857	−566,557	−151,857		−161,857
Foreign Currency adjustments		[−13,100]			
Mental Health Assessments			[10,000]		
Private study to identify challenges confronting the DoD's care of wounded warriors		[20,000]			
Unobligated balances		[−411,600]			
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	31,833,061	31,461,961	31,755,061	−1,148,615	30,684,446
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	35,028,914	34,757,814	35,265,914	−1,048,615	33,980,299

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
C-17 CLS ENGINE COST INCREASE			
FUEL	5,000		5,000
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	5,000		5,000
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	86,350		86,350
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	86,350		86,350
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	189,000	20,000	209,000
SOUTHCOM ISR		[20,000]	
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	189,000	20,000	209,000
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	7,968		7,968
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	7,968		7,968
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
IN-HOUSE CARE	65,902		65,902
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	214,259		214,259
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	15,311		15,311
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	5,059		5,059
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	300,531		300,531
EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE			
EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE	925,000	-554,287	370,713
ERI: Military Assistance and Support for Ukraine		[75,000]	
ERI: Transfer out to appropriations for proper execution		[-629,287]	
TOTAL EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE	925,000	-554,287	370,713
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND			
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	4,000,000	-2,700,000	1,300,000
Funding ahead of need		[-2,700,000]	
TOTAL COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	4,000,000	-2,700,000	1,300,000
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	5,513,849	-3,234,287	2,279,562
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	5,513,849	-3,234,287	2,279,562

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Army	CALIFORNIA	Concord	ACCESS CONTROL POINT	9,900	9,900	9,900		9,900
Army	CALIFORNIA	Concord	GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP	5,300	5,300	5,300		5,300
Army	CALIFORNIA	Fort Irwin	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE HANGAR	45,000	45,000	45,000		45,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson, Colorado	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	60,000	60,000	60,000		60,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson, Colorado	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE HANGAR	29,000	29,000	29,000		29,000
Army	GUANTANAMO	Guantanamo Bay	DINING FACILITY	12,000	12,000	12,000		12,000
	BAY, CUBA							
Army	GUANTANAMO	Guantanamo Bay	HEALTH CLINIC	11,800	11,800	11,800		11,800
	BAY, CUBA							
Army	GUANTANAMO	Guantanamo Bay	HIGH VALUE DETAINEE COMPLEX	0	69,000	0		0
	BAY, CUBA							
Army	HAWAII	Fort Shafter	COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITY COMPLEX	96,000	83,000	86,400	-11,000	85,000
Army	JAPAN	Kadena AB	MISSILE MAGAZINE	10,600	10,600	10,600		10,600
Army	KENTUCKY	Blue Grass Army Depot	SHIPPING AND RECEIVING BUILDING	0	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell, Kentucky	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE HANGAR	23,000	23,000	23,000		23,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Army	NEW YORK	Fort Drum, New York	UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE HANGAR	27,000	27,000	27,000		27,000
Army	NEW YORK	U.S. Military Academy	CADET BARRACKS, INCR 3	58,000	58,000	58,000		58,000
Army	PENNSYLVANIA	Letterkenny Army Depot	REBUILD SHOP	16,000	16,000	16,000		16,000
Army	SOUTH CAROLINA	Fort Jackson	TRAINEE BARRACKS COMPLEX 3, PH1	52,000	52,000	52,000		52,000
Army	TEXAS	Fort Hood	SIMULATIONS CENTER	0	46,000	0		0
Army	VIRGINIA	Fort Lee	ADV. INDIVIDUAL TRAINING BARRACKS COM- PLEX, PHASE 3	0	86,000	0		0
Army	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley- Eustis	TACTICAL VEHICLE HARDSTAND	7,700	7,700	7,700		7,700
Army	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	HOST NATION SUPPORT FY15	33,000	33,000	33,000		33,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MINOR CONSTRUCTION FY15	25,000	25,000	25,000		25,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN FY15	18,127	18,127	18,127		18,127
Military Construction, Army Total				539,427	742,427	544,827	4,000	543,427
Navy	ARIZONA	Yuma	AVIATION MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT COM- PLEX	16,608	16,608	16,608		16,608
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	P-8A HANGAR	27,826	27,826	27,826		27,826
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Bridgeport	E-LMR COMMUNICATIONS TOWERS	16,180	16,180	16,180		16,180
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	F-35C FACILITY ADDITION AND MODIFICATION	0	0	0	16,594	16,594
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	F-35C OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY	0	0	0	22,391	22,391
Navy	CALIFORNIA	San Diego	STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM DECENTRALIZA- TION	47,110	47,110	47,110		47,110
Navy	DISTRICT OF CO- LUMBIA	District of Columbia	ELECTRONICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY LAB- ORATORY	31,735	31,735	31,735		31,735
Navy	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier, Djibouti	ENTRY CONTROL POINT	9,923	9,923	9,923		9,923
Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	MH60 PARKING APRON	8,583	8,583	8,583		8,583
Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	P-8A RUNWAY THRESHOLDS AND TAXIWAYS	21,652	21,652	21,652		21,652
Navy	FLORIDA	Mayport	LCS OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY	20,520	20,520	20,520		20,520
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	GSE SHOPS AT NORTH RAMP	21,880	21,880	21,880		21,880
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	MWSS FACILITIES AT NORTH RAMP	28,771	28,771	28,771		28,771
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	FACILITY MODIFICATIONS FOR VMU, MWSD, & CH53E	51,182	51,182	51,182		51,182
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	ROAD AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS	2,200	2,200	2,200		2,200
Navy	HAWAII	Pearl Harbor	SUBMARINE MANEUVERING ROOM TRAINER FA- CILITY	9,698	9,698	9,698		9,698
Navy	JAPAN	Iwakuni	SECURITY MODS DPRI MC167-T (CVW-5 E2D EA-18G)	6,415	6,415	6,415		6,415
Navy	JAPAN	Kadena AB	AIRCRAFT MAINT HANGAR ALTERATIONS AND SAP-F	19,411	19,411	19,411		19,411
Navy	JAPAN	MCAS Futenma	HANGAR & RINSE FACILITY MODERNIZATIONS	4,639	4,639	4,639		4,639
Navy	JAPAN	Okinawa	LHD PRACTICE SITE IMPROVEMENTS	35,685	35,685	35,685		35,685
Navy	MARYLAND	Annapolis	CENTER FOR CYBER SECURITY STUDIES BUILDING	120,112	100,112	30,000	-90,112	30,000
Navy	MARYLAND	Indian Head	ADVANCED ENERGETICS RESEARCH LAB COM- PLEX PH 2	15,346	15,346	15,346		15,346
Navy	MARYLAND	Patuxent River	ATLANTIC TEST RANGE FACILITY	9,860	9,860	9,860		9,860
Navy	NEVADA	Fallon	AIR WING TRAINING FACILITY	27,763	27,763	27,763		27,763
Navy	NEVADA	Fallon	FACILITY ALTERATION FOR F-35 TRAINING MIS- SION	3,499	3,499	3,499		3,499
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	2ND RADIO BN COMPLEX PHASE 1	0	0	50,706	50,706	50,706
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	WATER TREATMENT PLANT REPLACEMENT	41,588	41,588	41,588		41,588
Navy	PENNSYLVANIA	Philadelphia	OHIO REPLACEMENT POWER & PROPULSION FACILITY	23,985	23,985	23,985		23,985
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	Charleston	NUCLEAR POWER OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FA- CILITY	35,716	35,716	35,716		35,716
Navy	SPAIN	Rota	SHIP BERTHING POWER UPGRADES	20,233	20,233	20,233		20,233
Navy	VIRGINIA	Dahlgren	MISSILE SUPPORT FACILITY	27,313	27,313	27,313		27,313
Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	EOD CONSOLIDATED OPS & LOGISTICS FACILI- TIES	39,274	39,274	39,274		39,274
Navy	VIRGINIA	Portsmouth	SUBMARINE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	9,743	9,743	9,743		9,743
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	AMMUNITION SUPPLY POINT EXPANSION	12,613	12,613	12,613		12,613
Navy	VIRGINIA	Yorktown	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	19,152	19,152	19,152		19,152
Navy	VIRGINIA	Yorktown	FAST COMPANY TRAINING FACILITY	7,836	7,836	7,836		7,836
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bangor	REGIONAL SHIP MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACIL- ITY	0	0	13,833	13,833	13,833

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bremerton	INTEGRATED WATER TREATMENT SYST. DD 1, 2, & 5	16,401	16,401	16,401		16,401
Navy	WASHINGTON	Kitsap	EXPLOSIVES HANDLING WHARF #2 (INC)	83,778	83,778	83,778		83,778
Navy	WASHINGTON	Port Angeles	TPS PORT ANGELES FORWARD OPERATING LOCATION	20,638	20,638	20,638		20,638
Navy	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	P-8A AIRCRAFT APRON AND SUPPORTING FACILITIES	24,390	24,390	24,390		24,390
Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	F-35C FACILITY ADDITION AND MODIFICATION	16,594	16,594	16,594	-16,594	0
Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	F-35C OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY	22,391	22,391	22,391	-22,391	0
Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCON DESIGN FUNDS	33,366	33,366	33,366		33,366
Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,163	7,163	7,163		7,163
Military Construction, Navy Total				1,018,772	998,772	993,199	-25,573	993,199
AF	ALASKA	Clear AFS	EMERGENCY POWER PLANT FUEL STORAGE	11,500	11,500	11,500		11,500
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F-35 AIRCRAFT MX HANGAR—SQDN #2	11,200	11,200	11,200		11,200
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F-35 FLIGHTLINE FILLSTANDS	15,600	15,600	15,600		15,600
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	GUAM STRIKE FUEL SYSTEMS MAINT.HANGAR INC 2	64,000	64,000	64,000		64,000
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PAR LOW OBSERVABLE/CORROSION CONTROL/COMPOSITE REPAIR SHOP	0	0	34,400	34,400	34,400
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—COMBAT COMM INFRASTR FACILITY	3,750	3,750	3,750		3,750
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—RED HORSE LOGISTICS FACILITY	3,150	3,150	3,150		3,150
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—SATELLITE FIRE STATION	6,500	6,500	6,500		6,500
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC-46A ADAL MOBILITY BAG STRG EXPANSION	2,300	2,300	2,300		2,300
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC-46A ADAL REGIONAL MX TNG FACILITY	16,100	16,100	16,100		16,100
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC-46A ALTER COMPOSITE MX SHOP	4,100	4,100	4,100		4,100
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC-46A ALTER TAXIWAY FOXTROT	5,500	5,500	5,500		5,500
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC-46A FUSELAGE TRAINER	6,400	6,400	6,400		6,400
AF	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	CYBERCOM JOINT OPERATIONS CENTER, INC- CREMENT 2	166,000	166,000	166,000		166,000
AF	MASSACHUSETTS	Hanscom AFB	DORMITORY (72 RM)	13,500	13,500	13,500		13,500
AF	NEBRASKA	Offutt AFB	USSTRATCOM REPLACEMENT FACILITY- INCR 4	180,000	180,000	180,000		180,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F-22 FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY	14,000	14,000	14,000		14,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F-35 AIRCRAFT MX UNIT—4 BAY HANGAR	31,000	31,000	31,000		31,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F-35 WEAPONS SCHOOL FACILITY	8,900	8,900	8,900		8,900
AF	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst	FIRE STATION	5,900	5,900	5,900		5,900
AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	KC-46A DEPOT MAINT COMPLEX SPT INFRASTR	48,000	48,000	48,000		48,000
AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	KC-46A TWO-BAY DEPOT MX HANGAR	63,000	63,000	63,000		63,000
AF	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	FIRE STATION	5,800	5,800	5,800		5,800
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	Croughton RAF	JAC CONSOLIDATION—PHASE 1	92,223	92,223	92,223		92,223
AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	10,738	10,738	10,738		10,738
AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	22,613	22,613	22,613		22,613
Military Construction, Air Force Total				811,774	811,774	846,174	34,400	846,174
Def-Wide	ARIZONA	Fort Huachuca	JITC BUILDING 52120 RENOVATION	1,871	1,871	1,871		1,871
Def-Wide	AUSTRALIA	Geraldton	COMBINED COMMUNICATIONS GATEWAY GERALDTON	9,600	9,600	9,600		9,600
Def-Wide	BELGIUM	Brussels	BRUSSELS ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL REPLACEMENT	41,626	41,626	41,626		41,626
Def-Wide	BELGIUM	Brussels	NATO HEADQUARTERS FACILITY	37,918	37,918	37,918		37,918
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton, California	SOF COMM/ELEC MAINTENANCE FACILITY	11,841	11,841	11,841		11,841
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF LOGISTICS SUPPORT UNIT 1 OPS FACILITY #1	41,740	41,740	41,740		41,740
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF SUPPORT ACTIVITY OPS FACILITY #2	28,600	28,600	28,600		28,600
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE & DISTRIBUTION FAC.	52,500	52,500	52,500		52,500
Def-Wide	COLORADO	Peterson AFB	DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	15,200	15,200	15,200		15,200
Def-Wide	CONUS	Various Locations	EAST COAST MISSILE SITE PLANNING AND DESIGN	0	20,000	0		0
Def-Wide	CONUS CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	SOF SKILLS TRAINING FACILITY	53,073	53,073	53,073		53,073
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Hunter Army Airfield	SOF COMPANY OPERATIONS FACILITY	7,692	7,692	7,692		7,692
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Robins AFB	REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	19,900	19,900	19,900		19,900
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	MEDICAL CENTER REPLACEMENT INCR 4	259,695	189,695	59,695	-70,000	189,695

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Def-Wide	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	Guantanamo Bay	REPLACE FUEL TANK	11,100	11,100	11,100		11,100
Def-Wide	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	Guantanamo Bay	W.T. SAMPSON E/M AND HS CONSOLID./RE- PLACEMENT	65,190	65,190	65,190		65,190
Def-Wide	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Har- bor-Hickam	REPLACE FUEL TANKS	3,000	3,000	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Har- bor-Hickam	UPGRADE FIRE SUPPRESSION & VENTILATION SYS.	49,900	49,900	49,900		49,900
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Misawa AB	EDGREN HIGH SCHOOL RENOVATION	37,775	37,775	37,775		37,775
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Okinawa	KILLIN ELEMENTARY REPLACEMENT/RENOVA- TION	71,481	71,481	71,481		71,481
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Okinawa	KUBASAKI HIGH SCHOOL REPLACEMENT/REN- OVATION	99,420	99,420	99,420		99,420
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Sasebo	E.J. KING HIGH SCHOOL REPLACEMENT/REN- OVATION	37,681	37,681	37,681		37,681
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell, Ken- tucky	SOF SYSTEM INTEGRATION MAINTENANCE OF- FICE FAC	18,000	18,000	18,000		18,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW CAMPUS FEEDERS PHASE 1	54,207	54,207	54,207		54,207
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW RECAPITALIZE BUILDING #1/SITE M INC 3	45,521	45,521	45,521		45,521
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	CONSTRUCT HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	18,300	18,300	18,300		18,300
Def-Wide	MICHIGAN	Selfridge ANGB	REPLACE FUEL DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES	35,100	35,100	35,100		35,100
Def-Wide	MISSISSIPPI	Stennis	SOF APPLIED INSTRUCTION FACILITY	10,323	10,323	10,323		10,323
Def-Wide	MISSISSIPPI	Stennis	SOF LAND ACQUISITION WESTERN MANEUVER AREA	17,224	17,224	17,224		17,224
Def-Wide	NEVADA	Fallon	SOF TACTICAL GROUND MOB. VEHICLE MAINT FAC.	20,241	20,241	20,241		20,241
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY (STS)	23,333	23,333	23,333		23,333
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	LEJEUNE HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION/RENOVATION	41,306	41,306	41,306		41,306
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	SOF INTEL/OPS EXPANSION	11,442	11,442	11,442		11,442
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF BATTALION OPERATIONS FACILITY	37,074	37,074	37,074		37,074
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF TACTICAL EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE FA- CILITY	8,000	8,000	8,000		8,000
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF TRAINING COMMAND BUILDING	48,062	48,062	48,062		48,062
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	8,500	8,500	8,500		8,500
Def-Wide	SOUTH CAROLINA	Beaufort	REPLACE FUEL DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES	40,600	40,600	40,600		40,600
Def-Wide	SOUTH DAKOTA	Ellsworth AFB	CONSTRUCT HYDRANT SYSTEM	8,000	8,000	8,000		8,000
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT INCR 6	131,500	201,500	131,500		131,500
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	MEDICAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	38,300	38,300	38,300		38,300
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Craney Island	REPLACE & ALTER FUEL DISTRIBUTION FACILI- TIES	36,500	36,500	36,500		36,500
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Def Distribution Depot Richmond	REPLACE ACCESS CONTROL POINT	5,700	5,700	5,700		5,700
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	PARKING LOT	7,239	7,239	7,239		7,239
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley- Eustis	HOSPITAL ADDITION/CUP REPLACEMENT	41,200	41,200	41,200		41,200
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek— Story	SOF HUMAN PERFORMANCE CENTER	11,200	11,200	11,200		11,200
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek— Story	SOF INDOOR DYNAMIC RANGE	14,888	14,888	14,888		14,888
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek— Story	SOF MOBILE COMM DET SUPPORT FACILITY	13,500	13,500	13,500		13,500
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	REDUNDANT CHILLED WATER LOOP	15,100	15,100	15,100		15,100
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	9,000	0	9,000	-9,000	0
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ECIP DESIGN	10,000	10,000	10,000		10,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PRO- GRAM	150,000	150,000	150,000		150,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	EXERCISE RELATED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	8,581	8,581	8,581		8,581
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	599	599	599		599
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN- SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	38,704	18,704	38,704		38,704

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	42,387	42,387	42,387		42,387
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	745	745	745		745
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	24,425	4,425	24,425	-20,000	4,425
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	1,183	1,183	1,183		1,183
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,932	5,932	5,932		5,932
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	10,334	10,334	10,334		10,334
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	2,000	2,000	2,000		2,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	6,846	6,846	6,846		6,846
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,100	4,100	4,100		4,100
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	2,700	2,700	2,700		2,700
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILCON	2,994	2,994	2,994		2,994
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	24,197	24,197	24,197		24,197
Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total				2,061,890	2,032,890	1,861,890	-99,000	1,962,890
Chem Demil	KENTUCKY	Blue Grass Army Depot	AMMUNITION DEMILITARIZATION PH XV	38,715	38,715	38,715		38,715
Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense Total				38,715	38,715	38,715	0	38,715
NATO	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	NATO Security Investment Program	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	199,700	199,700	174,700	-25,000	174,700
NATO Security Investment Program Total				199,700	199,700	174,700	-25,000	174,700
Army NG	DELAWARE	Dagsboro	NATIONAL GUARD VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	0	10,800	0		0
Army NG	MAINE	Augusta	NATIONAL GUARD RESERVE CENTER	30,000	30,000	30,000	2,000	32,000
Army NG	MARYLAND	Havre de Grace	NATIONAL GUARD READINESS CENTER	12,400	12,400	12,400		12,400
Army NG	MONTANA	Helena	NATIONAL GUARD READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	38,000	38,000	38,000		38,000
Army NG	NEW MEXICO	Alamogordo	READINESS CENTER ADD/ALT	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000
Army NG	NEW MEXICO	Alamogordo	NATIONAL GUARD READINESS CENTER	0	5,000	0		0
Army NG	NORTH DAKOTA	Valley City	NATIONAL GUARD VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	10,800	10,800	10,800		10,800
Army NG	VERMONT	North Hyde Park	NATIONAL GUARD VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	4,400	4,400	4,400		4,400
Army NG	WASHINGTON	Yakima	ENLISTED BARRACKS, TRANSIENT TRAINING	0	19,000	0		0
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	17,600	17,600	17,600		17,600
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	13,720	13,720	13,720		13,720
Military Construction, Army National Guard Total				126,920	161,720	131,920	7,000	133,920
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Fresno	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/AMSA	22,000	22,000	22,000		22,000
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	March (Riverside)	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Army Res	COLORADO	Fort Carson, Colorado	TRAINING BUILDING ADDITION	5,000	5,000	5,000		5,000
Army Res	ILLINOIS	Arlington Heights	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	26,000	0		0
Army Res	MISSISSIPPI	Starkville	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	0	9,300	0		0
Army Res	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	26,000	26,000	26,000		26,000
Army Res	NEW YORK	Mattydale	ARMY RESERVE CENTER/AMSA	23,000	23,000	23,000		23,000
Army Res	VIRGINIA	Fort Lee	TASS TRAINING CENTER	16,000	16,000	16,000		16,000
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	8,337	8,337	8,337		8,337
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,609	3,609	3,609		3,609
Military Construction, Army Reserve Total				103,946	164,246	128,946	25,000	128,946
N/MC Res	PENNSYLVANIA	Pittsburgh	RESERVE TRAINING CENTER—PITTSBURGH, PA	17,650	17,650	17,650		17,650
N/MC Res	WASHINGTON	Everett	JOINT RESERVE INTELLIGENCE CENTER	0	0	47,869	47,869	47,869
N/MC Res	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	C-40 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR	27,755	27,755	27,755		27,755
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR PLANNING & DESIGN	2,123	2,123	2,123		2,123
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,000	4,000	4,000		4,000
Military Construction, Naval Reserve Total				51,528	51,528	99,397	47,869	99,397
Air NG	ARKANSAS	Fort Smith Municipal Airport	CONSOLIDATED SCIF	0	0	13,200	13,200	13,200
Air NG	CONNECTICUT	Bradley IAP	CONSTRUCT C-130 FUEL CELL AND CORROSION CONTR	16,306	16,306	16,306		16,306

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Air NG	IOWA	Des Moines MAP	REMOTELY PILOTED AIRCRAFT AND TARGETING GROUP	8,993	8,993	8,993		8,993
Air NG	MICHIGAN	W. K. Kellogg Regional Airport	RPA BEDDOWN	6,000	6,000	6,000		6,000
Air NG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC-46A ADAL AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS & HY-DRANT SYST	7,100	7,100	7,100		7,100
Air NG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC-46A ADAL FUEL CELL BUILDING 253	16,800	16,800	16,800		16,800
Air NG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC-46A ADAL MAINT HANGAR BUILDING 254	18,002	18,002	18,002		18,002
Air NG	PENNSYLVANIA	Willow Grove ARF	RPA OPERATIONS CENTER	5,662	5,662	5,662		5,662
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	7,700	7,700	7,700		7,700
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	8,100	8,100	8,100	-2,000	6,100
Military Construction, Air National Guard Total				94,663	94,663	107,863	11,200	105,863
AF Res	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	GUARDIAN ANGEL OPERATIONS	0	0	14,500	14,500	14,500
AF Res	GEORGIA	Robins AFB	AFRC CONSOLIDATED MISSION COMPLEX, PH I	27,700	27,700	27,700		27,700
AF Res	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	KC-135 TANKER PARKING APRON EXPANSION	9,800	9,800	9,800		9,800
AF Res	TEXAS	Fort Worth	EOD FACILITY	3,700	3,700	3,700		3,700
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	6,892	6,892	6,892		6,892
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	1,400	1,400	1,400		1,400
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve Total				49,492	49,492	63,992	14,500	63,992
FH Con Army	ILLINOIS	Rock Island	FAMILY HOUSING NEW CONSTRUCTION	19,500	19,500	19,500		19,500
FH Con Army	KOREA	Camp Walker	FAMILY HOUSING NEW CONSTRUCTION	57,800	57,800	57,800		57,800
FH Con Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FAMILY HOUSING P & D	1,309	1,309	1,309		1,309
Family Housing Construction, Army Total				78,609	78,609	78,609	0	78,609
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS	14,136	14,136	14,136		14,136
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASED HOUSING	112,504	112,504	112,504		112,504
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY FACILITIES	65,245	65,245	65,245		65,245
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	3,117	3,117	3,117		3,117
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	43,480	43,480	43,480		43,480
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MILITARY HOUSING PRIVITIZATION INITIATIVE	20,000	20,000	20,000		20,000
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MISCELLANEOUS	700	700	700		700
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SERVICES	9,108	9,108	9,108		9,108
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES	82,686	82,686	82,686		82,686
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Army Total				350,976	350,976	350,976	0	350,976
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	38,543	38,543	38,543		38,543
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	HOUSING PRIVATIZATION	40,761	40,761	40,761		40,761
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASING	43,651	43,651	43,651		43,651
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE	99,934	99,934	99,934		99,934
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	47,834	47,834	47,834		47,834
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,993	1,993	1,993		1,993
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SERVICES ACCOUNT	12,709	12,709	12,709		12,709
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	42,322	42,322	42,322		42,322
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Air Force Total				327,747	327,747	327,747	0	327,747
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DESIGN	472	472	472		472
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IMPROVEMENTS	15,940	15,940	15,940		15,940

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Family Housing Construction, Navy And Marine Corps Total				16,412	16,412	16,412	0	16,412
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	17,881	17,881	17,881		17,881
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASING	65,999	65,999	65,999		65,999
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	97,612	97,612	97,612		97,612
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	55,124	55,124	55,124		55,124
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	366	366	366		366
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	27,876	27,876	27,876		27,876
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SERVICES ACCOUNT	18,079	18,079	18,079		18,079
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	71,092	71,092	71,092		71,092
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Navy And Marine Corps Total				354,029	354,029	354,029	0	354,029
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	3,362	3,362	3,362		3,362
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	20	20	20		20
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	746	746	746		746
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASING	42,083	42,083	42,083		42,083
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASING	11,179	11,179	11,179		11,179
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	344	344	344		344
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,128	2,128	2,128		2,128
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	378	378	378		378
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SERVICES ACCOUNT	31	31	31		31
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	170	170	170		170
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	659	659	659		659
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Defense-Wide Total				61,100	61,100	61,100	0	61,100
FHIF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND	1,662	1,662	1,662		1,662
DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund Total				1,662	1,662	1,662	0	1,662
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Closure, Army	BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE	84,417	84,417	84,417		84,417
Base Realignment and Closure—Army Total				84,417	84,417	84,417	0	84,417
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Closure, Navy	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE	57,406	57,406	57,406		57,406
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON—100: PLANING, DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT	7,682	7,682	7,682		7,682
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON—101: VARIOUS LOCATIONS	21,416	21,416	21,416		21,416
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON—138: NAS BRUNSWICK, ME	904	904	904		904
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON—157: MCSA KANSAS CITY, MO	40	40	40		40
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON—172: NWS SEAL BEACH, CONCORD, CA	6,066	6,066	6,066		6,066
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON—84: JRB WILLOW GROVE & CAMBRIA REG AP	1,178	1,178	1,178		1,178
Base Realignment and Closure—Navy Total				94,692	94,692	94,692	0	94,692
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DOD BRAC ACTIVITIES—AIR FORCE	90,976	90,976	90,976		90,976
Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force Total				90,976	90,976	90,976	0	90,976
PYS	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	42 USC 3374	0	–100,000	0		0
PYS	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ARMY	0	–79,577	0		0

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
PYS	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	0	-25,000	0		0
	Prior Year Savings Total			0	-204,577	0	0	0
GR	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	GENERAL REDUCTIONS	0	-69,000	0		0
	General Reductions Total			0	-69,000	0	0	0
	Total Military Construction			6,557,447	6,532,970	6,452,243	-5,604	6,551,843

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Army	Romania	Mihail Kogalniceanu	ERI: FUEL STORAGE CAPACITY	0	15,000	15,000
Army	Romania	Mihail Kogalniceanu	ERI: HAZARDOUS CARGO RAMP	0	5,000	5,000
Army	Romania	Mihail Kogalniceanu	ERI: MULTI MODAL IMPROVEMENTS	0	17,000	17,000
	Military Construction, Army Total			0	37,000	37,000
AF	Bulgaria	Graf Ignatievo	ERI: IMPROVE AIRFIELD INFRASTRUCTURE	0	3,200	3,200
AF	Estonia	Amari	ERI: IMPROVE AIRFIELD INFRASTRUCTURE	0	24,780	24,780
AF	Italy	Camp Darby	ERI: IMPROVE WEAPONS STORAGE FACILITY	0	44,450	44,450
AF	Latvia	Lielvarde	ERI: IMPROVE AIRFIELD INFRASTRUCTURE	0	10,710	10,710
AF	Lithuania	Siauliai	ERI: IMPROVE AIRFIELD INFRASTRUCTURE	0	13,120	13,120
AF	Poland	Lask	ERI: IMPROVE SUPPORT INFRASTRUCTURE	0	22,400	22,400
AF	Romania	Camp Turzii	ERI: IMPROVE AIRFIELD INFRASTRUCTURE	0	2,900	2,900
AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ERI: PLANNING AND DESIGN	0	11,500	11,500
	Military Construction, Air Force Total			0	133,060	133,060
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	CLASSIFIED PROJECT	46,000	0	46,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ERI: UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	0	4,350	4,350
	Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total			46,000	4,350	50,350
	Total, Military Construction, OCO Funding			46,000	174,410	220,410

**TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL
SECURITY PROGRAMS**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation					
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies					
Appropriation Summary:					
Energy Programs					
Nuclear Energy	104,000	0	0	0	104,000
Advisory Board					
Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health	0	0	2,000	2,000	2,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National nuclear security administration:					
Weapons activities	8,314,902	112,700	0	-104,342	8,210,560
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,555,156	10,000	285,000	219,602	1,774,758
Naval reactors	1,377,100	10,000	0	0	1,377,100
Federal salaries and expenses	410,842	-24,000	-7,500	-23,979	386,863
Total, National nuclear security administration	11,658,000	108,700	277,500	91,281	11,749,281
Environmental and other defense activities:					

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Defense environmental cleanup	5,327,538	–437,000	–463,000	–443,000	4,884,538
Other defense activities	753,000	5,300	–2,000	1,000	754,000
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	6,080,538	–431,700	–465,000	–442,000	5,638,538
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	17,738,538	–323,000	–187,500	–350,719	17,387,819
Total, Discretionary Funding	17,842,538	–323,000	–185,500	–348,719	17,493,819
Nuclear Energy					
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	104,000				104,000
Advisory Board					
Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health	0		2,000	2,000	2,000
Weapons Activities					
Directed stockpile work					
Life extension programs					
B61 Life extension program	643,000	–7,500			643,000
W76 Life extension program	259,168	7,100			259,168
W88 Alt 370	165,400	1,200			165,400
Cruise missile warhead life extension program	9,418	7,600	7,500	7,600	17,018
Total, Life extension programs	1,076,986	8,400	7,500	7,600	1,084,586
Stockpile systems					
B61 Stockpile systems	109,615				109,615
W76 Stockpile systems	45,728				45,728
W78 Stockpile systems	62,703	3,700			62,703
W80 Stockpile systems	70,610				70,610
B83 Stockpile systems	63,136				63,136
W87 Stockpile systems	91,255				91,255
W88 Stockpile systems	88,060				88,060
Total, Stockpile systems	531,107	3,700	0	0	531,107
Weapons dismantlement and disposition					
Operations and maintenance	30,008			10,000	40,008
Stockpile services					
Production support	350,942	12,300			350,942
Research and development support	29,649			–4,149	25,500
R&D certification and safety	201,479	11,000		–41,479	160,000
Management, technology, and production	241,805			–15,805	226,000
Plutonium sustainment	144,575	28,300			144,575
Tritium readiness	140,053				140,053
Total, Stockpile services	1,108,503	51,600	0	–61,433	1,047,070
Total, Directed stockpile work	2,746,604	63,700	7,500	–43,833	2,702,771
Campaigns:					
Science campaign					
Advanced certification	58,747				58,747
Primary assessment technologies	112,000				112,000
Dynamic materials properties	117,999			–7,999	110,000
Advanced radiography	79,340				79,340
Secondary assessment technologies	88,344				88,344
Total, Science campaign	456,430	0	0	–7,999	448,431
Engineering campaign					
Enhanced surety	52,003	2,400			52,003
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	20,832				20,832
Nuclear survivability	25,371				25,371
Enhanced surveillance	37,799	3,600			37,799
Total, Engineering campaign	136,005	6,000	0	0	136,005
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign					
Ignition	77,994				77,994
Support of other stockpile programs	23,598				23,598

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	61,297				61,297
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	5,024				5,024
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	9,100				9,100
Facility operations and target production	335,882		-7,500		335,882
Undistributed	0	-20,000			0
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	512,895	-20,000	-7,500	0	512,895
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	610,108				610,108
Nonnuclear Readiness Campaign	125,909			-55,909	70,000
Total, Campaigns	1,841,347	-14,000	-7,500	-63,908	1,777,439
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)					
Operations of facilities					
Kansas City Plant	125,000				125,000
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	71,000				71,000
Los Alamos National Laboratory	198,000				198,000
Nevada National Security Site	89,000				89,000
Pantex	75,000				75,000
Sandia National Laboratory	106,000				106,000
Savannah River Site	81,000				81,000
Y-12 National security complex	151,000				151,000
Total, Operations of facilities	896,000	0	0	0	896,000
Program readiness	136,700			-35,700	101,000
Material recycle and recovery	138,900				138,900
Containers	26,000				26,000
Storage	40,800				40,800
Maintenance and repair of facilities	205,000	15,000		15,000	220,000
Recapitalization	209,321	39,000		22,000	231,321
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	756,721	54,000	0	1,300	758,021
Construction:					
15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12	2,000				2,000
15-D-612 Emergency Operations Center, LLNL	2,000				2,000
15-D-611 Emergency Operations Center, SNL	4,000				4,000
15-D-301 HE Science & Engineering Facility, PX	11,800				11,800
15-D-302, TA-55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL	16,062				16,062
12-D-301 TRU waste facilities, LANL	6,938				6,938
11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL	10,000				10,000
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	15,000				15,000
06-D-141 PED/Construction, Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project Y-12	335,000				335,000
Total, Construction	402,800	0	0	0	402,800
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	2,055,521	54,000	0	1,300	2,056,821
Secure transportation asset					
Operations and equipment	132,851				132,851
Program direction	100,962				100,962
Total, Secure transportation asset	233,813	0	0	0	233,813
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	173,440	9,000		9,000	182,440
Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs	76,901			-6,901	70,000
Site stewardship					
Environmental projects and operations	53,000				53,000
Nuclear materials integration	16,218				16,218
Minority serving institution partnerships program	13,231				13,231
Total, Site stewardship	82,449	0	0	0	82,449
Defense nuclear security					
Operations and maintenance	618,123				618,123

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Total, Defense nuclear security	618,123	0	0	0	618,123
Information technology and cybersecurity	179,646				179,646
Legacy contractor pensions	307,058				307,058
Total, Weapons Activities	8,314,902	112,700	0	-104,342	8,210,560
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation					
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs					
Global threat reduction initiative	333,488	80,000	40,000	50,000	383,488
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D					
Operations and maintenance					
Nonproliferation and verification	360,808	70,000	30,000	32,593	393,401
Total, Operations and Maintenance	360,808	70,000	30,000	32,593	393,401
Nonproliferation and international security	141,359	36,400		2,887	144,246
International material protection and cooperation	305,467	-176,400	70,000	-10,878	294,589
Fissile materials disposition					
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition					
Operations and maintenance					
U.S. plutonium disposition	85,000				85,000
U.S. uranium disposition	25,000				25,000
Total, Operations and maintenance	110,000	0	0	0	110,000
Construction:					
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	196,000	0	145,000	145,000	341,000
99-D-141-02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC	5,125				5,125
Total, Construction	201,125	0	145,000	145,000	346,125
Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	311,125	0	145,000	145,000	456,125
Total, Fissile materials disposition	311,125	0	145,000	145,000	456,125
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs	1,452,247	10,000	285,000	219,602	1,671,849
Legacy contractor pensions	102,909				102,909
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,555,156	10,000	285,000	219,602	1,774,758
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,555,156	10,000	285,000	219,602	1,774,758
Naval Reactors					
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	412,380	10,000			412,380
Naval reactors development	425,700				425,700
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	156,100				156,100
S8G Prototype refueling	126,400				126,400
Program direction	46,600				46,600
Construction:					
15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3	400				400
15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade	600				600
15-D-902 KS Engineroom team trainer facility	1,500				1,500
15-D-901 KS Central office building and prototype staff facility	24,000				24,000
14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	141,100				141,100
13-D-905 Remote-handled low-level waste facility, INL	14,420				14,420
13-D-904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO	20,100				20,100
10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL	7,400				7,400
08-D-190 Expanded Core Facility M-290 receiving/discharge station,					
Naval Reactor Facility, ID	400				400
Total, Construction	209,920	0	0	0	209,920
Total, Naval Reactors	1,377,100	10,000	0	0	1,377,100
Federal Salaries And Expenses					
Program direction	410,842	-24,000	-7,500	-23,979	386,863

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Total, Office Of The Administrator	410,842	-24,000	-7,500	-23,979	386,863
Defense Environmental Cleanup					
Closure sites:					
Closure sites administration	4,889				4,889
Hanford site:					
River corridor and other cleanup operations	332,788	20,000		20,000	352,788
Central plateau remediation	474,292				474,292
Construction:					
15-D-401 Containerized sludge (RI-0012)	26,290				26,290
Total, Central plateau remediation	833,370	20,000	0	20,000	853,370
Richland community and regulatory support	14,701				14,701
Total, Hanford site	848,071	20,000	0	20,000	868,071
Idaho National Laboratory:					
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	364,293				364,293
Idaho community and regulatory support	2,910				2,910
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	367,203	0	0	0	367,203
NNSA sites					
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,366				1,366
Nevada	64,851				64,851
Sandia National Laboratories	2,801				2,801
Los Alamos National Laboratory	196,017				196,017
Construction:					
15-D-406 Hexavalent chromium D & D (VI-LanI-0030)	28,600				28,600
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	293,635	0	0	0	293,635
Oak Ridge Reservation:					
OR Nuclear facility D & D					
OR Nuclear facility D & D	73,155				73,155
Construction:					
14-D-403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility	9,400				9,400
Total, OR Nuclear facility D & D	82,555	0	0	0	82,555
U233 Disposition Program	41,626				41,626
OR cleanup and disposition:					
OR cleanup and disposition	71,137				71,137
Construction:					
15-D-405—Sludge Buildout	4,200				4,200
Total, OR cleanup and disposition	75,337	0	0	0	75,337
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,365				4,365
Solid waste stabilization and disposition,					
Oak Ridge technology development	3,000				3,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	206,883	0	0	0	206,883
Office of River Protection:					
Waste treatment and immobilization plant					
01-D-416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction	575,000				575,000
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility	115,000				115,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	690,000	0	0	0	690,000
Tank farm activities					
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	522,000				522,000
Construction:					
15-D-409 Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford	23,000				23,000
Total, Tank farm activities	545,000	0	0	0	545,000
Total, Office of River protection	1,235,000	0	0	0	1,235,000

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	House Authorized	Senate Authorized	Agreement Change	Agreement Authorized
Savannah River sites:					
Savannah River risk management operations	416,276				416,276
SR community and regulatory support	11,013				11,013
Radioactive liquid tank waste:					
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	553,175				553,175
Construction:					
15-D-402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6	34,642				34,642
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	135,000				135,000
Total, Construction	169,642	0	0	0	169,642
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	722,817	0	0	0	722,817
Total, Savannah River site	1,150,106	0	0	0	1,150,106
Waste isolation pilot plant	216,020				216,020
Program direction	280,784				280,784
Program support	14,979				14,979
Safeguards and Security:					
Oak Ridge Reservation	16,382				16,382
Paducah	7,297				7,297
Portsmouth	8,492				8,492
Richland/Hanford Site	63,668				63,668
Savannah River Site	132,196				132,196
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,455				4,455
West Valley	1,471				1,471
Technology development	13,007	6,000			13,007
Use of prior-year balances	0				0
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	4,864,538	26,000	0	20,000	4,884,538
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000	−463,000	−463,000	−463,000	0
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,327,538	−437,000	−463,000	−443,000	4,884,538
Other Defense Activities					
Specialized security activities	202,152	5,300		1,000	203,152
Environment, health, safety and security					
Environment, health, safety and security	118,763		−1,000		118,763
Program direction	62,235				62,235
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security	180,998	0	−1,000	0	180,998
Independent enterprise assessments					
Independent enterprise assessments	24,068				24,068
Program direction	49,466				49,466
Total, Independent enterprise assessments	73,534	0	0	0	73,534
Office of Legacy Management					
Legacy management	158,639		−1,000		158,639
Program direction	13,341				13,341
Total, Office of Legacy Management	171,980	0	−1,000	0	171,980
Defense-related activities					
Defense related administrative support					
Chief financial officer	46,877				46,877
Chief information officer	71,959				71,959
Total, Defense related administrative support	118,836	0	0	0	118,836
Office of hearings and appeals	5,500				5,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities	753,000	5,300	−2,000	1,000	754,000
Total, Other Defense Activities	753,000	5,300	−2,000	1,000	754,000

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 770, I call up the bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Extension of emergency unemployment compensation program.
- Sec. 3. Temporary extension of extended benefit provisions.
- Sec. 4. Extension of funding for reemployment services and reemployment and eligibility assessment activities.
- Sec. 5. Additional extended unemployment benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.
- Sec. 6. Flexibility for unemployment program agreements.
- Sec. 7. Ending unemployment payments to jobless millionaires and billionaires.
- Sec. 8. GAO study on the use of work suitability requirements in unemployment insurance programs.
- Sec. 9. Funding stabilization.
- Sec. 10. Prepayment of certain PBGC premiums.
- Sec. 11. Extension of customs user fees.
- Sec. 12. Emergency services, government, and certain nonprofit volunteers.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 4007(a)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “June 1, 2014”.

(b) **FUNDING.**—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by inserting “and” at the end; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following:

“(K) the amendment made by section 2(a) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014;”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 3. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXTENDED BENEFIT PROVISIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111–5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note), is amended—

(1) by striking “December 31, 2013” each place it appears and inserting “May 31, 2014”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “June 30, 2014” and inserting “November 30, 2014”.

(b) **EXTENSION OF MATCHING FOR STATES WITH NO WAITING WEEK.**—Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2014” and inserting “November 30, 2014”.

(c) **EXTENSION OF MODIFICATION OF INDICATORS UNDER THE EXTENDED BENEFIT PROGRAM.**—Section 203 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “May 31, 2014”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2), by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “May 31, 2014”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF FUNDING FOR REEMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND REEMPLOYMENT AND ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4004(c)(2)(A) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking “through fiscal year 2014” and inserting “through the first five months of fiscal year 2015”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–240).

(b) **TIMING FOR SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4001(i)(1)(A) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence:

“At a minimum, such reemployment services and reemployment and eligibility assessment activities shall be provided to an individual within a time period (determined appropriate by the Secretary) after the date the individual begins to receive amounts under section 4002(b) (first tier benefits) and, if applicable, again within a time period (determined appropriate by the Secretary) after the date the individual begins to receive amounts under section 4002(d) (third tier benefits).”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **PURPOSES OF SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES.**—The purposes of the reemployment services and reemployment and eligibility assessment activities under section 4001(i) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) are—

(1) to better link the unemployed with the overall workforce system by bringing individuals receiving unemployment insurance benefits in for personalized assessments and referrals to reemployment services; and

(2) to provide individuals receiving unemployment insurance benefits with early access to specific strategies that can help get them back into the workforce faster, including through—

(A) the development of a reemployment plan;

(B) the provision of access to relevant labor market information;

(C) the provision of access to information about industry-recognized credentials that are regionally relevant or nationally portable;

(D) the provision of referrals to reemployment services and training; and

(E) an assessment of the individual’s on-going eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits.

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Section 2(c)(2)(D)(iii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. 352(c)(2)(D)(iii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “June 30, 2013” and inserting “November 30, 2013”; and

(2) by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “May 31, 2014”.

(b) **CLARIFICATION ON AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS.**—Funds appropriated under either the first or second sentence of clause (iv) of section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act shall be available to cover the cost of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D) by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a) as well as to cover the cost of such benefits provided under such section 2(c)(2)(D), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATION.**—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the Railroad Retirement Board \$105,000 for administrative expenses associated with the payment of additional extended unemployment benefits provided under section 2(c)(2)(D) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act by reason of the amendments made by subsection (a), to remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. FLEXIBILITY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENTS.

(a) **FLEXIBILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (g) of section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall not apply with respect to a State that has enacted a law before December 1, 2013, that, upon taking effect, would violate such subsection.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Paragraph (1) is effective with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after December 29, 2013.

(b) **PERMITTING A SUBSEQUENT AGREEMENT.**—Nothing in title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) shall preclude a State whose agreement under such title was terminated from entering into a subsequent agreement under such title on or after the date of the enactment of this Act if the State, taking into account the application of subsection (a), would otherwise meet the requirements for an agreement under such title.

SEC. 7. ENDING UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO JOBLESS MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may be used for payments of unemployment compensation under the emergency unemployment compensation program under title IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) to an individual whose adjusted gross income in the preceding year was equal to or greater than \$1,000,000.

(b) **COMPLIANCE.**—Unemployment Insurance applications shall include a form or procedure for an individual applicant to certify the individual’s adjusted gross income was not equal to or greater than \$1,000,000 in the preceding year.

(c) **AUDITS.**—The certifications required by subsection (b) shall be auditable by the U.S. Department of Labor or the U.S. Government Accountability Office.

(d) **STATUS OF APPLICANTS.**—It is the duty of the States to verify the residency, employment, legal, and income status of applicants for Unemployment Insurance and no Federal funds may be expended for purposes of determining whether or not the prohibition under subsection (a) applies with respect to an individual.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. GAO STUDY ON THE USE OF WORK SUITABILITY REQUIREMENTS IN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the use

of work suitability requirements to strengthen requirements to ensure that unemployment insurance benefits are being provided to individuals who are actively looking for work and who truly want to return to the labor force. Such study shall include an analysis of—

(1) how work suitability requirements work under both State and Federal unemployment insurance programs; and

(2) how to incorporate and improve such requirements under Federal unemployment insurance programs; and

(3) other items determined appropriate by the Comptroller General.

(b) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall brief Congress on the ongoing study required under subsection (a). Such briefing shall include preliminary recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

SEC. 9. FUNDING STABILIZATION.

(a) **FUNDING STABILIZATION UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.**—The table in subclause (II) of section 430(h)(2)(C)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“If the calendar year is:	The applicable minimum percentage is:	The applicable maximum percentage is:
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017.	90%	110%
2018	85%	115%
2019	80%	120%
2020	75%	125%
After 2020	70%	130%”.

(b) **FUNDING STABILIZATION UNDER ERISA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The table in subclause (II) of section 303(h)(2)(C)(iv) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended to read as follows:

“If the calendar year is:	The applicable minimum percentage is:	The applicable maximum percentage is:
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017.	90%	110%
2018	85%	115%
2019	80%	120%
2020	75%	125%
After 2020	70%	130%”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Clause (ii) of section 101(f)(2)(D) of such Act is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(B) **STATEMENTS.**—The Secretary of Labor shall modify the statements required under subclauses (I) and (II) of section 101(f)(2)(D)(i) of such Act to conform to the amendments made by this section.

(c) **STABILIZATION NOT TO APPLY FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN ACCELERATED BENEFIT DISTRIBUTION RULES.**—

(1) **INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.**—The second sentence of paragraph (2) of section 436(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “of such plan” and inserting “of such plan (determined by not taking into account any adjustment of segment rates under section 430(h)(2)(C)(iv))”.

(2) **EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.**—The second sentence of subparagraph (B) of section 206(g)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056(g)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “of such plan” and inserting “of such plan (determined by not taking into account any adjustment of segment rates under section 303(h)(2)(C)(iv))”.

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(B) **COLLECTIVELY BARGAINED PLANS.**—In the case of a plan maintained pursuant to 1 or more collective bargaining agreements, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(4) **PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If this paragraph applies to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract, such plan or contract shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan during the period described in subparagraph (B)(ii).

(B) **AMENDMENTS TO WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—This paragraph shall apply to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract which is made—

(I) pursuant to the amendments made by this subsection, or pursuant to any regulation issued by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Labor under any provision as so amended, and

(II) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2016, or such later date as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

(ii) **CONDITIONS.**—This subsection shall not apply to any amendment unless, during the period—

(I) beginning on the date that the amendments made by this subsection or the regulation described in clause (i)(I) takes effect (or in the case of a plan or contract amendment not required by such amendments or such regulation, the effective date specified by the plan), and

(II) ending on the date described in clause (i)(II) (or, if earlier, the date the plan or contract amendment is adopted),

the plan or contract is operated as if such plan or contract amendment were in effect, and such plan or contract amendment applies retroactively for such period.

(C) **ANTI-CUTBACK RELIEF.**—A plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 204(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 411(d)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 solely by reason of a plan amendment to which this paragraph applies.

(d) **MODIFICATION OF FUNDING TARGET DETERMINATION PERIODS.**—

(1) **INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.**—Clause (i) of section 430(h)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “the first day of the plan year” and inserting “the valuation date for the plan year”.

(2) **EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.**—Clause (i) of section 303(h)(2)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1083(h)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “the first day of the plan year” and inserting “the valuation date for the plan year”.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) shall apply with respect to plan years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(2) **ELECTIONS.**—A plan sponsor may elect not to have the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) apply to any plan year beginning before January 1, 2014, either (as specified in the election)—

(A) for all purposes for which such amendments apply, or

(B) solely for purposes of determining the adjusted funding target attainment percentage under sections 436 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and 206(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 for such plan year.

A plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 204(g) of such Act and section 411(d)(6) of such Code solely by reason of an election under this paragraph.

SEC. 10. PREPAYMENT OF CERTAIN PBGC PREMIUMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4007 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1307) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) **ELECTION TO PREPAY FLAT DOLLAR PREMIUMS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The designated payor may elect to prepay during any plan year the premiums due under clause (i) or (v), whichever is applicable, of section 4006(a)(3)(A) for the number of consecutive subsequent plan years (not greater than 5) specified in the election.

“(2) **AMOUNT OF PREPAYMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount of the prepayment for any subsequent plan year under paragraph (1) shall be equal to the amount of the premium determined under clause (i) or (v), whichever is applicable, of section 4006(a)(3)(A) for the plan year in which the prepayment is made.

“(B) **ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS.**—If there is an increase in the number of participants in the plan during any plan year with respect to which a prepayment has been made, the designated payor shall pay a premium for such additional participants at the premium rate in effect under clause (i) or (v), whichever is applicable, of section 4006(a)(3)(A) for such plan year. No credit or other refund shall be granted in the case of a plan that has a decrease in number of participants during a plan year with respect to which a prepayment has been made.

“(C) **COORDINATION WITH PREMIUM FOR UNFUNDED VESTED BENEFITS.**—The amount of the premium determined under section 4006(a)(3)(A)(i) for the purpose of determining the prepayment amount for any plan year shall be determined without regard to the increase in such premium under section 4006(a)(3)(E). Such increase shall be paid in the same amount and at the same time as it would otherwise be paid without regard to this subsection.

“(3) **ELECTION.**—The election under this subsection shall be made at such time and in such manner as the corporation may prescribe.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 4007 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1307) is amended by striking “Premiums” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (f), premiums”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. EXTENSION OF CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2023” and inserting “September 30, 2024”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “September 30, 2023” and inserting “September 30, 2024”.

SEC. 12. EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND CERTAIN NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) **SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.**—

“(A) **EMERGENCY SERVICES VOLUNTEERS.**—Qualified services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to an eligible employer shall not be taken

into account under this section as service provided by an employee. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms 'qualified services', 'bona fide volunteer', and 'eligible employer' shall have the respective meanings given such terms under section 457(e).

“(B) CERTAIN OTHER GOVERNMENT AND NON-PROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to a specified employer shall not be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee.

“(ii) BONA FIDE VOLUNTEER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘bona fide volunteer’ means an employee of a specified employer whose only compensation from such employer is in the form of—

“(I) reimbursement for (or reasonable allowance for) reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of services by volunteers, or

“(II) reasonable benefits (including length of service awards), and nominal fees, customarily paid by similar entities in connection with the performance of services by volunteers.

“(iii) SPECIFIED EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘specified employer’ means—

“(I) any government entity, and

“(II) any organization described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

“(iv) COORDINATION WITH SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—This subparagraph shall not fail to apply with respect to services merely because such services are qualified services (as defined in section 457(e)(1)(C)).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MCKEON

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. McKeon moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979 with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-58 modified by the amendments printed in part A of House Report 113-646 and the amendment specified in section 5 of House Resolution 770.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1)(A) Senator Carl Levin of Michigan was elected a member of the United States Senate on November 7, 1978, for a full term beginning January 3, 1979. He has served continuously in the Senate since that date, and was appointed as a member of the Committee on Armed Services in January 1979. He has served on the Committee on Armed Services since that date, a period of nearly 36 years.

(B) A graduate of Detroit Central High School, Senator Levin went on to Swarthmore College, and graduated from Harvard Law School in 1959, gaining admittance to the Michigan bar. He served his State as assistant attorney general and general counsel of the Michigan Civil Rights Commission from 1964-1967, and later served

his hometown of Detroit as a member of the Detroit City Council from 1969-1973, and as the council’s president from 1974-1977.

(C) Senator Levin first served as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate for a period of the 107th Congress, and has remained chairman since the 110th Congress began in 2007. He has exercised extraordinary leadership as either the chairman or ranking minority member of the committee since the start of the 105th Congress in 1997.

(D) Each year, for the past 52 years, the Committee on Armed Services has reliably passed an annual defense authorization act, and this will be the 36th that Senator Levin has had a role in. In his capacity as member, ranking member, and chairman, he has been an advocate for a strong national defense, and has made lasting contributions to the security of our Nation.

(E) It is altogether fitting and proper that this Act, the last annual authorization act for the national defense that Senator Levin manages in and for the United States Senate as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, be named in his honor, as provided in subsection (a).

(2)(A) Representative Howard P. “Buck” McKeon was elected to the House of Representatives in 1992 to represent California’s 25th Congressional District.

(B) Chairman McKeon was born in Los Angeles and grew up in Tujunga CA. He served a two and a half year mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and attended Brigham Young University. Prior to his election to Congress, he was a small business owner, and served both on the William S. Hart Union High School District Board of Trustees and as the first mayor of the City of Santa Clarita.

(C) In the 111th Congress, Chairman McKeon was selected by his peers as the Ranking Member of the House Armed Services Committee and has served as Chairman since in the 112th and 113th Congresses. Previously Chairman McKeon had served as the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(D) Chairman McKeon is a champion of a strong national defense, the men and women of America’s Armed Forces and their families, and returning fiscal discipline to the Department of Defense. His priority has been to ensure our troops deployed around the world have the equipment, resources, authorities, training and time they need to successfully complete their missions and return home.

(E) For 52 consecutive years, the House Armed Services Committee, in a bipartisan, bicameral tradition, has passed and enacted an annual defense authorization act. Chairman McKeon had said it has been the privilege of his life to shepherd that tradition under his tenure.

(F) It is therefore fitting this Act, the last national defense authorization act of his tenure, be named in Chairman McKeon’s honor, as provided in subsection (a).

(c) REFERENCES.—Any reference in this or any other Act to the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015” shall be deemed to refer to the “Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”.

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) DIVISIONS.—This Act is organized into four divisions as follows:

(1) Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations.

(2) Division B—Military Construction Authorizations.

(3) Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations.

(4) Division D—Funding Tables.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.

Sec. 3. Congressional defense committees.

Sec. 4. Budgetary effects of this Act.

Sec. 5. Explanatory statement.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 101. Authorization of Appropriations.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Sec. 111. Plan on modernization of UH-60A aircraft of Army National Guard.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Sec. 121. Construction of San Antonio class amphibious ship.

Sec. 122. Limitation on availability of funds for mission modules for Littoral Combat Ship.

Sec. 123. Extension of limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship.

Sec. 124. Report on test evaluation master plan for Littoral Combat Ship seaframes and mission modules.

Sec. 125. Airborne electronic attack capabilities.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Sec. 131. Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of MQ-1 Predator aircraft.

Sec. 132. Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of U-2 aircraft.

Sec. 133. Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of A-10 aircraft.

Sec. 134. Prohibition on cancellation or modification of avionics modernization program for C-130 aircraft.

Sec. 135. Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Air Force aircraft.

Sec. 136. Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of E-3 airborne warning and control system aircraft.

Sec. 137. Limitation on availability of funds for divestment or transfer of KC-10 aircraft.

Sec. 138. Limitation on availability of funds for transfer of Air Force C-130H and C-130J aircraft.

Sec. 139. Limitation on availability of funds for transfer of Air Force KC-135 tankers.

Sec. 140. Report on C-130 aircraft.

Sec. 141. Report on status of F-16 aircraft.

Sec. 142. Report on options to modernize or replace T-1A aircraft.

Sec. 143. Report on status of air-launched cruise missile capabilities.

Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters

Sec. 151. Additional oversight requirements for the undersea mobility acquisition program of the United States Special Operations Command.

Sec. 152. Plan for modernization or replacement of digital avionic equipment.

Sec. 153. Comptroller General report on F-35 aircraft acquisition program.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 201. Authorization of Appropriations.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Sec. 211. Modification of authority for prizes for advanced technology achievements.

Sec. 212. Modification of Manufacturing Technology Program.

Sec. 213. Revision of requirement for acquisition programs to maintain defense research facility records.

Sec. 214. Treatment by Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center of significant modifications to test and evaluation facilities and resources.

Sec. 215. Revision to the service requirement under the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation Defense Education Program.

Sec. 216. Limitation on availability of funds for armored multi-purpose vehicle program.

Sec. 217. Limitation on availability of funds for unmanned carrier-launched airborne surveillance and strike system.

Sec. 218. Limitation on availability of funds for airborne reconnaissance systems.

Sec. 219. Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems aircraft.

Subtitle C—Reports

Sec. 221. Reduction in frequency of reporting by Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering.

Sec. 222. Independent assessment of inter-agency biodefense research and development.

Sec. 223. Briefing on modeling and simulation technological and industrial base in support of requirements of Department of Defense.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Sec. 231. Modification to requirement for contractor cost sharing in pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of certain defense systems.

Sec. 232. Pilot program on assignment to Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency of private sector personnel with critical research and development expertise.

Sec. 233. Pilot program on enhancement of preparation of dependents of members of Armed Forces for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Sec. 234. Sense of Congress on helicopter health and usage monitoring system of the Army.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environment

Sec. 311. Elimination of fiscal year limitation on prohibition of payment of fines and penalties from the Environmental Restoration Account, Defense.

Sec. 312. Method of funding for cooperative agreements under the Sikes Act.

Sec. 313. Report on prohibition of disposal of waste in open-air burn pits.

Sec. 314. Business case analysis of any plan to design, refurbish, or construct a biofuel refinery.

Sec. 315. Environmental restoration at former Naval Air Station Chin-coteague, Virginia.

Sec. 316. Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of drop-in fuels.

Sec. 317. Decontamination of a portion of former bombardment area on island of Culebra, Puerto Rico.

Sec. 318. Alternative fuel automobiles.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

Sec. 321. Modification of quarterly readiness reporting requirement.

Sec. 322. Additional requirement for strategic policy on prepositioning of materiel and equipment.

Sec. 323. Elimination of authority of Secretary of the Army to abolish arsenals.

Sec. 324. Modification of annual reporting requirement related to prepositioning of materiel and equipment.

Subtitle D—Reports

Sec. 331. Repeal of annual report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums.

Sec. 332. Army assessment of regionally aligned forces.

Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority

Sec. 341. Limitation on authority to enter into a contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul of the F117 engine.

Sec. 342. Limitation on establishment of regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers.

Sec. 343. Limitation on transfer of MC-12 aircraft to United States Special Operations Command.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sec. 351. Clarification of authority relating to provision of installation-support services through intergovernmental support agreements.

Sec. 352. Management of conventional ammunition inventory.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

Sec. 401. End strengths for active forces.

Sec. 402. Revisions in permanent active duty end strength minimum levels.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

Sec. 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve.

Sec. 412. End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves.

Sec. 413. End strengths for military technicians (dual status).

Sec. 414. Fiscal year 2015 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians.

Sec. 415. Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 421. Military personnel.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

Sec. 501. Authority to limit consideration for early retirement by selective retirement boards to particular warrant officer year groups and specialties.

Sec. 502. Authority for three-month deferral of retirement for officers selected for selective early retirement.

Sec. 503. Repeal of limits on percentage of officers who may be recommended for discharge during a fiscal year under enhanced selective discharge authority.

Sec. 504. Reports on number and assignment of enlisted aides for officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

Sec. 505. Repeal of requirement for submission to Congress of annual reports on joint officer management and promotion policy objectives for joint officers.

Sec. 506. Options for Phase II of joint professional military education.

Sec. 507. Elimination of requirement that a qualified aviator or naval flight officer be in command of an inactivated nuclear-powered aircraft carrier before decommissioning.

Sec. 508. Required consideration of certain elements of command climate in performance appraisals of commanding officers.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management

Sec. 511. Retention on the reserve active-status list following nonselection for promotion of certain health professions officers and first lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade) pursuing baccalaureate degrees.

Sec. 512. Consultation with Chief of the National Guard Bureau in selection of Directors and Deputy Directors, Army National Guard and Air National Guard.

Sec. 513. Centralized database of information on military technician positions.

Sec. 514. Report on management of personnel records of members of the National Guard.

Subtitle C—General Service Authorities

Sec. 521. Enhancement of participation of mental health professionals in boards for correction of military records and boards for review of discharge or dismissal of members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 522. Extension of authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 523. Provision of information to members of the Armed Forces on privacy rights relating to receipt of mental health services.

Sec. 524. Removal of artificial barriers to the service of women in the Armed Forces.

Subtitle D—Military Justice, Including Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Prevention and Response

- Sec. 531. Technical revisions and clarifications of certain provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 relating to the military justice system.
- Sec. 532. Ordering of depositions under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.
- Sec. 533. Access to Special Victims' Counsel.
- Sec. 534. Enhancement of victims' rights in connection with prosecution of certain sex-related offenses.
- Sec. 535. Enforcement of crime victims' rights related to protections afforded by certain Military Rules of Evidence.
- Sec. 536. Modification of Military Rules of Evidence relating to admissibility of general military character toward probability of innocence.
- Sec. 537. Modification of Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence, relating to the privilege against disclosure of communications between psychotherapists and patients.
- Sec. 538. Modification of Department of Defense policy on retention of evidence in a sexual assault case to permit return of personal property upon completion of related proceedings.
- Sec. 539. Requirements relating to Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners for the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 540. Modification of term of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 541. Review of decisions not to refer charges of certain sex-related offenses for trial by court-martial if requested by chief prosecutor.
- Sec. 542. Analysis and assessment of disposition of most serious offenses identified in unrestricted reports on sexual assaults in annual reports on sexual assaults in the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 543. Plan for limited use of certain information on sexual assaults in restricted reports by military criminal investigative organizations.
- Sec. 544. Improved Department of Defense information reporting and collection of domestic violence incidents involving members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 545. Additional duties for judicial proceedings panel.
- Sec. 546. Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 547. Confidential review of characterization of terms of discharge of members of the Armed Forces who are victims of sexual offenses.

Subtitle E—Member Education, Training, and Transition

- Sec. 551. Enhancement of authority to assist members of the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials.

- Sec. 552. Applicability of sexual assault prevention and response and related military justice enhancements to military service academies.
- Sec. 553. Authorized duration of foreign and cultural exchange activities at military service academies.
- Sec. 554. Enhancement of authority to accept support for Air Force Academy athletic programs.
- Sec. 555. Pilot program to assist members of the Armed Forces in obtaining post-service employment.
- Sec. 556. Plan for education of members of Armed Forces on cyber matters.
- Sec. 557. Enhancement of information provided to members of the Armed Forces and veterans regarding use of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance and Federal financial aid through Transition Assistance Program.
- Sec. 558. Procedures for provision of certain information to State veterans agencies to facilitate the transition of members of the Armed Forces from military service to civilian life.

Subtitle F—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters

- Sec. 561. Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees.
- Sec. 562. Impact aid for children with severe disabilities.
- Sec. 563. Amendments to the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012.
- Sec. 564. Authority to employ non-United States citizens as teachers in Department of Defense overseas dependents' school system.
- Sec. 565. Inclusion of domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools among functions of Advisory Council on Dependents' Education.
- Sec. 566. Protection of child custody arrangements for parents who are members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 567. Improved consistency in data collection and reporting in Armed Forces suicide prevention efforts.
- Sec. 568. Improved data collection related to efforts to reduce underemployment of spouses of members of the Armed Forces and close the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts.

Subtitle G—Decorations and Awards

- Sec. 571. Medals for members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who were killed or wounded in an attack by a foreign terrorist organization.
- Sec. 572. Authorization for award of the Medal of Honor to members of the Armed Forces for acts of valor during World War I.

Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements

- Sec. 581. Review and report on military programs and controls regarding professionalism.

- Sec. 582. Review and report on prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces.
- Sec. 583. Review and report on provision of job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members of the reserve components.
- Sec. 584. Report on foreign language, regional expertise, and culture considerations in overseas military operations.
- Sec. 585. Deadline for submission of report containing results of review of Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity role in sexual harassment cases.
- Sec. 586. Independent assessment of risk and resiliency of United States Special Operations Forces and effectiveness of the Preservation of the Force and Families and Human Performance Programs.
- Sec. 587. Comptroller General report on hazing in the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 588. Comptroller General report on impact of certain mental and physical trauma on discharges from military service for misconduct.

Subtitle I—Other Matters

- Sec. 591. Inspection of outpatient residential facilities occupied by recovering service members.
- Sec. 592. Designation of voter assistance offices.
- Sec. 593. Repeal of electronic voting demonstration project.
- Sec. 594. Authority for removal from national cemeteries of remains of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces who have no known next of kin.
- Sec. 595. Sense of Congress regarding leaving no member of the Armed Forces unaccounted for during the drawdown of United States forces in Afghanistan.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

- Sec. 601. No fiscal year 2015 increase in basic pay for general and flag officers.
- Sec. 602. Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing under certain circumstances.
- Sec. 603. Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau and Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau among senior members of the Armed Forces for purposes of pay and allowances.
- Sec. 604. Modification of computation of basic allowance for housing inside the United States.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

- Sec. 611. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces.
- Sec. 612. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals.
- Sec. 613. One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers.

Sec. 614. One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities.

Sec. 615. One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays.

Subtitle C—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits

Sec. 621. Earlier determination of dependent status with respect to transitional compensation for dependents of certain members separated for dependent abuse.

Sec. 622. Modification of determination of retired pay base for officers retired in general and flag officer grades.

Sec. 623. Inapplicability of reduced annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62 under the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 who first become members prior to January 1, 2016.

Sec. 624. Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for special needs trusts established for the benefit of dependent children incapable of self-support.

Sec. 625. Modification of per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service to reduce eligibility age for retirement for non-regular service.

Subtitle D—Commissary and Non-appropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations

Sec. 631. Procurement of brand-name and other commercial items for resale by commissary stores.

Sec. 632. Authority of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to enter into contracts with other Federal agencies and instrumentalities to provide and obtain certain goods and services.

Sec. 633. Competitive pricing of legal consumer tobacco products sold in Department of Defense retail stores.

Sec. 634. Review of management, food, and pricing options for defense commissary system.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits

Sec. 701. Mental health assessments for members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 702. Modifications of cost-sharing and other requirements for the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program.

Sec. 703. Elimination of inpatient day limits and other limits in provision of mental health services.

Sec. 704. Authority for provisional TRICARE coverage for emerging health care services and supplies.

Sec. 705. Clarification of provision of food to former members and dependents not receiving inpatient care in military medical treatment facilities.

Sec. 706. Availability of breastfeeding support, supplies, and counseling under the TRICARE program.

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

Sec. 711. Provision of notice of change to TRICARE benefits.

Sec. 712. Surveys on continued viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra.

Sec. 713. Review of military health system modernization study.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

Sec. 721. Designation and responsibilities of senior medical advisor for Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Sec. 722. Extension of authority for joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund.

Sec. 723. Report on status of reductions in TRICARE Prime service areas.

Sec. 724. Extension of authority to provide rehabilitation and vocational benefits to members of the Armed Forces with severe injuries or illnesses.

Sec. 725. Acquisition strategy for health care professional staffing services.

Sec. 726. Pilot program on medication therapy management under TRICARE program.

Sec. 727. Antimicrobial stewardship program at medical facilities of the Department of Defense.

Sec. 728. Report on improvements in the identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces.

Sec. 729. Report on efforts to treat infertility of military families.

Sec. 730. Report on implementation of recommendations of Institute of Medicine on improvements to certain resilience and prevention programs of the Department of Defense.

Sec. 731. Comptroller General report on transition of care for post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury.

Sec. 732. Comptroller General report on mental health stigma reduction efforts in the Department of Defense.

Sec. 733. Comptroller General report on women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

Sec. 801. Modular open systems approaches in acquisition programs.

Sec. 802. Recharacterization of changes to Major Automated Information System programs.

Sec. 803. Amendments relating to defense business systems.

Sec. 804. Report on implementation of acquisition process for information technology systems.

Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Sec. 811. Extension and modification of contract authority for advanced component development and prototype units.

Sec. 812. Amendments relating to authority of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to carry out certain prototype projects.

Sec. 813. Extension of limitation on aggregate annual amount available for contract services.

Sec. 814. Improvement in defense design-build construction process.

Sec. 815. Permanent authority for use of simplified acquisition procedures for certain commercial items.

Sec. 816. Restatement and revision of requirements applicable to multiyear defense acquisitions to be specifically authorized by law.

Sec. 817. Sourcing requirements related to avoiding counterfeit electronic parts.

Sec. 818. Amendments to Proof of Concept Commercialization Pilot Program.

Subtitle C—Industrial Base Matters

Sec. 821. Temporary extension of and amendments to test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans.

Sec. 822. Plan for improving data on bundled or consolidated contracts.

Sec. 823. Authority to provide education to small businesses on certain requirements of Arms Export Control Act.

Sec. 824. Matters relating to reverse auctions.

Sec. 825. Sole source contracts for small business concerns owned and controlled by women.

Subtitle D—Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform

Sec. 831. Chief Information Officer authority enhancements.

Sec. 832. Enhanced transparency and improved risk management in information technology investments.

Sec. 833. Portfolio review.

Sec. 834. Federal data center consolidation initiative.

Sec. 835. Expansion of training and use of information technology cadres.

Sec. 836. Maximizing the benefit of the Federal strategic sourcing initiative.

Sec. 837. Governmentwide software purchasing program.

Subtitle E—Never Contract With the Enemy

Sec. 841. Prohibition on providing funds to the enemy.

Sec. 842. Additional access to records.

Sec. 843. Definitions.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sec. 851. Rapid acquisition and deployment procedures for United States Special Operations Command.

Sec. 852. Consideration of corrosion control in preliminary design review.

Sec. 853. Program manager development report.

Sec. 854. Operational metrics for Joint Information Environment and supporting activities.

Sec. 855. Compliance with requirements for senior Department of Defense officials seeking employment with defense contractors.

Sec. 856. Enhancement of whistleblower protection for employees of grantees.

Sec. 857. Prohibition on reimbursement of contractors for congressional investigations and inquiries.

Sec. 858. Requirement to provide photovoltaic devices from United States sources.

- Sec. 859. Reimbursement of Department of Defense for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers.
- Sec. 860. Three-year extension of authority for Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

- Sec. 901. Reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Related Matters.
- Sec. 902. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.
- Sec. 903. Requirement for assessment of options to modify the number of combatant commands.
- Sec. 904. Office of Net Assessment.
- Sec. 905. Periodic review of Department of Defense management headquarters.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

- Sec. 911. Modifications of biennial strategic workforce plan relating to senior management, functional, and technical workforces of the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 912. Repeal of extension of Comptroller General report on inventory.
- Sec. 913. Extension of authority to waive reimbursement of costs of activities for nongovernmental personnel at Department of Defense regional centers for security studies.
- Sec. 914. Pilot program to establish Government lodging program.
- Sec. 915. Single standard mileage reimbursement rate for privately owned automobiles of Government employees and members of the uniformed services.
- Sec. 916. Modifications to requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

- Sec. 1001. General transfer authority.
- Sec. 1002. Authority to transfer funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to sustain nuclear weapons modernization and naval reactors.
- Sec. 1003. Reporting of balances carried forward by the Department of Defense at the end of each fiscal year.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

- Sec. 1011. Extension of authority to support unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia.
- Sec. 1012. Extension and modification of authority of Department of Defense to provide support for counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies.
- Sec. 1013. Availability of funds for additional support for counterdrug activities of certain foreign governments.
- Sec. 1014. Extension and modification of authority for joint task forces supporting law enforcement agencies conducting activities to counter transnational organized crime to support law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities.

- Sec. 1015. Sense of Congress regarding security in the Western Hemisphere.

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

- Sec. 1021. Definition of combatant and support vessel for purposes of the annual plan and certification relating to budgeting for construction of naval vessels.
- Sec. 1022. National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund.
- Sec. 1023. Limitation on use of funds for inactivation of U.S.S. George Washington.
- Sec. 1024. Sense of Congress recognizing the anniversary of the sinking of U.S.S. Thresher.
- Sec. 1025. Pilot program for sustainment of Littoral Combat Ships on extended deployments.
- Sec. 1026. Availability of funds for retirement or inactivation of Ticonderoga class cruisers or dock landing ships.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

- Sec. 1031. Extension of authority to make rewards for combating terrorism.
- Sec. 1032. Prohibition on use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.
- Sec. 1033. Prohibition on the use of funds for the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

- Sec. 1041. Modification of Department of Defense authority for humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance programs.
- Sec. 1042. Airlift service.
- Sec. 1043. Authority to accept certain voluntary legal support services.
- Sec. 1044. Expansion of authority for Secretary of Defense to use the Department of Defense reimbursement rate for transportation services provided to certain non-Department of Defense entities.
- Sec. 1045. Repeal of authority relating to use of military installations by Civil Reserve Air Fleet contractors.
- Sec. 1046. Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau among leadership of the Department of Defense provided physical protection and personal security.
- Sec. 1047. Inclusion of regional organizations in authority for assignment of civilian employees of the Department of Defense as advisors to foreign ministries of defense.
- Sec. 1048. Report and limitation on availability of funds for aviation foreign internal defense program.
- Sec. 1049. Modifications to OH-58D Kiowa Warrior aircraft.

Subtitle F—Studies and Reports

- Sec. 1051. Protection of top-tier defense-critical infrastructure from electromagnetic pulse.
- Sec. 1052. Response of the Department of Defense to compromises of classified information.

- Sec. 1053. Study on joint analytic capability of the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 1054. Business case analysis of the creation of an active duty association for the 168th Air Refueling Wing.
- Sec. 1055. Reports on recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force.
- Sec. 1056. Report on protection of military installations.
- Sec. 1057. Comptroller General briefing and report on Army and Army National Guard force structure changes.
- Sec. 1058. Improving analytic support to systems acquisition and allocation of acquisition, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets.
- Sec. 1059. Review of United States military strategy and the force posture of allies and partners in the United States Pacific Command area of responsibility.
- Sec. 1060. Repeal of certain reporting requirements relating to the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 1061. Repeal of requirement for Comptroller General of the United States annual reviews and report on pilot program on commercial fee-for-service air refueling support for the Air Force.
- Sec. 1062. Report on additional matters in connection with report on the force structure of the United States Army.
- Sec. 1063. Certification for realignment of forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

- Sec. 1071. Technical and clerical amendments.
- Sec. 1072. Reform of quadrennial defense review.
- Sec. 1073. Biennial surveys of Department of Defense civilian employees on workplace and gender relations matters.
- Sec. 1074. Revision to statute of limitations for aviation insurance claims.
- Sec. 1075. Pilot program for the Human Terrain System.
- Sec. 1076. Clarification of policies on management of special use airspace of Department of Defense.
- Sec. 1077. Department of Defense policies on community involvement in Department community outreach events.
- Sec. 1078. Notification of foreign threats to information technology systems impacting national security.
- Sec. 1079. Pilot program to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

- Sec. 1101. One-year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on premium pay and aggregate limitation on pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas.
- Sec. 1102. One-year extension of discretionary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to personnel on official duty in a combat zone.
- Sec. 1103. Revision to list of science and technology reinvention laboratories.

- Sec. 1104. Extension and modification of experimental program for scientific and technical personnel.
- Sec. 1105. Temporary authorities for certain positions at Department of Defense research and engineering facilities.
- Sec. 1106. Rate of overtime pay for Department of the Navy employees performing work aboard or dockside in support of the nuclear aircraft carrier forward deployed in Japan.
- Sec. 1107. Extension of part-time reemployment authority.
- Sec. 1108. Personnel authorities for civilian personnel for the United States Cyber Command and the cyber component headquarters of the military departments.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

- Sec. 1201. Modification and extension of Global Security Contingency Fund.
- Sec. 1202. Notice to Congress on certain assistance under authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction.
- Sec. 1203. Enhanced authority for provision of support to foreign military liaison officers of foreign countries while assigned to the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 1204. Prohibition on use of funds for assistance to units of foreign security forces that have committed a gross violation of human rights.
- Sec. 1205. Codification and enhancement of authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces.
- Sec. 1206. Training of security forces and associated security ministries of foreign countries to promote respect for the rule of law and human rights.
- Sec. 1207. Cross servicing agreements for loan of personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment in coalition operations.
- Sec. 1208. Extension and modification of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism.
- Sec. 1209. Authority to provide assistance to the vetted Syrian opposition.
- Sec. 1210. Provision of logistic support for the conveyance of certain defense articles to foreign forces training with the United States Armed Forces.
- Sec. 1211. Biennial report on programs carried out by the Department of Defense to provide training, equipment, or other assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq

- Sec. 1221. Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan.
- Sec. 1222. Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations.

- Sec. 1223. One-year extension of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations.
- Sec. 1224. United States plan for sustaining the Afghanistan National Security Forces through the end of fiscal year 2017.
- Sec. 1225. Semiannual report on enhancing security and stability in Afghanistan.
- Sec. 1226. Sense of Congress on stability and sovereignty of Afghanistan.
- Sec. 1227. Extension of Afghan Special Immigrant Program.
- Sec. 1228. Independent assessment of United States efforts against al-Qaeda.
- Sec. 1229. Sense of Congress on security of Afghan women.
- Sec. 1230. Review process for use of United States funds for construction projects in Afghanistan that cannot be physically accessed by United States Government personnel.
- Sec. 1231. Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan.
- Sec. 1232. One-year extension of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan.
- Sec. 1233. Clearance of unexploded ordnance on former United States training ranges in Afghanistan.
- Sec. 1234. Report on impact of end of major combat operations in Afghanistan on authority to use military force.
- Sec. 1235. Report on bilateral security cooperation with Pakistan.
- Sec. 1236. Authority to provide assistance to counter the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant.
- Sec. 1237. Extension and modification of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq.

Subtitle C—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation

- Sec. 1241. Limitation on military cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 1242. Notification and assessment of proposal to modify or introduce new aircraft or sensors for flight by the Russian Federation under Open Skies Treaty.
- Sec. 1243. Limitations on providing certain missile defense information to the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 1244. Report on non-compliance by the Russian Federation with its obligations under the INF Treaty.
- Sec. 1245. Annual report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 1246. Prohibition on use of funds to enter into contracts or other agreements with Rosoboronexport.
- Sec. 1247. Report on the New START Treaty.

Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region

- Sec. 1251. Strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region.
- Sec. 1252. Modifications to annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China.
- Sec. 1253. Military-to-military engagement with the Government of Burma.

- Sec. 1254. Report on Department of Defense munitions strategy of the United States Pacific Command.
- Sec. 1255. Missile defense cooperation in Northeast Asia.
- Sec. 1256. Sense of Congress and report on Taiwan and its contribution to regional peace and stability.
- Sec. 1257. Independent assessment of the ability of the Department of Defense to counter anti-access and area-denial strategies, capabilities, and other key technologies of potential adversaries.
- Sec. 1258. Sense of Congress reaffirming security cooperation with Japan and the Republic of Korea.
- Sec. 1259. Report on maritime security strategy in the Asia-Pacific region.
- Sec. 1259A. Sense of Congress on Taiwan maritime capabilities and exercise participation.
- Sec. 1259B. Modification of matters for discussion in annual reports of United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

- Sec. 1261. One-year extension of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities.
- Sec. 1262. Modification of national security planning guidance to deny safe havens to al-Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates.
- Sec. 1263. Enhanced authority to acquire goods and services of Djibouti in support of Department of Defense activities in United States Africa Command area of responsibility.
- Sec. 1264. Treatment of the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan under the Immigration and Nationality Act.
- Sec. 1265. Prohibition on integration of missile defense systems of China into missile defense systems of United States and sense of Congress concerning integration of missile defense systems of Russia into missile defense systems of NATO.
- Sec. 1266. Limitation on availability of funds to implement the Arms Trade Treaty.
- Sec. 1267. Notification and review of potentially significant arms control noncompliance.
- Sec. 1268. Inter-European Air Forces Academy.
- Sec. 1269. Department of Defense support to security of United States diplomatic facilities.
- Sec. 1270. Information on sanctioned persons and businesses through the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System.
- Sec. 1271. Reports on nuclear program of Iran.
- Sec. 1272. Sense of Congress on defense modernization by NATO countries.
- Sec. 1273. Report on protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict.
- Sec. 1274. United States strategy and plans for enhancing security and stability in Europe.
- Sec. 1275. Report on military assistance to Ukraine.

Sec. 1276. Sense of Congress on efforts to remove Joseph Kony from the battlefield and end the atrocities of the Lord's Resistance Army.

Sec. 1277. Extension of annual reports on the military power of Iran.

Sec. 1278. Report and strategy regarding North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel.

Sec. 1279. Rule of construction.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

Subtitle A—Funds

Sec. 1301. Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds.

Sec. 1302. Funding allocations.

Subtitle B—Consolidation and Modernization of Statutes Relating to the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

Sec. 1311. Short title.

Sec. 1312. Definitions.

PART I—PROGRAM AUTHORITIES

Sec. 1321. Authority to carry out Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

Sec. 1322. Use of funds for certain emergent threats or opportunities.

Sec. 1323. Authority for urgent threat reduction activities under Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

Sec. 1324. Use of funds for unspecified purposes or for increased amounts.

Sec. 1325. Use of contributions to Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

PART II—RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Sec. 1331. Prohibition on use of funds for specified purposes.

Sec. 1332. Requirement for on-site managers.

Sec. 1333. Limitation on use of funds until certain permits obtained.

Sec. 1334. Limitation on availability of funds for Cooperative Threat Reduction activities with Russian Federation.

PART III—RECURRING CERTIFICATIONS AND REPORTS

Sec. 1341. Annual certifications on use of facilities being constructed for Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction projects or activities.

Sec. 1342. Requirement to submit summary of amounts requested by project category.

Sec. 1343. Reports on activities and assistance under Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

Sec. 1344. Metrics for Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

PART IV—REPEALS AND TRANSITION PROVISIONS

Sec. 1351. Repeals.

Sec. 1352. Transition provisions.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Military Programs

Sec. 1401. Working capital funds.

Sec. 1402. Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.

Sec. 1403. Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.

Sec. 1404. Defense Inspector General.

Sec. 1405. Defense Health Program.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Sec. 1411. Authority for transfer of funds to joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, Illinois.

Sec. 1412. Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Sec. 1413. Comptroller General of the United States report on Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, North Chicago, Illinois.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 1501. Purpose.

Sec. 1502. Procurement.

Sec. 1503. Research, development, test, and evaluation.

Sec. 1504. Operation and maintenance.

Sec. 1505. Military personnel.

Sec. 1506. Working capital funds.

Sec. 1507. Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.

Sec. 1508. Defense Inspector General.

Sec. 1509. Defense Health program.

Sec. 1510. Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.

Sec. 1511. European Reassurance Initiative.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters

Sec. 1521. Treatment as additional authorizations.

Sec. 1522. Special transfer authority.

Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters

Sec. 1531. Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund.

Sec. 1532. Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.

Sec. 1533. Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund.

Sec. 1534. Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.

Sec. 1535. European Reassurance Initiative.

Sec. 1536. Plan for transition of funding of United States Special Operations Command from supplemental funding for overseas contingency operations to recurring funding for future-years defense programs.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Subtitle A—Space Activities

Sec. 1601. Department of Defense Space Security and Defense Program.

Sec. 1602. Evolved expendable launch vehicle notification.

Sec. 1603. Satellite communications responsibilities of Executive Agent for Space.

Sec. 1604. Rocket propulsion system development program.

Sec. 1605. Pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite communication services.

Sec. 1606. Update of National Security Space Strategy to include space control and space superiority strategy.

Sec. 1607. Allocation of funds for the Space Security and Defense Program; report on space control.

Sec. 1608. Prohibition on contracting with Russian suppliers of rocket engines for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

Sec. 1609. Assessment of evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

Sec. 1610. Competitive procedures required to launch payload for mission number five of the Operationally Responsive Space Program.

Sec. 1611. Availability of additional rocket cores pursuant to competitive procedures.

Sec. 1612. Limitations on availability of funds for weather satellite follow-on system and Defense Meteorological Satellite program.

Sec. 1613. Limitation on availability of funds for space-based infrared systems space data exploitation.

Sec. 1614. Limitations on availability of funds for hosted payload and wide field of view testbed of the space-based infrared systems.

Sec. 1615. Limitations on availability of funds for protected tactical demonstration and protected military satellite communications testbed of the advanced extremely high frequency program.

Sec. 1616. Study of space situational awareness architecture.

Sec. 1617. Briefing on range support for launches in support of national security.

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities

Sec. 1621. Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities Executive Agent.

Sec. 1622. One-year extension of report on imagery intelligence and geospatial information support provided to regional organizations and security alliances.

Sec. 1623. Extension of Secretary of Defense authority to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities.

Sec. 1624. Extension of authority relating to jurisdiction over Department of Defense facilities for intelligence collection or special operations activities abroad.

Sec. 1625. Assessment and limitation on availability of funds for intelligence activities and programs of United States Special Operations Command and special operations forces.

Sec. 1626. Annual briefing on the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements of the combatant commands.

Sec. 1627. Prohibition on National Intelligence Program consolidation.

Sec. 1628. Personnel security and insider threat.

Sec. 1629. Migration of Distributed Common Ground System of Department of the Army to an open system architecture.

Subtitle C—Cyberspace-Related Matters

Sec. 1631. Budgeting and accounting for cyber mission forces.

Sec. 1632. Reporting on cyber incidents with respect to networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors.

Sec. 1633. Executive agents for cyber test and training ranges.

Sec. 1634. Cyberspace mapping.

Sec. 1635. Review of cross domain solution policy and requirement for cross domain solution strategy.

Sec. 1636. Requirement for strategy to develop and deploy decryption service for the Joint Information Environment.

- Sec. 1637. Actions to address economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace.
- Sec. 1638. Sense of Congress regarding role of reserve components in defense of United States against cyber attacks.
- Sec. 1639. Sense of Congress on the future of the Internet and the .MIL top-level domain.

Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces

- Sec. 1641. Preparation of annual budget request regarding nuclear weapons.
- Sec. 1642. Improvement to biennial assessment on delivery platforms for nuclear weapons and the nuclear command and control system.
- Sec. 1643. Congressional Budget Office review of cost estimates for nuclear weapons.
- Sec. 1644. Retention of missile silos.
- Sec. 1645. Procurement authority for certain parts of intercontinental ballistic missile fuzes.
- Sec. 1646. Assessment of nuclear weapon secondary requirement.
- Sec. 1647. Certification on nuclear force structure.
- Sec. 1648. Advance notice and reports on B61 life extension program.
- Sec. 1649. Notification and report concerning removal or consolidation of dual-capable aircraft from Europe.
- Sec. 1650. Reports on installation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems at headquarters of United States Strategic Command.
- Sec. 1651. Report on plans for response of Department of Defense to INF Treaty violation.
- Sec. 1652. Statement of policy on the nuclear triad.
- Sec. 1653. Sense of Congress on deterrence and defense posture of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs

- Sec. 1661. Availability of funds for Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.
- Sec. 1662. Testing and assessment of missile defense systems prior to production and deployment.
- Sec. 1663. Acquisition plan for re-designed exo-atmospheric kill vehicle.
- Sec. 1664. Study on testing program of ground-based midcourse missile defense system.
- Sec. 1665. Sense of Congress and report on homeland ballistic missile defense.
- Sec. 1666. Sense of Congress and report on regional ballistic missile defense.

TITLE XXVII—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY

Subtitle A—Establishment and Duties of Commission

- Sec. 1701. Short title.
- Sec. 1702. National Commission on the Future of the Army.
- Sec. 1703. Duties of the Commission.
- Sec. 1704. Powers of the Commission.
- Sec. 1705. Commission personnel matters.
- Sec. 1706. Termination of the Commission.
- Sec. 1707. Funding.

Subtitle B—Related Limitations

- Sec. 1711. Prohibition on use of fiscal year 2015 funds to reduce strengths of Army personnel.

- Sec. 1712. Limitations on the transfer, including preparations for the transfer, of AH-64 Apache helicopters assigned to the Army National Guard.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

- Sec. 2001. Short title.
- Sec. 2002. Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

- Sec. 2101. Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2102. Family housing.
- Sec. 2103. Authorization of appropriations, Army.
- Sec. 2104. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project.
- Sec. 2105. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 projects.
- Sec. 2106. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project.
- Sec. 2107. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.
- Sec. 2108. Limitation on construction of cadet barracks at United States Military Academy, New York.
- Sec. 2109. Limitation on funding for family housing construction at Camp Walker, Republic of Korea.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

- Sec. 2201. Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2202. Family housing.
- Sec. 2203. Improvements to military family housing units.
- Sec. 2204. Authorization of appropriations, Navy.
- Sec. 2205. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects.
- Sec. 2206. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project.
- Sec. 2207. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects.
- Sec. 2208. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

- Sec. 2301. Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2302. Authorization of appropriations, Air Force.
- Sec. 2303. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2008 project.
- Sec. 2304. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project.
- Sec. 2305. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2012 project.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

- Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations
- Sec. 2401. Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2402. Authorized energy conservation projects.
- Sec. 2403. Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies.
- Sec. 2404. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects.
- Sec. 2405. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.
- Sec. 2406. Limitation on project authorization to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 projects pending submission of report.

Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations

- Sec. 2411. Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide.
- Sec. 2412. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 project.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

- Sec. 2501. Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2502. Authorization of appropriations, NATO.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations

- Sec. 2601. Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2602. Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2603. Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2604. Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2605. Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2606. Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

- Sec. 2611. Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects.
- Sec. 2612. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 projects.
- Sec. 2613. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project.
- Sec. 2614. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 projects.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

- Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations
- Sec. 2701. Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account.

Subtitle B—Prohibition on Additional BRAC Round

- Sec. 2711. Prohibition on conducting additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

- Sec. 2721. Modification of property disposal procedures under base realignment and closure process.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

- Sec. 2801. Congressional notification of construction projects, land acquisitions, and defense access road projects conducted under authorities other than a Military Construction Authorization Act.
- Sec. 2802. Modification of authority to carry out unspecified minor military construction.
- Sec. 2803. Clarification of authorized use of payments-in-kind and in-kind contributions.

- Sec. 2804. Use of one-step turn-key contractor selection procedures for additional facility projects.
- Sec. 2805. Limitations on military construction in European Command area of responsibility and European Reassurance Initiative.
- Sec. 2806. Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States.
- Sec. 2807. Application of residential building construction standards.
- Sec. 2808. Limitation on construction of new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

- Sec. 2811. Renewals, extensions, and succeeding leases for financial institutions operating on military installations.
- Sec. 2812. Deposit of reimbursed funds to cover administrative expenses relating to certain real property transactions.

Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment

- Sec. 2821. Realignment of Marines Corps forces in Asia-Pacific region.
- Sec. 2822. Establishment of surface danger zone, Ritidian Unit, Guam National Wildlife Refuge.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

- Sec. 2831. Land conveyance, Gordo Army Reserve Center, Gordo, Alabama.
- Sec. 2832. Land conveyance, West Nome Tank Farm, Nome, Alaska.
- Sec. 2833. Land conveyance, former Air Force Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point, Norwalk, California.
- Sec. 2834. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction and alternative land conveyance authority, former Walter Reed Army Hospital, District of Columbia.
- Sec. 2835. Land conveyance, former Lynn Haven fuel depot, Lynn Haven, Florida.
- Sec. 2836. Transfers of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Frank D. Merrill and Lake Lanier, Georgia.
- Sec. 2837. Land conveyance, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii.
- Sec. 2838. Modification of conditions on land conveyance, Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois.
- Sec. 2839. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Gruber, Oklahoma.
- Sec. 2840. Conveyance, Joint Base Charleston, South Carolina.
- Sec. 2841. Land exchanges, Arlington County, Virginia.

Subtitle E—Military Memorials, Monuments, and Museums

- Sec. 2851. Acceptance of in-kind gifts on behalf of Heritage Center for the National Museum of the United States Army.
- Sec. 2852. Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial, San Diego, California.
- Sec. 2853. Establishment of memorial to the victims of the shooting at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013.

Subtitle F—Designations

- Sec. 2861. Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

- Sec. 2871. Report on physical security at Department of Defense facilities.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

- Sec. 2901. Authorized Army construction and land acquisition project.
- Sec. 2902. Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects.
- Sec. 2903. Authorized Defense Agency construction and land acquisition project.
- Sec. 2904. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE XXX—NATURAL RESOURCES RELATED GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Land Conveyances and Related Matters

- Sec. 3001. Land conveyance, Wainwright, Alaska.
- Sec. 3002. Sealaska land entitlement finalization.
- Sec. 3003. Southeast Arizona land exchange and conservation.
- Sec. 3004. Land exchange, Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, Arizona, and Bureau of Land Management land in Riverside County, California.
- Sec. 3005. Special rules for Inyo National Forest, California, land exchange.
- Sec. 3006. Land exchange, Trinity Public Utilities District, Trinity County, California, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service.
- Sec. 3007. Idaho County, Idaho, shooting range land conveyance.
- Sec. 3008. School District 318, Minnesota, land exchange.
- Sec. 3009. Northern Nevada land conveyances.
- Sec. 3010. San Juan County, New Mexico, Federal land conveyance.
- Sec. 3011. Land conveyance, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Utah.
- Sec. 3012. Conveyance of certain land to the city of Fruit Heights, Utah.
- Sec. 3013. Land conveyance, Hanford Site, Washington.
- Sec. 3014. Ranch A Wyoming consolidation and management improvement.

Subtitle B—Public Lands and National Forest System Management

- Sec. 3021. Bureau of Land Management permit processing.
- Sec. 3022. Internet-based onshore oil and gas lease sales.
- Sec. 3023. Grazing permits and leases.
- Sec. 3024. Cabin user and transfer fees.
- Subtitle C—National Park System Units
- Sec. 3030. Addition of Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light to the Apostle Islands National Seashore.
- Sec. 3031. Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park.
- Sec. 3032. Coltsville National Historical Park.
- Sec. 3033. First State National Historical Park.
- Sec. 3034. Gettysburg National Military Park.
- Sec. 3035. Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park, Maryland.
- Sec. 3036. Harriet Tubman National Historical Park, Auburn, New York.
- Sec. 3037. Hinchliffe Stadium addition to Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park.
- Sec. 3038. Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site.

- Sec. 3039. Manhattan Project National Historical Park.
- Sec. 3040. North Cascades National Park and Stephen Mather Wilderness.
- Sec. 3041. Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve.
- Sec. 3042. San Antonio Missions National Historical Park.
- Sec. 3043. Valles Caldera National Preserve, New Mexico.
- Sec. 3044. Vicksburg National Military Park.
- Subtitle D—National Park System Studies, Management, and Related Matters
- Sec. 3050. Revolutionary War and War of 1812 American battlefield protection program.
- Sec. 3051. Special resource studies.
- Sec. 3052. National heritage areas and corridors.
- Sec. 3053. National historic site support facility improvements.
- Sec. 3054. National Park System donor acknowledgment.
- Sec. 3055. Coin to commemorate 100th anniversary of the National Park Service.
- Sec. 3056. Commission to study the potential creation of a National Women's History Museum.
- Sec. 3057. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Subtitle E—Wilderness and Withdrawals

- Sec. 3060. Alpine Lakes Wilderness additions and Pratt and Middle Fork Snoqualmie Rivers protection.
- Sec. 3061. Columbine-Hondo Wilderness.
- Sec. 3062. Hermosa Creek watershed protection.
- Sec. 3063. North Fork Federal lands withdrawal area.
- Sec. 3064. Pine Forest Range Wilderness.
- Sec. 3065. Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area and wilderness additions.
- Sec. 3066. Wovoka Wilderness.
- Sec. 3067. Withdrawal area related to Wovoka Wilderness.
- Sec. 3068. Withdrawal and reservation of additional public land for Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California.

Subtitle F—Wild and Scenic Rivers

- Sec. 3071. Illabot Creek, Washington, wild and scenic river.
- Sec. 3072. Missisquoi and Trout wild and scenic rivers, Vermont.
- Sec. 3073. White Clay Creek wild and scenic river expansion.
- Sec. 3074. Studies of wild and scenic rivers.

Subtitle G—Trust Lands

- Sec. 3077. Land taken into trust for benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.
- Sec. 3078. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Baraboo, Wisconsin.

Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Access and Property Issues

- Sec. 3081. Ensuring public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument.
- Sec. 3082. Anchorage, Alaska, conveyance of reversionary interests.
- Sec. 3083. Release of property interests in Bureau of Land Management land conveyed to the State of Oregon for establishment of Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center.

Subtitle I—Water Infrastructure

- Sec. 3087. Bureau of Reclamation hydropower development.

Sec. 3088. Toledo Bend Hydroelectric Project.
 Sec. 3089. East Bench Irrigation District contract extension.

Subtitle J—Other Matters

Sec. 3091. Commemoration of centennial of World War I.
 Sec. 3092. Miscellaneous issues related to Las Vegas valley public land and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.
 Sec. 3093. National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial.
 Sec. 3094. Extension of legislative authority for establishment of commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams.
 Sec. 3095. Refinancing of Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction loan.
 Sec. 3096. Payments in lieu of taxes.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Sec. 3101. National Nuclear Security Administration.
 Sec. 3102. Defense environmental cleanup.
 Sec. 3103. Other defense activities.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Sec. 3111. Design and use of prototypes of nuclear weapons for intelligence purposes.
 Sec. 3112. Plutonium pit production capacity.
 Sec. 3113. Life-cycle cost estimates of certain atomic energy defense capital assets.
 Sec. 3114. Expansion of requirement for independent cost estimates on life extension programs and new nuclear facilities.
 Sec. 3115. Definition of baseline and threshold for stockpile life extension project.
 Sec. 3116. Authorized personnel levels of National Nuclear Security Administration.
 Sec. 3117. Cost estimation and program evaluation by National Nuclear Security Administration.
 Sec. 3118. Cost containment for Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project.
 Sec. 3119. Production of nuclear warhead for long-range standoff weapon.
 Sec. 3120. Disposition of weapons-usable plutonium.
 Sec. 3121. Limitation on availability of funds for Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security.
 Sec. 3122. Limitation on availability of funds for certain nonproliferation activities between the United States and the Russian Federation.
 Sec. 3123. Identification of amounts required for uranium technology sustainment in budget materials for fiscal year 2016.

Subtitle C—Plans and Reports

Sec. 3131. Analysis and report on W88 Alt 370 program high explosives options.
 Sec. 3132. Analysis of existing facilities and sense of Congress with respect to plutonium strategy.
 Sec. 3133. Plan for verification and monitoring of proliferation of nuclear weapons and fissile material.

Sec. 3134. Comments of Administrator for Nuclear Security and Chairman of Nuclear Weapons Council on final report of Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Sec. 3141. Establishment of Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health; extension of authority of Office of Ombudsman for Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program.
 Sec. 3142. Technical corrections to Atomic Energy Defense Act.
 Sec. 3143. Technical corrections to National Nuclear Security Administration Act.
 Sec. 3144. Technology Commercialization Fund.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sec. 3201. Authorization.
 Sec. 3202. Inspector General of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.
 Sec. 3203. Number of employees of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Sec. 3401. Authorization of appropriations.
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION
 Sec. 3501. Authorization of appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal year 2015.
 Sec. 3502. Floating dry docks.
 Sec. 3503. Sense of Congress on the role of domestic maritime industry in national security.
 Sec. 3504. United States Merchant Marine Academy Board of Visitors.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

Sec. 4001. Authorization of amounts in funding tables.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

Sec. 4101. Procurement.
 Sec. 4102. Procurement for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Sec. 4201. Research, development, test, and evaluation.
 Sec. 4202. Research, development, test, and evaluation for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Sec. 4301. Operation and maintenance.
 Sec. 4302. Operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Sec. 4401. Military personnel.
 Sec. 4402. Military personnel for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 4501. Other authorizations.
 Sec. 4502. Other authorizations for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 4601. Military construction.
 Sec. 4602. Military construction for overseas contingency operations.

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Sec. 4701. Department of Energy national security programs.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.

In this Act, the term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THIS ACT.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purposes of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, jointly submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage in the House acting first on the conference report or amendment between the Houses.

SEC. 5. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.

The explanatory statement regarding this Act, printed in the House section of the Congressional Record on or about December 3, 2014, by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 101. Authorization of Appropriations.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Sec. 111. Plan on modernization of UH-60A aircraft of Army National Guard.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Sec. 121. Construction of San Antonio class amphibious ship.

Sec. 122. Limitation on availability of funds for mission modules for Littoral Combat Ship.

Sec. 123. Extension of limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship.

Sec. 124. Report on test evaluation master plan for Littoral Combat Ship seaframes and mission modules.

Sec. 125. Airborne electronic attack capabilities.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Sec. 131. Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of MQ-1 Predator aircraft.

Sec. 132. Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of U-2 aircraft.

Sec. 133. Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of A-10 aircraft.

Sec. 134. Prohibition on cancellation or modification of avionics modernization program for C-130 aircraft.

Sec. 135. Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Air Force aircraft.

Sec. 136. Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of E-3 airborne warning and control system aircraft.

Sec. 137. Limitation on availability of funds for divestment or transfer of KC-10 aircraft.

Sec. 138. Limitation on availability of funds for transfer of Air Force C-130H and C-130J aircraft.

Sec. 139. Limitation on availability of funds for transfer of Air Force KC-135 tankers.

- Sec. 140. Report on C-130 aircraft.
 Sec. 141. Report on status of F-16 aircraft.
 Sec. 142. Report on options to modernize or replace T-1A aircraft.
 Sec. 143. Report on status of air-launched cruise missile capabilities.

Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters

- Sec. 151. Additional oversight requirements for the undersea mobility acquisition program of the United States Special Operations Command.
 Sec. 152. Plan for modernization or replacement of digital avionics equipment.
 Sec. 153. Comptroller General report on F-35 aircraft acquisition program.

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for procurement for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in the funding table in section 4101.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

SEC. 111. PLAN ON MODERNIZATION OF UH-60A AIRCRAFT OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) **PLAN.**—Not later than March 15, 2015, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a prioritized plan for modernizing the entire fleet of UH-60A aircraft of the Army National Guard.

(b) **ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS.**—The plan under subsection (a) shall set forth the following:

(1) A detailed timeline for the modernization of the entire fleet of UH-60A aircraft of the Army National Guard.

(2) The number of UH-60L, UH-60L Digital, and UH-60M aircraft that the Army National Guard will possess upon completion of such modernization plan.

(3) The cost, by year, associated with such modernization plan.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

SEC. 121. CONSTRUCTION OF SAN ANTONIO CLASS AMPHIBIOUS SHIP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Navy may enter into a contract beginning with the fiscal year 2015 program year for the procurement of one San Antonio class amphibious ship. The Secretary may employ incremental funding for such procurement.

(b) **CONDITION ON OUT-YEAR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.**—A contract entered into under subsection (a) shall provide that any obligation of the United States to make a payment under such contract for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2015 is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose for such fiscal year.

SEC. 122. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MISSION MODULES FOR LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the procurement of additional mission modules for the Littoral Combat Ship program may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of the Navy submits to the congressional defense committees each of the following:

(1) The Milestone B program goals for cost, schedule, and performance for each module.

(2) Certification by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation with respect to the total number for each module type that is required to perform all necessary operational testing.

SEC. 123. EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP.

Section 124(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 693) is amended by striking “this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “this Act, the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, or otherwise made available for fiscal years 2014 or 2015”.

SEC. 124. REPORT ON TEST EVALUATION MASTER PLAN FOR LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP SEAFRAMES AND MISSION MODULES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the test evaluation master plan for the seaframes and mission modules for the Littoral Combat Ship program.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of the progress of the Navy with respect to the test evaluation master plan.

(2) An assessment of whether or not completion of the test evaluation master plan will demonstrate operational effectiveness and operational suitability for both seaframes and each mission module.

SEC. 125. AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK CAPABILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Navy shall ensure that the Navy retains the option of procuring more EA-18G aircraft in the event that the Secretary determines that further analysis of airborne electronic attack force structure indicates that the Navy should make such a procurement.

(b) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than March 2, 2015, the Secretary shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on—

(1) the options available to the Navy for ensuring that the Navy will not be precluded from procuring more EA-18G aircraft based on a determination made under subsection (a); and

(2) an update on the progress of the Navy in conducting an analysis of emerging requirements for airborne electronic attack.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

SEC. 131. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF MQ-1 PREDATOR AIRCRAFT.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—Except as provided by subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be used during fiscal year 2015 to retire any MQ-1 Predator aircraft.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to a damaged MQ-1 Predator aircraft if the Secretary determines that repairing such aircraft is not economically viable.

SEC. 132. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF U-2 AIRCRAFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to make significant changes to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage U-2 aircraft.

SEC. 133. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF A-10 AIRCRAFT.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON RETIREMENT.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by

this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any A-10 aircraft, except for such aircraft the Secretary of the Air Force, as of April 9, 2013, planned to retire.

(b) **LIMITATION ON MANNING LEVELS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided under paragraph (2), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to make significant changes to manning levels with respect to any A-10 aircraft squadrons.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—

(A) **BACK UP FLYING STATUS.**—The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to move up to 36 A-10 aircraft in the active component to backup flying status, and make conforming personnel adjustments, for the duration of fiscal year 2015 if—

(i) on or before the date that is 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees the certification described in subparagraph (B); and

(ii) a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date of such submittal.

(B) **CERTIFICATION.**—A certification described in this subparagraph is a certification that the Secretary of Defense has—

(i) received the results of the independent assessment under subsection (c) by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation regarding alternative ways to provide manpower during fiscal year 2015 to maintain the fighter fleet of the Air Force and to field F-35 aircraft; and

(ii) determined, after giving consideration to such assessment, that an action to move A-10 aircraft under subparagraph (A) is required to avoid—

(I) significantly degrading the readiness of the fighter fleet of the Air Force; or

(II) significantly delaying the planned fielding of F-35 aircraft.

(c) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall conduct an independent assessment of alternative ways to provide manpower during fiscal year 2015 to maintain the fighter fleet of the Air Force and to field F-35 aircraft. In conducting such assessment, the Director shall give consideration to the implementation approaches proposed by the Air Force and to other alternatives, including the retirement of other aircraft and the use of civilian or contractor maintainers on an interim basis for A-10 aircraft, F-35 aircraft, or other aircraft.

(d) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an independent study of the platforms used to conduct the close air support mission in light of the recommendation of the Air Force to retire the A-10 fleet.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than March 30, 2015, the Comptroller General shall brief the congressional defense committees on the preliminary findings of the study under paragraph (1), with a report to follow as soon as practicable, that includes an assessment of—

(A) the alternatives considered by the Air Force that led to the recommendation to retire the A-10 fleet, including the relative costs, benefits, and assumptions associated with the alternatives to such retirement;

(B) any capability gaps in close air support that would be created by such retirement

and to what extent the Department of Defense has plans to address such capability gaps; and

(C) any capability gaps in air superiority or global strike that could be created by the added cost to the Air Force of retaining the A-10 fleet.

SEC. 134. PROHIBITION ON CANCELLATION OR MODIFICATION OF AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM FOR C-130 AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be used to—

(A) take any action to cancel or modify the avionics modernization program of record for C-130 aircraft; or

(B) except as provided by paragraph (2), initiate an alternative communication, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management program for C-130 aircraft that is designed or intended to replace the avionics modernization program described in subparagraph (A).

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition in paragraph (1)(B) if the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the program described in such subparagraph is required to operate C-130 aircraft in airspace controlled by the Federal Aviation Administration or airspace controlled by the government of a foreign country.

(b) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for operation and maintenance for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, not more than 85 percent may be obligated or expended until a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary has obligated the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 2015 for the avionics modernization program of record for C-130 aircraft.

SEC. 135. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any aircraft of the Air Force, except for such aircraft the Secretary of the Air Force planned to retire as of April 9, 2013, until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary submits the report under subsection (b)(1).

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the appropriate contributions of the regular Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve to the total force structure of the Air Force.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A separate presentation of mix of forces for each mission and aircraft platform of the Air Force.

(B) An analysis and recommendations for not less than 80 percent of the missions and aircraft platforms described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 136. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF E-3 AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or other-

wise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to make significant changes to manning levels with respect to any E-3 airborne warning and control systems aircraft, or to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any such aircraft.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect the requirement to maintain the operational capability of the E-3 airborne warning and control system aircraft.

SEC. 137. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DIVESTMENT OR TRANSFER OF KC-10 AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to transfer, divest, or prepare to divest any KC-10 aircraft until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed divestment or transfer.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment referred to in subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) A five-year plan for the force structure laydown of all tanker aircraft.

(2) Current and future air refueling and cargo transportation requirements, broken down by aircraft, needed to meet the global reach and global power objectives of the Department of Defense, including how such objectives relate to supporting the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance.

(3) An operational risk assessment and mitigation strategy that evaluates the ability of the military to meet the requirements and objectives stipulated in the Guidance for Employment of the Force of the Department of Defense, the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan, and all steady-state rotational and warfighting surge contingency operational planning documents of the commanders of the geographical combatant commands.

SEC. 138. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OF AIR FORCE C-130H AND C-130J AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to transfer from one facility of the Department of Defense to another any C-130H or C-130J aircraft until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed transfer.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment referred to in subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) A five-year plan for the force structure laydown of C-130H2, C-130H3, and C-130J aircraft.

(2) An identification of how such plan deviates from the total force structure proposal of the Secretary described in section 1059(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1939).

(3) An explanation of why such plan deviates, if in any detail, from such proposal.

(4) An assessment of the national security benefits and any other expected benefits of the proposed transfers under subsection (a), including benefits for the facilities expected to receive the transferred aircraft.

(5) An assessment of the costs of the proposed transfers, including the impact of the

proposed transfers on the facilities from which the aircraft will be transferred.

(6) An analysis of the recommended basing alignment that demonstrates that the recommendation is the most effective and efficient alternative for such basing alignment.

(7) For units equipped with special capabilities, including the modular airborne firefighting system capability, a certification that missions using such capabilities will not be negatively affected by the proposed transfers.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a sufficiency review of such report, including any findings and recommendations relating to such review.

SEC. 139. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OF AIR FORCE KC-135 TANKERS.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to transfer from Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam to another facility of the Department of Defense any KC-135 aircraft until a period of 60 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed transfer.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment referred to in subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) A recommended basing alignment of Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam KC-135 aircraft.

(2) An identification of how, and an explanation of why, such recommended basing alignment deviates, if in any detail, from the current basing plan.

(3) An assessment of the national security benefits and any other expected benefits of the proposed transfer under subsection (a), including benefits for the facilities expected to receive the transferred aircraft.

(4) An assessment of the costs of the proposed transfer, including the impact of the proposed transfer on the facilities from which the aircraft will be transferred.

(5) An analysis of the recommended basing alignment that demonstrates that the recommendation is the most effective and efficient alternative for such basing alignment.

SEC. 140. REPORT ON C-130 AIRCRAFT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report including a complete analysis and fielding plan for C-130 aircraft.

(b) CONTENT.—The fielding plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include specific details of the plan of the Secretary to maintain intra-theater airlift capacity and capability within both the active and reserve components, including the modernization and recapitalization plan for C-130H and C-130J aircraft.

SEC. 141. REPORT ON STATUS OF F-16 AIRCRAFT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status and location, and any plans to change during the period of the future-years defense program the status or locations, of all F-16 aircraft in the inventory of the Air Force.

SEC. 142. REPORT ON OPTIONS TO MODERNIZE OR REPLACE T-1A AIRCRAFT.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on options for the modernization or replacement of the T-1A aircraft capability.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

- (1) A description of options for—
 - (A) new procurement;
 - (B) conducting a service life extension program on existing aircraft;
 - (C) replacing organic aircraft with leased aircraft or services for the longer term; and
 - (D) replacing organic aircraft with leased aircraft or services while the Secretary executes a new procurement or service life extension program.

(2) An evaluation of the ability of each alternative to meet future training requirements.

(3) Estimates of life cycle costs.

(4) A description of potential cost savings from merging a T-1A capability replacement program with other programs of the Air Force, such as the Companion Trainer Program.

SEC. 143. REPORT ON STATUS OF AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE CAPABILITIES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The capability provided by the nuclear-capable, air-launched cruise missile is critical to maintaining a credible and effective air-delivery leg of the nuclear triad, preserving the ability to respond to geopolitical and technical surprise, and reassuring allies of the United States through credible extended deterrence.

(2) In the fiscal year 2015 budget request of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Air Force delayed development of the long-range standoff weapon, the follow-on for the air-launched cruise missile, by three years.

(3) The Secretary plans to sustain the current air-launched cruise missile, known as the AGM-86, until approximately 2030, with multiple service life-extension programs required to preserve but not enhance the existing capabilities of the air-launched cruise missile.

(4) The AGM-86 was initially developed in the 1970s and deployed in the 1980s.

(5) The average age of the inventory of air-launched cruise missiles is more than 30 years old.

(6) The operating environment, particularly the sophistication of integrated air defenses, has evolved substantially since the inception of the air-launched cruise missile.

(7) The AGM-86 is no longer in production and the inventory of spare bodies for required annual testing continues to diminish, posing serious challenges for long-term sustainment.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of the current air-launched cruise missile and the development of the follow-on system, the long-range standoff weapon, in accordance with section 217 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 706).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the effectiveness and survivability of the air-launched cruise mis-

sile through 2030, including the impact of any degradation on the ability of the United States Strategic Command to meet deterrence requirements, including the number of targets held at risk by the air-launched cruise missile or the burdens placed on other legs of the nuclear triad.

(B) A description of age-related failure trends, an assessment of potential age-related fleet-wide reliability and supportability problems, and the estimated costs for sustaining the air-launched cruise missile.

(C) A detailed plan, including initial cost estimates, for the development and deployment of the follow-on system that will achieve initial operational capability before 2030.

(D) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of alternative development strategies, including initial cost estimates, that would achieve full operational capability before 2030.

(E) An assessment of current testing requirements and the availability of test bodies to sustain the air-launched cruise missile over the long term.

(F) A description of the extent to which the airframe and other related components can be completed independent of the payload, as determined by the Nuclear Weapons Council established by section 179 of title 10, United States Code.

(G) A statement of the risks assumed by not fielding an operational replacement for the existing air-launched cruise missile by 2030.

(3) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in classified form, but may include an unclassified summary.

Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters**SEC. 151. ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE UNDERSEA MOBILITY ACQUISITION PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.**

Section 144 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1325) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development system” before the semicolon; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or other comparable and qualified entity selected by the Director” before the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **TECHNOLOGY ROADMAP.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commander shall develop a plan consisting of a technology roadmap for undersea mobility capabilities that includes the following:

“(A) A description of the current capabilities provided by covered elements as of the date of the plan.

“(B) An identification and description of the requirements of the Commander for future undersea mobility platforms.

“(C) An identification of resources necessary to fulfill the requirements identified in subparagraph (B).

“(D) A description of the technology readiness levels of any covered element currently under development as of the date of the plan.

“(E) An identification of any potential gaps or projected shortfall in capability, along with steps to mitigate any such gap or shortfall.

“(F) Any other matters the Commander determines appropriate.

“(2) **SUBMISSION.**—The Commander shall submit to the congressional defense committees the plan under paragraph (1) at the same time as the Under Secretary submits the first report under subsection (a)(2) following the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.”.

SEC. 152. PLAN FOR MODERNIZATION OR REPLACEMENT OF DIGITAL AVIONIC EQUIPMENT.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the potential modernization or replacement of digital avionics equipment, including use of commercial-off-the-shelf digital avionics equipment, to meet the equipment requirements under the Next Generation Air Transportation System of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the requirements imposed on aircraft of the Department of Defense by the Federal Aviation Administration transition to the equipment requirements described in subsection (a), including—

(A) an identification of the type and number of aircraft that the Secretary will need to upgrade;

(B) a definition of the upgrades needed for such aircraft; and

(C) the schedule required for the Secretary to make such upgrades in time to meet such requirements.

(2) A description of options for—

(A) acquiring new equipment, including—

(i) new procurement; and

(ii) leasing equipment and installation and other services, including the use of public-private partnerships; and

(B) modernizing existing equipment.

(3) An evaluation of the ability of each option to meet future operational requirements and to meet the equipment requirements described in subsection (a).

(4) An estimated timeline to modernize or replace the digital avionics equipment in each military department or other element of the Department.

(5) The estimated costs of options to modernize or replace the avionics equipment in each military department or other element of the Department in order to meet such requirements.

SEC. 153. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON F-35 AIRCRAFT ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than April 15, 2015, and each year thereafter until the F-35 aircraft acquisition program enters into full-rate production, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report reviewing such program.

(b) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—Each report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The extent to which the F-35 aircraft acquisition program is meeting cost, schedule, and performance goals.

(2) The progress and results of developmental and operational testing.

(3) The progress of the procurement and manufacturing of F-35 aircraft.

(4) An assessment of any plans or efforts of the Secretary of Defense to improve the efficiency of the procurement and manufacturing of F-35 aircraft.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations
Sec. 201. Authorization of Appropriations.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

- Sec. 211. Modification of authority for prizes for advanced technology achievements.
- Sec. 212. Modification of Manufacturing Technology Program.
- Sec. 213. Revision of requirement for acquisition programs to maintain defense research facility records.
- Sec. 214. Treatment by Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center of significant modifications to test and evaluation facilities and resources.
- Sec. 215. Revision to the service requirement under the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation Defense Education Program.
- Sec. 216. Limitation on availability of funds for armored multi-purpose vehicle program.
- Sec. 217. Limitation on availability of funds for unmanned carrier-launched airborne surveillance and strike system.
- Sec. 218. Limitation on availability of funds for airborne reconnaissance systems.
- Sec. 219. Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems aircraft.

Subtitle C—Reports

- Sec. 221. Reduction in frequency of reporting by Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering.
- Sec. 222. Independent assessment of inter-agency biodefense research and development.
- Sec. 223. Briefing on modeling and simulation technological and industrial base in support of requirements of Department of Defense.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

- Sec. 231. Modification to requirement for contractor cost sharing in pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of certain defense systems.
- Sec. 232. Pilot program on assignment to Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency of private sector personnel with critical research and development expertise.
- Sec. 233. Pilot program on enhancement of preparation of dependents of members of Armed Forces for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.
- Sec. 234. Sense of Congress on helicopter health and usage monitoring system of the Army.

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation as specified in the funding table in section 4201.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 211. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR PRIZES FOR ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ACHIEVEMENTS.

(a) MODIFICATION OF LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF AWARDS.—Subsection (c)(1) of section 2374a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “The total amount” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “No prize competition may result in the award of a cash prize of more than \$10,000,000.”.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

“(e) ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS.—In addition to such sums as may be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Secretary to award prizes under this section, the Secretary may accept funds from other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and from State and local governments, to award prizes under this section.”.

(c) FREQUENCY OF REPORTING.—Subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (b)(1) of this section, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—
(A) by striking “each year” and inserting “every other year”; and

(B) by striking “fiscal year” and inserting “two fiscal years”;

(2) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “a fiscal year” and inserting “a period of two fiscal years”; and

(3) in the subsection heading, by striking “ANNUAL” and inserting “BIENNIAL”.

SEC. 212. MODIFICATION OF MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

(a) MODIFICATION OF JOINT DEFENSE MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PANEL REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (e)(5) of section 2521 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering” and inserting “one or more individuals designated by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics for purposes of this paragraph”.

(b) DECREASED FREQUENCY OF UPDATE OF FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN.—Subsection (f)(3) of such section is amended by striking “on a biennial basis” and inserting “not less frequently than once every four years”.

SEC. 213. REVISION OF REQUIREMENT FOR ACQUISITION PROGRAMS TO MAINTAIN DEFENSE RESEARCH FACILITY RECORDS.

Section 2364 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting “and issue” after “technology position”; and

(ii) by striking “combatant commands” and inserting “components of the Department of Defense”; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “any position paper” and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: “any technological assessment made by a Defense research facility shall be provided to the Defense Technical Information Center repository to support acquisition decisions.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “this section:” and all that follows through “(1) The term” and inserting “this section, the term”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively,

and moving such paragraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left.

SEC. 214. TREATMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TEST RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CENTER OF SIGNIFICANT MODIFICATIONS TO TEST AND EVALUATION FACILITIES AND RESOURCES.

(a) REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES.—Subsection (c)(1)(B) of section 196 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “Base” the following: “, including with respect to the expansion, divestment, consolidation, or curtailment of activities.”.

(b) ELEMENTS OF STRATEGIC PLANS.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (E) and (F) as subparagraph (F) and (G), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) An assessment of plans and business case analyses supporting any significant modification of the test and evaluation facilities and resources of the Department projected, proposed, or recommended by the Secretary of a military department or the head of a Defense Agency for such period, including with respect to the expansion, divestment, consolidation, or curtailment of activities.”.

(c) CERTIFICATION OF BUDGETS.—Subsection (e)(1) of such section is amended by inserting “and for the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of this title for that fiscal year” after “activities for a fiscal year”.

(d) ASSESSMENT OF PLANS FOR FACILITIES.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (g), (h), and (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

“(f) APPROVAL OF CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of a military department or the head of a Defense Agency with test and evaluation responsibilities may not implement a projected, proposed, or recommended significant modification of the test and evaluation facilities and resources of the Department, including with respect to the expansion, divestment, consolidation, or curtailment of activities, until—

“(A) the Secretary or the head, as the case may be, submits to the Director a business case analysis for such modification; and

“(B) the Director reviews such analysis and approves such modification.

“(2) The Director shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an annual report containing the comments of the Director with respect to each business case analysis reviewed under paragraph (1)(B) during the year covered by the report.”.

SEC. 215. REVISION TO THE SERVICE REQUIREMENT UNDER THE SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND RESEARCH FOR TRANSFORMATION DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Subparagraph (B) of section 2192a(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(B) in the case of a person not an employee of the Department of Defense, the person shall enter into a written agreement to accept and continue employment for the period of obligated service determined under paragraph (2)—

“(i) with the Department; or

“(ii) with a public or private entity or organization outside of the Department if the Secretary—

“(I) is unable to find an appropriate position for the person within the Department; and

“(II) determines that employment of the person with such entity or organization for the purpose of such obligated service would provide a benefit to the Department.”.

SEC. 216. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE PROGRAM.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, for the armored multi-purpose vehicle program, not more than 80 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees the report under subsection (b)(1).

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the armored multi-purpose vehicle program.

(2) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An identification of the existing capability gaps of the M-113 family of vehicles assigned, as of the date of the report, to units outside of combat brigades.

(B) An identification of the mission roles that are in common between—

(i) such vehicles assigned to units outside of combat brigades; and

(ii) the vehicles examined in the armor brigade combat team during the armored multi-purpose vehicle analysis of alternatives.

(C) The estimated timeline and the rough order of magnitude of funding requirements associated with complete M-113 family of vehicles divestiture within the units outside of combat brigades and the risk associated with delaying the replacement of such vehicles.

(D) A description of the requirements for force protection, mobility, and size, weight, power, and cooling capacity for the mission roles of M-113 family of vehicles assigned to units outside of combat brigades.

(E) A discussion of the mission roles of the M-113 family of vehicles assigned to units outside of combat brigades that are comparable to the mission roles of the M-113 family of vehicles assigned to armor brigade combat teams.

(F) A discussion of whether a one-for-one replacement of the M-113 family of vehicles assigned to units outside of combat brigades is likely.

(G) With respect to mission roles, a discussion of any substantive distinctions that exist in the capabilities of the M-113 family of vehicles that are needed based on the level of the unit to which the vehicle is assigned (not including combat brigades).

(H) A discussion of the relative priority of fielding among the mission roles.

(I) An assessment for the feasibility of incorporating medical wheeled variants within the armor brigade combat teams.

SEC. 217. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR UNMANNED CARRIER-LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE SYSTEM.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy, for the unmanned carrier-launched airborne surveillance and strike system may be obligated or expended to award a contract for air vehicle segment development until a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report that—

(1) certifies that a review of the requirements for air vehicle segments of the unmanned carrier-launched surveillance and strike system is complete; and

(2) includes the results of such review.

(b) **ADDITIONAL REPORT.**—At the same time that the President submits to Congress the budget for fiscal year 2017 under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that—

(1) identifies the cost and performance trade-offs that the Navy made in arriving at the set of requirements for the air vehicle segments of the unmanned carrier-launched surveillance and strike system, including with respect to strike capability in an anti-access or area denial environment;

(2) addresses the derivation of requirements for the overall composition of the future carrier air wing, including any contribution made to the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities of carrier strike groups from non-carrier air wing forces, such as the MQ-4C Triton;

(3) specifies how the Navy derived the plan for achieving the best mix of capabilities for the carrier strike group air wing to conduct representative joint intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance strike campaigns in the 2030 timeframe, including how the unmanned carrier-launched surveillance and strike system, F-35C aircraft, EA-18G aircraft, and the aircraft that is proposed to replace the F/A-18E/F (FA-XX) would contribute to the overall capability, including in an anti-access or area denial threat environment;

(4) defines the acquisition strategy for the unmanned carrier-launched surveillance and strike system program and justifies any changes in such strategy from an acquisition strategy for a traditional program that is consistent with Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02; and

(5) establishes a formal acquisition program cost and schedule baseline to allow the Navy to track unit costs and provide regular reports to Congress on cost, schedule, and performance progress.

SEC. 218. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for imaging and targeting support of airborne reconnaissance systems, not more than 25 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a plan regarding using such funds for such purpose during fiscal year 2015; and

(2) a strategic plan for the funding of advanced airborne reconnaissance technologies supporting manned and unmanned systems.

(b) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 219. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEMS AIRCRAFT.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or other-

wise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Air Force may be used to make any significant changes to manning levels with respect to any operational Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems aircraft or take any action to retire or to prepare to retire such aircraft until the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees the report required by subsection (b).

(b) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(1) An update of the results of the analysis of alternatives for recapitalizing the current Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems capability.

(2) An assessment of the cost and schedule of developing and fielding a new aircraft and radar system to replace the current Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems aircraft that would deliver two replacement aircraft to the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems aircraft operating base by fiscal year 2019.

Subtitle C—Reports

SEC. 221. REDUCTION IN FREQUENCY OF REPORTING BY DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 139b(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking “IN GENERAL.—” and all that follows through “Each report” and inserting “CONTENTS.— Each report submitted under paragraph (1) or (2)”;

(3) by inserting before paragraph (3), as so redesignated, the following new paragraphs (1) and (2):

“(1) **ANNUAL REPORT BY DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION.**—Not later than March 31 of each year, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the activities undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) during the preceding year.

“(2) **BIENNIAL REPORT BY DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING.**—Not later than March 31 of every other year, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the activities undertaken pursuant to subsection (b) during the preceding two-year period.”; and

(4) in the subsection heading, by striking “ANNUAL REPORT” and inserting “ANNUAL AND BIENNIAL REPORTS”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and the first report submitted under paragraph (2) of section 139b(d) of such title, as added by subsection (a)(3), shall be submitted not later than March 31, 2015.

SEC. 222. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF INTER-AGENCY BIODEFENSE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with an entity that is not part of the Department of Defense to conduct an assessment of biodefense research and development activities at the National Interagency Biodefense Campus.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Identification and assessment of such legal, regulatory, management, and practice barriers as may reduce the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations on the Campus to perform designated missions, including such barriers as may exist with respect to the following:

(A) Sharing of funds for intramural and extramural research and other activities—

(i) within and between the Defense Agencies and the military departments;

(ii) between the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies; and

(iii) between the Department of Defense and the private sector.

(B) Sharing in efforts related to the construction, modernization, and maintenance of research facilities—

(i) within and between the Defense Agencies and the military departments;

(ii) between the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies; and

(iii) between the Department of Defense and the private sector.

(C) Exchange and mobility of personnel—

(i) within and between the Defense Agencies and the military departments;

(ii) between the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies; and

(iii) between the Department of Defense and the private sector.

(D) Technology transfer and transition—

(i) within and between the Defense Agencies and the military departments;

(ii) between the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies; and

(iii) between the Department of Defense and the private sector.

(2) Formulation of recommendations for such legal, regulatory, management, and practices as may support attempts to overcome the barriers identified under paragraph (1).

(c) COORDINATION.—The assessment conducted under subsection (a) shall be conducted in coordination with the following:

(1) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

(2) The Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(3) Such other private and public sector organizations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 540 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees the findings of the entity that conducted the assessment under subsection (a) with respect to such assessment.

(e) DEFENSE AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Defense Agency” has the meaning given such term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 223. BRIEFING ON MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGICAL AND INDUSTRIAL BASE IN SUPPORT OF REQUIREMENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a briefing that provides—

(1) an update to the assessment, findings, and recommendations in the report submitted under section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2465); and

(2) the status of implementing any such recommendations.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 231. MODIFICATION TO REQUIREMENT FOR CONTRACTOR COST SHARING IN PILOT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE TECHNOLOGY PROTECTION FEATURES DURING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN DEFENSE SYSTEMS.

Section 243(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended in the matter following paragraph (2)—

(1) by striking “at least one-half” and inserting “half”; and

(2) by inserting “, or such other portion of such cost as the Secretary considers appropriate upon showing of good cause” after “such activities”.

SEC. 232. PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSIGNMENT TO DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY OF PRIVATE SECTOR PERSONNEL WITH CRITICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EXPERTISE.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—In accordance with the provisions of this section, the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency may carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of temporarily assigning covered individuals with significant technical expertise in research and development areas of critical importance to defense missions to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to lead research or development projects of the Agency.

(b) ASSIGNMENT OF COVERED INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS ASSIGNED.—Under the pilot program, the Director may assign covered individuals to the Agency as described in subsection (a), but may not have more than five covered individuals so assigned at any given time.

(2) PERIOD OF ASSIGNMENT.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Director may, under the pilot program, assign a covered individual described in subsection (a) to lead research and development projects of the Agency for a period of not more than two years.

(B) The Director may extend the assignment of a covered individual for one additional period of not more than two years as the Director considers appropriate.

(3) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW.—

(A) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Director shall carry out the pilot program in accordance with the provisions of subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, except that, for purposes of the pilot program, the term “other organization”, as used in such subchapter, shall be deemed to include a covered entity.

(B) A covered individual employed by a covered entity who is assigned to the Agency under the pilot program is deemed to be an employee of the Department of Defense for purposes of the following provisions of law:

(i) Chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code.

(ii) Sections 201, 203, 205, 207, 208, 209, 603, 606, 607, 643, 654, 1905, and 1913 of title 18, United States Code.

(iii) Sections 1343, 1344, and 1349(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(iv) Chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the “Federal Tort Claims Act”), and any other Federal tort liability statute.

(v) The Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(vi) Section 1043 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(vii) Chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code.

(4) PAY AND SUPERVISION.—A covered individual employed by a covered entity who is assigned to the Agency under the pilot program—

(A) may continue to receive pay and benefits from such covered entity with or without reimbursement by the Agency;

(B) is not entitled to pay from the Agency; and

(C) shall be subject to supervision by the Director in all duties performed for the Agency under the pilot program.

(c) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—

(1) PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED.—The Director shall develop practices and procedures to manage conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflicts of interest that could arise through assignments under the pilot program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The practices and procedures required by paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, the requirement that each covered individual assigned to the Agency under the pilot program shall sign an agreement that provides for the following:

(A) The nondisclosure of any trade secrets or other nonpublic or proprietary information which is of commercial value to the covered entity from which such covered individual is assigned.

(B) The assignment of rights to intellectual property developed in the course of any research or development project under the pilot program—

(i) to the Agency and its contracting partners in accordance with applicable provisions of law regarding intellectual property rights; and

(ii) not to the covered individual or the covered entity from which such covered individual is assigned.

(C) Such additional measures as the Director considers necessary to carry out the program in accordance with Federal law.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CHARGES BY COVERED ENTITIES.—A covered entity may not charge the Federal Government, as direct or indirect costs under a Federal contract, the costs of pay or benefits paid by the covered entity to a covered individual assigned to the Agency under the pilot program.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than the first October 31 after the first fiscal year in which the Director carries out the pilot program and each October 31 thereafter that immediately follows a fiscal year in which the Director carries out the pilot program, the Director shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the activities carried out under the pilot program during the most recently completed fiscal year.

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided in this section shall expire on September 30, 2025, except that any covered individual assigned to the Agency under the pilot program shall continue in such assignment until the terms of such assignment have been satisfied.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “covered individual” means any individual who is employed by a covered entity.

(2) The term “covered entity” means any non-Federal, nongovernmental entity that, as of the date on which a covered individual employed by the entity is assigned to the Agency under the pilot program, is a non-traditional defense contractor (as defined in section 2302 of title 10, United States Code).

SEC. 233. PILOT PROGRAM ON ENHANCEMENT OF PREPARATION OF DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES FOR CAREERS IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of—

(1) enhancing the preparation of covered students for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; and

(2) providing assistance to teachers at covered schools to enhance preparation described in paragraph (1).

(b) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary shall coordinate with the following:

(1) The Secretaries of the military departments.

(2) The Secretary of Education.

(3) The National Science Foundation.

(4) The heads of such other Federal, State, and local government and private sector organizations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(c) **ACTIVITIES.**—Activities under the pilot program may include the following:

(1) Establishment of targeted internships and cooperative research opportunities at defense laboratories and other technical centers for covered students and teachers at covered schools.

(2) Establishment of scholarships and fellowships for covered students.

(3) Efforts and activities that improve the quality of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics educational and training opportunities for covered students and teachers at covered schools, including with respect to improving the development of curricula at covered schools.

(4) Development of travel opportunities, demonstrations, mentoring programs, and informal science education for covered students and teachers at covered schools.

(d) **METRICS.**—The Secretary shall establish outcome-based metrics and internal and external assessments to evaluate the merits and benefits of activities conducted under the pilot program with respect to the needs of the Department of Defense.

(e) **AUTHORITIES.**—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, make use of the authorities under chapter 111 and sections 2601, 2605, and 2374a of title 10, United States Code, section 219 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (10 U.S.C. 2358 note), and such other authorities as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(f) **REPORT.**—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on activities carried out under the pilot program.

(g) **TERMINATION.**—The pilot program shall terminate on September 30, 2020.

(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “covered schools” means elementary or secondary schools at which the Secretary determines a significant number of dependents of members of the Armed Forces are enrolled.

(2) The term “covered students” means dependents of members of the Armed Forces who are enrolled at a covered school.

SEC. 234. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HELICOPTER HEALTH AND USAGE MONITORING SYSTEM OF THE ARMY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a health and usage monitoring system for current and future helicopter platforms

of the Army that provides early warning for failing systems may reduce costly emergency maintenance, improve maintenance schedules, and increase fleet readiness; and

(2) the Secretary of the Army should—

(A) consider establishing health and usage monitoring requirements; and

(B) after any decision to proceed with a program of record for such system, use full and open competition in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environment

Sec. 311. Elimination of fiscal year limitation on prohibition of payment of fines and penalties from the Environmental Restoration Account, Defense.

Sec. 312. Method of funding for cooperative agreements under the Sikes Act.

Sec. 313. Report on prohibition of disposal of waste in open-air burn pits.

Sec. 314. Business case analysis of any plan to design, refurbish, or construct a biofuel refinery.

Sec. 315. Environmental restoration at former Naval Air Station Chincoteague, Virginia.

Sec. 316. Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of drop-in fuels.

Sec. 317. Decontamination of a portion of former bombardment area on island of Culebra, Puerto Rico.

Sec. 318. Alternative fuel automobiles.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

Sec. 321. Modification of quarterly readiness reporting requirement.

Sec. 322. Additional requirement for strategic policy on prepositioning of materiel and equipment.

Sec. 323. Elimination of authority of Secretary of the Army to abolish arsenals.

Sec. 324. Modification of annual reporting requirement related to prepositioning of materiel and equipment.

Subtitle D—Reports

Sec. 331. Repeal of annual report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums.

Sec. 332. Army assessment of regionally aligned forces.

Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority

Sec. 341. Limitation on authority to enter into a contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul of the F117 engine.

Sec. 342. Limitation on establishment of regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers.

Sec. 343. Limitation on transfer of MC-12 aircraft to United States Special Operations Command.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sec. 351. Clarification of authority relating to provision of installation-support services through intergovernmental support agreements.

Sec. 352. Management of conventional ammunition inventory.

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the

Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4301.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environment

SEC. 311. ELIMINATION OF FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION ON PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT OF FINES AND PENALTIES FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION ACCOUNT, DEFENSE.

Section 2703(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “for fiscal years 1995 through 2010.”; and

(2) by striking “for fiscal years 1997 through 2010”.

SEC. 312. METHOD OF FUNDING FOR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS UNDER THE SIKES ACT.

(a) **METHOD OF PAYMENTS UNDER COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—Subsection (b) of section 103A of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670c-1) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “Funds”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) In the case of a cooperative agreement under subsection (a)(2), such funds—

“(A) may be paid in a lump sum and include an amount intended to cover the future costs of the natural resource maintenance and improvement activities provided for under the agreement; and

“(B) may be placed by the recipient in an interest-bearing or other investment account, and any interest or income shall be applied for the same purposes as the principal.

“(3) If any funds are placed by a recipient in an interest-bearing or other investment account under paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary of Defense shall report biennially to the congressional defense committees on the disposition of such funds.”.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS; AGREEMENT UNDER OTHER LAWS.**—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS; AGREEMENT UNDER OTHER LAWS.**—(1) Cooperative agreements and interagency agreements entered into under this section shall be subject to the availability of funds.

“(2) Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, a cooperative agreement under this section may be used to acquire property or services for the direct benefit or use of the United States Government.”.

SEC. 313. REPORT ON PROHIBITION OF DISPOSAL OF WASTE IN OPEN-AIR BURN PITS.

(a) **REVIEW AND REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the compliance of the military departments and combatant commands with Department of Defense Instruction 4715.19 and with section 317 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2249; 10 U.S.C. 2701 note) regarding the disposal of covered waste in burn pits. Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of such review. Such report shall address each of the following:

(1) The reporting of covered waste through environmental surveys and assessments, including environmental condition reports, of base camps supporting a contingency operation.

(2) How covered waste and non-covered waste is defined and identified in environmental surveys and assessments covered by paragraph (1), in policies, instructions, and

guidance issued by the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the combatant commands, and in the oversight of contracts for, and the operation of, waste disposal facilities at base camps supporting contingency operations.

(3) Whether the two categories of waste are appropriately and clearly distinguished in such surveys and assessments.

(4) The current decision authority responsible for determinations regarding whether a base camp supporting a contingency operation is in compliance with the Department of Defense Instruction and section 317 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2249; 10 U.S.C. 2701 note) and the chain of command by which such determinations are made and reported.

(5) The process through which a waiver of the prohibition on disposal of covered waste in a burn pit is requested and approved, and the process by which Congress is notified of such waiver, pursuant to the applicable provision of law, and how such processes could be improved.

(6) Updates to policies, guidelines, and instructions that have been undertaken pursuant to the review to address gaps and deficiencies regarding covered waste disposal to ensure compliance.

(7) Other matters or recommendations the Secretary of Defense determines are appropriate.

(b) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.**—Not later than 120 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the assessment of the Comptroller General of the methodology used by the Secretary of Defense in conducting the review under subsection (a), the adequacy of the report, compliance with Department of Defense Instruction and applicable law regarding the disposal of covered waste in burn pits by the military departments and combatant commands, and any additional findings or recommendations the Comptroller General determines are appropriate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “covered waste” has the meaning given that term in section 317(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2249; 10 U.S.C. 2701 note).

(2) The term “base camp supporting a contingency operation” means any base, location, site, cooperative security location, forward operating base, forward operating site, main operating base, patrol base, or other location as determined by the Secretary from which support is provided to a contingency operation that—

(A) has at least 100 attached or assigned United States personnel; and

(B) is in place for a period of time of 90 days or longer.

(3) The term “burn pit” means an area that—

(A) does not contain a commercially manufactured incinerator or other equipment specifically designed and manufactured for burning of solid waste; and

(B) is designated for the purpose of disposing of solid waste by burning in the outdoor air;

(C) is in a location where at least 100 United States personnel are attached or assigned; and

(D) is in place longer than 90 days.

(4) The term “contingency operation” has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(13) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 314. BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS OF ANY PLAN TO DESIGN, REFURBISH, OR CONSTRUCT A BIOFUEL REFINERY.

Not later than 30 days before entering into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuel refinery, or of any other facility or infrastructure used to refine biofuels, the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the congressional defense committees a business case analysis for such planning, design, refurbishing, or construction.

SEC. 315. ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AT FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION CHINCOTEAGUE, VIRGINIA.

(a) **ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROJECT.**—Notwithstanding the administrative jurisdiction of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration over the Wallops Flight Facility, Virginia, the Secretary of Defense may undertake an environmental restoration project in a manner consistent with chapter 160 of title 10, United States Code, at the property constituting that facility in order to provide necessary response actions for contamination from a release of a hazardous substance or a pollutant or contaminant that is attributable to the activities of the Department of Defense at the time the property was under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy or used by the Navy pursuant to a permit or license issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the area formerly known as the Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Virginia. Any such project may be undertaken jointly or in conjunction with an environmental restoration project of the Administrator.

(b) **INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary and the Administrator may enter into an agreement or agreements to provide for the effective and efficient performance of environmental restoration projects for purposes of subsection (a). Notwithstanding section 2215 of title 10, United States Code, any such agreement may provide for environmental restoration projects conducted jointly or by one agency on behalf of the other or both agencies and for reimbursement of the agency conducting the project by the other agency for that portion of the project for which the reimbursing agency has authority to respond.

(c) **SOURCE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS.**—Pursuant to section 2703(c) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary may use funds available in the Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites, account of the Department of Defense for environmental restoration projects conducted for or by the Secretary under subsection (a) and for reimbursable agreements entered into under subsection (b).

(d) **NO EFFECT ON COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.**—Nothing in this section affects or limits the application of or obligation to comply with any environmental law, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

SEC. 316. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PROCUREMENT OF DROP-IN FUELS.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to make a bulk purchase of a

drop-in fuel for operational purposes unless the fully burdened cost of that drop-in fuel is cost-competitive with the fully burdened cost of a traditional fuel available for the same purpose.

(b) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the requirements of paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation under subsection (a) with respect to a purchase.

(2) **NOTICE REQUIRED.**—Not later than 30 days after issuing a waiver under this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees notice of the waiver. Any such notice shall include each of the following:

(A) The rationale of the Secretary for issuing the waiver.

(B) A certification that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(C) The expected fully burdened cost of the purchase for which the waiver is issued.

(c) **NOTICE OF PURCHASE REQUIRED.**—If the Secretary of Defense intends to purchase a drop-in fuel intended for operational use with a fully burdened cost in excess of 10 percent more than the fully burdened cost of a traditional fuel available for the same purpose, the Secretary shall provide notice of such intended purchase to the congressional defense committees by not later than 30 days before the date on which such purchase is intended to be made.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “drop-in fuel” means a neat or blended liquid hydrocarbon fuel designed as a direct replacement for a traditional fuel with comparable performance characteristics and compatible with existing infrastructure and equipment.

(2) The term “traditional fuel” means a liquid hydrocarbon fuel derived or refined from petroleum.

(3) The term “operational purposes” means for the purposes of conducting military operations, including training, exercises, large scale demonstrations, and moving and sustaining military forces and military platforms. The term does not include research, development, testing, evaluation, fuel certification, or other demonstrations.

(4) The term “fully burdened cost” means the commodity price of the fuel plus the total cost of all personnel and assets required to move and, when necessary, protect the fuel from the point at which the fuel is received from the commercial supplier to the point of use.

SEC. 317. DECONTAMINATION OF A PORTION OF FORMER BOMBARDMENT AREA ON ISLAND OF CULEBRA, PUERTO RICO.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that certain limited portions of the former bombardment area on the Island of Culebra should be available for safe public recreational use while the remainder of the area is most advantageously reserved as habitat for endangered and threatened species.

(b) **MODIFICATION OF RESTRICTION ON DECONTAMINATION LIMITATION.**—The first sentence of section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 (Public Law 93-166; 87 Stat. 668) shall not apply to the beaches, the campgrounds, and the Carlos Rosario Trail.

(c) **MODIFICATION OF DEED RESTRICTIONS.**—Notwithstanding paragraph 9 of the quitclaim deed, the Secretary of the Army may expend funds available in the Environmental Restoration Account, Formerly Used Defense Sites, established pursuant to section 2703(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, to

decontaminate the beaches, the campgrounds, and the Carlos Rosario Trail of unexploded ordnance.

(d) **PRECISE BOUNDARIES.**—The Secretary of the Army shall determine the exact boundaries of the beaches, the campgrounds, and the Carlos Rosario Trail for purposes of this section.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “beaches” means the portions of Carlos Rosario Beach, Flamenco Beach, and Tamarindo Beach identified in green in Figure 4 as Beach and located inside of the former bombardment area.

(2) The term “campgrounds” means the areas identified in blue in Figure 4 as Campgrounds in the former bombardment area.

(3) The term “Carlos Rosario Trail” means the trail identified in yellow in Figure 4 as the Carlos Rosario Trail and traversing the southern portion of the former bombardment area from the campground to the Carlos Rosario Beach.

(4) The term “Figure 4” means Figure 4, located on page 8 of the study.

(5) The term “former bombardment area” means that area on the Island of Culebra, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, consisting of approximately 408 acres, conveyed to the Commonwealth by the quitclaim deed, and subject to the first sentence of section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 (Public Law 93–166; 87 Stat. 668).

(6) The term “quitclaim deed” means the quitclaim deed from the United States of America to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico conveying the former bombardment area, signed by the Governor of Puerto Rico on December 20, 1982.

(7) The term “study” means the “Study Relating to the Presence of Unexploded Ordinance in a Portion of the Former Naval Bombardment Area of Culebra Island, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico”, dated April 20, 2012, prepared by the United States Army for the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2815 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4464).

(8) The term “unexploded ordnance” has the meaning given the term in section 101(e)(5) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 318. ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.

(a) **MAXIMUM FUEL ECONOMY INCREASE FOR ALTERNATIVE FUEL AUTOMOBILES.**—Section 32906(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “(except an electric automobile)” and inserting “(except an electric automobile or, beginning with model year 2016, an alternative fueled automobile that uses a fuel described in subparagraph (E) of section 32901(a)(1))”.

(b) **MINIMUM DRIVING RANGES FOR DUAL FUELED PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES.**—Section 32901(c)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, except that beginning with model year 2016, alternative fueled automobiles that use a fuel described in subparagraph (E) of subsection (a)(1) shall have a minimum driving range of 150 miles” after “at least 200 miles”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by adding at the end the following: “Beginning with model year 2016, if the Secretary prescribes a minimum driving range of 150 miles for alternative fueled automobiles that use a fuel described in subparagraph (E) of subsection (a)(1), subparagraph (A) shall not apply to dual fueled automobiles (except electric automobiles).”.

(c) **ELECTRIC DUAL FUELED AUTOMOBILES.**—Section 32905 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **ELECTRIC DUAL FUELED AUTOMOBILES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—At the request of the manufacturer, the Administrator may measure the fuel economy for any model of dual fueled automobile manufactured after model year 2015 that is capable of operating on electricity in addition to gasoline or diesel fuel, obtains its electricity from a source external to the vehicle, and meets the minimum driving range requirements established by the Secretary for dual fueled electric automobiles, by dividing 1.0 by the sum of—

“(A) the percentage utilization of the model on gasoline or diesel fuel, as determined by a formula based on the model’s alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under section 32904(c); and

“(B) the percentage utilization of the model on electricity, as determined by a formula based on the model’s alternative fuel range, divided by the fuel economy measured under section 32904(a)(2).

“(2) **ALTERNATIVE CALCULATION.**—If the manufacturer does not request that the Administrator calculate the manufacturing incentive for its electric dual fueled automobiles in accordance with paragraph (1), the Administrator shall calculate such incentive for such automobiles manufactured by such manufacturer after model year 2015 in accordance with subsection (b).”.

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 32906(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 32905(e)” and inserting “section 32905(f)”.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

SEC. 321. MODIFICATION OF QUARTERLY READINESS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Section 482 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “the” before “military readiness”; and

(B) by inserting “of the active and reserve components” after “military readiness”; and

(C) by striking “subsections (b), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k)” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “subsections (b), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i).”;

(2) by striking subsections (d), (e), (f), and (k);

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

“(d) **PREPOSITIONED STOCKS.**—Each report shall also include a military department-level or agency-level assessment of the readiness of prepositioned stocks, including—

“(1) an assessment of the fill and materiel readiness of stocks by geographic location;

“(2) an overall assessment by military department or Defense Agency of the ability of the respective stocks to meet operation and contingency plans; and

“(3) a mitigation plan for any shortfalls or gaps identified under paragraph (1) or (2) and a timeline associated with corrective action.”;

(4) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), and (l) as subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), and (j) respectively;

(5) in subsection (e)(1), as redesignated by paragraph (4), by striking “National Response Plan” and inserting “National Response Framework”;

(6) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) The assessment included in the report under paragraph (1) by the Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall include a separate assessment prepared by the Commander of United States Cyber Command relating to the readiness of United States Cyber Command and the readiness of the cyber force of each of the military departments.”;

(7) in subsection (h), as so redesignated—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND RELATED” after “SUPPORT”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “combat support agencies” and inserting “combat support and related agencies”; and

(C) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “combat support agency” and inserting “combat support and related agencies”; and

(8) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection (i):

“(i) **MAJOR EXERCISE ASSESSMENTS.**—(1) Each report under this section shall also include information on each major exercise conducted by a geographic or functional combatant command or military department, including—

“(A) a list of exercises by name for the period covered by the report;

“(B) the cost and location of each such exercise; and

“(C) a list of participants by country or military department.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘major exercise’ means a named major training event, an integrated or joint exercise, or a unilateral major exercise.”.

SEC. 322. ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGIC POLICY ON PREPOSITIONING OF MATERIEL AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 2229(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “support for crisis response elements,” after “service requirements,”.

SEC. 323. ELIMINATION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO ABOLISH ARSENALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4532 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) The Secretary” and inserting “The Secretary”;

(2) by striking subsection (b); and

(3) in the section heading, by striking “; abolition of”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 433 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 4532 and inserting the following new item:

“4532. Factories and arsenals: manufacture at.”.

SEC. 324. MODIFICATION OF ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT RELATED TO PREPOSITIONING OF MATERIEL AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 321(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 732; 10 U.S.C. 2229 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “Not later than” and inserting the following:

“(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than”;

(2) by striking “, and annually thereafter”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) **PROGRESS REPORTS.**—Not later than one year after submitting the report required under paragraph (1), and annually thereafter for two years, the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report assessing the progress of the Department of Defense in implementing its strategic policy and plan for

its prepositioned stocks and including any additional information related to the Department's management of its prepositioned stocks that the Comptroller General determines appropriate.”.

Subtitle D—Reports

SEC. 331. REPEAL OF ANNUAL REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATION AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR MILITARY MUSEUMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 489 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 23 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 489.

SEC. 332. ARMY ASSESSMENT OF REGIONALLY ALIGNED FORCES.

At the same time as the President transmits to Congress the budget for fiscal year 2016 under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of how the Army has—

(1) captured and incorporated lessons learned through the initial employment of the regionally aligned forces;

(2) identified, where appropriate, institutionalized and improved region-specific initial, sustaining, and predeployment training;

(3) improved the coordination of activities among special operations forces, Army regionally aligned forces, Department of State country teams, contractors of the Department of State and the Department of Defense, the geographic combatant commands, the Joint Staff, and international partners;

(4) identified and evaluated the various Department of Defense appropriations accounts at the subactivity group, project, program, and activity level and other sources of Federal resources used to fund activities of regionally aligned forces, including the amount of funds obligated or expended from each such account;

(5) identified and assessed the effects associated with activities of regionally aligned forces conducted to meet Department of Defense and geographic combatant command security cooperation requirements;

(6) identified and assessed the effect on the core mission readiness of regionally aligned forces while supporting geographic combatant commander requirements through regionally aligned force activities, and, in the case of any such effect that is assessed as degrading the core mission readiness of such forces, identified plans to mitigate such degradation;

(7) identified and assessed opportunities, costs, benefits, and risks associated with the potential expansion of the regionally aligned forces model; and

(8) identified and assessed opportunities, costs, benefits, and risks associated with retaining or ensuring the availability of regional expertise within forces as aligned to a specific region.

Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority

SEC. 341. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT FOR THE SUSTAINMENT, MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, OR OVERHAUL OF THE F117 ENGINE.

The Secretary of the Air Force may not enter into a contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul of the F117 engine until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of the Air Force has obtained sufficient data to determine that the Secretary of the Air Force is paying

a fair and reasonable price for F117 sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul as compared to the PW2000 commercial-derivative engine sustainment price for sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul in the private sector. The Secretary may waive the limitation in the preceding sentence to enter into a contract if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the interest of national security.

SEC. 342. LIMITATION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES COORDINATION CENTERS.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to establish Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers.

SEC. 343. LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF MC-12 AIRCRAFT TO UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided under subsection (c), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, may be obligated or expended for the transfer of MC-12 aircraft from the Air Force to the United States Special Operations Command before the date that is 60 days after the date of the delivery of the report required under subsection (b).

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2015, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an analysis and justification for the transfer of MC-12 aircraft from the Air Force to the United States Special Operations Command.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a description of the current platform requirements for manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft to support United States Special Operations Forces;

(B) an analysis of alternatives comparing various manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft, including U-28 aircraft, in meeting the platform requirements for manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft to support United States Special Operations Forces;

(C) an analysis of the remaining service life of the U-28 aircraft to be divested by the United States Special Operations Command and the MC-12 aircraft to be transferred from the Air Force;

(D) a description of the future manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platform requirements of the United States Special Operations Command for areas outside of Afghanistan, including range, payload, endurance, and other requirements, as defined by the Command's “Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Road Map”;

(E) an analysis of the cost to convert MC-12 aircraft to provide intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities equal to or better than those provided by the U-28 aircraft;

(F) a description of the engineering and integration needed to convert MC-12 aircraft to provide intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities equal to or better than those provided by the U-28 aircraft; and

(G) the expected annual cost to operate 16 U-28 aircraft as a Government-owned, contractor operated program.

(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to up to 13 aircraft designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to be transferred from the Air Force to the United States Special Operations Command and flown by the Air National Guard in support of special operations aviation foreign internal defense and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

SEC. 351. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO PROVISION OF INSTALLATION-SUPPORT SERVICES THROUGH INTERGOVERNMENTAL SUPPORT AGREEMENTS.

(a) TRANSFER OF SECTION 2336 TO CHAPTER 159.—

(1) TRANSFER AND REDESIGNATION.—Section 2336 of title 10, United States Code, is transferred to chapter 159 of such title, inserted after section 2678, and redesignated as section 2679.

(2) REVISED SECTION HEADING.—The heading of such section, as so transferred and redesignated, is amended to read as follows:

“§2679. Installation-support services: intergovernmental support agreements”.

(b) CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—Such section, as so transferred and redesignated, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary concerned” and inserting “Notwithstanding any other provision of law governing the award of Federal government contracts for goods and services, the Secretary concerned”; and

(ii) by striking “a State or local” and inserting “, on a sole source basis, with a State or local”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an” and inserting “An”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B) respectively; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Any contract for the provision of installation-support services awarded by the Federal Government or a State or local government pursuant to an intergovernmental support agreement provided in subsection (a) shall be awarded on a competitive basis.”.

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (e) the following new paragraph:

“(4) The term ‘intergovernmental support agreement’ means a legal instrument reflecting a relationship between the Secretary concerned and a State or local government that contains such terms and conditions as the Secretary concerned considers appropriate for the purposes of this section and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2336.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 159 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2678 the following new item:

“2679. Installation-support services: intergovernmental support agreements.”.

SEC. 352. MANAGEMENT OF CONVENTIONAL AMMUNITION INVENTORY.

(a) CONSOLIDATION OF DATA.—Not later than 240 days after the date of the enactment

of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall issue Department-wide guidance designating an authoritative source of data for conventional ammunition. Not later than 10 days after issuing the guidance required by this subsection, the Under Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees on what source of data has been designated under this subsection.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The Secretary of the Army shall include in the appropriate annual ammunition inventory reports, as determined by the Secretary, information on all available ammunition for use during the redistribution process, including any ammunition that was unclaimed and categorized for disposal by another military service during a year before the year during which the report is submitted.

(c) **BRIEFING AND REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing and a report on the management of the conventional ammunition demilitarization stockpile of the Department of Defense.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The briefing and report required by paragraph (1) shall include each of the following:

(A) An assessment of the adequacy of Department of Defense policies and procedures governing the demilitarization of excess, obsolete, and unserviceable conventional ammunition.

(B) An assessment of the adequacy of the maintenance by the Department of information on the quantity, value, condition, and location of excess, obsolete, and unserviceable conventional ammunition for each of the Armed Forces.

(C) An assessment of whether the Department has conducted an analysis comparing the costs of storing and maintaining items in the conventional ammunition demilitarization stockpile with the costs of the disposal of items in the stockpile.

(D) An assessment of whether the Department has—

(i) identified challenges in managing the current and anticipated conventional ammunition demilitarization stockpile; and

(ii) if so, developed mitigation plans to address such challenges.

(E) Such other matters relating to the management of the conventional ammunition demilitarization stockpile as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(3) **DEADLINES.**—The briefing required by paragraph (1) shall be provided by not later than April 30, 2015. The report required by that paragraph shall be submitted not later than June 1, 2015.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

Sec. 401. End strengths for active forces.

Sec. 402. Revisions in permanent active duty end strength minimum levels.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

Sec. 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve.

Sec. 412. End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves.

Sec. 413. End strengths for military technicians (dual status).

Sec. 414. Fiscal year 2015 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians.

Sec. 415. Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations
Sec. 421. Military personnel.

Subtitle A—Active Forces

SEC. 401. END STRENGTHS FOR ACTIVE FORCES.

The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 2015, as follows:

- (1) The Army, 490,000.
- (2) The Navy, 323,600.
- (3) The Marine Corps, 184,100.
- (4) The Air Force, 312,980.

SEC. 402. REVISIONS IN PERMANENT ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTH MINIMUM LEVELS.

Section 691(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (4) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

- “(1) For the Army, 490,000.
- “(2) For the Navy, 323,600.
- “(3) For the Marine Corps, 184,100.
- “(4) For the Air Force, 310,900.”

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

SEC. 411. END STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for Selected Reserve personnel of the reserve components as of September 30, 2015, as follows:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 350,200.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 202,000.
- (3) The Navy Reserve, 57,300.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 39,200.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 105,000.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 67,100.
- (7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 7,000.

(b) **END STRENGTH REDUCTIONS.**—The end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by—

(1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at the end of the fiscal year; and

(2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at the end of the fiscal year.

(c) **END STRENGTH INCREASES.**—Whenever units or individual members of the Selected Reserve of any reserve component are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the end strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be increased proportionately by the total authorized strengths of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

SEC. 412. END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

Within the end strengths prescribed in section 411(a), the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 2015, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 31,385.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 16,261.
- (3) The Navy Reserve, 9,973.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 14,704.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 2,830.

SEC. 413. END STRENGTHS FOR MILITARY TECHNICIANS (DUAL STATUS).

The minimum number of military technicians (dual status) as of the last day of fiscal year 2015 for the reserve components of the Army and the Air Force (notwithstanding section 129 of title 10, United States Code) shall be the following:

- (1) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 27,210.
- (2) For the Army Reserve, 7,895.
- (3) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 21,792.
- (4) For the Air Force Reserve, 9,789.

SEC. 414. FISCAL YEAR 2015 LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.

(a) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **NATIONAL GUARD.**—Within the limitation provided in section 10217(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard as of September 30, 2015, may not exceed the following:

(A) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 1,600.

(B) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 350.

(2) **ARMY RESERVE.**—The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve as of September 30, 2015, may not exceed 595.

(3) **AIR FORCE RESERVE.**—The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Air Force Reserve as of September 30, 2015, may not exceed 90.

(b) **NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “non-dual status technician” has the meaning given that term in section 10217(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 415. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF RESERVE PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR OPERATIONAL SUPPORT.

During fiscal year 2015, the maximum number of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who may be serving at any time on full-time operational support duty under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, is the following:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 17,000.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 13,000.
- (3) The Navy Reserve, 6,200.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 3,000.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 16,000.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 14,000.

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 421. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for military personnel, as specified in the funding table in section 4401.

(b) **CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION.**—The authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) supersedes any other authorization of appropriations (definite or indefinite) for such purpose for fiscal year 2015.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

Sec. 501. Authority to limit consideration for early retirement by selective retirement boards to particular warrant officer year groups and specialties.

- Sec. 502. Authority for three-month deferral of retirement for officers selected for selective early retirement.
- Sec. 503. Repeal of limits on percentage of officers who may be recommended for discharge during a fiscal year under enhanced selective discharge authority.
- Sec. 504. Reports on number and assignment of enlisted aides for officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.
- Sec. 505. Repeal of requirement for submission to Congress of annual reports on joint officer management and promotion policy objectives for joint officers.
- Sec. 506. Options for Phase II of joint professional military education.
- Sec. 507. Elimination of requirement that a qualified aviator or naval flight officer be in command of an inactivated nuclear-powered aircraft carrier before decommissioning.
- Sec. 508. Required consideration of certain elements of command climate in performance appraisals of commanding officers.
- Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management
- Sec. 511. Retention on the reserve active-status list following nonselection for promotion of certain health professions officers and first lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade) pursuing baccalaureate degrees.
- Sec. 512. Consultation with Chief of the National Guard Bureau in selection of Directors and Deputy Directors, Army National Guard and Air National Guard.
- Sec. 513. Centralized database of information on military technician positions.
- Sec. 514. Report on management of personnel records of members of the National Guard.
- Subtitle C—General Service Authorities
- Sec. 521. Enhancement of participation of mental health professionals in boards for correction of military records and boards for review of discharge or dismissal of members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 522. Extension of authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 523. Provision of information to members of the Armed Forces on privacy rights relating to receipt of mental health services.
- Sec. 524. Removal of artificial barriers to the service of women in the Armed Forces.
- Subtitle D—Military Justice, Including Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Prevention and Response
- Sec. 531. Technical revisions and clarifications of certain provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 relating to the military justice system.
- Sec. 532. Ordering of depositions under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.
- Sec. 533. Access to Special Victims' Counsel.
- Sec. 534. Enhancement of victims' rights in connection with prosecution of certain sex-related offenses.
- Sec. 535. Enforcement of crime victims' rights related to protections afforded by certain Military Rules of Evidence.
- Sec. 536. Modification of Military Rules of Evidence relating to admissibility of general military character toward probability of innocence.
- Sec. 537. Modification of Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence, relating to the privilege against disclosure of communications between psychotherapists and patients.
- Sec. 538. Modification of Department of Defense policy on retention of evidence in a sexual assault case to permit return of personal property upon completion of related proceedings.
- Sec. 539. Requirements relating to Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners for the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 540. Modification of term of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 541. Review of decisions not to refer charges of certain sex-related offenses for trial by court-martial if requested by chief prosecutor.
- Sec. 542. Analysis and assessment of disposition of most serious offenses identified in unrestricted reports on sexual assaults in annual reports on sexual assaults in the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 543. Plan for limited use of certain information on sexual assaults in restricted reports by military criminal investigative organizations.
- Sec. 544. Improved Department of Defense information reporting and collection of domestic violence incidents involving members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 545. Additional duties for judicial proceedings panel.
- Sec. 546. Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 547. Confidential review of characterization of terms of discharge of members of the Armed Forces who are victims of sexual offenses.
- Subtitle E—Member Education, Training, and Transition
- Sec. 551. Enhancement of authority to assist members of the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials.
- Sec. 552. Applicability of sexual assault prevention and response and related military justice enhancements to military service academies.
- Sec. 553. Authorized duration of foreign and cultural exchange activities at military service academies.
- Sec. 554. Enhancement of authority to accept support for Air Force Academy athletic programs.
- Sec. 555. Pilot program to assist members of the Armed Forces in obtaining post-service employment.
- Sec. 556. Plan for education of members of Armed Forces on cyber matters.
- Sec. 557. Enhancement of information provided to members of the Armed Forces and veterans regarding use of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance and Federal financial aid through Transition Assistance Program.
- Sec. 558. Procedures for provision of certain information to State veterans agencies to facilitate the transition of members of the Armed Forces from military service to civilian life.
- Subtitle F—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters
- Sec. 561. Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees.
- Sec. 562. Impact aid for children with severe disabilities.
- Sec. 563. Amendments to the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012.
- Sec. 564. Authority to employ non-United States citizens as teachers in Department of Defense overseas dependents' school system.
- Sec. 565. Inclusion of domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools among functions of Advisory Council on Dependents' Education.
- Sec. 566. Protection of child custody arrangements for parents who are members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 567. Improved consistency in data collection and reporting in Armed Forces suicide prevention efforts.
- Sec. 568. Improved data collection related to efforts to reduce underemployment of spouses of members of the Armed Forces and close the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts.
- Subtitle G—Decorations and Awards
- Sec. 571. Medals for members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who were killed or wounded in an attack by a foreign terrorist organization.
- Sec. 572. Authorization for award of the Medal of Honor to members of the Armed Forces for acts of valor during World War I.
- Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements
- Sec. 581. Review and report on military programs and controls regarding professionalism.
- Sec. 582. Review and report on prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces.
- Sec. 583. Review and report on provision of job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members of the reserve components.
- Sec. 584. Report on foreign language, regional expertise, and culture considerations in overseas military operations.
- Sec. 585. Deadline for submission of report containing results of review of Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity role in sexual harassment cases.

Sec. 586. Independent assessment of risk and resiliency of United States Special Operations Forces and effectiveness of the Preservation of the Force and Families and Human Performance Programs.

Sec. 587. Comptroller General report on hazing in the Armed Forces.

Sec. 588. Comptroller General report on impact of certain mental and physical trauma on discharges from military service for misconduct.

Subtitle I—Other Matters

Sec. 591. Inspection of outpatient residential facilities occupied by recovering service members.

Sec. 592. Designation of voter assistance offices.

Sec. 593. Repeal of electronic voting demonstration project.

Sec. 594. Authority for removal from national cemeteries of remains of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces who have no known next of kin.

Sec. 595. Sense of Congress regarding leaving no member of the Armed Forces unaccounted for during the drawdown of United States forces in Afghanistan.

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

SEC. 501. AUTHORITY TO LIMIT CONSIDERATION FOR EARLY RETIREMENT BY SELECTIVE RETIREMENT BOARDS TO PARTICULAR WARRANT OFFICER YEAR GROUPS AND SPECIALTIES.

Section 581(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(2) by designating the second sentence of paragraph (1) as paragraph (2); and

(3) in paragraph (2), as so designated—

(A) by striking “the list shall include each” and inserting “the list shall include—“(A) the name of each”;

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) with respect to a group of warrant officers designated under subparagraph (A) who are in a particular grade and competitive category, only those warrant officers in that grade and competitive category who are also in a particular year group or specialty, or any combination thereof determined by the Secretary concerned.”.

SEC. 502. AUTHORITY FOR THREE-MONTH DEFERRAL OF RETIREMENT FOR OFFICERS SELECTED FOR SELECTIVE EARLY RETIREMENT.

(a) WARRANT OFFICERS.—Section 581(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary concerned”;

(2) by striking “90 days” and inserting “three months”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) An officer recommended for early retirement under this section, if approved for deferral under paragraph (1), shall be retired on the date requested by the officer, and approved by the Secretary concerned, which date shall be not later than the first day of the tenth calendar month beginning after the month in which the Secretary concerned approves the report of the board which recommended the officer for early retirement.”.

(b) OFFICERS ON THE ACTIVE-DUTY LIST.—Section 638(b) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(1)(A) An officer in a grade below brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half) who is recommended for early retirement under this section or section 638a of this title and whose early retirement is approved by the Secretary concerned shall be retired, under any provision of law under which he is eligible to retire, on the date requested by him and approved by the Secretary concerned, which date shall be not later than the first day of the seventh calendar month beginning after the month in which the Secretary concerned approves the report of the board which recommended the officer for early retirement.

“(B) If an officer described in subparagraph (A) is not eligible for retirement under any provision of law, the officer shall be retained on active duty until the officer is qualified for retirement under section 3911, 6323, or 8911 of this title, and then be retired under that section, unless the officer is sooner retired or discharged under some other provision of law, with such retirement under that section occurring not later than the later of the following:

“(i) The first day of the month beginning after the month in which the officer becomes qualified for retirement under that section.

“(ii) The first day of the seventh calendar month beginning after the month in which the Secretary concerned approves the report of the board which recommended the officer for early retirement.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting “(A)” before “The Secretary concerned”;

(B) by striking “90 days” and inserting “three months”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) An officer recommended for early retirement under paragraph (1)(A) or section 638a of this title, if approved for deferral under subparagraph (A), shall be retired on the date requested by the officer, and approved by the Secretary concerned, which date shall be not later than the first day of the tenth calendar month beginning after the month in which the Secretary concerned approves the report of the board which recommended the officer for early retirement.

“(C) The Secretary concerned may defer the retirement of an officer otherwise approved for early retirement under paragraph (1)(B), but in no case later than the first day of the tenth calendar month beginning after the month in which the Secretary concerned approves the report of the board which recommended the officer for early retirement.

“(D) An officer recommended for early retirement under paragraph (2), if approved for deferral under subparagraph (A), shall be retired on the date requested by the officer, and approved by the Secretary concerned, which date shall be not later than the first day of the thirteenth calendar month beginning after the month in which the Secretary concerned approves the report of the board which recommended the officer for early retirement.”.

SEC. 503. REPEAL OF LIMITS ON PERCENTAGE OF OFFICERS WHO MAY BE RECOMMENDED FOR DISCHARGE DURING A FISCAL YEAR UNDER ENHANCED SELECTIVE DISCHARGE AUTHORITY.

Section 638a(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

SEC. 504. REPORTS ON NUMBER AND ASSIGNMENT OF ENLISTED AIDES FOR OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON NUMBER OF ENLISTED AIDES.—Section 981 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report—

“(1) specifying the number of enlisted aides authorized and allocated for general officers and flag officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and joint pool as of September 30 of the previous year; and

“(2) justifying, on a billet-by-billet basis, the authorization and assignment of each enlisted aide to each general officer and flag officer position.”.

(b) REPORT ON REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF ENLISTED AIDES AND AUTHORIZATION AND ASSIGNMENT PROCEDURES AND DUTIES.—Not later than June 30, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the following:

(1) A list of the official military and official representational duties that each Secretary of a military department—

(A) authorizes enlisted aides to perform on the personal staffs of officers of an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned; and

(B) considers necessary to be performed by enlisted aides to relieve the officers from minor duties, which, if performed by the officers, would be done at the expense of the officers' primary military or official duties.

(2) Subject to the limitations in section 981 of title 10, United States Code, the procedures used for allocating authorized enlisted aides—

(A) between the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps and the joint pool;

(B) within each Armed Force, including the regulations prescribed by the Secretaries of the military departments regarding the allocation of enlisted aides; and

(C) within the joint pool.

(3) The justification, on a billet-by-billet basis, for the authorization and assignment of each enlisted aide to each general officer and flag officer position as of September 30, 2014.

(4) Such recommendations as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for changes to the statutory method of calculating the authorized number of enlisted aides.

(c) REPORT OBJECTIVE.—In developing the report required by subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall have the objective of reducing the maximum number of enlisted aides authorized and allocated for general officers and flag officers by 40, subject to the validation of duties under subsection (b)(1) and the billet-by-billet justification of positions under subsection (b)(3).

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—

(1) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the report submitted by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (b).

(2) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.—The review under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the methodology used by the Secretary of Defense in satisfying the requirements imposed by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b).

(B) An assessment of the adequacy of the data used by the Secretary to support the conclusions contained in the report.

(3) REPORT ON RESULTS OF REVIEW.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the review conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 505. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS OF ANNUAL REPORTS ON JOINT OFFICER MANAGEMENT AND PROMOTION POLICY OBJECTIVES FOR JOINT OFFICERS.

(a) REPEAL OF ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(1) JOINT OFFICER MANAGEMENT.—Section 667 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) PROMOTION POLICY OBJECTIVES FOR JOINT OFFICERS.—Section 662 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) QUALIFICATIONS.—”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 38 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 667.

SEC. 506. OPTIONS FOR PHASE II OF JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION.

Section 2154(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “consisting of a joint professional military education curriculum” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “consisting of—

“(A) a joint professional military education curriculum taught in residence at the Joint Forces Staff College or a senior level service school that has been designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense as a joint professional military education institution; or

“(B) a senior level service course of at least ten months that has been designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense as a joint professional military education course.”.

SEC. 507. ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT A QUALIFIED AVIATOR OR NAVAL FLIGHT OFFICER BE IN COMMAND OF AN INACTIVATED NUCLEAR-POWERED AIRCRAFT CARRIER BEFORE DECOMMISSIONING.

Section 5942(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to command of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier that has been inactivated for the purpose of permanent decommissioning and disposal.”.

SEC. 508. REQUIRED CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN ELEMENTS OF COMMAND CLIMATE IN PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS OF COMMANDING OFFICERS.

The Secretary of a military department shall ensure that the performance appraisal of a commanding officer in an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of that Secretary indicates the extent to which the commanding officer has or has not established a command climate in which—

(1) allegations of sexual assault are properly managed and fairly evaluated; and

(2) a victim of criminal activity, including sexual assault, can report the criminal activity without fear of retaliation, including ostracism and group pressure from other members of the command.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management

SEC. 511. RETENTION ON THE RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST FOLLOWING NON-SELECTION FOR PROMOTION OF CERTAIN HEALTH PROFESSIONS OFFICERS AND FIRST LIEUTENANTS AND LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE) PURSUING BACCALAUREATE DEGREES.

(a) RETENTION OF CERTAIN FIRST LIEUTENANTS AND LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE) FOLLOWING NONSELECTION FOR PROMOTION.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 14701 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “A reserve officer of” and inserting “(A) A reserve officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps described in subparagraph (B) who is required to be removed from the reserve active-status list under section 14504 of this title, or a reserve officer of”; and

(2) by striking “of this title may, subject to the needs of the service and to section 14509 of this title,” and inserting “of this title, may”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) A reserve officer covered by this subparagraph is a reserve officer of the Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps who holds the grade of first lieutenant, or a reserve officer of the Navy who holds the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), and who—

“(i) is a health professions officer; or

“(ii) is actively pursuing an undergraduate program of education leading to a baccalaureate degree.

“(C) The consideration of a reserve officer for continuation on the reserve active-status list pursuant to this paragraph is subject to the needs of the service and to section 14509 of this title.”.

(b) RETENTION OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS OFFICERS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) CONTINUATION OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS OFFICERS.—(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(6), a health professions officer obligated to a period of service incurred under section 16201 of this title who is required to be removed from the reserve active-status list under section 14504, 14505, 14506, or 14507 of this title and who has not completed a service obligation incurred under section 16201 of this title shall be retained on the reserve active-status list until the completion of such service obligation and then discharged, unless sooner retired or discharged under another provision of law.

“(2) The Secretary concerned may waive the applicability of paragraph (1) to any officer if the Secretary determines that completion of the service obligation of that officer is not in the best interest of the service.

“(3) A health professions officer who is continued on the reserve active-status list under this subsection who is subsequently promoted or whose name is on a list of officers recommended for promotion to the next higher grade is not required to be discharged or retired upon completion of the officer's service obligation. Such officer may continue on the reserve active-status list as other officers of the same grade unless separated under another provision of law.”.

SEC. 512. CONSULTATION WITH CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU IN SELECTION OF DIRECTORS AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) ROLE OF CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—Paragraph (1) of section 10506(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “(after consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau)” after “selected by the Secretary of the Army”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “(after consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau)” after “selected by the Secretary of the Air Force”.

(b) CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of such section is amended by striking “The officers so selected” and inserting “The Director and Deputy Director, Army National Guard, and the Director and Deputy Director, Air National Guard.”.

(c) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISION.—Paragraph (3) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D).

(d) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to assignments to the National Guard Bureau under section 10506 of title 10, United States Code, that occur after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 513. CENTRALIZED DATABASE OF INFORMATION ON MILITARY TECHNICIAN POSITIONS.

(a) CENTRALIZED DATABASE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain a centralized database of information on military technician positions that will contain and set forth current information on all military technician positions of the Armed Forces.

(b) ELEMENTS.—

(1) IDENTIFICATION OF POSITIONS.—The database required by subsection (a) shall identify each military technician position, whether dual-status or non-dual status.

(2) ADDITIONAL DETAILS.—For each military technician position identified pursuant to paragraph (1), the database required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the functions of the position.

(B) A statement of the military necessity for the position.

(C) A statement of whether the position is—

(i) a general administration, clerical, or office service occupation; or

(ii) directly related to the maintenance of military readiness.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish the database required by subsection (a) in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing the progress made in establishing the database required by subsection (a).

SEC. 514. REPORT ON MANAGEMENT OF PERSONNEL RECORDS OF MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than December 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report regarding the management of personnel records of members of the Army National Guard of the United States and the Air Guard of the United States.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall assess the following:

(1) The roles and responsibilities of States and Federal agencies in the management of the records of members of the Army National Guard of the United States and the Air Guard of the United States.

(2) The extent to which States have digitized the records of National Guard members.

(3) The extent to which States and Federal agencies have the capability to share digitized records of National Guard members.

(4) The measures required to correct deficiencies, if any, noted by the Secretary of Defense in the capability of Federal agencies to effectively manage the records of National Guard members.

(5) The authorities, responsibilities, processes, and procedures for the maintenance and disposition of the records of National Guard members who—

(A) are discharged or separated from the National Guard;

(B) are transferred to the Retired Reserve; or

(C) but for age, would be eligible for retired or retainer pay.

Subtitle C—General Service Authorities

SEC. 521. ENHANCEMENT OF PARTICIPATION OF MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IN BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS AND BOARDS FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE OR DISMISSAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.—Section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection (g):

“(g) Any medical advisory opinion issued to a board established under subsection (a)(1) with respect to a member or former member of the armed forces who was diagnosed while serving in the armed forces as experiencing a mental health disorder shall include the opinion of a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist if the request for correction of records concerned relates to a mental health disorder.”.

(b) BOARDS FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE OR DISMISSAL.—

(1) REVIEW FOR CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS WITH PTSD OR TBI.—Subsection (d)(1) of section 1553 of such title is amended by striking “physician, clinical psychologist, or psychiatrist” the second place it appears and inserting “clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with training on mental health issues connected with post traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury (as applicable)”.

(2) REVIEW FOR CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS WITH MENTAL HEALTH DIAGNOSES.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) In the case of a former member of the armed forces (other than a former member covered by subsection (d)) who was diagnosed while serving in the armed forces as experiencing a mental health disorder, a board established under this section to review the former member’s discharge or dismissal shall include a member who is a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with special training on mental health disorders.”.

SEC. 522. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT PROGRAMS ON CAREER FLEXIBILITY TO ENHANCE RETENTION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—Subsection (m) of section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 10 U.S.C. prec. 701 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “No member”;

(2) by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2019”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) A member may not be reactivated to active duty in the Armed Forces under a pilot program conducted under this section after December 31, 2022.”.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (k) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and 2017” and inserting “2017, and 2019”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “March 1, 2019” and inserting “March 1, 2023”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS FOR FINAL REPORT.—In addition to the elements required by paragraph (3), the final report under this subsection shall include the following:

“(A) A description of the costs to each military department of each pilot program conducted under this section.

“(B) A description of the reasons why members choose to participate in the pilot programs.

“(C) A description of the members who did not return to active duty at the conclusion of their inactivation from active duty under the pilot programs, and a statement of the reasons why the members did not return to active duty.

“(D) A statement whether members were required to perform inactive duty training as part of their participation in the pilot programs, and if so, a description of the members who were required to perform such inactive duty training, a statement of the reasons why the members were required to perform such inactive duty training, and a description of how often the members were required to perform such inactive duty training.”.

SEC. 523. PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ON PRIVACY RIGHTS RELATING TO RECEIPT OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION REQUIRED.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall ensure that the information described in subsection (b) is provided—

(1) to each officer candidate during initial training;

(2) to each recruit during basic training; and

(3) to other members of the Armed Forces at such times as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(b) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—The information required to be provided under subsection (a) shall include information on the applicability of the Department of Defense Instruction on Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information in DoD Health Care Programs and other regulations regarding privacy prescribed pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191) to records regarding a member of the Armed Forces seeking and receiving mental health services.

SEC. 524. REMOVAL OF ARTIFICIAL BARRIERS TO THE SERVICE OF WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) ROLE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN DEVELOPMENT OF GENDER-NEUTRAL OCCUPATIONAL STANDARDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the gender-neutral occupational standards being developed by the Secretaries of the military departments pursuant to section 543 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), as amended by section 523 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 756)—

(1) accurately predict performance of actual, regular, and recurring duties of a military occupation; and

(2) are applied equitably to measure individual capabilities.

(b) FEMALE PERSONAL PROTECTION GEAR.—The Secretary of Defense shall direct each Secretary of a military department to take immediate steps to ensure that combat equipment distributed to female members of the Armed Forces—

(1) is properly designed and fitted; and

(2) meets required standards for wear and survivability.

(c) REVIEW OF OUTREACH AND RECRUITMENT EFFORTS FOCUSED ON OFFICERS.—

(1) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of United States shall conduct a review of Services’ Outreach and Recruitment Efforts gauged toward women representation in the officer corps.

(2) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.—In conducting the review under this subsection, the Comptroller General shall—

(A) identify and evaluate current initiatives the Armed Forces are using to increase accession of women into the officer corps;

(B) identify new recruiting efforts to increase accessions of women into the officer corps specifically at the military service academies, Officer Candidate Schools, Officer Training Schools, the Academy of Military Science, and Reserve Officer Training Corps; and

(C) identify efforts, resources, and funding required to increase military service academy accessions by women.

(3) SUBMISSION OF RESULTS.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the review under this subsection.

Subtitle D—Military Justice, Including Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Prevention and Response

SEC. 531. TECHNICAL REVISIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 RELATING TO THE MILITARY JUSTICE SYSTEM.

(a) REVISIONS OF ARTICLE 32 AND ARTICLE 60, UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.—

(1) EXPLICIT AUTHORITY FOR CONVENING AUTHORITY TO TAKE ACTION ON FINDINGS OF A COURT-MARTIAL WITH RESPECT TO A QUALIFYING OFFENSE.—Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of section 860 of title 10, United States Code (article 60 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 1702(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 955), is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “and may be taken only with respect to a qualifying offense” after “is not required”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(i) by striking “, other than a charge or specification for a qualifying offense,”; and

(ii) by inserting “, but may take such action with respect to a qualifying offense” after “thereto”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(i) by striking “, other than a charge or specification for a qualifying offense,”; and

(ii) by inserting “, but may take such action with respect to a qualifying offense” before the period.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENT FOR EXPLANATION IN WRITING FOR MODIFICATION TO FINDINGS OF A COURT-MARTIAL.—Paragraph (3)(C) of subsection (c) of section 860 of title 10, United States Code

(article 60 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 1702(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 955), is amended by striking “(other than a qualifying offense)”.

(3) VICTIM SUBMISSION OF MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY CONVENING AUTHORITY DURING CLEMENCY PHASE OF COURTS-MARTIAL PROCESS.—Subsection (d) of section 860 of title 10, United States Code (article 60 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 1706(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 960), is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by inserting “, if applicable” after “(article 54(e))”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “if applicable,”; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “loss” and inserting “harm”.

(4) RESTORATION OF WAIVER OF ARTICLE 32 HEARINGS BY THE ACCUSED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 832(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code (article 32(a)(1) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 1702(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 954), is amended by inserting “, unless such hearing is waived by the accused” after “preliminary hearing”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 834(a)(2) of such title (article 34(a)(2) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 1702(c)(3)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 957), is amended by inserting “(if there is such a report)” after “a preliminary hearing under section 832 of this title (article 32)”.

(5) NON-APPLICABILITY OF PROHIBITION ON PRE-TRIAL AGREEMENTS FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES WITH MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES.—Section 860(c)(4)(C)(ii) of title 10, United States Code (article 60(c)(4)(C)(ii) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 1702(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 955), is amended by inserting “pursuant to section 856(b) of this title (article 56(b))” after “applies”.

(b) DEFENSE COUNSEL INTERVIEW OF VICTIM OF AN ALLEGED SEX-RELATED OFFENSE.—

(1) REQUESTS TO INTERVIEW VICTIM THROUGH COUNSEL.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 846 of title 10, United States Code (article 46(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 958), is amended by striking “through trial counsel” and inserting “through the Special Victims’ Counsel or other counsel for the victim, if applicable”.

(2) CORRECTION OF REFERENCES TO TRIAL COUNSEL.—Such section is further amended by striking “trial counsel” each place it appears and inserting “counsel for the Government”.

(3) CORRECTION OF REFERENCES TO DEFENSE COUNSEL.—Such section is further amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “DEFENSE COUNSEL” and inserting “COUNSEL FOR ACCUSED”; and

(B) by striking “defense counsel” each place it appears and inserting “counsel for the accused”.

(c) SPECIAL VICTIMS’ COUNSEL FOR VICTIMS OF SEX-RELATED OFFENSES.—Section 1044e of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 1716(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 966), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4), by striking “the Department of Defense” and inserting “the United States”;;

(2) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting “, and within the Marine Corps, by the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps” after “employed”; and

(3) in subsection (e)(1), by inserting “concerned” after “jurisdiction of the Secretary”.

(d) REPEAL OF OFFENSE OF CONSENSUAL SODOMY UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.—

(1) CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF FORCIBLE SODOMY.—Section 925(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 125(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 1707 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 961), is amended by striking “force” and inserting “unlawful force”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) ARTICLE 43.—Section 843(b)(2)(B) of such title (article 43(b)(2)(B) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking “Sodomy” and inserting “Forcible sodomy”; and

(ii) in clause (v), by striking “sodomy” and inserting “forcible sodomy”.

(B) ARTICLE 118.—Section 918(4) of such title (article 118(4) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) is amended by striking “sodomy” and inserting “forcible sodomy”.

(e) CLARIFICATION OF SCOPE OF PROSPECTIVE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR PURPOSES OF INAPPROPRIATE AND PROHIBITED RELATIONSHIPS.—Section 1741(e)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 977; 10 U.S.C. prec. 501 note) is amended by inserting “who is pursuing or has recently pursued becoming a member of the Armed Forces and” after “a person”.

(f) EXTENSION OF CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS TO VICTIMS OF OFFENSES UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.—

(1) CLARIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON DEFINITION OF VICTIM TO NATURAL PERSONS.—Subsection (b) of section 806b of title 10, United States Code (article 6b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 1701 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 952), is amended by striking “a person” and inserting “an individual”.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO APPOINT INDIVIDUALS TO ASSUME RIGHTS OF CERTAIN VICTIMS.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “LEGAL GUARDIAN” and inserting “APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO ASSUME RIGHTS”;;

(B) by inserting “(but who is not a member of the armed forces)” after “under 18 years of age”;;

(C) by striking “designate a legal guardian from among the representatives” and inserting “designate a representative”;;

(D) by striking “other suitable person” and inserting “another suitable individual”; and

(E) by striking “the person” and inserting “the individual”.

(g) REVISION TO EFFECTIVE DATES TO FACILITATE TRANSITION TO REVISED RULES FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING REQUIREMENTS AND CONVENING AUTHORITY ACTION POST-CONVICTION.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR AMENDMENTS RELATED TO ARTICLE 32.—Effective as of December 26, 2013, and as if included therein as enacted, section 1702(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 958; 10 U.S.C. 802

note, 832 note) is amended by striking “one year after” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting “on the later of December 26, 2014, or the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and shall apply with respect to preliminary hearings conducted on or after that effective date.”.

(2) TRANSITION RULE FOR AMENDMENTS RELATED TO ARTICLE 60.—

(A) TRANSITION RULE.—Section 1702(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 958; 10 U.S.C. 860 note) is amended—

(i) by striking “The amendments” and inserting “(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) With respect to the findings and sentence of a court-martial that includes both a conviction for an offense committed before the effective date specified in subparagraph (A) and a conviction for an offense committed on or after that effective date, the convening authority shall have the same authority to take action on such findings and sentence as was in effect on the day before such effective date, except with respect to a mandatory minimum sentence under section 856(b) of title 10, United States Code (article 56(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).”.

(B) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the findings and sentence of a court-martial with respect to which the convening authority has taken action before the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 532. ORDERING OF DEPOSITIONS UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

Subsection (a) of section 849 of title 10, United States Code (article 49 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) At any time after charges have been signed as provided in section 830 of this title (article 30), oral or written depositions may be ordered as follows:

“(A) Before referral of such charges for trial, by the convening authority who has such charges for disposition.

“(B) After referral of such charges for trial, by the convening authority or the military judge hearing the case.

“(2) An authority authorized to order a deposition under paragraph (1) may order the deposition at the request of any party, but only if the party demonstrates that, due to exceptional circumstances, it is in the interest of justice that the testimony of the prospective witness be taken and preserved for use at a preliminary hearing under section 832 of this title (article 32) or a court-martial.

“(3) If a deposition is to be taken before charges are referred for trial, the authority under paragraph (1)(A) may designate commissioned officers as counsel for the Government and counsel for the accused, and may authorize those officers to take the deposition of any witness.”.

SEC. 533. ACCESS TO SPECIAL VICTIMS’ COUNSEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1044e of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) DESIGNATION; PURPOSES.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall designate legal counsel (to be known as ‘Special Victims’ Counsel’) for the purpose of providing legal assistance to an individual described in paragraph

(2) who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense, regardless of whether the report of that offense is restricted or unrestricted.

“(2) An individual described in this paragraph is any of the following:

“(A) An individual eligible for military legal assistance under section 1044 of this title.

“(B) An individual who is—

“(i) not covered under subparagraph (A);

“(ii) a member of a reserve component of the armed forces; and

“(iii) a victim of an alleged sex-related offense as described in paragraph (1)—

“(I) during a period in which the individual served on active duty, full-time National Guard duty, or inactive-duty training; or

“(II) during any period, regardless of the duty status of the individual, if the circumstances of the alleged sex-related offense have a nexus to the military service of the victim, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking “eligible for military legal assistance under section 1044 of this title” each place it appears and inserting “described in subsection (a)(2)”.

SEC. 534. ENHANCEMENT OF VICTIMS' RIGHTS IN CONNECTION WITH PROSECUTION OF CERTAIN SEX-RELATED OFFENSES.

(a) REPRESENTATION BY SPECIAL VICTIMS' COUNSEL.—Section 1044e(b)(6) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Accompanying the victim” and inserting “Representing the victim”.

(b) CONSULTATION REGARDING VICTIM'S PREFERENCE IN PROSECUTION VENUE.—

(1) CONSULTATION PROCESS REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a process to ensure consultation with the victim of an alleged sex-related offense that occurs in the United States to solicit the victim's preference regarding whether the offense should be prosecuted by court-martial or in a civilian court with jurisdiction over the offense.

(2) CONVENING AUTHORITY CONSIDERATION OF PREFERENCE.—The preference expressed by the victim of an alleged sex-related offense under paragraph (1) regarding the prosecution of the offense, while not binding, should be considered by the convening authority in making the determination regarding whether to refer the charge or specification for the offense to a court-martial for trial.

(3) NOTICE TO APPROPRIATE JURISDICTION OF VICTIM'S PREFERENCE FOR CIVILIAN PROSECUTION.—If the victim of an alleged sex-related offense expresses a preference under paragraph (1) for prosecution of the offense in a civilian court, the convening authority described in paragraph (2) shall ensure that the civilian authority with jurisdiction over the offense is notified of the victim's preference for civilian prosecution.

(4) NOTICE TO VICTIM OF STATUS OF CIVILIAN PROSECUTION WHEN VICTIM EXPRESSES PREFERENCE FOR CIVILIAN PROSECUTION.—Following notification of the civilian authority with jurisdiction over an alleged sex-related offense of the preference of the victim of the offense for prosecution of the offense in a civilian court, the convening authority shall be responsible for notifying the victim if the convening authority learns of any decision by the civilian authority to prosecute or not prosecute the offense in a civilian court.

(c) MODIFICATION OF MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Part III of the Manual for Courts-Martial shall be modified to provide that when a victim of an al-

leged sex-related offense has a right to be heard in connection with the prosecution of the alleged sex-related such offense, the victim may exercise that right through counsel, including through a Special Victims' Counsel under section 1044e of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)).

(d) NOTICE TO COUNSEL ON SCHEDULING OF PROCEEDINGS.—The Secretary concerned shall establish policies and procedures designed to ensure that any counsel of the victim of an alleged sex-related offense, including a Special Victims' Counsel under section 1044e of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)), is provided prompt and adequate notice of the scheduling of any hearing, trial, or other proceeding in connection with the prosecution of such offense in order to permit such counsel the opportunity to prepare for such proceeding.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “alleged sex-related offense” has the meaning given that term in section 1044e(g) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term “Secretary concerned” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(9) of such title.

SEC. 535. ENFORCEMENT OF CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS RELATED TO PROTECTIONS AFFORDED BY CERTAIN MILITARY RULES OF EVIDENCE.

Section 806b of title 10, United States Code (article 6b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) ENFORCEMENT BY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS.—(1) If the victim of an offense under this chapter believes that a court-martial ruling violates the victim's rights afforded by a Military Rule of Evidence specified in paragraph (2), the victim may petition the Court of Criminal Appeals for a writ of mandamus to require the court-martial to comply with the Military Rule of Evidence.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies with respect to the protections afforded by the following:

“(A) Military Rule of Evidence 513, relating to the psychotherapist-patient privilege.

“(B) Military Rule of Evidence 412, relating to the admission of evidence regarding a victim's sexual background.”.

SEC. 536. MODIFICATION OF MILITARY RULES OF EVIDENCE RELATING TO ADMISSIBILITY OF GENERAL MILITARY CHARACTER TOWARD PROBABILITY OF INNOCENCE.

(a) MODIFICATION REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Rule 404(a) of the Military Rules of Evidence shall be amended to provide that the general military character of an accused is not admissible for the purpose of showing the probability of innocence of the accused for an offense specified in subsection (b).

(b) COVERED OFFENSES.—Subsection (a) applies to the following offenses under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice):

(1) An offense under sections 920 through 923a of such title (articles 120 through 123a).

(2) An offense under sections 925 through 927 of such title (articles 125 through 127).

(3) An offense under sections 929 through 932 of such title (articles 129 through 132).

(4) Any other offense under such chapter (the Uniform Code of Military Justice) in which evidence of the general military character of the accused is not relevant to an element of an offense for which the accused has been charged.

(5) An attempt to commit an offense or a conspiracy to commit an offense specified in a preceding paragraph as punishable under section 880 or 881 of such title (article 80 or 81).

SEC. 537. MODIFICATION OF RULE 513 OF THE MILITARY RULES OF EVIDENCE, RELATING TO THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST DISCLOSURE OF COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN PSYCHOTHERAPISTS AND PATIENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence shall be modified as follows:

(1) To include communications with other licensed mental health professionals within the communications covered by the privilege.

(2) To strike the current exception to the privilege contained in subparagraph (d)(8) of Rule 513.

(3) To require a party seeking production or admission of records or communications protected by the privilege—

(A) to show a specific factual basis demonstrating a reasonable likelihood that the records or communications would yield evidence admissible under an exception to the privilege;

(B) to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the requested information meets one of the enumerated exceptions to the privilege;

(C) to show that the information sought is not merely cumulative of other information available; and

(D) to show that the party made reasonable efforts to obtain the same or substantially similar information through non-privileged sources.

(4) To authorize the military judge to conduct a review *in camera* of records or communications only when—

(A) the moving party has met its burden as established pursuant to paragraph (3); and

(B) an examination of the information is necessary to rule on the production or admissibility of protected records or communications.

(5) To require that any production or disclosure permitted by the military judge be narrowly tailored to only the specific records or communications, or portions of such records or communications, that meet the requirements for one of the enumerated exceptions to the privilege and are included in the stated purpose for which the such records or communications are sought.

SEC. 538. MODIFICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICY ON RETENTION OF EVIDENCE IN A SEXUAL ASSAULT CASE TO PERMIT RETURN OF PERSONAL PROPERTY UPON COMPLETION OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS.

Section 586 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1434; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) RETURN OF PERSONAL PROPERTY UPON COMPLETION OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding subsection (c)(4)(A), personal property retained as evidence in connection with an incident of sexual assault involving a member of the Armed Forces may be returned to the rightful owner of such property after the conclusion of all legal, adverse action, and administrative proceedings related to such incident.”.

SEC. 539. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAMINERS FOR THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) PERSONNEL ELIGIBLE FOR ASSIGNMENT.—

(1) SPECIFIED PERSONNEL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an individual who may be assigned to duty as a Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner (SAFE) for the Armed Forces is limited to members of the Armed

Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who are also one of the following:

- (A) A physician.
- (B) A nurse practitioner.
- (C) A nurse midwife.
- (D) A physician assistant.
- (E) A registered nurse.

(2) **INDEPENDENT DUTY CORPSMEN.**—An independent duty corpsman or equivalent may be assigned to duty as a Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner for the Armed Forces if the assignment of an individual specified in paragraph (1) is impracticable.

(b) **TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain, and update when appropriate, a training and certification program for Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners. The training and certification programs shall apply uniformly to all Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners under the jurisdiction of the Secretaries of the military departments.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each training and certification program under this subsection shall include training in sexual assault forensic examinations by qualified personnel who possess—

(A) a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner—Adult/Adolescent (SANE-A) certification or equivalent certification; or

(B) training and clinical or forensic experience in sexual assault forensic examinations similar to that required for a certification described in subparagraph (A).

(3) **NATURE OF TRAINING.**—The training provided under each training and certification program under this subsection shall incorporate and reflect current best practices and standards on sexual assault forensic examinations.

(4) **APPLICABILITY OF TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.**—Effective beginning one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, an individual may not be assigned to duty as a Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner for the Armed Forces unless the individual has completed, by the date of such assignment, all training required under the training and certification program under this subsection.

(c) **REPORT ON TRAINING AND QUALIFICATIONS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAMINERS.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare a report on the adequacy of the training and qualifications of each member of the Armed Forces and civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is assigned responsibilities of a Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner.

(2) **REPORT ELEMENTS.**—The report shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the adequacy of the training and certifications required for the members and employees described in paragraph (1).

(B) Such improvements as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate in the process used to select and assign members and employees to positions that include responsibility for sexual assault forensic examinations.

(C) Such improvements as the Secretary considers appropriate for training and certifying member and employees that perform sexual assault forensic examinations.

(3) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit the report to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(d) **CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Subsection (b) of section 1725 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 971) is amended—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “NURSE EXAMINERS” and inserting “FORENSIC EXAMINERS”;

(B) in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking “sexual assault nurse examiner” each place it appears and inserting “Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner”;

(C) in paragraph (1), by striking “sexual assault nurse examiners” and inserting “Sexual Assault Forensic Examiners”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (3).

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The heading of such section is amended by striking “NURSE EXAMINERS” and inserting “FORENSIC EXAMINERS”.

SEC. 540. MODIFICATION OF TERM OF JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **MODIFICATION OF TERMS.**—Section 942(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code (article 142(b)(2) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “March 31” and inserting “January 31”;

(B) by striking “October 1” and inserting “July 31”; and

(C) by striking “September 30” and inserting “July 31”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “September 30” each place it appears and inserting “July 31”; and

(B) by striking “April 1” and inserting “February 1”.

(b) **SAVING PROVISION.**—No person who is serving as a judge of the court on the date of the enactment of this Act, and no survivor of any such person, shall be deprived of any annuity provided by section 945 of title 10, United States Code, by the operation of the amendments made by subsection (a).

SEC. 541. REVIEW OF DECISIONS NOT TO REFER CHARGES OF CERTAIN SEX-RELATED OFFENSES FOR TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL IF REQUESTED BY CHIEF PROSECUTOR.

Section 1744(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 981; 10 U.S.C. 834 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “(c)” and all that follows through “In any case where” and inserting the following:

“(c) **REVIEW OF CERTAIN CASES NOT REFERRED TO COURT-MARTIAL.**—

“(1) **CASES NOT REFERRED FOLLOWING STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE RECOMMENDATION FOR REFERRAL FOR TRIAL.**—In any case where”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) **CASES NOT REFERRED BY CONVENING AUTHORITY UPON REQUEST FOR REVIEW BY CHIEF PROSECUTOR.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In any case where a convening authority decides not to refer a charge of a sex-related offense to trial by court-martial, the Secretary of the military department concerned shall review the decision as a superior authority authorized to exercise general court-martial convening authority if the chief prosecutor of the Armed Force concerned, in response to a request by the detailed counsel for the Government, requests review of the decision by the Secretary.

“(B) **CHIEF PROSECUTOR DEFINED.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘chief prosecutor’ means the chief prosecutor or equivalent position of an Armed Force, or, if an Armed Force does not have a chief prosecutor or equivalent position, such other trial counsel as shall be

designated by the Judge Advocate General of that Armed Force, or in the case of the Marine Corps, the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.”.

SEC. 542. ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF DISPOSITION OF MOST SERIOUS OFFENSES IDENTIFIED IN UNRESTRICTED REPORTS ON SEXUAL ASSAULTS IN ANNUAL REPORTS ON SEXUAL ASSAULTS IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **SUBMITTAL TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE OF INFORMATION ON EACH ARMED FORCE.**—Subsection (b) of section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) An analysis of the disposition of the most serious offenses occurring during sexual assaults committed by members of the Armed Force during the year covered by the report, as identified in unrestricted reports of sexual assault by any members of the Armed Forces, including the numbers of reports identifying offenses that were disposed of by each of the following:

“(A) Conviction by court-martial, including a separate statement of the most serious charge preferred and the most serious charge for which convicted.

“(B) Acquittal of all charges at court-martial.

“(C) Non-judicial punishment under section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

“(D) Administrative action, including by each type of administrative action imposed.

“(E) Dismissal of all charges, including by reason for dismissal and by stage of proceedings in which dismissal occurred.”.

(b) **SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ASSESSMENT OF INFORMATION IN REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) an assessment of the information submitted to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b)(11); and”;

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting “other” before “assessments”.

(c) **APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply beginning with the report regarding sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces required to be submitted by March 1, 2015, under section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

SEC. 543. PLAN FOR LIMITED USE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION ON SEXUAL ASSAULTS IN RESTRICTED REPORTS BY MILITARY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan that will allow an individual who files a restricted report on an incident of sexual assault to elect to permit a military criminal investigative organization, on a confidential

basis and without affecting the restricted nature of the report, to access certain information in the report, including identifying information of the alleged perpetrator if available, for the purpose of identifying individuals who are suspected of perpetrating multiple sexual assaults.

(b) **PLAN ELEMENTS.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An explanation of how the military criminal investigative organization would use, maintain, and protect information in the restricted report.

(2) An explanation of how the identity of an individual who elects to provide access to such information will be protected.

(3) A timeline for implementation of the plan during the one-year period beginning on the date of the submission of the plan to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

SEC. 544. IMPROVED DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INFORMATION REPORTING AND COLLECTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INCIDENTS INVOLVING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **DATA REPORTING AND COLLECTION IMPROVEMENTS.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a comprehensive management plan to address deficiencies in the reporting of information on incidents of domestic violence involving members of the Armed Forces for inclusion in the Department of Defense database on domestic violence incidents required by section 1562 of title 10, United States Code, to ensure that the database provides an accurate count of domestic violence incidents and any consequent disciplinary action.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 543(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 1562 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively.

SEC. 545. ADDITIONAL DUTIES FOR JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS PANEL.

(a) **ADDITIONAL DUTIES IMPOSED.**—The independent panel established by the Secretary of Defense under section 576(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1758), known as the “judicial proceedings panel”, shall perform the following additional duties:

(1) Conduct a review and assessment regarding the impact of the use of any mental health records of the victim of an offense under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), by the accused during the preliminary hearing conducted under section 832 of such title (article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and during court-martial proceedings, as compared to the use of similar records in civilian criminal legal proceedings.

(2) Conduct a review and assessment regarding the establishment of a privilege under the Military Rules of Evidence against the disclosure of communications between—

(A) users of and personnel staffing the Department of Defense Safe Helpline; and

(B) users of and personnel staffing of the Department of Defense Safe HelpRoom.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF RESULTS.**—The judicial proceedings panel shall include the results of the reviews and assessments conducted under subsection (a) in one of the reports required by section 576(c)(2)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1760).

SEC. 546. DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION, PROSECUTION, AND DEFENSE OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain within the Department of Defense an advisory committee to be known as the “Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces” (in this section referred to as the “Advisory Committee”).

(2) **DEADLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish the Advisory Committee not later than 30 days before the termination date of the independent panel established by the Secretary under section 576(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1758), known as the “judicial proceedings panel”.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Advisory Committee shall consist of not more than 20 members, to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense, who have experience with the investigation, prosecution, and defense of allegations of sexual assault offenses. Members of the Advisory Committee may include Federal and State prosecutors, judges, law professors, and private attorneys. Members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty may not serve as a member of the Advisory Committee.

(c) **DUTIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretary of Defense on the investigation, prosecution, and defense of allegations of rape, forcible sodomy, sexual assault, and other sexual misconduct involving members of the Armed Forces.

(2) **BASIS FOR PROVISION OF ADVICE.**—For purposes of providing advice to the Secretary pursuant to this subsection, the Advisory Committee shall review, on an ongoing basis, cases involving allegations of sexual misconduct described in paragraph (1).

(d) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than March 30 each year, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report describing the results of the activities of the Advisory Committee pursuant to this section during the preceding year.

(e) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Advisory Committee shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the establishment of the Advisory Committee pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) **CONTINUATION.**—The Secretary of Defense may continue the Advisory Committee after the termination date applicable under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that continuation of the Advisory Committee after that date is advisable and appropriate. If the Secretary determines to continue the Advisory Committee after that date, the Secretary shall submit to the President and the congressional committees specified in subsection (d) a report describing the reasons for that determination and specifying the new termination date for the Advisory Committee.

(f) **DUE DATE FOR ANNUAL REPORT OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS PANEL.**—Section 576(c)(2)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1760) is amended by inserting “annually thereafter” after “reports”.

SEC. 547. CONFIDENTIAL REVIEW OF CHARACTERIZATION OF TERMS OF DISCHARGE OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE VICTIMS OF SEXUAL OFFENSES.

(a) **CONFIDENTIAL REVIEW PROCESS THROUGH BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.**—The Secretaries of the military departments shall each establish a confidential process, utilizing boards for the correction of military records of the military department concerned, by which an individual who was the victim of a sex-related offense during service in the Armed Forces may challenge the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of the individual from the Armed Forces on the grounds that the terms or characterization were adversely affected by the individual being the victim of such an offense.

(b) **CONSIDERATION OF INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCES IN CONNECTION WITH OFFENSES.**—In deciding whether to modify the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation from the Armed Forces of an individual described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the military department concerned shall instruct boards for the correction of military records—

(1) to give due consideration to the psychological and physical aspects of the individual's experience in connection with the sex-related offense; and

(2) to determine what bearing such experience may have had on the circumstances surrounding the individual's discharge or separation from the Armed Forces.

(c) **PRESERVATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY.**—Documents considered and decisions rendered pursuant to the process required by subsection (a) shall not be made available to the public, except with the consent of the individual concerned.

(d) **SEX-RELATED OFFENSE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “sex-related offense” means any of the following:

(1) Rape or sexual assault under subsection (a) or (b) of section 920 of title 10, United States Code (article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(2) Forcible sodomy under section 925 of such title (article 125 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(3) An attempt to commit an offense specified in paragraph (1) or (2) as punishable under section 880 of such title (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

Subtitle E—Member Education, Training, and Transition

SEC. 551. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY TO ASSIST MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO OBTAIN PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 2015. Program to assist members in obtaining professional credentials

“(a) **PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall carry out a program to enable members of the armed forces to obtain, while serving in the armed forces, professional credentials related to military training and skills that—

“(1) are acquired during service in the armed forces incident to the performance of their military duties; and

“(2) translate into civilian occupations.

“(b) **PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.**—(1) Under the program required by this section, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to the Coast

Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall provide for the payment of expenses of members for professional accreditation, Federal occupational licenses, State-imposed and professional licenses, professional certification, and related expenses.

“(2) The authority under paragraph (1) may not be used to pay the expenses of a member to obtain professional credentials that are a prerequisite for appointment in the armed forces.

“(C) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

“(2) The regulations shall apply uniformly to the armed forces to the extent practicable.

“(3) The regulations shall include the following:

“(A) Requirements for eligibility for participation in the program under this section.

“(B) A description of the professional credentials and occupations covered by the program.

“(C) Mechanisms for oversight of the payment of expenses and the provision of other benefits under the program.

“(D) Such other matters in connection with the payment of expenses and the provision of other benefits under the program as the Secretaries consider appropriate.

“(d) EXPENSES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘expenses’ means expenses for class room instruction, hands-on training (and associated materials), manuals, study guides and materials, text books, processing fees, and test fees and related fees.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 101 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2015 and inserting the following new item:

“2015. Program to assist members in obtaining professional credentials.”.

SEC. 552. APPLICABILITY OF SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE AND RELATED MILITARY JUSTICE ENHANCEMENTS TO MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES.

(a) MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall ensure that the provisions of title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 950), including amendments made by that title, and the provisions of subtitle D, including amendments made by such subtitle, apply to the United States Military Academy, the Naval Academy, and the Air Force Academy, as applicable.

(b) COAST GUARD ACADEMY.—The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall ensure that the provisions of title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 950), including amendments made by that title, and the provisions of subtitle D, including amendments made by such subtitle, apply to the Coast Guard Academy.

SEC. 553. AUTHORIZED DURATION OF FOREIGN AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES AT MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES.

(a) UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.—Section 4345a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “two weeks” and inserting “four weeks”.

(b) NAVAL ACADEMY.—Section 6957b(a) of such title is amended by striking “two weeks” and inserting “four weeks”.

(c) AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—Section 9345a(a) of such title is amended by striking “two weeks” and inserting “four weeks”.

SEC. 554. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT SUPPORT FOR AIR FORCE ACADEMY ATHLETIC PROGRAMS.

Section 9362 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (e), (f), and (g) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(e) ACCEPTANCE OF SUPPORT.—

“(1) SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM THE CORPORATION.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, the Secretary of the Air Force may accept from the corporation funds, supplies, equipment, and services for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy.

“(2) FUNDS RECEIVED FROM OTHER SOURCES.—The Secretary may charge fees for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy. The Secretary may accept and retain fees for services and other benefits provided incident to the operation of its athletic programs, including fees from the National Collegiate Athletic Association, fees from athletic conferences, game guarantees from other educational institutions, fees for ticketing or licensing, and other consideration provided incidental to the execution of the athletic programs of the Academy.

“(3) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary shall ensure that contributions accepted under this subsection do not—

“(A) reflect unfavorably on the ability of the Department of the Air Force, any of its employees, or any member of the armed forces to carry out any responsibility or duty in a fair and objective manner; or

“(B) compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Air Force, or any individual involved in such a program.

“(f) LEASES AND LICENSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may, in accordance with section 2667 of this title, enter into leases or licenses with the corporation for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy. Consideration provided under such a lease or license may be provided in the form of funds, supplies, equipment, and services for the support of the athletic programs of the Academy.

“(2) SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Secretary may provide support services to the corporation without charge while the corporation conducts its support activities at the Academy. In this paragraph, the term ‘support services’ includes utilities, office furnishings and equipment, communications services, records staging and archiving, audio and video support, and security systems in conjunction with the leasing or licensing of property. Any such support services may only be provided without any liability of the United States to the corporation.

“(g) CONTRACTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with the corporation for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy. Notwithstanding section 2304(k) of this title, the Secretary may enter such contracts or cooperative agreements on a sole source basis pursuant to section 2304(c)(5) of this title. Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, a cooperative agreement under this section may be used to acquire property, services, or travel for the direct benefit or use of the athletic programs of the Academy.

“(h) TRADEMARKS AND SERVICE MARKS.—

“(1) LICENSING, MARKETING, AND SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENTS.—An agreement under subsection (g) may, consistent with section 2260 of this title (other than subsection (d) of such section), authorize the corporation to enter into licensing, marketing, and sponsorship agreements relating to trademarks and

service marks identifying the Academy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—No licensing, marketing, or sponsorship agreement may be entered into under paragraph (1) if—

“(A) such agreement would reflect unfavorably on the ability of the Department of the Air Force, any of its employees, or any member of the armed forces to carry out any responsibility or duty in a fair and objective manner; or

“(B) the Secretary determines that the use of the trademark or service mark would compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of any program of the Department of the Air Force, or any individual involved in such a program.

“(i) RETENTION AND USE OF FUNDS.—Any funds received under this section may be retained for use in support of the athletic programs of the Academy and shall remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 555. PILOT PROGRAM TO ASSIST MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN OBTAINING POST-SERVICE EMPLOYMENT.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may conduct the program described in subsection (c) to enhance the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services to eligible members of the Armed Forces described in subsection (b) for the purposes of—

(1) assisting such members in obtaining post-service employment; and

(2) reducing the amount of “Unemployment Compensation for Ex-Servicemembers” that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating pays into the Unemployment Trust Fund.

(b) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—Employment services provided under the program are limited to members of the Armed Forces, including members of the reserve components, who are being separated from the Armed Forces or released from active duty.

(c) EVALUATION OF USE OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT STAFFING AGENCIES.—

(1) PROGRAM DESCRIBED.—The Secretary of Defense may execute a program to evaluate the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of utilizing the services of civilian employment staffing agencies to assist eligible members of the Armed Forces in obtaining post-service employment.

(2) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—To manage the program authorized by this subsection, the Secretary of Defense may select a civilian organization (in this section referred to as the “program manager”) whose principal members have experience—

(A) administering pay-for-performance programs; and

(B) within the employment staffing industry.

(3) EXCLUSION.—The program manager may not be a staffing agency.

(d) ELIGIBLE CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT STAFFING AGENCIES.—In consultation with the program manager if utilized under subsection (c)(2), the Secretary of Defense shall establish the eligibility requirements to be used for the selection of civilian employment staffing agencies to participate in the program. In establishing the eligibility requirements for the selection of the civilian employment staffing agencies, the Secretary of Defense shall also take into account civilian employment staffing agencies that are willing to work and consult with State and county Veterans Affairs offices and State National Guard offices, when appropriate.

(e) **PAYMENT OF STAFFING AGENCY FEES.**—To encourage employers to employ an eligible member of the Armed Forces under the program if executed under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall pay a participating civilian employment staffing agency a portion of its agency fee (not to exceed 50 percent above the member's hourly wage). Payment of the agency fee will only be made after the member has been employed and paid by the private sector and the hours worked have been verified by the Secretary. The staffing agency shall be paid on a weekly basis only for hours the member worked, but not to exceed a total of 800 hours.

(f) **OVERSIGHT REQUIREMENTS.**—In conducting the program, the Secretary of Defense shall establish—

(1) program monitoring standards; and
(2) reporting requirements, including the hourly wage for each eligible member of the Armed Forces obtaining employment under the program, the numbers of hours worked during the month, and the number of members who remained employed with the same employer after completing the first 800 hours of employment.

(g) **SOURCE AND LIMITATION ON PROGRAM OBLIGATIONS.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense for operation and maintenance for each fiscal year during which the program under this section is authorized, not more than \$35,000,000 may be used to carry out the program.

(h) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—If the Secretary of Defense executes the program under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the results of the program, particularly whether the program achieved the purposes specified in subsection (a). The report shall be submitted not later than January 15, 2019.

(2) **COMPARISON WITH OTHER PROGRAMS.**—The report shall include a comparison of the results of the program conducted under this section and the results of other employment assistant programs utilized by the Department of Defense. The comparison shall include the number of members of the Armed Forces obtaining employment through each program and the cost to the Department per member.

(3) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(i) **DURATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to carry out programs under this section expires on September 30, 2018.

SEC. 556. PLAN FOR EDUCATION OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES ON CYBER MATTERS.

(a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 360 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Secretaries of the military departments, shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan for the education of officers and enlisted members of the Armed Forces relating to cyber security and cyber activities of the Department of Defense.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A framework for provision of basic cyber education for all members of the Armed Forces.

(2) A framework for undergraduate and postgraduate education, joint professional military education, and strategic war gaming for cyber strategic and operational leadership.

(3) Definitions of required positions, including military occupational specialties and rating specialties for each military department, along with the corresponding level of cyber training, education, qualifications, or certifications required for each specialty.

SEC. 557. ENHANCEMENT OF INFORMATION PROVIDED TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS REGARDING USE OF POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AND FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID THROUGH TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enhance the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program (TAP) of the Department of Defense by providing additional information that is more complete and accurate than the information provided as of the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to individuals who apply for educational assistance under chapter 30 or 33 of title 38, United States Code, to pursue a program of education at an institution of higher learning.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The additional information required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Information provided by the Secretary of Education that is publically available and addresses—

(i) to the extent practicable, differences between types of institutions of higher learning in such matters as tuition and fees, admission requirements, accreditation, transferability of credits, credit for qualifying military training, time required to complete a degree, and retention and job placement rates; and

(ii) how Federal educational assistance provided under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) may be used in conjunction with educational assistance provided under chapters 30 and 33 of title 38, United States Code.

(B) Information about the Postsecondary Education Complaint System of the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Education, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

(C) Information about the GI Bill Comparison Tool of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(D) Information about each of the Principles of Excellence established by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Education pursuant to Executive Order 13607 of April 27, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 25861), including how to recognize whether an institution of higher learning may be violating any of such principles.

(E) Information to enable individuals described in paragraph (1) to develop a postsecondary education plan appropriate and compatible with their educational goals.

(F) Such other information as the Secretary of Education considers appropriate.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Education, and the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION COMPONENT ONLINE.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program is available to members of the Armed Forces on an Internet website of the Department of Defense so that members have an option to complete such component electronically and remotely.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “institution of higher learning” has the meaning given such term in section 3452 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term “types of institutions of higher learning” means the following:

(A) An educational institution described in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(B) An educational institution described in subsection (b) or (c) of section 102 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1002).

SEC. 558. PROCEDURES FOR PROVISION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO STATE VETERANS AGENCIES TO FACILITATE THE TRANSITION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM MILITARY SERVICE TO CIVILIAN LIFE.

(a) **PROCEDURES REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop procedures to share the information described in subsection (b) regarding members of the Armed Forces who are being separated from the Armed Forces with State veterans agencies in electronic data format as a means of facilitating the transition of such members from military service to civilian life.

(b) **COVERED INFORMATION.**—The information to be shared with State veterans agencies regarding a member shall include the following:

(1) Military service and separation data.

(2) A personal email address.

(3) A personal telephone number.

(4) A mailing address.

(c) **CONSENT.**—The procedures developed pursuant to subsection (a) shall require the consent of a member of the Armed Forces before any information described in subsection (b) regarding the member is shared with a State veterans agency.

(d) **USE OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the information shared with State veterans agencies in accordance with the procedures developed pursuant to subsection (a) is only shared by such agencies with county government veterans service offices for such purposes as the Secretary shall specify for the administration and delivery of benefits.

(e) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the progress made by the Secretary—

(A) in developing the procedures required by subsection (a); and

(B) in sharing information with State veterans agencies as described in such subsection.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the procedures developed to share information with State veterans agencies.

(B) A description of the sharing activities carried out by the Secretary in accordance with such procedures.

(C) The number of members of the Armed Force who gave their consent for the sharing of information with State veterans agencies.

(D) Such recommendations as the Secretary may have for legislative or administrative action to improve the sharing of information as described in subsection (a).

Subtitle F—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters

SEC. 561. CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO ASSIST LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES THAT BENEFIT DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOLS WITH SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF MILITARY DEPENDENT STUDENTS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities as specified in the funding table in section 4301, \$25,000,000 shall be available only for the purpose of providing assistance to local educational agencies under subsection (a) of section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 20 U.S.C. 7703b).

(b) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “local educational agency” has the meaning given that term in section 8013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7713(9)).

SEC. 562. IMPACT AID FOR CHILDREN WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 pursuant to section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities as specified in the funding table in section 4301, \$5,000,000 shall be available for payments under section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 114 Stat. 1654A-77; 20 U.S.C. 7703a).

SEC. 563. AMENDMENTS TO THE IMPACT AID IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2012.

Section 563(c) of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1748; 20 U.S.C. 6301 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “(other than the amendment made by paragraph (3)(A) of such subsection)” after “subsection (b)”;

(B) by striking “2-year” and inserting “5-year”;

(2) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting “(other than the amendment made by paragraph (3)(A) of such subsection)” after “subsection (b)”;

(B) by striking “2-year” and inserting “5-year”;

(C) by inserting “(other than the amendment made by paragraph (3)(A) of such subsection)” after “made by such subsection”.

SEC. 564. AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY NON-UNITED STATES CITIZENS AS TEACHERS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSEAS DEPENDENTS' SCHOOL SYSTEM.

Section 2(2)(A) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (20 U.S.C. 901(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the comma at the end the following: “or, in the case of a teaching position that involves instruction in the host-nation language, a local national when a citizen of the United States is not reasonably available to provide such instruction”.

SEC. 565. INCLUSION OF DOMESTIC DEPENDENT ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS AMONG FUNCTIONS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION.

(a) EXPANSION OF FUNCTIONS.—Subsection (c) of section 1411 of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 929) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, and of the domestic dependent elementary and sec-

ondary school system established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code,” after “of the defense dependents' education system”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and in the domestic dependent elementary and secondary school system” before the comma at the end.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCIL.—Subsection (a)(1)(B) of such section is amended—

(1) by inserting “and the domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code” after “the defense dependents' education system”;

(2) by inserting “either” before “such system”.

SEC. 566. PROTECTION OF CHILD CUSTODY ARRANGEMENTS FOR PARENTS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION.—Title II of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 521 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 208. CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION.

“(a) DURATION OF TEMPORARY CUSTODY ORDER BASED ON CERTAIN DEPLOYMENTS.—If a court renders a temporary order for custodial responsibility for a child based solely on a deployment or anticipated deployment of a parent who is a servicemember, the court shall require that the temporary order shall expire not later than the period justified by the deployment of the servicemember.

“(b) LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF MEMBER'S DEPLOYMENT IN DETERMINATION OF CHILD'S BEST INTEREST.—If a motion or a petition is filed seeking a permanent order to modify the custody of the child of a servicemember, no court may consider the absence of the servicemember by reason of deployment, or the possibility of deployment, as the sole factor in determining the best interest of the child.

“(c) NO FEDERAL JURISDICTION OR RIGHT OF ACTION OR REMOVAL.—Nothing in this section shall create a Federal right of action or otherwise give rise to Federal jurisdiction or create a right of removal.

“(d) PREEMPTION.—In any case where State law applicable to a child custody proceeding involving a temporary order as contemplated in this section provides a higher standard of protection to the rights of the parent who is a deploying servicemember than the rights provided under this section with respect to such temporary order, the appropriate court shall apply the higher State standard.

“(e) DEPLOYMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘deployment’ means the movement or mobilization of a servicemember to a location for a period of longer than 60 days and not longer than 540 days pursuant to temporary or permanent official orders—

“(1) that are designated as unaccompanied;

“(2) for which dependent travel is not authorized; or

“(3) that otherwise do not permit the movement of family members to that location.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title II the following new item:

“Sec. 208. Child custody protection.”.

SEC. 567. IMPROVED CONSISTENCY IN DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING IN ARMED FORCES SUICIDE PREVENTION EFFORTS.

(a) POLICY FOR STANDARD SUICIDE DATA COLLECTION, REPORTING, AND ASSESSMENT.—

(1) POLICY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe a policy for the develop-

ment of a standard method for collecting, reporting, and assessing information regarding—

(A) any suicide or attempted suicide involving a member of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof; and

(B) any death that is reported as a suicide involving a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces.

(2) PURPOSE OF POLICY.—The purpose of the policy required by this subsection is to improve the consistency and comprehensiveness of—

(A) the suicide prevention policy developed pursuant to section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note); and

(B) the suicide prevention and resilience program for the National Guard and Reserves established pursuant to section 10219 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop the policy required by this subsection in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

(b) SUBMISSION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit the policy developed under subsection (a) to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall implement the policy developed under subsection (a) not later than 180 days after the date of the submittal of the policy under paragraph (1).

(c) DEPENDENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term “dependent”, with respect to a member of the Armed Forces, means a person described in section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code, except that, in the case of a parent or parent-in-law of the member, the income requirements of subparagraph (E) of such section do not apply.

SEC. 568. IMPROVED DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO EFFORTS TO REDUCE UNDEREMPLOYMENT OF SPOUSES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CLOSE THE WAGE GAP BETWEEN MILITARY SPOUSES AND THEIR CIVILIAN COUNTERPARTS.

(a) DATA COLLECTION EFFORTS.—In addition to monitoring the number of spouses of members of the Armed Forces who obtain employment through military spouse employment programs, the Secretary of Defense shall collect data to evaluate the effectiveness of military spouse employment programs—

(1) in addressing the underemployment of military spouses;

(2) in matching military spouses' education and experience to available employment positions; and

(3) in closing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report evaluating the progress of military spouse employment programs—

(1) in reducing military spouse unemployment and underemployment; and

(2) in reducing the wage gap between military spouses and their civilian counterparts.

(c) MILITARY SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “military spouse employment programs” means the Military Spouse Employment Partnership (MSEP).

Subtitle G—Decorations and Awards**SEC. 571. MEDALS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WHO WERE KILLED OR WOUNDED IN AN ATTACK BY A FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.**

(a) PURPLE HEART.—

(1) AWARD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1129 the following new section:

“§ 1129a. Purple Heart: members killed or wounded in attacks by foreign terrorist organizations

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the award of the Purple Heart, the Secretary concerned shall treat a member of the armed forces described in subsection (b) in the same manner as a member who is killed or wounded as a result of an international terrorist attack against the United States.

“(b) COVERED MEMBERS.—(1) A member described in this subsection is a member on active duty who was killed or wounded in an attack by a foreign terrorist organization in circumstances where the death or wound is the result of an attack targeted on the member due to such member's status as a member of the armed forces, unless the death or wound is the result of willful misconduct of the member.

“(2) For purposes of this section, an attack by an individual or entity shall be considered to be an attack by a foreign terrorist organization if—

“(A) the individual or entity was in communication with the foreign terrorist organization before the attack; and

“(B) the attack was inspired or motivated by the foreign terrorist organization.

“(c) FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘foreign terrorist organization’ means an entity designated as a foreign terrorist organization by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189).”

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 57 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1129 the following new item:

“1129a. Purple Heart: members killed or wounded in attacks by foreign terrorist organizations.”

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—

(A) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as of September 11, 2001.

(B) REVIEW OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS INCIDENTS.—The Secretary concerned shall undertake a review of each death or wounding of a member of the Armed Forces that occurred between September 11, 2001, and the date of the enactment of this Act under circumstances that could qualify as being the result of an attack described in section 1129a of title 10, United States Code (as added by paragraph (1)), to determine whether the death or wounding qualifies as a death or wounding resulting from an attack by a foreign terrorist organization for purposes of the award of the Purple Heart pursuant to such section (as so added).

(C) ACTIONS FOLLOWING REVIEW.—If the death or wounding of a member of the Armed Forces reviewed under subparagraph (B) is determined to qualify as a death or wounding resulting from an attack by a foreign terrorist organization as described in section 1129a of title 10, United States Code (as so added), the Secretary concerned shall take

appropriate action under such section to award the Purple Heart to the member.

(D) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “Secretary concerned” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(9) of title 10, United States Code.

(b) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE MEDAL FOR THE DEFENSE OF FREEDOM.—

(1) REVIEW OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2009, ATTACK AT FORT HOOD, TEXAS.—If the Secretary concerned determines, after a review under subsection (a)(2)(B) regarding the attack that occurred at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009, that the death or wounding of any member of the Armed Forces in that attack qualified as a death or wounding resulting from an attack by a foreign terrorist organization as described in section 1129a of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), the Secretary of Defense shall make a determination as to whether the death or wounding of any civilian employee of the Department of Defense or civilian contractor in the same attack meets the eligibility criteria for the award of the Secretary of Defense Medal for the Defense of Freedom.

(2) AWARD.—If the Secretary of Defense determines under paragraph (1) that the death or wounding of any civilian employee of the Department of Defense or civilian contractor in the attack that occurred at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009, meets the eligibility criteria for the award of the Secretary of Defense Medal for the Defense of Freedom, the Secretary shall take appropriate action to award the Secretary of Defense Medal for the Defense of Freedom to the employee or contractor.

SEC. 572. AUTHORIZATION FOR AWARD OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR ACTS OF VALOR DURING WORLD WAR I.

(a) WILLIAM SHEMIN.—

(1) WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the President may award the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of such title to William Shemin for the acts of valor during World War I described in paragraph (1).

(2) ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor referred to in paragraph (1) are the actions of William Shemin while serving as a Rifleman with G Company, 2d Battalion, 47th Infantry Regiment, 4th Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in connection with combat operations against an armed enemy on the Vesle River, near Bazoches, France, from August 7 to August 9, 1918, during World War I for which he was originally awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

(b) HENRY JOHNSON.—

(1) WAIVER OF TIME LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding the time limitations specified in section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, or any other time limitation with respect to the awarding of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces, the President may award the Medal of Honor under section 3741 of such title to Henry Johnson for the acts of valor during World War I described in paragraph (2).

(2) ACTS OF VALOR DESCRIBED.—The acts of valor referred to in paragraph (2) are the actions of Henry Johnson while serving as a member of Company C, 369th Infantry Regiment, 93rd Division, American Expeditionary Forces, during combat operations against the enemy on the front lines of the Western Front in France on May 15, 1918, during

World War I for which he was previously awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements**SEC. 581. REVIEW AND REPORT ON MILITARY PROGRAMS AND CONTROLS REGARDING PROFESSIONALISM.**

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a preliminary review of the effectiveness of current programs and controls of the Department of Defense and the military departments regarding the professionalism of members of the Armed Forces.

(b) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing recommendations to strengthen professionalism programs in the Department of Defense.

SEC. 582. REVIEW AND REPORT ON PREVENTION OF SUICIDE AMONG MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, shall conduct a review of Department of Defense efforts regarding the prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the review under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall consult with, and consider the recommendations of, the Office of Suicide Prevention, the Secretaries of the military departments, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, and the United States Special Operations Command regarding the feasibility of implementing, for members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents, particular elements of the Department of Defense suicide prevention policy developed pursuant to section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) and section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note).

(c) ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.—The review conducted under subsection (a) shall specifically include an assessment of each of the following:

(1) Current Armed Forces and United States Special Operations Command policy guidelines on the prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents.

(2) Current and directed Armed Forces and United States Special Operations Command suicide prevention programs and activities for members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents, including programs provided by the Defense Health Program and the Office of Suicide Prevention and programs supporting family members.

(3) Current Armed Forces and United States Special Operations Command strategies to reduce suicides among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents, including the cost of such strategies across the future-years defense program.

(4) Current Armed Forces and United States Special Operations Command standards of care for suicide prevention among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents, including training standards for behavioral health

care providers to ensure that such providers receive training on clinical best practices and evidence-based treatments as information on such practices and treatments becomes available.

(5) The integration of mental health screenings and suicide risk and prevention efforts for members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents into the delivery of primary care for such members and dependents.

(6) The standards for responding to attempted or completed suicides among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents, including guidance and training to assist commanders in addressing incidents of attempted or completed suicide within their units.

(7) The standards regarding data collection for individual members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents, including related factors such as domestic violence and child abuse.

(8) The means to ensure the protection of privacy of members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents who seek or receive treatment related to suicide prevention.

(9) The potential need to differentiate members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents from members of conventional forces and their dependents in the development and delivery of the Department of Defense suicide prevention program.

(10) Such other matters as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate in connection with the prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents.

(d) **SUBMISSION OF REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the review conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 583. REVIEW AND REPORT ON PROVISION OF JOB PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT SERVICES DIRECTLY TO MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.

(a) **REVIEW REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the feasibility of improving the efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members in the National Guard and Reserves. In evaluating potential job placement programs, the Secretary shall consider—

- (1) the likely cost of the program;
- (2) the impact of the program on increasing employment opportunities and results for members of the reserve components; and
- (3) how a Department program would compare to other unemployment or underemployment programs of the Federal Government already available to members of the reserve components.

(b) **SUBMISSION OF REPORT.**—Not later than April 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the review.

SEC. 584. REPORT ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE, REGIONAL EXPERTISE, AND CULTURE CONSIDERATIONS IN OVERSEAS MILITARY OPERATIONS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report concerning—

(1) foreign language, regional expertise, and culture considerations, including gender-based considerations in the context of foreign cultural norms; and

(2) how such considerations factor into the planning and execution of overseas operations and missions of the Armed Forces.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall consult with, and consider the recommendations of, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(c) **ELEMENTS OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An assessment of how foreign language, regional expertise, and culture considerations, including gender-based considerations in the context of foreign cultural norms, affect overseas operations and missions of the Armed Forces, including lessons learned as a result of members of the Armed Forces engaging with female civilian populations in Iraq and Afghanistan and during other overseas operations and missions.

(2) An identification of how the Department of Defense addresses such considerations in its planning and execution of overseas operations and missions, including how it educates military commanders on foreign language, regional expertise, and culture considerations, including gender-based considerations in the context of foreign cultural norms.

(3) An evaluation of the adequacy of current programs and the need for additional or modified programs to train members of the Armed Forces regarding such considerations, including proposed changes in the length of training and curriculum.

(4) An evaluation of the need for advisors within the military commands and Armed Forces, including billet descriptions for such advisors, where to assign them within the military command and Armed Forces, and the desirability and feasibility of assigning such advisors in combatant command and joint task force staffs.

(5) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense may determine to be appropriate.

(d) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report prepared under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 585. DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORT CONTAINING RESULTS OF REVIEW OF OFFICE OF DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ROLE IN SEXUAL HARASSMENT CASES.

Not later than April 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the review conducted pursuant to section 1735 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 976).

SEC. 586. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF RISK AND RESILIENCY OF UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PRESERVATION OF THE FORCE AND FAMILIES AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for an independent assessment of—

(1) the mental, behavioral, and psychological health challenges facing members of the Armed Forces assigned to special operations forces; and

(2) the effectiveness of the Preservation of the Force and Families Program and the Human Performance Program of the United

States Special Operations Command in addressing such challenges.

(b) **ENTITY CONDUCTING ASSESSMENT.**—To conduct the assessment required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall select a federally funded research and development center or another appropriate independent entity.

(c) **ASSESSMENT ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall specifically include the following:

(1) The factors contributing to the mental, behavioral, and psychological health challenges facing members of the Armed Forces assigned to special operations forces.

(2) The effectiveness of the Preservation of the Force and Families Program in addressing the mental, behavioral, and psychological health of members of the special operations forces, including the extent to which measurements of effectiveness are being utilized to assess progress—

(A) in reducing suicide and other mental, behavioral, and psychological risks; and

(B) in increasing the resiliency of such members.

(3) The effectiveness of the Human Performance Program in improving the mental, behavioral, and psychological health of members of the special operations forces, including the extent to which measurements of effectiveness are being utilized to assess progress—

(A) in reducing suicide and other mental, behavioral and psychological risks; and

(B) in increasing the resiliency of such members.

(4) Such other matters as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(d) **SUBMISSION OF REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the results of the assessment conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 587. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON HAZING IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the designated congressional committees a report on the policies to prevent hazing, and systems initiated to track incidents of hazing, in each of the Armed Forces.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An evaluation of the definition of hazing by the Armed Forces.

(2) A description of the criteria used, and the methods implemented, in the systems to track incidents of hazing in the Armed Forces.

(3) The number of alleged and substantiated incidents of hazing, as reflected in the tracking systems, over the last two years for each Armed Force, the nature of these incidents, and actions taken to address such incidents through non-judicial and judicial action.

(4) An assessment of the following:

(A) The prevalence of hazing in each Armed Force.

(B) The policies in place and the training on hazing provided to members throughout the course of their careers for each Armed Force.

(C) The available outlets through which victims or witnesses of hazing can report hazing both within and outside their chain of command, and whether or not anonymous reporting is permitted.

(D) The actions taken to mitigate hazing incidents in each Armed Force.

(E) The effectiveness of the training and policies in place regarding hazing.

(5) An evaluation of the additional actions, if any, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security propose to take to further address hazing in the Armed Forces.

(6) Such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate for improving hazing prevention programs, policies, and other actions taken to address hazing within the Armed Forces.

(c) **DESIGNATED CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “designated congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 588. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON IMPACT OF CERTAIN MENTAL AND PHYSICAL TRAUMA ON DISCHARGES FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR MISCONDUCT.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the impact of mental and physical trauma relating to Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), behavioral health matters not related to Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, and other neurological combat traumas (in this section referred to as “covered traumas”) on the discharge of members of the Armed Forces from the Armed Forces for misconduct.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the extent to which the Armed Forces have in place processes for the consideration of the impact of mental and physical trauma relating to covered traumas on members of the Armed Forces who are being considered for discharge from the Armed Forces for misconduct, including the compliance of the Armed Forces with such processes and mechanisms in the Department of Defense for ensuring the compliance of the Armed Forces with such processes.

(2) An assessment of the extent to which the Armed Forces provide members of the Armed Forces, including commanding officers, junior officers, and noncommissioned officers, training on the symptoms of covered traumas and the identification of the presence of such conditions in members of the Armed Forces.

(3) An assessment of the extent to which members of the Armed Forces who receive treatment for a covered trauma before discharge from the Armed Forces are later discharged from the Armed Forces for misconduct.

(4) An identification of the number of members of the Armed Forces discharged as described in paragraph (3) who are ineligible for benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs based on characterization of discharge.

(5) An assessment of the extent to which members of the Armed Forces who accept a discharge from the Armed Forces for misconduct in lieu of trial by court-martial are counseled on the potential for ineligibility for benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs as a result of such discharge before acceptance of such discharge.

Subtitle I—Other Matters

SEC. 591. INSPECTION OF OUTPATIENT RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES OCCUPIED BY RECOVERING SERVICE MEMBERS.

Section 1662(a) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110-181; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended by striking “inspected on a semiannual basis for the first two years after the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter” and inserting “inspected at least once every two years”.

SEC. 592. DESIGNATION OF VOTER ASSISTANCE OFFICES.

(a) **DESIGNATION AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (a) of section 1566a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and under” and inserting “Under”; and

(2) by inserting after “their jurisdiction” the following: “, or at such installations as the Secretary of the military department concerned shall determine are best located to provide access to voter assistance services for all covered individuals in a particular location.”.

(b) **REPORT ON CLOSURE OF VOTER ASSISTANCE OFFICE.**—Subsection (f) of such section is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary of Defense”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The Secretary of a military department shall provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives with notice of any decision by the Secretary to close a voter assistance office that was designated on an installation before the date of the enactment of this paragraph. The notice shall include the rationale for the closure, the timing of the closure, the number of covered individuals supported by the office, and the plan for providing the assistance available under subsection (a) to covered individuals after the closure of the office.”.

SEC. 593. REPEAL OF ELECTRONIC VOTING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107; 52 U.S.C. 20301 note) is repealed.

SEC. 594. AUTHORITY FOR REMOVAL FROM NATIONAL CEMETERIES OF REMAINS OF CERTAIN DECEASED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO HAVE NO KNOWN NEXT OF KIN.

(a) **REMOVAL AUTHORITY.**—Section 1488 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **REMOVAL OF REMAINS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS WITH NO KNOWN NEXT OF KIN.**—(1) The Secretary of the Army may authorize the removal of the remains of a covered member of the armed forces who is buried in an Army National Military Cemetery from the Army National Military Cemetery for transfer to any other cemetery.

“(2) The Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, may authorize the removal of the remains of a covered member of the armed forces who is buried in a cemetery of the National Cemetery System from that cemetery for transfer to any Army National Military Cemetery.

“(3) A removal of remains may not be authorized under this subsection unless the individual seeking the removal of the remains—

“(A) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Army that the member

of the armed forces concerned has no known next of kin or other person who is interested in maintaining the place of burial; and

“(B) undertakes full responsibility for all expenses of the removal of the remains and the reburial of the remains at another cemetery as authorized by this subsection.

“(4) In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘Army National Military Cemetery’ means a cemetery specified in section 4721(b) of this title.

“(B) The term ‘covered member of the armed forces’ means a member of the armed forces who—

“(i) has been awarded the Medal of Honor; and

“(ii) has no known next of kin.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Such section is further amended—

(1) by inserting before “If a cemetery” the following:

“(a) **REMOVAL UPON DISCONTINUANCE OF INSTALLATION CEMETERY.**—”;

(2) by striking “his jurisdiction” and inserting “the jurisdiction of the Secretary concerned”; and

(3) by inserting before “With respect to” the following:

“(b) **REMOVAL FROM TEMPORARY INTERMENT OR ABANDONED GRAVE OR CEMETERY.**—”.

SEC. 595. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING LEAVING NO MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES UNACCOUNTED FOR DURING THE DRAWDOWN OF UNITED STATES FORCES IN AFGHANISTAN.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States—

(1) should undertake every reasonable effort—

(A) to search for and repatriate members of the Armed Forces who are missing; and

(B) to repatriate members of the Armed Forces who are captured;

(2) has a responsibility to keep the promises made to members of the Armed Forces who risk their lives on a daily basis on behalf of the people of the United States; and

(3) while continuing to transition leadership roles in combat operations in Afghanistan to the people of Afghanistan, must continue to fulfill the promise of the United States Soldier’s Creed and the Warrior Ethos, which states that “I will never leave a fallen comrade”, with respect to any member of the Armed Forces who is in a missing status or captured as a result of service in Afghanistan now or in the future.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Sec. 601. No fiscal year 2015 increase in basic pay for general and flag officers.

Sec. 602. Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing under certain circumstances.

Sec. 603. Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau and Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau among senior members of the Armed Forces for purposes of pay and allowances.

Sec. 604. Modification of computation of basic allowance for housing inside the United States.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

Sec. 611. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces.

- Sec. 612. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals.
- Sec. 613. One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers.
- Sec. 614. One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities.
- Sec. 615. One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays.
- Subtitle C—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits
- Sec. 621. Earlier determination of dependent status with respect to transitional compensation for dependents of certain members separated for dependent abuse.
- Sec. 622. Modification of determination of retired pay base for officers retired in general and flag officer grades.
- Sec. 623. Inapplicability of reduced annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62 under the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 who first become members prior to January 1, 2016.
- Sec. 624. Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for special needs trusts established for the benefit of dependent children incapable of self-support.
- Sec. 625. Modification of per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service to reduce eligibility age for retirement for non-regular service.
- Subtitle D—Commissary and Non-appropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations
- Sec. 631. Procurement of brand-name and other commercial items for resale by commissary stores.
- Sec. 632. Authority of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to enter into contracts with other Federal agencies and instrumentalities to provide and obtain certain goods and services.
- Sec. 633. Competitive pricing of legal consumer tobacco products sold in Department of Defense retail stores.
- Sec. 634. Review of management, food, and pricing options for defense commissary system.

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

SEC. 601. NO FISCAL YEAR 2015 INCREASE IN BASIC PAY FOR GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS.

In the case of commissioned officers in the uniformed services in pay grades O-7 through O-10—

(1) section 203(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, shall be applied for rates of basic pay payable for such officers during calendar year 2015 by using the rate of pay for level II of the Executive Schedule in effect during 2014; and

(2) the rates of monthly basic pay payable for such officers shall not increase during calendar year 2015.

SEC. 602. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY INCREASE IN RATES OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

Section 403(b)(7)(E) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking “Decem-

ber 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 603. INCLUSION OF CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AND SENIOR ENLISTED ADVISOR TO THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AMONG SENIOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR PURPOSES OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

(a) BASIC PAY RATE EQUAL TREATMENT OF CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AND SENIOR ENLISTED ADVISOR TO THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—

(1) CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—The rate of basic pay for an officer while serving as the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be the same as the rate of basic pay for the officers specified in Footnote 2 of the table entitled “COMMISSIONED OFFICERS” in section 601(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136; 37 U.S.C. 1009 note), regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code.

(2) SENIOR ENLISTED ADVISOR TO THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 685 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 37 U.S.C. 205 note) is amended by inserting “or as Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau” after “Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended by inserting “AND FOR THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU” after “CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF”.

(b) PAY DURING TERMINAL LEAVE AND WHILE HOSPITALIZED.—Section 210 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “or the senior enlisted advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Chief of the National Guard Bureau” after “that armed force” the first place it appears; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (6).

(c) PERSONAL MONEY ALLOWANCE.—Section 414 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5), by striking “or Commandant of the Coast Guard” and inserting “Commandant of the Coast Guard, or Chief of the National Guard Bureau”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “or the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff” and inserting “the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau”.

(d) RETIRED BASE PAY.—Section 1406(i) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU,” after “CHIEFS OF SERVICE,”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “as Chief of the National Guard Bureau,” after “Chief of Service,”; and

(B) by inserting “or the senior enlisted advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Chief of the National Guard Bureau” after “of an armed force”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking clause (vi).

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to months of service that begin on or after that date.

SEC. 604. MODIFICATION OF COMPUTATION OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(3)(A) The monthly amount of the basic allowance for housing for an area of the United States for a member of a uniformed service shall be the amount equal to the difference between—

“(i) the amount of the monthly cost of adequate housing in that area, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as the member; and

“(ii) the amount equal to a specified percentage (determined under subparagraph (B)) of the national average monthly cost of adequate housing in the United States, as determined by the Secretary, for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as the member.

“(B) The percentage to be used for purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be determined by the Secretary of Defense and may not exceed one percent.”.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Any reduction authorized by paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), shall not apply with respect to benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under the laws administered by the Secretary, including pursuant to sections 3108 and 3313 of title 38, United States Code. Such benefits that are determined in accordance with such section 403 shall be subject to paragraph (3) of such section as such paragraph was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

SEC. 611. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR RESERVE FORCES.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”:

(1) Section 308b(g), relating to Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus.

(2) Section 308c(i), relating to Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus.

(3) Section 308d(c), relating to special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units.

(4) Section 308g(f)(2), relating to Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service.

(5) Section 308h(e), relating to Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

(6) Section 308i(f), relating to Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service.

(7) Section 478a(e), relating to reimbursement of travel expenses for inactive-duty training outside of normal commuting distance.

(8) Section 910(g), relating to income replacement payments for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service.

SEC. 612. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.

(a) TITLE 10 AUTHORITIES.—The following sections of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”:

(1) Section 2130a(a)(1), relating to nurse-officer candidate accession program.

(2) Section 16302(d), relating to repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve.

(b) TITLE 37 AUTHORITIES.—The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”:

(1) Section 302c-1(f), relating to accession and retention bonuses for psychologists.

(2) Section 302d(a)(1), relating to accession bonus for registered nurses.

(3) Section 302e(a)(1), relating to incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists.

(4) Section 302g(e), relating to special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties.

(5) Section 302h(a)(1), relating to accession bonus for dental officers.

(6) Section 302j(a), relating to accession bonus for pharmacy officers.

(7) Section 302k(f), relating to accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties.

(8) Section 302l(g), relating to accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

SEC. 613. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PAY AND BONUS AUTHORITIES FOR NUCLEAR OFFICERS.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”:

(1) Section 312(f), relating to special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service.

(2) Section 312b(c), relating to nuclear career accession bonus.

(3) Section 312c(d), relating to nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

SEC. 614. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO TITLE 37 CONSOLIDATED SPECIAL PAY, INCENTIVE PAY, AND BONUS AUTHORITIES.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”:

(1) Section 331(h), relating to general bonus authority for enlisted members.

(2) Section 332(g), relating to general bonus authority for officers.

(3) Section 333(i), relating to special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers.

(4) Section 334(i), relating to special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers.

(5) Section 335(k), relating to special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions.

(6) Section 336(g), relating to contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(7) Section 351(h), relating to hazardous duty pay.

(8) Section 352(g), relating to assignment pay or special duty pay.

(9) Section 353(i), relating to skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus.

(10) Section 355(h), relating to retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

SEC. 615. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO PAYMENT OF OTHER TITLE 37 BONUSES AND SPECIAL PAYS.

The following sections of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”:

(1) Section 301b(a), relating to aviation officer retention bonus.

(2) Section 307a(g), relating to assignment incentive pay.

(3) Section 308(g), relating to reenlistment bonus for active members.

(4) Section 309(e), relating to enlistment bonus.

(5) Section 316a(g), relating to incentive pay for members of precommissioning programs pursuing foreign language proficiency.

(6) Section 324(g), relating to accession bonus for new officers in critical skills.

(7) Section 326(g), relating to incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage.

(8) Section 327(h), relating to incentive bonus for transfer between branches of the Armed Forces.

(9) Section 330(f), relating to accession bonus for officer candidates.

Subtitle C—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits

SEC. 621. EARLIER DETERMINATION OF DEPENDENT STATUS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS SEPARATED FOR DEPENDENT ABUSE.

Section 1059(d)(4) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “as of the date on which the individual described in subsection (b) is separated from active duty” and inserting “as of the date on which the separation action is initiated by a commander of the individual described in subsection (b)”.

SEC. 622. MODIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF RETIRED PAY BASE FOR OFFICERS RETIRED IN GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER GRADES.

(a) REINSTATEMENT OF EARLIER METHOD OF DETERMINATION.—Section 1407a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1407a. Retired pay base: officers retired in general or flag officer grades

“(a) RATES OF BASIC PAY TO BE USED IN DETERMINATION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, in a case in which the determination under section 1406 or 1407 of this title of the retired pay base applicable to the computation of the retired pay of a covered general or flag officer involves a rate of basic pay payable to that officer for any period between October 1, 2006, and December 31, 2014, that was subject to a reduction under section 203(a)(2) of title 37 for such period, such retired-pay-base determination shall be made using the rate of basic pay for such period provided by law, without regard to the reduction under section 203(a)(2) of title 37.

“(b) PARTIAL PRESERVATION OF COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY BASE USING UNCAPPED RATES OF BASIC PAY FOR COVERED OFFICERS WHO FIRST BECAME MEMBERS BEFORE SEPTEMBER 8, 1980, AND WHOSE RETIRED PAY COMMENCES AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.—

“(1) OFFICERS RETIRING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2014.—In the case of a covered general or flag officer who first became a member of a uniformed service before September 8, 1980, and who is retired after December 31, 2014, under any provision of law other than chapter 1223 of this title or is transferred to the Retired Reserve after December 31, 2014, the retired pay base applicable to the computation of the retired pay of that officer shall be determined as provided in paragraph (2) if determination of such retired pay base as provided in that paragraph results in a higher retired pay base than determination of such retired pay base as otherwise provided by law (including the application of section 203(a)(2) of title 37).

“(2) ALTERNATIVE DETERMINATION OF RETIRED PAY BASE USING UNCAPPED RATES OF

BASIC PAY AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2014.—For a determination in accordance with this paragraph, the amount of an officer's retired pay base shall be determined by using the rate of basic pay provided as of December 31, 2014, for that officer's grade as of that date for purposes of basic pay, with that officer's years of service creditable as of that date for purposes of basic pay, and without regard to any reduction under section 203(a)(2) of title 37.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR OFFICER RETIRED IN A LOWER GRADE.—In a case in which the retired grade of the officer is lower than the grade in which the officer was serving on December 31, 2014, paragraph (2) shall be applied as if the officer was serving on that date in the officer's retired grade.

“(c) PRESERVATION OF COMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY BASE USING UNCAPPED RATES OF BASIC PAY FOR OFFICERS TRANSFERRING TO RETIRED RESERVE DURING SPECIFIED PERIOD.—In the case of a covered general or flag officer who is transferred to the Retired Reserve between October 1, 2006, and December 31, 2014, and who becomes entitled to receive retired pay under section 12731 of this title after December 31, 2014, the retired pay base applicable to the computation of the retired pay of that officer shall be determined using the rates of basic pay provided by law without regard to any reduction in rates of basic pay under section 203(a)(2) of title 37.

“(d) COVERED GENERAL OR FLAG OFFICER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered general or flag officer’ means a member or former member of a uniformed service who after September 30, 2006—

“(1) is retired in a general officer grade or flag officer grade (or an equivalent grade, in the case of an officer of the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration); or

“(2) is transferred to the Retired Reserve in a general officer grade or flag officer grade.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 1407a of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), shall be effective for retired pay that commences after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 623. INAPPLICABILITY OF REDUCED ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT OF RETIRED PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER THE AGE OF 62 UNDER THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 WHO FIRST BECAME MEMBERS PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 2016.

Subparagraph (G) of section 1401a(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, which shall take effect December 1, 2015, pursuant to section 403(a) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67; 127 Stat. 1186), as amended by section 10001 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113-76; 128 Stat. 151) and section 2 of Public Law 113-82 (128 Stat. 1009), is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2016”.

SEC. 624. SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN ANNUITIES FOR SPECIAL NEEDS TRUSTS ESTABLISHED FOR THE BENEFIT OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN INCAPABLE OF SELF-SUPPORT.

(a) SPECIAL NEEDS TRUST AS ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1450 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph (4):

“(4) SPECIAL NEEDS TRUSTS FOR SOLE BENEFIT OF CERTAIN DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—Notwithstanding subsection (i), a supplemental or special needs trust established under subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 1917(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396p(d)(4)) for the sole benefit of a dependent child considered disabled under section 1614(a)(3) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1382c(a)(3)) who is incapable of self-support because of mental or physical incapacity.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) ANNUITIES EXEMPTION.—Subsection (i) of such section is amended by inserting “(a)(4) or” after “subsection”.

(B) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1448 of such title is amended—

(i) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) SPECIAL NEEDS TRUSTS FOR SOLE BENEFIT OF CERTAIN DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—A person who has established a supplemental or special needs trust under subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 1917(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396p(d)(4)) for the sole benefit of a dependent child considered disabled under section 1614(a)(3) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1382c(a)(3)) who is incapable of self-support because of mental or physical incapacity may elect to provide an annuity to that supplemental or special needs trust.”;

(ii) in subsection (d)(2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section 1450(a)(2)” and inserting “subsection (a)(2) or (a)(4) of section 1450”; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “section 1450(a)(3)” and inserting “subsection (a)(3) or (a)(4) of section 1450”; and

(iii) in subsection (f)(2), by inserting “, or to a special needs trust pursuant to section 1450(a)(4) of this title,” after “dependent child”.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Section 1455(d) of such title is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “AND FIDUCIARIES” and inserting “, FIDUCIARIES, AND SPECIAL NEEDS TRUSTS”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) a dependent child incapable of self-support because of mental or physical incapacity for whom a supplemental or special needs trust has been established under subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 1917(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396p(d)(4)).”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (H) as subparagraphs (D) through (I), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph (C):

“(C) In the case of an annuitant referred to in paragraph (1)(C), payment of the annuity to the supplemental or special needs trust established for the annuitant.”;

(C) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking “subparagraphs (D) and (E)” and inserting “subparagraphs (E) and (F)”;

(D) in subparagraph (H), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting “or (1)(C)” after “paragraph (1)(B)” in the matter preceding clause (i);

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) procedures for determining when annuity payments to a supplemental or special needs trust shall end based on the death or marriage of the dependent child for which the trust was established.”; and

(4) in paragraph (3), by striking “OR FIDUCIARY” in the paragraph heading and inserting “, FIDUCIARY, OR TRUST”.

SEC. 625. MODIFICATION OF PER-FISCAL YEAR CALCULATION OF DAYS OF CERTAIN ACTIVE DUTY OR ACTIVE SERVICE TO REDUCE ELIGIBILITY AGE FOR RETIREMENT FOR NON-REGULAR SERVICE.

Section 12731(f)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “, subject to subparagraph (C),” after “shall be reduced”; and

(2) by striking “so performs in any fiscal year after such date, subject to subparagraph (C)” and inserting “serves on such active duty or performs such active service in any fiscal year after January 28, 2008, or in any two consecutive fiscal years after September 30, 2014”.

Subtitle D—Commissary and Non-appropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations

SEC. 631. PROCUREMENT OF BRAND-NAME AND OTHER COMMERCIAL ITEMS FOR RESALE BY COMMISSARY STORES.

Subsection (f) of section 2484 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(f) PROCUREMENT OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS USING PROCEDURES OTHER THAN COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense may use the exception provided in section 2304(c)(5) of this title for the procurement of any commercial item (including brand-name and generic items) for resale in, at, or by commissary stores.”.

SEC. 632. AUTHORITY OF NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES TO PROVIDE AND OBTAIN CERTAIN GOODS AND SERVICES.

Section 2492 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Federal department, agency, or instrumentality” and all that follows through the period at the end of the section and inserting the following: “Federal department, agency, or instrumentality—

“(1) to provide or obtain goods and services beneficial to the efficient management and operation of the exchange system or that morale, welfare, and recreation system; or

“(2) to provide or obtain food services beneficial to the efficient management and operation of the dining facilities on military installations offering food services to members of the armed forces.”.

SEC. 633. COMPETITIVE PRICING OF LEGAL CONSUMER TOBACCO PRODUCTS SOLD IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RETAIL STORES.

(a) PROHIBITION ON BANNING SALE OF LEGAL CONSUMER TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments may not take any action to implement any new policy that would ban the sale of any legal consumer tobacco product category sold as of January 1, 2014, within the defense retail systems or on any Department of Defense vessel at sea.

(b) USE OF PRICES COMPARABLE TO LOCAL PRICES.—The Secretary of Defense shall issue regulations regarding the pricing of tobacco and tobacco-related products sold in an outlet of the defense retail systems inside the United States, including territories and

possessions of the United States, to prohibit the sale of a product at a price below the most competitive price for that product in the local community.

(c) APPLICATION TO OVERSEAS DEFENSE RETAIL SYSTEMS.—The regulations required by subsection (b) shall direct that the price of a tobacco or tobacco-related product sold in an outlet of the defense retail systems outside of the United States shall be within the range of prices established for that product in outlets of the defense retail systems inside the United States.

(d) DEFENSE RETAIL SYSTEMS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “defense retail systems” has the meaning given that term in section 2487(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 634. REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT, FOOD, AND PRICING OPTIONS FOR DEFENSE COMMISSARY SYSTEM.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review, utilizing the services of an independent organization experienced in grocery retail analysis, of the defense commissary system to determine the qualitative and quantitative effects of—

(1) using variable pricing in commissary stores to reduce the expenditure of appropriated funds to operate the defense commissary system;

(2) implementing a program to make available more private label products in commissary stores;

(3) converting the defense commissary system to a nonappropriated fund instrumentality; and

(4) eliminating or at least reducing second-distribution funding.

(b) ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF REVIEW.—The review required by this section also shall consider the following:

(1) The impact of changes to the operation of the defense commissary system on commissary patrons, in particular junior enlisted members and junior officers and their dependents, that would result from—

(A) displacing current value and name-brand products with private-label products; and

(B) reducing or eliminating financial subsidies to the commissary system.

(2) The sensitivity of commissary patrons, in particular junior enlisted members and junior officers and their dependents, to pricing changes that may result in reduced overall cost savings for patrons.

(3) The feasibility of generating net revenue from pricing and stock assortment changes.

(4) The relationship of higher prices and reduced patron savings to patron usage and accompanying sales, both on a national and regional basis.

(5) The impact of changes to the operation of the defense commissary system on industry support; such as vendor stocking, promotions, discounts, and merchandising activities and programs.

(6) The ability of the current commissary management and information technology systems to accommodate changes to the existing pricing and management structure.

(7) The product category management systems and expertise of the Defense Commissary Agency.

(8) The impact of changes to the operation of the defense commissary system on military exchanges and other morale, welfare, and recreation programs for members of the Armed Forces.

(9) The identification of management and legislative changes that would be required in connection with changes to the defense commissary system.

(10) An estimate of the time required to implement recommended changes to the current pricing and management model of the defense commissary system.

(c) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than September 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the review required by this section.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits

- Sec. 701. Mental health assessments for members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 702. Modifications of cost-sharing and other requirements for the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program.
- Sec. 703. Elimination of inpatient day limits and other limits in provision of mental health services.
- Sec. 704. Authority for provisional TRICARE coverage for emerging health care services and supplies.
- Sec. 705. Clarification of provision of food to former members and dependents not receiving inpatient care in military medical treatment facilities.
- Sec. 706. Availability of breastfeeding support, supplies, and counseling under the TRICARE program.

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

- Sec. 711. Provision of notice of change to TRICARE benefits.
- Sec. 712. Surveys on continued viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra.
- Sec. 713. Review of military health system modernization study.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

- Sec. 721. Designation and responsibilities of senior medical advisor for Armed Forces Retirement Home.
- Sec. 722. Extension of authority for joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund.
- Sec. 723. Report on status of reductions in TRICARE Prime service areas.
- Sec. 724. Extension of authority to provide rehabilitation and vocational benefits to members of the Armed Forces with severe injuries or illnesses.
- Sec. 725. Acquisition strategy for health care professional staffing services.
- Sec. 726. Pilot program on medication therapy management under TRICARE program.
- Sec. 727. Antimicrobial stewardship program at medical facilities of the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 728. Report on improvements in the identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces.
- Sec. 729. Report on efforts to treat infertility of military families.
- Sec. 730. Report on implementation of recommendations of Institute of Medicine on improvements to certain resilience and prevention programs of the Department of Defense.

Sec. 731. Comptroller General report on transition of care for post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury.

Sec. 732. Comptroller General report on mental health stigma reduction efforts in the Department of Defense.

Sec. 733. Comptroller General report on women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries.

Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits

SEC. 701. MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **ANNUAL MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1074m the following new section:

“§ 1074n. Annual mental health assessments for members of the armed forces

“(a) **MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS.**—Subject to subsection (c), not less frequently than once each calendar year, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a person-to-person mental health assessment for—

“(1) each member of a regular component of the armed forces; and

“(2) each member of the Selected Reserve of an armed force.

“(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The mental health assessments provided pursuant to this section shall—

“(1) be conducted in accordance with the requirements of subsection (c)(1) of section 1074m of this title with respect to a mental health assessment provided pursuant to such section; and

“(2) include a review of the health records of the member that are related to each previous health assessment or other relevant activities of the member while serving in the armed forces, as determined by the Secretary.

“(c) **SUFFICIENCY OF OTHER MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS.**—(1) The Secretary is not required to provide a mental health assessment pursuant to this section to an individual in a calendar year in which the individual has received a mental health assessment pursuant to section 1074m of this title.

“(2) The Secretary may treat periodic health assessments and other person-to-person assessments that are provided to members of the armed forces, including examinations under section 1074f of this title, as meeting the requirements for mental health assessments required under this section if the Secretary determines that such assessments and person-to-person assessments meet the requirements for mental health assessments established by this section.

“(d) **PRIVACY MATTERS.**—Any medical or other personal information obtained under this section shall be protected from disclosure or misuse in accordance with the laws on privacy applicable to such information.

“(e) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the other administering Secretaries, prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1074m the following new item:

“1074n. Annual mental health assessments for members of the armed forces.”.

(3) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the issuance of the regulations prescribed under section 1074n(e) of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall implement such regulations.

(4) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date on which the Secretary of Defense implements the regulations described in paragraph (3), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the annual mental health assessments of members of the Armed Forces conducted pursuant to section 1074n of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1).

(B) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A description of the tools and processes used to provide the annual mental health assessments of members of the Armed Forces conducted pursuant to such section 1074n, including—

(I) whether such tools and processes are evidenced-based; and

(II) the process by which such tools and processes have been approved for use in providing mental health assessments.

(ii) Such recommendations for improving the tools and processes used to conduct such assessments, including tools that may address the underreporting of mental health conditions, as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(iii) Such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate for improving the monitoring and reporting of the number of members of the Armed Forces—

(I) who receive such assessments;

(II) who are referred for care based on such assessments; and

(III) who receive care based on such referrals.

(C) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—No personally identifiable information of a member of the Armed Forces may be included in any report under subparagraph (A).

(5) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1074m(e)(1) of such title is amended by inserting “and section 1074n of this title” after “pursuant to this section”.

(b) **FREQUENCY OF MENTAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS FOR DEPLOYED MEMBERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1074m of such title is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) Until January 1, 2019, once during each 180-day period during which a member is deployed.”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) by personnel in deployed units whose responsibilities include providing unit health care services if such personnel are available and the use of such personnel for the assessments would not impair the capacity of such personnel to perform higher priority tasks; and”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (a)(2) of such section 1074m is amended by striking “subparagraph (B) and (C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (C) and (D)”.

SEC. 702. MODIFICATIONS OF COST-SHARING AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TRICARE PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF PHARMACEUTICAL AGENTS THROUGH NATIONAL MAIL-ORDER PHARMACY PROGRAM.—Paragraph (5) of section 1074g(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “at least one of the means described in paragraph (2)(E)” and inserting “the national mail-order pharmacy program”; and

(2) by striking “may include” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “shall include cost-sharing by the eligible covered beneficiary as specified in paragraph (6).”.

(b) MODIFICATION OF COST-SHARING AMOUNTS.—Paragraph (6)(A) of such section 1074g(a) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “\$5” and inserting “\$8”;

(B) in subclause (II), by striking “\$17; and” and inserting “\$20.”; and

(C) by striking subclause (III); and

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by striking “\$13” and inserting “\$16”; and

(B) in subclause (III), by striking “\$43” and inserting “\$46”.

(c) REFILLS OF PRESCRIPTION MAINTENANCE MEDICATIONS THROUGH MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITY PHARMACIES OR NATIONAL MAIL ORDER PHARMACY PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9)(A) Beginning on October 1, 2015, the pharmacy benefits program shall require eligible covered beneficiaries generally to refill non-generic prescription maintenance medications through military treatment facility pharmacies or the national mail-order pharmacy program.

“(B) The Secretary shall determine the maintenance medications subject to the requirement under subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall ensure that—

“(i) such medications are generally available to eligible covered beneficiaries through retail pharmacies only for an initial filling of a 30-day or less supply; and

“(ii) any refills of such medications are obtained through a military treatment facility pharmacy or the national mail-order pharmacy program.

“(C) The Secretary may exempt the following prescription maintenance medications from the requirement of subparagraph (A):

“(i) Medications that are for acute care needs.

“(ii) Such other medications as the Secretary determines appropriate.”.

(2) TERMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 716(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 10 U.S.C. 1074g note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

(d) GAO REPORT ON PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than July 1, 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the satisfaction of beneficiaries participating in the pilot program under section 716 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 10 U.S.C. 1074g note). Such report shall address the following:

(1) The satisfaction of beneficiaries participating in the pilot program.

(2) The timeliness of refilling prescriptions under the pilot program.

(3) The accuracy of prescription refills under the pilot program.

(4) The availability of medications refilled under the pilot program.

(5) The cost savings to the Department of Defense realized by the pilot program.

(6) The number of beneficiaries who did not participate in the pilot program by reason of subsection (c) of such section 716.

(7) Any other matters the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

SEC. 703. ELIMINATION OF INPATIENT DAY LIMITS AND OTHER LIMITS IN PROVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) INPATIENT DAY LIMITS.—Section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraph (6); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (17) as paragraphs (6) through (16), respectively;

(2) by striking subsection (i); and

(3) by redesignating subsections (j) through (q) as subsections (i) through (p), respectively.

(b) WAIVER OF NONAVAILABILITY STATEMENT OR PREAUTHORIZATION.—Section 721(a) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (10 U.S.C. 1073 note) is amended by striking “(other than mental health services)”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1079(e)(7), by striking “subsection (a)(13)” and inserting “subsection (a)(12)”;

(2) in section 1086—

(A) in subsection (d)(4)(A)(ii), by striking “section 1079(j)(1)” and inserting “section 1079(i)(1)”;

(B) in subsection (g), by striking “Section 1079(j)” and inserting “Section 1079(i)”;

(3) in section 1105(c), by striking “section 1079(a)(7)” and inserting “section 1079(a)(6)”.

SEC. 704. AUTHORITY FOR PROVISIONAL TRICARE COVERAGE FOR EMERGING HEALTH CARE SERVICES AND SUPPLIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1079b the following new section:

“§ 1079c. Provisional coverage for emerging services and supplies

“(a) PROVISIONAL COVERAGE.—In carrying out the TRICARE program, including pursuant to section 1079(a)(12) of this title, the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, may provide provisional coverage for the provision of a service or supply if the Secretary determines that such service or supply is widely recognized in the United States as being safe and effective.

“(b) CONSIDERATION OF EVIDENCE.—In making a determination under subsection (a), the Secretary may consider—

“(1) clinical trials published in refereed medical literature;

“(2) formal technology assessments;

“(3) the positions of national medical policy organizations;

“(4) national professional associations;

“(5) national expert opinion organizations; and

“(6) such other validated evidence as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(c) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—In making a determination under subsection (a), the Secretary may arrange for an evaluation from the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies or such other independent entity as the Secretary selects.

“(d) DURATION AND TERMS OF COVERAGE.—

(1) Provisional coverage under subsection (a)

for a service or supply may be in effect for not longer than a total of five years.

“(2) Prior to the expiration of provisional coverage of a service or supply, the Secretary shall determine the coverage, if any, that will follow such provisional coverage and take appropriate action to implement such determination. If the Secretary determines that the implementation of such determination regarding coverage requires legislative action, the Secretary shall make a timely recommendation to Congress regarding such legislative action.

“(3) The Secretary, at any time, may—

“(A) terminate the provisional coverage under subsection (a) of a service or supply, regardless of whether such termination is before the end of the period described in paragraph (1);

“(B) establish or disestablish terms and conditions for such coverage; or

“(C) take any other action with respect to such coverage.

“(e) PUBLIC NOTICE.—The Secretary shall promptly publish on a publicly accessible Internet website of the TRICARE program a notice for each service or supply that receives provisional coverage under subsection (a), including any terms and conditions for such coverage.

“(f) FINALITY OF DETERMINATIONS.—Any determination to approve or disapprove a service or supply under subsection (a) and any action made under subsection (d)(3) shall be final.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1079b the following new item:

“1079c. Provisional coverage for emerging services and supplies.”.

SEC. 705. CLARIFICATION OF PROVISION OF FOOD TO FORMER MEMBERS AND DEPENDENTS NOT RECEIVING INPATIENT CARE IN MILITARY MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES.

Section 1078b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “A member” each place it appears and inserting “A member or former member”; and

(2) in subsection (a)(2)(C), by striking “member or dependent” and inserting “member, former member, or dependent”.

SEC. 706. AVAILABILITY OF BREASTFEEDING SUPPORT, SUPPLIES, AND COUNSELING UNDER THE TRICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1079(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(17) Breastfeeding support, supplies (including breast pumps and associated equipment), and counseling shall be provided as appropriate during pregnancy and the postpartum period.”.

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

SEC. 711. PROVISION OF NOTICE OF CHANGE TO TRICARE BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1097c the following new section:

“§ 1097d. TRICARE program: notice of change to benefits

“(a) PROVISION OF NOTICE.—(1) If the Secretary makes a significant change to any benefits provided by the TRICARE program to covered beneficiaries, the Secretary shall provide individuals described in paragraph (2) with notice explaining such changes.

“(2) The individuals described by this paragraph are covered beneficiaries participating in the TRICARE program who may be affected by a significant change covered by a notification under paragraph (1).

“(3) The Secretary shall provide notice under paragraph (1) through electronic means.

“(b) **TIMING OF NOTICE.**—The Secretary shall provide notice under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) by the earlier of the following dates:

“(1) The date that the Secretary determines would afford individuals described in paragraph (2) of such subsection adequate time to understand the change covered by the notification.

“(2) The date that is 90 days before the date on which the change covered by the notification becomes effective.

“(3) The effective date of a significant change that is required by law.

“(c) **SIGNIFICANT CHANGE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘significant change’ means a systemwide change—

“(1) in the structure of the TRICARE program or the benefits provided under the TRICARE program (not including the addition of new services or benefits); or

“(2) in beneficiary cost-share rates of more than 20 percent.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1097c the following new item:

“1097d. TRICARE program: notice of change to benefits.”

SEC. 712. SURVEYS ON CONTINUED VIABILITY OF TRICARE STANDARD AND TRICARE EXTRA.

Section 711(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 1073 note) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(1) by striking “on a biennial basis”; and

(2) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting the following: “paragraph (1) during 2017 and 2020”.

SEC. 713. REVIEW OF MILITARY HEALTH SYSTEM MODERNIZATION STUDY.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may not restructure or realign a military medical treatment facility based on the modernization study until a 90-day period has elapsed following the date on which the Comptroller General of the United States is required to submit to the congressional defense committees the report under subsection (b)(3).

(2) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(A) During the period from 2006 to 2012, for each military medical treatment facility considered under the modernization study—

(i) the average daily inpatient census;

(ii) the average inpatient capacity;

(iii) the top five inpatient admission diagnoses;

(iv) each medical specialty available;

(v) the average daily percent of staffing available for each medical specialty;

(vi) the beneficiary population within the catchment area;

(vii) the budgeted funding level;

(viii) whether the facility has a helipad capable of receiving medical evacuation airlift patients arriving on the primary evacuation aircraft platform for the military installation served;

(ix) a determination of whether the civilian hospital system in which the facility resides is a Federally-designated underserved medical community and the effect on such community from any reduction in staff or functions or downgrade of the facility;

(x) if the facility serves a training center—

(I) a determination of the risk with respect to high-tempo, live-fire military operations,

treating battlefield-like injuries, and the potential for a mass casualty event if the facility is downgraded to a clinic or reduced in personnel or capabilities; and

(II) a description of the extent to which the Secretary, in making such determination, consulted with the appropriate training directorate, training and doctrine command, and forces command of each military department;

(xi) a site assessment by TRICARE to assess the network capabilities of TRICARE providers in the local area;

(xii) the inpatient mental health availability; and

(xiii) the average annual inpatient care directed to civilian medical facilities.

(B) For each military medical treatment facility considered under the modernization study—

(i) the civilian capacity by medical specialty in each catchment area;

(ii) the distance in miles to the nearest civilian emergency care department;

(iii) the distance in miles to the closest civilian inpatient hospital, listed by level of care and whether the facility is designated a sole community hospital;

(iv) the availability of ambulance service on the military installation and the distance in miles to the nearest civilian ambulance service, including the average response time to the military installation;

(v) an estimate of the cost to restructure or realign the military medical treatment facility, including with respect to bed closures and civilian personnel reductions; and

(vi) if the military medical treatment facility is restructured or realigned, an estimate of—

(I) the number of civilian personnel reductions, listed by series;

(II) the number of local support contracts terminated; and

(III) the increased cost of purchased care.

(C) The results of the modernization study with respect to the recommendations of the Secretary to restructure or realign military medical treatment facilities.

(D) An assessment of the analysis made by the Secretary to inform decisions regarding the modernization of the military health care system in the modernization study.

(E) An assessment of the extent to which the Secretary evaluated in the modernization study the impact on the access of eligible beneficiaries to quality health care, and satisfaction with such care, caused by the following changes proposed in the study:

(i) Changes in military medical treatment facility infrastructure.

(ii) Changes in staffing levels of professionals.

(iii) Changes in inpatient, ambulatory surgery, and specialty care capacity and capabilities.

(F) An assessment of the extent to which the Secretary evaluated in the modernization study how any reduced inpatient, ambulatory surgery, or specialty care capacity and capabilities at military medical treatment facilities covered by the study would impact timely access to care for eligible beneficiaries at local civilian community hospitals within reasonable driving distances of the catchment areas of such facilities.

(G) An assessment of the extent to which the Secretary consulted in conducting the modernization study with community hospitals in locations covered by the study to determine their capacities for additional inpatient and ambulatory surgery patients and their capabilities to meet additional demands for specialty care services.

(H) An assessment of the extent to which the Secretary considered in the modernization study the impact that the change in the structure or alignment of military medical treatment facilities covered by the study would have on timely access by local civilian populations to inpatient, ambulatory surgery, or specialty care services if additional eligible beneficiaries also sought access to such services from the same providers.

(I) An assessment of the impact of the elimination of health care services at military medical treatment facilities covered by the modernization study on civilians employed at such facilities.

(b) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.**—

(1) **REVIEW.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the report under subsection (a)(2).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The review under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the methodology used by the Secretary of Defense in conducting the study.

(B) An assessment of the adequacy of the data used by the Secretary with respect to such study.

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report under subsection (a)(2), the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the review under paragraph (1).

(c) **MODERNIZATION STUDY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “modernization study” means the Military Health System Modernization Study of the Department of Defense directed by the Resource Management Decision of the Department of Defense numbered MP-D-01.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

SEC. 721. DESIGNATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SENIOR MEDICAL ADVISOR FOR ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME.

(a) **DESIGNATION OF SENIOR MEDICAL ADVISOR.**—Subsection (a) of section 1513A of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 413a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “Deputy Director of the TRICARE Management Activity” and inserting “Deputy Director of the Defense Health Agency”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “Deputy Director of the TRICARE Management Activity” both places it appears and inserting “Deputy Director of the Defense Health Agency”.

(b) **CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES OF SENIOR MEDICAL ADVISOR.**—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by striking “health care standards of the Department of Veterans Affairs” and inserting “nationally recognized health care standards and requirements”.

SEC. 722. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR JOINT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY DEMONSTRATION FUND.

Section 1704(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2573) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2016”.

SEC. 723. REPORT ON STATUS OF REDUCTIONS IN TRICARE PRIME SERVICE AREAS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Section 732 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 1097a note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—

“(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the status of reducing the availability of TRICARE Prime in regions described in subsection (d)(1)(B).

“(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) A description of the implementation of the transition for affected eligible beneficiaries under the TRICARE program who no longer have access to TRICARE Prime under TRICARE managed care contracts as of the date of the report, including—

“(i) the number of eligible beneficiaries who have transitioned from TRICARE Prime to the TRICARE Standard option of the TRICARE program since October 1, 2013;

“(ii) the number of eligible beneficiaries who transferred their TRICARE Prime enrollment to a more distant available Prime service area to remain in TRICARE Prime, by State;

“(iii) the number of eligible beneficiaries who were eligible to transfer to a more distant available Prime service area, but chose to use TRICARE Standard;

“(iv) the number of eligible beneficiaries who elected to return to TRICARE Prime pursuant to subsection (c)(1); and

“(v) the number of affected eligible beneficiaries who, as of the date of the report, changed residences to remain eligible for TRICARE Prime in a new region.

“(B) An estimate of the increased annual costs per affected eligible beneficiary incurred by such beneficiary for health care under the TRICARE program.

“(C) A description of the efforts of the Department to assess the impact on access to health care and beneficiary satisfaction for affected eligible beneficiaries.

“(D) A description of the estimated cost savings realized by reducing the availability of TRICARE Prime in regions described in subsection (d)(1)(B).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b)(3)(A) of such section is amended by striking “subsection (c)(1)(B)” and inserting “subsection (d)(1)(B)”.

SEC. 724. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE REHABILITATION AND VOCATIONAL BENEFITS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WITH SEVERE INJURIES OR ILLNESSES.

Section 1631(b)(2) of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110-181; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 725. ACQUISITION STRATEGY FOR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL STAFFING SERVICES.

(a) ACQUISITION STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and carry out an acquisition strategy with respect to entering into contracts for the services of health care professional staff at military medical treatment facilities.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The acquisition strategy under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Identification of the responsibilities of the military departments and elements of the Department of Defense in carrying out such strategy.

(B) Methods to analyze, using reliable and detailed data covering the entire Department, the amount of funds expended on con-

tracts for the services of health care professional staff.

(C) Methods to identify opportunities to consolidate requirements for such services and reduce cost.

(D) Methods to measure cost savings that are realized by using such contracts instead of purchased care.

(E) Metrics to determine the effectiveness of such strategy.

(F) Metrics to evaluate the success of the strategy in achieving its objectives, including metrics to assess the effects of the strategy on the timeliness of beneficiary access to professional health care services in military medical treatment facilities.

(G) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of implementing the acquisition strategy under paragraph (1) of subsection (a), including how each element under subparagraphs (A) through (G) of paragraph (2) of such subsection is being carried out.

SEC. 726. PILOT PROGRAM ON MEDICATION THERAPY MANAGEMENT UNDER TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In accordance with section 1092 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall carry out a pilot program to evaluate the feasibility and desirability of including medication therapy management as part of the TRICARE program.

(b) ELEMENTS OF PILOT PROGRAM.—In carrying out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure the following:

(1) Patients who participate in the pilot program are patients who—

(A) have more than one chronic condition; and

(B) are prescribed more than one medication.

(2) Medication therapy management services provided under the pilot program are focused on improving patient use and outcomes of prescription medications.

(3) The design of the pilot program considers best commercial practices in providing medication therapy management services, including practices under the prescription drug program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-101 et seq.).

(4) The pilot program includes methods to measure the effect of medication therapy management services on—

(A) patient use and outcomes of prescription medications; and

(B) the costs of health care.

(c) LOCATIONS.—

(1) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) in not less than three locations.

(2) FIRST LOCATION CRITERIA.—Not less than one location selected under paragraph (1) shall meet the following criteria:

(A) The location is a pharmacy at a military medical treatment facility.

(B) The patients participating in the pilot program at such location generally receive primary care services from health care providers at such facility.

(3) SECOND LOCATION CRITERIA.—Not less than one location selected under paragraph (1) shall meet the following criteria:

(A) The location is a pharmacy at a military medical treatment facility.

(B) The patients participating in the pilot program at such location generally do not receive primary care services from health care providers at such facility.

(4) THIRD LOCATION CRITERION.—Not less than one location selected under paragraph (1) shall be a pharmacy located at a location other than a military medical treatment facility.

(d) DURATION.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) for a period determined appropriate by the Secretary that is not less than two years.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 30 months after the date on which the Secretary commences the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the pilot program that includes—

(1) information on the effect of medication therapy management services on—

(A) patient use and outcomes of prescription medications; and

(B) the costs of health care;

(2) the recommendations of the Secretary with respect to incorporating medication therapy management into the TRICARE program; and

(3) such other information as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “medication therapy management” means professional services provided by qualified pharmacists to patients to improve the effective use and outcomes of prescription medications provided to the patients.

(2) The term “TRICARE program” has the meaning given that term in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 727. ANTIMICROBIAL STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM AT MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall carry out an antimicrobial stewardship program at medical facilities of the Department of Defense.

(b) COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.—In carrying out the antimicrobial stewardship program required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop a consistent manner in which to collect and analyze data on antibiotic usage, health issues related to antibiotic usage, and antimicrobial resistance trends at medical facilities of the Department.

(c) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a plan for carrying out the antimicrobial stewardship program required by subsection (a).

SEC. 728. REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS IN THE IDENTIFICATION AND TREATMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH CONDITIONS AND TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an evaluation of specific tools, processes, and best practices to improve the identification of and treatment by the Armed Forces of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An evaluation of existing peer-to-peer identification and intervention programs in each of the Armed Forces.

(2) An evaluation of programs that provide training and certification to health care providers that treat mental health conditions

and traumatic brain injury in members of the Armed Forces.

(3) An evaluation of programs and services provided by the Armed Forces that provide training and certification to providers of cognitive rehabilitation and other rehabilitation for traumatic brain injury to members of the Armed Forces.

(4) An evaluation of programs and services provided by the Armed Forces that assist members of the Armed Forces and family members affected by suicides among members of the Armed Forces.

(5) An evaluation of tools and processes used by the Armed Forces to identify traumatic brain injury in members of the Armed Forces and to distinguish mental health conditions likely caused by traumatic brain injury from mental health conditions caused by other factors.

(6) An evaluation of the unified effort of the Armed Forces to promote mental health and prevent suicide through the integration of clinical and nonclinical programs of the Armed Forces.

(7) Recommendations with respect to improving, consolidating, expanding, and standardizing the programs, services, tools, processes, and efforts described in paragraphs (1) through (6).

(8) A description of existing efforts to reduce the time from development and testing of new mental health and traumatic brain injury tools and treatments for members of the Armed Forces to widespread dissemination of such tools and treatments among the Armed Forces.

(9) Recommendations as to the feasibility and advisability of conducting mental health assessments before the enlistment or commissioning of a member of the Armed Forces and again during the 90-day period preceding the date of discharge or release of the member from the Armed Forces, including the utility of using tools and processes in such mental health assessments that conform to those used in other mental health assessments provided to members of the Armed Forces.

(10) Recommendations on how to track changes in the mental health assessment of a member of the Armed Forces relating to traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety, and other conditions.

(c) PRIVACY MATTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any medical or other personal information obtained pursuant to any provision of this section shall be protected from disclosure or misuse in accordance with the laws on privacy applicable to such information.

(2) EXCLUSION OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION FROM REPORTS.—No personally identifiable information may be included in the report required by subsection (a).

SEC. 729. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO TREAT INFERTILITY OF MILITARY FAMILIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report assessing the access of members of the Armed Forces and the dependents of such members to reproductive counseling and treatments for infertility.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description, by location, of the infertility treatment services available at military medical treatment facilities throughout the military health care system.

(2) An identification of factors that might disrupt treatment, including lack of timely

access to treatment, change in duty station, or overseas deployments.

(3) The number of members of the Armed Forces who have received specific infertility treatment services during the five-year period preceding the date of the report.

(4) The number of dependents of members who have received specific infertility treatment services during the five-year period preceding the date of the report.

(5) The number of births resulting from infertility treatment services described in paragraphs (3) and (4).

(6) A comparison of infertility treatment services covered by health plans sponsored by the Federal Government and infertility treatment services provided by the military health care system.

(7) The current cost to the Department of Defense for providing infertility treatment services to members and dependents.

(8) The current cost to members and dependents for infertility treatment services provided by the military health care system.

(9) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

SEC. 730. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE ON IMPROVEMENTS TO CERTAIN RESILIENCE AND PREVENTION PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of implementing the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine regarding improvements to programs of the Department of Defense intended to strengthen mental, emotional, and behavioral abilities associated with managing adversity, adapting to change, recovering, and learning in connection with service in the Armed Forces.

SEC. 731. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON TRANSITION OF CARE FOR POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER OR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than September 1, 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report that assesses the transition of care for post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The programs, policies, and regulations that affect the transition of care, particularly with respect to individuals who are taking or have been prescribed antidepressants, stimulants, antipsychotics, mood stabilizers, anxiolytics, depressants, or hallucinogens.

(2) Upon transitioning to care furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the extent to which the pharmaceutical treatment plan of an individual changes, and the factors determining such changes.

(3) The extent to which the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs have worked together to identify and apply best pharmaceutical treatment practices.

(4) A description of the off-formulary waiver process of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the extent to which the process is applied efficiently at the treatment level.

(5) The benefits and challenges of harmonizing the formularies across the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(6) Any other issues that the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

(c) TRANSITION OF CARE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “transition of care” means the transition of an individual from receiving treatment furnished by the Secretary of Defense to treatment furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 732. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON MENTAL HEALTH STIGMA REDUCTION EFFORTS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a review of the policies, procedures, and programs of the Department of Defense to reduce the stigma associated with mental health treatment for members of the Armed Forces and deployed civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The review under subsection (a) shall address, at a minimum, the following:

(1) An assessment of the availability and access to mental health treatment services for members of the Armed Forces and deployed civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

(2) An assessment of the perception of the impact of the stigma of mental health treatment on the career advancement and retention of members of the Armed Forces and such employees.

(3) An assessment of the policies, procedures, and programs, including training and education, of each of the Armed Forces to reduce the stigma of mental health treatment for members of the Armed Forces and such employees at each unit level of the organized forces.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the review under subsection (a).

SEC. 733. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND OTHER COVERED BENEFICIARIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty and other covered beneficiaries under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description and assessment of women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries, including with respect to access to care, scope of available care, and availability of specialty care, and with a particular emphasis on maternity care.

(2) An assessment of whether the quality measures used by the military health care system with respect to women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries facilitate expected outcomes, and an assessment of whether another, or additional, evidence-based quality measures would improve outcomes in the military health care system.

(3) A description and assessment of nationally recognized recommendations to improve access to health services and better health outcomes for women members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries.

(4) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller

General considers appropriate to improve women's health care services for members of the Armed Forces and other covered beneficiaries.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

- Sec. 801. Modular open systems approaches in acquisition programs.
- Sec. 802. Recharacterization of changes to Major Automated Information System programs.
- Sec. 803. Amendments relating to defense business systems.
- Sec. 804. Report on implementation of acquisition process for information technology systems.
- Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations
- Sec. 811. Extension and modification of contract authority for advanced component development and prototype units.
- Sec. 812. Amendments relating to authority of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to carry out certain prototype projects.
- Sec. 813. Extension of limitation on aggregate annual amount available for contract services.
- Sec. 814. Improvement in defense design-build construction process.
- Sec. 815. Permanent authority for use of simplified acquisition procedures for certain commercial items.
- Sec. 816. Restatement and revision of requirements applicable to multiyear defense acquisitions to be specifically authorized by law.
- Sec. 817. Sourcing requirements related to avoiding counterfeit electronic parts.
- Sec. 818. Amendments to Proof of Concept Commercialization Pilot Program.

Subtitle C—Industrial Base Matters

- Sec. 821. Temporary extension of and amendments to test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans.
- Sec. 822. Plan for improving data on bundled or consolidated contracts.
- Sec. 823. Authority to provide education to small businesses on certain requirements of Arms Export Control Act.
- Sec. 824. Matters relating to reverse auctions.
- Sec. 825. Sole source contracts for small business concerns owned and controlled by women.
- Subtitle D—Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform
- Sec. 831. Chief Information Officer authority enhancements.
- Sec. 832. Enhanced transparency and improved risk management in information technology investments.
- Sec. 833. Portfolio review.
- Sec. 834. Federal data center consolidation initiative.
- Sec. 835. Expansion of training and use of information technology cadres.
- Sec. 836. Maximizing the benefit of the Federal strategic sourcing initiative.

Sec. 837. Governmentwide software purchasing program.

Subtitle E—Never Contract With the Enemy

Sec. 841. Prohibition on providing funds to the enemy.

Sec. 842. Additional access to records.

Sec. 843. Definitions.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

- Sec. 851. Rapid acquisition and deployment procedures for United States Special Operations Command.
- Sec. 852. Consideration of corrosion control in preliminary design review.
- Sec. 853. Program manager development report.
- Sec. 854. Operational metrics for Joint Information Environment and supporting activities.
- Sec. 855. Compliance with requirements for senior Department of Defense officials seeking employment with defense contractors.
- Sec. 856. Enhancement of whistleblower protection for employees of grantees.
- Sec. 857. Prohibition on reimbursement of contractors for congressional investigations and inquiries.
- Sec. 858. Requirement to provide photovoltaic devices from United States sources.
- Sec. 859. Reimbursement of Department of Defense for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers.
- Sec. 860. Three-year extension of authority for Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

SEC. 801. MODULAR OPEN SYSTEMS APPROACHES IN ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) PLAN FOR MODULAR OPEN SYSTEMS APPROACH THROUGH DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF STANDARDS AND ARCHITECTURES.—Not later than January 1, 2016, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives detailing a plan to develop standards and define architectures necessary to enable open systems approaches in the key mission areas of the Department of Defense with respect to which the Under Secretary determines that such standards and architectures would be feasible and cost effective.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF MODULAR OPEN SYSTEMS APPROACHES.—

(1) REVIEW OF ACQUISITION GUIDANCE.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall review current acquisition guidance, and modify such guidance as necessary, to—

(A) ensure that acquisition programs include open systems approaches in the product design and acquisition of information technology systems to the maximum extent practicable; and

(B) for any information technology system not using an open systems approach, ensure that written justification is provided in the contract file for the system detailing why an open systems approach was not used.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The review required in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) consider whether the guidance includes appropriate exceptions for the acquisition of—

- (i) commercial items; and
- (ii) solutions addressing urgent operational needs;

(B) determine the extent to which open systems approaches should be addressed in analysis of alternatives, acquisition strategies, system engineering plans, and life cycle sustainment plans; and

(C) ensure that increments of acquisition programs consider the extent to which the increment will implement open systems approaches as a whole.

(3) DEADLINE FOR REVIEW.—The review required in this subsection shall be completed no later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) TREATMENT OF ONGOING AND LEGACY PROGRAMS.—

(1) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report covering the matters specified in paragraph (2).

(2) MATTERS COVERED.—Subject to paragraph (3), the report required in this subsection shall—

(A) identify all information technology systems that are in development, production, or deployed status as of the date of the enactment of this Act, that are or were major defense acquisition programs or major automated information systems, and that are not using an open systems approach;

(B) identify gaps in standards and architectures necessary to enable open systems approaches in the key mission areas of the Department of Defense, as determined pursuant to the plan submitted under subsection (a); and

(C) outline a process for potential conversion to an open systems approach for each information technology system identified under subparagraph (A).

(3) LIMITATIONS.—The report required in this subsection shall not include information technology systems—

(A) having a planned increment before fiscal year 2021 that will result in conversion to an open systems approach; and

(B) that will be in operation for fewer than 15 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term “information technology” has the meaning given the term in section 11101(6) of title 40, United States Code.

(2) OPEN SYSTEMS APPROACH.—The term “open systems approach” means, with respect to an information technology system, an integrated business and technical strategy that—

(A) employs a modular design and uses widely supported and consensus-based standards for key interfaces;

(B) is subjected to successful validation and verification tests to ensure key interfaces comply with widely supported and consensus-based standards; and

(C) uses a system architecture that allows components to be added, modified, replaced, removed, or supported by different vendors throughout the lifecycle of the system to afford opportunities for enhanced competition and innovation while yielding—

- (i) significant cost and schedule savings; and
- (ii) increased interoperability.

SEC. 802. RECHARACTERIZATION OF CHANGES TO MAJOR AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM PROGRAMS.

(a) ADDITION TO COVERED DETERMINATION OF A SIGNIFICANT CHANGE.—Subsection (c)(2) of section 2445c of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) the automated information system or information technology investment failed to achieve a full deployment decision within five years after the Milestone A decision for the program or, if there was no Milestone A decision, the date when the preferred alternative is selected for the program (excluding any time during which program activity is delayed as a result of a bid protest).”

(b) REMOVAL OF COVERED DETERMINATION OF A CRITICAL CHANGE.—Subsection (d)(3) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT FOR CLARITY.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended by striking “(A) is primarily due to an extension of a program, and (B) involves” and inserting “are primarily due to an extension of a program and involve”.

SEC. 803. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS.

(a) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION SYSTEMS FROM DEFINITION OF DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM.—Subsection (j)(1) of section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after “(1)”;

(2) by striking “, other than a national security system,”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) The term does not include—

“(i) a national security system; or

“(ii) an information system used exclusively by and within the defense commissary system or the exchange system or other instrumentality of the Department of Defense conducted for the morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the armed forces using nonappropriated funds.”

(b) BUSINESS PROCESS MAPPING REQUIREMENT.—Section 2222 of such title is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by inserting “, including business process mapping,” after “re-engineering efforts”; and

(2) in subsection (j), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) The term ‘business process mapping’ means a procedure in which the steps in a business process are clarified and documented in both written form and in a flow chart.”

SEC. 804. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ACQUISITION PROCESS FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the acquisition process for information technology systems required by section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2402; 10 U.S.C. 2225 note).

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, include the following elements:

(1) The applicable regulations, instructions, or policies implementing the acquisition process.

(2) With respect to the criteria established for such process in section 804(a) of such Act—

(A) an explanation for any criteria not yet implemented;

(B) a schedule for the implementation of any criteria not yet implemented; and

(C) an explanation for any proposed deviation from the criteria.

(3) Identification of any categories of information technology acquisitions to which the acquisition process will not apply.

(4) Recommendations for any legislation that may be required to implement the remaining criteria of the acquisition process.

Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

SEC. 811. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPE UNITS.

Section 819 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2409; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “advanced component development or prototype of technology” and inserting “advanced component development, prototype, or initial production of technology”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “prototype items” and inserting “items”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5);

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph (4):

“(4) APPLICABILITY.—The authority provided in subsection (a) applies only to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force.”; and

(C) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2019”.

SEC. 812. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO AUTHORITY OF THE DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO AUTHORITY.—Section 845(a)(1) of Public Law 103–160 (10 U.S.C. 2371 note) is amended by striking “weapons or weapon systems proposed to be acquired or developed by the Department of Defense, or to improvement of weapons or weapon systems in use by the Armed Forces” and inserting the following: “enhancing the mission effectiveness of military personnel and the supporting platforms, systems, components, or materials proposed to be acquired or developed by the Department of Defense, or to improvement of platforms, systems, components, or materials in use by the Armed Forces”.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS.—Section 845 of Public Law 103–160 (10 U.S.C. 2371 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(B), by inserting “or small business” after “defense contractor”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “NONTRADITIONAL DEFENSE CONTRACTOR DEFINED.—In this section, the” and inserting the following: “DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The term ‘small business’ means a small business concern as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).”

SEC. 813. EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE ANNUAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR CONTRACT SERVICES.

Section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1489), as amended by section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 804) is further amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking “or 2014” and inserting “2014, or 2015”;

(2) in subsection (c)(3), by striking “and 2014” and inserting “2014, and 2015”;

(3) in subsection (d)(4), by striking “or 2014” and inserting “2014, or 2015”;

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) USE OF OTHER DATA.—For purposes of compliance with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(2), the Secretaries of the military departments and the heads of the Defense Agencies may use other available sources of data, such as advisory and assistance services information collected for purposes of the annual budget submission of the Department of Defense, to corroborate data from the annual inventory of contractor services required in section 2330a of title 10, United States Code. Any discrepancy identified between the inventory data and the data from other available sources shall be resolved and reported to the congressional defense committees.”

SEC. 814. IMPROVEMENT IN DEFENSE DESIGN-BUILD CONSTRUCTION PROCESS.

Section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence of subsection (d) and inserting the following: “If the contract value exceeds \$4,000,000, the maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed 5 unless the head of the contracting activity, delegable to a level no lower than the senior contracting official within the contracting activity, approves the contracting officer’s justification with respect to an individual solicitation that a number greater than 5 is in the Federal Government’s interest. The contracting officer shall provide written documentation of how a maximum number exceeding 5 is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection procedures.”

SEC. 815. PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR USE OF SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

Section 4202 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (division D of Public Law 104–106; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note) is amended by striking subsection (e).

SEC. 816. RESTATEMENT AND REVISION OF REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO MULTIYEAR DEFENSE ACQUISITIONS TO BE SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (i) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(i) DEFENSE ACQUISITIONS SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED BY LAW.—(1) In the case of the Department of Defense, a multiyear contract in an amount equal to or greater than \$500,000,000 may not be entered into under this section unless the contract is specifically authorized by law in an Act other than an appropriations Act.

“(2) In submitting a request for a specific authorization by law to carry out a defense acquisition program using multiyear contract authority under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall include in the request the following:

“(A) A report containing preliminary findings of the agency head required in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a), together with the basis for such findings.

“(B) Confirmation that the preliminary findings of the agency head under subparagraph (A) were made after the completion of a cost analysis performed by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation for the purpose of section 2334(e)(1) of this title, and that the analysis supports those preliminary findings.

“(3) A multiyear contract may not be entered into under this section for a defense acquisition program that has been specifically authorized by law to be carried out using multiyear contract authority unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing, not later than 30 days before entry into the contract, that each of the following conditions is satisfied:

“(A) The Secretary has determined that each of the requirements in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) will be met by such contract and has provided the basis for such determination to the congressional defense committees.

“(B) The Secretary’s determination under subparagraph (A) was made after completion of a cost analysis conducted on the basis of section 2334(e)(2) of this title, and the analysis supports the determination.

“(C) The system being acquired pursuant to such contract has not been determined to have experienced cost growth in excess of the critical cost growth threshold pursuant to section 2433(d) of this title within 5 years prior to the date the Secretary anticipates such contract (or a contract for advance procurement entered into consistent with the authorization for such contract) will be awarded.

“(D) A sufficient number of end items of the system being acquired under such contract have been delivered at or within the most current estimates of the program acquisition unit cost or procurement unit cost for such system to determine that current estimates of such unit costs are realistic.

“(E) During the fiscal year in which such contract is to be awarded, sufficient funds will be available to perform the contract in such fiscal year, and the future-years defense program for such fiscal year will include the funding required to execute the program without cancellation.

“(F) The contract is a fixed price type contract.

“(G) The proposed multiyear contract provides for production at not less than minimum economic rates given the existing tooling and facilities.

“(4) If for any fiscal year a multiyear contract to be entered into under this section is authorized by law for a particular procurement program and that authorization is subject to certain conditions established by law (including a condition as to cost savings to be achieved under the multiyear contract in comparison to specified other contracts) and if it appears (after negotiations with contractors) that such savings cannot be achieved, but that substantial savings could nevertheless be achieved through the use of a multiyear contract rather than specified other contracts, the President may submit to Congress a request for relief from the specified cost savings that must be achieved through multiyear contracting for that program. Any such request by the President shall include details about the request for a multiyear contract, including details about the negotiated contract terms and conditions.

“(5)(A) The Secretary may obligate funds for procurement of an end item under a multiyear contract for the purchase of property only for procurement of a complete and usable end item.

“(B) The Secretary may obligate funds appropriated for any fiscal year for advance procurement under a contract for the purchase of property only for the procurement of those long-lead items necessary in order to meet a planned delivery schedule for complete major end items that are programmed under the contract to be acquired with funds appropriated for a subsequent fiscal year (including an economic order quantity of such long-lead items when authorized by law).

“(6) The Secretary may make the certification under paragraph (3) notwithstanding the fact that one or more of the conditions of such certification are not met, if the Secretary determines that, due to exceptional circumstances, proceeding with a multiyear contract under this section is in the best interest of the Department of Defense and the Secretary provides the basis for such determination with the certification.

“(7) The Secretary may not delegate the authority to make the certification under paragraph (3) or the determination under paragraph (6) to an official below the level of Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a)(7) of such section is amended by striking “subparagraphs (C) through (F) of paragraph (1) of subsection (i)” and inserting “subparagraphs (C) through (F) of subsection (i)(3)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to requests for specific authorization by law to carry out defense acquisition programs using multiyear contract authority that are made on or after that date.

SEC. 817. SOURCING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO AVOIDING COUNTERFEIT ELECTRONIC PARTS.

Section 818(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1495; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “, whenever possible,”;

(B) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking “trusted suppliers” and inserting “suppliers identified as trusted suppliers in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to subparagraph (C) or (D)”;

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in clause (ii), by striking “trusted suppliers,” and inserting “suppliers identified as trusted suppliers in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to subparagraph (C) or (D); and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) obtain electronic parts from alternate suppliers if such parts are not available from original manufacturers, their authorized dealers, or suppliers identified as trusted suppliers in accordance with regulations prescribed pursuant to subparagraph (C) or (D);”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting “for” before “inspection”;

(B) by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A), if obtaining the electronic parts in accordance with such clauses is not possible”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking “identify trusted suppliers that have appropriate

policies” and inserting “identify as trusted suppliers those that have appropriate policies”.

SEC. 818. AMENDMENTS TO PROOF OF CONCEPT COMMERCIALIZATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARIES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS TO CARRY OUT PILOT.—Section 1603(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 944; 10 U.S.C. 2359 note) is amended by inserting after “Engineering” the following: “and the Secretary of each military department”.

(b) REVIEW BOARD REVISIONS.—

(1) Section 1603(c)(3)(B)(i) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“(i) rigorous review of commercialization potential or military utility of technologies, including through use of outside expertise;”.

(2) Section 1603(d)(1) of such Act is amended by striking “, including incentives and activities undertaken by review board experts”.

(c) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF AWARDS.—Section 1603(c)(5)(B)(i) of such Act is amended by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

(d) AUTHORITY FOR USE OF BASIC RESEARCH FUNDS.—Section 1603(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting “AND USE OF FUNDS” after “LIMITATION”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary of a military department may use basic research funds, or other funds considered appropriate by the Secretary, to conduct the pilot program within the military department concerned.”

(e) ONE-YEAR EXTENSION.—Section 1603(g) of such Act is amended by striking “2018” and inserting “2019”.

Subtitle C—Industrial Base Matters

SEC. 821. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AND AMENDMENTS TO TEST PROGRAM FOR NEGOTIATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLANS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (e) of section 834 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (15 U.S.C. 637 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE SUBCONTRACTING PLANS.—Subsection (b) of section 834 of such Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraph (4)”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4), and in that paragraph by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$100,000,000”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) Each comprehensive subcontracting plan of a contractor shall require that the contractor report to the Secretary of Defense on a semi-annual basis the following information:

“(A) The amount of first-tier subcontract dollars awarded during the six-month period covered by the report to covered small business concerns, with the information set forth separately—

“(i) by North American Industrial Classification System code;

“(ii) by major defense acquisition program, as defined in section 2430(a) of title 10, United States Code;

“(iii) by contract, if the contract is for the maintenance, overhaul, repair, servicing, rehabilitation, salvage, modernization, or modification of supplies, systems, or equipment and the total value of the contract, including options, exceeds \$100,000,000; and

“(iv) by military department.

“(B) The total number of subcontracts active under the test program during the six-month period covered by the report that would have otherwise required a subcontracting plan under paragraph (4) or (5) of section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)).

“(C) Costs incurred in negotiating, complying with, and reporting on comprehensive subcontracting plans.

“(D) Costs avoided by adoption of a comprehensive subcontracting plan.”.

(c) ADDITIONAL CONSEQUENCE FOR FAILURE TO MAKE GOOD FAITH EFFORT TO COMPLY.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (d) of section 834 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking “COMPANY-WIDE” and inserting “COMPREHENSIVE” in the heading;

(B) by striking “company-wide” and inserting “comprehensive subcontracting”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: “In addition, any such failure shall be a factor considered as part of the evaluation of past performance of an offeror.”.

(2) REPEAL OF SUSPENSION OF SUBSECTION (D).—Section 402 of Public Law 101-574 (104 Stat. 2832; 15 U.S.C. 637 note) is repealed.

(d) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 834 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (15 U.S.C. 637 note) is further amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “A contractor that”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Effective in fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter in which the test program is in effect, the Secretary of Defense may not negotiate a comprehensive subcontracting plan for a fiscal year with any contractor with which such a plan was negotiated in the prior fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the contractor did not meet the subcontracting goals negotiated in the plan for the prior fiscal year.”.

(e) REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 834 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“(f) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the results of the test program to the Committees on Armed Services and on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services and on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate.”.

(f) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—

(1) COVERED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—Subsection (g) of section 834 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ‘covered small business concern’ includes each of the following:

“(1) A small business concern, as that term is defined under section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)).

“(2) A small business concern owned and controlled by veterans, as that term is defined in section 3(q)(3) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(3)).

“(3) A small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, as that term is defined in section 3(q)(2) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(2)).

“(4) A qualified HUBZone small business concern, as that term is defined under section 3(p)(5) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(5)).

“(5) A small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, as that term is defined in section 8(d)(3)(C) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)).

“(6) A small business concern owned and controlled by women, as that term is defined under section 3(n) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 632(n)).”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 834 of such Act is amended by striking “small business concerns and small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals” and inserting “covered small business concerns”.

SEC. 822. PLAN FOR IMPROVING DATA ON BUNDLED OR CONSOLIDATED CONTRACTS.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(s) DATA QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2015, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in consultation with the Small Business Procurement Advisory Council, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, and the Administrator of General Services, shall develop a plan to improve the quality of data reported on bundled or consolidated contracts in the Federal procurement data system (described in section 1122(a)(4)(A) of title 41, United States Code).

“(2) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall—

“(A) describe the roles and responsibilities of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, each Director of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, the Administrator of General Services, senior procurement executives, and Chief Acquisition Officers in—

“(i) improving the quality of data reported on bundled or consolidated contracts in the Federal procurement data system; and

“(ii) contributing to the annual report required by subsection (p)(4);

“(B) recommend changes to policies and procedures, including training procedures of relevant personnel, to properly identify and mitigate the effects of bundled or consolidated contracts;

“(C) recommend requirements for periodic and statistically valid data verification and validation; and

“(D) recommend clear data verification responsibilities.

“(3) PLAN SUBMISSION.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall submit the plan to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate not later than December 1, 2016.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

“(A) CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER; SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE.—The terms ‘Chief Acquisition Officer’ and ‘senior procurement executive’ have the meanings given such terms in section 44(a) of this Act.

“(B) BUNDLED OR CONSOLIDATED CONTRACT.—The term ‘bundled or consolidated contract’ means a bundled contract (as defined in section 3(o)) or a contract resulting from the consolidation of contracting requirements (as defined in section 44(a)(2)).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 44(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657q(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “appointed or” before “designated”; and

(B) by striking “section 16(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414(a))” and inserting “section 1702(a) of title 41, United States Code”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “section 16(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414(c))” and inserting “section 1702(c) of title 41, United States Code”.

SEC. 823. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE EDUCATION TO SMALL BUSINESSES ON CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.

(a) ASSISTANCE AT SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—Section 21(c)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(1)) is amended by inserting at the end the following: “Applicants receiving grants under this section may also assist small businesses by providing, where appropriate, education on the requirements applicable to small businesses under the regulations issued under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) and on compliance with those requirements.”.

(b) PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 2418 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) An eligible entity assisted by the Department of Defense under this chapter also may furnish education on the requirements applicable to small businesses under the regulations issued under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) and on compliance with those requirements.”.

SEC. 824. MATTERS RELATING TO REVERSE AUCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall clarify regulations on reverse auctions, as necessary, to ensure that—

(1) single bid contracts may not be entered into resulting from reverse auctions unless compliant with existing Federal regulations and Department of Defense memoranda providing guidance on single bid offers;

(2) all reverse auctions provide offerors with the ability to submit revised bids throughout the course of the auction;

(3) if a reverse auction is conducted by a third party—

(A) inherently governmental functions are not performed by private contractors, including by the third party; and

(B) past performance or financial responsibility information created by the third party is made available to offerors; and

(4) reverse auctions resulting in design-build military construction contracts specifically authorized in law are prohibited.

(b) TRAINING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President of the Defense Acquisition University shall establish comprehensive training available for contract specialists in the Department of Defense on the use of reverse auctions.

(c) DESIGN-BUILD DEFINED.—In this section, the term “design-build” means procedures used for the selection of a contractor on the basis of price and other evaluation criteria to perform, in accordance with the provisions of a firm fixed-price contract, both the design and construction of a facility using performance specifications supplied by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 825. SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.—Subsection (m) of section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (2)(E) to read as follows:

“(E) each of the concerns is certified by a Federal agency, a State government, the Administrator, or a national certifying entity approved by the Administrator as a small business concern owned and controlled by women.”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “paragraph (2)(F)” each place such term appears and inserting “paragraph (2)(E)”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(7) **AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.**—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women described in paragraph (2)(A) and certified under paragraph (2)(E) if—

“(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity and the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that 2 or more businesses described in paragraph (2)(A) will submit offers;

“(B) the anticipated award price of the contract (including options) will not exceed—

“(i) \$6,500,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

“(ii) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity; and

“(C) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.

“(8) **AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN IN SUBSTANTIALLY UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES.**—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women certified under paragraph (2)(E) that is in an industry in which small business concerns owned and controlled by women are substantially underrepresented (as determined by the Administrator under paragraph (3)) if—

“(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity and the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that 2 or more businesses in an industry that has received a waiver under paragraph (3) will submit offers;

“(B) the anticipated award price of the contract (including options) will not exceed—

“(i) \$6,500,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

“(ii) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity; and

“(C) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price.”.

(b) **REPORTING ON GOALS FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.**—Clause (viii) of subsection 15(h)(2)(E) of such Act is amended—

(1) in subclause (IV), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subclause (V) as subclause (VIII); and

(3) by inserting after subclause (IV) the following new subclauses:

“(V) through sole source contracts awarded using the authority under subsection 8(m)(7);

“(VI) through sole source contracts awarded using the authority under section 8(m)(8);

“(VII) by industry for contracts described in subclause (III), (IV), (V), or (VI); and”.

(c) **ACCELERATED DEADLINE FOR REPORT ON INDUSTRIES UNDERREPRESENTED BY SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.**—Paragraph (2) of section 29(o) of such Act is amended by striking “5 years after the date of enactment” and inserting “3 years after the date of enactment”.

Subtitle D—Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform

SEC. 831. CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER AUTHORITY ENHANCEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter II of chapter 113 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§11319. Resources, planning, and portfolio management

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘covered agency’ means each agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31.

“(2) The term ‘information technology’ has the meaning given that term under capital planning guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget.

“(b) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES FOR CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS.**—

“(1) **PLANNING, PROGRAMMING, BUDGETING, AND EXECUTION AUTHORITIES FOR CIOS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of each covered agency other than the Department of Defense shall ensure that the Chief Information Officer of the agency has a significant role in—

“(i) the decision processes for all annual and multi-year planning, programming, budgeting, and execution decisions, related reporting requirements, and reports related to information technology; and

“(ii) the management, governance, and oversight processes related to information technology.

“(B) **BUDGET FORMULATION.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall require in the annual information technology capital planning guidance of the Office of Management and Budget the following:

“(i) That the Chief Information Officer of each covered agency other than the Department of Defense approve the information technology budget request of the covered agency, and that the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense review and provide recommendations to the Secretary of Defense on the information technology budget request of the Department.

“(ii) That the Chief Information Officer of each covered agency certify that information technology investments are adequately implementing incremental development, as defined in capital planning guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget.

“(C) **REVIEW.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A covered agency other than the Department of Defense—

“(I) may not enter into a contract or other agreement for information technology or information technology services, unless the contract or other agreement has been reviewed and approved by the Chief Information Officer of the agency;

“(II) may not request the reprogramming of any funds made available for information technology programs, unless the request has been reviewed and approved by the Chief Information Officer of the agency; and

“(III) may use the governance processes of the agency to approve such a contract or

other agreement if the Chief Information Officer of the agency is included as a full participant in the governance processes.

“(ii) **DELEGATION.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subclause (II), the duties of a Chief Information Officer under clause (i) are not delegable.

“(II) **NON-MAJOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.**—For a contract or agreement for a non-major information technology investment, as defined in the annual information technology capital planning guidance of the Office of Management and Budget, the Chief Information Officer of a covered agency other than the Department of Defense may delegate the approval of the contract or agreement under clause (i) to an individual who reports directly to the Chief Information Officer.

“(2) **PERSONNEL-RELATED AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each covered agency other than the Department of Defense, the Chief Information Officer of the covered agency shall approve the appointment of any other employee with the title of Chief Information Officer, or who functions in the capacity of a Chief Information Officer, for any component organization within the covered agency.

“(c) **LIMITATION.**—None of the authorities provided in this section shall apply to telecommunications or information technology that is fully funded by amounts made available—

“(1) under the National Intelligence Program, defined by section 3(6) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(6));

“(2) under the Military Intelligence Program or any successor program or programs; or

“(3) jointly under the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program (or any successor program or programs).”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 113 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 11318 the following new item:

“11319. Resources, planning, and portfolio management.”.

SEC. 832. ENHANCED TRANSPARENCY AND IMPROVED RISK MANAGEMENT IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS.

Section 11302(c) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (5), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph (1):

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘covered agency’ means an agency listed in section 901(b)(1) or 901(b)(2) of title 31.

“(B) The term ‘major information technology investment’ means an investment within a covered agency information technology investment portfolio that is designated by the covered agency as major, in accordance with capital planning guidance issued by the Director.

“(C) The term ‘national security system’ has the meaning provided in section 3542 of title 44.”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraphs:

“(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall make available to the public a list of each major information technology investment, without regard to whether the investments are for

new information technology acquisitions or for operations and maintenance of existing information technology, including data on cost, schedule, and performance.

“(B) AGENCY INFORMATION.—

“(i) The Director shall issue guidance to each covered agency for reporting of data required by subparagraph (A) that provides a standardized data template that can be incorporated into existing, required data reporting formats and processes. Such guidance shall integrate the reporting process into current budget reporting that each covered agency provides to the Office of Management and Budget, to minimize additional workload. Such guidance shall also clearly specify that the investment evaluation required under subparagraph (C) adequately reflect the investment's cost and schedule performance and employ incremental development approaches in appropriate cases.

“(ii) The Chief Information Officer of each covered agency shall provide the Director with the information described in subparagraph (A) on at least a semi-annual basis for each major information technology investment, using existing data systems and processes.

“(C) INVESTMENT EVALUATION.—For each major information technology investment listed under subparagraph (A), the Chief Information Officer of the covered agency, in consultation with other appropriate agency officials, shall categorize the investment according to risk, in accordance with guidance issued by the Director.

“(D) CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.—If either the Director or the Chief Information Officer of a covered agency determines that the information made available from the agency's existing data systems and processes as required by subparagraph (B) is not timely and reliable, the Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Director and the head of the agency, shall establish a program for the improvement of such data systems and processes.

“(E) WAIVER OR LIMITATION AUTHORITY.—The applicability of subparagraph (A) may be waived or the extent of the information may be limited by the Director, if the Director determines that such a waiver or limitation is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(F) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall not apply to national security systems or to telecommunications or information technology that is fully funded by amounts made available—

“(i) under the National Intelligence Program, defined by section 3(6) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(6));

“(ii) under the Military Intelligence Program or any successor program or programs; or

“(iii) jointly under the National Intelligence Program and the Military Intelligence Program (or any successor program or programs).

“(4) RISK MANAGEMENT.—For each major information technology investment listed under paragraph (3)(A) that receives a high risk rating, as described in paragraph (3)(C), for 4 consecutive quarters—

“(A) the Chief Information Officer of the covered agency and the program manager of the investment within the covered agency, in consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government, shall conduct a review of the investment that shall identify—

“(i) the root causes of the high level of risk of the investment;

“(ii) the extent to which these causes can be addressed; and

“(iii) the probability of future success;

“(B) the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government shall communicate the results of the review under subparagraph (A) to—

“(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(ii) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(iii) the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with primary jurisdiction over the agency;

“(C) in the case of a major information technology investment of the Department of Defense, the assessment required by subparagraph (A) may be accomplished in accordance with section 2445c of title 10, provided that the results of the review are provided to the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government upon request and to the committees identified in subsection (B); and

“(D) for a covered agency other than the Department of Defense, if on the date that is one year after the date of completion of the review required under subsection (A), the investment is rated as high risk under paragraph (3)(C), the Director shall deny any request for additional development, modernization, or enhancement funding for the investment until the date on which the Chief Information Officer of the covered agency determines that the root causes of the high level of risk of the investment have been addressed, and there is sufficient capability to deliver the remaining planned increments within the planned cost and schedule.

“(5) SUNSET OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) shall not be in effect on and after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.”.

SEC. 833. PORTFOLIO REVIEW.

Section 11319 of title 40, United States Code, as added by section 831, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“(c) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PORTFOLIO, PROGRAM, AND RESOURCE REVIEWS.—

“(1) PROCESS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers of appropriate agencies, shall implement a process to assist covered agencies in reviewing their portfolio of information technology investments—

“(A) to identify or develop ways to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the information technology investments of the covered agency;

“(B) to identify or develop opportunities to consolidate the acquisition and management of information technology services, and increase the use of shared-service delivery models;

“(C) to identify potential duplication and waste;

“(D) to identify potential cost savings;

“(E) to develop plans for actions to optimize the information technology portfolio, programs, and resources of the covered agency;

“(F) to develop ways to better align the information technology portfolio, programs, and financial resources of the covered agency to any multi-year funding requirements or strategic plans required by law;

“(G) to develop a multi-year strategy to identify and reduce duplication and waste within the information technology portfolio

of the covered agency, including component-level investments and to identify projected cost savings resulting from such strategy; and

“(H) to carry out any other goals that the Director may establish.

“(2) METRICS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Chief Information Officers of appropriate agencies, shall develop standardized cost savings and cost avoidance metrics and performance indicators for use by agencies for the process implemented under paragraph (1).

“(3) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Chief Information Officer of each covered agency, in conjunction with the Chief Operating Officer or Deputy Secretary (or equivalent) of the covered agency and the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government, shall conduct an annual review of the information technology portfolio of the covered agency.

“(4) APPLICABILITY TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—In the case of the Department of Defense, processes established pursuant to this subsection shall apply only to the business systems information technology portfolio of the Department of Defense and not to national security systems as defined by section 11103(a) of this title. The annual review required by paragraph (3) shall be carried out by the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense (or any successor to such Officer), in consultation with the Chief Information Officer, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and other appropriate Department of Defense officials. The Secretary of Defense may designate an existing investment or management review process to fulfill the requirement for the annual review required by paragraph (3), in consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government.

“(5) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government shall submit a quarterly report on the cost savings and reductions in duplicative information technology investments identified through the review required by paragraph (3) to—

“(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(ii) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(iii) upon a request by any committee of Congress, to that committee.

“(B) INCLUSION IN OTHER REPORTS.—The reports required under subparagraph (A) may be included as part of another report submitted to the committees of Congress described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A).

“(6) SUNSET.—This subsection shall not be in effect on and after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.”.

SEC. 834. FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INITIATIVE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government established under section 3602 of title 44, United States Code (and also known as the Office of E-Government and Information Technology), within the Office of Management and Budget.

(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term “covered agency” means the following (including all associated components of the agency):

- (A) Department of Agriculture.
- (B) Department of Commerce.
- (C) Department of Defense.
- (D) Department of Education.
- (E) Department of Energy.
- (F) Department of Health and Human Services.
- (G) Department of Homeland Security.
- (H) Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- (I) Department of the Interior.
- (J) Department of Justice.
- (K) Department of Labor.
- (L) Department of State.
- (M) Department of Transportation.
- (N) Department of Treasury.
- (O) Department of Veterans Affairs.
- (P) Environmental Protection Agency.
- (Q) General Services Administration.
- (R) National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
- (S) National Science Foundation.
- (T) Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
- (U) Office of Personnel Management.
- (V) Small Business Administration.
- (W) Social Security Administration.
- (X) United States Agency for International Development.

(3) FDCCI.—The term “FDCCI” means the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, dated February 26, 2010, or any successor thereto.

(4) GOVERNMENT-WIDE DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION AND OPTIMIZATION METRICS.—The term “Government-wide data center consolidation and optimization metrics” means the metrics established by the Administrator under subsection (b)(2)(G).

(b) FEDERAL DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION INVENTORIES AND STRATEGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ANNUAL REPORTING.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), each year, beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of the enactment of this Act and each fiscal year thereafter, the head of each covered agency, assisted by the Chief Information Officer of the agency, shall submit to the Administrator—

(i) a comprehensive inventory of the data centers owned, operated, or maintained by or on behalf of the agency; and

(ii) a multi-year strategy to achieve the consolidation and optimization of the data centers inventoried under clause (i), that includes—

(I) performance metrics—

(aa) that are consistent with the Government-wide data center consolidation and optimization metrics; and

(bb) by which the quantitative and qualitative progress of the agency toward the goals of the FDCCI can be measured;

(II) a timeline for agency activities to be completed under the FDCCI, with an emphasis on benchmarks the agency can achieve by specific dates;

(III) year-by-year calculations of investment and cost savings for the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date set forth in subsection (e), broken down by each year, including a description of any initial costs for data center consolidation and optimization and life cycle cost savings and other improvements, with an emphasis on—

(aa) meeting the Government-wide data center consolidation and optimization metrics; and

(bb) demonstrating the amount of agency-specific cost savings each fiscal year achieved through the FDCCI; and

(IV) any additional information required by the Administrator.

(B) USE OF OTHER REPORTING STRUCTURES.—The Administrator may require a covered agency to include the information required to be submitted under this subsection through reporting structures determined by the Administrator to be appropriate.

(C) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORTING.—For any year that the Department of Defense is required to submit a performance plan for reduction of resources required for data servers and centers, as required under section 2867(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 2223a note), the Department of Defense—

(i) may submit to the Administrator, in lieu of the multi-year strategy required under subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(I) the defense-wide plan required under section 2867(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 2223a note); and

(II) the report on cost savings required under section 2867(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 2223a note); and

(ii) shall submit the comprehensive inventory required under subparagraph (A)(i), unless the defense-wide plan required under section 2867(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 2223a note)—

(I) contains a comparable comprehensive inventory; and

(II) is submitted under clause (i).

(D) STATEMENT.—Each year, beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of the enactment of this Act and each fiscal year thereafter, the head of each covered agency, acting through the Chief Information Officer of the agency, shall—

(i)(I) submit a statement to the Administrator stating whether the agency has complied with the requirements of this section; and

(II) make the statement submitted under subclause (I) publicly available; and

(ii) if the agency has not complied with the requirements of this section, submit a statement to the Administrator explaining the reasons for not complying with such requirements.

(E) AGENCY IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Each covered agency, under the direction of the Chief Information Officer of the agency, shall—

(I) implement the strategy required under subparagraph (A)(ii); and

(II) provide updates to the Administrator, on a quarterly basis, of—

(aa) the completion of activities by the agency under the FDCCI;

(bb) any progress of the agency towards meeting the Government-wide data center consolidation and optimization metrics; and

(cc) the actual cost savings and other improvements realized through the implementation of the strategy of the agency.

(ii) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—For purposes of clause (i)(I), implementation of the defense-wide plan required under section 2867(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 2223a note) by the Department of Defense shall be considered implementation of the strategy required under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the reporting of information by a covered agency

to the Administrator, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or Congress.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Administrator shall—

(A) establish the deadline, on an annual basis, for covered agencies to submit information under this section;

(B) establish a list of requirements that the covered agencies must meet to be considered in compliance with paragraph (1);

(C) ensure that information relating to agency progress towards meeting the Government-wide data center consolidation and optimization metrics is made available in a timely manner to the general public;

(D) review the inventories and strategies submitted under paragraph (1) to determine whether they are comprehensive and complete;

(E) monitor the implementation of the data center strategy of each covered agency that is required under paragraph (1)(A)(ii);

(F) update, on an annual basis, the cumulative cost savings realized through the implementation of the FDCCI; and

(G) establish metrics applicable to the consolidation and optimization of data centers Government-wide, including metrics with respect to—

(i) costs;

(ii) efficiencies, including, at a minimum, server efficiency; and

(iii) any other factors the Administrator considers appropriate.

(3) COST SAVING GOAL AND UPDATES FOR CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall develop, and make publicly available, a goal, broken down by year, for the amount of planned cost savings and optimization improvements achieved through the FDCCI during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date set forth in subsection (e).

(B) ANNUAL UPDATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date on which the goal described in subparagraph (A) is made publicly available, and each year thereafter, the Administrator shall aggregate the reported cost savings of each covered agency and optimization improvements achieved to date through the FDCCI and compare the savings to the projected cost savings and optimization improvements developed under subparagraph (A).

(ii) UPDATE FOR CONGRESS.—The goal required to be developed under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted to Congress and shall be accompanied by a statement describing—

(I) the extent to which each covered agency has developed and submitted a comprehensive inventory under paragraph (1)(A)(i), including an analysis of the inventory that details specific numbers, use, and efficiency level of data centers in each inventory; and

(II) the extent to which each covered agency has submitted a comprehensive strategy that addresses the items listed in paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

(4) GAO REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review and verify the quality and completeness of the inventory and strategy of each covered agency required under paragraph (1)(A).

(B) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, on an annual basis, publish a report on each review conducted under subparagraph (A).

(c) ENSURING CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS FOR DATA CENTER CONSOLIDATION AND CLOUD COMPUTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In implementing a data center consolidation and optimization strategy under this section, a covered agency shall do so in a manner that is consistent with Federal guidelines on cloud computing security, including—

(A) applicable provisions found within the Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP); and

(B) guidance published by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the ability of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to update or modify the Federal guidelines on cloud computing security.

(d) WAIVER OF REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense, or their respective designee, may waive the applicability to any national security system, as defined in section 3542 of title 44, United States Code, of any provision of this section if the Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, or their respective designee, determines that such waiver is in the interest of national security. Not later than 30 days after making a waiver under this subsection, the Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, or their respective designee, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a statement describing the waiver and the reasons for the waiver.

(e) SUNSET.—This section is repealed effective on October 1, 2018.

SEC. 835. EXPANSION OF TRAINING AND USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CADRES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure timely progress by Federal agencies toward developing, strengthening, and deploying information technology acquisition cadres consisting of personnel with highly specialized skills in information technology acquisition, including program and project managers.

(b) STRATEGIC PLANNING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, in consultation with the Administrator for E-Government and Information Technology, shall work with Federal agencies, other than the Department of Defense, to update their acquisition human capital plans that were developed pursuant to the October 27, 2009, guidance issued by the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy in furtherance of section 1704(g) of title 41, United States Code (originally enacted as section 869 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4553)), to address how the agencies are meeting their human capital requirements to support the timely and effective acquisition of information technology.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The updates required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy and shall address, at a minimum, each Federal agency's consideration or use of the following procedures:

(A) Development of an information technology acquisition cadre within the agency or use of memoranda of understanding with

other agencies that have such cadres or personnel with experience relevant to the agency's information technology acquisition needs.

(B) Development of personnel assigned to information technology acquisitions, including cross-functional training of acquisition information technology and program personnel.

(C) Use of the specialized career path for information technology program managers as designated by the Office of Personnel Management and plans for strengthening information technology program management.

(D) Use of direct hire authority.

(E) Conduct of peer reviews.

(F) Piloting of innovative approaches to information technology acquisition workforce development, such as industry-government rotations.

(c) FEDERAL AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "Federal agency" means each agency listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 836. MAXIMIZING THE BENEFIT OF THE FEDERAL STRATEGIC SOURCING INITIATIVE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall prescribe regulations providing that when the Federal Government makes a purchase of services and supplies offered under the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative (managed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy) but such Initiative is not used, the contract file for the purchase shall include a brief analysis of the comparative value, including price and nonprice factors, between the services and supplies offered under such Initiative and services and supplies offered under the source or sources used for the purchase.

SEC. 837. GOVERNMENTWIDE SOFTWARE PURCHASING PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services shall identify and develop a strategic sourcing initiative to enhance Governmentwide acquisition, shared use, and dissemination of software, as well as compliance with end user license agreements.

(b) GOVERNMENTWIDE USER LICENSE AGREEMENT.—The Administrator, in developing the initiative under subsection (a), shall allow for the purchase of a license agreement that is available for use by all Executive agencies (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code) as one user to the maximum extent practicable and as appropriate.

Subtitle E—Never Contract With the Enemy

SEC. 841. PROHIBITION ON PROVIDING FUNDS TO THE ENEMY.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS AND ENTITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in conjunction with the Director of National Intelligence and in consultation with the Secretary of State, establish in each covered combatant command a program to identify persons and entities within the area of responsibility of such command that—

(1) provide funds, including goods and services, received under a covered contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of an executive agency directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity; or

(2) fail to exercise due diligence to ensure that none of the funds, including goods and services, received under a covered contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of an executive agency are provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(b) NOTICE OF IDENTIFIED PERSONS AND ENTITIES.—

(1) NOTICE.—Upon the identification of a person or entity as being described by sub-

section (a), the head of the executive agency concerned (or the designee of such head) and the commander of the covered combatant command concerned (or the specified deputies of the commander) shall be notified, in writing, of such identification of the person or entity.

(2) RESPONSIVE ACTIONS.—Upon receipt of a notice under paragraph (1), the head of the executive agency concerned (or the designee of such head) and the commander of the covered combatant command concerned (or the specified deputies of the commander) may notify the heads of contracting activities, or other appropriate officials of the agency or command, in writing of such identification.

(3) MAKING OF NOTIFICATIONS.—Any written notification pursuant to this subsection shall be made in accordance with procedures established to implement the revisions of regulations required by this section.

(c) AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE OR VOID CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND TO RESTRICT FUTURE AWARD.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards shall be revised to provide that, upon notice from the head of an executive agency (or the designee of such head) or the commander of a covered combatant command (or the specified deputies of the commander) pursuant to subsection (b), the head of contracting activity of an executive agency, or other appropriate official, may do the following:

(1) Restrict the award of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements of the executive agency concerned upon a written determination by the head of contracting activity or other appropriate official that the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement would provide funds received under such contract, grant, or cooperative agreement directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(2) Terminate for default any contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of the executive agency concerned upon a written determination by the head of contracting activity or other appropriate official that the contractor, or the recipient of the grant or cooperative agreement, has failed to exercise due diligence to ensure that none of the funds received under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement are provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(3) Void in whole or in part any contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of the executive agency concerned upon a written determination by the head of contracting activity or other appropriate official that the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement provides funds directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(d) CLAUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards shall be revised to require that—

(A) the clause described in paragraph (2) shall be included in each covered contract, grant, and cooperative agreement of an executive agency that is awarded on or after the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, each covered contract, grant, and cooperative agreement of an executive agency that

is awarded before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be modified to include the clause described in paragraph (2).

(2) **CLAUSE DESCRIBED.**—The clause described in this paragraph is a clause that—

(A) requires the contractor, or the recipient of the grant or cooperative agreement, to exercise due diligence to ensure that none of the funds, including goods and services, received under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement are provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity; and

(B) notifies the contractor, or the recipient of the grant or cooperative agreement, of the authority of the head of contracting activity, or other appropriate official, to terminate or void the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, in whole or in part, as provided in subsection (c).

(3) **TREATMENT AS VOID.**—For purposes of this section:

(A) A contract, grant, or cooperative agreement that is void is unenforceable as contrary to public policy.

(B) A contract, grant, or cooperative agreement that is void in part is unenforceable as contrary to public policy with regard to a segregable task or effort under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement.

(4) **PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The President shall ensure that the process for revising regulations required by paragraph (1) shall include an opportunity for public comment, including an opportunity for comment on standards of due diligence required by this section.

(e) **REQUIREMENTS FOLLOWING CONTRACT ACTIONS.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards shall be revised as follows:

(1) To require that any head of contracting activity, or other appropriate official, taking an action under subsection (c) to terminate, void, or restrict a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement notify in writing the contractor or recipient of the grant or cooperative agreement, as applicable, of the action.

(2) To permit the contractor or recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement subject to an action taken under subsection (c) to terminate or void the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, as the case may be, an opportunity to challenge the action by requesting an administrative review of the action under the procedures of the executive agency concerned not later than 30 days after receipt of notice of the action.

(f) **ANNUAL REVIEW; PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—

(1) **ANNUAL REVIEW.**—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Director of National Intelligence and in consultation with the Secretary of State shall, on an annual basis, review the lists of persons and entities previously covered by a notice under subsection (b) as having been identified as described by subsection (a) in order to determine whether or not such persons and entities continue to warrant identification as described by subsection (a). If a determination is made pursuant to such a review that a person or entity no longer warrants identification as described by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall notify the head of the executive agency concerned (or the designee of such head) and the commander of the covered combatant command concerned (or the specified deputies of the commander) in writing of such determination.

(2) **PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—Classified information relied upon to make an identification in accordance with subsection (a) may not be disclosed to a contractor or a recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement with respect to which an action is taken pursuant to the authority provided in subsection (c), or to their representatives, in the absence of a protective order issued by a court of competent jurisdiction established under Article I or Article III of the Constitution of the United States that specifically addresses the conditions upon which such classified information may be so disclosed.

(g) **DELEGATION OF CERTAIN RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

(1) **COMBATANT COMMAND RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The commander of a covered combatant command may delegate the responsibilities in this section to any deputies of the commander specified by the commander for purposes of this section. Any delegation of responsibilities under this paragraph shall be made in writing.

(2) **NONDELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR CERTAIN ACTIONS.**—The authority provided by subsection (c) to terminate, void, or restrict contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, in whole or in part, may not be delegated below the level of head of contracting activity, or equivalent official for purposes of grants or cooperative agreements.

(h) **ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.**—

(1) **SHARING OF INFORMATION ON SUPPORTERS OF THE ENEMY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, carry out a program through which agency components may provide information to heads of executive agencies (or the designees of such heads) and the commanders of the covered combatant commands (or the specified deputies of the commanders) relating to persons or entities who may be providing funds, including goods and services, received under contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements of the executive agencies directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity. The program shall be designed to facilitate and encourage the sharing of risk and threat information between executive agencies and the covered combatant commands.

(2) **INCLUSION OF INFORMATION ON CONTRACT ACTIONS IN FAPIIS AND OTHER SYSTEMS.**—Upon the termination, voiding, or restriction of a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement of an executive agency under subsection (c), the head of contracting activity of the executive agency shall provide for the inclusion in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), or other formal system of records on contractors or entities, of appropriate information on the termination, voiding, or restriction, as the case may be, of the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement.

(3) **REPORTS.**—The head of contracting activity that receives a notice pursuant to subsection (b) shall submit to the head of the executive agency concerned (or the designee of such head) and the commander of the covered combatant command concerned (or specified deputies) a report on the action, if any, taken by the head of contracting activity pursuant to subsection (c), including a determination not to terminate, void, or restrict the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement as otherwise authorized by subsection (c).

(i) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1 of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Director of the Office

of Management and Budget shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the use of the authorities in this section in the preceding calendar year, including the following:

(A) For each instance in which an executive agency exercised the authority to terminate, void, or restrict a contract, grant, and cooperative agreement pursuant to subsection (c), based on a notification under subsection (b), the following:

(i) The executive agency taking such action.

(ii) An explanation of the basis for the action taken.

(iii) The value of the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement voided or terminated.

(iv) The value of all contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements of the executive agency in force with the person or entity concerned at the time the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement was terminated or voided.

(B) For each instance in which an executive agency did not exercise the authority to terminate, void, or restrict a contract, grant, and cooperative agreement pursuant to subsection (c), based on a notification under subsection (b), the following:

(i) The executive agency concerned.

(ii) An explanation of the basis for not taking the action.

(2) **FORM.**—Any report under this subsection may, at the election of the Director—

(A) be submitted in unclassified form, but with a classified annex; or

(B) be submitted in classified form.

(j) **INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The provisions of this section do not apply to contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements that are performed entirely inside the United States.

(k) **NATIONAL SECURITY EXCEPTION.**—Nothing in this section shall apply to the authorized intelligence or law enforcement activities of the United States Government.

(l) **CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER AUTHORITIES.**—Except as provided in subsection (m), the authorities in this section shall be in addition to, and not to the exclusion of, any other authorities available to executive agencies to implement policies and purposes similar to those set forth in this section.

(m) **COORDINATION WITH CURRENT AUTHORITIES.**—

(1) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY RELATED TO CENTCOM.**—Effective 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is repealed.

(2) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY RELATED TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**—Effective 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 810; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is repealed.

(3) **USE OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITIES IN IMPLEMENTATION OF REQUIREMENTS.**—In providing for the implementation of the requirements of this section by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense may use and modify for that purpose the regulations and procedures established for purposes of the implementation of the requirements of section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 and section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

(n) SUNSET.—The provisions of this section shall cease to be effective on December 31, 2019.

SEC. 842. ADDITIONAL ACCESS TO RECORDS.

(a) CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, applicable regulations shall be revised to provide that, except as provided under subsection (c)(1), the clause described in paragraph (2) may, as appropriate, be included in each covered contract, grant, and cooperative agreement of an executive agency that is awarded on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CLAUSE.—The clause described in this paragraph is a clause authorizing the head of the executive agency concerned, upon a written determination pursuant to paragraph (3), to examine any records of the contractor, the recipient of a grant or cooperative agreement, or any subcontractor or subgrantee under such contract, grant, or cooperative agreement to the extent necessary to ensure that funds, including goods and services, available under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement are not provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(3) WRITTEN DETERMINATION.—The authority to examine records pursuant to the contract clause described in paragraph (2) may be exercised only upon a written determination by the contracting officer, or comparable official responsible for a grant or cooperative agreement, upon a finding by the commander of a covered combatant command (or the specified deputies of the commander) or the head of an executive agency (or the designee of such head) that there is reason to believe that funds, including goods and services, available under the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement concerned may have been provided directly or indirectly to a covered person or entity.

(4) FLOWDOWN.—A clause described in paragraph (2) may also be included in any subcontract or subgrant under a covered contract, grant, or cooperative agreement if the subcontract or subgrant has an estimated value in excess of \$50,000.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1 of 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the use of the authority provided by this section in the preceding calendar year.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall identify, for the calendar year covered by such report, each instance in which an executive agency exercised the authority provided under this section to examine records, explain the basis for the action taken, and summarize the results of any examination of records so undertaken.

(3) FORM.—Any report under this subsection may be submitted in classified form.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES APPLICABLE TO CENTCOM.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall not apply to contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements covered under section 842 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1513; 10 U.S.C. 2313 note).

(2) EXTENSION OF CURRENT AUTHORITIES APPLICABLE TO CENTCOM.—Section 842(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1514; 10 U.S.C. 2313 note) is amended by striking “date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon Na-

tional Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”.

SEC. 843. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTINGENCY OPERATION.—The term “contingency operation” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(13) of title 10, United States Code.

(3) CONTRACT.—The term “contract” includes a contract for commercial items but is not limited to a contract for commercial items.

(4) COVERED COMBATANT COMMAND.—The term “covered combatant command” means the following:

(A) The United States Africa Command.

(B) The United States Central Command.

(C) The United States European Command.

(D) The United States Pacific Command.

(E) The United States Southern Command.

(F) The United States Transportation Command.

(5) COVERED CONTRACT, GRANT, OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT DEFINED.—The term “covered contract, grant, or cooperative agreement” means a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with an estimated value in excess of \$50,000 that is performed outside the United States, including its possessions and territories, in support of a contingency operation in which members of the Armed Forces are actively engaged in hostilities.

(6) COVERED PERSON OR ENTITY.—The term “covered person or entity” means a person or entity that is actively opposing United States or coalition forces involved in a contingency operation in which members of the Armed Forces are actively engaged in hostilities.

(7) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term “executive agency” has the meaning given that term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

(8) HEAD OF CONTRACTING ACTIVITY.—The term “head of contracting activity” has the meaning described in section 1.601 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(9) UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS, COST PRINCIPLES, AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL AWARDS.—The term “Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards” means the guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget in part 200 of chapter II of title 2 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

SEC. 851. RAPID ACQUISITION AND DEPLOYMENT PROCEDURES FOR UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH PROCEDURES.—The Secretary may prescribe procedures for the rapid acquisition and deployment of items for the United States Special Operations Command that are currently under development by the Department of Defense or available from the commercial sector and are—

(1) urgently needed to react to an enemy threat or to respond to significant and urgent safety situations;

(2) needed to avoid significant risk of loss of life or mission failure; or

(3) needed to avoid collateral damage risk where the absence of collateral damage is a requirement for mission success.

(b) ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED.—The procedures prescribed under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A process for streamlined communication between the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command and the acquisition and research and development communities, including—

(A) a process for the Commander to communicate needs to the acquisition community and the research and development community; and

(B) a process for the acquisition community and the research and development community to propose items that meet the needs communicated by the Commander.

(2) Procedures for demonstrating, rapidly acquiring, and deploying items proposed pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), including—

(A) a process for demonstrating performance and evaluating for current operational purposes the existing capability of an item;

(B) a process for developing an acquisition and funding strategy for the deployment of an item; and

(C) a process for making deployment determinations based on information obtained pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(c) TESTING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The process for demonstrating performance and evaluating for current operational purposes the existing capability of an item prescribed under subsection (b)(2)(A) shall include—

(A) an operational assessment in accordance with expedited procedures prescribed by the Director of Operational Testing and Evaluation; and

(B) a requirement to provide information to the deployment decision-making authority about any deficiency of the item in meeting the original requirements for the item (as stated in an operational requirements document or similar document).

(2) DEFICIENCY NOT A DETERMINING FACTOR.—The process may not include a requirement for any deficiency of an item to be the determining factor in deciding whether to deploy the item.

(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT IN CASE OF DEFICIENCY.—In the case of any deficiency of an item, a decision to deploy the item may be made only if the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command determines that, for reasons of national security, the deficiency of the item is acceptable.

(d) LIMITATION.—The quantity of items of a system procured using the procedures prescribed pursuant to this section may not exceed the number established for low-rate initial production for the system. Any such items shall be counted for purposes of the number of items of the system that may be procured through low-rate initial production.

(e) ANNUAL FUNDING LIMITATION.—Of the funds available to the Commander of the United States Special Operations Command in any given fiscal year, not more than \$50,000,000 may be used to procure items under this section.

(f) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER RAPID ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—The Commander of the United States Special Operations Command may not use the authority under this section at the same time the Commander uses the authority under section 806 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note).

(g) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.—

(1) NOTIFICATION BEFORE PROCEDURES GO INTO EFFECT.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees at least 30 days before the procedures prescribed pursuant to this section are made effective.

(2) NOTIFICATION AFTER USE OF PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees not later than 48 hours after each use of the procedures prescribed pursuant to this section.

SEC. 852. CONSIDERATION OF CORROSION CONTROL IN PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall ensure that Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02 and other applicable guidance require full consideration, during preliminary design review for a product, of metals, materials, and technologies that effectively prevent or control corrosion over the life cycle of the product.

SEC. 853. PROGRAM MANAGER DEVELOPMENT REPORT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on enhancing the role of Department of Defense civilian and military program managers in developing and carrying out defense acquisition programs.

(b) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—The report required by this section shall address, at a minimum, recommendations for—

(1) enhancing training and educational opportunities for program managers;

(2) increasing emphasis on the mentoring of current and future program managers by experienced senior executives and program managers within the Department;

(3) improving career paths and career opportunities for program managers;

(4) creating additional incentives for the recruitment and retention of highly qualified individuals to serve as program managers;

(5) improving required resource levels and support (including systems engineering expertise, cost estimating expertise, and software development expertise) for program managers;

(6) improving means of collecting and disseminating best practices and lessons learned to enhance program management across the Department;

(7) creating common templates and tools to support improved data gathering and analysis for program management and oversight purposes;

(8) increasing accountability of program managers for the results of defense acquisition programs;

(9) enhancing monetary and nonmonetary awards for successful accomplishment of program objectives by program managers; and

(10) improving program manager tenure with the goal of maintaining both civilian and military program managers in their positions for a sufficient period of time to ensure program stability and consistency of leadership, including consideration of tying program manager tenure to milestone decision points for major defense acquisition programs and major automated information system programs.

SEC. 854. OPERATIONAL METRICS FOR JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT AND SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES.

(a) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, shall issue guidance for measuring the operational effectiveness and efficiency of the Joint Information Environment within the military departments, Defense Agencies, and combatant commands. The guidance shall include a definition of specific metrics for data collection, and a requirement for each military department, Defense Agency, and combatant command to regularly collect and assess data on such operational effectiveness and efficiency and report the results to such Chief Information Officer on a regular basis.

(b) BASELINE ARCHITECTURE.—The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense shall identify a baseline architecture for the Joint Information Environment by identifying and reporting to the Secretary of Defense any information technology programs or other investments that support that architecture.

(c) JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Joint Information Environment” means the initiative of the Department of Defense to modernize the information technology networks and systems within the Department.

SEC. 855. COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR SENIOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICIALS SEEKING EMPLOYMENT WITH DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.

Section 847(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 243; 10 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by inserting after “repository” the following: “maintained by the General Counsel of the Department”.

SEC. 856. ENHANCEMENT OF WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION FOR EMPLOYEES OF GRANTEES.

(a) ADDITION OF REFERENCE TO GRANTEE.—Section 2409(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “or subcontractor” and inserting “, subcontractor, grantee, or subgrantee”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2409(g) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “or a grant”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) The term ‘grantee’ means a person awarded a grant with an agency.”.

SEC. 857. PROHIBITION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF CONTRACTORS FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS AND INQUIRIES.

Section 2324(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(Q) Costs incurred by a contractor in connection with a congressional investigation or inquiry into an issue that is the subject matter of a proceeding resulting in a disposition as described in subsection (k)(2).”.

SEC. 858. REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE PHOTOVOLTAIC DEVICES FROM UNITED STATES SOURCES.

(a) CONTRACT REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each covered contract includes a provision requiring that any photovoltaic device installed under the contract be manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States, unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned determines, on a case-by-case basis, that the inclusion of such requirement is inconsistent with the public interest or involves unreasonable costs, subject to exceptions provided in the Trade

Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) or otherwise provided by law.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED CONTRACT.—The term “covered contract” means a contract awarded by the Department of Defense that provides for a photovoltaic device to be—

(A) installed inside the United States on Department of Defense property or in a facility owned by the Department of Defense; or

(B) reserved for the exclusive use of the Department of Defense in the United States for the full economic life of the device.

(2) PHOTOVOLTAIC DEVICE.—The term “photovoltaic device” means a device that converts light directly into electricity through a solid-state, semiconductor process.

SEC. 859. REIMBURSEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO NONGOVERNMENTAL ENTERTAINMENT-ORIENTED MEDIA PRODUCERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2264. Reimbursement for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be credited to the applicable appropriations account or fund from which the expenses described in subsection (b) were charged any amounts received by the Department of Defense as reimbursement for such expenses.

“(b) DESCRIPTION OF EXPENSES.—The expenses referred to in subsection (a) are any expenses—

“(1) incurred by the Department of Defense as a result of providing assistance to a nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producer;

“(2) for which the Department of Defense requires reimbursement under section 9701 of title 31 or any other provision of law; and

“(3) for which the Department of Defense received reimbursement after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2264. Reimbursement for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers.”.

SEC. 860. THREE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND.

Section 2216a(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2018”.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

Sec. 901. Reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Related Matters.

Sec. 902. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

Sec. 903. Requirement for assessment of options to modify the number of combatant commands.

Sec. 904. Office of Net Assessment.

Sec. 905. Periodic review of Department of Defense management headquarters.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

- Sec. 911. Modifications of biennial strategic workforce plan relating to senior management, functional, and technical workforces of the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 912. Repeal of extension of Comptroller General report on inventory.
- Sec. 913. Extension of authority to waive reimbursement of costs of activities for nongovernmental personnel at Department of Defense regional centers for security studies.
- Sec. 914. Pilot program to establish Government lodging program.
- Sec. 915. Single standard mileage reimbursement rate for privately owned automobiles of Government employees and members of the uniformed services.
- Sec. 916. Modifications to requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing.

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

SEC. 901. REORGANIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND RELATED MATTERS.

(a) CONVERSION OF POSITION OF DEPUTY CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER TO POSITION OF UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on February 1, 2017, section 132a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 132a. Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information

“(a) There is an Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information, appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(b) The Under Secretary also serves as—

“(1) the Performance Improvement Officer of the Department of Defense; and

“(2) the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.

“(c) Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense in the role of the Deputy Secretary as the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, including the following:

“(1) Assisting the Deputy Secretary of Defense in the Deputy Secretary’s role as the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense under section 132(c) of this title.

“(2) Supervising the management of the business operations of the Department of Defense and adjudicating issues and conflicts in functional domain business policies.

“(3) Establishing business strategic planning and performance management policies and measures and developing the Department of Defense Strategic Management Plan.

“(4) Establishing business information technology portfolio policies and overseeing investment management of that portfolio for the Department of Defense.

“(5) Establishing end-to-end business process and policies for establishing, eliminating, and implementing business standards, and managing the Business Enterprise Architecture.

“(6) Supervising the business process re-engineering of the functional domains of the

Department in order to support investment planning and technology development decision making for information technology systems.

“(d) The Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information takes precedence in the Department of Defense after the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense.”.

(2) PLACEMENT IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Effective on the effective date specified in paragraph (1), section 131(b)(2) of such title is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as subparagraphs (B) through (F), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated) the following new subparagraph (A):

“(A) The Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information.”.

(b) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) STATUTORY ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION.—Chapter 4 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 141 the following new section:

“§ 142. Chief Information Officer

“(a) There is a Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.

“(b)(1) The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense—

“(A) is the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense for the purposes of sections 3506(a)(2) and 3544(a)(3) of title 44;

“(B) has the responsibilities and duties specified in section 11315 of title 40;

“(C) has the responsibilities specified for the Chief Information Officer in sections 2222, 2223(a), and 2224 of this title; and

“(D) exercises authority, direction, and control over the Information Assurance Directorate of the National Security Agency.

“(2) The Chief Information Officer shall perform such additional duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe.

“(c) The Chief Information Officer takes precedence in the Department of Defense with the officials serving in positions specified in section 131(b)(4) of this title. The officials serving in positions specified in section 131(b)(4) and the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense take precedence among themselves in the order prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.”.

(2) PLACEMENT IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Section 131(b) of such title, as amended by subsection (a)(2), is further amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

“(5) The Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.”.

(c) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.—Section 186 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(d) ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS.—Section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “and” at the end of paragraph (1);

(B) by striking “; and” at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3);

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Defense Business Systems Management Committee” and inserting “investment review board established under subsection (g)”; and

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “, not later than March 15, 2012.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “each” the first place it appears and inserting “the”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(F), by striking “and the Defense Business Systems Management Committee, as required by section 186(c) of this title.”.

(e) DEADLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF INVESTMENT REVIEW BOARD AND INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT PROCESS.—The investment review board and investment management process required by section 2222(g) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (d)(3), shall be established not later than March 15, 2015.

(f) REDESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR OPERATIONAL ENERGY PLANS AND PROGRAMS TO REFLECT MERGER WITH DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT.—Paragraph (9) of section 138(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(9) One of the Assistant Secretaries is the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment. The Assistant Secretary—

“(A) is the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics on matters relating to energy, installations, and environment; and

“(B) is the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense regarding operational energy plans and programs.”.

(g) CLARIFICATION OF POLICY AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR ENERGY, INSTALLATIONS, AND ENVIRONMENT.—

(1) TRANSFER OF POLICY PROVISIONS FROM SECTION 138C.—Chapter 173 of such title is amended—

(A) by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2926. Operational energy activities”;

(B) by transferring paragraph (3) of section 138c(c) of such title to section 2926, as added by subparagraph (A), inserting such paragraph after the section heading, and redesignating such paragraph as subsection (a);

(C) in subsection (a) (as so inserted and redesignated)—

(i) by inserting “ALTERNATIVE FUEL ACTIVITIES.—” before “The Assistant Secretary”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (E) as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively; and

(iii) in paragraph (5) (as so redesignated), by striking “subsection (e)(4)” and inserting “subsection (c)(4)”;

(D) by transferring subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 138c of such title to section 2926, as added by subparagraph (A), inserting those subsections after subsection (a) (as transferred and redesignated by subparagraph (B)), and redesignating those subsections as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively;

(E) in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 2926 (as transferred and redesignated by subparagraphs (B) and (D)), by inserting “of Defense for Installations, Energy, and Environment” after “Assistant Secretary” the first place it appears in each such subsection;

(F) in subsection (b) of section 2926 (as transferred and redesignated by subparagraph (D)), by striking “provide guidance to, and consult with, the Secretary of Defense,

the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments,” and inserting “make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary of Defense and provide guidance to the Secretaries of the military departments”; and

(G) in subsection (c) of section 2926 (as transferred and redesignated by subparagraph (D)), by amending paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) to read as follows:

“(4) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the budget for a fiscal year is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the proposed budgets for that fiscal year that were reviewed by the Assistant Secretary under paragraph (3).

“(5) For each proposed budget covered by a report under paragraph (4) for which the certification of the Assistant Secretary under paragraph (3) is that the budget is not adequate for implementation of the strategy, the report shall include the following:

“(A) A copy of the report set forth in paragraph (3).

“(B) A discussion of the actions that the Secretary proposes to take, together with any recommended legislation that the Secretary considers appropriate, to address the inadequacy of the proposed budget.

“(C) An appendix prepared by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff describing—

“(i) the progress made by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council in implementing the energy Key Performance Parameter; and

“(ii) details regarding how operational energy is being addressed in defense planning, scenarios, support to strategic analysis, and resulting policy to improve combat capability.

“(D) An appendix prepared by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics certifying that and describing how the acquisition system is addressing operational energy in the procurement process, including long-term sustainment considerations, and how programs are extending combat capability as a result of these considerations.

“(E) A separate statement of estimated expenditures and requested appropriations for that fiscal year for the activities of the Assistant Secretary in carrying out the duties of the Assistant Secretary.

“(F) Any additional comments that the Secretary considers appropriate regarding the inadequacy of the proposed budgets.

“(6) For each proposed budget covered by a report under paragraph (4) for which the certification of the Assistant Secretary under paragraph (3) is that the budget is adequate for implementation of the strategy, the report shall include the items set forth in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of paragraph (5).”.

(2) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROVISION.—Sections 138c of such title is repealed.

(h) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN PRESCRIBED ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE POSITIONS.—Chapter 4 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR LOGISTICS AND MATERIEL READINESS.—Paragraph (7) of section 138(b) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by inserting after “Readiness” the following: “, who shall be appointed from among persons with an extensive background in the sustainment of major weapons systems and combat support equipment”;

(B) by striking the second sentence;

(C) by transferring to the end of that paragraph (as amended by subparagraph (B)) the text of subsection (b) of section 138a; and

(D) by transferring to the end of that paragraph (as amended by subparagraph (C)) the text of subsection (c) of section 138a; and

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) in the text transferred by subparagraph (C) of this paragraph as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively.

(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING.—Paragraph (8) of such section is amended—

(A) by striking the second sentence and inserting the text of subsection (a) of section 138b;

(B) by inserting after the text added by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph the following: “The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation, shall—”;

(C) by transferring paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) of section 138b to the end of that paragraph (as amended by subparagraphs (A) and (B)), indenting those paragraphs 2 ems from the left margin, and redesignating those paragraphs as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(D) in subparagraph (A) (as so transferred and redesignated)—

(i) by striking “The Assistant Secretary” and all that follows through “Test and Evaluation, shall”;

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(E) in subparagraph (B) (as so transferred and redesignated), by striking “The Assistant Secretary” and all that follows through “Test and Evaluation, shall”.

(3) ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL, AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS.—Paragraph (10) of such section is amended—

(A) by striking the second sentence and inserting the text of subsection (b) of section 138d; and

(B) by inserting after the text added by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph the text of subsection (a) of such section and in that text as so inserted—

(i) by striking “of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs”;

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively.

(4) REPEAL OF SEPARATE SECTIONS.—Sections 138a, 138b, and 138d are repealed.

(i) CODIFICATION OF RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF THE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TITLE.—

(1) CODIFICATION.—Effective on January 1, 2015, section 137a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) The officials authorized under this section shall be the only Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense.”.

(2) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Effective on the effective date specified in paragraph (1), section 906(a)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2426; 10 U.S.C. 137a note) is repealed.

(j) CLARIFICATION OF ORDERS OF PRECEDENCE.—

(1) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—Effective on the effective date specified in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) section 131(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking paragraph (5); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(B) section 142 of such title is amended by striking subsection (c).

(2) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO OTHER POSITIONS.—Effective on the effective date specified in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) section 133(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the Deputy Secretary of Defense” and inserting “, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information”;

(B) section 134(c) of such title is amended by inserting “the Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information,” after “the Deputy Secretary of Defense”;

(C) section 137a(d) of such title is amended in the first sentence by striking all that follows after “the military departments,” and inserting “and the Under Secretaries of Defense.”;

(D) section 138(d) of such title is amended by striking “the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.”.

(k) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (8) of section 131(b) (as redesignated by subsection (b)(2))—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (H) as subparagraphs (B) through (I), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the following new subparagraph (A):

“(A) The two Deputy Directors within the Office of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation under section 139a(c) of this title.”.

(2) In section 132(b), by striking “is disabled or there is no Secretary of Defense” and inserting “dies, resigns, or is otherwise unable to perform the functions and duties of the office”.

(3) In section 137a(b), by striking “is absent or disabled” and inserting “dies, resigns, or is otherwise unable to perform the functions and duties of the office”.

(3) Effective on the effective date specified in subsection (a)(1), in section 2222—

(A) by striking “the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense” each place it appears in subsections (c)(2)(E), (f)(1)(D), (f)(1)(E), (f)(2)(E), and (g)(1) and inserting “the Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information”;

(B) in subsection (g)(3)(A)—

(i) by striking “Deputy Chief Management Officer” the first place it appears and inserting “Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information”;

(ii) by striking “Deputy Chief Management Officer” the second, third, and fourth places it appears and inserting “Under Secretary”.

(4) In section 2925(b), by striking “Operational Energy Plans and Programs” and inserting “Energy, Installations, and Environment”.

(l) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 4 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) effective on the effective date specified in subsection (a)(1), by amending the item relating to section 132a to read as follows:

“132a. Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information.”;

(B) by striking the items relating to sections 138a, 138b, 138c, and 138d; and

(C) by inserting after the item relating to section 141 the following new item:

“142. Chief Information Officer.”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 186.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter III of chapter 173 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2926. Operational energy activities.”.

(m) EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE MATTERS.—

(1) EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE LEVEL II.—Effective on the effective date specified in subsection (a)(1), section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting above the item relating to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics the following:

“Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information.”.

(2) EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE LEVEL III.—Effective on the effective date specified in subsection (a)(1), section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO PRIOR REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE.—Section 5315 of such title is amended by striking “Assistant Secretaries of Defense (16)” and inserting “Assistant Secretaries of Defense (14)”.

(n) REFERENCES.—

(1) DCMO.—After February 1, 2017, any reference to the Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense in any provision of law or in any rule, regulation, or other record, document, or paper of the United States shall be deemed to refer to the Under Secretary of Defense for Business Management and Information.

(2) ASDEIE.—Any reference to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs or to the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment in any provision of law or in any rule, regulation, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to refer to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment.

SEC. 902. ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS.

(a) SINGLE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS.—

(1) REDESIGNATION OF POSITION.—The position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs is hereby redesignated as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. The individual serving in that position on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act may continue in office after that date without further appointment.

(2) STATUTORY DUTIES.—Paragraph (2) of section 138(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) One of the Assistant Secretaries is the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. In addition to any duties and powers prescribed under paragraph (1), the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs shall have as the principal duty of such Assistant Secretary the overall supervision of manpower and reserve affairs of the Department of Defense.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CROSS REFERENCE IN SUBTITLE E.—Section 10201 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“§ 10201. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs

“As provided in section 138(b)(2) of this title, the official in the Department of Defense with responsibility for overall supervision of reserve affairs of the Department of Defense is the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1007 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 10201 and inserting the following new item:

“10201. Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.”.

SEC. 903. REQUIREMENT FOR ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS TO MODIFY THE NUMBER OF COMBATANT COMMANDS.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment of the feasibility, advisability, and recommendations, if any, for reducing or increasing the number or consolidating the common staff functions and infrastructure of the combatant commands by the end of fiscal year 2020.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An analysis of alternative versions of the Unified Command Plan for distribution and assignment of the following:

(A) Command responsibility and authority.

(B) Span of control.

(C) Headquarters structure and organization.

(D) Staff functions, capabilities, and capacities.

(2) A detailed analysis of each alternative that reduces or increases the number or consolidates the common staff functions of the combatant commands in terms of assigned personnel, resources, and infrastructure, set forth separately by fiscal year, by the end of fiscal year 2020.

(3) A description of the changes to the Unified Command Plan necessary to implement such reductions, increases, or consolidations.

(4) An assessment of the feasibility, advisability, risks, and estimated costs associated with such reductions, increases, or consolidations.

(5) An assessment of efficiencies, potential savings from such efficiencies, and operational risk, if any, that could be realized by—

(A) combining or otherwise sharing common staff or support functions between two or more combatant command headquarters;

(B) establishing a new organization to manage the combined staff or support functions of two or more combatant command headquarters; or

(C) any other efficiency initiatives or arrangements that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) USE OF PREVIOUS STUDIES AND OUTSIDE EXPERTS.—In conducting the assessment required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff may—

(1) use and incorporate previous plans or studies of the Department of Defense; and

(2) consult with and incorporate views of defense experts from outside the Department.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the findings and recommendations of the assessment required by sub-

section (a). The report shall include the views of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(2) FORM.—The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 904. OFFICE OF NET ASSESSMENT.

(a) INDEPENDENT OFFICE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain an independent organization within the Department of Defense to develop and coordinate net assessments of the standing, trends, and future prospects of the military capabilities and potential of the United States in comparison with the military capabilities and potential of other countries or groups of countries, so as to identify emerging or future threats or opportunities for the United States.

(b) DIRECT REPORT TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The head of the office established and maintained pursuant to subsection (a) shall report directly to the Secretary of Defense without intervening authority and may communicate views on matters within the responsibility of the office directly to the Secretary without obtaining the approval or concurrence of any other official within the Department of Defense.

SEC. 905. PERIODIC REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan for implementing a periodic review and analysis of the Department of Defense personnel requirements for management headquarters.

(b) ELEMENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following for each covered organization:

(1) A description of how current management headquarters are sized and structured to execute Department of Defense assigned mission requirements, including a list of the reference documents and instructions that explain the mission requirements of the management headquarters and how the management headquarters are sized and structured.

(2) A description of the critical capabilities and skillsets required by management headquarters to execute Department of Defense strategic guidance in order to fulfill mission objectives.

(3) An identification and analysis of the factors that directly or indirectly influence or contribute to the expense of Department of Defense management headquarters.

(4) An assessment of the effectiveness of current systems in use to track how military, civilian, and contract personnel are identified, managed, and tracked at the management headquarters.

(5) A description of the proposed timeline, required resources necessary, and Department of Defense documents, instructions, and regulations that need to be updated in order to implement a permanent periodic review and analysis of Department of Defense personnel requirements for management headquarters.

(c) COVERED ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered organization” includes each of the following:

(1) The Office of the Secretary of Defense

(2) The Joint Staff.

(3) The Defense Agencies.

(4) The Department of Defense field activities.

(5) The headquarters of the combatant commands.

(6) Headquarters, Department of the Army, including the Secretary of the Army, the Office of the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Army Staff.

(7) The major command headquarters of the Army.

(8) The Office of the Secretary of the Navy, the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Headquarters, United States Marine Corps.

(9) The major command headquarters of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

(10) Headquarters, Department of the Air Force, including the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Office of the Air Force Chief of Staff, and the Air Staff.

(11) The major command headquarters of the Air Force.

(12) The National Guard Bureau.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees the plan required by subsection (a).

(e) AMENDMENTS.—Section 904(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 816; 10 U.S.C. 111 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, consolidations,” after “through changes”;

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by inserting “, consolidations,” after “through changes”; and

(B) by inserting “, or other associated cost drivers, including a discussion of how the changes, consolidations, or reductions were prioritized,” after “programs and offices”;

(4) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “, including the risks of, and capabilities gained or lost by implementing, such modifications” before the period; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(F) A description of how the plan supports or affects current Department of Defense strategic guidance, policy, and mission requirements, including the quadrennial defense review, the Unified Command Plan, and the strategic choices and management review.

“(G) A description of the associated costs specifically addressed by the savings.”.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 911. MODIFICATIONS OF BIENNIAL STRATEGIC WORKFORCE PLAN RELATING TO SENIOR MANAGEMENT, FUNCTIONAL, AND TECHNICAL WORKFORCES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) SENIOR MANAGEMENT WORKFORCE.—Subsection (c) of section 115b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph (1):

“(1) Each strategic workforce plan under subsection (a) shall—

“(A) specifically address the shaping and improvement of the senior management workforce of the Department of Defense; and

“(B) include an assessment of the senior functional and technical workforce of the Department of Defense within the appropriate functional community.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “such senior management, functional, and technical workforce” and inserting “such senior management workforce and such senior functional and technical workforce”.

(b) HIGHLY QUALIFIED EXPERTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “subsection (f)(1)” in subparagraphs (D) and (E) and inserting “subsection (h)(1) or (h)(2)”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection (f):

“(f) HIGHLY QUALIFIED EXPERTS.—(1) Each strategic workforce plan under subsection (a) shall include an assessment of the workforce of the Department of Defense comprising highly qualified experts appointed pursuant to section 9903 of title 5 (in this subsection referred to as the ‘HQE workforce’).

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), each plan shall include, with respect to the HQE workforce—

“(A) an assessment of the critical skills and competencies of the existing HQE workforce and projected trends in that workforce based on expected losses due to retirement and other attrition;

“(B) specific strategies for attracting, compensating, and motivating the HQE workforce of the Department, including the program objectives of the Department to be achieved through such strategies and the funding needed to implement such strategies;

“(C) any incentives necessary to attract or retain HQE personnel;

“(D) any changes that may be necessary in resources or in the rates or methods of pay needed to ensure the Department has full access to appropriately qualified personnel; and

“(E) any legislative actions that may be necessary to achieve HQE workforce goals.”.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (h) of such section (as redesignated by subsection (b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘senior management workforce of the Department of Defense’ includes the following categories of Department of Defense civilian personnel:

“(A) Appointees in the Senior Executive Service under section 3131 of title 5.

“(B) Persons serving in the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service under section 1606 of this title.

“(2) The term ‘senior functional and technical workforce of the Department of Defense’ includes the following categories of Department of Defense civilian personnel:

“(A) Persons serving in positions described in section 5376(a) of title 5.

“(B) Scientists and engineers appointed pursuant to section 342(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 108 Stat. 2721), as amended by section 1114 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398 (114 Stat. 1654A-315)).

“(C) Scientists and engineers appointed pursuant to section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (5 U.S.C. 3104 note).

“(D) Persons serving in Intelligence Senior Level positions under section 1607 of this title.

“(3) The term ‘acquisition workforce’ includes individuals designated under section 1721 of this title as filling acquisition positions.”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows: “SENIOR MANAGEMENT WORKFORCE; SENIOR FUNCTIONAL AND TECHNICAL WORKFORCE.”.

(e) FORMATTING OF ANNUAL REPORT.—Subsections (d)(1) and (e)(1) of such section are each amended by striking “include a separate chapter to”.

SEC. 912. REPEAL OF EXTENSION OF COMP-TROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON INVENTORY.

Section 803(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2402), as amended by section 951(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 839), is amended by striking “2013, 2014, and 2015” and inserting “and 2013”.

SEC. 913. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS OF ACTIVITIES FOR NONGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REGIONAL CENTERS FOR SECURITY STUDIES.

Section 941(b)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (10 U.S.C. 184 note) is amended by striking “through 2014” and inserting “through 2019”.

SEC. 914. PILOT PROGRAM TO ESTABLISH GOVERNMENT LODGING PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5911 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may, for the period of time described in subsection (b), establish and carry out a Government lodging program to provide Government or commercial lodging for employees of the Department of Defense or members of the uniformed services under the Secretary’s jurisdiction performing duty on official travel, and may require such travelers to occupy adequate quarters on a rental basis when available.

(b) PROGRAM DURATION.—The authority to establish and execute a Government lodging program under this section expires on December 31, 2019.

(c) LIMITATION.—A Government lodging program developed under the authority in subsection (a), and a requirement under subsection (a) with respect to an employee of the Department of Defense, may not be construed to be subject to a duty to negotiate under chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the exercise of authority provided by subsection (a). The report shall include a detailed description of the facets of the Government lodging program, a description of how the program will increase travel efficiencies within the Department, a description of how the program will increase the safety of authorized travelers of the Department of Defense, and an estimate of the savings expected to be achieved by the program.

(2) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Each year, the Secretary shall include with the materials submitted to Congress by the Secretary in support of the budget submitted by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a report that provides actual savings achieved (or costs incurred) under the Government lodging program to date and a description of estimated savings for the fiscal year budget being submitted, any changes to program rules made since the prior report, and an overall assessment to date of the program’s effectiveness in increasing efficiency of travel and safety of Department employees.

(3) FINAL REPORT.—With the budget materials submitted to Congress by the Secretary in support of the budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall include a final report providing the

Secretary's overall assessment of the effectiveness of the Government lodging program established under subsection (a), including a statement of savings achieved (or costs incurred) as of that date, and a recommendation for whether the program shall be made permanent. The Secretary may, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies, make a recommendation on whether the program should be expanded and made permanent with respect to those other Federal agencies.

(4) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 915. SINGLE STANDARD MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT RATE FOR PRIVATELY OWNED AUTOMOBILES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5704(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the last sentence by striking all that follows “the rate per mile” and inserting “shall be the single standard mileage rate established by the Internal Revenue Service.”

(b) **REGULATIONS AND REPORTS.**—

(1) **PROVISIONS RELATING TO PRIVATELY OWNED AIRPLANES AND MOTORCYCLES.**—Paragraph (1)(A) of section 5707(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(1)(A) The Administrator of General Services shall conduct periodic investigations of the cost of travel and the operation of privately owned airplanes and privately owned motorcycles by employees while engaged on official business, and shall report the results of such investigations to Congress at least once a year.”

(2) **PROVISIONS RELATING TO PRIVATELY OWNED AUTOMOBILES.**—Clause (i) of section 5707(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(i) shall provide that the mileage reimbursement rate for privately owned automobiles, as provided in section 5704(a)(1), is the single standard mileage rate established by the Internal Revenue Service referred to in that section, and”.

SEC. 916. MODIFICATIONS TO REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCOUNTING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES LISTED AS MISSING.

(a) **DESIGNATION OF AGENCY AND DIRECTOR.**—Subsection (a) of section 1501 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR MISSING PERSONS.**—(1)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall designate a single organization within the Department of Defense to have responsibility for Department matters relating to missing persons, including accounting for missing persons and persons whose remains have not been recovered from the conflict in which they were lost.

“(B) The organization designated under this paragraph shall be a Defense Agency or other entity of the Department of Defense outside the military departments and is referred to in this chapter as the ‘designated Defense Agency’.

“(C) The head of the organization designated under this paragraph is referred to in this chapter as the ‘designated Agency Director’.

“(2) Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the responsibilities of the designated Agency Director shall include the following:

“(A) Policy, control, and oversight within the Department of Defense of the entire process for investigation and recovery related to missing persons, including matters related to search, rescue, escape, and evasion.

“(B) Policy, control, and oversight of the program established under section 1509 of this title.

“(C) Responsibility for accounting for missing persons, including locating, recovering, and identifying missing persons or their remains after hostilities have ceased.

“(D) Coordination for the Department of Defense with other departments and agencies of the United States on all matters concerning missing persons.

“(E) Dissemination of appropriate information on the status of missing persons to authorized family members.

“(F) Establishment of a means for communication between officials of the designated Defense Agency and family members of missing persons, veterans service organizations, concerned citizens, and the public on the Department's efforts to account for missing persons, including a readily available means for communication of their views and recommendations to the designated Agency Director.

“(3) In carrying out the responsibilities established under this subsection, the designated Agency Director shall be responsible for the coordination for such purposes within the Department of Defense among the military departments, the Joint Staff, and the commanders of the combatant commands.

“(4) The designated Agency Director shall establish policies, which shall apply uniformly throughout the Department of Defense, for personnel recovery (including search, rescue, escape, and evasion) and for personnel accounting (including locating, recovering, and identifying missing persons or their remains after hostilities have ceased).

“(5) The designated Agency Director shall establish procedures to be followed by Department of Defense boards of inquiry, and by officials reviewing the reports of such boards, under this chapter.”

(b) **PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS AND OTHER FORMS OF SUPPORT.**—Chapter 76 of such title is amended by inserting after section 1501 the following new section:

“§ 1501a. Public-private partnerships; other forms of support

“(a) **PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.**—The Secretary of Defense may enter into arrangements known as public-private partnerships with appropriate entities outside the Government for the purposes of facilitating the activities of the designated Defense Agency. The Secretary may only partner with foreign governments or foreign entities with the concurrence of the Secretary of State. Any such arrangement shall be entered into in accordance with authorities provided under this section or any other authority otherwise available to the Secretary. Regulations prescribed under subsection (e)(1) shall include provisions for the establishment and implementation of such partnerships.

“(b) **ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY PERSONAL SERVICES.**—The Secretary of Defense may accept voluntary services to facilitate accounting for missing persons in the same manner as the Secretary of a military department may accept such services under section 1588(a)(9) of this title.

“(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND GRANTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may enter into a cooperative agreement with, or make a grant to, a private entity for purposes related to support of the activities of the designated Defense Agency.

“(2) **INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding section 2304(k) of this title, the Secretary may enter such cooperative agreements or grants on a sole-source basis pursuant to section 2304(c)(5) of this title.

“(d) **USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONAL PROPERTY.**—The Secretary may allow a private entity to use, at no cost, personal property of the Department of Defense to assist the entity in supporting the activities of the designated Defense Agency.

“(e) **REGULATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to implement this section.

“(2) **LIMITATION.**—Such regulations shall provide that acceptance of a gift (including a gift of services) or use of a gift under this section may not occur if the nature or circumstances of the acceptance or use would compromise the integrity, or the appearance of integrity, of any program of the Department of Defense or any individual involved in such program.

“(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.**—The term ‘cooperative agreement’ means an authorized cooperative agreement as described in section 6305 of title 31.

“(2) **GRANT.**—The term ‘grant’ means an authorized grant as described in section 6304 of title 31.”

(c) **SECTION 1505 CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 1505(c) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the office established under section 1501 of this title” and inserting “the designated Agency Director”; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking “head of the office established under section 1501 of this title” and inserting “designated Agency Director”.

(d) **SECTION 1509 AMENDMENTS.**—Section 1509 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “PROCESS”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “POW/MIA accounting community” and inserting “through the designated Agency Director”;

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph (2):

“(2)(A) The Secretary shall assign or detail to the designated Defense Agency on a full-time basis a senior medical examiner from the personnel of the Armed Forces Medical Examiner System. The primary duties of the medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall include the identification of remains in support of the function of the designated Agency Director to account for unaccounted for persons covered by subsection (a).

“(B) In carrying out functions under this chapter, the medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall report to the designated Agency Director.

“(C) The medical examiner so assigned or detailed shall—

“(i) exercise scientific identification authority;

“(ii) establish identification and laboratory policy consistent with the Armed Forces Medical Examiner System; and

“(iii) advise the designated Agency Director on forensic science disciplines.

“(D) Nothing in this chapter shall be interpreted as affecting the authority of the

Armed Forces Medical Examiner under section 1471 of this title.”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “; CENTRALIZED DATABASE” after “FILES”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain a single centralized database and case management system containing information on all missing persons for whom a file has been established under this subsection. The database and case management system shall be accessible to all elements of the Department of Defense involved in the search, recovery, identification, and communications phases of the program established by this section.”; and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “establishing and”; and

(ii) by striking “Secretary of Defense shall coordinate” and inserting “designated Agency Director shall ensure coordination”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “staff” after “National Security Council”; and

(ii) by striking “POW/MIA accounting community”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) In carrying out the program, the designated Agency Director shall coordinate all external communications and events associated with the program.”.

(e) REPORT ON POW/MIA POLICIES.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on policies and proposals for providing access to information and documents to the next of kin of missing service personnel, including under chapter 76 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section

(2) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A description of information and documents to be provided to the next of kin, including the status of recovery efforts and service records.

(B) A description of the Department’s plans, if any, to review the classification status of records related to past covered conflicts and missing service personnel.

(C) An assessment of whether it is feasible and advisable to develop a public interface for any database of missing personnel being developed.

(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of section 1509 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1509. Program to resolve missing person cases”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 76 of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting after the item relating to section 1501 the following new item:

“1501a. Public-private partnerships; other forms of support.”; and

(B) by striking the item relating to section 1509 and inserting the following new item:

“1509. Program to resolve missing person cases.”.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

Sec. 1001. General transfer authority.

Sec. 1002. Authority to transfer funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to sustain nuclear weapons modernization and naval reactors.

Sec. 1003. Reporting of balances carried forward by the Department of Defense at the end of each fiscal year.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

Sec. 1011. Extension of authority to support unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia.

Sec. 1012. Extension and modification of authority of Department of Defense to provide support for counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies.

Sec. 1013. Availability of funds for additional support for counterdrug activities of certain foreign governments.

Sec. 1014. Extension and modification of authority for joint task forces supporting law enforcement agencies conducting activities to counter transnational organized crime to support law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities.

Sec. 1015. Sense of Congress regarding security in the Western Hemisphere.

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

Sec. 1021. Definition of combatant and support vessel for purposes of the annual plan and certification relating to budgeting for construction of naval vessels.

Sec. 1022. National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund.

Sec. 1023. Limitation on use of funds for inactivation of U.S.S. George Washington.

Sec. 1024. Sense of Congress recognizing the anniversary of the sinking of U.S.S. Thresher.

Sec. 1025. Pilot program for sustainment of Littoral Combat Ships on extended deployments.

Sec. 1026. Availability of funds for retirement or inactivation of Ticonderoga class cruisers or dock landing ships.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

Sec. 1031. Extension of authority to make rewards for combating terrorism.

Sec. 1032. Prohibition on use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Sec. 1033. Prohibition on the use of funds for the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

Sec. 1041. Modification of Department of Defense authority for humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance programs.

Sec. 1042. Airlift service.

Sec. 1043. Authority to accept certain voluntary legal support services.

Sec. 1044. Expansion of authority for Secretary of Defense to use the Department of Defense reimbursement rate for transportation services provided to certain non-Department of Defense entities.

Sec. 1045. Repeal of authority relating to use of military installations by Civil Reserve Air Fleet contractors.

Sec. 1046. Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau among leadership of the Department of Defense provided physical protection and personal security.

Sec. 1047. Inclusion of regional organizations in authority for assignment of civilian employees of the Department of Defense as advisors to foreign ministries of defense.

Sec. 1048. Report and limitation on availability of funds for aviation foreign internal defense program.

Sec. 1049. Modifications to OH-58D Kiowa Warrior aircraft.

Subtitle F—Studies and Reports

Sec. 1051. Protection of top-tier defense-critical infrastructure from electromagnetic pulse.

Sec. 1052. Response of the Department of Defense to compromises of classified information.

Sec. 1053. Study on joint analytic capability of the Department of Defense.

Sec. 1054. Business case analysis of the creation of an active duty association for the 168th Air Refueling Wing.

Sec. 1055. Reports on recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force.

Sec. 1056. Report on protection of military installations.

Sec. 1057. Comptroller General briefing and report on Army and Army National Guard force structure changes.

Sec. 1058. Improving analytic support to systems acquisition and allocation of acquisition, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets.

Sec. 1059. Review of United States military strategy and the force posture of allies and partners in the United States Pacific Command area of responsibility.

Sec. 1060. Repeal of certain reporting requirements relating to the Department of Defense.

Sec. 1061. Repeal of requirement for Comptroller General of the United States annual reviews and report on pilot program on commercial fee-for-service air refueling support for the Air Force.

Sec. 1062. Report on additional matters in connection with report on the force structure of the United States Army.

Sec. 1063. Certification for realignment of forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

Sec. 1071. Technical and clerical amendments.

Sec. 1072. Reform of quadrennial defense review.

Sec. 1073. Biennial surveys of Department of Defense civilian employees on workplace and gender relations matters.

- Sec. 1074. Revision to statute of limitations for aviation insurance claims.
- Sec. 1075. Pilot program for the Human Terrain System.
- Sec. 1076. Clarification of policies on management of special use airspace of Department of Defense.
- Sec. 1077. Department of Defense policies on community involvement in Department community outreach events.
- Sec. 1078. Notification of foreign threats to information technology systems impacting national security.
- Sec. 1079. Pilot program to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans.

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

SEC. 1001. GENERAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this division for fiscal year 2015 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this section may not exceed \$4,500,000,000.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR TRANSFERS BETWEEN MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS.—A transfer of funds between military personnel authorizations under title IV shall not be counted toward the dollar limitation in paragraph (2).

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) to transfer authorizations—

(1) may only be used to provide authority for items that have a higher priority than the items from which authority is transferred; and

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress.

(c) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(d) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall promptly notify Congress of each transfer made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1002. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER FUNDS TO THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION TO SUSTAIN NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION AND NAVAL REACTORS.

(a) TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—If the amount authorized to be appropriated for the weapons activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration under section 3101 or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 is less than \$8,700,000,000 (the amount projected to be required for such activities in fiscal year 2015 as specified in the report under section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2549)), the Secretary of Defense may transfer, from amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 pursuant

to this Act, to the Secretary of Energy an amount, not to exceed \$150,000,000, to be available only for naval reactors or weapons activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—In the event of a transfer under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify Congress of the transfer, and shall include in such notice the Department of Defense account or accounts from which funds are transferred.

(c) TRANSFER MECHANISM.—Any funds transferred under this section shall be transferred in accordance with established procedures for reprogramming under section 1001 or successor provisions of law.

(d) CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORITY.—The transfer authority provided under subsection (a) is in addition to any other transfer authority provided under this Act.

SEC. 1003. REPORTING OF BALANCES CARRIED FORWARD BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AT THE END OF EACH FISCAL YEAR.

Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees, and make publicly available on the Internet website of the Department of Defense, the following information:

(1) The total dollar amount, by account, of all balances carried forward by the Department of Defense at the end of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year during which such information is submitted.

(2) The total dollar amount, by account, of all unobligated balances carried forward by the Department of Defense at the end of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year during which such information is submitted.

(3) The total dollar amount, by account, of any balances (both obligated and unobligated) that have been carried forward by the Department of Defense for five years or more as of the end of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year during which such information is submitted.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

SEC. 1011. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO SUPPORT UNIFIED COUNTERDRUG AND COUNTERTERRORISM CAMPAIGN IN COLOMBIA.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 2042), as most recently amended by section 1011 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 126 Stat. 843), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “2014” and inserting “2016”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “2014” and inserting “2016”.

(b) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON ASSISTANCE.—Not later than 15 days before providing assistance under section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (as amended by subsection (a)) using funds available for fiscal year 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a notice setting forth the assistance to be provided, including the types of such assistance, the budget for such assistance, and the anticipated completion date and duration of the provision of such assistance.

SEC. 1012. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES OF OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (a) of section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 374 note) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2017”.

(b) EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO INCLUDE ACTIVITIES TO COUNTER TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by inserting “or activities to counter transnational organized crime” after “counter-drug activities” each place it appears;

(2) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting “or responsibilities for countering transnational organized crime” after “counter-drug responsibilities”; and

(3) in subsection (b)(5), by inserting “or counter-transnational organized crime” after “Counter-drug”.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON FACILITIES PROJECTS.—Subsection (h)(2) of such section is amended by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$250,000”.

(d) DEFINITION OF TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) DEFINITION OF TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.—In this section, the term ‘transnational organized crime’ means self-perpetuating associations of individuals who operate transnationally for the purpose of obtaining power, influence, monetary, or commercial gains, wholly or in part by illegal means, while protecting their activities through a pattern of corruption or violence or through a transnational organization structure and the exploitation of transnational commerce or communication mechanisms.”.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1004. ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES AND ACTIVITIES TO COUNTER TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.”.

SEC. 1013. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

Subsection (e) of section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; 111 Stat. 1881), as most recently amended by section 1013(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 844), is amended to read as follows:

“(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2014 in which the authority under this section is in effect for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, an amount not to exceed \$125,000,000 shall be available in such fiscal year for the provision of support under this section.”.

SEC. 1014. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR JOINT TASK FORCES SUPPORTING LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES CONDUCTING ACTIVITIES TO COUNTER TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME TO SUPPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES CONDUCTING COUNTER-TERRORISM ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (10 U.S.C. 371 note) is amended by inserting “or counter-transnational organized crime activities” after “counter-terrorism activities”.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”;

(2) by inserting “for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities that are” after “funds”; and

(3) by inserting “or counter-transnational organized crime” after “counter-terrorism”.

(c) REPORTS.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—
(A) by striking “after 2008”; and
(B) by striking “Congress” and inserting “the congressional defense committees”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—
(A) by inserting “, counter-transnational organized crime,” after “counter-drug” the first place it appears; and

(B) by striking “counterterrorism support” and inserting “counter-terrorism or counter-transnational organized crime support”;

(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period the following: “, and a description of the objectives of such support”; and

(4) in paragraph (3), by striking “conducting counter-drug operations” and inserting “exercising the authority under subsection (a)”.

(d) **CONDITIONS.**—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “or counter-transnational organized crime” after “counter-terrorism”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “Congress” and inserting “the congressional defense committees”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: “, together with a description of the vital national security interests associated with the support covered by such waiver”; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (C).

(e) **SUPPORT FOR COUNTER-TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.**—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—(1) In this section, the term ‘transnational organized crime’ has the meaning given such term in section 1004(j) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 374 note).
“(2) For purposes of applying the definition of transnational organized crime under paragraph (1) to this section, the term ‘illegal means’, as it appears in such definition, includes the trafficking of money, human trafficking, illicit financial flows, illegal trade in natural resources and wildlife, trade in illegal drugs and weapons, and other forms of illegal means determined by the Secretary of Defense.”.

“(2) For purposes of applying the definition of transnational organized crime under paragraph (1) to this section, the term ‘illegal means’, as it appears in such definition, includes the trafficking of money, human trafficking, illicit financial flows, illegal trade in natural resources and wildlife, trade in illegal drugs and weapons, and other forms of illegal means determined by the Secretary of Defense.”.

SEC. 1015. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SECURITY IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The stability and security of the Western Hemisphere has a direct impact on the security interests of the United States.

(2) Over the past decade, there has been a marked increase in violence and instability in the region as a result of weak governance and increasingly capable transnational criminal organizations. These criminal organizations operate global, multi-billion dollar networks that traffic narcotics, humans, weapons, and bulk cash.

(3) Conflict between the various transnational criminal organizations for smuggling routes and territory has resulted in skyrocketing violence. According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Honduras has the highest murder rate in the world with 90 murders per 100,000 people.

(4) United States Northern Command and United States Southern Command are the lead combatant commands for Department of Defense efforts to combat illicit trafficking in the Western Hemisphere.

(5) To combat these destabilizing threats, through a variety of authorities, the Department of Defense advises, trains, educates, and equips vetted troops in the region to en-

hance their military and police forces, with an emphasis on human rights and the rule of law.

(6) As a result of decades of instability and violence, tens of thousands of unaccompanied alien children and their families have fled to the border between the United States and Mexico. In fiscal year 2014, approximately 66,000 such children were apprehended crossing into the United States from Mexico.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department of Defense should continue its efforts to combat transnational criminal organizations in the Western Hemisphere;

(2) the Department of Defense should increase its maritime, aerial and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities in the region to more effectively support efforts to reduce illicit trafficking into the United States; and

(3) enhancing the capacity of partner nations in the region to combat the threat posed by transnational criminal organizations should be a cornerstone of the Department of Defense’s strategy in the region.

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

SEC. 1021. DEFINITION OF COMBATANT AND SUPPORT VESSEL FOR PURPOSES OF THE ANNUAL PLAN AND CERTIFICATION RELATING TO BUDGETING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS.

Section 231(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The term ‘combatant and support vessel’ means any commissioned ship built or armed for naval combat or any naval ship designed to provide support to combatant ships and other naval operations. Such term does not include patrol coastal ships, non-commissioned combatant craft specifically designed for combat roles, or ships that are designated for potential mobilization.”.

SEC. 1022. NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 131 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2218 the following new section:

“§ 2218a. National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund’.

“(b) **ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.**—The Secretary of Defense shall administer the Fund consistent with the provisions of this section.

“(c) **FUND PURPOSES.**—(1) Funds in the Fund shall be available for obligation and expenditure only for construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of national sea-based deterrence vessels.

“(2) Funds in the Fund may not be used for a purpose or program unless the purpose or program is authorized by law.

“(d) **DEPOSITS.**—There shall be deposited in the Fund all funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of national sea-based deterrence vessels.

“(e) **EXPIRATION OF FUNDS AFTER 5 YEARS.**—No part of an appropriation that is deposited in the Fund pursuant to subsection (d) shall remain available for obligation more than five years after the end of fiscal year for which appropriated except to the extent specifically provided by law.

“(f) **BUDGET REQUESTS.**—Budget requests submitted to Congress for the Fund shall separately identify the amount requested for programs, projects, and activities for construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of national sea-based deterrence vessels.

“(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘Fund’ means the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund established by subsection (a).

“(2) The term ‘national sea-based deterrence vessel’ means any vessel owned, operated, or controlled by the Department of Defense that carries operational intercontinental ballistic missiles.”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 131 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2218 the following new item:

“2218a. National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund.”.

(b) **TRANSFER AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), and to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, the Secretary of Defense may transfer to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund established by section 2218a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), amounts not to exceed \$3,500,000,000 from unobligated funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2014, 2015, or 2016 for the Navy for the Ohio Replacement Program. The transfer authority provided under this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority provided to the Secretary of Defense by law.

(2) **AVAILABILITY.**—Funds transferred to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available for the same period for which the transferred funds were originally appropriated.

SEC. 1023. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR INACTIVATION OF U.S.S. GEORGE WASHINGTON.

No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Navy may be obligated or expended to conduct tasks connected to the inactivation of the U.S.S. George Washington (CVN-73) unless such tasks are identical to tasks that would be necessary to conduct a refueling and complex overhaul of the vessel.

SEC. 1024. SENSE OF CONGRESS RECOGNIZING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF U.S.S. THRESHER.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) U.S.S. Thresher was first launched at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard on July 9, 1960.

(2) U.S.S. Thresher departed Portsmouth Naval Shipyard for her final voyage on April 9, 1963, with a crew of 16 officers, 96 sailors, and 17 civilians.

(3) The mix of that crew reflects the unity of the naval submarine service, military and civilian, in the protection of the United States.

(4) At approximately 7:47 a.m. on April 10, 1963, while in communication with the surface ship U.S.S. Skylark, and approximately 220 miles off the coast of New England, U.S.S. Thresher began her final descent.

(5) U.S.S. Thresher was declared lost with all hands on April 10, 1963.

(6) In response to the loss of U.S.S. Thresher, the United States Navy instituted new regulations to ensure the health of the submariners and the safety of the submarines of the United States.

(7) Those regulations led to the establishment of the Submarine Safety and Quality

Assurance program (SUBSAFE), now one of the most comprehensive military safety programs in the world.

(8) SUBSAFE has kept the submariners of the United States safe at sea ever since as the strongest, safest submarine force in history.

(9) Since the establishment of SUBSAFE, no SUBSAFE-certified submarine has been lost at sea, which is a legacy owed to the brave individuals who perished aboard U.S.S. Thresher.

(10) From the loss of U.S.S. Thresher, there arose in the institutions of higher education in the United States the ocean engineering curricula that enables the preeminence of the United States in submarine warfare.

(11) The crew of U.S.S. Thresher demonstrated the “last full measure of devotion” in service to the United States, and this devotion characterizes the sacrifices of all submariners, past and present.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) recognizes the 51st anniversary of the sinking of U.S.S. Thresher;

(2) remembers with profound sorrow the loss of U.S.S. Thresher and her gallant crew of sailors and civilians on April 10, 1963; and

(3) expresses its deepest gratitude to all submariners on “eternal patrol”, who are forever bound together by dedicated and honorable service to the United States of America.

SEC. 1025. PILOT PROGRAM FOR SUSTAINMENT OF LITTORAL COMBAT SHIPS ON EXTENDED DEPLOYMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) of section 7310 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may establish a pilot program for the sustainment of Littoral Combat Ships when operating on extended deployment as follows:

(1) The pilot program shall be limited to no more than three Littoral Combat Ships at any one time operating in extended deployment status.

(2) Sustainment authorized under the pilot program is limited to corrective and preventive maintenance or repair (whether intermediate- or depot-level) and facilities maintenance. Such maintenance or repair may be performed—

(A) in a foreign shipyard;

(B) at a facility outside of a foreign shipyard; or

(C) at any other facility convenient to the vessel.

(3) Such maintenance or repair may be performed on a vessel as described in paragraph (2) only if the work is performed by United States Government personnel or United States contractor personnel.

(4) Facilities maintenance may be performed by a foreign contractor on a vessel as described in paragraph (2).

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the conclusion of the pilot program authorized under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the pilot program. Such report shall include each of the following:

(1) Lessons learned from the pilot program regarding sustainment of Littoral Combat Ships while operating on extended deployments, including the extent to which shipboard personnel were involved in performing maintenance.

(2) A comprehensive sustainment strategy, including maintenance requirements, concepts, and costs, intended to support Littoral Combat Ships operating on extended deployments.

(3) Observations and recommendations regarding limited exceptions to existing authorities required to support Littoral Combat Ships operating on extended deployments.

(4) The effect of the pilot program on material readiness and operational availability.

(5) Whether overseas maintenance periodicities undertaken during the pilot program were accomplished in the scheduled or allotted timeframes throughout the pilot program.

(6) The total cost to sustain the three Littoral Combat Ships selected for the pilot program during the program, including all costs for Federal and contractor employees performing corrective and preventive maintenance, and all facilitization costs, both ashore and shipboard.

(7) A detailed comparison of costs, including the cost of labor, between maintenance support provided in the United States and any savings achieved by performing facilities maintenance in foreign shipyards.

(8) A description of the permanent facilities required to support Littoral Combat Ships operating on extended deployment at overseas locations.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “corrective and preventive maintenance or repair” means—

(A) maintenance or repair actions performed as a result of a failure in order to return or restore equipment to acceptable performance levels; or

(B) scheduled maintenance or repair actions intended to prevent or discover functional failures, including scheduled periodic maintenance requirements and integrated class maintenance plan tasks that are time-directed maintenance actions.

(2) The term “facilities maintenance” means—

(A) preservation or corrosion control efforts, including surface preparation and preservation of the structural facility to minimize effects of corrosion; or

(B) cleaning services, including—

(i) light surface cleaning of ship structures and compartments; and

(ii) deep cleaning of bilges to remove dirt, oily waste, and other foreign matter.

(d) TERMINATION.—The authority to carry out a pilot program under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

SEC. 1026. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OR INACTIVATION OF TICONDEROGA CLASS CRUISERS OR DOCK LANDING SHIPS.

(a) LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense by this Act or the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, inactivate, or place in storage a cruiser or dock landing ship.

(2) USE OF SMOSF FUNDS.—As provided by section 8107 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), funds in the Ship, Modernization, Operations, and Sustainment Fund may be used only for 11 Ticonderoga-class cruisers (CG 63 through CG 73) and 3 dock landing ships (LSD 41, LSD 42, and LSD 46).

(b) MODERNIZATION OF TICONDEROGA CLASS CRUISERS AND DOCK LANDING SHIPS.—The Secretary of the Navy shall begin the upgrade of two cruisers specified in (a)(2) during fiscal year 2015, including—

(1) hull, mechanical, and electrical upgrades; and

(2) combat systems modernizations.

(c) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS ON MODERNIZATION.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—During the period of modernization under subsection (b) of the vessels specified in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of the Navy shall—

(A) continue to maintain the vessels in a manner that will ensure the ability of the vessels to reenter the operational fleet;

(B) conduct planning activities to ensure scheduled and deferred maintenance and modernization work items are identified and included in maintenance availability work packages; and

(C) conduct hull, mechanical, and electrical and combat system modernization necessary to achieve a service life of 40 years.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—During the period of modernization under subsection (b) of the vessels specified in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary may not—

(A) permit removal or cannibalization of equipment or systems to support operational vessels, other than—

(i) rotatable pool equipment; and

(ii) equipment or systems necessary to support urgent operational requirements (but only with the approval of the Secretary of Defense); or

(B) make any irreversible modifications that will prohibit the vessel from reentering the operational fleet.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the same time as the submittal to Congress of the budget of the President under section 1105 of title 31, United States, for each fiscal year during which activities under the modernization of vessels will be carried out under this section, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written report on the status of the modernization of vessels under this section.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) The status of modernization efforts, including availability schedules, equipment procurement schedules, and by-fiscal year funding requirements.

(B) The readiness and operational and manning status of each vessel to be undergoing modernization under this section during the fiscal year covered by such report.

(C) The current material condition assessment for each such vessel.

(D) A list of rotatable pool equipment that is identified across the whole class of cruisers to support operations on a continuing basis.

(E) A list of equipment, other than rotatable pool equipment and components incidental to performing maintenance, removed from each such vessel, including a justification for the removal, the disposition of the equipment, and plan for restoration of the equipment.

(F) A detailed plan for obligations and expenditures by vessel for the fiscal year beginning during the calendar year during which the report is submitted, and projections of obligations by vessel by fiscal year for the remaining time a vessel is projected to be in the modernization program.

(G) A statement of the funding required for that fiscal year to ensure the Ship, Modernization, Operations, and Sustainment Fund account has adequate resources to execute the plan under subparagraph (F) for that fiscal year and the following fiscal year.

(3) NOTICE ON VARIANCE FROM PLAN.—Not later than 30 days before executing any material deviation from a plan described in paragraph (2)(F) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing of such deviation from the plan.

(e) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED LIMITATION.—Section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 846) is repealed.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

SEC. 1031. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE REWARDS FOR COMBATING TERRORISM.

Section 127b(c)(3)(C) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 1032. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 850) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 1033. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR THE TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

Section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 851) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

SEC. 1041. MODIFICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORITY FOR HUMANITARIAN DEMINING ASSISTANCE AND STOCKPILED CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) INCLUSION OF INFORMATION ABOUT INSUFFICIENT FUNDING IN ANNUAL REPORT.—Subsection (d)(3) of section 407 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or insufficient funding” after “such activities”.

(b) DEFINITION OF STOCKPILED CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (e)(2) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “and includes” and inserting the following: “small arms, and light weapons, including man-portable air-defense systems. Such term includes”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, small arms, and light weapons, including man-portable air-defense systems”.

SEC. 1042. AIRLIFT SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 931 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 9516. Airlift service

“(a) INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION.—(1) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the transportation of passengers or property by CRAF-eligible aircraft in interstate air transportation obtained by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department through a contract for airlift service in the United States may be provided only by an air carrier that—

“(A) has aircraft in the civil reserve air fleet or offers to place the aircraft in that fleet; and

“(B) holds a certificate issued under section 41102 of title 49.

“(2) The Secretary of Transportation shall act as expeditiously as possible on an appli-

cation for a certificate under section 41102 of title 49 to provide airlift service.

“(b) TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN LOCATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the transportation of passengers or property by CRAF-eligible aircraft between a place in the United States and a place outside the United States obtained by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department through a contract for airlift service shall be provided by an air carrier referred to in subsection (a).

“(c) TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN FOREIGN LOCATIONS.—The transportation of passengers or property by CRAF-eligible aircraft between two places outside the United States obtained by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department through a contract for airlift service shall be provided by an air carrier referred to in subsection (a) whenever transportation by such an air carrier is reasonably available.

“(d) EXCEPTION.—When the Secretary of Defense decides that no air carrier holding a certificate under section 41102 of title 49 is capable of providing, and willing to provide, the airlift service, the Secretary of Defense may make a contract to provide the service with an air carrier not having a certificate.

“(e) CRAF-ELIGIBLE AIRCRAFT DEFINED.—In this section, ‘CRAF-eligible aircraft’ means aircraft of a type the Secretary of Defense has determined to be eligible to participate in the civil reserve air fleet.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“9516. Airlift service.”.

SEC. 1043. AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CERTAIN VOLUNTARY LEGAL SUPPORT SERVICES.

Section 1588(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) Voluntary legal support services provided by law students through internship and externship programs approved by the Secretary concerned.”.

SEC. 1044. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO USE THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REIMBURSEMENT RATE FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICES PROVIDED TO CERTAIN NON-DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ENTITIES.

(a) ELIGIBLE CATEGORIES OF TRANSPORTATION.—Subsection (a) of section 2642 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “During the period beginning on October 28, 2009, and ending on October 28, 2019, for” and inserting “For”; and

(B) by striking “of Defense” the first place it appears and all that follows through “military sales” and inserting “of Defense”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) For military transportation services provided in support of foreign military sales.

“(5) For military transportation services provided to a State, local, or tribal agency (including any organization composed of State, local, or tribal agencies).

“(6) For military transportation services provided to a Department of Defense contractor when transporting supplies that are for, or destined for, a Department of Defense entity.”.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN CATEGORIES OF TRANSPORTATION.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN CATEGORIES OF TRANSPORTATION.—The provisions of paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6) of subsection (a) shall apply only to military transportation services provided before October 1, 2019.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 2642. Transportation services provided to certain non-Department of Defense agencies and entities: use of Department of Defense reimbursement rate”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 157 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“2642. Transportation services provided to certain non-Department of Defense agencies and entities: use of Department of Defense reimbursement rate.”.

SEC. 1045. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO USE OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS BY CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET CONTRACTORS.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 9513 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 931 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 9513.

SEC. 1046. INCLUSION OF CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AMONG LEADERSHIP OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROVIDED PHYSICAL PROTECTION AND PERSONAL SECURITY.

(a) INCLUSION.—Subsection (a) of section 1074 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 330) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph (7):

“(7) Chief of the National Guard Bureau.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by striking “paragraphs (1) through (7)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) through (8)”.

SEC. 1047. INCLUSION OF REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN AUTHORITY FOR ASSIGNMENT OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AS ADVISORS TO FOREIGN MINISTRIES OF DEFENSE.

(a) INCLUSION OF REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN AUTHORITY.—Section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1599; 10 U.S.C. 168 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “or regional organizations with security missions” after “foreign countries”; and

(B) by inserting “or regional organization” after “ministry” each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2);

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively, and inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTICE.—Not later than 15 days before assigning a civilian employee of the Department of Defense as an advisor to a regional organization with a security mission under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the

Senate and the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a notification of such assignment. Such a notification shall include each of the following:

“(1) A statement of the intent of the Secretary to assign the employee as an advisor to the regional organization.

“(2) The name of the regional organization and the location and duration of the assignment.

“(3) A description of the assignment, including a description of the training or assistance proposed to be provided to the regional organization, the justification for the assignment, a description of the unique capabilities the employee can provide to the regional organization, and a description of how the assignment serves the national security interests of the United States.

“(4) Any other information relating to the assignment that the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.”;

(3) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by inserting “and regional organizations with security missions” after “defense ministries” each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (5); and

(4) in subsection (e), as so redesignated, by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (d)”.

(b) UPDATE OF POLICY GUIDANCE ON AUTHORITY.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy shall issue an update of the policy of the Department of Defense for assignment of civilian employees of the Department as advisors to foreign ministries of defense and regional organizations under the authority in section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1599; 10 U.S.C. 168 note), as amended by this section.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The section heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1081. AUTHORITY FOR ASSIGNMENT OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AS ADVISORS TO FOREIGN MINISTRIES OF DEFENSE AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.”

SEC. 1048. REPORT AND LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR AVIATION FOREIGN INTERNAL DEFENSE PROGRAM.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the aviation foreign internal defense program. Such report shall include each of the following:

(A) An overall description of the program, including validated requirements from each of the geographic combatant commands and the Joint Staff, and of the statutory authorities used to support fixed and rotary wing aviation foreign internal defense programs within the Department of Defense.

(B) Program goals, proposed metrics of performance success, and anticipated procurement and operation and maintenance costs across the Future Years Defense Program.

(C) A comprehensive strategy outlining and justifying contributing commands and units for program execution, including the use of the Air Force, the Special Operations Command, the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and the National Guard.

(D) The results of any analysis of alternatives and efficiencies reviews for any contracts awarded to support the aviation foreign internal defense program.

(E) A certification that the program is cost effective and meets the requirements of the geographic combatant commands.

(F) Any other items the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) LIMITATION.—Not more than 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for Procurement, Defense-wide, for the fixed-wing aviation foreign internal defense program, may be obligated or expended until the date that is 45 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense provides to the congressional defense committees the certification required under subsection (a).

SEC. 1049. MODIFICATIONS TO OH-58D KIOWA WARRIOR AIRCRAFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 2244a of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may modify OH-58D Kiowa Warrior aircraft of the Army that the Secretary determines will not be retired and will remain in the aircraft fleet of the Army.

(b) MANNER OF MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out the modifications under subsection (a) in a manner that ensures—

(1) the safety and survivability of the crews of the OH-58D Kiowa Warrior aircraft;

(2) the safety of flight for such aircraft; and

(3) that the minimum capability requirements of the commanders of the combatant commands are met.

Subtitle F—Studies and Reports

SEC. 1051. PROTECTION OF TOP-TIER DEFENSE-CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE FROM ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than June 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on whether top-tier defense-critical infrastructure requiring electromagnetic pulse protection that receives its power supply from commercial or other non-military sources is protected from the adverse effects of man-made or naturally occurring electromagnetic pulse. In the case of any of such infrastructure that the Secretary determines is not protected from such adverse effects, the Secretary shall include in the report a description of the actions that would be required to provide for the protection of such infrastructure from such adverse effects.

(b) FORM OF SUBMISSION.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in classified form.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “top-tier defense-critical infrastructure” means Department of Defense infrastructure essential to project, support, and sustain the Armed Forces and military operations worldwide.

SEC. 1052. RESPONSE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO COMPROMISES OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Compromises of classified information cause indiscriminate and long-lasting damage to United States national security and often have a direct impact on the safety of warfighters.

(2) In 2010, hundreds of thousands of classified documents were illegally copied and disclosed across the Internet.

(3) Classified information has been disclosed in numerous public writings and manuscripts endangering current operations.

(4) In 2013, nearly 1,700,000 files were downloaded from United States Government

information systems, threatening the national security of the United States and placing the lives of United States personnel at extreme risk. The majority of the information compromised relates to the capabilities, operations, tactics, techniques, and procedures of the Armed Forces of the United States, and is the single greatest quantitative compromise in the history of the United States.

(5) The Department of Defense is taking steps to mitigate the harm caused by these leaks.

(6) Congress must be kept apprised of the progress of the mitigation efforts to ensure the protection of the national security of the United States.

(b) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on actions taken by the Secretary in response to significant compromises of classified information. Such report shall include each of the following:

(A) A description of any changes made to Department of Defense policies or guidance relating to significant compromises of classified information, including regarding security clearances for employees of the Department, information technology, and personnel actions.

(B) An overview of the efforts made by any task force responsible for the mitigation of such compromises of classified information.

(C) A description of the resources of the Department that have been dedicated to efforts relating to such compromises.

(D) A description of the plan of the Secretary to continue evaluating the damage caused by, and to mitigate the damage from, such compromises.

(E) A general description and estimate of the anticipated costs associated with mitigating such compromises.

(2) UPDATES TO REPORT.—During calendar years 2015 and 2016, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees quarterly updates to the report required by paragraph (1). Each such update shall include information regarding any changes or progress with respect to the matters covered by such report.

SEC. 1053. STUDY ON JOINT ANALYTIC CAPABILITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall commission an appropriate entity outside the Department of Defense to conduct an independent assessment of the joint analytic capabilities of the Department of Defense to support strategy, plans, and force development and their link to resource decisions.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) An assessment of the analytical capability of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Staff to support force planning, defense strategy development, program and budget decisions, and the review of war plans.

(2) Recommendations on improvements to such capability as required, including changes to processes or organizations that may be necessary.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entity that conducts the assessment required by subsection (a) shall provide to the Secretary an unclassified report, with a classified annex (if appropriate), containing its

findings as a result of the assessment. Not later than 90 days after the date of the receipt of the report, the Secretary shall transmit the report to the congressional defense committees, together with such comments on the report as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 1054. BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS OF THE CREATION OF AN ACTIVE DUTY ASSOCIATION FOR THE 168TH AIR REFUELING WING.

(a) **BUSINESS CASE ANALYSIS.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall conduct a business case analysis of the creation of a 4-PAA (Personnel-Only) KC-135R active association with the 168th Air Refueling Wing. Such analysis shall include consideration of—

(1) any efficiencies or cost savings achieved assuming the 168th Air Refueling Wing meets 100 percent of current air refueling requirements after the active association is in place;

(2) improvements to the mission requirements of the 168th Air Refueling Wing and Air Mobility Command; and

(3) effects on the operations of Air Mobility Command.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the business case analysis conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 1055. REPORTS ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE AIR FORCE.

(a) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the submittal to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, of the budget of the President for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the response of the Air Force to the 42 specific recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force in the report of the Commission pursuant to section 363(b) of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force Act of 2012 (subtitle G of title III of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1704).

(b) **ELEMENTS OF INITIAL REPORT.**—The initial report of the Secretary under subsection (a) shall set forth the following:

(1) Specific milestones for review by the Air Force of the recommendations of the Commission described in subsection (a).

(2) A preliminary implementation plan for each of such recommendations that do not require further review by the Air Force as of the date of such report for implementation.

(c) **ELEMENTS OF SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.**—Each report of the Secretary under subsection (a) after the initial report shall set forth the following:

(1) An implementation plan for each of the recommendations of the Commission described in subsection (a), and not previously covered by a report under this section, that do not require further review by the Air Force as of the date of such report for implementation.

(2) A description of the accomplishments of the Air Force in implementing the recommendations of the Commission previously identified as not requiring further review by the Air Force for implementation in an earlier report under this section, including a description of any such recommendation that is fully implemented as of the date of such report.

(d) **DEVIATION FROM COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS.**—If any implementation plan under this section includes a proposal to deviate in a material manner from a rec-

ommendation of the Commission described in subsection (a), the report setting forth such implementation plan shall—

(1) describe the deviation; and

(2) include a justification of the Air Force for the deviation.

(e) **ALLOCATION OF SAVINGS.**—Each report of the Secretary under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify any savings achieved by the Air Force as of the date of such report in implementing the recommendations of the Commission described in subsection (a) when compared with spending anticipated by the budget of the President for fiscal year 2015; and

(2) indicate the manner in which such savings affected the budget request of the President for the fiscal year beginning in the year in which such report is submitted.

SEC. 1056. REPORT ON PROTECTION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to Congress a report on the protection of military installations. Such report shall include each of the following:

(1) An identification of specific issues, shortfalls, and gaps related to the authorities providing for the protection of military installations by the agencies concerned and risks associated with such gaps.

(2) A description of specific and detailed examples of incidents that have actually occurred that illustrate the concerns referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) Any recommendations for proposed legislation that would—

(A) improve the ability of the Department of Defense to fulfill its requirement to provide for the protection of military installations; and

(B) address the concerns referred to in paragraph (1).

SEC. 1057. COMPTROLLER GENERAL BRIEFING AND REPORT ON ARMY AND ARMY NATIONAL GUARD FORCE STRUCTURE CHANGES.

(a) **BRIEFING AND REPORT.**—

(1) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than March 1, 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written briefing on the assessment of the Comptroller General of the Aviation Restructuring Initiative of the Army and of any proposals submitted by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau or the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation Office of the Department of Defense that could serve as alternatives to the Army's proposal for adjusting the structure and mix of its combat aviation forces among regular Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard units.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the submittal of the briefing under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a final report on the assessment referred to in that paragraph.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The briefing and report of the Comptroller General required by subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, each of the following:

(1) A comparison of the assumptions on strategy, current demands, historical readiness rates, anticipated combat requirements, and the constraints and limitations associated with mobilization, utilization, and rotation policies underlying the Aviation Restructuring Initiative and any alternatives proposed by the Chief of the National Guard

Bureau and the Department of Defense Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation Office.

(2) An assessment of the models used to estimate future costs and cost savings associated with each proposal for allocating Army aviation platforms among the regular Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard units.

(3) A comparison of the military and civilian personnel requirements for supporting combat aviation brigades under each proposal, including a description of the anticipated requirements and funding allocated for active Guard Reserve and full-time military technicians supporting the Army National Guard AH-64 "Apache" units.

(c) **SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE ARMY.**—Congress is concerned with the planned reductions and realignments the Army has proposed for the regular Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserves in order to comply with the funding constraints under the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25). Concerns are particularly associated with proposed reductions in end strength for all components that will result in additional reductions in the number of regular Army and National Guard brigade combat teams as well as reductions and realignments of combat aircraft within and between the regular Army and the Army National Guard. Sufficient funding should be provided to retain the force structure and sustain the readiness of as much Total Army combat capability as possible.

SEC. 1058. IMPROVING ANALYTIC SUPPORT TO SYSTEMS ACQUISITION AND ALLOCATION OF ACQUISITION, INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE AND RECONNAISSANCE ASSETS.

(a) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall review and issue or revise guidance to components of the Department of Defense to improve the application of operations research and systems analysis to—

(1) the requirements process for acquisition of major defense acquisition programs and major automated information systems; and

(2) the allocation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems to the combatant commands.

(b) **BRIEFING OF CONGRESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall brief—

(1) the congressional defense committees on any guidance issued or revised under subsection (a); and

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on any guidance issued or revised under subsection (a)(2) relevant to intelligence.

SEC. 1059. REVIEW OF UNITED STATES MILITARY STRATEGY AND THE FORCE POSTURE OF ALLIES AND PARTNERS IN THE UNITED STATES PACIFIC COMMAND AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY.

(a) **INDEPENDENT REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall commission an independent review of the United States Asia-Pacific rebalance, with a focus on issues expected to be critical during the ten-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, including the national security interests and military strategy of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region.

(2) **CONDUCT OF REVIEW.**—The review conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be conducted by an independent organization that has—

(A) recognized credentials and expertise in national security and military affairs; and

(B) access to policy experts throughout the United States and from the Asia-Pacific region.

(3) ELEMENTS.—The review conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) An assessment of the risks to United States national security interests in the United States Pacific Command area of responsibility during the ten-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act as a result of changes in the security environment.

(B) An assessment of the current and planned United States force posture adjustments and the impact of such adjustments on the strategy to rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region.

(C) An assessment of the current and planned force posture and adjustments of United States allies and partners in the region and the impact of such adjustments on the strategy to rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region.

(D) An evaluation of the key capability gaps and shortfalls of the United States and its allies and partners in the Asia-Pacific region, including undersea warfare (including submarines), naval and maritime, ballistic missile defense, cyber, munitions, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities.

(E) An analysis of the willingness and capacity of allies, partners, and regional organizations to contribute to the security and stability of the Asia-Pacific region, including potential required adjustments to United States military strategy based on that analysis.

(F) An appraisal of the Arctic ambitions of actors in the Asia-Pacific region in the context of current and projected capabilities, including an analysis of the adequacy and relevance of the Arctic Roadmap prepared by the Navy.

(G) An evaluation of theater security cooperation efforts of the United States Pacific Command in the context of current and projected threats, and desired capabilities and priorities of the United States and its allies and partners.

(H) The views of noted policy leaders and regional experts, including military commanders, in the Asia-Pacific region.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent organization that conducted the review pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report containing the findings of the review. The report shall be submitted in classified form, but may contain an unclassified annex.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of the report required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees the report, together with any comments on the report that the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 1060. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) OVERSIGHT OF PROCUREMENT, TEST, AND OPERATIONAL PLANS FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS.—Section 223a is amended by striking subsection (d).

(2) ANNUAL REPORT ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE COM-PETITION.—

(A) REPEAL.—Chapter 146 is amended by striking section 2462.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 146 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2462.

(b) DISPLAY OF ANNUAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS FOR AIR SOVEREIGNTY ALERT MISSION UNDER DUNCAN HUNTER NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.—Section 354 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4426; 10 U.S.C. 221 note) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 1061. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ANNUAL REVIEWS AND REPORT ON PILOT PROGRAM ON COMMERCIAL FEE-FOR-SERVICE AIR REFUELING SUPPORT FOR THE AIR FORCE.

Section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-81; 122 Stat. 335) is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 1062. REPORT ON ADDITIONAL MATTERS IN CONNECTION WITH REPORT ON THE FORCE STRUCTURE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to Congress a report on the matters specified in subsection (b) with respect to the report of the Secretary on the force structure of the United States Army submitted under section 1066 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1943).

(b) MATTERS.—The matters specified in this subsection with respect to the report referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) An update of the planning assumptions and scenarios used to determine the size and force structure of the Army, including the reserve components, for the future-years defense program for fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

(2) An updated evaluation of the adequacy of the proposed force structure for meeting the goals of the national military strategy of the United States.

(3) A description of any new alternative force structures considered, if any, including the assessed advantages and disadvantages of each and a brief explanation of why those not selected were rejected.

(4) The estimated resource requirements of each of the new alternative force structures referred to in paragraph (3).

(5) An updated independent risk assessment of the proposed Army force structure, to be conducted by the Chief of Staff of the Army.

(6) A description of plans and actions taken to implement and apply the recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States regarding force reduction analysis and decision process improvements in the report entitled “Defense Infrastructure: Army Brigade Combat Team Inactivations Informed by Analysis but Actions Needed to Improve Stationing Process” (GAO-14-76, December 2013) used in the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Assessment of the Army.

(7) Such other information or updates as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1063. CERTIFICATION FOR REALIGNMENT OF FORCES AT LAJES AIR FORCE BASE, AZORES.

Prior to taking any action to realign forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, the

Secretary of Defense shall certify to the congressional defense committees that—

(1) the action is supported by a European Infrastructure Consolidation Assessment initiated by the Secretary of Defense on January 25, 2013, including a specific assessment of the efficacy of Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, in support of the United States overseas force posture; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense has determined, based on an analysis of operational requirements, that Lajes Air Force Base is not an optimal location for United States Special Operations Command or for United States Africa Command. The certification shall include a discussion of the basis for such determination.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

SEC. 1071. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REFLECT ENACTMENT OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2013(a)(1) is amended by striking “section 6101(b)–(d) of title 41” and inserting “section 6101 of title 41”.

(2) Section 2302 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking “section 4 of such Act” and inserting “such section”; and

(B) in paragraph (9)(A)—

(i) by striking “section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422)” and inserting “chapter 15 of title 41”; and

(ii) by striking “such section” and inserting “such chapter”.

(3) Section 2306a(b)(3)(B) is amended by striking “section 4(12)(C)(i) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12)(C)(i))” and inserting “section 103(3)(A) of title 41”.

(4) Section 2314 is amended by striking “Sections 6101(b)–(d)” and inserting “Sections 6101”.

(5) Section 2321(f)(2) is amended by striking “section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c))” and inserting “section 104 of title 41”.

(6) Section 2359b(k)(4)(A) is amended by striking “section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)” and inserting “section 110 of title 41”.

(7) Section 2379 is amended—

(A) in subsections (a)(1)(A), (b)(2)(A), and (c)(1)(B)(i), by striking “section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12))” and inserting “section 103 of title 41”; and

(B) in subsections (b) and (c)(1), by striking “section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c))” and inserting “section 104 of title 41”.

(8) Section 2410m(b)(1) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “section 7 of such Act” and inserting “section 7104(a) of such title”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “section 7 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978” and inserting “section 7104(a) of title 41”.

(9) Section 2533(a) is amended by striking “such Act” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting “chapter 83 of such title”.

(10) Section 2533b is amended—

(A) in subsection (h)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “sections 34 and 35 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 430 and 431)” and inserting “sections 1906 and 1907 of title 41”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c))” and inserting “section 104 of title 41”; and

(B) in subsection (m)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)” and inserting “section 105 of title 41”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403)” and inserting “section 131 of title 41”; and

(iii) in paragraph (5), by striking “section 35(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 431(c))” and inserting “section 104 of title 41”.

(11) Section 2545(1) is amended by striking “section 4(16) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(16))” and inserting “section 131 of title 41”.

(12) Section 7312(f) is amended by striking “Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)” and inserting “Section 6101 of title 41”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO OTHER DEFENSE-RELATED STATUTES TO REFLECT ENACTMENT OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) The Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) is amended as follows:

(A) Section 846(a) (10 U.S.C. 2534 note) is amended—

(i) by striking “the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.)” and inserting “chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(ii) by striking “that Act” and inserting “that chapter”.

(B) Section 866 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (b)(4)(A), by striking “section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422)” and inserting “chapter 15 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(ii) in subsection (e)(2)(A), by striking “section 4(13) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(13))” and inserting “section 110 of title 41, United States Code”.

(C) Section 893(f)(2) (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking “section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422)” and inserting “chapter 15 of title 41, United States Code”.

(2) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) is amended as follows:

(A) Section 805(c)(1) (10 U.S.C. 2330 note) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section 4(12)(E) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12)(E))” and inserting “section 103(5) of title 41, United States Code”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “section 4(12)(F) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12)(F))” and inserting “section 103(6) of title 41, United States Code”.

(B) Section 821(b)(2) (10 U.S.C. 2304 note) is amended by striking “section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12))” and inserting “section 103 of title 41, United States Code”.

(C) Section 847 (10 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(5), by striking “section 27(e) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423(e))” and inserting “section 2105 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “section 4(16) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act” and inserting “section 131 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(iii) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423)” and inserting “chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code”.

(D) Section 862 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)” and inserting “section 1303 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(ii) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “section 6(j) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(j))” and inserting “section 1126 of title 41, United States Code”.

(3) The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) is amended as follows:

(A) Section 832(d)(3) (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking “section 8(b) of the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 357(b))” and inserting “section 6701(3) of title 41, United States Code”.

(B) Section 852(b)(2)(A)(ii) (10 U.S.C. 2324 note) is amended by striking “section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12))” and inserting “section 103 of title 41, United States Code”.

(4) Section 8118 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-287; 10 U.S.C. 2533a note) is amended by striking “section 34 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 430)” and inserting “section 1906 of title 41, United States Code”.

(5) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136) is amended as follows:

(A) Section 812(b)(2) (10 U.S.C. 2501 note) is amended by striking “section 6(d)(4)(A) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405(d)(4)(A))” and inserting “section 1122(a)(4)(A) of title 41, United States Code”.

(B) Section 1601(c) (10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “section 32A of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, as added by section 1443 of this Act” and inserting “section 1903 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “Subsections (a) and (b) of section 7 of the Anti-Kickback Act of 1986 (41 U.S.C. 57(a) and (b))” and inserting “Section 8703(a) of title 41, United States Code”.

(6) Section 8025(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-87; 10 U.S.C. 2410d note), is amended by striking “the Javits-Wagner-O’Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48)” and inserting “chapter 85 of title 41, United States Code”.

(7) Section 817(e)(1)(B) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 10 U.S.C. 2306a note) is amended by striking “section 26(f)(5)(B) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422(f)(5)(B))” and inserting “section 1502(b)(3)(B) of title 41, United States Code”.

(8) Section 801(f)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107; 10 U.S.C. 2330 note) is amended by striking “section 16(3) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414(3))” and inserting “section 1702(c) of title 41, United States Code”.

(9) Section 803(d) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261; 10 U.S.C. 2306a note) is amended by striking “subsection (b)(1)(B) of section 304A of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254b)” and inserting “section 3503(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code”.

(10) Section 848(e)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note) is amended by striking “section 32 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 428)” and inserting “section 1902 of title 41, United States Code”.

(11) Section 722(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-201; 10 U.S.C. 1073 note) is amended by striking “section 25(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c))” and inserting “section 1303(a) of title 41, United States Code”.

(12) Section 3412(k) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106; 10 U.S.C. 7420 note) is amended by striking “section 303(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c))” and inserting “section 3304(a) of title 41, United States Code”.

(13) Section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 10 U.S.C. 2371 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2)(A), by striking “section 16(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414(c))” and inserting “section 1702(c) of title 41, United States Code”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1)(B)(ii), by striking “section 16(3) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414(3))” and inserting “section 1702(c) of title 41, United States Code”;

(C) in subsection (e)(2)(A), by striking “section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12))” and inserting “section 103 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(D) in subsection (h), by striking “section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423)” and inserting “chapter 21 of title 41, United States Code”.

(14) Section 326(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended by striking “section 25(c) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c))” and inserting “section 1303(a) of title 41, United States Code”.

(15) Section 806 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-190; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act” and inserting “section 103 of title 41, United States Code”; and

(B) in subsection (c)—
(i) by striking “section 25(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act” and inserting “section 1302(a) of title 41, United States Code”; and

(ii) by striking “section 25(c)(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c)(1))” and inserting “section 1303(a)(1) of such title 41”.

(16) Section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(A) by designating the subsection after subsection (k), relating to definitions, as subsection (l); and

(B) in paragraph (8) of that subsection, by striking “the first section of the Act of June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 46; popularly known as the ‘Wagner-O’Day Act’)” and inserting “section 8502 of title 41, United States Code”.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REFLECT RECLASSIFICATION OF PROVISIONS OF LAW CODIFIED IN TITLE 50, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 113(b), 125(a), and 155(d) are amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 401)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3002)”.

(2) Sections 113(e)(2), 117(a)(1), 118(b)(1), 118a(b)(1), 153(b)(1)(C)(i), 231(b)(1), 231a(c)(1), and 2501(a)(1)(A) are amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 404a)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3043)”.

(3) Sections 167(g), 421(c), and 2557(c) are amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 413 et seq.)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.)”.

(4) Section 201(b)(1) is amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 403-6(b))” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3041(b))”.

(5) Section 429 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “Section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1)” and inserting “section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024)”;

(B) in subsection (e), by striking “(50 U.S.C. 401a(4))” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3003(4))”.

(6) Section 442(d) is amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 404e(a))” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3045(a))”.

(7) Section 444 is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “(50 U.S.C. 403o)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3515)”;

(B) in subsection (e)(2)(B), by striking “(50 U.S.C. 403a et seq.)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.)”.

(8) Section 457 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “(50 U.S.C. 431)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3141)”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “(50 U.S.C. 431(b))” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3141(b))”.

(9) Sections 462, 1599a(a), and 1623(a) are amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 402 note)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3614)”.

(10) Sections 491(c)(3), 494(d)(1), 496(a)(1), 2409(e)(1) are amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 401a(4))” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3003(4))”.

(11) Section 1605(a)(2) is amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 403r)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3518)”.

(12) Section 2723(d)(2) is amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 413)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3091)”.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO OTHER DEFENSE-RELATED STATUTES TO REFLECT RECLASSIFICATION OF PROVISIONS OF LAW CODIFIED IN TITLE 50, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) The following provisions of law are amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 401a(4))” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3003(4))”:

(A) Section 911(3) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note).

(B) Sections 801(b)(3) and 911(e)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; 2271 note).

(C) Section 812(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136; 10 U.S.C. 2501 note).

(2) Section 901(d) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 10 U.S.C. 137 note) is amended by striking “(50 U.S.C. 401 et seq.)” and inserting “(50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.)”.

(e) DATE OF ENACTMENT REFERENCES.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1218(d)(3) is amended by striking “on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010” and inserting “on October 28, 2014”.

(2) Section 1566a(a) is amended by striking “Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and under” and inserting “Under”.

(3) Section 2275(d) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013” and inserting “before January 2, 2013”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013” and inserting “on or after January 2, 2013”.

(4) Section 2601a(e) is amended by striking “after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012” and inserting “after December 31, 2011”.

(5) Section 6328(c) is amended by striking “on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010” and inserting “on or after October 28, 2009”.

(f) OTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 118 is amended by striking subsection (g).

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 is amended—

(A) by striking the item relating to section 130e and inserting the following new item:

“130e. Treatment under Freedom of Information Act of certain critical infrastructure security information.”;

(B) by striking the item relating to section 130f and inserting the following new item:

“130f. Congressional notification of sensitive military operations.”.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 is amended by inserting a period at the end of the item relating to section 189.

(4) Section 189(c)(1) is amended by striking “139c” and inserting “2430(a)”.

(5) Section 407(a)(3)(A) is amended by striking the comma after “as applicable”.

(6) Section 429(c) is amended by striking “act” and inserting “law”.

(7) Section 488(a) is amended by inserting a comma after “Every three years”.

(8) Section 674(b) is amended by striking “after” and inserting “after”.

(9) Section 949i(b) is amended by striking “,” and inserting a comma.

(10) Section 950b(b)(2)(A) is amended by striking “give” and inserting “given”.

(11) Section 1040(a)(1) is amended by striking “.” and inserting a period.

(12) Section 1044(d)(2) is amended by striking “.” and inserting a period.

(13) Section 1074m(a)(2) is amended by striking “subparagraph” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “subparagraphs”.

(14) Section 1154(a)(2)(A)(ii) is amended by striking “U.S.C.1411” and inserting “U.S.C. 1411”.

(15) Section 1513(1) is amended in the last sentence by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (c)”.

(16) Section 2222(g)(3) is amended by striking “(A)” after “(3)”.

(17) Section 2335(d) is amended—

(A) by designating the last sentence of paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(B) in paragraph (3), as so designated—

(i) by inserting before “each of” the following paragraph heading: “OTHER TERMS.—”;

(ii) by striking “the term” and inserting “that term”;

(iii) by striking “Federal Campaign” and inserting “Federal Election Campaign”.

(18) Section 2430(c)(2) is amended by striking “section 2366a(a)(4)” and inserting “section 2366a(a)(6)”.

(19) Section 2601a is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “issue” and inserting “prescribe”;

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “issued” and inserting “prescribed”.

(20) Section 2371 is amended by striking subsection (h).

(21) The item relating to section 2642 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 157 is amended by striking “rates” and inserting “rate”.

(22) Section 2642(a)(3) is amended by inserting “and” after “Department of Defense”.

(23) Section 2684a(h) is amended by inserting “670” after “U.S.C.”.

(24) Section 2853(c)(1)(A) is amended by striking “can be still be” and inserting “can still be”.

(25) Section 2866(a)(4)(A) is amended by striking “repayed” and inserting “repaid”.

(26) Section 2884(c) is amended by striking “on evaluation” in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting “an evaluation”.

(27) Section 7292(d)(2) is amended by striking “section 1024(a)” and inserting “section 1018(a)”.

(g) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014.—Effective as of December 26, 2013, and as if included therein as enacted, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 314 (127 Stat. 729) is amended by striking “Section 317(c)(2)” and inserting “Section 317(d)(2)”.

(2) Section 812(a)(3)(B) (127 Stat. 807) is amended by inserting “the first place it appears” before the semicolon.

(3) Section 905(b) (127 Stat. 818) is amended by striking “TRAINING, AND EDUCATION” and inserting “TRAINING, AND EDUCATION”.

(4) Section 1073(a)(2)(B) (127 Stat. 869) is amended by striking “and” after “inserting”.

(5) Section 1709(b)(1)(B) (127 Stat. 962; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended by striking “of” after “such”.

(6) Section 2712 (127 Stat. 1004) is repealed.

(7) Section 2809(a) (127 Stat. 1013) is amended by striking “subjection” and inserting “subsection”.

(8) Section 2966 (127 Stat. 1042) is amended in the section heading by striking “TITLE” and inserting “ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION”.

(9) Section 2971(a) (127 Stat. 1044) is amended—

(A) by striking “the map” and inserting “the maps”;

(B) by striking “the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws” and inserting “and the mineral leasing laws”.

(10) Section 2972(d)(1) (127 Stat. 1045) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “public” before “land”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “public”.

(11) Section 2977(c)(3) (127 Stat. 1047) is amended by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

(h) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013.—Effective as of January 2, 2013, and as if included therein as enacted, section 604(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1774) is amended by striking “on the date of the enactment

of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013" and inserting "on January 2, 2013,".

(i) IKE SKELTON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011.—Section 1631(b)(6) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended by striking "section 596(b) of such Act" and inserting "section 596(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 10 U.S.C. 1561 note)".

(j) STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACT.—Section 11(b)(2) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b)(2)) is amended by striking "under section 9(b)(2)(G)" and inserting "under section 9(b)(2)(H)".

(k) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS MADE BY THIS ACT.—For purposes of applying amendments made by provisions of this Act other than this section, the amendments made by this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately before any such amendments by other provisions of this Act.

SEC. 1072. REFORM OF QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REFORM.—Section 118 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 118. Defense Strategy Review

“(a) DEFENSE STRATEGY REVIEW.—

“(1) REVIEW REQUIRED.—Every four years, during a year following a year evenly divisible by four, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a comprehensive examination (to be known as a ‘Defense Strategy Review’) of the national defense strategy, force structure, modernization plans, posture, infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the defense program and policies of the United States with a view toward determining and expressing the defense strategy of the United States and establishing a defense program. Each such Defense Strategy Review shall be conducted in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

“(2) CONDUCT OF REVIEW.—Each Defense Strategy Review shall be conducted so as to—

“(A) delineate a national defense strategy in support of the most recent National Security Strategy prescribed by the President pursuant to section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043);

“(B) provide a mechanism for—

“(i) setting priorities for sizing and shaping the force, guiding the development and sustainment of capabilities, allocating resources, and adjusting the organization of the Department of Defense to respond to changes in the strategic environment;

“(ii) monitoring, assessing, and holding accountable agencies within the Department of Defense for the development of policies and programs that support the national defense strategy;

“(iii) integrating and supporting other national and related interagency security policies and strategies with other Department of Defense guidance, plans, and activities; and

“(iv) communicating such national defense strategy to Congress, relevant United States Government agencies, allies and international partners, and the private sector;

“(C) consider three general timeframes of the near-term (associated with the future-years defense program), mid-term (10 to 15 years), and far-term (20 years);

“(D) address the security environment, threats, trends, opportunities, and challenges, and define the nature and magnitude

of the strategic and military risks associated with executing the national defense strategy by using the most recent net assessment submitted by the Secretary of Defense under section 113 of this title, the risk assessment submitted by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under section 153 of this title, and, as determined necessary or useful by the Secretary, any other Department of Defense, Government, or non-government strategic or intelligence estimate, assessment, study, or review;

“(E) define the force size and structure, capabilities, modernization plans, posture, infrastructure, readiness, organization, and other elements of the defense program of the Department of Defense that would be required to execute missions called for in such national defense strategy;

“(F) to the extent practical, estimate the budget plan sufficient to execute the missions called for in such national defense strategy;

“(G) define the nature and magnitude of the strategic and military risks associated with executing such national defense strategy; and

“(H) understand the relationships and tradeoffs between missions, risks, and resources.

“(3) SUBMISSION OF REPORT ON DEFENSE STRATEGY REVIEW TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The Secretary shall submit a report on each Defense Strategy Review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Each such report shall be submitted by not later than March 1 of the year following the year in which the review is conducted. If the year in which the review is conducted is in the second term of a President, the Secretary may submit an update to the Defense Strategy Review report submitted during the first term of that President.

“(4) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (3) shall provide a comprehensive discussion of the Review, including each of the following:

“(A) The national defense strategy of the United States.

“(B) The assumed or defined prioritized national security interests of the United States that inform the national defense strategy defined in the Review.

“(C) The assumed strategic environment, including the threats, developments, trends, opportunities, and challenges that affect the assumed or defined national security interests of the United States.

“(D) The assumed steady state activities, crisis and conflict scenarios, military end states, and force planning construct examined in the review.

“(E) The prioritized missions of the armed forces under the strategy and a discussion of the roles and missions of the components of the armed forces to carry out those missions.

“(F) The assumed roles and capabilities provided by other United States Government agencies and by allies and international partners.

“(G) The force size and structure, capabilities, posture, infrastructure, readiness, organization, and other elements of the defense program that would be required to execute the missions called for in the strategy.

“(H) An assessment of the significant gaps and shortfalls between the force size and structure, capabilities, and additional elements as required by subparagraph (G) and the current elements in the Department's existing program of record, a prioritization of those gaps and shortfalls, and an understanding of the relationships and tradeoffs between missions, risks, and resources.

“(I) An assessment of the risks assumed by the strategy, including—

“(i) how the Department defines, categorizes, and measures risk, including strategic and military risk; and

“(ii) the plan for mitigating major identified risks, including the expected timelines for, and extent of, any such mitigation, and the rationale for where greater risk is accepted.

“(J) Any other key assumptions and elements addressed in the review or that the Secretary considers necessary to include.

“(5) CJCS REVIEW.—(A) Upon the completion of each Review under this subsection, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall prepare and submit to the Secretary of Defense the Chairman's assessment of risks under the defense strategy developed by the Review and a description of the capabilities needed to address such risks.

“(B) The Chairman's assessment shall be submitted to the Secretary in time for the inclusion of the assessment in the report on the Review required by paragraph (3). The Secretary shall include the Chairman's assessment, together with the Secretary's comments, in the report in its entirety.

“(6) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (3) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if the Secretary determines it is necessary to protect national security.

“(b) NATIONAL DEFENSE PANEL.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than February 1 of a year following a year evenly divisible by four, there shall be established an independent panel to be known as the National Defense Panel (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Panel’). The Panel shall have the duties set forth in this subsection.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Panel shall be composed of ten members from private civilian life who are recognized experts in matters relating to the national security of the United States. Eight of the members shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) Two by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

“(B) Two by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

“(C) Two by the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

“(D) Two by the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

“(3) CO-CHAIRS OF THE PANEL.—In addition to the members appointed under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense shall appoint two members from private civilian life to serve as co-chairmen of the panel.

“(4) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Panel. Any vacancy in the Panel shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

“(5) DUTIES.—The Panel shall have the following duties with respect to a Defense Strategy Review conducted under subsection (a):

“(A) Assessing the current and future security environment, including threats, trends, developments, opportunities, challenges, and risks, by using the most recent net assessment submitted by the Secretary of Defense under section 113 of this title, the risk assessment submitted by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs under section 153 of this title, and, as determined necessary or useful by the Panel, any other Department of Defense, Government, or non-government strategic or intelligence estimate, assessment, study, review, or expert.

“(B) Suggesting key issues that should be addressed in the Defense Strategy Review.

“(C) Based upon the assessment under subparagraph (A), identifying and discussing the national security interests of the United States and the role of the armed forces and the Department of Defense related to the protection or promotion of those interests.

“(D) Assessing the report on the Defense Strategy Review submitted by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a)(3).

“(E) Assessing the assumptions, strategy, findings, and risks of the report on the Defense Strategy Review submitted under subsection (a)(3).

“(F) Considering alternative defense strategies.

“(G) Assessing the force structure and capabilities, posture, infrastructure, readiness, organization, budget plans, and other elements of the defense program of the United States to execute the missions called for in the Defense Strategy Review and in the alternative strategies considered under subparagraph (F).

“(H) Providing to Congress and the Secretary of Defense, in the report required by paragraph (7), any recommendations it considers appropriate for their consideration.

“(6) FIRST MEETING.—If the Secretary of Defense has not made the Secretary's appointments to the Panel under paragraph (3) by March 1 of a year in which the Panel is established, the Panel shall convene for its first meeting with the remaining members.

“(7) REPORTS.—Not later than three months after the date on which the report on a Defense Strategy Review is submitted under paragraph (3) of subsection (a) to the committees of Congress referred to in such paragraph, the Panel shall submit to such committees a report on the Panel's assessment of such Defense Strategy Review, as required by paragraph (5).

“(8) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—The following administrative provisions apply to a Panel established under paragraph (1):

“(A) The Panel may request directly from the Department of Defense and any of its components such information as the Panel considers necessary to carry out its duties under this subsection. The head of the department or agency concerned shall cooperate with the Panel to ensure that information requested by the Panel under this paragraph is promptly provided to the maximum extent practical.

“(B) Upon the request of the co-chairs, the Secretary of Defense shall make available to the Panel the services of any federally funded research and development center that is covered by a sponsoring agreement of the Department of Defense.

“(C) The Panel shall have the authorities provided in section 3161 of title 5 and shall be subject to the conditions set forth in such section.

“(D) Funds for activities of the Panel shall be provided from amounts available to the Department of Defense.

“(9) TERMINATION.—A Panel established under paragraph (1) shall terminate 45 days after the date on which the Panel submits its report on a Defense Strategy Review under paragraph (7).”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 118 at the beginning of chapter 2 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“118. Defense Strategy Review.”

(b) REPEAL OF QUADRENNIAL ROLES AND MISSIONS REVIEW.—

(1) REPEAL.—Chapter 2 of such title is amended by striking section 118b.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by striking the item relating to section 118b.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 118 of such title, as amended by subsection (a), and the amendments made by this section, shall take effect on October 1, 2015.

(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR NEXT DEFENSE STRATEGY REVIEW.—The first Defense Strategy Review required by subsection (a)(1) of section 118 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall include an analysis of enduring mission requirements for equipping, training, sustainment, and other operation and maintenance activities of the Department of Defense, including the Defense Agencies and military departments, that are financed by amounts authorized to be appropriated for overseas contingency operations.

SEC. 1073. BIENNIAL SURVEYS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES ON WORKPLACE AND GENDER RELATIONS MATTERS.

(a) SURVEYS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 23 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 481 the following new section:

“§481a. Workplace and gender relations issues: surveys of Department of Defense civilian employees

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall carry out every other fiscal year a survey of civilian employees of the Department of Defense to solicit information on gender issues, including issues relating to gender-based assault, harassment, and discrimination, and the climate in the Department for forming professional relationships between male and female civilian employees of the Department.

“(2) Each survey under this section shall be known as a ‘Department of Defense Civilian Employee Workplace and Gender Relations Survey’.

“(b) ELEMENTS.—Each survey conducted under this section shall be conducted so as to solicit information on the following:

“(1) Indicators of positive and negative trends for professional and personal relationships between male and female civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

“(2) The specific types of assault on civilian employees of the Department by other personnel of the Department (including contractor personnel) that have occurred, and the number of times each respondent has been so assaulted during the preceding fiscal year.

“(3) The effectiveness of Department policies designed to improve professional relationships between male and female civilian employees of the Department.

“(4) The effectiveness of current processes for complaints on and investigations into gender-based assault, harassment, and discrimination involving civilian employees of the Department.

“(5) Any other issues relating to assault, harassment, or discrimination involving civilian employees of the Department that the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Upon the completion of a survey under this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the survey.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 23 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 481 the following new item:

“481a. Workplace and gender relations issues: surveys of Department of Defense civilian employees.”

(3) INITIAL SURVEY.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the first survey required by section 481a of title 10, United States Code (as added by this subsection), during fiscal year 2016.

(b) REPORT ON FEASIBILITY OF SIMILAR SURVEYS OF MILITARY DEPENDENTS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth an assessment by the Secretary of the feasibility of conducting recurring surveys of each population specified in paragraph (2) on issues relating to gender-based assault, harassment, and discrimination.

(2) COVERED POPULATIONS.—The populations specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Military dependents.

(B) Contractors of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 1074. REVISION TO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR AVIATION INSURANCE CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 44309 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “A civil action shall not be instituted against the United States under this chapter unless the claimant first presents the claim to the Secretary of Transportation and such claim is finally denied by the Secretary in writing and notice of the denial of such claim is sent by certified or registered mail.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following new subsection (c):

“(c) TIME REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Except as provided under paragraph (2), an insurance claim made under this chapter against the United States shall be forever barred unless it is presented in writing to the Secretary of Transportation within two years after the date on which the loss event occurred. Any civil action arising out of the denial of such a claim shall be filed by not later than six months after the date of the mailing, by certified or registered mail, of notice of final denial of the claim by the Secretary.

“(2)(A) For claims based on liability to persons with whom the insured has no privity of contract, an insurance claim made under the authority of this chapter against the United States shall be forever barred unless it is presented in writing to the Secretary of Transportation by not later than the earlier of—

“(i) the date that is 60 days after the date on which final judgment is entered by a tribunal of competent jurisdiction; or

“(ii) the date that is six years after the date on which the loss event occurred.

“(B) Any civil action arising out of the denial of such claim shall be filed by not later than six months after the date of mailing, by certified or registered mail, of notice of final denial of the claim by the Secretary.

“(3) A claim made under this chapter shall be deemed to be administratively denied if the Secretary fails to make a final disposition of the claim before the date that is 6 months after the date on which the claim is presented to the Secretary, unless the Secretary makes a different agreement with the claimant when there is good cause for an agreement.”

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a claim arising after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1075. PILOT PROGRAM FOR THE HUMAN TERRAIN SYSTEM.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Army may carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary utilizes Human Terrain System assets in the United States Pacific Command area of responsibility to support phase 0 shaping operations and the theater security cooperation plans of the Commander of the United States Pacific Command.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of the pilot program under this section. Such report shall include the independent analysis and recommendations of the Commander of the United States Pacific Command regarding the effectiveness of the program and how it could be improved.

(2) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than December 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a final report on the pilot program. Such report shall include an analysis of the comparative value of human terrain information relative to other analytic tools and techniques, recommendations regarding expanding the program to include other combatant commands, and any improvements to the program and necessary resources that would enable expanding the program.

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to carry out a pilot program under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2016.

SEC. 1076. CLARIFICATION OF POLICIES ON MANAGEMENT OF SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue guidance to clarify the policies of the Department of Defense with respect to—

(1) the appropriate management of special use airspace managed by the Department; and

(2) governing access by non-Department users to such special use airspace.

(b) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the status of implementing the guidance issued under subsection (a).

SEC. 1077. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICIES ON COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN DEPARTMENT COMMUNITY OUTREACH EVENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report setting forth such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate for modifications of the policies of the Department of Defense on the involvement of non-Federal entities in Department community outreach events (including air shows, parades, open houses, and performances by military musical units) that feature any unit, aircraft, vessel, equipment, or members of the Armed Forces in order to increase the involvement of non-Federal entities in such events.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall prepare the report required by subsection (a) in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of current Department of Defense policies and regulations on the ac-

ceptance and use of voluntary gifts, donations, sponsorships, and other forms of support from non-Federal entities and persons for Department community outreach events described in subsection (a), including the authorities or requirements of the Department to accept fees for such air shows, parades, open houses, and performances by military musical units.

(2) Recommendations for modifications of such policies and regulations in order to permit additional voluntary support and funding from non-Federal entities for such events, including recommendations on matters such as increased recognition of donors, authority for military units to endorse the fundraising efforts of certain donors, and authority for the Armed Forces to charge fees or solicit and accept donations for parking and admission to such events.

SEC. 1078. NOTIFICATION OF FOREIGN THREATS TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS IMPACTING NATIONAL SECURITY.**(a) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the Secretary of Defense determines, through the use of open source information or the use of existing authorities (including section 806 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4260; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note)), that there is evidence of a national security threat described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a notification of such threat.

(2) **NATIONAL SECURITY THREAT.**—A national security threat described in this paragraph is a threat to an information technology or telecommunications component or network by an agent of a foreign power in which the compromise of such technology, component, or network poses a significant risk to the programs and operations of the Department of Defense, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) **FORM.**—A notification under this subsection shall be submitted in classified form.

(b) **ACTION PLAN REQUIRED.**—In the event that a notification is submitted pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall work with the head of any department or agency affected by the national security threat to develop a plan of action for responding to the concerns leading to the notification.

(c) **AGENT OF A FOREIGN POWER.**—In this section, the term “agent of a foreign power” has the meaning given such term in section 101(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(b)).

SEC. 1079. PILOT PROGRAM TO REHABILITATE AND MODIFY HOMES OF DISABLED AND LOW-INCOME VETERANS.**(a) DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **DISABLED.**—The term “disabled” means an individual with a disability, as defined by section 12102 of title 42, United States Code.

(2) **ELIGIBLE VETERAN.**—The term “eligible veteran” means a disabled or low-income veteran.

(3) **ENERGY EFFICIENT FEATURES OR EQUIPMENT.**—The term “energy efficient features or equipment” means features of, or equipment in, a primary residence that help reduce the amount of electricity used to heat, cool, or ventilate such residence, including insulation, weatherstripping, air sealing, heating system repairs, duct sealing, or other measures.

(4) **LOW-INCOME VETERAN.**—The term “low-income veteran” means a veteran whose income does not exceed 80 percent of the median income for an area, as determined by the Secretary.

(5) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.**—The term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is—

(A) described in section 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(19) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(B) exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

(6) PRIMARY RESIDENCE.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “primary residence” means a single family house, a duplex, or a unit within a multiple-dwelling structure that is the principal dwelling of an eligible veteran and is owned by such veteran or a family member of such veteran.

(B) **FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term “family member” includes—

(i) a spouse, child, grandchild, parent, or sibling;

(ii) a spouse of such a child, grandchild, parent, or sibling; or

(iii) any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with a veteran is the equivalent of a family relationship.

(7) **QUALIFIED ORGANIZATION.**—The term “qualified organization” means a nonprofit organization that provides nationwide or statewide programs that primarily serve veterans or low-income individuals.

(8) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(9) **VETERAN.**—The term “veteran” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(10) **VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATION.**—The term “veterans service organization” means any organization recognized by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for the representation of veterans under section 5902 of title 38, United States Code.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF A PILOT PROGRAM.—**(1) GRANT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish a pilot program to award grants to qualified organizations to rehabilitate and modify the primary residence of eligible veterans.

(B) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall work in conjunction with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish and oversee the pilot program and to ensure that such program meets the needs of eligible veterans.

(C) **MAXIMUM GRANT.**—A grant award under the pilot program to any one qualified organization shall not exceed \$1,000,000 in any one fiscal year, and such an award shall remain available until expended by such organization.

(2) APPLICATION.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each qualified organization that desires a grant under the pilot program shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and, in addition to the information required under subparagraph (B), accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(B) **CONTENTS.**—Each application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a plan of action detailing outreach initiatives;

(ii) the approximate number of veterans the qualified organization intends to serve using grant funds;

(iii) a description of the type of work that will be conducted, such as interior home modifications, energy efficiency improvements, and other similar categories of work; and

(iv) a plan for working with the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans service organizations to identify veterans who

are not eligible for programs under chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, and meet their needs.

(3) **USE OF FUNDS.**—A grant award under the pilot program shall be used—

(A) to modify and rehabilitate the primary residence of an eligible veteran, and may include—

(i) installing wheelchair ramps, widening exterior and interior doors, reconfiguring and re-equipping bathrooms (which includes installing new fixtures and grab bars), removing doorway thresholds, installing special lighting, adding additional electrical outlets and electrical service, and installing appropriate floor coverings to—

(I) accommodate the functional limitations that result from having a disability; or

(II) if such residence does not have modifications necessary to reduce the chances that an elderly, but not disabled person, will fall in their home, reduce the risks of such an elderly person from falling;

(ii) rehabilitating such residence that is in a state of interior or exterior disrepair; and

(iii) installing energy efficient features or equipment if—

(I) an eligible veteran's monthly utility costs for such residence is more than 5 percent of such veteran's monthly income; and

(II) an energy audit of such residence indicates that the installation of energy efficient features or equipment will reduce such costs by 10 percent or more; and

(B) in connection with modification and rehabilitation services provided under the pilot program, to provide technical, administrative, and training support to an affiliate of a qualified organization receiving a grant under such pilot program.

(4) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds may be expended under the pilot program only for the benefit of an eligible veteran who the Secretary determines is residing in and reasonably intends to continue residing in a primary residence owned by such veteran or by a member of such veteran's family. The Secretary shall make this determination on the basis of a certification by the veteran or a member of the veteran's family that the veteran intends to continue residing in the primary residence for a sufficient period of time to be determined by the Secretary.

(5) **OVERSIGHT.**—The Secretary shall direct the oversight of the grant funds for the pilot program so that such funds are used efficiently until expended to fulfill the purpose of addressing the adaptive housing needs of eligible veterans.

(6) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A qualified organization receiving a grant under the pilot program shall contribute towards the housing modification and rehabilitation services provided to eligible veterans an amount equal to not less than 50 percent of the grant award received by such organization.

(B) **IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.**—In order to meet the requirement under subparagraph (A), such organization may arrange for in-kind contributions.

(7) **LIMITATION COST TO THE VETERANS.**—A qualified organization receiving a grant under the pilot program shall modify or rehabilitate the primary residence of an eligible veteran at no cost to such veteran (including application fees) or at a cost such that such veteran pays no more than 30 percent of his or her income in housing costs during any month.

(8) **REPORTS.**—

(A) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, on an annual basis, a re-

port that provides, with respect to the year for which such report is written—

(i) the number of eligible veterans provided assistance under the pilot program;

(ii) the socioeconomic characteristics of such veterans, including their gender, age, race, and ethnicity;

(iii) the total number, types, and locations of entities contracted under such program to administer the grant funding;

(iv) the amount of matching funds and in-kind contributions raised with each grant;

(v) a description of the housing rehabilitation and modification services provided, costs saved, and actions taken under such program;

(vi) a description of the outreach initiatives implemented by the Secretary to educate the general public and eligible entities about such program;

(vii) a description of the outreach initiatives instituted by grant recipients to engage eligible veterans and veteran service organizations in projects utilizing grant funds under such program;

(viii) a description of the outreach initiatives instituted by grant recipients to identify eligible veterans and their families; and

(ix) any other information that the Secretary considers relevant in assessing such program.

(B) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the completion of the pilot program, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that provides such information that the Secretary considers relevant in assessing the pilot program.

(C) **INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.**—Not later than March 31, 2019, the Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report containing a review of—

(i) the use of appropriated funds by the Secretary and by grantees under the pilot program; and

(ii) oversight and accountability of grantees under the pilot program.

(9) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Housing and Urban Development for carrying out this section \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

Sec. 1101. One-year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on premium pay and aggregate limitation on pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas.

Sec. 1102. One-year extension of discretionary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to personnel on official duty in a combat zone.

Sec. 1103. Revision to list of science and technology reinvention laboratories.

Sec. 1104. Extension and modification of experimental program for scientific and technical personnel.

Sec. 1105. Temporary authorities for certain positions at Department of Defense research and engineering facilities.

Sec. 1106. Rate of overtime pay for Department of the Navy employees performing work aboard or dockside in support of the nuclear aircraft carrier forward deployed in Japan.

Sec. 1107. Extension of part-time reemployment authority.

Sec. 1108. Personnel authorities for civilian personnel for the United States Cyber Command and the cyber component headquarters of the military departments.

SEC. 1101. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE ANNUAL LIMITATION ON PREMIUM PAY AND AGGREGATE LIMITATION ON PAY FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WORKING OVERSEAS.

Effective January 1, 2015, section 1101(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4615), as most recently amended by section 1101 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), is further amended by striking “through 2014” and inserting “through 2015”.

SEC. 1102. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO GRANT ALLOWANCES, BENEFITS, AND GRATUITIES TO PERSONNEL ON OFFICIAL DUTY IN A COMBAT ZONE.

Paragraph (2) of section 1603(a) of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109-234; 120 Stat. 443), as added by section 1102 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4616) and most recently amended by section 1102 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), is further amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 1103. REVISION TO LIST OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY REINVENTION LABORATORIES.

Section 1105(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2487; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(18) The Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

“(19) The Space and Missile Defense Command Technical Center.”.

SEC. 1104. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL.

(a) **POSITIONS COVERED BY AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (b)(1) of section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (5 U.S.C. 3104 note) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “60 scientific and engineering positions” and inserting “100 scientific and engineering positions”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” at the end;

(C) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D); and

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (C).

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by striking “the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency” and inserting “the Department of Defense”.

(b) **ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS.**—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “12-month period” and inserting “calendar year”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “fiscal year” and inserting “calendar year”.

(c) EXTENSION.—Subsection (e)(1) of such section is amended by striking “September 30, 2016” and inserting “September 30, 2019”.

SEC. 1105. TEMPORARY AUTHORITIES FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING FACILITIES.

Section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) STUDENTS ENROLLED IN SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING PROGRAMS.—The director of any STRL may appoint qualified candidates enrolled in a program of undergraduate or graduate instruction leading to a bachelor's or an advanced degree in a scientific, technical, engineering or mathematical course of study at an institution of higher education (as that term is defined in section 101 and 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) to positions described in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) as an employee in a laboratory described in that paragraph without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code (other than sections 3303 and 3328 of such title).”;

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) CANDIDATES ENROLLED IN SCIENTIFIC AND ENGINEERING PROGRAMS.—The positions described in this paragraph are scientific and engineering positions that may be temporary or term in any laboratory designated by section 1105(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2486; 10 U.S.C. 2358 note) as a Department of Defense science and technology reinvention laboratory.”; and

(3) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In the case of a laboratory described in subsection (b)(3), with respect to appointment authority under subsection (a)(3), the number equal to 3 percent of the total number of scientific and engineering positions in such laboratory that are filled as of the close of the fiscal year last ending before the start of such calendar year.”.

SEC. 1106. RATE OF OVERTIME PAY FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY EMPLOYEES PERFORMING WORK ABOARD OR DOCKSIDE IN SUPPORT OF THE NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER FORWARD DEPLOYED IN JAPAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 5542(a)(6) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”.

(b) LIMITATION ON OVERTIME PAY.—Notwithstanding the authority provided by such section (as amended by subsection (a)), during fiscal year 2015 the Secretary of the Navy may not pay more than \$250,000 in overtime pay under such section until the Director of the Office of Personnel Management submits a report containing the information described in section 1105(b)(2) of Public Law 111–383, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011.

SEC. 1107. EXTENSION OF PART-TIME REEMPLOYMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) CSRS.—Section 8344(1)(7) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “5 years after the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010” and inserting “on December 31, 2019”.

(b) FERS.—Section 8468(i)(7) of such title is amended by striking “5 years after the date of enactment of the National Defense Au-

thorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010” and inserting “on December 31, 2019”.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall be effective as of October 28, 2014.

SEC. 1108. PERSONNEL AUTHORITIES FOR CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR THE UNITED STATES CYBER COMMAND AND THE CYBER COMPONENT HEADQUARTERS OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Principal Cyber Advisor to the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) identify improvements to be made to the employment, compensation, and promotion authorities of the Department of Defense to meet the needs of the United States Cyber Command and the cyber component headquarters of the military departments for obtaining and retaining civilian personnel with the skills and experience required to support the missions and responsibilities of those organizations;

(2) identify the additional employment, compensation, and promotion authorities necessary to ensure that the United States Cyber Command and the cyber component headquarters of the military departments have a civilian workforce able to support the missions and responsibilities of those organizations; and

(3) submit to the Secretary recommendations for administrative and legislative actions, including actions in connection with authorities identified pursuant to paragraph (2), to ensure that the United States Cyber Command and the cyber component headquarters of the military departments have a civilian workforce able to support the missions and responsibilities of those organizations.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

Sec. 1201. Modification and extension of Global Security Contingency Fund.

Sec. 1202. Notice to Congress on certain assistance under authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction.

Sec. 1203. Enhanced authority for provision of support to foreign military liaison officers of foreign countries while assigned to the Department of Defense.

Sec. 1204. Prohibition on use of funds for assistance to units of foreign security forces that have committed a gross violation of human rights.

Sec. 1205. Codification and enhancement of authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces.

Sec. 1206. Training of security forces and associated security ministries of foreign countries to promote respect for the rule of law and human rights.

Sec. 1207. Cross servicing agreements for loan of personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment in coalition operations.

Sec. 1208. Extension and modification of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism.

Sec. 1209. Authority to provide assistance to the vetted Syrian opposition.

Sec. 1210. Provision of logistic support for the conveyance of certain defense articles to foreign forces training with the United States Armed Forces.

Sec. 1211. Biennial report on programs carried out by the Department of Defense to provide training, equipment, or other assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq

Sec. 1221. Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan.

Sec. 1222. Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations.

Sec. 1223. One-year extension of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations.

Sec. 1224. United States plan for sustaining the Afghanistan National Security Forces through the end of fiscal year 2017.

Sec. 1225. Semiannual report on enhancing security and stability in Afghanistan.

Sec. 1226. Sense of Congress on stability and sovereignty of Afghanistan.

Sec. 1227. Extension of Afghan Special Immigrant Program.

Sec. 1228. Independent assessment of United States efforts against al-Qaeda.

Sec. 1229. Sense of Congress on security of Afghan women.

Sec. 1230. Review process for use of United States funds for construction projects in Afghanistan that cannot be physically accessed by United States Government personnel.

Sec. 1231. Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan.

Sec. 1232. One-year extension of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan.

Sec. 1233. Clearance of unexploded ordnance on former United States training ranges in Afghanistan.

Sec. 1234. Report on impact of end of major combat operations in Afghanistan on authority to use military force.

Sec. 1235. Report on bilateral security cooperation with Pakistan.

Sec. 1236. Authority to provide assistance to counter the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant.

Sec. 1237. Extension and modification of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq.

Subtitle C—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation

Sec. 1241. Limitation on military cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation.

Sec. 1242. Notification and assessment of proposal to modify or introduce new aircraft or sensors for flight by the Russian Federation under Open Skies Treaty.

Sec. 1243. Limitations on providing certain missile defense information to the Russian Federation.

Sec. 1244. Report on non-compliance by the Russian Federation with its obligations under the INF Treaty.

Sec. 1245. Annual report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation.

Sec. 1246. Prohibition on use of funds to enter into contracts or other agreements with Rosoboronexport.

Sec. 1247. Report on the New START Treaty. Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region

Sec. 1251. Strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region.

Sec. 1252. Modifications to annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China.

Sec. 1253. Military-to-military engagement with the Government of Burma.

Sec. 1254. Report on Department of Defense munitions strategy of the United States Pacific Command.

Sec. 1255. Missile defense cooperation in Northeast Asia.

Sec. 1256. Sense of Congress and report on Taiwan and its contribution to regional peace and stability.

Sec. 1257. Independent assessment of the ability of the Department of Defense to counter anti-access and area-denial strategies, capabilities, and other key technologies of potential adversaries.

Sec. 1258. Sense of Congress reaffirming security cooperation with Japan and the Republic of Korea.

Sec. 1259. Report on maritime security strategy in the Asia-Pacific region.

Sec. 1259A. Sense of Congress on Taiwan maritime capabilities and exercise participation.

Sec. 1259B. Modification of matters for discussion in annual reports of United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Sec. 1261. One-year extension of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities.

Sec. 1262. Modification of national security planning guidance to deny safe havens to al-Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates.

Sec. 1263. Enhanced authority to acquire goods and services of Djibouti in support of Department of Defense activities in United States Africa Command area of responsibility.

Sec. 1264. Treatment of the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Sec. 1265. Prohibition on integration of missile defense systems of China into missile defense systems of United States and sense of Congress concerning integration of missile defense systems of Russia into missile defense systems of NATO.

Sec. 1266. Limitation on availability of funds to implement the Arms Trade Treaty.

Sec. 1267. Notification and review of potentially significant arms control noncompliance.

Sec. 1268. Inter-European Air Forces Academy.

Sec. 1269. Department of Defense support to security of United States diplomatic facilities.

Sec. 1270. Information on sanctioned persons and businesses through the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System.

Sec. 1271. Reports on nuclear program of Iran.

Sec. 1272. Sense of Congress on defense modernization by NATO countries.

Sec. 1273. Report on protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict.

Sec. 1274. United States strategy and plans for enhancing security and stability in Europe.

Sec. 1275. Report on military assistance to Ukraine.

Sec. 1276. Sense of Congress on efforts to remove Joseph Kony from the battlefield and end the atrocities of the Lord's Resistance Army.

Sec. 1277. Extension of annual reports on the military power of Iran.

Sec. 1278. Report and strategy regarding North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel.

Sec. 1279. Rule of construction.

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

SEC. 1201. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF GLOBAL SECURITY CONTINGENCY FUND.

(a) REVISIONS TO GLOBAL SECURITY CONTINGENCY FUND.—Subsection (c)(1) of section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1625; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note) is amended by striking “the provision of equipment, supplies, and training.” and inserting the following: “the provision of the following:

“(A) Equipment, including routine maintenance and repair of such equipment.

“(B) Supplies.

“(C) With respect to amounts in the Fund appropriated or transferred into the Fund after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, small-scale construction not exceeding \$750,000 on a per-project basis.

“(D) Training.”

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Subsection (i) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “Amounts” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), amounts”;

(2) by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2017”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Amounts appropriated and transferred to the Fund before the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 shall remain available for obligation and expenditure after September 30, 2015, only for activities under programs commenced under subsection (b) before September 30, 2015.”

(c) EXPIRATION.—Subsection (p) of such section, as amended by section 1202(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 894), is further amended—

(1) by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2017”;

(2) by striking “fiscal years 2012 through 2015” and inserting “fiscal years 2012 through 2017”;

(3) by adding at the end before the period the following: “and subject to the requirements contained in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (i)”.

SEC. 1202. NOTICE TO CONGRESS ON CERTAIN ASSISTANCE UNDER AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT ACTIVITIES TO ENHANCE THE CAPABILITY OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO RESPOND TO INCIDENTS INVOLVING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

Section 1204(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 896; 10 U.S.C. 401 note) is amended by inserting after “congressional defense committees” the following: “and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives”.

SEC. 1203. ENHANCED AUTHORITY FOR PROVISION OF SUPPORT TO FOREIGN MILITARY LIAISON OFFICERS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES WHILE ASSIGNED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (a) of section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—
(A) by striking “The Secretary of Defense” and inserting “Subject to subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense”; and

(B) by striking “involved in a military operation with the United States”;

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “in connection with the planning for, or conduct of, a military operation”; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking “To the headquarters of” and all that follows and inserting “To the Joint Staff.”

(b) TRAVEL, SUBSISTENCE, AND MEDICAL CARE EXPENSES.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “to the headquarters of a combatant command”; and

(B) by inserting “or by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as appropriate” before the period at the end; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “if such travel” and all that follows and inserting “if such travel meets each of the following conditions:

“(A) The travel is in support of the national interests of the United States.

“(B) The commander of the relevant combatant command or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as applicable, directs round-trip travel from the assigned location to one or more travel locations.”

(c) TERMS OF REIMBURSEMENT.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking “To the extent that the Secretary determines appropriate, the” and inserting “The”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The terms of reimbursement shall be specified in the appropriate agreement used to assign the liaison officer to a combatant command or to the Joint Staff.”

(d) LIMITATION AND OVERSIGHT.—Such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) LIMITATION AND OVERSIGHT.—(1) The amount of unreimbursed support for any liaison officer supported under subsection (b)(1) in any fiscal year may not exceed \$200,000 (in fiscal year 2014 constant dollars).

“(2) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall be responsible for implementing the authority under this section.”

(e) SECRETARY OF STATE COORDINATION.—Such section, as so amended, is further amended by inserting after subsection (d), as added by subsection (d)(2) of this section, the following new subsection (e):

“(e) SECRETARY OF STATE COORDINATION.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to

provide administrative services and support under subsection (a) for the performance of duties by a liaison officer of another nation may be exercised only with respect to a liaison officer of another nation whose assignment as described in that subsection is accepted by the Secretary of Defense with the coordination of the Secretary of State.”.

(f) DEFINITION.—Subsection (f) of such section (as so redesignated) is amended by inserting “training programs conducted to familiarize, orient, or certify liaison personnel regarding unique aspects of the assignments of the liaison personnel,” after “police protection.”.

SEC. 1204. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE TO UNITS OF FOREIGN SECURITY FORCES THAT HAVE COMMITTED A GROSS VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2249e. Prohibition on use of funds for assistance to units of foreign security forces that have committed a gross violation of human rights

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Of the amounts made available to the Department of Defense, none may be used for any training, equipment, or other assistance for a unit of a foreign security force if the Secretary of Defense has credible information that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights.

“(2) The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, ensure that prior to a decision to provide any training, equipment, or other assistance to a unit of a foreign security force full consideration is given to any credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by such unit.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that the government of such country has taken all necessary corrective steps, or if the equipment or other assistance is necessary to assist in disaster relief operations or other humanitarian or national security emergencies.

“(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary determines that the waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

“(d) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish, and periodically update, procedures to ensure that any information in the possession of the Department of Defense about gross violations of human rights by units of foreign security forces is shared on a timely basis with the Department of State.

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than 15 days after the application of any exception under subsection (b) or the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report—

“(1) in the case of an exception under subsection (b), providing notice of the use of the exception and stating the grounds for the exception; and

“(2) in the case of a waiver under subsection (c), describing—

“(A) the information relating to the gross violation of human rights;

“(B) the extraordinary circumstances that necessitate the waiver;

“(C) the purpose and duration of the training, equipment, or other assistance; and

“(D) the United States forces and the foreign security force unit involved.

“(f) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 134 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2249e. Prohibition on use of funds for assistance to units of foreign security forces that have committed a gross violation of human rights.”.

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31, 2015, and every March 31 thereafter through 2024, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth for the preceding fiscal year the following:

(A) The total number of cases submitted for vetting for purposes of section 2249e of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), and the total number of such cases approved, or suspended or rejected for human rights reasons, non-human rights reasons, or administrative reasons.

(B) In the case of units rejected for non-human rights reasons, a detailed description of the reasons relating to the rejection.

(C) A description of the interagency processes that were used to evaluate compliance with requirements to conduct vetting.

(D) An addendum that includes any comments by the commanders of the combatant commands about the impact of section 2249e of title 10, United States Code (as so added), on their theater security cooperation plan.

(E) Such other matters with respect to the administration of section 2249e of title 10, United States Code (as so added), as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) FORM.—Each report under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” has the meaning given that term in subsection (f) of section 2249e of title 10, United States Code (as so added).

SEC. 1205. CODIFICATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY TO BUILD THE CAPACITY OF FOREIGN SECURITY FORCES.

(a) CODIFICATION, EXTENSION, AND ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 136 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2282. Authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is authorized to conduct or support a program or programs as follows:

“(1) To build the capacity of a foreign country’s national military forces in order for that country to—

“(A) conduct counterterrorism operations; or

“(B) participate in or support on-going allied or coalition military or stability operations that benefit the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) To build the capacity of a foreign country’s national maritime or border security forces to conduct counterterrorism operations.

“(3) To build the capacity of a foreign country’s national-level security forces that have among their functional responsibilities a counterterrorism mission in order for such forces to conduct counterterrorism operations.

“(b) TYPES OF CAPACITY BUILDING.—

“(1) AUTHORIZED ELEMENTS.—A program under subsection (a) may include the provision of equipment, supplies, training, defense services, and small-scale military construction.

“(2) REQUIRED ELEMENTS.—A program under subsection (a) shall include elements that promote the following:

“(A) Observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

“(B) Respect for civilian control of the military.

“(c) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) ANNUAL FUNDING LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Defense may use amounts specifically authorized and appropriated or otherwise made available to carry out programs under this section on an annual basis to carry out programs authorized by subsection (a).

“(2) ASSISTANCE OTHERWISE PROHIBITED BY LAW.—The Secretary of Defense may not use the authority in subsection (a) to provide any type of assistance described in subsection (b) that is otherwise prohibited by any provision of law.

“(3) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of Defense may not use the authority in subsection (a) to provide assistance described in subsection (b) to any foreign country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

“(4) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ACTIVITIES ACROSS FISCAL YEARS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts made available in a fiscal year to carry out the authority in subsection (a) may be used for programs under that authority that begin in the fiscal year such amounts are made available but end in the next fiscal year.

“(B) ACHIEVEMENT OF FULL OPERATIONAL CAPABILITY.—If, in accordance with subparagraph (A), equipment is delivered under a program under the authority in subsection (a) in the fiscal year after the fiscal year in which the program begins, amounts for supplies, training, defense services, and small-scale military construction associated with such equipment and necessary to ensure that the recipient unit achieves full operational capability for such equipment may be used in the fiscal year in which the foreign country takes receipt of such equipment and in the next fiscal year.

“(5) LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR SMALL-SCALE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.—

“(A) ACTIVITIES UNDER PARTICULAR PROGRAMS.—The amount that may be obligated or expended for small-scale military construction activities under any particular program authorized under subsection (a) may not exceed \$750,000.

“(B) ACTIVITIES UNDER ALL PROGRAMS.—The amount that may be obligated or expended for small-scale military construction activities during a fiscal year for all programs authorized under subsection (a) during that fiscal year may not exceed up to five percent of the amount made available in such fiscal year to carry out the authority in subsection (a).

“(d) FORMULATION AND EXECUTION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense and the

Secretary of State shall jointly formulate any program under subsection (a). The Secretary of Defense shall coordinate with the Secretary of State in the implementation of any program under subsection (a).

“(e) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than 15 days before initiating activities under a program under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a notice of the following:

“(A) The country whose capacity to engage in activities in subsection (a) will be built under the program.

“(B) The budget, implementation timeline with milestones, anticipated delivery schedule for assistance, military department responsible for management and associated program executive office, and completion date for the program.

“(C) The source and planned expenditure of funds to complete the program.

“(D) A description of the arrangements, if any, for the sustainment of the program and the source of funds to support sustainment of the capabilities and performance outcomes achieved under the program beyond its completion date, if applicable.

“(E) A description of the program objectives and assessment framework to be used to develop capability and performance metrics associated with operational outcomes for the recipient unit.

“(F) Information, including the amount, type, and purpose, on the assistance provided the country during the three preceding fiscal years under each of the following programs, accounts, or activities:

“(i) A program under this section.

“(ii) The Foreign Military Financing program under the Arms Export Control Act.

“(iii) Peacekeeping Operations.

“(iv) The International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) program under section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291).

“(v) Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR).

“(vi) Counterdrug activities authorized by section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 374 note) and section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998.

“(vii) Any other significant program, account, or activity for the provision of security assistance that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State consider appropriate.

“(G) An assessment of the capacity of the recipient country to absorb assistance under the program.

“(H) An assessment of the manner in which the program fits into the theater security cooperation strategy of the applicable geographic combatant command.

“(2) COORDINATION WITH SECRETARY OF STATE.—Any notice under paragraph (1) shall be prepared in coordination with the Secretary of State.

“(f) ASSESSMENTS OF PROGRAMS.—Amounts available to conduct or support programs under subsection (a) shall be available to the Secretary of Defense to conduct assessments and determine the effectiveness of such programs in building the operational capacity and performance of the recipient units concerned.

“(g) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 136 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“2282. Authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 943(g)(1) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4578), as most recently amended by section 1205(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1624), is further amended by striking “sections 1206 and 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 119 Stat. 3456 and 3458)” and inserting “section 2282 of title 10, United States Code, and section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 119 Stat. 3458)”.

(2) Section 1209(b)(1)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 368), as most recently amended by section 1203(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2512), is further amended by striking “section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 119 Stat. 3456)” and inserting “section 2282 of title 10, United States Code”.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY.—Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) is repealed.

(d) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance as specified in the funding table in section 4301, up to \$350,000,000 may be used for programs under subsection (a) of section 2282 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section).

(2) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT FOR BUILDING CAPACITY TO PARTICIPATE IN ALLIED OR COALITION MILITARY OR STABILITY OPERATIONS.—Of the amount available under paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2015, not more than \$150,000,000 may be used in such fiscal year for purposes described in subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 2282 of title 10, United States Code (as so added).

(e) ANNUAL SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report summarizing the findings of the assessments of programs carried out under subsection (f) of section 2282 of title 10, United States Code (as so added), during such fiscal year.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, for each program assessed under such subsection (f) during the fiscal year covered by such report, the following:

(A) A description of the nature and the extent of the potential or actual terrorist threat, if any, that the program is intended to address.

(B) A description of the program, including the objectives of the program, the types of recipient country units receiving assistance under the program, and the baseline operational capability and performance of the

units receiving assistance under the program before the commencement of receipt of assistance under the program.

(C) A description of the extent to which the program is implemented by United States Government personnel or contractors.

(D) A description of the assessment framework to be used to develop capability and performance metrics associated with operational outcomes for units receiving assistance under the program.

(E) An assessment of the program using the assessment framework described in subparagraph (D).

(F) An assessment of the effectiveness of the program in achieving its intended purpose.

(f) BIENNIAL COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AUDITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31 of each of 2016, 2018 and 2020, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an audit of such program or programs conducted or supported pursuant to section 2282 of title 10, United States Code (as so added), during the preceding two fiscal years as the Comptroller General shall select for purposes of such report.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report should, to the extent information is available, include, for the program or programs covered by such report, the following:

(A) A description of the program or programs, including—

(i) the objectives of the program or programs;

(ii) the types of units receiving assistance under the program or programs;

(iii) the delivery and completion schedules for assistance under the program or programs; and

(iv) the baseline operational capability and performance of the units receiving assistance under the program or programs before the commencement of receipt of assistance under the program or programs.

(B) An assessment of the capacity of each recipient country to absorb assistance under the program or programs.

(C) An assessment of the arrangements, if any, for the sustainment of the program or programs, including any source of funds to support sustainment of the capabilities and performance outcomes achieved under the program or program beyond completion date, if applicable.

(D) An assessment of the effectiveness of the program or programs in achieving their intended purpose.

(E) Such other matters as the Comptroller considers appropriate.

(g) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In subsections (e) and (f), the term “appropriate committees of Congress” has the meaning given that term in subsection (g) of section 2282 of title 10, United States Code (as so added).

SEC. 1206. TRAINING OF SECURITY FORCES AND ASSOCIATED SECURITY MINISTRIES OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO PROMOTE RESPECT FOR THE RULE OF LAW AND HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to conduct human rights training of security forces and associated security ministries of foreign countries.

(b) CONSTRUCTION WITH LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Human rights training authorized by this section may be conducted for security forces otherwise prohibited from receiving such training under any provision of law only if—

(1) such training is conducted in the country of origin of the security forces;

(2) such training is withheld from any individual of a unit when there is credible information that such individual has committed a gross violation of human rights or has commanded a unit that has committed a gross violation of human rights;

(3) such training may be considered a corrective step, but is not sufficient for meeting the accountability requirement under the exception established in subsection (b) of section 2249e of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 1204(a) of this Act); and

(4) reasonable efforts have been made to assist the foreign country to take all necessary corrective steps regarding a gross violation of human rights with respect to the unit, including using funds authorized by this Act to provide technical assistance or other types of support for accountability.

(c) **ROLE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.**—

(1) **CONCURRENCE.**—Training activities may be conducted under this section only with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Secretary of State on the content of the training, the methods of instruction to be provided, and the intended beneficiaries of training conducted under this section.

(d) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—Human rights training authorized by this section may include associated activities and expenses necessary for the conduct of training and assessments designed to further the purposes of this section, including technical assistance or other types of support for accountability.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than March 31 each year through 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the use of the authority in this section during the preceding fiscal year. Each report shall include information on any human rights training (as defined in subsection (f)) or other assistance that was provided during the fiscal year to foreign security forces.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section

(1) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “human rights training” means training for the purpose of directly improving the conduct of foreign security forces to—

(A) prevent gross violations of human rights and support accountability for such violations;

(B) strengthen compliance with the laws of armed conflict and respect for civilian control over the military;

(C) promote and assist in the establishment of a military justice system and other mechanisms for accountability; and

(D) prevent the use of child soldiers.

(g) **SUNSET.**—The authority in subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2020.

SEC. 1207. CROSS SERVICING AGREEMENTS FOR LOAN OF PERSONNEL PROTECTION AND PERSONNEL SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT IN COALITION OPERATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, enter into an arrangement, under an agreement concluded pursuant to section 2342 of title 10, United States Code, under which the United States agrees to loan personnel protection and personnel surviv-

ability equipment for the use of such equipment by military forces of a nation participating in the following:

(1) A coalition operation with the United States as part of a contingency operation.

(2) A coalition operation with the United States as part of a peacekeeping operation under the Charter of the United Nations or another international agreement.

(3) Training of such forces in connection with the deployment of such forces to be deployed to an operation described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(b) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **LOAN ONLY OF EQUIPMENT FOR WHICH US FORCES HAVE NO UNFULFILLED REQUIREMENTS.**—Equipment may be loaned to the military forces of a nation under the authority of this section only upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that the United States forces in the coalition operation concerned have no unfulfilled requirements for such equipment.

(2) **SCOPE OF USE OF LOANED EQUIPMENT.**—Equipment loaned to the military forces of a nation under the authority of this section may be used by those forces only for personnel protection or to aid in the personnel survivability of those forces and only in—

(A) a coalition operation with the United States described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a); or

(B) training described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a).

(3) **DURATION OF USE OF LOANED EQUIPMENT.**—Equipment loaned to the military forces of a nation under the authority of this section may be used by the military forces of that nation not longer than the duration of that country’s participation in the coalition operation concerned.

(4) **NOTICE AND WAIT ON LOAN OF EQUIPMENT FOR TRAINING.**—Equipment may not be loaned under subsection (a) in connection with training described in paragraph (3) of that subsection until 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress written notice on the loan of such equipment for such purpose.

(c) **WAIVER OF REIMBURSEMENT IN CASE OF LOSS OF EQUIPMENT IN COMBAT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of equipment loaned under the authority of this section that is damaged or destroyed as a result of combat operations during coalition operations while held by forces to which loaned under this section, the Secretary of Defense may, with respect to such equipment, waive any other requirement under applicable law for—

(A) reimbursement;

(B) replacement-in-kind; or

(C) exchange of supplies or services of an equal value.

(2) **BASIS FOR WAIVER.**—Any waiver under this subsection may be made only if the Secretary determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(3) **WAIVER ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.**—Any waiver under this subsection may be made only on a case-by-case basis.

(d) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—If the authority provided under this section is exercised during a fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the exercise of such authority by not later than October 30 of the year in which such fiscal year ends. Each report on the exercise of such authority shall specify the recipient country of the equipment loaned, the type of equipment loaned,

and the duration of the loan of such equipment.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term “personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment” means items enumerated in categories I, II, III, VII, and X of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)) that the Secretary of Defense designates as available for loan under this section.

(f) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority in subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2019.

SEC. 1208. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR SUPPORT OF SPECIAL OPERATIONS TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

(a) **AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR SUPPORT.**—Subsection (a) of section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 2086), as most recently amended by section 1203(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1621), is further amended by striking “\$50,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”.

(b) **EXTENSION.**—Subsection (h) of such section 1208, as most recently amended by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2012, is further amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 1209. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO THE VETTED SYRIAN OPPOSITION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, supplies, stipends, construction of training and associated facilities, and sustainment, to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriately vetted Syrian groups and individuals, through December 31, 2016, for the following purposes:

(1) Defending the Syrian people from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and securing territory controlled by the Syrian opposition.

(2) Protecting the United States, its friends and allies, and the Syrian people from the threats posed by terrorists in Syria.

(3) Promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria.

(b) **NOTICE BEFORE PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.**—Not later than 15 days prior to the provision of assistance authorized under subsection (a) to appropriately vetted recipients for the first time—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate, that contains a description of—

(A) the plan for providing such assistance;

(B) the requirements and process used to determine appropriately vetted recipients; and

(C) the mechanisms and procedures that will be used to monitor and report to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives

and Senate on unauthorized end-use of provided training and equipment and other violations of relevant law by appropriately vetted recipients; and

(2) the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate, that contains a description of how such assistance fits within a larger regional strategy.

(c) **PLAN ELEMENTS.**—The plan required in subsection (b)(1) shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(1) the goals and objectives of assistance authorized under subsection (a);

(2) the concept of operations, timelines, and types of training, equipment, stipends, sustainment, construction, and supplies to be provided;

(3) the roles and contributions of partner nations;

(4) the number and role of United States Armed Forces personnel involved;

(5) any additional military support and sustainment activities; and

(6) any other relevant details.

(d) **QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the Secretary of Defense submits the report required in subsection (b)(1), and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate a progress report. Such progress report shall, based on the most recent quarterly information, include—

(1) any updates to or changes in the plan, strategy, vetting requirements and process, and end-use monitoring mechanisms and procedures, as required in subsection (b)(1);

(2) a description of how the threat of attacks against United States or coalition personnel is being mitigated, statistics on any such attacks, including green-on-blue attacks, and how such attacks are being mitigated;

(3) a description of the appropriately vetted recipients receiving assistance authorized under subsection (a);

(4) the recruitment, throughput, and retention rates of appropriately vetted recipients and equipment;

(5) any misuse or loss of provided training and equipment and how such misuse or loss is being mitigated;

(6) a description of the command and control of appropriately vetted recipients;

(7) an assessment of the operational effectiveness of the appropriately vetted recipients in meeting the purposes specified in subsection (a);

(8) a description of sustainment support provided to appropriately vetted recipients pursuant to subsection (a);

(9) a list of construction projects carried out under authority in subsection (a);

(10) a statement of the amount of funds expended during the period for which the report is submitted, and in aggregate since September 19, 2014, to provide assistance by authorized category pursuant to subsection (a) and section 149 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113-164); and

(11) an assessment of the effectiveness of the assistance authorized under subsection (a) as measured against subsections (b) and (c).

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) The term “appropriately vetted” means, with respect to elements of the Syrian

opposition and other Syrian groups and individuals, at a minimum—

(A) assessments of such elements, groups, and individuals for associations with terrorist groups, Shia militias aligned with or supporting the Government of Syria, and groups associated with the Government of Iran. Such groups include, but are not limited to, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), Jabhat al Nusrah, Ahrar al Sham, other al-Qaeda related groups, and Hezbollah; and

(B) a commitment from such elements, groups, and individuals to promoting the respect for human rights and the rule of law.

(2) The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(f) **REPROGRAMMING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense may submit a reprogramming or transfer request of funds made available for Overseas Contingency Operations beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on December 31, 2016, to the congressional defense committees to carry out activities authorized under this section.

(g) **AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments to provide assistance as authorized by this section. Any funds so accepted by the Secretary shall be credited to appropriations for the appropriate operation and maintenance accounts, except that any funds so accepted by the Secretary shall not be available for obligation until a reprogramming request is submitted to the congressional defense committees.

(h) **CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(i) **WAR POWERS RESOLUTION MATTERS.**—Nothing in this section supersedes or alters the continuing obligations of the President to report to Congress pursuant to section 4 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543) regarding the use of United States Armed Forces abroad.

(j) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the provision of assistance pursuant to subsection (a), the President may waive any provision of law if the President determines that such provision of law would (but for the waiver) impede national security objectives of the United States by prohibiting, restricting, delaying, or otherwise limiting the provision of such assistance. Such waiver shall not take effect until 30 days after the date on which the President notifies the appropriate congressional committees of such determination and the provision of law to be waived.

(k) **ASSISTANCE TO THIRD COUNTRIES IN PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary may provide assistance to third countries for purposes of the provision of assistance authorized under this section.

SEC. 1210. PROVISION OF LOGISTIC SUPPORT FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES TO FOREIGN FORCES TRAINING WITH THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—During fiscal years 2015 and 2016, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide logistic support for the conveyance of certain defense articles in Afghanistan to the armed forces of a country with which the Armed Forces of the United States plan to conduct bilateral or multilateral training overseas during fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

(b) **LIMITATIONS.**—The Secretary may provide logistic support under subsection (a) only—

(1) in accordance with the Arms Export Control Act and other relevant export control laws of the United States;

(2) in accordance with section 516(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j); and

(3) with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—The total value of logistic support provided under subsection (a) for a fiscal year may not exceed \$10,000,000.

(d) **SOURCE OF FUNDS.**—To provide logistic support under subsection (a), the Secretary may use funds available for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after the last day of a fiscal year during which the Secretary of Defense exercises the authority under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the exercise of authority under this section during that fiscal year. Such report shall include a description of the types of defense articles provided, the amount of funds expended, and the countries that received defense articles.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “logistic support” means—

(A) the use of military transportation and cargo-handling assets, including aircraft;

(B) materiel support in the form of fuel, petroleum, oil, or lubricants; and

(C) commercially contracted transportation.

(2) The term “certain defense article” means an item that has been declared an excess defense article and has been transferred from the stocks of the Department of Defense in Afghanistan but has not yet been made available for disposal through the Defense Logistics Agency process.

SEC. 1211. BIENNIAL REPORT ON PROGRAMS CARRIED OUT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO PROVIDE TRAINING, EQUIPMENT, OR OTHER ASSISTANCE OR REIMBURSEMENT TO FOREIGN SECURITY FORCES.

(a) **BIENNIAL REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than February 1 of each of 2016, 2018, and 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that sets forth, on a country-by-country basis, a description of each program carried out by the Department of Defense to provide training, equipment, or other security assistance or reimbursement during the two fiscal years ending in the year before the year in which such report is submitted under the authorities specified in subsection (c).

(b) **ELEMENTS OF REPORT.**—Each report required under subsection (a) shall provide for each program covered by such report, and for the reporting period covered by such report, the following:

(1) A description of the purpose and type of the training, equipment, or assistance or reimbursement provided, including how the training, equipment, or assistance or reimbursement provided advances the theater security cooperation strategy of the combatant command, as appropriate.

(2) The cost of such training, equipment, or assistance or reimbursement, including by type of support provided.

(3) A description of the metrics, if any, used for assessing the effectiveness of such training, equipment, or assistance or reimbursement provided.

(c) SPECIFIED AUTHORITIES.—The authorities specified in this subsection are the following authorities (or any successor authorities):

(1) Section 127d of title 10, United States Code, relating to authority to provide logistic support, supplies, and services to allied forces participating in a combined operation with the Armed Forces.

(2) Section 166a(b)(6) of title 10, United States Code, relating to humanitarian and civic assistance by the commanders of the combatant commands.

(3) Section 168 of title 10, United States Code, relating to authority—

(A) to provide assistance to nations of the former Soviet Union as part of the Warsaw Initiative Fund;

(B) to conduct the Defense Institution Reform Initiative; and

(C) to conduct a program to increase defense institutional legal capacity through the Defense Institute of International Legal Studies.

(4) Section 2010 of title 10, United States Code, relating to authority to reimburse foreign troops for participation in combined exercises.

(5) Section 2011 of title 10, United States Code, relating to authority to reimburse foreign troops for participation in Joint Combined Exercise Training.

(6) Section 2249c of title 10, United States Code, relating to authority to use appropriated funds for costs associated with education and training of foreign officials under the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program.

(7) Section 2282 of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 1205 of this Act), relating to authority to build the capacity of foreign military forces, or the predecessor authority to such section in section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 119 Stat. 3456).

(8) Section 2561 of title 10, United States Code, relating to authority to provide humanitarian assistance.

(9) Section 1532, relating to the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.

(10) Section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (32 U.S.C. 107 note), relating to authority for National Guard State Partnership program.

(11) Section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 168 note), relating to the Ministry of Defense Advisors program.

(12) Section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note), relating to the Global Security Contingency Fund.

(13) Section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 393), relating to authority to reimburse certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations.

(14) Section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (122

Stat. 394), relating to authorization for logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations.

(15) Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; 111 Stat. 1881), relating to authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of Peru and Colombia.

(16) Section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 374 note), relating to additional support for counter-drug activities.

(17) Any other authority on assistance or reimbursement that the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate and consistent with subsection (a).

(d) NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORT.—If any information required under subsection (a) has been included in another report or notification previously submitted to Congress by law, the Secretary of Defense may provide a list of such reports and notifications at the time of submitting the report required by subsection (a) in lieu of including such information in the report required by subsection (a).

(e) FORM.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(f) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED REQUIREMENT.—Section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (122 Stat. 368) is repealed.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq

SEC. 1221. COMMANDERS' EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) ONE-YEAR EXTENSION.—Section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1619), as most recently amended by section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 904), is further amended by striking “fiscal year 2014” each place it appears and inserting “fiscal year 2015”.

(b) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORTS.—Subsection (b) of such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “QUARTERLY” and inserting “SEMI-ANNUAL”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “QUARTERLY” and inserting “SEMI-ANNUAL”; and

(B) by striking “fiscal year quarter” and inserting “half fiscal year”; and

(C) by striking “that quarter” and inserting “that half fiscal year”.

(c) FUNDS AVAILABLE DURING FISCAL YEAR 2015.—Subsection (a) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by striking “\$60,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”.

(d) RESTRICTION ON AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking “\$20,000,000” and inserting “\$2,000,000”.

(e) NOTIFICATION ON CERTAIN PROJECTS.—Subsection (g) of such section is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “to advance the military campaign plan for Afghanistan” and inserting “to directly benefit the security or stability of the people of Afghanistan”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “any agreement with either the Government of Afghanistan,” and inserting “any written agreement with either the Government of

Afghanistan, an entity owned or controlled by the Government of Afghanistan.”.

(f) SUBMITTAL OF REVISED GUIDANCE.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a copy of the guidance issued by the Secretary to the Armed Forces concerning the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan as revised to take into account the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 1222. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN COALITION NATIONS FOR SUPPORT PROVIDED TO UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (a) of section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1213 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 905), is further amended—

(1) by striking “fiscal year 2014” and inserting “fiscal year 2015”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “Operation Enduring Freedom” and inserting “Iraq or in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan”.

(b) OTHER SUPPORT.—Subsection (b) of such section, as so amended, is further amended by inserting “Iraq or in” before “Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan”.

(c) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS AVAILABLE.—Subsection (d)(1) of such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking “during fiscal year 2014 may not exceed \$1,500,000,000” and inserting “during fiscal year 2015 may not exceed \$1,200,000,000”; and

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “during fiscal year 2013 may not exceed \$1,200,000,000” and inserting “during fiscal year 2015 may not exceed \$1,000,000,000”.

(d) EXTENSION OF NOTICE REQUIREMENT RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN FOR SUPPORT PROVIDED BY PAKISTAN.—Section 1232(b)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (122 Stat. 393), as most recently amended by section 1213(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (127 Stat. 906), is further amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

(e) EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN PENDING CERTIFICATION ON PAKISTAN.—Section 1227(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2001), as amended by section 1213(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (127 Stat. 906), is further amended by striking “fiscal year 2014” and inserting “fiscal year 2015”.

(f) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON REIMBURSEMENT OF PAKISTAN PENDING CERTIFICATION ON PAKISTAN.—Of the total amount of reimbursements and support authorized for Pakistan during fiscal year 2015 pursuant to the third sentence of section 1233(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (as amended by subsection (b)(2)), \$300,000,000 shall not be eligible for the waiver under section 1227(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (126 Stat. 2001) unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(1) Pakistan has undertaken military operations in North Waziristan that have contributed to significantly disrupting the safe haven and freedom of movement of the Haqqani network in Pakistan; and

(2) Pakistan has taken steps that have demonstrated a commitment to ensuring that North Waziristan does not return to being a safe haven for the Haqqani network.

SEC. 1223. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF LOGISTICAL SUPPORT FOR COALITION FORCES SUPPORTING CERTAIN UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 394), as most recently amended by section 1217(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 909), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “fiscal year 2014” and inserting “fiscal year 2015”;

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “during the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on December 31, 2014” and inserting “during the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on December 31, 2015”; and

(3) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR USE OF FUNDS IN CONNECTION WITH IRAQ.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of such section 1234, as so amended, is further amended by inserting “and Iraq” after “in Afghanistan”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section 1234 is amended by inserting “AND IRAQ” after “AFGHANISTAN”.

SEC. 1224. UNITED STATES PLAN FOR SUSTAINING THE AFGHANISTAN NATIONAL SECURITY FORCES THROUGH THE END OF FISCAL YEAR 2017.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a detailed plan for sustaining the Afghanistan National Army (ANA) and the Afghanistan National Police (ANP) of the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF) through the end of fiscal year 2017, with the objective of ensuring that the ANSF will be able to independently and effectively conduct operations and maintain security and stability in Afghanistan.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The plan contained in the report required under subsection (a) shall include a description of the following matters:

(1) A comprehensive sustainment strategy, including target end-strengths, budget, and defined objectives.

(2) The commitments for funding contributions from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and non-NATO nations for sustaining the ANSF through the end of fiscal year 2017, any shortfalls in funding for such purposes, and the plan for achieving such commitments as necessary to sustain the ANSF.

(3) A mechanism for tracking funding, equipment, training, and services provided to the ANSF by the United States, countries participating in NATO's Operation Resolute Support, and other members of the international community contributing to the sustainment of the ANSF.

(4) Plans for assisting the Government of Afghanistan to achieve the following goals:

(A) Improve and sustain effective Afghan security institutions with fully capable senior leadership and staff, including logistics, intelligence, medical, and recruiting units.

(B) Train and equip key enabling capabilities, including for the Afghan Special Operations Forces, the Afghan Air Force, and Afghan Special Mission Wing, such that these

entities are fully-capable of conducting operations independently and in sufficient numbers.

(C) Establish effective and sustainable ANSF-readiness assessment tools and metrics.

(D) Improve and sustain strong, professional ANSF officers at the junior-, mid-, and senior-levels.

(E) Enhance strong ANSF communication and control between central command and regions, provinces, and districts.

(F) Develop and improve institutional mechanisms for incorporating lessons learned and best practices into ANSF operations.

(G) Improve ANSF oversight mechanisms, including an effective record-keeping system to track ANSF equipment and personnel and a sustainable process to identify, investigate, and eliminate corruption.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1225. SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON ENHANCING SECURITY AND STABILITY IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress on a semiannual basis a report on building and sustaining the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) and enhancing security and stability in Afghanistan.

(2) SUBMITTAL.—A report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than June 15 each year, for the 6-month period ending on May 31 of such year, and not later than December 15 each year, for the 6-month period ending on November 30 of such year. No report is required to be submitted under paragraph (1) after the report required to be submitted on December 15, 2017.

(3) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) STRATEGY AND OBJECTIVES OF UNITED STATES AND NATO MISSIONS IN AFGHANISTAN AFTER 2014.—A detailed description of—

(A) the strategy and objectives of any post-2014 United States mission and any mission agreed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), to train, advise, and assist the ANSF or to conduct counterterrorism operations; and

(B) indicators of effectiveness as developed by the Secretary or NATO, as appropriate, in the assessment of any such United States train, advise, and assist mission and of any such train, advise, and assist mission agreed by NATO, including efforts to build the counterterrorism capabilities of the ANSF.

(2) THREAT ASSESSMENT.—An assessment of the current security conditions in Afghanistan and the security conditions anticipated in Afghanistan during the 24-month period beginning on the date of the submittal of such report, including with respect to threats from terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and the Haqqani Network.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF SIZE AND STRUCTURE AND STRATEGY AND BUDGET OF ANSF.—A description of—

(A) the size and force structure of the ANSF, including the Afghanistan National Army (ANA), the Afghanistan National Police (ANP), the Afghan Border Police, the Afghan Local Police, and such other major force components of the ANSF as the Secretary considers appropriate;

(B) the rationale for any changes in the overall end strength or the mix of force structure for the ANSF during the period covered by such report;

(C) levels of recruitment, retention, and attrition within the ANSF, in the aggregate and by force component;

(D) personnel end strength within the Afghanistan Ministry of Defense and the Afghanistan Ministry of Security;

(E) the strategy and budget of the ANSF; and

(F) a description of the activities of the ANSF during the period covered by the report.

(4) ASSESSMENT OF SIZE, STRUCTURE, CAPABILITIES, AND STRATEGY OF ANSF.—An assessment whether the size, structure, capabilities, and strategy of the ANSF are sufficient to provide security in light of the current security conditions in Afghanistan and the security conditions anticipated in Afghanistan during the 24-month period beginning on the date of the submittal of such report. Such assessment should describe the risks and trade-offs the ANSF are making and any gaps in the capacity and capabilities of the ANSF.

(5) BUILDING KEY CAPABILITIES AND ENABLING FORCES WITHIN ANSF.—

(A) A description of programs to achieve key mission enabling capabilities within the ANSF, including any major milestones and timelines, and the end states intended to be achieved by such programs, including for the following:

- (i) Security institution capacity building.
- (ii) Special operations forces and their key enablers.
- (iii) Intelligence.
- (iv) Logistics.
- (v) Maintenance.
- (vi) Air forces.

(B) Metrics, as developed by the Commander of United States forces in Afghanistan, for monitoring and evaluating the performance of such programs in achieving the intended outcomes of such programs.

(6) FINANCING THE ANSF.—A description of—

(A) any plan agreed by the United States, the international community, and the Government of Afghanistan to fund and sustain the ANSF that serves as current guidance on such matters during the period covered by such report, including a description of whether such plan differs from—

(i) in the case of the first report submitted under subsection (a), commitments undertaken at the 2012 NATO Summit in Chicago and the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework; or

(ii) in the case of any other report submitted under subsection (a), such plan as set forth in the previous report submitted under subsection (a);

(B) the Afghan Security Forces Fund financing plan through 2017;

(C) contributions by the international community to sustaining the ANSF during the period covered by such report;

(D) contributions by the Government of Afghanistan to sustaining the ANSF during the period covered by such report; and

(E) efforts to ensure that the Government of Afghanistan can assume an increasing financial responsibility for sustaining the ANSF consistent with its commitments at

the Chicago Summit and the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework.

(c) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(d) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY.**—Section 1230 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) is repealed.

SEC. 1226. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON STABILITY AND SOVEREIGNTY OF AFGHANISTAN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a top national security priority for the United States continues to be to support the stability and sovereignty of Afghanistan and to help Afghanistan ensure that its territory is not used by al Qaeda, the Haqqani Network, or other violent extremist groups to launch attacks against the United States or its interests;

(2) the presence of United States military forces in Afghanistan after 2014 to train, advise, and assist the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF) and conduct counterterrorism operations is a key step to maintaining the significant gains achieved in Afghanistan and should be executed consistent with the security conditions on the ground;

(3) any drawdown of such United States military forces and operations should be considered in relation to security conditions on the ground in Afghanistan at the time of the drawdown and the recommendations of senior United States military commanders; and

(4) NATO member countries and other members of the international community should honor their commitments to support Afghanistan at the Lisbon, Chicago, and Tokyo conferences taking into account the mutual accountability framework agreed by the Government of Afghanistan.

SEC. 1227. EXTENSION OF AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT PROGRAM.

Section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(A) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) was or is employed in Afghanistan on or after October 7, 2001, for not less than 1 year—

“(I) by, or on behalf of, the United States Government; or

“(II) by the International Security Assistance Force in a capacity that required the alien—

“(aa) while traveling off-base with United States military personnel stationed at International Security Assistance Force, to serve as an interpreter or translator for such United States military personnel; or

“(bb) to perform sensitive and trusted activities for United States military personnel stationed at International Security Assistance Force;”;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking “the United States Government,” and inserting “an entity or organization described in clause (ii);”;

(C) in clause (iv), by striking “by the United States Government,” and inserting “described in clause (ii).”;

(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (3) the following:

“(F) **FISCAL YEARS 2015 AND 2016.**—In addition to any unused balance under subparagraph (D), for the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and ending on September 30, 2016, the total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section shall not exceed 4,000. For purposes of status provided under this subparagraph—

“(i) the period during which an alien must have been employed in accordance with paragraph (2)(A)(ii) must terminate on or before September 30, 2015;

“(ii) the principal alien seeking special immigrant status under this subparagraph shall apply to the Chief of Mission in accordance with paragraph (2)(D) not later than December 31, 2015; and

“(iii) the authority to issue visas shall commence on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and shall terminate on March 31, 2017.”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) **REPORT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives containing the following information:

“(A) The occupations of aliens who—

“(i) were provided special immigrant status under this section; and

“(ii) were considered principal aliens for such purpose.

“(B) The number of appeals submitted under paragraph (2)(D)(ii)(I)(bb) from application denials by the Chief of Mission and the number of those applications that were approved pursuant to the appeal.

“(C) The number of applications denied by the Chief of Mission on the basis of derogatory information that were appealed and the number of those applications that were approved pursuant to the appeal.

“(D) The number of applications denied by the Chief of Mission on the basis that the applicant did not establish faithful and valuable service to the United States Government that were appealed and the number of those applications that were approved pursuant to the appeal.

“(E) The number of applications denied by the Chief of Mission for failure to establish the one-year period of employment required that were appealed and the number of those applications that were approved pursuant to the appeal.

“(F) The number of applications denied by the Chief of Mission for failure to establish employment by or on behalf of the United States Government that were appealed and the number of those applications that were approved pursuant to the appeal.

“(G) The number of special immigrant status approvals revoked by the Chief of Mission and the reason for each revocation.

“(H) The number of special immigrant status approvals revoked by the Chief of Mission that were appealed and the number of those revocations that were overturned pursuant to the appeal.”.

SEC. 1228. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF UNITED STATES EFFORTS AGAINST AL-QAEDA.

(a) **INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, shall provide for the conduct of an independent assessment of the effectiveness of the United States efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda, in-

cluding its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents since September 11, 2001.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of al-Qaeda core’s current relationship with affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, and how it has changed over time.

(2) An assessment of the current objectives, capabilities, and overall strategy of al-Qaeda core, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, and how they have changed over time.

(3) An assessment of the operational and organizational structure of al-Qaeda core, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, and how it has changed over time.

(4) An analysis of the activities that have proven to be most effective and least effective at disrupting and dismantling al-Qaeda, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(5) Recommendations for United States policy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(6) Other matters that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entity selected for the conduct of the assessment required by subsection (a) shall provide to the Secretary of Defense and the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing its findings as a result of the assessment.

(2) **FORM.**—The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1229. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should continue to work with the Government of Afghanistan and Afghan civil society to promote the rights of women in Afghanistan and their inclusion in the political, economic, and security transition process; and

(2) the United States Government should continue to support and encourage efforts by the Government of Afghanistan to recruit, integrate, train, and retain women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF), including through the use of not less than \$25,000,000 as specified in section 1531(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 938) for programs and activities for such purposes, which may include—

(A) assistance in prioritizing efforts to increase the number of women serving in the ANSF, taking into account the Master Ministerial Development Plan for Afghanistan National Army (ANA) Gender Integration;

(B) further development of training for the ANA and the Afghanistan National Police (ANP) to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces;

(C) assistance in the development of a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address gender-

based violence, such as the Family Response Units of the ANP, and to ensure that such units are appropriately resourced;

(D) assistance in the development of accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel relating to the treatment of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF;

(E) assistance in the implementation of a plan, developed in coordination with the Government of Afghanistan, to promote the equal treatment of female members of the ANA and ANP through such steps as providing appropriate equipment, modifying facilities, and ensuring literacy and gender awareness training for female recruits and male counterparts; and

(F) assistance to the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior in recruiting, training, and funding sufficient female searchers and security officers to staff voting stations during the 2015 parliamentary elections.

SEC. 1230. REVIEW PROCESS FOR USE OF UNITED STATES FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN AFGHANISTAN THAT CANNOT BE PHYSICALLY ACCESSED BY UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for a construction project in Afghanistan in excess of \$1,000,000 that cannot be audited and physically inspected by authorized United States Government personnel or their designated representatives, in accordance with generally-accepted auditing guidelines.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only with respect to a project that is initiated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) WAIVER.—The prohibition in subsection (a) may be waived with respect to a project otherwise covered by that subsection if not later than 15 days prior to the initial obligation of funds for the project the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report that contains the following:

(1) A determination of the Secretary of Defense that—

(A) the project clearly contributes to United States national interests or strategic objectives;

(B) the project has been coordinated with the Government of Afghanistan and any other implementing agencies or international donors; and

(C) adequate arrangements have been made for sustainment of the project following its completion, including arrangements with respect to funding and technical capacity for sustainment.

(2) A plan that contains—

(A) a description of how the Secretary of Defense will monitor the use of the funds for the project—

(i) to ensure the funds are used for the specific purposes for which the funds are intended; and

(ii) to mitigate waste, fraud, and abuse; and

(B) metrics to measure the progress and effectiveness of the project in meeting its objectives.

SEC. 1231. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER DEFENSE ARTICLES AND PROVIDE DEFENSE SERVICES TO THE MILITARY AND SECURITY FORCES OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subsection (h) of section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239;

126 Stat. 1992) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Subsection (f)(1) of such section is amended by striking “March 31, 2015” and inserting “March 31, 2016”.

(c) EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—Subsection (i)(2) of such section is amended by striking “and 2014” each place it appears and inserting “, 2014, and 2015”.

SEC. 1232. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS FOR REINTEGRATION ACTIVITIES IN AFGHANISTAN.

Section 1216 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4392), as most recently amended by section 1212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 905), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “\$25,000,000” and inserting “\$5,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “for fiscal year 2015”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

SEC. 1233. CLEARANCE OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE ON FORMER UNITED STATES TRAINING RANGES IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT CLEARANCE.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may, using funds specified in subsection (c), conduct surface and sub-surface clearance of unexploded ordnance at closed training ranges used by the Armed Forces of the United States in Afghanistan.

(b) CONDITIONS ON AUTHORITY.—

(1) LIMITATION TO RANGES NOT TRANSFERRED TO AFGHANISTAN.—The surface and sub-surface clearance of unexploded ordnance authorized under subsection (a) may only take place on training ranges managed and operated by the Armed Forces of the United States that have not been transferred to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for use by its armed forces.

(2) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS AVAILABLE.—Funds expended for clearance pursuant to the authority in subsection (a) through September 30, 2016, may not exceed \$250,000,000.

(c) FUNDS.—The surface and sub-surface clearance of unexploded ordnance authorized by subsection (a) shall be paid for using amounts as follows:

(1) For fiscal year 2015, amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 1502 and available for operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations.

(2) For fiscal year 2016, amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense as additional authorizations of appropriations for overseas contingency operations and available for operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations.

(d) UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “unexploded ordnance” has the meaning given that term in section 101(e)(5) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 1234. REPORT ON IMPACT OF END OF MAJOR COMBAT OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN ON AUTHORITY TO USE MILITARY FORCE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the impact, if

any, of the end of major combat operations in Afghanistan on the authority of the Armed Forces of the United States to use military force, including the authority to detain, with regard to al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces, pursuant to—

(1) the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40); and

(2) any other available legal authority.

(b) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1235. REPORT ON BILATERAL SECURITY COOPERATION WITH PAKISTAN.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every six months thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the nature and extent of bilateral security cooperation between the United States and Pakistan.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of any strategic security objectives that the United States and Pakistan have agreed to pursue in cooperation.

(2) A description of programs or activities that the United States and Pakistan have jointly undertaken to pursue mutually agreed security cooperation objectives.

(3) A description and assessment of the effectiveness of efforts by Pakistan, unilaterally or jointly with the United States, to disrupt operations and eliminate safe havens of al Qaeda, Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan, and other militant extremist groups such as the Haqqani Network and the Quetta Shura Taliban located in Pakistan.

(4) A description and assessment of efforts by Pakistan, unilaterally or jointly with the United States, to counter the threat of improvised explosive devices and the networks involved in the acquisition, production, and delivery of such devices and their precursors and components.

(5) An assessment of the effectiveness of any United States security assistance to Pakistan to achieve the strategic security objectives described in paragraph (1).

(6) A description of any metrics used to assess the effectiveness of programs and activities described in paragraph (2).

(c) FORM.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) SUNSET.—The requirements in this section shall terminate on December 31, 2017.

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(f) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE AND SUPERSEDED REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1232 of the National

Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (c).

SEC. 1236. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO COUNTER THE ISLAMIC STATE IN IRAQ AND THE LEVANT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense is authorized, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance, including training, equipment, logistics support, supplies, and services, stipends, facility and infrastructure repair and renovation, and sustainment, to military and other security forces of or associated with the Government of Iraq, including Kurdish and tribal security forces or other local security forces, with a national security mission, through December 31, 2016, for the following purposes:

(1) Defending Iraq, its people, allies, and partner nations from the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and groups supporting ISIL.

(2) Securing the territory of Iraq.

(b) **NOTICE BEFORE PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section, not more than 25 percent of such funds may be obligated or expended until not later than 15 days after—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate, that contains a description of—

(A) the plan for providing such assistance;

(B) an identification of such forces designated to receive such assistance; and

(C) the plan for re-training and re-building such forces; and

(2) the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, in unclassified form with a classified annex as appropriate, that contains a description of how such assistance supports a larger regional strategy.

(c) **PLAN ELEMENTS.**—The plan required in subsection (a)(1) shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(1) the goals and objectives of assistance authorized under subsection (a);

(2) the concept of operations, timelines, and types of training, equipment, stipends, sustainment, and supplies to be provided;

(3) the roles and contributions of partner nations;

(4) the number and role of United States Armed Forces personnel involved;

(5) any additional military support and sustainment activities; and

(6) any other relevant details.

(d) **QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the report required in subsection (b)(1), and every 30 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall provide the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate with a progress report. Such progress report shall, based on the most recent quarterly information, include a description of the following:

(1) Any updates to or changes in the plan, strategy, process, vetting requirements and process as described in subsection (e), and end-use monitoring mechanisms and procedures.

(2) A description of how attacks against United States or coalition personnel are being mitigated, statistics on any such attacks, including “green-on-blue” attacks.

(3) A description of the forces receiving assistance authorized under subsection (a).

(4) A description of the recruitment, throughput, and retention rates of recipients and equipment.

(5) A description of any misuse or loss of provided equipment and how such misuse or loss is being mitigated.

(6) An assessment of the operational effectiveness of the forces receiving assistance authorized under subsection (a).

(7) A description of sustainment support provided to the forces authorized under subsection (a).

(8) A list of projects to repair or renovate facilities authorized under subsection (a).

(9) A statement of the amount of funds expended during the period for which the report is submitted.

(10) An assessment of the effectiveness of the assistance authorized under subsection (a).

(e) **VETTING.**—The Secretary of Defense should ensure that prior to providing assistance to elements of any forces described in subsection (a) such elements are appropriately vetted, including at a minimum, by—

(1) conducting assessments of such elements for associations with terrorist groups or groups associated with the Government of Iran; and

(2) receiving commitments from such elements to promote respect for human rights and the rule of law.

(f) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(g) **FUNDING.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this Act for Overseas Contingency Operations in title XV for fiscal year 2015, there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,618,000,000 to carry out this section. Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until September 30, 2016.

(h) **AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense may accept and retain contributions, including assistance in-kind, from foreign governments, including the Government of Iraq, to provide assistance authorized under subsection (a). Any funds accepted by the Secretary may be credited to the account from which funds are made available for the provision of assistance authorized under subsection (a) and may be used for such purpose until expended.

(i) **CONSTRUCTION OF AUTHORIZATION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to constitute a specific statutory authorization for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations wherein hostilities are clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(j) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of the provision of assistance pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may waive any provision of law described in subparagraph (B) if the Secretary—

(i) determines that such provision of law would (but for the waiver) prohibit, restrict, delay, or otherwise limit the provision of such assistance; and

(ii) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a notice of and justification for the waiver and the provision of law to be waived.

(B) **PROVISIONS OF LAW.**—The provisions of law described in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) Any provision of law relating to the acquisition of items and support services.

(ii) Sections 40 and 40A of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780 and 2785).

(2) **BY PRESIDENT.**—For purposes of the provision of assistance pursuant to subsection (a), the President may waive any provision of law other than a provision of law described in paragraph (1)(B) if the President determines that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to waive such provision of law. Such waiver shall not take effect until 15 days after the date on which the President notifies the appropriate congressional committees of such determination and the provision of law to be waived.

(3) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the President shall transmit to the congressional defense committees a report that provides a specific list of provisions of law that need to be waived under this subsection for purposes of the provision of assistance pursuant to subsection (a) and a justification for each such waiver.

(B) **UPDATE.**—The President shall submit to the congressional defense committees an update of the report required by subparagraph (A) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(k) **COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this subsection, not more than 60 percent of such funds may be obligated or expended until not later than 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense certifies to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate that an amount equal to not less than 40 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section has been contributed by other countries and entities for the purposes described in subsection (a), which may include contributions of in-kind support for forces described in subsection (a), as determined from October 1, 2014, of which not less than 50 percent of such amount contributed by other countries and entities has been contributed by the Government of Iraq.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The limitation in paragraph (1) shall not apply if the Secretary of Defense determines, in writing, that the national security objectives of the United States will be compromised by the application of the limitation to any such assistance, and notifies the appropriate congressional committees not less than 15 days in advance of the exemption taking effect, including a justification for the Secretary's determination and a description of the assistance to be exempted from the application of such limitation.

SEC. 1237. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO SUPPORT OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF SECURITY COOPERATION IN IRAQ.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Subsection (f)(1) of section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1631; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), as most recently amended by section 1214 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 906; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), is further amended—

(1) by striking “fiscal year 2014” and inserting “fiscal year 2015”;

(2) by striking “non-operational”; and

(3) by striking “in an institutional environment” and inserting “at a base or facility of the Government of Iraq”.

(b) AMOUNT AVAILABLE.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “fiscal year 2014 may not exceed \$209,000,000” and inserting “fiscal year 2015 may not exceed \$140,000,000”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “fiscal year 2014” and inserting “fiscal year 2015”.

Subtitle C—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation

SEC. 1241. LIMITATION ON MILITARY COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be used for any bilateral military-to-military cooperation between the Governments of the United States and the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the Russian Federation has ceased its occupation of Ukrainian territory and its aggressive activities that threaten the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(2) the Russian Federation is abiding by the terms of and taking steps in support of the Minsk Protocol, signed on September 5, 2014, regarding a ceasefire in eastern Ukraine.

(b) NONAPPLICABILITY.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any activities necessary to ensure the compliance of the United States with its obligations or the exercise of rights of the United States under any bilateral or multilateral arms control or nonproliferation agreement or any other treaty obligation of the United States; and

(2) any activities required to provide logistical or other support to the conduct of United States or North Atlantic Treaty Organization military operations in Afghanistan or the withdrawal from Afghanistan.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if—

(1) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State—

(A) determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States; and

(B) submits to the appropriate congressional committees—

(i) a notification that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States and a description of the national security interest covered by the waiver; and

(ii) a report explaining why the Secretary of Defense cannot make the certification under subsection (a); and

(2) a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits the information in the report under subparagraph (B)(ii).

(d) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN MILITARY BASES.—The certification requirement specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall not apply to military bases of the Russian Federation in Ukraine’s Crimean peninsula operating in accordance with its 1997 agreement on the Status and Conditions of the Black Sea Fleet Stationing on the Territory of Ukraine.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to funds described in subsection (a) that are unobligated on or after such date of enactment.

SEC. 1242. NOTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL TO MODIFY OR INTRODUCE NEW AIRCRAFT OR SENSORS FOR FLIGHT BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDER OPEN SKIES TREATY.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Russian Federation submits to the States Parties to the Open Skies Treaty a proposal to modify or introduce a new aircraft or sensor for flight by the Russian Federation under the Open Skies Treaty, the President shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress of such proposal and the relevant details thereof.

(b) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days prior to the date on which the United States intends to agree to a proposal described in subsection (a), the Director of National Intelligence, jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an assessment of such proposal on the national security of the United States.

(2) ADDITIONAL ELEMENT.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) shall include a description of any plans of the United States to mitigate the effect of the proposal on the national security of the United States, including an analysis of the cost and effectiveness of any such plans.

(3) FORM.—The assessment required by paragraph (1) may be submitted in classified or unclassified form as appropriate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) OPEN SKIES TREATY.—The term “Open Skies Treaty” means the Treaty on Open Skies, done at Helsinki March 24, 1992, and entered into force January 1, 2002.

SEC. 1243. LIMITATIONS ON PROVIDING CERTAIN MISSILE DEFENSE INFORMATION TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Section 1246(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 923) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting after “2014” the following: “or 2015”; and

(B) by adding at the end before the period the following: “or information relating to velocity at burnout of United States missile defense interceptors or targets”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by inserting “and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives” after “congressional defense committees”.

SEC. 1244. REPORT ON NON-COMPLIANCE BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION WITH ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE INF TREATY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) It was the object and purpose of the INF Treaty to eliminate the production or deployment of ground launched ballistic and cruise missiles with a range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometers, which was accomplished in 1992.

(2) The July 2014 Department of State annual report on “Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments” stated that “The United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty not to possess, produce, or flight-test a ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) with a range capability of 500km to 5,500km, or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles.”.

(3) In a letter to the Senate Armed Services Committee dated October 23, 2014, General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote “these violations are a serious challenge to the security of the United States and our allies. These actions, particularly when placed in the broader context of Russian regional aggression, must be met with a strategic response.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Russian Federation’s actions in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty adversely affect the national security of the United States and its allies, including the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and those in East Asia;

(2) the Government of the Russian Federation is responsible for this violation and also for returning to compliance with the INF Treaty;

(3) it is in the national security interests of the United States and its allies for the INF Treaty to remain in effect and for the Russian Federation to return to full and verifiable compliance with all its obligations under the INF Treaty; and

(4) as identified in section 1061 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 865), the President should take appropriate actions to resolve the issues relating to non-compliance by the Russian Federation with its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on noncompliance by the Russian Federation with its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the effect of Russian noncompliance on the national security interests of the United States and its allies, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and those in East Asia.

(B) A description of the President’s plan to resolve issues related to Russian noncompliance, including—

(i) actions that have been taken, and what further actions are planned or warranted by the United States;

(ii) plans to address Russian noncompliance diplomatically with the Russian Federation to resolve concerns about such non-compliance and bring Russia back into full compliance with the INF Treaty;

(iii) an assessment of possible steps (including verification measures) that would

permit confidence that the Russian Federation has returned to full compliance; and

(iv) the status of any United States efforts to develop coordinated or cooperative responses with allies.

(C) An assessment of whether Russian non-compliance threatens the viability of the INF Treaty, whether such noncompliance constitutes a material breach of the INF Treaty, and whether it is in the interests of the United States to remain a party to the INF Treaty if such noncompliance continues.

(3) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) BRIEFINGS REQUIRED.—At the time of the submission of the report required under subsection (c), and every six months thereafter until the date on which the Russian Federation is in compliance with its obligations under the INF Treaty, the Secretary of State, jointly with the Secretary of Defense and the heads of such other departments or agencies as appropriate, shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the status of United States efforts to resolve its concerns relating to non-compliance by the Russian Federation with its obligations under the INF Treaty.

(e) NOTIFICATION.—In the event the President determines that the Russian Federation has deployed, or intends to deploy, systems that violate the INF Treaty, the President shall promptly notify the appropriate congressional committees of such determination and any plans to respond to such deployments.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) INF TREATY.—The term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

SEC. 1245. ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY AND SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS INVOLVING THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than June 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report, in both classified and unclassified form, on the security and military strategies and capabilities of the Russian Federation (in this section referred to as “Russia”).

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the security priorities and objectives of Russia, including those priorities and objectives that would affect the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Middle East, and the People’s Republic of China.

(2) A description of the goals and factors shaping Russian security strategy and military strategy, including military spending and investment priorities and their alignment with the security priorities and objectives described in paragraph (1).

(3) An assessment of the force structure of the Russian military.

(4) A description of Russia’s current missile defense strategy and capabilities, including efforts to develop missile defense capabilities.

(5) A description of developments in Russian military doctrine and training.

(6) An assessment of the tactics, techniques, and procedures used by Russia in operations in Ukraine.

(7) An assessment of the proliferation activities of Russia and Russian entities, as a supplier of materials, technologies, or expertise relating to nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction or missile systems.

(8) A description of Russia’s asymmetric capabilities, including its strategy and efforts to develop and deploy electronic warfare, space and counterspace, and cyber warfare capabilities, including details on the number of malicious cyber incidents and associated activities against Department of Defense networks that are known or suspected to have been conducted or directed by the Government of the Russian Federation.

(9) A description of Russia’s nuclear strategy and associated doctrines and nuclear capabilities, including the size and state of Russia’s nuclear weapons stockpile, its nuclear weapons production capacities, and plans for developing its nuclear capabilities.

(10) A description of Russia’s anti-access and area denial capabilities.

(11) A description of Russia’s modernization program for its command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance program and its applications for Russia’s precision guided weapons.

(12) In consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of State, developments regarding United States-Russian engagement and cooperation on security matters.

(13) The current state of United States military-to-military cooperation with Russia’s armed forces, which shall include the following:

(A) A comprehensive and coordinated strategy for such military-to-military cooperation.

(B) A summary of all such military-to-military cooperation during the one-year period ending on the day before the date of submission of the report, including a summary of topics discussed.

(C) A description of such military-to-military cooperation planned for the 12-month period beginning on the date of submission of the report.

(D) An assessment by the Secretary of Defense of the benefits that Russia expects to gain from such military-to-military cooperation.

(E) An assessment by the Secretary of Defense of the benefits the Department of Defense expects to gain from such military-to-military cooperation, and any concerns regarding such cooperation.

(F) An assessment by the Secretary of Defense of how such military-to-military cooperation fits into the larger security relationship between the United States and Russia.

(14) A description of changes to United States policy on military-to-military contacts with Russia resulting from Russia’s annexation of Crimea.

(15) Other military and security developments involving Russia that the Secretary of Defense considers relevant to United States national security.

(c) NONDUPLICATION.—If any information required under subsection (b) has been in-

cluded in another report or notification previously submitted to Congress as required by law, the Secretary of Defense may provide a list of such reports and notifications at the time of submitting the report required by subsection (a) in lieu of including such information in the report required by subsection (a).

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(e) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AUTHORITY.—Section 10 of the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–95) is repealed.

(f) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on June 1, 2018.

SEC. 1246. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS OR OTHER AGREEMENTS WITH ROSOBORONEXPORT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2015 may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, to make a grant to, or to provide a loan or loan guarantee to Rosoboronexport or a subsidiary that is publicly known to be controlled by Rosoboronexport.

(b) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense may waive the application of subsection (a) with respect to a contract or other agreement for the supply of spare parts for, or conduct of any other activity related to, the maintenance of helicopters operated by the Afghan National Security Forces or otherwise purchased by the Department of Defense only if, prior to issuing the waiver, the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a certification described in paragraph (2).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—A certification referred to in paragraph (1) is a certification that contains the following:

(A) A determination of the Commander of United States forces in Afghanistan that—

(i) the supply of spare parts or conduct of the related activity is critical to the success of the mission of the Afghan National Security Forces in Afghanistan; and

(ii) the failure to supply spare parts or conduct the related activity would have a negative impact on the mission of United States forces in Afghanistan.

(B) A determination of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics that no practicable alternative exists to entering into such contract or other agreement for supply of spare parts or conduct of the related activity.

(C) A determination of the Secretary of Defense, after consideration of the determinations described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), that the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

(3) INITIAL LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Defense may exercise the authority of paragraph (1) beginning on or after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required by the matter relating to section 1531 in the Joint Explanatory Statement to accompany the National Defense Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (H.R. 3304, One Hundred Thirteenth Congress) regarding the potential to incorporate United States-manufactured rotary wing aircraft into the Afghan National Security Forces after the current program of record is completed.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the following:

(1) A list of known transfers of lethal military equipment by Rosoboronexport to the Government of the Syria since March 15, 2011.

(2) A list of known contracts, if any, that Rosoboronexport has signed with the Government of the Syria since March 15, 2011.

(3) A list of existing contracts, subcontracts, memoranda of understanding, cooperative agreements, grants, loans, and loan guarantees between the Department of Defense and Rosoboronexport, including a description of the transactions, signing dates, values, and quantities.

(4) A discussion of what role, if any, Rosoboronexport has had in providing military weapons, including heavy weapons, to the rebel forces in eastern Ukraine.

SEC. 1247. REPORT ON THE NEW START TREATY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) There have been significant changes in the geopolitical environment during 2014, including developments that pose a challenge to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The July 2014 Department of State annual report on “Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments” stated that “The United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty not to possess, produce, or flight-test a ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) with a range capability of 500km to 5,500km, or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles.”

(3) The July 2014 Department of State “Annual Report on Implementation of the New START Treaty” stated that “Based on the information available as of December 31, 2013, the United States certifies the Russian Federation to be in compliance with the terms of the New START Treaty.”

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report stating the reasons continued implementation of the New START Treaty is in the national security interests of the United States.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) **INF TREATY.**—The term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

(3) **NEW START TREATY.**—The term “New START Treaty” means the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on April 8, 2010, and entered into force on February 5, 2011.

Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region

SEC. 1251. STRATEGY TO PRIORITIZE UNITED STATES DEFENSE INTERESTS IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **REQUIRED REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains the strategy of the Department of Defense to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region.

(2) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall address the following:

(A) United States national security interests in the Asia-Pacific region.

(B) The security environment, including threats to global and regional United States national security interests emanating from the Asia-Pacific region, including efforts by the People’s Republic of China to advance their national interests in the Asia-Pacific region.

(C) Regional multilateral institutions, such as the Association of Southeast Asia Nations (ASEAN).

(D) Bilateral security cooperation relationships, including military-to-military engagements and security assistance.

(E) United States military presence, posture, and capabilities supporting the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region.

(F) Humanitarian and disaster relief response capabilities.

(G) International rules-based structures.

(H) Actions the Department of Defense could take, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to advance United States national security interests in the Asia-Pacific region.

(I) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate.

(3) **FORM.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(b) **RESOURCES.**—The report required by subsection (a)(1) shall be informed by the results of the integrated, multi-year planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of United States policy in Asia submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7043(a) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76; 128 Stat. 533)).

(c) **ANNUAL BUDGET.**—The President, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded in the annual budget of the United States Government that relate to the strategy required by subsection (a)(1) and the integrated strategy referred to in subsection (b).

SEC. 1252. MODIFICATIONS TO ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY AND SECURITY DEVELOPMENTS INVOLVING THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—Subsection (b)(14) of section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Pub-

lic Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 781; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended by striking “their response” and inserting “their capabilities, organizational affiliations, roles within China’s overall maritime strategy, activities affecting United States allies and partners, and responses”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and applies with respect to reports required to be submitted under subsection (a) of section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 on or after that date.

SEC. 1253. MILITARY-TO-MILITARY ENGAGEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF BURMA.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Department of Defense is authorized to provide the Government of Burma the following:

(1) Consultation, education, and training on human rights, the laws of armed conflict, civilian control of the military, rule of law, and other legal matters.

(2) Consultation, education, and training on English-language, humanitarian and disaster relief, and improvements to medical and health standards.

(3) Courses or workshops on defense institution reform.

(4) Observer status to bilateral or multilateral humanitarian assistance and disaster relief exercises.

(5) Aid or support in the event of a humanitarian crisis or natural disaster.

(b) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each March 1 thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on military-to-military engagement between the United States Armed Forces and the Burmese military.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the military-to-military activities between the United States and Burma, and how engagement with the Burmese military supports the United States national security strategy and promotes reform in Burma.

(B) A description of the objectives of the United States for developing the military-to-military relationship with the Burmese military, how the United States measures progress toward such objectives, and the implications of failing to achieve such objectives.

(C) A description and assessment of the political, military, economic, and civil society reforms being undertaken by the Government of Burma, including those affecting—

(i) individual freedoms and human rights of the Burmese people, including those of ethnic and religious minorities and internally displaced populations;

(ii) the peaceful settlement of armed conflicts between the Government of Burma and ethnic minority groups in Burma;

(iii) civilian control of the armed forces;

(iv) constitutional and electoral reforms;

(v) access for the purposes of human rights monitoring and humanitarian assistance to all areas in Burma, and cooperation with civilian authorities to investigate and resolve cases of human rights violations;

(vi) governmental transparency and accountability; and

(vii) respect for the laws of armed conflict and human rights, including with respect to child soldiers.

(D) A description and assessment of relationships of the Government of Burma with unlawful or sanctioned entities.

(3) **FORM.**—Each report under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(4) **SUNSET.**—The requirement to submit additional reports under this subsection shall terminate at the end of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—No Department of Defense assistance to the Government of Burma is authorized by this Act except as provided in this section.

(d) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1254. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MUNITIONS STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES PACIFIC COMMAND.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than April 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the munitions strategy of the United States Pacific Command to address deficiencies in the ability of the United States Pacific Command to execute major operational plans.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An identification of current and projected critical munitions requirements, including as identified in the most-recent future-years defense program submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 221 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) An assessment of—

(A) significant munitions gaps and deficiencies; and

(B) munitions capabilities and necessary munitions investments to address identified gaps and deficiencies.

(3) A description of current and planned munitions programs to address munitions gaps and deficiencies identified in paragraph (2), including with respect to—

(A) research, development, test, and evaluation efforts;

(B) cost, schedule, performance, and budget, to the extent such information is available; and

(C) known industrial base issues.

(4) An assessment of infrastructure deficiencies or needed enhancements to ensure adequate munitions storage and munitions deployment capability.

(5) Any other matters concerning the munitions strategy of the United States Pacific Command the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

SEC. 1255. MISSILE DEFENSE COOPERATION IN NORTHEAST ASIA.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that increased cooperation on missile defense among the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea would enhance the security of allies of the United States in Northeast Asia, increase the defense of forward-based forces of the United States, and enhance the protection of the United States with regard to threats from the Korean Peninsula.

(b) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment to

identify opportunities for increasing missile defense cooperation among the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, and to evaluate options for enhanced short-range missile, rocket, and artillery defense capabilities to address threats from the Korean Peninsula.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The assessment under subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) Candidate areas for increasing missile defense cooperation, including greater information sharing, systems integration, and joint operations.

(2) Potential challenges and limitations to enabling such cooperation and options for mitigating such challenges and limitations.

(3) An assessment of the utility of short-range missile defense and counter-rocket, artillery, and mortar system capabilities on the Korean Peninsula, including with respect to—

(A) meeting the military needs for defense of the Korean Peninsula;

(B) cost, schedule, and availability;

(C) technology maturity and risk; and

(D) consideration of alternatives.

(4) Such other matters as the Secretary of Defense determines to be appropriate.

(d) **BRIEFING REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the assessment under subsection (b).

SEC. 1256. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON TAIWAN AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the United States reaffirms its security commitments under the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8) as the cornerstone of United States relations with Taiwan and as a key instrument of peace, security, and stability in the Taiwan Strait since the enactment of such Act in 1979.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than December 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the self-defense capabilities of Taiwan.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (b) shall contain the following:

(1) A description of the key assumptions made regarding the impact of the Chinese People's Liberation Army on the maritime or territorial security of Taiwan, including the Chinese People's Liberation Army's—

(A) undersea and surface warfare capabilities in the littoral areas in and around the Taiwan Strait;

(B) amphibious and heavy sealift capabilities;

(C) capabilities to establish air dominance over Taiwan; and

(D) capabilities of the Second Artillery Corps.

(2) An assessment of the force posture, capabilities, and readiness of the armed forces of Taiwan for maintaining the maritime or territorial security of Taiwan, including an assessment of Taiwan's—

(A) undersea and surface warfare capabilities;

(B) air and land-based capabilities;

(C) early warning and command and control capabilities; and

(D) other deterrent, anti-access and area-denial capabilities, or asymmetric capabilities that could contribute to Taiwan's self-defense.

(3) Recommendations for further security cooperation and assistance efforts between Taiwan and the United States.

(4) Any other matters the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (b) may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(e) **NONDUPLICATION OF EFFORTS.**—If any information required under subsection (c) has been included in another report or notification previously submitted to Congress as required by law, the Secretary of Defense may provide a list of such reports and notifications at the time of submitting the report required by subsection (b) in lieu of including such information.

SEC. 1257. INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE ABILITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO COUNTER ANTI-ACCESS AND AREA-DENIAL STRATEGIES, CAPABILITIES, AND OTHER KEY TECHNOLOGIES OF POTENTIAL ADVERSARIES.

(a) **ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into an agreement with an independent entity to conduct an assessment of the ability of the Department of Defense to counter anti-access and area-denial strategies, capabilities, and other key technologies of potential adversaries.

(2) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The assessment required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of anti-access and area-denial strategies, capabilities, and other key technologies of potential adversaries during each of the fiscal year periods described in paragraph (3) that would represent a significant challenge to deployed forces and systems of the United States military, including an assessment of the extent to which such strategies, capabilities, and other key technologies could affect United States military operations.

(B) An assessment of gaps and deficiencies in the ability of the Department of Defense to address anti-access and area-denial strategies, capabilities, and other key technologies described in subparagraph (A), including an assessment of the adequacy of current strategies, programs, and investments of the Department of Defense.

(C) Recommendations for adjustments in United States policy and strategy, force posture, investments in capabilities, systems and technologies, and changes in business and management processes, or other novel approaches to address gaps and deficiencies described in subparagraph (B), or to restore, maintain, or expand United States military technological advantages, particularly in those areas in which potential adversaries are closing gaps or have achieved technological superiority with respect to the United States.

(D) Any other matters the independent entity determines to be appropriate.

(3) **FISCAL YEAR PERIODS DESCRIBED.**—The fiscal year periods described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Fiscal years 2015 through 2019.

(B) Fiscal years 2020 through 2030.

(C) Fiscal years 2031 and thereafter.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes the assessment required under subsection (a) and any other matters the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(2) **FORM.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex if necessary.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the independent entity described in subsection (a) with timely access to appropriate information, data, resources, and analysis so that the entity may conduct a thorough and independent assessment as required under subsection (a).

SEC. 1258. SENSE OF CONGRESS REAFFIRMING SECURITY COOPERATION WITH JAPAN AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States values its alliances with the Governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea as cornerstones of peace and security in the region, based on shared values of democracy, the rule of law, free and open markets, and respect for human rights;

(2) the United States welcomes Japan's new policy of collective self-defense, which will enable Japan to contribute more proactively to regional and global peace and security, as well as Japan's recent increases in defense funding, adoption of a National Security Strategy, and formation of security institutions such as the Japanese National Security Council;

(3) the United States reaffirms its commitment to the Government of Japan under Article V of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States of America and Japan that “[e]ach Party recognizes that an armed attack against either Party in the territories under the administration of Japan would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional provisions and processes”;

(4) the United States welcomes the Republic of Korea's ratification of a new five-year Special Measures Agreement, which establishes the framework for Republic of Korea contributions to offset costs associated with the stationing of United States forces in the Republic of Korea, as well as efforts by the Republic of Korea to enhance its defense capabilities, including its recent decision to acquire surveillance and strike capabilities;

(5) the United States and the Republic of Korea share deep concerns that the nuclear and ballistic missiles programs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its repeated provocations pose grave threats to peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and to Northeast Asia, that the United States and the Republic of Korea and will work together to achieve the peaceful denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and that the United States and the Republic of Korea remain fully committed to continuing close cooperation on the full range of issues related to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; and

(6) the United States welcomes greater security cooperation with, and among, Japan and the Republic of Korea to promote mutual interests and to address shared concerns.

SEC. 1259. REPORT ON MARITIME SECURITY STRATEGY IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that outlines the strategy of the Department of Defense with regard to maritime security in the Asia-Pacific region, with particular emphasis on the South China Sea and the East China Sea.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall outline the strategy described in that subsection and include the following:

(1) An assessment of how the actions of the People's Republic of China in the South China Sea and the East China Sea have affected the status quo with regard to competing territorial and maritime claims and United States security interests in those seas.

(2) An assessment of how the naval and other maritime strategies and capabilities of the People's Republic of China, including military and law enforcement capabilities, affect the strategy in the Asia-Pacific region.

(3) An assessment of how anti-access and area denial strategies and capabilities of the People's Republic of China in the Asia-Pacific region, including weapons and technologies, affect the strategy.

(4) A description of any ongoing or planned changes in United States military capabilities, operations, and posture in the Asia-Pacific region to support the strategy.

(5) A description of any current or planned bilateral or regional naval or maritime capacity-building initiatives in the Asia-Pacific region.

(6) An assessment of how the strategy leverages military-to-military engagements between the United States and the People's Republic of China to reduce the potential for miscalculation and tensions in the South China Sea and the East China Sea, including a specific description of the effects of such engagements on particular incidents or interactions involving the People's Republic of China in those seas.

(7) Any other matters the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1259A. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAIWAN MARITIME CAPABILITIES AND EXERCISE PARTICIPATION.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should consider opportunities to help enhance the maritime capabilities and nautical skills of the Taiwanese navy that may contribute to Taiwan's self-defense and to regional peace and stability; and

(2) the People's Republic of China and Taiwan should be afforded opportunities to participate in the humanitarian assistance and disaster relief portions of future multilateral exercises, such as the Pacific Partnership, Pacific Angel, and Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC) exercises, to increase their respective capacities to conduct these types of operations.

SEC. 1259B. MODIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION IN ANNUAL REPORTS OF UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION.

(a) MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION.—Section 1238(c)(2) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 22 U.S.C. 7002(c)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) through (J) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) The role of the People's Republic of China in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and other weapon systems (including systems and technologies of a dual use nature), including actions the United States might take to encourage the People's Republic of China to cease such practices.

“(B) The qualitative and quantitative nature of the transfer of United States produc-

tion activities to the People's Republic of China, including the relocation of manufacturing, advanced technology and intellectual property, and research and development facilities, the impact of such transfers on the national security of the United States (including the dependence of the national security industrial base of the United States on imports from China), the economic security of the United States, and employment in the United States, and the adequacy of United States export control laws in relation to the People's Republic of China.

“(C) The effects of the need for energy and natural resources in the People's Republic of China on the foreign and military policies of the People's Republic of China, the impact of the large and growing economy of the People's Republic of China on world energy and natural resource supplies, prices, and the environment, and the role the United States can play (including through joint research and development efforts and technological assistance) in influencing the energy and natural resource policies of the People's Republic of China.

“(D) Foreign investment by the United States in the People's Republic of China and by the People's Republic of China in the United States, including an assessment of its economic and security implications, the challenges to market access confronting potential United States investment in the People's Republic of China, and foreign activities by financial institutions in the People's Republic of China.

“(E) The military plans, strategy and doctrine of the People's Republic of China, the structure and organization of the People's Republic of China military, the decision-making process of the People's Republic of China military, the interaction between the civilian and military leadership in the People's Republic of China, the development and promotion process for leaders in the People's Republic of China military, deployments of the People's Republic of China military, resources available to the People's Republic of China military (including the development and execution of budgets and the allocation of funds), force modernization objectives and trends for the People's Republic of China military, and the implications of such objectives and trends for the national security of the United States.

“(F) The strategic economic and security implications of the cyber capabilities and operations of the People's Republic of China.

“(G) The national budget, fiscal policy, monetary policy, capital controls, and currency management practices of the People's Republic of China, their impact on internal stability in the People's Republic of China, and their implications for the United States.

“(H) The drivers, nature, and implications of the growing economic, technological, political, cultural, people-to-people, and security relations of the People's Republic of China's with other countries, regions, and international and regional entities (including multilateral organizations), including the relationship among the United States, Taiwan, and the People's Republic of China.

“(I) The compliance of the People's Republic of China with its commitments to the World Trade Organization, other multilateral commitments, bilateral agreements signed with the United States, commitments made to bilateral science and technology programs, and any other commitments and agreements strategic to the United States (including agreements on intellectual property rights and prison labor imports), and United States enforcement policies with respect to such agreements.

“(J) The implications of restrictions on speech and access to information in the People’s Republic of China for its relations with the United States in economic and security policy, as well as any potential impact of media control by the People’s Republic of China on United States economic interests.

“(K) The safety of food, drug, and other products imported from China, the measures used by the People’s Republic of China Government and the United States Government to monitor and enforce product safety, and the role the United States can play (including through technical assistance) to improve product safety in the People’s Republic of China.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to annual reports submitted under section 1238(c) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 after such date of enactment.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 1261. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR NON-CONVENTIONAL ASSISTED RECOVERY CAPABILITIES.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Subsection (h) of section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4579), as most recently amended by section 1241 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 920), is further amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”.

(b) **CROSS-REFERENCE AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (f) of such section is amended by striking “413b(e)” and inserting “3093(e)”.

SEC. 1262. MODIFICATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY PLANNING GUIDANCE TO DENY SAFE HAVENS TO AL-QAEDA AND ITS VIOLENT EXTREMIST AFFILIATES.

(a) **MODIFICATION.**—Section 1032(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1571; 50 U.S.C. 3043 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraph (D), (E), and (F), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) For each specified geographic area, a description of the following:

“(i) The feasibility of conducting multilateral programs to train and equip the military forces of relevant countries in the area.

“(ii) The authority and funding that would be required to support such programs.

“(iii) How such programs would be implemented.

“(iv) How such programs would support the national security priorities and interests of the United States and complement other efforts of the United States Government in the area and in other specified geographic areas.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (F) (as redesignated), by striking “subparagraph (C)” and inserting “subparagraph (D)”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “paragraph (2)(C)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(D)”.

(b) **REPORT.**—Section 1032(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1571; 50 U.S.C. 3043 note), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) **REPORT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a detailed summary of the national security planning guidance required under paragraph (1), including any updates thereto.

“(B) **FORM.**—The report may include a classified annex as determined to be necessary by the President.

“(C) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(i) the congressional defense committees; and

“(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 1263. ENHANCED AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE GOODS AND SERVICES OF DJIBOUTI IN SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES IN UNITED STATES AFRICA COMMAND AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States forces should continue to be forward postured in Africa and in the Middle East;

(2) Djibouti is in a strategic location to support United States vital national security interests in the region;

(3) the United States should take definitive steps to maintain its basing access and agreements with the Government of Djibouti to support United States vital national security interests in the region;

(4) the United States should devise and implement a comprehensive governmental approach to engaging with the Government of Djibouti to reinforce the strategic partnership between the United States and Djibouti; and

(5) the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, should take concrete steps to advance and strengthen the relationship between United States and the Government of Djibouti.

(b) **AUTHORITY.**—In the case of a good or service to be acquired in direct support of covered activities for which the Secretary of Defense makes a determination described in subsection (c), the Secretary may conduct a procurement in which—

(1) competition is limited to goods of Djibouti or services of Djibouti; or

(2) a preference is provided for goods of Djibouti or services of Djibouti.

(c) **DETERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A determination described in this subsection is a determination by the Secretary of either of the following:

(A) That the good or service concerned is to be used only in support of covered activities.

(B) That it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to limit competition or provide a preference as described in subsection (b) because such limitation or preference is necessary—

(i) to reduce—

(I) United States transportation costs; or

(II) delivery times in support of covered activities; or

(i) to promote regional security, stability, and economic prosperity in Africa.

(C) That the good or service is of equivalent quality of a good or service that would have otherwise been acquired.

(2) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.**—A determination under paragraph (1)(B) shall not be effective for purposes of a limitation or preference under subsection (b) unless the Secretary also determines that the limitation or preference will not adversely affect—

(A) United States military operations or stability operations in the United States Africa Command area of responsibility; or

(B) the United States industrial base.

(d) **REPORTING AND OVERSIGHT.**—In exercising the authority under subsection (b) to procure goods or services in support of covered activities, the Secretary of Defense—

(1) in the case of the procurement of services, shall ensure that the procurement is conducted in accordance with the management structure implemented pursuant to section 2330(a) of title 10, United States Code;

(2) shall ensure that such goods or services are identified and reported under a single, joint Department of Defense-wide system for the management and accountability of contractors accompanying United States forces operating overseas or in contingency operations (such as the synchronized predeployment and operational tracker (SPOT) system); and

(3) shall ensure that the United States Africa Command has sufficiently trained staff and adequate resources to conduct oversight of procurements carried out pursuant to subsection (b), including oversight to detect and deter fraud, waste, and abuse.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED ACTIVITIES.**—The term “covered activities” means Department of Defense activities in the United States Africa Command area of responsibility.

(2) **GOOD OF DJIBOUTI.**—The term “good of Djibouti” means a good wholly the growth, product, or manufacture of Djibouti.

(3) **SERVICE OF DJIBOUTI.**—The term “service of Djibouti” means a service performed by a person that—

(A)(i) is operating primarily in Djibouti; or

(ii) is making a significant contribution to the economy of Djibouti through payment of taxes or use of products, materials, or labor of Djibouti, as determined by the Secretary of State; and

(B) is properly licensed or registered by authorities of the Government of Djibouti, as determined by the Secretary of State.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The authority and requirements of this section expire at the close of September 30, 2018.

SEC. 1264. TREATMENT OF THE KURDISTAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE PATRIOTIC UNION OF KURDISTAN UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

(a) **REMOVAL OF THE KURDISTAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE PATRIOTIC UNION OF KURDISTAN FROM TREATMENT AS TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan shall be excluded from the definition of terrorist organization (as defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(vi)(III) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(vi)(III))) for purposes of such section 212(a)(3)(B).

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, may suspend the application of paragraph (1) for either or both of the groups referred to in paragraph (1) in such Secretary’s sole and

unreviewable discretion. Prior to or contemporaneous with such suspension, the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report their reasons for suspension to the Committees on Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, the Committees on Appropriations in the House of Representatives and of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(b) **RELIEF REGARDING ADMISSIBILITY OF NONIMMIGRANT ALIENS ASSOCIATED WITH THE KURDISTAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE PATRIOTIC UNION OF KURDISTAN.**—

(1) **FOR ACTIVITIES OPPOSING THE BA'ATH REGIME.**—Paragraph (3)(B) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)) shall not apply to an alien with respect to activities undertaken in association with the Kurdistan Democratic Party or the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan in opposition to the regime of the Arab Socialist Ba'ath Party and the autocratic dictatorship of Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

(2) **FOR MEMBERSHIP IN THE KURDISTAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND PATRIOTIC UNION OF KURDISTAN.**—Paragraph (3)(B) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)) shall not apply to an alien applying for a nonimmigrant visa, who presents themselves for inspection to an immigration officer at a port of entry as a nonimmigrant, or who is applying in the United States for nonimmigrant status, and who is a member of the Kurdistan Democratic Party or the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan and currently serves or has previously served as a senior official (such as Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister, Deputy Minister, President, Vice-President, Member of Parliament, provincial Governor or member of the National Security Council) of the Kurdistan Regional Government or the federal government of the Republic of Iraq.

(3) **EXCEPTION.**—Neither paragraph (1) nor paragraph (2) shall apply if the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) determine in their sole unreviewable discretion that such alien poses a threat to the safety and security of the United States, or does not warrant a visa, admission to the United States, or a grant of an immigration benefit or protection, in the totality of the circumstances. This provision shall be implemented by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security in consultation with the Attorney General.

(c) **PROHIBITION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (whether statutory or nonstatutory), section 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252), sections 1361 and 1651 of title 28, United States Code, section 2241 of such title, and any other habeas corpus provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction to review any determination made pursuant to this section.

SEC. 1265. PROHIBITION ON INTEGRATION OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF CHINA INTO MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF UNITED STATES AND SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING INTEGRATION OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF RUSSIA INTO MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS OF NATO.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or other-

wise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to integrate a missile defense system of the People's Republic of China into any missile defense system of the United States.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that missile defense systems of the Russian Federation should not be integrated into the missile defense systems of the United States or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) if such integration undermines the security of the United States or NATO, respectively.

SEC. 1266. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE ARMS TRADE TREATY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended to implement the Arms Trade Treaty, or to make any change to existing programs, projects, or activities as approved by Congress in furtherance of, pursuant to, or otherwise to implement the Arms Trade Treaty, unless the Arms Trade Treaty has received the advice and consent of the Senate and has been the subject of implementing legislation, as required, by Congress.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the Department of Defense from assisting foreign countries in bringing their laws and regulations up to United States standards.

SEC. 1267. NOTIFICATION AND REVIEW OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ARMS CONTROL NONCOMPLIANCE.

(a) **NOTICE TO PRESIDENT.**—If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, has substantial reason to believe that there is a case of foreign activity that would pose a significant threat to United States national security interests and that may be inconsistent with an arms control treaty to which the United States is a party, and such case is not included in, or is significantly different from a case included in, the most-recent annual report submitted to Congress pursuant to section 403 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2593a), the Secretary of Defense shall notify the President of such belief of the Secretary.

(b) **REFERRAL TO SECRETARY OF STATE.**—If the President receives a notification from the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a), the President shall promptly refer the matter to the Secretary of State to arrange for an inter-agency review of the case in order to provide for an assessment of whether the case constitutes a significant case of non-compliance with an arms control treaty to which the United States is a party.

(c) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the President makes a referral under subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the results of the assessment of the case with respect to which the referral was made under subsection (b).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1268. INTER-EUROPEAN AIR FORCES ACADEMY.

(a) **OPERATION.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may operate the Air Force education and training facility known as the Inter-European Air Forces Academy (in this section referred to as the “Academy”).

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Academy shall be to provide military education and training to military personnel of countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or signatories to the Partnership for Peace Framework Documents.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(1) **CONCURRENCE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.**—Military personnel of a country may be provided education and training under this section only with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

(2) **ASSISTANCE OTHERWISE PROHIBITED BY LAW.**—Education and training may not be provided under this section to the military personnel of any country that is otherwise prohibited from receiving such type of assistance under any other provision of law.

(d) **SUPPLIES AND CLOTHING.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may, under such conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, provide to a person receiving education and training under this section the following:

(1) Transportation incident to such education and training.

(2) Supplies and equipment to be used during such education and training.

(3) Billeting, food, and health services in connection with the receipt of such education and training.

(e) **LIVING ALLOWANCE.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may pay to a person receiving education and training under this section a living allowance at a rate to be prescribed by the Secretary, taking into account the rates of living allowances authorized for a member of the Armed Forces under similar circumstances.

(f) **FUNDING.**—Amounts for the operations and maintenance of the Academy, and for the provision of education and training through the Academy, may be paid from funds available for the Air Force for operation and maintenance.

(g) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year in which the Secretary of the Air Force operates the Academy pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the operations of the Academy during such fiscal year.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report under this subsection shall set forth, for the fiscal year covered by such report, the following:

(A) A description of the operations of the Academy, including a description of the education and training courses provided under this section.

(B) A summary of the number of individuals receiving education and training through the Academy, set forth by country of origin and education or training provided.

(C) The amount paid by the Secretary for the operations and maintenance of the Academy.

(D) The amounts paid by the Secretary under subsections (d) and (e) in connection with the provision of education and training through the Academy.

(E) Any other matters the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(h) **EXPIRATION.**—The authority in subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2019.

SEC. 1269. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT TO SECURITY OF UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES.

(a) MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARD PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall—

(A) develop and implement a plan to incorporate the additional Marine Corps Security Guard personnel authorized under section 404 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 10 U.S.C. 5983 note) at United States embassies, consulates, and other facilities;

(B) conduct an annual review of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program, including—

(i) an evaluation of whether the size and composition of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program is adequate to meet global diplomatic security requirements;

(ii) an assessment of whether Marine Corps security guards are appropriately deployed among facilities to respond to evolving security developments and potential threats to United States diplomatic facilities abroad; and

(iii) an assessment of the mission objectives of the Marine Corps Security Guard Program and the procedural rules of engagement to protect diplomatic personnel under the Program; and

(C) provide an assessment of the effectiveness of Department of Defense-provided Security Augmentation Units utilized during the previous year to improve security at high threat, high risk facilities, including an evaluation of any impediments to the effectiveness of such units.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an unclassified report, with a classified annex as necessary, that addresses the requirements set forth in paragraph (1).

(b) REPORT ON “NEW NORMAL” AND GENERAL MISSION REQUIREMENTS OF UNITED STATES AFRICA COMMAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on what changes, if any, have been made to the force posture and structure of the United States Africa Command or adjacent combatant commands to respond, if requested, to a diplomatic facility’s security requirements (so-called “new normal” requirements) and general mission of United States Africa Command.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) A detailed description of the “new normal” requirements in the area of responsibility of the United States Africa Command.

(B) A description of any changes required for the United States Africa Command or adjacent combatant commands to meet the “new normal” and general mission requirements in the United States Africa Command area of responsibility, including the gaps in capability, size, posture, agreements, basing, and enabler support of crisis response forces and associated assets to respond to requests for support from the Secretary of State.

(C) A discussion and estimate of the military forces required to support mission requirements of the United States Africa Command and the shortfall, if any, in meeting such requirements.

(D) A discussion and estimate of the annual intelligence, surveillance, and recon-

naissance requirements of the United States Africa Command and the shortfall, if any, in meeting such requirements.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1270. INFORMATION ON SANCTIONED PERSONS AND BUSINESSES THROUGH THE FEDERAL AWARDEE PERFORMANCE AND INTEGRITY INFORMATION SYSTEM.

Section 2313(c) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) Whether the person is included on any of the following lists maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury:

“(A) The specially designated nationals and blocked persons list (commonly known as the ‘SDN list’).

“(B) The sectoral sanctions identification list.

“(C) The foreign sanctions evaders list.

“(D) The list of persons sanctioned under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) that do not appear on the SDN list (commonly known as the ‘Non-SDN Iranian Sanctions Act list’).

“(E) The list of foreign financial institutions subject to part 561 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.”.

SEC. 1271. REPORTS ON NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the interim agreement relating to the nuclear program of Iran. Such report shall include—

(1) verification of whether Iran is complying with such agreement; and

(2) an assessment of the overall state of the nuclear program of Iran.

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—If the interim agreement described in subsection (a) is renewed or if a comprehensive and final agreement is entered into regarding the nuclear program of Iran, by not later than 90 days after such renewal or final agreement being entered into, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on such renewed or final agreement. Such report shall include the matters described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(d) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1272. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DEFENSE MODERNIZATION BY NATO COUNTRIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress findings the following:

(1) At the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) summit in Wales in September 2014, NATO members made important commitments to reverse the decline in their defense budgets and to aim to move toward the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of two percent of each member’s Gross Domestic Product on defense within a decade.

(2) At the Wales summit, NATO members declared that increased investments in defense should be directed towards meeting the capability priorities of the Alliance.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should work with other NATO members as they seek to modernize their defense capabilities to encourage such members to procure defense systems, including air and missile defense systems, that are interoperable with NATO defense systems and help fill critical NATO shortfalls;

(2) such United States efforts to facilitate the modernization of defense capabilities are particularly important to help address the security requirements of the newer members of NATO in Eastern Europe; and

(3) the United States stands ready to assist other NATO members to modernize their defense capabilities and restructure their armed forces consistent with the objectives set out at the NATO summit in Wales in September 2014.

SEC. 1273. REPORT ON PROTECTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY IN EVENT OF ARMED CONFLICT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on efforts of the Department of Defense to protect cultural property abroad, including activities undertaken pursuant to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of Department of Defense policies, directives, and regulations for the protection of cultural property abroad at risk of destruction due to armed conflict.

(2) A description of actions the Armed Forces have taken to protect cultural property abroad, including efforts to avoid damage to cultural property during military construction activities and efforts made to inform military personnel about the identification and protection of cultural property as part of the law of war.

(3) The status and number of specialist personnel in the Armed Forces assigned to secure respect for cultural property abroad and to cooperate with civilian authorities responsible for safeguarding cultural property abroad, consistent with the requirements of the 1954 Hague Convention.

SEC. 1274. UNITED STATES STRATEGY AND PLANS FOR ENHANCING SECURITY AND STABILITY IN EUROPE.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of the force posture, readiness, and responsiveness of United States forces and the forces of other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in the area of responsibility of the United States European Command, and of contingency plans for such United States forces, with the objective of ensuring that the posture, readiness, and responsiveness of

such forces are appropriate to meet the obligations of collective self-defense under Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty. The review shall include an assessment of the capabilities and capacities needed by the Armed Forces of the United States to respond to unconventional or hybrid warfare tactics like those used by the Russian Federation in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine.

(b) UNITED STATES STRATEGY AND PLANS.—

(1) REPORT ON STRATEGY AND PLANS REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on a strategy and plans for enhancing security and stability in Europe.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) A summary of the relevant findings of the review conducted under subsection (a).

(B) A description of any initiatives or recommendations of the Secretary of Defense for enhancing the force posture, readiness, and responsiveness of United States forces in the area of responsibility of the United States European Command as a result of the review.

(C) A description of any initiatives of other members of NATO for enhancing the force posture, readiness, and responsiveness of their forces within the area of responsibility of NATO.

(D) A plan for reassuring Central European and Eastern European members of NATO regarding the commitment of the United States and other members of NATO to their obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, including collective defense under Article V, including the following:

(i) A description of measures to be undertaken by the United States to reassure members of NATO regarding the commitment of the United States to its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty.

(ii) A description of measures undertaken or to be undertaken by other members of NATO to provide assurances of their commitment to meet their obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty.

(iii) A description of any planned measures to increase the presence of the Armed Forces of the United States and the forces of other members of NATO, including on a rotational basis, on the territories of the Central European and Eastern European members of NATO.

(iv) A description of the measures undertaken by the United States and other members of NATO to enhance the capability of members of NATO to respond to tactics like those used by the Russian Federation in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine or to assist members of NATO in responding to such tactics.

(E) A plan for enhancing bilateral and multilateral security cooperation with appropriate countries participating in the NATO Partnership for Peace program using the authorities for enhancing security cooperation specified in subsection (c), which plan shall include the following:

(i) An identification of the objectives and priorities of such United States security assistance and cooperation programs, on a bilateral and regional basis, and the resources required to achieve such objectives and priorities.

(ii) A methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of such United States security assistance and cooperation programs, bilaterally and regionally, in making progress toward identified objectives and priorities.

(3) FORM.—The report required by this subsection shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) AUTHORITIES FOR ENHANCING SECURITY COOPERATION.—The authorities for enhancing security cooperation specified in this subsection include the following:

(1) Section 168 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the Warsaw Initiative Fund.

(2) Section 2282 of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 1205 of this Act), relating to authority to build the capacity of foreign military forces.

(3) Section 1206 of this Act, relating to training of security forces and associated ministries of foreign countries to promote respect for the rule of law and human rights.

(4) Section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (10 U.S.C. 168 note), relating to the Ministry of Defense Advisors program.

(5) Section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 2151 note), relating to the Global Security Contingency Fund.

(6) Any other authority available to the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of State appropriate for the purpose of this section.

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1275. REPORT ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should provide lethal and nonlethal military assistance to the Government of Ukraine to defend its territory and sovereignty from further aggressive actions designed to undermine regional peace and stability to the extent such assistance is defensive and non-provocative in nature.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment and submit to the congressional defense committees a report related to military assistance to Ukraine.

(c) ELEMENTS.—At a minimum, the report required under subsection (b) should provide a detailed explanation of the following matters:

(1) Military equipment, supplies, and defense services, including type, quantity, and prioritization of such items, requested by the Government of Ukraine.

(2) Military equipment, supplies, and defense services, including type, quantity, and actual or estimated delivery date, that the United States Government has provided, is providing, and plans to provide to the Government of Ukraine.

(3) An assessment of what United States military assistance to the Government of Ukraine, including type and quantity, would most effectively improve the military readiness and capabilities of the Ukrainian military, including a discussion of those defensive, lethal capabilities that could be provided by the United States that would enable the Government of Ukraine to better ensure the territorial integrity of Ukraine.

(4) An assessment of the need for, appropriateness of, and force protection concerns

of any United States military advisors that may be made available to the armed forces of Ukraine.

(5) Military training requested by the Government of Ukraine.

(6) Military training the United States Government has conducted with Ukraine in the previous six months.

(7) Military training the United States Government plans to conduct with the Government of Ukraine in the next year.

(d) FORM.—The report required under subsection (b) shall be unclassified in form, but may contain a classified annex.

(e) SUNSET.—The requirements in this section shall terminate on January 31, 2017.

SEC. 1276. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EFFORTS TO REMOVE JOSEPH KONY FROM THE BATTLEFIELD AND END THE ATROCITIES OF THE LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY.

Consistent with the provisions of the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-172), it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the ongoing United States advise and assist operation in support of regional governments in Central Africa and the African Union to remove Joseph Kony and his top commanders from the battlefield and end atrocities perpetuated by the Lord's Resistance Army, also known as Operation Observant Compass, has made significant progress in achieving its objectives;

(2) the Department of Defense should continue its support of Operation Observant Compass, particularly through the provision of key enablers, such as mobility assets and targeted intelligence collection and analytical support, to enable regional partners to effectively conduct operations against Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army;

(3) Operation Observant Compass must be integrated into a comprehensive strategy to support security and stability in the region; and

(4) the regional governments should recommit themselves to the Regional Cooperation Initiative for the Elimination of the Lord's Resistance Army authorized by the African Union.

SEC. 1277. EXTENSION OF ANNUAL REPORTS ON THE MILITARY POWER OF IRAN.

Section 1245(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2544) is amended by striking “December 31 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2016”.

SEC. 1278. REPORT AND STRATEGY REGARDING NORTH AFRICA, WEST AFRICA, AND THE SAHEL.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with other appropriate Federal officials, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains an assessment of the actions taken by the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies to identify, locate, and bring to justice those persons and organizations that planned, authorized, or committed the attacks against the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya that occurred on September 11 and 12, 2012, and the legal authorities available for such purposes.

(b) STRATEGY.—

(1) TIMING AND CONTENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a comprehensive strategy to counter the growing threat posed by radical Islamist terrorist groups in North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel, which shall include, among other things—

(A) a description of the radical Islamist terrorist groups active in the region, including an assessment of their origins, strategic aims, tactical methods, funding sources, leadership, and relationships with other terrorist groups or state actors;

(B) a strategy to stem the movement of foreign fighters from North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel to other areas, including Syria and Iraq;

(C) a description of steps the United States is taking to stabilize the political and security situation in North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel and support counterterrorism and stability efforts in the region;

(D) a description of the key military, diplomatic, intelligence, and public diplomacy resources available to address these growing regional terrorist threats; and

(E) a strategy to maximize the coordination between, and the effectiveness of, United States military, diplomatic, intelligence, and public diplomacy resources to counter these growing regional terrorist threats.

(2) **DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1279. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of force against Iran.

SEC. 1280. APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND FOR COOPERATION ON THE USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding the provisions for congressional consideration of a proposed agreement for cooperation in subsection d. of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), the amendments to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes, done at Washington, July 22, 2014, and transmitted to Congress on July 24, 2014, including all portions thereof (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Amendment”), may be brought into effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act as if all the requirements in such section 123 for consideration of the Amendment had been satisfied, subject to subsection (b) of this section.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954 AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.**—Upon coming into effect, the Amendment shall be subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) and any other applicable United States law as if the Amendment had come into effect in accordance with the requirements of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

Subtitle A—Funds

Sec. 1301. Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds.

Sec. 1302. Funding allocations.

Subtitle B—Consolidation and Modernization of Statutes Relating to the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

Sec. 1311. Short title.

Sec. 1312. Definitions.

PART I—PROGRAM AUTHORITIES

Sec. 1321. Authority to carry out Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

Sec. 1322. Use of funds for certain emergent threats or opportunities.

Sec. 1323. Authority for urgent threat reduction activities under Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

Sec. 1324. Use of funds for unspecified purposes or for increased amounts.

Sec. 1325. Use of contributions to Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

PART II—RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Sec. 1331. Prohibition on use of funds for specified purposes.

Sec. 1332. Requirement for on-site managers.

Sec. 1333. Limitation on use of funds until certain permits obtained.

Sec. 1334. Limitation on availability of funds for Cooperative Threat Reduction activities with Russian Federation.

PART III—RECURRING CERTIFICATIONS AND REPORTS

Sec. 1341. Annual certifications on use of facilities being constructed for Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction projects or activities.

Sec. 1342. Requirement to submit summary of amounts requested by project category.

Sec. 1343. Reports on activities and assistance under Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

Sec. 1344. Metrics for Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

PART IV—REPEALS AND TRANSITION PROVISIONS

Sec. 1351. Repeals.

Sec. 1352. Transition provisions.

Subtitle A—Funds

SEC. 1301. SPECIFICATION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS.

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2015 COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS DEFINED.**—As used in this subtitle, the term “fiscal year 2015 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds” means the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program established under section 1321.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program shall be available for obligation for fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017.

SEC. 1302. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.

Of the \$365,108,000 authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 in section 301 and made available by the funding table in section 4301 for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program established under section 1321, the following amounts may be obligated for the purposes specified:

(1) For strategic offensive arms elimination, \$1,000,000.

(2) For chemical weapons destruction, \$15,720,000.

(3) For global nuclear security, \$20,703,000.

(4) For cooperative biological engagement, \$256,762,000.

(5) For proliferation prevention, \$40,704,000.

(6) For threat reduction engagement, \$2,375,000.

(7) For activities designated as Other Assessments/Administrative Costs, \$27,844,000.

Subtitle B—Consolidation and Modernization of Statutes Relating to the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

SEC. 1311. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act”.

SEC. 1312. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) The term “congressional defense committees” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term “Cooperative Threat Reduction funds” means funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations for the Program, or otherwise made available to the Program.

(3) The term “Program” means the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program of the Department of Defense established under section 1321.

PART I—PROGRAM AUTHORITIES

SEC. 1321. AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a program, referred to as the “Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program”, with respect to foreign countries to do the following:

(1) Facilitate the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of chemical, biological, or other weapons, weapons components, weapons-related materials, and associated delivery vehicles.

(2) Facilitate—

(A) the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons-usable or high-threat radiological materials, nuclear weapons components, and associated delivery vehicles; and

(B) the elimination of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons components, and nuclear weapons delivery vehicles.

(3) Prevent the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons, weapons components, and weapons-related materials, technology, and expertise.

(4) Prevent the proliferation of biological weapons, weapons components, and weapons-related materials, technology, and expertise, which may include activities that facilitate detection and reporting of highly pathogenic diseases or other diseases that are associated with or that could be used as an early warning mechanism for disease outbreaks that could affect the Armed Forces of the United States or allies of the United States, regardless of whether such diseases are caused by biological weapons.

(5) Prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction-related materials, including materials, equipment, and technology that could be used for the design, development, production, or use of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the means of delivery of such weapons.

(6) Carry out military-to-military and defense contacts for advancing the mission of the Program, subject to subsection (f).

(b) **CONCURRENCE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.**—The authority under subsection (a) to carry out the Program is subject to any concurrence of the Secretary of State or other appropriate agency head required under section 1322 or 1323 (unless such concurrence is otherwise exempted pursuant to section 1352 with respect to activities or determinations carried out or made before the date of the enactment of this Act).

(c) **SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority to carry out the Program in subsection (a) includes authority to provide equipment, goods, and services, but does not include authority to provide funds directly for a project or activity carried out under the Program.

(d) **TYPE OF PROGRAM.**—The Program carried out under subsection (a) may involve assistance in planning and in resolving technical problems associated with weapons destruction and proliferation. The Program may also involve the funding of critical short-term requirements relating to weapons destruction.

(e) **REIMBURSEMENT OF OTHER AGENCIES.**—The Secretary of Defense may reimburse heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government under this section for costs of the participation of the respective departments and agencies in the Program.

(f) **MILITARY-TO-MILITARY AND DEFENSE CONTACTS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the military-to-military and defense contacts carried out under subsection (a)(6)—

(1) are focused and expanded to support specific relationship-building opportunities, which could lead to the development of the Program in new geographic areas and achieve other benefits of the Program;

(2) are directly administered as part of the Program; and

(3) include cooperation and coordination with—

(A) the unified combatant commands; and
(B) the Department of State.

(g) **PRIOR NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **ANNUAL REQUIREMENT.**—Not less than 15 days before any obligation of any Cooperative Threat Reduction funds, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on that proposed obligation of such funds for that fiscal year.

(2) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—Each report under paragraph (1) shall specify—

(A) the activities and forms of assistance for which the Secretary plans to obligate funds;

(B) the amount of the proposed obligation; and

(C) the projected involvement (if any) of any other department or agency of the United States and of the private sector of the United States in the activities and forms of assistance for which the Secretary plans to obligate such funds.

(3) **EXCEPTION FOR NOTIFICATIONS PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a proposed obligation of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds that is covered by a notification previously submitted by the Secretary to the congressional defense committees that includes the matters described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of paragraph (2).

SEC. 1322. USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN EMER- GENT THREATS OR OPPORTUNITIES.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the Program, the Secretary of Defense may obligate and expend Cooperative Threat Reduction

funds for a fiscal year, and any Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for a prior fiscal year that remain available for obligation, for a proliferation threat reduction project or activity if the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, determines each of the following:

(1) That such project or activity will—

(A) assist the United States in the resolution of a critical emerging proliferation threat; or

(B) permit the United States to take advantage of opportunities to achieve long-standing nonproliferation goals.

(2) That such project or activity will be completed in a period not exceeding five years.

(3) That the Department of Defense is the entity of the Federal Government that is most capable of carrying out such project or activity.

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—At the time at which the Secretary obligates funds under subsection (a) for a project or activity, the Secretary of Defense shall notify, in writing, the congressional defense committees and the Secretary of State shall notify, in writing, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of the determinations made under such subsection with respect to such project or activity, together with—

(1) a justification for such determinations; and

(2) a description of the scope and duration of such project or activity.

(c) **NON-DEFENSE AGENCY PARTNER-NATION CONTACTS.**—With respect to military-to-military and defense contacts carried out under subsection (a)(6) of section 1321, as further described in subsection (f) of such section, concurrence of the Secretary of State under subsection (a) is required only for participation in such contacts by personnel from non-defense agencies of foreign countries.

(d) **EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS.**—The requirement for a determination under subsection (a) shall not apply to a state of the former Soviet Union.

SEC. 1323. AUTHORITY FOR URGENT THREAT REDUCTION ACTIVITIES UNDER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR URGENT THREAT REDUCTION ACTIVITIES.**—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), not more than 15 percent of the total amount of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for covered activities.

(b) **SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DETERMINATION AND NOTICE FOR URGENT THREAT REDUCTION ACTIVITIES IN GOVERNED AREAS.**—With respect to an area not covered by subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may obligate or expend funds pursuant to subsection (a) for covered activities if—

(1) the Secretary determines, in writing, that—

(A) a threat arising in such area from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, or biological weapons or weapons-related materials, technologies, or expertise must be addressed urgently;

(B) certain provisions of law would unnecessarily impede the ability of the Secretary to carry out such covered activities to address such threat; and

(C) it is necessary to obligate or expend such funds to carry out such covered activities;

(2) the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy concur with such determination; and

(3) at the time at which the Secretary of Defense first obligates such funds, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submits to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—

(A) the determination under paragraph (1);

(B) a description of the covered activities to be carried out using such funds;

(C) the expected time frame for such activities; and

(D) the expected cost of such activities.

(c) **PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION AND NOTICE FOR URGENT THREAT REDUCTION ACTIVITIES IN UNGOVERNED AREAS.**—With respect to an ungoverned area or an area that is not controlled by an effective governmental authority, as determined by the Secretary of State, the President may obligate or expend funds pursuant to subsection (a) for covered activities if—

(1) the President determines, in writing, that—

(A) a threat arising in such an area from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, or biological weapons or weapons-related materials, technologies, or expertise must be addressed urgently; and

(B) it is necessary to obligate or expend such funds to carry out such covered activities to address such threat; and

(2) at the time at which the President first obligates such funds, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submits to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—

(A) the determination under paragraph (1);

(B) a description of the covered activities to be carried out using such funds;

(C) the expected time frame for such activities; and

(D) the expected cost of such activities.

(d) **COVERED ACTIVITY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered activity” means an activity under the Program to address a threat arising from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, or biological weapons or weapons-related materials, technologies, or expertise.

SEC. 1324. USE OF FUNDS FOR UNSPECIFIED PURPOSES OR FOR INCREASED AMOUNTS.

(a) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF INTENT TO USE FUNDS FOR UNSPECIFIED PURPOSES.**—

(1) **REPORT.**—For any fiscal year for which Cooperative Threat Reduction funds are specifically authorized in an Act other than an appropriations Act for specific purposes within the Program, the Secretary of Defense may obligate or expend such funds, or other funds otherwise made available for the Program for that fiscal year, for purposes other than such specified purposes if—

(A) the Secretary determines that such obligation or expenditure is necessary in the national interests of the United States;

(B) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees—

(i) notification of the intent of the Secretary to make such an obligation or expenditure of funds; and

(ii) a complete discussion of the purpose and justification for such obligation or expenditure, including the amount of funds to be obligated or expended; and

(C) a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary submits the notification and discussion under subparagraph (B).

(2) **CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER LAWS.**—Paragraph (1) may not be construed to authorize the obligation or expenditure of Cooperative Threat Reduction Program funds for a purpose for which the obligation or expenditure of such funds is specifically prohibited under section 1331 or any other provision of law.

(b) **LIMITED AUTHORITY TO VARY INDIVIDUAL AMOUNTS PROVIDED FOR ANY FISCAL YEAR FOR SPECIFIED PURPOSES.**—For any fiscal year for which Cooperative Threat Reduction funds are specifically authorized in an Act other than an appropriations Act for specific purposes within the Program, the Secretary may obligate or expend such funds, or other funds otherwise made available for the Program for that fiscal year, in excess of the specific amount so authorized for that purpose if—

(1) the Secretary determines that such obligation or expenditure is necessary in the national interests of the United States;

(2) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees—

(A) notification of the intent of the Secretary to make such an obligation or expenditure of funds in excess of such authorized amount; and

(B) a complete discussion of the justification for exceeding such specified amounts, including the amount by which the Secretary will exceed such specified amounts; and

(3) a period of 15 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary submits the notification and discussion under paragraph (2).

SEC. 1325. USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may enter into one or more agreements with any person (including a foreign government, international organization, multinational entity, or any other entity) that the Secretary considers appropriate under which the person contributes funds for activities conducted under the Program.

(2) **CONCURRENCE BY SECRETARY OF STATE.**—The Secretary may enter into an agreement under paragraph (1) only with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

(b) **RETENTION AND USE OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, and subject to subsections (c) and (d), the Secretary of Defense may retain and obligate or expend funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a) for purposes of the Program. Funds so contributed shall be retained in a separate fund established in the Treasury for such purposes and shall be available to be obligated or expended without further appropriation.

(c) **RETURN OF FUNDS NOT OBLIGATED OR EXPENDED WITHIN THREE YEARS.**—If the Secretary does not obligate or expend funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a) by the date that is three years after the date on which the contribution was made, the Secretary shall return the amount to the person who made the contribution.

(d) **NOTICE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after receiving funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notice—

(A) specifying the value of the contribution and the purpose for which the contribution was made; and

(B) identifying the person who made the contribution.

(2) **LIMITATION ON USE OF AMOUNTS.**—The Secretary may not obligate funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a) until a period of 15 days elapses following the date on which the Secretary submits the notice under paragraph (1).

(e) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than the first Monday in February of each year, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on amounts contributed pursuant to subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year. Each such report shall include, for the fiscal year covered by the report, the following:

(1) A statement of any funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a), including, for each such contribution, the value of the contribution and the identity of the person who made the contribution.

(2) A statement of any funds so contributed that were obligated or expended by the Secretary, including, for each such contribution, the purposes for which the funds were obligated or expended.

(3) A statement of any funds so contributed that were retained but not obligated or expended, including, for each such contribution, the purposes (if known) for which the Secretary intends to obligate or expend the amount.

(f) **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.**—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees—

(1) an implementation plan for the authority provided under this section prior to obligating or expending any funds contributed pursuant to subsection (a); and

(2) any updates to such plan that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(g) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

PART II—RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

SEC. 1331. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR SPECIFIED PURPOSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Cooperative Threat Reduction funds may not be obligated or expended for any of the following purposes:

(1) Conducting any peacekeeping exercise or other peacekeeping-related activity.

(2) Provision of housing.

(3) Provision of assistance to promote environmental restoration.

(4) Provision of assistance to promote job retraining.

(5) Provision of assistance to promote defense conversion.

(b) **LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS.**—Cooperative Threat Reduction funds may not be obligated or expended for the elimination of—

(1) conventional weapons; or

(2) delivery vehicles of conventional weapons, unless such delivery vehicles could reasonably be used or adapted to be used for the delivery of chemical, nuclear, or biological weapons.

SEC. 1332. REQUIREMENT FOR ON-SITE MANAGERS.

(a) **ON-SITE MANAGER REQUIREMENT.**—Before obligating any Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for a project described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall

appoint one on-site manager for that project. The manager shall be appointed from among employees of the Federal Government.

(b) **PROJECTS COVERED.**—Subsection (a) applies to a project—

(1) to be located in a state of the former Soviet Union;

(2) which involves dismantlement, destruction, or storage facilities, or construction of a facility; and

(3) with respect to which the total contribution by the Department of Defense is expected to exceed \$50,000,000.

(c) **DUTIES OF ON-SITE MANAGER.**—The on-site manager appointed under subsection (a) shall—

(1) develop, in cooperation with representatives from governments of states participating in the project, a list of those steps or activities critical to achieving the disarmament or nonproliferation goals of the project;

(2) establish a schedule for completing those steps or activities;

(3) meet with all participants to seek assurances that those steps or activities are being completed on schedule; and

(4) suspend the participation of the United States in a project when a participant other than the United States fails to complete a scheduled step or activity on time, unless the Secretary of Defense directs the on-site manager to resume the participation of the United States.

(d) **AUTHORITY TO MANAGE MORE THAN ONE PROJECT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), an employee of the Federal Government may serve as on-site manager for more than one project, including projects at different locations.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—If such an employee serves as on-site manager for more than one project in a fiscal year, the total cost of the projects for that fiscal year may not exceed \$150,000,000.

(e) **STEPS OR ACTIVITIES.**—Steps or activities referred to in subsection (c)(1) are those steps or activities that, if not completed, will prevent a project from achieving its disarmament or nonproliferation goals, including, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Identification and acquisition of permits (as defined in section 1333).

(2) Verification that the items, substances, or capabilities to be dismantled, secured, or otherwise modified are available for dismantlement, securing, or modification.

(3) Timely provision of financial, personnel, management, transportation, and other resources.

(f) **NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—In any case in which the Secretary directs an on-site manager to resume the participation of the United States in a project under subsection (c)(4), the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees of such direction by not later than 30 days after the date of such direction.

SEC. 1333. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS UNTIL CERTAIN PERMITS OBTAINED.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall seek to obtain all the permits required to complete each phase of construction of a project under the Program in a state of the former Soviet Union before obligating more than 40 percent of the total costs of that phase of the project.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), with respect to a new construction project to be carried out by the Program, not more than 40 percent of the total costs of the project may be obligated from Cooperative

Threat Reduction funds for any fiscal year until the Secretary—

(1) determines the number and type of permits that may be required for the lifetime of the project in the proposed location or locations of the project; and

(2) obtains from the state in which the project is to be located any permits that may be required to begin construction.

(c) **EXCEPTION TO LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS.**—The limitation in subsection (b) on the obligation of funds for a construction project otherwise covered by such subsection shall not apply with respect to the obligation of funds for a particular project if the Secretary—

(1) determines that it is necessary in the national interest to obligate funds for such project; and

(2) submits to the congressional defense committees a notification of the intent to obligate funds for such project, together with a complete discussion of the justification for doing so.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, with respect to a project under the Program:

(1) The term “new construction project” means a construction project for which no funds have been obligated or expended as of November 24, 2003.

(2) The term “permit” means any local or national permit for development, general construction, environmental, land use, or other purposes that is required for purposes of major construction.

SEC. 1334. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACTIVITIES WITH RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should carry out activities under the Program in the Russian Federation only if those activities are consistent with and in support of the security interests of the United States; and

(2) in carrying out any such activities after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense should focus on only those activities that—

(A) are in support of the arms control obligations of the United States and the Russian Federation; or

(B) will reduce the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction and related materials and technology to the United States and countries in the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian regions.

(b) **COMPLETION OF COOPERATION THREAT REDUCTION ACTIVITIES IN RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**—Cooperative Threat Reduction funds made available for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015 may not be obligated or expended for activities in the Russian Federation unless such activities in Russia are specifically authorized by law.

PART III—RECURRING CERTIFICATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 1341. ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS ON USE OF FACILITIES BEING CONSTRUCTED FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROJECTS OR ACTIVITIES.

Not later than the first Monday in February each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a certification for each facility of a project or activity of the Program for which construction occurred during the preceding fiscal year on matters as follows:

(1) Whether or not such facility will be used for its intended purpose by the government of the foreign country in which the facility is constructed.

(2) Whether or not the government of such country remains committed to the use of such facility for such purpose.

(3) Whether the actions needed to ensure security at the facility, including the secure transportation of any materials, substances, or weapons to, from, or within the facility, have been taken.

SEC. 1342. REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT SUMMARY OF AMOUNTS REQUESTED BY PROJECT CATEGORY.

(a) **SUMMARY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees in the materials and manner specified in subsection (c)—

(1) a descriptive summary, with respect to the appropriations requested for the Program for the fiscal year after the fiscal year in which the summary is submitted, of the amounts requested for each project category under each program element; and

(2) a descriptive summary, with respect to appropriations for the Program for the fiscal year in which the list is submitted and the previous fiscal year, of the amounts obligated or expended, or planned to be obligated or expended, for each project category under each program element.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF PURPOSE AND INTENT.**—The descriptive summary required under subsection (a) shall include a narrative description of each program and project category under each program element that explains the purpose and intent of the funds requested.

(c) **INCLUSION IN CERTAIN MATERIALS SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS.**—The summary required to be submitted in a fiscal year under subsection (a) shall be set forth by project category, and by amounts specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection in connection with such project category, in each of the following:

(1) The annual report on activities and assistance under the Program required in such fiscal year under section 1343.

(2) The budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for the fiscal year succeeding such fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code).

SEC. 1343. REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES AND ASSISTANCE UNDER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—In any year in which the President submits to Congress, under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the budget for a fiscal year that requests funds for the Department of Defense for activities or assistance under the Program, the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the activities and assistance carried out under the Program.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—Each report under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than the first Monday in February of a year.

(c) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—Each report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An estimate of the total amount that will be required to be expended by the United States during the fiscal year covered by the budget described in subsection (a) in order to achieve the objectives of the Program.

(2) A five-year plan setting forth the amount of funds and other resources proposed to be provided by the United States for the Program during the period covered by the plan, including the purpose for which such funds and resources will be used.

(3) A description of the activities and assistance carried out under the Program during the fiscal year preceding the submission of the report, including—

(A) the funds notified, obligated, and expended for such activities and assistance and the purposes for which such funds were notified, obligated, and expended for such fiscal year and cumulatively for the Program;

(B) a description of the participation, if any, of each department and agency of the Federal Government in such activities and assistance;

(C) a description of such activities and assistance, including the forms of assistance provided;

(D) a description of the United States private sector participation in the portion of such activities and assistance that were supported by the obligation and expenditure of funds for the Program; and

(E) such other information as the Secretary considers appropriate to fully inform Congress of the operation of activities and assistance carried out under the Program, including, with respect to proposed demilitarization or conversion projects, information on the progress toward demilitarization of facilities and the conversion of the demilitarized facilities to civilian activities.

(4) A description of the means (including program management, audits, examinations, and other means) used by the United States during the fiscal year preceding the submission of the report to ensure that assistance provided under the Program is fully accounted for, that such assistance is being used for its intended purpose, and that such assistance is being used efficiently and effectively, including—

(A) if such assistance consisted of equipment, a description of the current location of such equipment and the current condition of such equipment;

(B) if such assistance consisted of contracts or other services, a description of the status of such contracts or services and the methods used to ensure that such contracts and services are being used for their intended purpose;

(C) a determination whether the assistance described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) has been used for its intended purpose and an assessment of whether the assistance being provided is being used effectively and efficiently; and

(D) a description of the efforts planned to be carried out during the fiscal year beginning in the year of the report to ensure that Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction assistance provided during such fiscal year is fully accounted for and is used for its intended purpose.

(5) A description of the defense and military activities carried out under section 1321(a)(6) during the fiscal year preceding the submission of the report, including—

(A) the amount of funds obligated or expended for such activities;

(B) the strategy, goals, and objectives for which such funds were obligated and expended;

(C) a description of the activities carried out, including the forms of assistance provided, and the justification for each form of assistance provided;

(D) the success of each activity, including the goals and objectives achieved for each activity;

(E) a description of participation by private sector entities in the United States in carrying out such activities, and the participation of any other department or agency of the Federal Government in such activities; and

(F) any other information that the Secretary considers relevant to provide a complete description of the operation and success of activities carried out under the Program.

SEC. 1344. METRICS FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Defense shall implement metrics to measure the impact and effectiveness of activities of the Program to address threats arising from the proliferation of chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

PART IV—REPEALS AND TRANSITION PROVISIONS

SEC. 1351. REPEALS.

The following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) Sections 212, 221, 222, and 231 of the Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991 (title II of Public Law 102-228; 22 U.S.C. 2551 note).

(2) Sections 1412 and 1431 of the Former Soviet Union Demilitarization Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5902 and 5921).

(3) Sections 1203, 1204, 1206, and 1208 of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (22 U.S.C. 5952, 5953, 5955, and 5957).

(4) Section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106; 22 U.S.C. 5955 note).

(5) Section 1501 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-201; 50 U.S.C. 2362 note).

(6) Section 1307 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note).

(7) Section 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note).

(8)(A) Sections 1303 and 1304 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note).

(B) Section 1306 of such Act (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 114 Stat. 1654A-340).

(C) Section 1308 of such Act (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 22 U.S.C. 5959).

(9) Section 1304 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note).

(10) Sections 1305 and 1306 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314; 116 Stat. 2673; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note).

(11) Sections 1303, 1305, 1307, and 1308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5960, 5961, 5962, and 5963).

(12)(A) Section 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note).

(B) Sections 1304 and 1305 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 5964 and 5965).

(C) Section 1306 of such Act (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2560; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note).

SEC. 1352. TRANSITION PROVISIONS.

(a) DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN PROLIFERATION THREAT REDUCTION PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.—Any determination made before the date of the enactment of this Act under section 1308(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (22 U.S.C. 5963(a)) shall be treated as a determination under section 1322(a).

(b) DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO URGENT THREAT REDUCTION ACTIVITIES.—Any determination made before the date of the enactment of this Act under section 1305(b) of the

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (22 U.S.C. 5965(b)) shall be treated as a determination under section 1323(b).

(c) FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM.—Funds made available for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1632) or the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 672) that remain available for obligation as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be available for the Program.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Military Programs

Sec. 1401. Working capital funds.

Sec. 1402. Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.

Sec. 1403. Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.

Sec. 1404. Defense Inspector General.

Sec. 1405. Defense Health Program.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Sec. 1411. Authority for transfer of funds to joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, Illinois.

Sec. 1412. Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Sec. 1413. Comptroller General of the United States report on Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, North Chicago, Illinois.

Subtitle A—Military Programs

SEC. 1401. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1402. CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

(b) USE.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) are authorized for—

(1) the destruction of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521); and

(2) the destruction of chemical warfare materiel of the United States that is not covered by section 1412 of such Act.

SEC. 1403. DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE-WIDE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1404. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

SEC. 1405. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4501, for use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense in providing for the health of eligible beneficiaries.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 1411. AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO JOINT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FACILITY DEMONSTRATION FUND FOR CAPTAIN JAMES A. LOVELL FEDERAL HEALTH CARE CENTER, ILLINOIS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for section 1405 and available for the Defense Health Program for operation and maintenance, \$146,857,000 may be transferred by the Secretary of Defense to the Joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund established by subsection (a)(1) of section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2571). For purposes of subsection (a)(2) of such section 1704, any funds so transferred shall be treated as amounts authorized and appropriated specifically for the purpose of such a transfer.

(b) USE OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.—For the purposes of subsection (b) of such section 1704, facility operations for which funds transferred under subsection (a) may be used are operations of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, consisting of the North Chicago Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the Navy Ambulatory Care Center, and supporting facilities designated as a combined Federal medical facility under an operational agreement covered by section 706 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4500).

SEC. 1412. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund the sum of \$63,400,000 for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

SEC. 1413. COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES REPORT ON CAPTAIN JAMES A. LOVELL FEDERAL HEALTH CARE CENTER, NORTH CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the submittal to Congress by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of the evaluation report on the joint Department of Defense—Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility demonstration project known as the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, North Chicago, Illinois, that is required to be submitted in March 2016, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on that demonstration project.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include an assessment by the Comptroller General of the following:

(1) The evaluation measures, standards, and criteria used by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to measure the overall effectiveness and success of the medical facility referred to in subsection (a).

(2) The measurable effect, if any, on the missions of the Department of the Navy and the Department of Veterans Affairs of the

provision of care in a joint facility such as the medical facility.

(3) Such other matters with respect to the medical facility demonstration project described in subsection (a) as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.**—For purposes of the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall make available to the Comptroller General any documents related to the medical facility demonstration project referred to in such subsection, including any evaluation plans, task summaries, in-process reviews, interim reports, and draft final report.

(d) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 1501. Purpose.

Sec. 1502. Procurement.

Sec. 1503. Research, development, test, and evaluation.

Sec. 1504. Operation and maintenance.

Sec. 1505. Military personnel.

Sec. 1506. Working capital funds.

Sec. 1507. Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide.

Sec. 1508. Defense Inspector General.

Sec. 1509. Defense Health program.

Sec. 1510. Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.

Sec. 1511. European Reassurance Initiative.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters

Sec. 1521. Treatment as additional authorizations.

Sec. 1522. Special transfer authority.

Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters

Sec. 1531. Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund.

Sec. 1532. Afghanistan Security Forces Fund.

Sec. 1533. Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund.

Sec. 1534. Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.

Sec. 1535. European Reassurance Initiative.

Sec. 1536. Plan for transition of funding of United States Special Operations Command from supplemental funding for overseas contingency operations to recurring funding for future-years defense programs.

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 1501. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this subtitle is to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 to provide additional funds for overseas contingency operations being carried out by the Armed Forces.

SEC. 1502. PROCUREMENT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for procurement accounts for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities, as specified in the funding table in section 4102.

SEC. 1503. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the

Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation, as specified in the funding table in section 4202.

SEC. 1504. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, as specified in the funding table in section 4302.

SEC. 1505. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for military personnel, as specified in the funding table in section 4402.

SEC. 1506. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1507. DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE-WIDE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1508. DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1509. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Defense Health Program, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

SEC. 1510. COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

(b) **DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.**—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2016.

SEC. 1511. EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the European Reassurance Initiative, as specified in the funding table in section 4502.

(b) **DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.**—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall remain available for obligation through September 30, 2016.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters

SEC. 1521. TREATMENT AS ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 1522. SPECIAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this title for fiscal year 2015 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—The total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this subsection may not exceed \$3,500,000,000.

(b) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Transfers under this section shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as transfers under section 1001.

(c) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.**—The transfer authority provided by this section is in addition to the transfer authority provided under section 1001.

Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters

SEC. 1531. AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND.

No amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be available for, or used for purposes of, the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund.

SEC. 1532. AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND.

(a) **CONTINUATION OF EXISTING LIMITATION ON THE USE OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.**—Funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund for fiscal year 2015 shall be subject to the conditions contained in subsections (b) through (g) of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 428), as amended by section 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4424).

(b) **EQUIPMENT DISPOSITION.**—

(1) **ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may accept equipment that is procured using amounts in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund authorized under this Act and is intended for transfer to the security forces of Afghanistan, but is not accepted by such security forces.

(2) **CONDITIONS ON ACCEPTANCE OF EQUIPMENT.**—Before accepting any equipment under the authority provided by paragraph (1)—

(A) the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees the report required by subsection (c); and

(B) the Commander of United States forces in Afghanistan shall make a determination that the equipment was procured for the purpose of meeting requirements of the security forces of Afghanistan, as agreed to by both the Government of Afghanistan and the United States, but is no longer required by such security forces or was damaged before transfer to such security forces.

(3) **ELEMENTS OF DETERMINATION.**—In making a determination under paragraph (2)(B) regarding equipment, the Commander of United States forces in Afghanistan shall consider alternatives to Secretary of Defense acceptance of the equipment. An explanation of each determination, including the basis for the determination and the alternatives considered, shall be included in the relevant quarterly report required under paragraph (5).

(4) **TREATMENT AS DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STOCKS.**—Equipment accepted under the authority provided by paragraph (1) may be treated as stocks of the Department of Defense upon notification to the congressional defense committees of such treatment.

(5) **QUARTERLY REPORTS ON EQUIPMENT DISPOSITION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 90-day period thereafter during which the authority provided by paragraph (1) is exercised, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the equipment accepted under this subsection or section 1531(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 938; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note) during the period covered by the report. Each report shall include a list of all equipment that was accepted during the period covered by the report and treated as stocks of the Department and copies of the determinations made under paragraph (2)(B), as required by paragraph (3).

(c) **REPORT ON AFGHANISTAN EQUIPMENT PROCUREMENT PROCESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander of United States forces in Afghanistan, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing in detail—

(1) the methods used to identify equipment requirements for the security forces of Afghanistan and to incorporate such requirements into the procurement process for such security forces; and

(2) the steps being taken to improve coordination between United States forces in Afghanistan and the security forces of Afghanistan within such procurement process.

(d) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 1531(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 938; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note)—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “prior Acts” and inserting “this Act or prior Acts”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3).

SEC. 1533. JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND.

(a) **USE AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 1514 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 120 Stat. 2439), as in effect before the amendments made by section 1503 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4649), but as amended by subsection (b) of this section, shall apply to the funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund for fiscal year 2015.

(b) **PLAN FOR CONSOLIDATION AND ALIGNMENT OF RAPID ACQUISITION ORGANIZATIONS.**—

(1) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to consolidate and align all of the rapid acquisition or quick reaction capability organizations, including, at a minimum, the following—

(A) The Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO).

(B) The Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell (JRAC).

(C) The Warfighter Senior Integration Group (SIG).

(D) The Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Task Force.

(E) The Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council (AROC).

(F) Any other Department of Defense-wide or military department specific organizations, and associated capabilities and funding, carrying out comparable joint urgent operational needs (JUONs) or joint emergent operational needs (JEONs) efforts.

(2) **PLAN ELEMENTS.**—The plan required by this subsection shall include the following elements:

(A) A review, and if necessary, recommended modifications to the current arrangements for oversight of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(B) A review and, if necessary, recommended modifications to the current policies and regulations governing the satisfaction of joint urgent operational needs (JUONs) and joint emergent operational needs (JEONs).

(C) A review, and if necessary, recommended modifications to authorities provided to enduring or successor rapid acquisition or quick reaction capability organizations.

(3) **PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.**—The plan required by this subsection shall include a timeline for—

(A) implementation of the consolidation and alignment decisions contained in the plan; and

(B) consolidation of funding sources, including the consolidation of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund with the Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund.

(c) **EXTENSION OF INTERDICTION OF IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE PRECURSOR CHEMICALS AUTHORITY.**—Section 1532(c)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2057), as amended by section 1532(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 939), is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”.

(d) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **PROHIBITION; EXCEPTIONS.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization may be used for the purposes of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization assigning personnel or contractors on a permanent or temporary basis, or as a detail, to the combatant commands or associated military components unless such personnel or contractors are supporting—

(A) Operation Enduring Freedom and any successor operation to that operation,

(B) Operation Inherent Resolve and any successor operation to that operation, or

(C) another operation that, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, requires the direct support of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization.

(2) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—If the Secretary of Defense makes a determination pursuant to paragraph (1)(C) that an operation requires the direct support of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a notice of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

SEC. 1534. COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND.

(a) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by this title for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund shall be available for the following purposes:

(1) To provide support and assistance to foreign security forces or other groups or in-

dividuals to conduct, support, or facilitate counterterrorism and crisis response activities under authority provided the Department of Defense by any other provision of law (in this section referred to as an “underlying Department of Defense authority”).

(2) To improve the capacity of the United States Armed Forces to provide enabling support to counterterrorism and crisis response activities undertaken by foreign security forces or other groups or individuals under any underlying Department of Defense authority.

(b) **GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Activities using amounts available pursuant to subsection (a) may be conducted only in the area of responsibility of the United States Central Command or the United States Africa Command, but may not include activities for the provision of assistance or other support for the Government of Iraq.

(2) **ADDITIONAL AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY.**—Activities using amounts available pursuant to subsection (a) may be conducted in an area of responsibility of a geographic combatant command not specified in paragraph (1) if the Secretary of Defense determines that—

(A) such activities are consistent with the purposes specified in subsection (a);

(B) the absence of such activities would result in an increased risk to the national security of the United States; and

(C) such activities could not be conducted using funds already available to the Department of Defense (other than funds transferred from the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund).

(3) **NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF ADDITIONAL AREAS.**—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a notification of any determination made pursuant to paragraph (2) not later than 15 days before transferring amounts from the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund for activities in the area of responsibility covered by such determination.

(c) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—Activities using amounts available pursuant to subsection (a) may be conducted by contract, including contractor-operated capabilities, if the Secretary of Defense typically acquires services or equipment by contract in conducting a similar activity for the Department of Defense.

(d) **TRANSFER REQUIREMENT AND AUTHORITIES.**—

(1) **USE OF FUNDS ONLY PURSUANT TO TRANSFER.**—Amounts in the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund may be used for the purposes specified in subsection (a) only pursuant to transfers authorized by this subsection.

(2) **TRANSFERS AUTHORIZED.**—Amounts in the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund may be transferred from the Fund to any accounts of the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance for the purposes specified in subsection (a).

(3) **REPROGRAMMING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall submit a reprogramming or transfer request from amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 1510 to the congressional defense committees to carry out activities supported under this section. Each such request shall set forth the following:

(A) A detailed description of the activities to be supported by the reprogramming or transfer, including the request of the commander of the combatant command concerned for support, urgent operational need, or emergent operational need.

(B) The amount planned to be obligated or expended on such activities, the recipient of such amount, and the timeline for such obligation or expenditure.

(C) The underlying Department of Defense authorities that authorize such activities.

(4) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—The transfer of an amount to an account under the authority in paragraph (2) shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for such account by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(5) TRANSFERS BACK TO THE FUND.—Upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund under paragraph (2) are not necessary for the purpose provided, such funds may be transferred back to the Fund.

(6) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The transfer authority provided by paragraph (2) is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense.

(e) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), nothing in this section may be construed to terminate, alter, or override any requirement or limitation applicable to activities funded with amounts in the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund under the underlying Department of Defense authority that authorizes such activities.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY OF LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—A limitation on the amount that may be used for activities in a fiscal year under the underlying Department of Defense authority that authorizes such activities shall not apply to amounts made available for such activities in such fiscal year pursuant to this section.

(f) PLAN.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the intended management and use of the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund. The plan shall include the following:

(1) An identification of the underlying Department of Defense authorities that the Secretary has identified as available for use pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) A detailed description, to the maximum extent practicable, of the requirements, activities, and planned allocation of amounts available for use pursuant to subsection (a).

(3) An identification of the senior civilian employee of the Department of Defense designated by the Secretary to serve as manager of the Fund.

(g) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the end of the first half of fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017, and the second half of fiscal years 2015 and 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth, for the preceding fiscal half-year, the following:

(1) A description of the underlying Department of Defense authorities that authorized activities supported by the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund.

(2) A description of the activities supported by the Fund.

(3) A description of any obligations and expenditures of amounts transferred from the Fund, including recipients of amounts, set forth by country (where applicable).

(4) A description of any determinations made as described in subsection (d)(5), and a description of any transfers back to the Fund pursuant to that subsection.

(5) A description of any revisions to the plan submitted pursuant to subsection (f).

(h) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—No amounts may be transferred from the Counterter-

rorism Partnerships Fund after December 31, 2016.

SEC. 1535. EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) TOTAL AMOUNT AND AUTHORIZED PURPOSES OF ERI.—The \$1,000,000,000 authorized to be appropriated in sections 1502, 1504, 1505, 1511, and 2904 for fiscal year 2015 for the European Reassurance Initiative, as specified in the funding tables in sections 4102, 4302, 4402, 4502, and 4602, may be used by the Secretary of Defense solely for the following purposes:

(1) Activities to increase the presence of the United States Armed Forces in Europe.

(2) Bilateral and multilateral military exercises and training with allies and partner nations in Europe.

(3) Activities to improve infrastructure in Europe to enhance the responsiveness of the United States Armed Forces.

(4) Activities to enhance the prepositioning in Europe of equipment of the United States Armed Forces.

(5) Activities to build the defense and security capacity of allies and partner nations in Europe.

(b) ACTIVITIES TO BUILD DEFENSE AND SECURITY CAPACITY OF ALLIES AND PARTNER NATIONS.—Of the funds made available for the European Reassurance Initiative that will be used for the purpose specified in subsection (a)(5)—

(1) not less than \$75,000,000 shall be available to be used for programs, activities, and assistance to support the Government of Ukraine;

(2) not less than \$30,000,000 shall be available to be used for programs and activities to build the capacity of European allies and partner nations; and

(3) the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds to support activities conducted under the authorities of the Department of Defense specified in section 1274(c) of this Act.

(c) TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO CERTAIN FUNDS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS ONLY PURSUANT TO TRANSFER.—In the case of the funds authorized to be appropriated in section 1511 for the European Reassurance Initiative Fund, as specified in the funding tables in section 4502, the funds may be used for the purposes specified in subsection (a) only pursuant to a transfer of the funds to either or both of the following accounts of the Department of Defense:

(A) Military personnel accounts.

(B) Operation and maintenance accounts.

(2) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—During fiscal years 2015 and 2016, the transfer of an amount made available for the European Reassurance Initiative to an account under the authority provided by paragraph (1) or subsection (b)(3) shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for such account by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(3) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The transfer authority provided by paragraph (1) and subsection (b)(3) is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense.

(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 15 days before that date on which a transfer of funds under subsection (b)(3) or (c)(1) takes effect, the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing of the planned transfer. Each notice of a transfer of funds shall include the following:

(1) A detailed description of the project or activity to be supported by the transfer of funds, including any request of the Com-

mander of the United States European Command for support, urgent operational need, or emergent operational need.

(2) The amount planned to be transferred and expended on such project or activity.

(3) A timeline for expenditure of the transferred funds.

(e) DURATION OF TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The transfer authority provided by subsections (b)(3) and (c)(1) expires September 30, 2016.

SEC. 1536. PLAN FOR TRANSITION OF FUNDING OF UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND FROM SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TO RECURRING FUNDING FOR FUTURE-YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAMS.

At the same time the budget of the President for fiscal year 2016 is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to maintain critical and enduring special operations capabilities for the United States Special Operations Command by fully transitioning funding for the United States Special Operations Command from funds available for overseas contingency operations to funds available for the Department of Defense on a recurring basis for purposes of future-years defense programs.

TITLE XVI.—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Subtitle A—Space Activities

Sec. 1601. Department of Defense Space Security and Defense Program.

Sec. 1602. Evolved expendable launch vehicle notification.

Sec. 1603. Satellite communications responsibilities of Executive Agent for Space.

Sec. 1604. Rocket propulsion system development program.

Sec. 1605. Pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite communication services.

Sec. 1606. Update of National Security Space Strategy to include space control and space superiority strategy.

Sec. 1607. Allocation of funds for the Space Security and Defense Program; report on space control.

Sec. 1608. Prohibition on contracting with Russian suppliers of rocket engines for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

Sec. 1609. Assessment of evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

Sec. 1610. Competitive procedures required to launch payload for mission number five of the Operationally Responsive Space Program.

Sec. 1611. Availability of additional rocket cores pursuant to competitive procedures.

Sec. 1612. Limitations on availability of funds for weather satellite follow-on system and Defense Meteorological Satellite program.

Sec. 1613. Limitation on availability of funds for space-based infrared systems space data exploitation.

Sec. 1614. Limitations on availability of funds for hosted payload and wide field of view testbed of the space-based infrared systems.

Sec. 1615. Limitations on availability of funds for protected tactical demonstration and protected military satellite communications testbed of the advanced extremely high frequency program.

Sec. 1616. Study of space situational awareness architecture.

Sec. 1617. Briefing on range support for launches in support of national security.

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities

Sec. 1621. Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities Executive Agent.

Sec. 1622. One-year extension of report on imagery intelligence and geospatial information support provided to regional organizations and security alliances.

Sec. 1623. Extension of Secretary of Defense authority to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities.

Sec. 1624. Extension of authority relating to jurisdiction over Department of Defense facilities for intelligence collection or special operations activities abroad.

Sec. 1625. Assessment and limitation on availability of funds for intelligence activities and programs of United States Special Operations Command and special operations forces.

Sec. 1626. Annual briefing on the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements of the combatant commands.

Sec. 1627. Prohibition on National Intelligence Program consolidation.

Sec. 1628. Personnel security and insider threat.

Sec. 1629. Migration of Distributed Common Ground System of Department of the Army to an open system architecture.

Subtitle C—Cyberspace-Related Matters

Sec. 1631. Budgeting and accounting for cyber mission forces.

Sec. 1632. Reporting on cyber incidents with respect to networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors.

Sec. 1633. Executive agents for cyber test and training ranges.

Sec. 1634. Cyberspace mapping.

Sec. 1635. Review of cross domain solution policy and requirement for cross domain solution strategy.

Sec. 1636. Requirement for strategy to develop and deploy decryption service for the Joint Information Environment.

Sec. 1637. Actions to address economic or industrial espionage in cyber space.

Sec. 1638. Sense of Congress regarding role of reserve components in defense of United States against cyber attacks.

Sec. 1639. Sense of Congress on the future of the Internet and the .MIL top-level domain.

Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces

Sec. 1641. Preparation of annual budget request regarding nuclear weapons.

Sec. 1642. Improvement to biennial assessment on delivery platforms for nuclear weapons and the nuclear command and control system.

Sec. 1643. Congressional Budget Office review of cost estimates for nuclear weapons.

Sec. 1644. Retention of missile silos.

Sec. 1645. Procurement authority for certain parts of intercontinental ballistic missile fuzes.

Sec. 1646. Assessment of nuclear weapon secondary requirement.

Sec. 1647. Certification on nuclear force structure.

Sec. 1648. Advance notice and reports on B61 life extension program.

Sec. 1649. Notification and report concerning removal or consolidation of dual-capable aircraft from Europe.

Sec. 1650. Reports on installation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems at headquarters of United States Strategic Command.

Sec. 1651. Report on plans for response of Department of Defense to INF Treaty violation.

Sec. 1652. Statement of policy on the nuclear triad.

Sec. 1653. Sense of Congress on deterrence and defense posture of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs

Sec. 1661. Availability of funds for Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

Sec. 1662. Testing and assessment of missile defense systems prior to production and deployment.

Sec. 1663. Acquisition plan for re-designed exo-atmospheric kill vehicle.

Sec. 1664. Study on testing program of ground-based midcourse missile defense system.

Sec. 1665. Sense of Congress and report on homeland ballistic missile defense.

Sec. 1666. Sense of Congress and report on regional ballistic missile defense.

Subtitle A—Space Activities

SEC. 1601. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) critical United States national security space systems are facing a serious growing foreign threat;

(2) the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation are both developing capabilities to disrupt the use of space by the United States in a conflict, as recently outlined by the Director of National Intelligence in testimony before Congress; and

(3) a fully-developed multi-faceted space security and defense program is needed to deter and defeat any adversaries' acts of space aggression.

(b) REPORT ON ABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES TO DETER AND DEFEAT ADVERSARY SPACE AGGRESSION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an assessment of the ability of the Department of Defense to deter and defeat any act of space aggression by an adversary.

(c) STUDY ON ALTERNATIVE DEFENSE AND DETERRENCE STRATEGIES IN RESPONSE TO FOREIGN COUNTERSPACE CAPABILITIES.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Office of Net Assessment, shall conduct a study of potential

alternative defense and deterrent strategies in response to the existing and projected counterspace capabilities of China and Russia. Such study shall include an assessment of the congruence of such strategies with the current United States defense strategy and defense programs of record, and the associated implications of pursuing such strategies.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees the results of the study required under paragraph (1).

SEC. 1602. EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE NOTIFICATION.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—At the same time as the President submits the budget required under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, the Secretary of the Air Force shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees notice of each change to the evolved expendable launch vehicle acquisition plan and schedule from the plan and schedule included in the budget submitted by the President under such section 1105 for fiscal year 2015. Such notification shall include—

(1) an identification of the change;

(2) a national security rationale for the change;

(3) the impact of the change on the evolved expendable launch vehicle block buy contract;

(4) the impact of the change on the opportunities for competition for certified evolved expendable launch vehicle launch providers; and

(5) the costs or savings of the change.

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT IF NO CHANGES.—No notification under subsection (a) is required if at the time such notification would be required no change described in subsection (a) has occurred.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) with respect to a change to the evolved expendable launch vehicle acquisition schedule for an intelligence-related launch, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 1603. SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXECUTIVE AGENT FOR SPACE.

The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, revise Department of Defense directives and guidance to require the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space to ensure that in developing space strategies, architectures, and programs for satellite communications, the Executive Agent shall—

(1) conduct strategic planning to ensure the Department of Defense is effectively and efficiently meeting the satellite communications requirements of the military departments and commanders of the combatant commands;

(2) coordinate with the secretaries of the military departments, the commanders of the combatant commands, and the heads of Defense Agencies to eliminate duplication of effort and to ensure that resources are used to achieve the maximum effort in related satellite communication science and technology; research, development, test and evaluation; production; and operations and sustainment;

(3) coordinate with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Chief Information Officer of the Department to ensure that effective and efficient acquisition approaches are being used to acquire military and commercial satellite communications for the Department, including space, ground, and user terminal integration; and

(4) coordinate with the chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council to develop a process to identify the current and projected satellite communications requirements of the Department.

SEC. 1604. ROCKET PROPULSION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop a next-generation rocket propulsion system that enables the effective, efficient, and expedient transition from the use of non-allied space launch engines to a domestic alternative for national security space launches.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The system developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be available in the United States;

(B) meet the requirements of the national security space community;

(C) be developed by not later than 2019;

(D) be developed using full and open competition; and

(E) be available for purchase by all space launch providers of the United States.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(1) a plan to carry out the development of the rocket propulsion system under subsection (a), including an analysis of the benefits of using public-private partnerships;

(2) the requirements of the program to develop such system; and

(3) the estimated cost of such system.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 1605. PILOT PROGRAM FOR ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL SATELLITE COMMUNICATION SERVICES.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may develop and carry out a pilot program to determine the feasibility and advisability of expanding the use of working capital funds by the Secretary to effectively and efficiently acquire commercial satellite communications services to meet the requirements of the military departments, Defense Agencies, and combatant commanders.

(2) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2020 for the Department of Defense for the acquisition of satellite communications, not more than \$50,000,000 may be obligated or expended for such pilot program during such a fiscal year.

(3) CERTAIN AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out the pilot program under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not use the authorities provided in sections 2208(k) and 2210(b) of title 10, United States Code.

(b) GOALS.—In developing and carrying out the pilot program under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall ensure that the pilot program—

(1) provides a cost-effective and strategic method to acquire commercial satellite communications services;

(2) incentivizes private-sector participation and investment in technologies to meet future requirements of the Department of Defense with respect to commercial satellite communications services;

(3) takes into account the potential for a surge or other change in the demand of the Department for commercial satellite communications services in response to global or regional events; and

(4) ensures the ability of the Secretary to control and account for the cost of programs and work performed under the pilot program.

(c) DURATION.—The pilot program under subsection (a)(1) shall terminate on October 1, 2020.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(A) a plan and schedule to carry out the pilot program under subsection (a)(1); or

(B) if the Secretary finds that carrying out the pilot program authorized under subsection (a)(1) is not an appropriate method to effectively and efficiently acquire commercial satellite communications services, a description of how the Secretary will achieve the goals described in subsection (b) without carrying out such pilot program.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than December 1, 2020, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the pilot program under subsection (a)(1). The report shall include—

(A) an assessment of expanding the use of working capital funds to effectively and efficiently acquire commercial satellite communications services to meet the requirements of the military departments, Defense Agencies, and combatant commanders; and

(B) a description of—

(i) any contract entered into under the pilot program, the funding used under such contract, and the efficiencies realized under such contract;

(ii) the advantages and challenges of using working capital funds as described in subparagraph (A);

(iii) any additional authorities the Secretary determines necessary to acquire commercial satellite communications services as described in subsection (a)(1); and

(iv) any recommendations of the Secretary with respect to improving or extending the pilot program.

SEC. 1606. UPDATE OF NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE STRATEGY TO INCLUDE SPACE CONTROL AND SPACE SUPERIORITY STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, update the National Security Space Strategy to include a strategy relating to space control and space superiority for the protection of national security space assets.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy relating to space control and space superiority required by subsection (a) shall address the following:

(1) Threats to national security space assets.

(2) Protection of national security space assets.

(3) The role of offensive space operations.

(4) Countering offensive space operations.

(5) Operations to implement the strategy.

(6) Projected resources required over the period covered by the current future-years

defense program under section 221 of title 10, United States Code.

(7) The development of an effective deterrence posture.

(c) CONSISTENCY WITH SPACE PROTECTION STRATEGY.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Director, ensure that the strategy relating to space control and space superiority required by subsection (a) is consistent with the Space Protection Strategy developed under section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2271 note).

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31, 2015, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the Director, submit a report on the strategy relating to space control and space superiority required by subsection (a) to—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—If the report required by paragraph (1) is submitted in classified form, such report shall also include an unclassified summary.

(e) SPACE PROTECTION STRATEGY.—Section 911(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) Fiscal years 2026 through 2030.”.

SEC. 1607. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR THE SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM; REPORT ON SPACE CONTROL.

(a) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act and made available for the Space Security and Defense Program, a majority of such funds shall be allocated to the development of offensive space control and active defensive strategies and capabilities.

(b) STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO ALLOCATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall include, in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the budget of the Department of Defense for a fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code), a statement with respect to whether the budget of the Department allocates funds for the Space Security and Defense Program as required by subsection (a).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that contains the following:

(1) An updated integrated capabilities document for offensive space control.

(2) A concept of operations for the defense of critical national security space assets in all orbital regimes.

(3) An assessment of the effectiveness of existing deterrence strategies.

(4) A review of the appropriate types of accounts that should be used to fund space control programs in accordance with the direction required by subsection (a).

(d) TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENT.—The requirements under subsections (a) and (b) shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1608. PROHIBITION ON CONTRACTING WITH RUSSIAN SUPPLIERS OF ROCKET ENGINES FOR THE EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsections (b) and (c), beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense may not award or renew a contract for the procurement of property or

services for space launch activities under the evolved expendable launch vehicle program if such contract carries out such space launch activities using rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation.

(b) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) with respect to a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days before the waiver takes effect, that—

(1) the waiver is necessary for the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) the space launch services and capabilities covered by the contract could not be obtained at a fair and reasonable price without the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation.

(c) **EXCEPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to either—

(A) the placement of orders or the exercise of options under the contract numbered FA8811-13-C-0003 and awarded on December 18, 2013; or

(B) subject to paragraph (2), a contract awarded for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities that includes the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation that prior to February 1, 2014, were either fully paid for by the contractor or covered by a legally binding commitment of the contractor to fully pay for such rocket engines.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—The Secretary may not award or renew a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities described in paragraph (1)(B) unless the Secretary, upon the advice of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the offeror has provided to the Secretary sufficient documentation to conclusively demonstrate that prior to February 1, 2014, the offeror had either fully paid for the rocket engines described in such paragraph or made a legally binding commitment to fully pay for such rocket engines.

SEC. 1609. ASSESSMENT OF EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

Not later than June 1, 2015, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the evolved expendable launch vehicle program that includes an assessment of the advisability of the Secretary of Defense requiring, when selecting launch providers for the program using competitive procedures as described in section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, that new entrant launch providers or incumbent launch providers establish or maintain business systems that comply with the data requirements and cost accounting standards of the Department of Defense, including certified cost or price data.

SEC. 1610. COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES REQUIRED TO LAUNCH PAYLOAD FOR MISSION NUMBER FIVE OF THE OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In awarding a contract for the launch of the payload for mission number five of the Operationally Responsive Space Program, the Secretary of the Air Force shall use competitive procedures described in section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, and ensure that the policies of the Department of Defense concerning competitive space launch opportunities are followed.

(b) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may waive the requirement under subsection (a) if—

(1) the Secretary—

(A) determines that the waiver is necessary in the national security interests of the United States; and

(B) submits to the congressional defense committees a report on such determination and use of the waiver; and

(2) a period of 15 days elapses following the date on which the Secretary submits such report.

SEC. 1611. AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL ROCKET CORES PURSUANT TO COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Relative to the number of rocket cores for which space launch providers certified under the evolved expendable launch vehicle program may submit bids or competitive proposals under competitive procedures pursuant to the National Security Space Launch Procurement Forecast, as of the date on which the President submitted the budget for fiscal year 2015 to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) during fiscal year 2015, increase by one the number of such cores for which such providers may submit bids or competitive proposals; and

(2) for fiscal years 2015 through 2017, increase by one (in addition to the core referred to in paragraph (1)) the number of such cores for which such providers may submit bids or competitive proposals, unless the Secretary—

(A) determines that there is no practicable way to increase the number of such cores for which such providers may submit bids or competitive proposals and remain in compliance with the requirements of the firm fixed price contract for 36 rocket engine cores during the five fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2013; and

(B) not later than 45 days after making such determination, submits to the congressional defense committees—

(i) a certification that there is no practicable way to make the increase described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) a description of the basis for the determination.

(b) **COMPETITIVE PROCEDURES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “competitive procedures” means procedures as described in section 2304 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 1612. LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR WEATHER SATELLITE FOLLOW-ON SYSTEM AND DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM.

(a) **WEATHER SATELLITE FOLLOW-ON SYSTEM.**—

(1) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for the weather satellite follow-on system, not more than 50 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees the plan under paragraph (2).

(2) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan to meet the meteorological and oceanographic collection requirements of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, including the requirements of the combatant commands, the military departments, and the Defense Agencies (as defined in section 101(a)(11) of title 10, United States Code). The plan shall include the following:

(A) How the Secretary will use existing assets of the defense meteorological satellite program, including an identification of the extent to which requirements can be ad-

dressed by the Defense Meteorological Satellite program.

(B) How the Secretary will use other sources of data, such as civil, commercial satellite weather data, and international partnerships, to meet such requirements, and the extent to which requirements can be addressed by such sources of data.

(C) An explanation of the relevant risks, costs, and schedule.

(D) The requirements of the weather satellite follow-on system.

(3) **GAO REVIEW.**—

(A) The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the analysis of alternatives for the weather satellite follow-on system, or space based environmental monitoring, to determine—

(i) the extent that such analysis of alternatives met best practices and fully addressed the concerns of the acquisition, operation, and user communities; and

(ii) how the Department of Defense assessed and addressed the cost, schedule, and risks posed for each alternative evaluated under such analysis of alternatives.

(B) The Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the review under subparagraph (A).

(b) DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM.—

(1) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program may be obligated or expended for the storage of a satellite of such program until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

(A) the Department of Defense intends to launch the satellite; and

(B) storing the satellite until the anticipated launch of the satellite is the most cost-effective approach to meeting the requirements of the Department.

(2) REQUIREMENTS IN THE EVENT OF NO LAUNCH.—

(A) If the Secretary determines not to launch the next satellite of the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program, the Secretary shall—

(i) certify to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary will be able to meet the related requirements of the Department; and

(ii) not later than 60 days after making such certification, submit to such committees a report on how the Secretary will meet such related requirements.

(B) The Comptroller General shall—

(i) review the report submitted under subparagraph (A)(ii) to ensure that such report fully addresses the concerns of the user communities; and

(ii) submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing such review.

SEC. 1613. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR SPACE-BASED INFRARED SYSTEMS SPACE DATA EXPLOITATION.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for data exploitation under the space-based infrared systems, not more than 50 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force, acting as the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space, submits to the congressional defense committees certification that—

(1) such funds will be used in support of data exploitation of the current space-based

infrared systems program of record, including the scanning and staring sensor; or

(2) the data from such program of record, including such scanning and staring sensor, is being fully exploited and no further efforts are warranted.

SEC. 1614. LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR HOSTED PAYLOAD AND WIDE FIELD OF VIEW TESTBED OF THE SPACE-BASED INFRARED SYSTEMS.

(a) PHASED LIMITATIONS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for the hosted payload and wide field of view testbed of the space-based infrared systems program—

(1) not more than 50 percent may be obligated or expended on alternative approaches to the program of record of such program until the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the appropriate congressional committees a copy of the analysis of alternatives for such program of record; and

(2) following the date on which the Secretary submits such analysis of alternatives, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended on alternative approaches to the program of record of such program until a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command jointly provide to the appropriate congressional committees a briefing on the findings and recommendations of the Secretary and Commander under such analysis of alternatives, including the cost evaluation of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitations in subsection (a) shall not apply to efforts to examine and develop technology insertion opportunities for the program of record specified in subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

- (1) The congressional defense committees.
- (2) The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.
- (3) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 1615. LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PROTECTED TACTICAL DEMONSTRATION AND PROTECTED MILITARY SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS TESTBED OF THE ADVANCED EXTREMELY HIGH FREQUENCY PROGRAM.

(a) PHASED LIMITATIONS.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for the protected tactical demonstration and protected military satellite communications testbed of the advanced extremely high frequency program—

(1) not more than 50 percent may be obligated or expended on alternative approaches to the program of record for such program until the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees a copy of the analysis of alternatives for such program of record; and

(2) following the date on which the Secretary submits such analysis of alternatives, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended on alternative approaches to the program of record for such program until a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command jointly provide to the congressional

defense committees a briefing on the findings and recommendations of the Secretary and Commander under such analysis of alternatives, including the cost evaluation of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitations in subsection (a) shall not apply to efforts to examine and develop technology insertion opportunities for the current, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, programs of record.

SEC. 1616. STUDY OF SPACE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS ARCHITECTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall direct the Defense Science Board to conduct a study of the effectiveness of the ground and space sensor system architecture for space situational awareness.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study required by subsection (a) shall include an assessment of the following:

(1) Projected needs, based on current and future threats, for the ground and space sensor system during the five-, 10-, and 20-year periods beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Capabilities of the ground and space sensor system to conduct defensive and offensive operations.

(3) Integration of ground and space sensors with ground processing, control, and battle management systems.

(4) Any other matters relating to space situational awareness the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—If the report required by paragraph (1) is submitted in classified form, such report shall also include an unclassified summary.

SEC. 1617. BRIEFING ON RANGE SUPPORT FOR LAUNCHES IN SUPPORT OF NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the requirements and investments needed to modernize Department of Defense space launch facilities and supporting infrastructure.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) The results of the investigation into the failure of the radar system supporting the Eastern range in March 2014, including the causes for the failure.

(2) An assessment of each current radar and other system as well as supporting infrastructure required to support the mission requirement of the range, including back-up systems.

(3) An estimate of the annual level of dedicated funding required to maintain and modernize the range infrastructure in adequate condition to meet national security requirements.

(4) A review of requirements to repair, upgrade, and modernize the radars and other mission support systems to current technologies.

(5) A prioritized list of projects, costs, and projected funding schedules needed to carry out the maintenance, repair, and modernization requirements.

Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities

SEC. 1621. TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES EXECUTIVE AGENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 430. Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities Executive Agent

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence shall designate a civilian employee of the Department or a member of the armed forces to serve as the Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities Executive Agent.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Executive Agent designated under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) report directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

“(2) work with the combatant commands, military departments, and the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) to—

“(A) develop methods to increase warfighter effectiveness through the exploitation of national capabilities; and

“(B) promote cross-domain integration of such capabilities into military operations, training, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance activities.”

(b) BRIEFINGS.—At the same time as the President submits to Congress the budget pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the Executive Agent designated under subsection (a) of section 430 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section), in consultation with the commanders of the combatant commands, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the heads of the Department of Defense intelligence agencies and offices (including the Directors of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, and the National Reconnaissance Office), shall provide to the congressional defense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a briefing on the investments, activities, challenges, and opportunities of the Executive Agent in carrying out the responsibilities under subsection (b) of such section 430.

SEC. 1622. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF REPORT ON IMAGERY INTELLIGENCE AND GEOSPATIAL INFORMATION SUPPORT PROVIDED TO REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND SECURITY ALLIANCES.

Section 921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1878) is amended by striking “2014 and 2015” and inserting “2014 through 2016”.

SEC. 1623. EXTENSION OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES AS SECURITY FOR INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES.

Section 431(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended, in the second sentence, by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

SEC. 1624. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO JURISDICTION OVER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES FOR INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION OR SPECIAL OPERATIONS ACTIVITIES ABROAD.

Section 926(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public

Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1541) is amended, in the matter before paragraph (1)—

(1) by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2017”; and

(2) by striking “fiscal year 2016” and inserting “fiscal year 2018”.

SEC. 1625. ASSESSMENT AND LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS OF UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND AND SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, and the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States an assessment of the intelligence activities and programs of United States Special Operations Command and special operations forces.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The assessment under paragraph (1) shall include each of the following elements:

(A) An overall strategy defining such intelligence activities and programs, including definitions of intelligence activities and programs carried out by special operations forces and how such activities and programs relate to conventional military intelligence and the capabilities of the Armed Forces.

(B) The oversight roles and responsibilities of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, and the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Intelligence Oversight with respect to the employment of special operations forces for intelligence activities and programs, including an analysis of any oversight limitations or gaps.

(C) A strategy and roadmap of United States Special Operations Command intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance programs and requirements, including enabling capabilities provided by the Armed Forces, for special operations across the future years defense program.

(D) A comprehensive description of Joint Staff-validated current and anticipated future requirements for the intelligence activities and programs of each geographic combatant commander that are likely to be fulfilled by special operations forces, including those that can only be addressed by special operations forces, programs, or capabilities.

(E) Validated current and expected future United States Special Operations Command force structure requirements necessary to meet near-, mid-, and long-term special operations intelligence activities and programs of the geographic combatant commanders.

(F) A comprehensive review and assessment of statutory authorities, and Department and interagency policies, including limitations, for special operations forces intelligence activities and programs.

(G) A cost estimate of special operations intelligence activities and programs, including an estimate of the costs of the period of the current future years defense program, including a description of all rules and assumptions used to develop the cost estimates.

(H) A copy of any memoranda of understanding or memoranda of agreement between the Department of Defense and other departments or agencies of the United States Government, or between components of the Department of Defense that are required to implement objectives of special operations intelligence activities and programs.

(I) Any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) FORM.—The assessment required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(4) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the assessment required under paragraph (1) is submitted, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a review of such assessment. Such review shall include an assessment of—

(A) the extent to which the assessment required under paragraph (1) addressed the elements required under paragraph (2);

(B) the sufficiency of oversight of the intelligence activities and programs of special operations forces by the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, and the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Intelligence Oversight;

(C) the validity of the cost estimate of special operations intelligence activities and programs required by paragraph (2)(G); and

(D) any other matters the Comptroller General determines are relevant.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not more than 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for procurement, Defense-wide, for intelligence systems, and for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, for intelligence systems development may be obligated until the assessment required under subsection (a) is submitted.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply—

(A) with respect to funds authorized to be appropriated for Overseas Contingency Operations under title XV; or

(B) in any case where the Secretary of Defense determines the limitation in paragraph (1) may impede a current operation.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM.—The term “future years defense program” means the future years defense program under section 221 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) GEOGRAPHIC COMBATANT COMMANDER.—The term “geographic combatant commander” means a commander of a combatant command (as defined in section 161(c) of title 10, United States Code) with a geographic area of responsibility.

SEC. 1626. ANNUAL BRIEFING ON THE INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMBATANT COMMANDS.

At the same time that the President’s budget is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020—

(1) the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall provide to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a briefing on—

(A) the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements, by specific intelligence capability type, of each of the combatant commands;

(B) for the year preceding the year in which the briefing is provided, the satisfaction rate of each of the combatant commands with the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements, by specific intelligence capability type, of such combatant command; and

(C) a risk analysis identifying the critical gaps and shortfalls in such requirements in relation to such satisfaction rate; and

(2) the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence shall provide to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a briefing on short-term, mid-term, and long-term strategies to address the critical intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance requirements of the combatant commands.

SEC. 1627. PROHIBITION ON NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2015, to execute—

(1) the separation of the National Intelligence Program budget from the Department of Defense budget;

(2) the consolidation of the National Intelligence Program budget within the Department of Defense budget; or

(3) the establishment of a new appropriations account or appropriations account structure for the National Intelligence Program budget.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM.—The term “National Intelligence Program” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

(2) NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM BUDGET.—The term “National Intelligence Program budget” means the portions of the Department of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program.

SEC. 1628. PERSONNEL SECURITY AND INSIDER THREAT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than March 30, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the plans of the Department to address—

(1) the adoption of an interim capability to continuously evaluate the security status of the employees and contractors of the Department who have been determined eligible for and granted access to classified information by the Department of Defense Central Adjudication Facilities;

(2) the use of an interim system to assist in developing requirements, lessons learned, business rules, privacy standards, and operational concepts applicable to the objective automated records checks and continuous evaluation capability required by the strategy for modernizing personnel security;

(3) the engineering for an interim system and the objective automated records checks and continuous evaluation capability for initial investigations and reinvestigations required by the strategy for modernizing personnel security to support automation-assisted insider threat analyses conducted across the law enforcement, personnel security, human resources, counterintelligence, physical security, network behavior monitoring, and cybersecurity activities of all the components of the Department of Defense, pursuant to Executive Order 13587;

(4) how competitive processes and open systems designs will be used to acquire advanced commercial technologies throughout the life cycle of the objective continuous evaluation capability required by the strategy for modernizing personnel security;

(5) how the senior agency official in the Department of Defense for insider threat detection and prevention will be supported by experts in counterintelligence, personnel security, law enforcement, human resources, physical security, network monitoring, cybersecurity, and privacy and civil liberties from relevant components of the Department and experts in information technology, large-scale data analysis, systems engineering, and program acquisition;

(6) how the senior agency official, in developing the integrated, automation-assisted insider threat capability, will be supported by—

(A) the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics;

(B) the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense; and

(C) the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; and

(7) who will be responsible and accountable for managing the development and fielding of the automation-assisted insider threat capability.

(b) **INCLUSION OF GAPS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include specific gaps in policy and statute to address the requirements placed on the Department by section 907(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) and Executive Order 13587.

(c) **STRATEGY FOR MODERNIZING PERSONNEL SECURITY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “strategy for modernizing personnel security” means the strategy developed under section 907(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

SEC. 1629. MIGRATION OF DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEM OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY TO AN OPEN SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE.

(a) **MIGRATION REQUIRED.**—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall migrate the Distributed Common Ground System of the Department of the Army, including the Red Disk initiative under development at the Intelligence and Security Command, to an open system architecture to enable—

(1) competitive acquisition of components, services, and applications for the Distributed Common Ground System; and

(2) rapid competitive development and integration of new capabilities for the Distributed Common Ground System.

(b) **COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE STANDARDS.**—In carrying out the migration required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that the Distributed Common Ground System—

(1) is in compliance with the open system architecture standards developed under the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise by the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence; and

(2) reuses services and components of the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise.

(c) **OPEN SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “open system architecture” means, with respect to an information technology system, an integrated business and technical strategy that—

(1) employs a modular design and uses widely supported and consensus-based standards for key interfaces;

(2) is subjected to successful validation and verification tests to ensure key interfaces

comply with widely supported and consensus-based standards; and

(3) uses a system architecture that allows components to be added, modified, replaced, removed, or supported by different vendors throughout the life-cycle of the system to afford opportunities for enhanced competition and innovation while yielding—

(A) significant cost and schedule savings; and

(B) increased interoperability.

Subtitle C—Cyberspace-Related Matters

SEC. 1631. BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING FOR CYBER MISSION FORCES.

(a) **BUDGETING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 238. Cyber mission forces: program elements

“(a) **BUDGET JUSTIFICATION DISPLAY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress, as a part of the defense budget materials for fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, a budget justification display that includes—

“(1) a major force program category for the five-year defense plan of the Department of Defense for the training, manning, and equipping of the cyber mission forces; and

“(2) program elements for the cyber mission forces.

“(b) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may waive the requirement under subsection (a) for fiscal year 2017 if the Secretary—

“(1) determines the Secretary is unable to comply with such requirement for fiscal year 2017; and

“(2) establishes a plan to implement the requirement for fiscal year 2018.”.

(2) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 9 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“238. Cyber mission forces: program elements.”.

(b) **ASSESSMENT OF TRANSFER ACCOUNT FOR CYBER ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall assess the feasibility and advisability of establishing a transfer account to execute the funds contained in the major force program category required by subsection (a).

(2) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than April 1, 2015, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

(B) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) The findings of the Secretary with respect to the assessment carried out under paragraph (1).

(ii) A recommendation as to whether a transfer account should be established as described in such paragraph.

SEC. 1632. REPORTING ON CYBER INCIDENTS WITH RESPECT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS OF OPERATIONALLY CRITICAL CONTRACTORS.

(a) **REPORTING.**—Part I of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 18 the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 19—CYBER MATTERS

“Sec.

“391. Reporting on cyber incidents with respect to networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors.

“§ 391. Reporting on cyber incidents with respect to networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors and certain other contractors

“(a) **DESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENT COMPONENT TO RECEIVE REPORTS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall designate a component of the Department of Defense to receive reports of cyber incidents from contractors in accordance with this section and with section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 2224 note) or from other governmental entities.

“(b) **PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING CYBER INCIDENTS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures that require an operationally critical contractor to report in a timely manner to component designated under subsection (a) each time a cyber incident occurs with respect to a network or information system of such operationally critical contractor.

“(c) **PROCEDURE REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **DESIGNATION AND NOTIFICATION.**—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a process for—

“(A) designating operationally critical contractors; and

“(B) notifying a contractor that it has been designated as an operationally critical contractor.

“(2) **RAPID REPORTING.**—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall require each operationally critical contractor to rapidly report to the component of the Department designated pursuant to subsection (d)(2)(A) on each cyber incident with respect to any network or information systems of such contractor. Each such report shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment by the contractor of the effect of the cyber incident on the ability of the contractor to meet the contractual requirements of the Department.

“(B) The technique or method used in such cyber incident.

“(C) A sample of any malicious software, if discovered and isolated by the contractor, involved in such cyber incident.

“(D) A summary of information compromised by such cyber incident.

“(3) **DEPARTMENT ASSISTANCE AND ACCESS TO EQUIPMENT AND INFORMATION BY DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL.**—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

“(A) include mechanisms for Department personnel to, if requested, assist operationally critical contractors in detecting and mitigating penetrations; and

“(B) provide that an operationally critical contractor is only required to provide access to equipment or information as described in subparagraph (A) to determine whether information created by or for the Department in connection with any Department program was successfully exfiltrated from a network or information system of such contractor and, if so, what information was exfiltrated.

“(4) **PROTECTION OF TRADE SECRETS AND OTHER INFORMATION.**—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall provide for the reasonable protection of trade secrets, commercial or financial information, and information that can be used to identify a specific person.

“(5) **DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.**—The procedures established pursuant to subsection (a) shall limit the dissemination of information obtained or derived through the procedures to entities—

“(A) with missions that may be affected by such information;

“(B) that may be called upon to assist in the diagnosis, detection, or mitigation of cyber incidents;

“(C) that conduct counterintelligence or law enforcement investigations; or

“(D) for national security purposes, including cyber situational awareness and defense purposes.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CYBER INCIDENT.—The term ‘cyber incident’ means actions taken through the use of computer networks that result in an actual or potentially adverse effect on an information system or the information residing therein.

“(2) OPERATIONALLY CRITICAL CONTRACTOR.—The term ‘operationally critical contractor’ means a contractor designated by the Secretary for purposes of this section as a critical source of supply for airlift, sea-lift, intermodal transportation services, or logistical support that is essential to the mobilization, deployment, or sustainment of the Armed Forces in a contingency operation.”

(b) ISSUANCE OF PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall establish the procedures required by subsection (b) of section 391 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Act, the Secretary of Defense shall complete an assessment of—

(A) requirements that were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act for contractors to share information with Department components regarding cyber incidents (as defined in subsection (d) of such section 391) with respect to networks or information systems of contractors; and

(B) Department policies and systems for sharing information on cyber incidents with respect to networks or information systems of Department contractors.

(2) ACTIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.—Upon completion of the assessment required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) designate a Department component under subsection (a) of such section 391; and

(B) issue or revise guidance applicable to Department components that ensures the rapid sharing by the component designated pursuant to such section 391 or section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (10 U.S.C. 2224 note) of information relating to cyber incidents with respect to networks or information systems of contractors with other appropriate Department components.

(d) TABLE OF CHAPTERS AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, and at the beginning of part I of such subtitle, are each amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 18 the following new item:

“19. Cyber matters 391”.
SEC. 1633. EXECUTIVE AGENTS FOR CYBER TEST AND TRAINING RANGES.

(a) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—Chapter 19 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 1632 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 392. Executive agents for cyber test and training ranges

“(a) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Principal Cyber Advisor, shall—

“(1) designate a senior official from among the personnel of the Department of Defense to act as the executive agent for cyber and information technology test ranges; and

“(2) designate a senior official from among the personnel of the Department of Defense

to act as the executive agent for cyber and information technology training ranges.

“(b) ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND AUTHORITIES.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of the executive agents designated under subsection (a). Such roles, responsibilities, and authorities shall include the development of a biennial integrated plan for cyber and information technology test and training resources.

“(2) BIENNIAL INTEGRATED PLAN.—The biennial integrated plan required under paragraph (1) shall include plans for the following:

“(A) Developing and maintaining a comprehensive list of cyber and information technology ranges, test facilities, test beds, and other means of testing, training, and developing software, personnel, and tools for accommodating the mission of the Department. Such list shall include resources from both governmental and nongovernmental entities.

“(B) Organizing and managing designated cyber and information technology test ranges, including—

“(i) establishing the priorities for cyber and information technology ranges to meet Department objectives;

“(ii) enforcing standards to meet requirements specified by the United States Cyber Command, the training community, and the research, development, testing, and evaluation community;

“(iii) identifying and offering guidance on the opportunities for integration amongst the designated cyber and information technology ranges regarding test, training, and development functions;

“(iv) finding opportunities for cost reduction, integration, and coordination improvements for the appropriate cyber and information technology ranges;

“(v) adding or consolidating cyber and information technology ranges in the future to better meet the evolving needs of the cyber strategy and resource requirements of the Department;

“(vi) finding opportunities to continuously enhance the quality and technical expertise of the cyber and information technology test workforce through training and personnel policies; and

“(vii) coordinating with interagency and industry partners on cyber and information technology range issues.

“(C) Defining a cyber range architecture that—

“(i) may add or consolidate cyber and information technology ranges in the future to better meet the evolving needs of the cyber strategy and resource requirements of the Department;

“(ii) coordinates with interagency and industry partners on cyber and information technology range issues;

“(iii) allows for integrated closed loop testing in a secure environment of cyber and electronic warfare capabilities;

“(iv) supports science and technology development, experimentation, testing and training; and

“(v) provides for interconnection with other existing cyber ranges and other kinetic range facilities in a distributed manner.

“(D) Certifying all cyber range investments of the Department of Defense.

“(E) Performing such other assessments or analyses as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(3) STANDARD FOR CYBER EVENT DATA.—The executive agents designated under sub-

section (a), in consultation with the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, shall jointly select a standard language from open-source candidates for representing and communicating cyber event and threat data. Such language shall be machine-readable for the Joint Information Environment and associated test and training ranges.

“(c) SUPPORT WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the military departments, Defense Agencies, and other components of the Department of Defense provide the executive agents designated under subsection (a) with the appropriate support and resources needed to perform the roles, responsibilities, and authorities of the executive agents.

“(d) COMPLIANCE WITH EXISTING DIRECTIVE.—The Secretary shall carry out this section in compliance with Directive 5101.1.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘designated cyber and information technology range’ includes the National Cyber Range, the Joint Information Operations Range, the Defense Information Assurance Range, and the C4 Assessments Division of J6 of the Joint Staff.

“(2) The term ‘Directive 5101.1’ means Department of Defense Directive 5101.1, or any successor directive relating to the responsibilities of an executive agent of the Department of Defense.

“(3) The term ‘executive agent’ has the meaning given the term ‘DoD Executive Agent’ in Directive 5101.1.”

(b) DESIGNATION AND ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, designate the executive agents required under subsection (a) of section 392 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section; and

(2) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, prescribe the roles, responsibilities, and authorities required under subsection (b) of such section 392.

(c) SELECTION OF STANDARD LANGUAGE.—Not later than June 1, 2015, the executive agents designated under subsection (a) of section 392 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall select the standard language under subsection (b)(3) of such section 392.

(d) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 19 of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 1632 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“392. Executive agents for cyber test and training ranges.”

SEC. 1634. CYBERSPACE MAPPING.

(a) DESIGNATION OF NETWORK.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan to use a controlled laboratory environment or an existing network or network segment within the Department of Defense to identify network mapping capabilities to meet requirements of the United States Cyber Command.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Principal Cyber Advisor shall submit to the Secretary policy recommendations regarding the mapping of cyberspace to support the operational requirements of the United States Cyber Command.

SEC. 1635. REVIEW OF CROSS DOMAIN SOLUTION POLICY AND REQUIREMENT FOR CROSS DOMAIN SOLUTION STRATEGY.

(a) **REVIEW OF POLICY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall review the policies and guidance of the Department of Defense concerning the procurement, approval, and use of cross domain solutions by the Department of Defense.

(b) **STRATEGY FOR CROSS DOMAIN SOLUTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a strategy for procurement, approval, and use of cross domain solutions by the Department.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Identification and assessment of the current cross domain solutions in use throughout the Department of Defense, including the relative capabilities of such solutions and any gaps in current capabilities.

(B) A determination of the requirements for cross domain solutions for enterprise applications as well as deployed warfighting operations, including operations with coalition partners.

(C) A plan to enable verification of compliance with Department of Defense policies regarding the use of cross domain solutions.

(D) A review of the current Department of Defense Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation Process for the applicability of such process to future virtualized cross domain technology.

(E) A plan to meet the cross domain solution requirements for the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise that must operate within the Joint Information Environment and the Intelligence Community Information Technology Environment.

SEC. 1636. REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGY TO DEVELOP AND DEPLOY DECRYPTION SERVICE FOR THE JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT.

(a) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop a strategy to develop and deploy a decryption service that enables the efficient decryption and re-encryption of encrypted communications within the Joint Information Environment and through the Internet access points of the Joint Information Environment in a manner that allows the Secretary to inspect the content of such communications to detect cyber threats and insider threat activity.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The strategy required developed pursuant to subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Requirements.

(2) An estimate of the cost.

(3) An assessment of the added security benefit.

(4) An architecture.

(5) A concept of operations.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.**—Not later than October 1, 2015, the Secretary shall brief the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)) on the strategy developed under subsection (a).

SEC. 1637. ACTIONS TO ADDRESS ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE IN CYBERSPACE.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2020, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on foreign economic and industrial espionage in cyberspace during the 12-month period preceding the submission of the report that—

(A) identifies—

(i) foreign countries that engage in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons;

(ii) foreign countries identified under clause (i) that the President determines engage in the most egregious economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to such trade secrets or proprietary information (to be known as “priority foreign countries”);

(iii) categories of technologies or proprietary information developed by United States persons that—

(I) are targeted for economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace; and

(II) to the extent practicable, have been appropriated through such espionage;

(iv) articles manufactured or otherwise produced using technologies or proprietary information described in clause (iii)(II); and

(v) to the extent practicable, services provided using such technologies or proprietary information;

(B) describes the economic or industrial espionage engaged in by the foreign countries identified under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A); and

(C) describes—

(i) actions taken by the President to decrease the prevalence of economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace; and

(ii) the progress made in decreasing the prevalence of such espionage.

(2) **DETERMINATION OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES ENGAGING IN ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE IN CYBERSPACE.**—For purposes of clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A), the President shall identify a foreign country as a foreign country that engages in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons if the government of the foreign country—

(A) engages in economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace with respect to trade secrets or proprietary information owned by United States persons; or

(B) facilitates, supports, fails to prosecute, or otherwise permits such espionage by—

(i) individuals who are citizens or residents of the foreign country; or

(ii) entities that are organized under the laws of the foreign country or are otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the government of the foreign country.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

(b) **IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of each person described in paragraph (2), if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **PERSONS DESCRIBED.**—A person described in this paragraph is a foreign person the President determines knowingly requests, engages in, supports, facilitates, or benefits from the significant appropriation, through economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace, of technologies or proprietary information developed by United States persons.

(3) **EXCEPTION.**—The authority to impose sanctions under paragraph (1) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(4) **IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.**—

(A) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this subsection.

(B) **PENALTIES.**—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, or conspires to violate, or causes a violation of, this subsection or a regulation prescribed under this subsection to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of that Act.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the application of any penalty or the exercise of any authority provided for under any other provision of law.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) **CYBERSPACE.**—The term “cyberspace”—

(A) means the interdependent network of information technology infrastructures; and

(B) includes the Internet, telecommunications networks, computer systems, and embedded processors and controllers.

(3) **ECONOMIC OR INDUSTRIAL ESPIONAGE.**—The term “economic or industrial espionage” means—

(A) stealing a trade secret or proprietary information or appropriating, taking, carrying away, or concealing, or by fraud, artifice, or deception obtaining, a trade secret or proprietary information without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information;

(B) copying, duplicating, downloading, uploading, destroying, transmitting, delivering, sending, communicating, or conveying a trade secret or proprietary information without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information; or

(C) knowingly receiving, buying, or possessing a trade secret or proprietary information that has been stolen or appropriated, obtained, or converted without the authorization of the owner of the trade secret or proprietary information.

(4) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(5) **OWN.**—The term “own”, with respect to a trade secret or proprietary information, means to hold rightful legal or equitable title to, or license in, the trade secret or proprietary information.

(6) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(7) **PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.**—The term “proprietary information” means competitive bid preparations, negotiating strategies, executive emails, internal financial data, strategic business plans, technical designs, manufacturing processes, source code, data derived from research and development investments, and other commercially valuable information that a person has developed or obtained if—

(A) the person has taken reasonable measures to keep the information confidential; and

(B) the information is not generally known or readily ascertainable through proper means by the public.

(8) **TECHNOLOGY.**—The term “technology” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(9) **TRADE SECRET.**—The term “trade secret” has the meaning given that term in section 1839 of title 18, United States Code.

(10) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) an individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States;

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States; or

(C) a person located in the United States.

SEC. 1638. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ROLE OF RESERVE COMPONENTS IN DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES AGAINST CYBER ATTACKS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) members of the reserve components may possess knowledge of critical infrastructure in the States in which the members serve that may be of value for purposes of defending such infrastructure against cyber threats;

(2) traditional members of the reserve components and reserve component technicians may have experience in both the private and public sector that could benefit the readiness of the Department of Defense's cyber force and the development of cyber capabilities;

(3) the long-standing relationship the reserve components has with local and civil authorities may be beneficial for purposes of providing for a coordinated response to a cyber attack and defending against cyber threats;

(4) the States are already working to establish cyber partnerships with the reserve components; and

(5) the reserve components have a role in the defense of the United States against cyber threats and consideration should be given to how the reserve components might be integrated into a comprehensive national approach for cyber defense.

SEC. 1639. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE FUTURE OF THE INTERNET AND THE .MIL TOP-LEVEL DOMAIN.

It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should—

(1) work within the existing interagency process underway as of the date of the enactment of this Act regarding the transfer of the remaining role of the United States Government in the functions of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority to a global multi-stakeholder community and support transferring this role only if—

(A) assurances are provided for the protection of the current status of legacy top-level domain names and Internet Protocol address numbers, particularly those used by the Department of Defense and the components of the United States Government for national security purposes;

(B) mechanisms are institutionalized to uphold and protect consensus-based decision making in the multi-stakeholder approach; and

(C) existing stress-testing scenarios of the accountability process of the multi-stakeholder model can be confidently shown to work transparently, securely, and efficiently to maintain a free, open, and resilient Internet; and

(2) take all necessary steps to sustain the successful stewardship and good standing of the Internet root zone servers managed by components of the Department of Defense, including active participation, review, and analysis for transition planning documents and accountability stress testing.

Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces

SEC. 1641. PREPARATION OF ANNUAL BUDGET REQUEST REGARDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

Section 179(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3)(A) With respect to the preparation of a budget for a fiscal year to be submitted by the President to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, the Secretary of Defense may not agree to a proposed transfer of estimated nuclear budget request authority unless the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) A report described in this subparagraph is a report that includes the following:

“(i) Except as provided by subparagraph (C), certification that, during the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year covered by the budget for which the report is submitted, the Secretary of Energy obligated or expended any amounts covered by a proposed transfer of estimated nuclear budget request authority made for such prior fiscal year in a manner consistent with a memorandum of agreement that was developed by the Nuclear Weapons Council and entered into by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy.

“(ii) A detailed assessment by the Nuclear Weapons Council regarding how the Administrator for Nuclear Security implemented any agreements and decisions of the Council made during such prior fiscal year.

“(iii) An assessment from each of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command regarding any effects to the military during such prior fiscal year that were caused by the delay or failure of the Administrator to implement any agreements or decisions described in clause (ii).

“(C) With respect to a report described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may waive the requirement to include the certification described in clause (i) of such subparagraph if the Secretary—

“(i) determines that such waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

“(ii) instead of the certification described in such clause (i), includes as part of such report—

“(I) a copy of the agreement that the Secretary has entered into with the Secretary of Energy regarding the manner and the purpose for which the Secretary of Energy will obligate or expend any amounts covered by a proposed transfer of estimated nuclear budget request authority for the fiscal year covered by the budget for which such report is submitted; and

“(II) an explanation for why the Secretary did not include such certification in such report.

“(4) The Secretary of Defense shall include with the defense budget materials for a fiscal

year the memorandum of agreement described in subparagraph (B)(i) of paragraph (3), or the agreement described in subparagraph (C) of such paragraph, as the case may be, that covers such fiscal year.

“(5)(A) Not later than 30 days after the President submits to Congress the budget for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall submit to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff an assessment of—

“(i) whether such budget allows the Federal Government to meet the nuclear stockpile and stockpile stewardship program requirements during the fiscal year covered by the budget and the four subsequent fiscal years; and

“(ii) if the Commander determines that such budget does not allow the Federal Government to meet such requirements, a description of the steps being taken to meet such requirements.

“(B) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff receives the assessment of the Commander of the United States Strategic Command under subparagraph (A), the Chairman shall submit to the congressional defense committees—

“(i) such assessment as it was submitted to the Chairman; and

“(ii) any comments of the Chairman.

“(6) In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘budget’ has the meaning given that term in section 231(f) of this title.

“(B) The term ‘defense budget materials’ has the meaning given that term in section 231(f) of this title.

“(C) The term ‘proposed transfer of estimated nuclear budget request authority’ means, in preparing a budget, a request for the Secretary of Defense to transfer an estimated amount of the proposed budget authority of the Secretary to the Secretary of Energy for purposes relating to nuclear weapons.”

SEC. 1642. IMPROVEMENT TO BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT ON DELIVERY PLATFORMS FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND THE NUCLEAR COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM.

Section 492(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, and the ability to meet operational availability requirements for,” after “military effectiveness of”.

SEC. 1643. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REVIEW OF COST ESTIMATES FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

Section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1576), as most recently amended by section 1054 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 861), is further amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following new subsection (b):

“(b) **ESTIMATE OF COSTS BY CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.**—

“(1) **BUDGETS FOR ODD-NUMBERED FISCAL YEARS.**—Not later than July 1 of each year in which the President transmits a covered odd-numbered fiscal year report, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

“(A) an estimate of the costs during the 10-year period beginning on the date of such covered odd-numbered fiscal year report associated with fielding and maintaining the current nuclear weapons and nuclear weapon delivery systems of the United States;

“(B) an estimate of the costs during such period of any life extension, modernization,

or replacement of any current nuclear weapons or nuclear weapon delivery systems of the United States that is anticipated as of the date of such covered odd-numbered fiscal year report; and

“(C) an estimate of the relative percentage of total defense spending during such period represented by the costs estimated under subparagraphs (A) and (B).

“(2) BUDGETS FOR EVEN-NUMBERED FISCAL YEARS.—If the Director determines that a covered even-numbered fiscal year report contains a significant change that affects the estimates of the Director included in the report submitted under paragraph (1) in the year prior to the year in which such covered even-numbered fiscal year report is submitted, the Director shall submit to the congressional defense committees a letter describing such significant changes.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘covered even-numbered fiscal year report’ means a report required to be transmitted under subsection (a)(1) not later than 30 days after the submission to Congress of the budget of the President for an even-numbered fiscal year.

“(B) The term ‘covered odd-numbered fiscal year report’ means a report required to be transmitted under subsection (a)(1) not later than 30 days after the submission to Congress of the budget of the President for an odd-numbered fiscal year.”.

SEC. 1644. RETENTION OF MISSILE SILOS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—During the period in which the New START Treaty (as defined in section 494(a)(2)(D) of title 10, United States Code) is in effect, the Secretary of Defense shall preserve each intercontinental ballistic missile silo that contains a deployed missile as of the date of the enactment of this Act in, at minimum, a warm status that enables such silo to—

(1) remain a fully functioning element of the interconnected and redundant command and control system of the missile field; and

(2) be made fully operational with a deployed missile.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from temporarily placing an intercontinental ballistic missile silo offline to perform maintenance activities.

SEC. 1645. PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PARTS OF INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE FUZES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may enter into contracts for the life-of-type procurement of covered parts of the intercontinental ballistic missile fuze.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 1502(a) of title 31, United States Code, of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by section 101 and available for Missile Procurement, Air Force as specified in the funding table in section 4101, \$4,700,000 shall be available for the procurement of covered parts pursuant to contracts entered into under subsection (a).

(c) COVERED PARTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered parts” means commercially available off-the-shelf items as defined in section 104 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 1646. ASSESSMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPON SECONDARY REQUIREMENT.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall assess the annual secondary production requirement needed to sustain a safe, secure, reliable, and effective nuclear deterrent.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the assessment conducted under subsection (a).

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An explanation of the rationale and assumptions that led to the current 50 to 80 secondaries per year production requirement, including the factors considered in determining such requirement.

(B) An analysis of whether there are any changes to such 50 to 80 secondaries per year production requirement, including the reasons for any such changes.

(C) A description of how the secondary production requirement is affected by or related to—

(i) the demands of stockpile modernization, including the schedule for life extension programs;

(ii) the requirement for a responsive infrastructure, including the ability to hedge against technical failure and geopolitical risk; and

(iii) the number of secondaries held in reserve or the inactive stockpile, and the likelihood such secondaries may be reused.

(E) The proposed timeframe for achieving such 50 to 80 secondaries per year production requirement.

(3) FORM.—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1647. CERTIFICATION ON NUCLEAR FORCE STRUCTURE.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall certify to the congressional defense committees that the plan for implementation of the New START Treaty (as defined in section 494(a)(2)(D) of title 10, United States Code) announced on April 8, 2014, will enable the United States to meet its obligations under such treaty in a manner that ensures the nuclear forces of the United States—

(1) are capable, survivable, and balanced; and

(2) maintain strategic stability, deterrence and extended deterrence, and allied assurance.

SEC. 1648. ADVANCE NOTICE AND REPORTS ON B61 LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) NOTIFICATION AND REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days before any decision is made to reduce the number of final production units for the B61 life extension program below the total number of such units planned in the stockpile stewardship and management plan required by section 4203 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523) for fiscal year 2015—

(1) the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council established under section 179 of title 10, United States Code, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(A) a notification of such decision;

(B) an explanation of the proposed changes to the life extension program; and

(C) a comprehensive discussion of the justification for such changes; and

(2) the Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes—

(A) an assessment of such changes to the life extension program;

(B) a description of the risks associated with such decision;

(C) an assessment of the impact of such decision on the ability of the United States Strategic Command to meet deterrence, extended deterrence, and assurance requirements during the expected lifetime of the B61-12 bomb; and

(D) such other matters as the Commander considers appropriate.

(b) FORM OF REPORTS.—Each report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1649. NOTIFICATION AND REPORT CONCERNING REMOVAL OR CONSOLIDATION OF DUAL-CAPABLE AIRCRAFT FROM EUROPE.

(a) NOTIFICATION AND REPORT.—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the Secretary of Defense removes or consolidates dual-capable aircraft of the United States from the area of responsibility of the United States European Command, the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees of such proposed removal or consolidation. Such notification shall include a report explaining—

(1) how such removal or consolidation is in the national security interests of the United States and the allies of the United States, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Alliance; and

(2) whether, and in what respects, such proposed removal or consolidation is affected by—

(A) the armed forces of the Russian Federation continuing to illegally occupy Ukrainian territory;

(B) the Russian Federation deploying or preparing to deploy its nuclear weapons to Ukrainian territory;

(C) the Russian Federation not complying with the INF Treaty and other treaties and agreements to which it is a party; and

(D) the Russian Federation not complying with the CFE Treaty and not lifting its suspension of Russian observance of its treaty obligations.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “CFE Treaty” means the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, signed at Paris, November 19, 1990, and entered into force July 17, 1992.

(2) The “dual-capable aircraft” means tactical fighter aircraft that can perform both conventional and nuclear missions.

(3) The term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington, December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

SEC. 1650. REPORTS ON INSTALLATION OF NUCLEAR COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS AT HEADQUARTERS OF UNITED STATES STRATEGIC COMMAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the budget of the President for a fiscal year is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the installation and operation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems associated with the construction of the headquarters of the United States Strategic Command.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall address, with respect to the installation and operation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems associated with the construction of the headquarters of the United States Strategic Command, the following:

(1) Milestones and costs associated with installation of communications systems.

(2) Milestones and costs associated with integrating targeting and analysis planning tools.

(3) An assessment of progress on the upgrade of systems that existed before the date of the enactment of this Act, such as the Strategic Automated Command and Control System and the MILSTAR satellite communications system, for compatibility with such nuclear command, control, and communications systems.

(4) Such other information as the Commander of the United States Strategic Command considers necessary to assess adherence to overall cost, scope, and schedule milestones.

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall not be required to submit a report under subsection (a) with the budget of the President for any fiscal year after the date on which the Commander certifies to the congressional defense committees that all milestones relating to the installation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems associated with the construction of the headquarters of the United States Strategic Command have been completed and such systems are fully operational.

SEC. 1651. REPORT ON PLANS FOR RESPONSE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO INF TREATY VIOLATION.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing a detailed description of any steps being taken or planned to be taken by the Secretary in response to actions of the Government of the Russian Federation in violation of its obligations under the INF Treaty in order to reduce the negative impact of such actions on the national security of the United States.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include a description of any plans to conduct activities relating to the research, development, testing, or deployment of potential future military capabilities of the United States, including with respect to activities to modify, test, or deploy existing military systems, to deter or defend against the threat of intermediate-range nuclear force systems of Russia if Russia deploys such systems.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) **INF TREATY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “INF Treaty” means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, commonly referred to as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988.

SEC. 1652. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON THE NUCLEAR TRIAD.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems consisting of—

(A) heavy bombers equipped with nuclear gravity bombs and air-launched nuclear cruise missiles;

(B) land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles equipped with nuclear warheads that are capable of carrying multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles; and

(C) ballistic missile submarines equipped with submarine launched ballistic missiles and multiple nuclear warheads;

(2) to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace a capability to forward-deploy nuclear weapons and dual-capable fighter-bomber aircraft;

(3) to deter potential adversaries and assure allies and partners of the United States through strong and long-term commitment to the nuclear deterrent of the United States and the personnel, systems, and infrastructure that comprise such deterrent; and

(4) to ensure that the members of the Armed Forces who operate the nuclear deterrent of the United States have the training, resources, and national support required to execute the critical national security mission of the members.

SEC. 1653. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DETERRENCE AND DEFENSE POSTURE OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States reaffirms and remains committed to the policies enumerated by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the Deterrence and Defense Posture Review, dated May 20, 2012, and the Wales Summit Declaration of September 2014, including the following statements:

(1) As stated in the Deterrence and Defense Posture Review:

(A) “The greatest responsibility of the Alliance is to protect and defend our territory and our populations against attack, as set out in Article 5 of the Washington Treaty. The Alliance does not consider any country to be its adversary. However, no one should doubt NATO’s resolve if the security of any of its members were to be threatened. NATO will ensure that it maintains the full range of capabilities necessary to deter and defend against any threat to the safety and security of our populations, wherever it should arise. Allies’ goal is to bolster deterrence as a core element of our collective defense and contribute to the indivisible security of the Alliance.”

(B) “Nuclear weapons are a core component of NATO’s overall capabilities for deterrence and defense alongside conventional and missile defense forces. The review has shown that the Alliance’s nuclear force posture currently meets the criteria for an effective deterrence and defense posture.”

(C) “The circumstances in which any use of nuclear weapons might have to be contemplated are extremely remote. As long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance. The supreme guarantee of the security of the Allies is provided by the strategic nuclear forces of the Alliance, particularly those of the United States; the independent strategic forces of the United Kingdom and France, which have a deterrent role of their own, contribute to the overall deterrence and security of the Allies.”

(D) “NATO must have the full range of capabilities necessary to deter and defend against threats to the safety of its populations and the security of its territory, which is the Alliance’s greatest responsibility.”

(E) “NATO is committed to maintaining an appropriate mix of nuclear, conventional, and missile defense capabilities for deterrence and defense to fulfill its commitments as set out in the Strategic Concept. These capabilities, underpinned by NATO’s Integrated Command Structure, offer the strong-

est guarantee of the Alliance’s security and will ensure that it is able to respond to a variety of challenges and unpredictable contingencies in a highly complex and evolving international security environment.”

(2) As stated in the Wales Summit Declaration:

(A) “Deterrence, based on an appropriate mix of nuclear, conventional, and missile defence capabilities, remains a core element of our overall strategy.”

(B) “Arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation continue to play an important role in the achievement of the Alliance’s security objectives. Both the success and failure of these efforts can have a direct impact on the threat environment of NATO. In this context, it is of paramount importance that disarmament and non-proliferation commitments under existing treaties are honoured, including the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which is a crucial element of Euro-Atlantic security. In that regard, Allies call on Russia to preserve the viability of the INF Treaty through ensuring full and verifiable compliance.”

Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs

SEC. 1661. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR IRON DOME SHORT-RANGE ROCKET DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 1502 for procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency, not more than \$350,972,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system as specified in the funding table in section 4102, including for co-production of Iron Dome parts and components in the United States by industry of the United States.

(b) **CONDITIONS.**—

(1) **AGREEMENT.**—Funds described in subsection (a) to produce the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense program shall be available subject to the terms, conditions, and co-production targets specified for fiscal year 2015 in the “Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement,” signed on March 5, 2014.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds described in subsection (a), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees—

(A) a certification that the agreement specified in paragraph (1) is being implemented as provided in such agreement; and

(B) an assessment detailing any risks relating to the implementation of such agreement.

SEC. 1662. TESTING AND ASSESSMENT OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS PRIOR TO PRODUCTION AND DEPLOYMENT.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is a high priority of the United States that the ballistic missile defense system should work in an operationally effective and cost-effective manner;

(2) prior to making final production decisions for such systems, and prior to the operational deployment of such systems, the United States should conduct operationally realistic intercept flight testing that should create sufficiently challenging operational conditions to establish confidence that such systems will work in an operationally effective and cost-effective manner when needed; and

(3) in order to achieve these objectives, and to avoid post-production and post-deployment problems, it is essential for the Department of Defense to follow a “fly before you buy” approach to adequately test and assess the elements of the ballistic missile defense system before final production decisions or operational deployment.

(b) **SUCCESSFUL TESTING REQUIRED PRIOR TO FINAL PRODUCTION OR OPERATIONAL DEPLOYMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense may not make a final production decision for, or operationally deploy, a covered system unless—

(1) the Secretary ensures that—

(A) sufficient and operationally realistic testing of the covered system is conducted to assess the performance of the covered system in order to inform a final production decision or an operational deployment decision; and

(B) the results of such testing have demonstrated a high probability that the covered system—

(i) will work in an operationally effective manner; and

(ii) has the ability to accomplish the intended mission of the covered system;

(2) the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has carried out subsection (c) with respect to such covered system; and

(3) the Commander of the United States Strategic Command has carried out subsection (d) with respect to such covered system.

(c) **ASSESSMENT BY DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.**—The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation shall—

(1) provide to the Secretary the assessment of the Director, based on the available test data, of the sufficiency, adequacy, and results of the testing of each covered system, including an assessment of whether the covered system will be sufficiently effective, suitable, and survivable when needed; and

(2) submit to the congressional defense committees a written summary of such assessment.

(d) **ASSESSMENT BY COMMANDER OF UNITED STATES STRATEGIC COMMAND.**—The Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall—

(1) provide to the Secretary a military utility assessment of the operational utility of each covered system; and

(2) not later than 30 days after providing such assessment to the Secretary, submit to the congressional defense committees a written summary of such assessment.

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter, modify, or otherwise affect a determination of the Secretary with respect to the participation of the Missile Defense Agency in the Joint Capabilities Integration Development System or the acquisition reporting process under the Department of Defense Directive 5000 series.

(f) **COVERED SYSTEM.**—In this section, the term “covered system” means a new or substantially upgraded interceptor or weapon system of the ballistic missile defense system, other than the re-designed exo-atmospheric kill vehicle covered by the acquisition plan developed under section 1663.

SEC. 1663. ACQUISITION PLAN FOR RE-DESIGNED EXO-ATMOSPHERIC KILL VEHICLE.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the existing models of the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle of the ground-based midcourse defense system are prototype designs that were developed and deployed without using traditional acquisition practices in

order to provide an initial defensive capability for an emerging ballistic missile threat;

(2) consequently, while the deployed models of the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle have demonstrated an initial level of capability against a limited threat, such models do not have the degree of reliability, robustness, cost effectiveness, and performance that are desirable;

(3) the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle for the ground-based midcourse defense system needs to be re-designed to substantially improve the performance and reliability of such kill vehicles; and

(4) the Secretary of Defense should follow a robust and rigorous acquisition plan for the design, development, and testing of the re-designed exo-atmospheric kill vehicle.

(b) **ACQUISITION PLAN REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall develop an acquisition plan for the re-design of the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle of the ground-based midcourse defense system that includes rigorous elements for system engineering, design, integration, development, testing, and evaluation.

(c) **OBJECTIVES.**—The objectives of the acquisition plan under subsection (b) shall be to ensure that the re-designed exo-atmospheric kill vehicle is operationally effective, reliable, producible, cost effective, maintainable, and testable.

(d) **APPROVAL OF ACQUISITION PLAN REQUIRED.**—The acquisition plan under subsection (b) shall be subject to approval by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

(e) **TESTING REQUIRED.**—Prior to operational deployment of the re-designed exo-atmospheric kill vehicle, the Secretary shall ensure that the re-designed kill vehicle has demonstrated, through successful, operationally realistic flight testing—

(1) a high probability of working in an operationally effective manner; and

(2) the ability to accomplish the intended mission of the re-designed kill vehicle, including against more complex emerging ballistic missile threats.

(f) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics approves the acquisition plan under subsection (d), the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the acquisition plan and the manner in which the plan will meet the objectives described in subsection (c).

SEC. 1664. STUDY ON TESTING PROGRAM OF GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM.

(a) **STUDY.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct a study on the testing program of the ground-based midcourse missile defense system.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The study under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of whether the testing program described in subsection (a) has established, as of the date of the study, that the ground-based midcourse missile defense system has a high probability of performing reliably and effectively against limited missile threats from North Korea and Iran under realistic operational conditions, including an explanation of the degree of confidence supporting such assessment.

(2) An assessment of whether the currently planned testing program, if implemented, is

sufficient to establish reasonable confidence that the ground-based midcourse missile defense system has a high probability of performing reliably and effectively under realistic operational conditions against current and plausible near- and medium-term limited ballistic missile threats from North Korea and Iran.

(3) Any recommendations for improvements that could be made to the testing program to—

(A) achieve reasonable confidence that the system would be reliable and effective under realistic operational conditions; or

(B) improve test and cost efficiencies.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after entering into the contract under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report containing the study. The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1665. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON HOMELAND BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is a national priority to defend the United States homeland against the threat of limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate);

(2) although the currently deployed ground-based midcourse defense system provides a level of protection of the entire United States homeland, including the East Coast, against the threat of limited ballistic missile attack from North Korea and Iran, this capability needs to be improved to meet evolving ballistic missile threats;

(3) the initial step in this process of improvement is to correct the problems that caused the flight test failures with the current kill vehicles, and to improve the reliability of the deployed ground-based interceptor fleet;

(4) as indicated by senior officials of the Department of Defense, continued investments to enhance homeland defense sensor and discrimination capabilities are essential to improve the operational effectiveness and shot doctrine of the ground-based midcourse defense system;

(5) given limitations with the currently deployed exo-atmospheric kill vehicles, it is important to re-design the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle using a rigorous acquisition approach, including realistic testing, that can achieve a demonstrated capability as soon as practicable using sound acquisition principles and practices; and

(6) in order to stay ahead of evolving ballistic missile threats, the Department should design the next generation exo-atmospheric kill vehicle to take full advantage of improvements in sensors, discrimination, kill assessment, battle management, and command and control, including the potential to engage multiple objects.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Northern Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the status of current and planned efforts to improve the homeland ballistic missile defense capability of the United States.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed description of the current assessment of the threat to the United States from limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate),

particularly from countries such as North Korea and Iran, and an assessment of the projected future threat through 2023, including a discussion of confidence levels and uncertainties in such threat assessment.

(B) A detailed description of the status of efforts to correct the problems that caused the flight test failures of the capability enhancement-I and capability enhancement-II exo-atmospheric kill vehicles.

(C) A detailed description of the status of efforts to field the additional 14 ground-based interceptors planned for deployment at Fort Greely, Alaska, including the status of the refurbishment of Missile Field 1 at Fort Greely, and the operational impact of the additional interceptors.

(D) A detailed description of the plans and progress toward improving the capability, reliability, and availability of fielded ground-based interceptors, including progress toward improving the capabilities of ground-based interceptors deployed with upgraded capability enhancement-I and capability enhancement-II exo-atmospheric kill vehicles.

(E) A detailed description of the planned improvements to homeland ballistic missile defense sensor and discrimination capabilities, including through the use of additional sensor systems of the United States, and an assessment of the expected operational benefits of such improvements to homeland ballistic missile defense.

(F) A detailed description of the plans and efforts to redesign, develop, test, and field the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle for the ground-based midcourse defense system, and an explanation of the expected improvements of such kill vehicle with respect to capability, cost effectiveness, reliability, maintainability, and producibility.

(G) A detailed description of the plans for developing, testing, and fielding the next generation exo-atmospheric kill vehicle, and an explanation of how the anticipated capabilities are intended to remain ahead of evolving ballistic missile threats.

(H) A status of efforts on, and goals for, a common kill vehicle with multiple object kill capability, and an explanation of how such capability could keep the missile defense capability of the United States paced ahead of evolving ballistic missile threats.

(I) A detailed description of the options to improve the homeland ballistic missile defense capability that would respond to the emergence of a long-range ballistic missile threat from Iran, including an evaluation of the potential benefits and drawbacks of—

(i) the deployment of a missile defense interceptor site on the East Coast;

(ii) the deployment of a missile defense interceptor site in another location in the United States other than on the East Coast;

(iii) the deployment of a missile defense interceptor site in a location other than in the United States; and

(iv) the deployment of additional ground-based interceptors for the ground-based midcourse defense system at Fort Greely, Alaska, or Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, or both.

(J) Any other matters the Director considers appropriate.

(3) FORM.—The report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 1666. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON REGIONAL BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the regional ballistic missile capabilities of countries such as Iran and North

Korea pose a serious and growing threat to forward deployed forces of the United States, allies, and partner countries;

(2) given this growing threat, it is a high priority for the United States to develop, test, and deploy effective regional missile defense capabilities to provide the commanders of the geographic combatant commands with capabilities to meet the operational requirements of the commanders, and for allies and partners of the United States to improve their regional missile defense capabilities;

(3) the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization partners should continue the development, testing, and implementation of phases 2 and 3 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach to defend forward deployed forces of the United States, allies, and partners in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Europe against the growing regional missile capability of Iran;

(4) the United States should continue efforts to improve regional missile defense capabilities in the Middle East, including its close cooperation with Israel and its efforts with countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council, in order to improve regional security against the growing regional missile capabilities of Iran; and

(5) the United States should continue to work closely with its allies in Asia, particularly Japan, South Korea, and Australia, to improve regional ballistic missile defense capabilities, particularly against the growing threat from North Korean ballistic missiles.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report setting forth the status and progress of efforts to improve the regional missile defense capabilities of the United States in Europe, the Middle East, and the Asia-Pacific region, including efforts and cooperation by allies and partner countries.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) A detailed description of the status of implementation (including on the basis of technical development and acquisition of systems and capabilities) of the European Phased Adaptive Approach, including—

(A) the status of efforts to develop, test, and deploy the capabilities planned for phases 2 and 3 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach;

(B) a detailed description of the current and projected defended area of each phase of the European Phased Adaptive Approach and the missile defense requirement for the capability provided under each such phase;

(C) a detailed description of current force structure plans of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization associated with the different phases of the European Phased Adaptive Approach at various alert conditions and readiness levels;

(D) a detailed explanation of the current concept of operations for phase 1 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach and information on phase 2, including—

(i) the arrangements for allocating the command of assets assigned to the missile defense of Europe between the Commander of the United States European Command and the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe;

(ii) an explanation of the circumstances under which such command would be allocated to each such commander; and

(iii) a description of the prioritization of defense of both the deployed forces of the United States and the territory of the member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization using available missile defense interceptor inventory;

(E) an explanation of the concept for the defense of assets of the European Phased Adaptive Approach in the event such assets are targeted by adversaries; and

(F) an explanation of the development and acquisition of the active layered theater ballistic missile defense system of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, including the interoperability of such system with the ballistic missile defense system and other command and control systems of the United States.

(2) A detailed description of the status of efforts to improve the regional missile defense capabilities of the United States and the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council in the Middle East against regional missile threats from Iran, including the progress made toward, and benefits of, multilateral cooperation and data sharing among the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council with respect to multilateral integrated air and missile defense against threats from Iran.

(3) A detailed description of the progress of the United States and the allies of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region, particularly Japan, South Korea, and Australia, to improve regional ballistic missile defense capabilities and an assessment of the value of increasing cooperation, information sharing, and opportunities for additional interoperability on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

(4) A description of how the missile defense acquisitions of allies and partners of the United States, including the acquisition of missile defense technology of the United States, could be optimized to contribute to integrated and networked regional missile defense, including a description of any steps being taken to carry out such optimization.

(5) A detailed description of—

(A) the degree of coordination among the commanders of the geographic combatant commands with respect to integrated missile defense planning and operations, including obstacles and opportunities to improving such coordination and integrated capabilities; and

(B) efforts to integrate offensive and defensive forces, as specified in the “Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Strategy: Vision 2020” signed by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in December 2013.

(6) A detailed description of the phased and adaptive elements of the regional missile defense approaches of the United States tailored to the specific regional requirements in the areas of responsibility of the United States Central Command and the United States Pacific Command, including the role of missile defense capabilities of allies and partners of the United States in each region.

(7) A detailed description of the regional missile defense risk assessment and priorities of the commanders of the geographic combatant commands and a detailed description of the assessed ballistic missile threat facing each geographic combatant command through 2024.

(8) A detailed explanation of the contributions made by the regional missile defense capabilities of the United States to the defense of the United States.

(9) Such other matters as the Director considers appropriate.

(d) FORM.—The report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

TITLE XVII—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY

Subtitle A—Establishment and Duties of Commission

Sec. 1701. Short title.

Sec. 1702. National Commission on the Future of the Army.

Sec. 1703. Duties of the Commission.

Sec. 1704. Powers of the Commission.

Sec. 1705. Commission personnel matters.

Sec. 1706. Termination of the Commission.

Sec. 1707. Funding.

Subtitle B—Related Limitations

Sec. 1711. Prohibition on use of fiscal year 2015 funds to reduce strengths of Army personnel.

Sec. 1712. Limitations on the transfer, including preparations for the transfer, of AH-64 Apache helicopters assigned to the Army National Guard.

Subtitle A—Establishment and Duties of Commission

SEC. 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “National Commission on the Future of the Army Act of 2014”.

SEC. 1702. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Commission on the Future of the Army (in this subtitle referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of eight members, of whom—

(A) four shall be appointed by the President;

(B) one shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) one shall be appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(D) one shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(E) one shall be appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) APPOINTMENT DATE.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) EFFECT OF LACK OF APPOINTMENT BY APPOINTMENT DATE.—If one or more appointments under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) is not made by the appointment date specified in paragraph (2), the authority to make such appointment or appointments shall expire, and the number of members of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number of appointments so not made. If an appointment under subparagraph (B), (C), (D), or (E) of paragraph (1) is not made by the appointment date specified in paragraph (2), the authority to make an appointment under such subparagraph shall expire, and the number of members of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number otherwise appointable under such subparagraph.

(4) EXPERTISE.—In making appointments under this subsection, consideration should be given to individuals with expertise in national and international security policy and strategy, military forces capability, force structure design, organization, and employment, and reserve forces policy.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.—The Commission shall select a Chair and Vice Chair from among its members.

(e) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its initial meeting.

(f) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(g) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

SEC. 1703. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) STUDY ON STRUCTURE OF THE ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive study of the structure of the Army, and policy assumptions related to the size and force mixture of the Army, in order—

(A) to make an assessment of the size and force mixture of the active component of the Army and the reserve components of the Army; and

(B) to make recommendations on the modifications, if any, of the structure of the Army related to current and anticipated mission requirements for the Army at acceptable levels of national risk and in a manner consistent with available resources and anticipated future resources.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In undertaking the study required by subsection (a), the Commission shall give particular consideration to the following:

(A) An evaluation and identification of a structure for the Army that—

(i) has the depth and scalability to meet current and anticipated requirements of the combatant commands;

(ii) achieves cost-efficiency between the regular and reserve components of the Army, manages military risk, takes advantage of the strengths and capabilities of each, and considers fully burdened lifecycle costs;

(iii) ensures that the regular and reserve components of the Army have the capacity needed to support current and anticipated homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States;

(iv) provides for sufficient numbers of regular members of the Army to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the reserve components of the Army could be recruited;

(v) maintains a peacetime rotation force to avoid exceeding operational tempo goals of 1:2 for active members of the Army and 1:5 for members of the reserve components of the Army; and

(vi) manages strategic and operational risk by making tradeoffs among readiness, efficiency, effectiveness, capability, and affordability.

(B) An evaluation and identification of force generation policies for the Army with respect to size and force mixture in order to fulfill current and anticipated mission requirements for the Army in a manner consistent with available resources and anticipated future resources, including policies in connection with—

(i) readiness;

(ii) training;

(iii) equipment;

(iv) personnel; and

(v) maintenance of the reserve components as an operational reserve in order to main-

tain as much as possible the level of expertise and experience developed since September 11, 2001.

(C) An identification and evaluation of the distribution of responsibility and authority for the allocation of Army National Guard personnel and force structure to the States and territories.

(D) An identification and evaluation of the strategic basis or rationale, analytical methods, and decision-making processes for the allocation of Army National Guard personnel and force structure to the States and territories.

(b) STUDY ON TRANSFER OF CERTAIN AIRCRAFT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall also conduct a study of a transfer of Army National Guard AH-64 Apache aircraft from the Army National Guard to the regular Army.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the study required by paragraph (1), the Commission shall consider the factors specified in subsection (a)(2).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than February 1, 2016, the Commission shall submit to the President and the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission as a result of the studies required by subsections (a) and (b), together with its recommendations for such legislative and administrative actions as the Commission considers appropriate in light of the results of the studies.

SEC. 1704. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties under this subtitle.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out its duties under this subtitle. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

SEC. 1705. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government may be compensated at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of \$155,400 for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chair of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate

an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) **COMPENSATION.**—The Chair of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(d) **DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.**—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(e) **PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.**—The Chair of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 1706. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits its report under this subtitle.

SEC. 1707. FUNDING.

Amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by section 301 and available for operation and maintenance for the Army as specified in the funding table in section 4301 may be available for the activities of the Commission under this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Related Limitations

SEC. 1711. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FISCAL YEAR 2015 FUNDS TO REDUCE STRENGTHS OF ARMY PERSONNEL.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Army may be used to reduce Army personnel below the end strength authorizations for personnel of the Army specified in section 401(1) for active duty personnel and section 411 for Selected Reserve personnel of the reserve components of the Army.

SEC. 1712. LIMITATIONS ON THE TRANSFER, INCLUDING PREPARATIONS FOR THE TRANSFER, OF AH-64 APACHE HELICOPTERS ASSIGNED TO THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON TRANSFERS DURING FISCAL YEAR 2015.**—During fiscal year 2015, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army may not transfer any AH-64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the regular Army.

(b) **ADDITIONAL LIMITATION ON AIRCRAFT OR PERSONNEL TRANSFERS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.**—In addition to the prohibition on transfers imposed by subsection (a), but sub-

ject to the exceptions provided in subsection (e), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army may not, before March 31, 2016—

(1) divest, retire, or transfer, or prepare to divest, retire, or transfer, any AH-64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the regular Army; or

(2) reduce personnel related to any AH-64 Apache helicopters of the Army National Guard below the levels of such personnel as of September 30, 2014.

(c) **CONTINUED READINESS OF AIRCRAFT AND PERSONNEL.**—The Secretary of the Army shall ensure the continuing readiness of AH-64 Apache helicopters during fiscal year 2015 as necessary to meet the requirements of combatant commanders.

(d) **EFFECT ON PERSONNEL ACTIONS AND TRAINING.**—Notwithstanding the prohibition imposed by subsection (a), the limitation imposed by subsection (b), and the duty imposed by subsection (c), the Secretary of the Army may—

(1) carry out any personnel action, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, necessary to support Army aviation readiness and operations;

(2) conduct qualification and reclassification training for pilots, crew, and military occupational specialties related to Army Aviation; and

(3) continue flight training and advanced qualification courses for selected National Guard personnel related to AH-64 Apache helicopters in accordance with Army readiness requirements.

(e) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Subject to the Secretary of Defense certification required by subsection (f), the Secretary of the Army may—

(1) during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on March 31, 2016, make preparations for the transfer of not more than 48 AH-64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the regular Army; and

(2) during the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016, transfer not more than 48 AH-64 Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to the regular Army.

(f) **CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—The certification referred to in subsection (e) is a certification by the Secretary of Defense in writing to the congressional defense committees that the commencement of preparations to transfer AH-64 Apache helicopters pursuant to the exception provided by subsection (e)(1) or a transfer of AH-64 Apache helicopters pursuant to the exception provided by subsection (e)(2) would not create unacceptable risk—

(1) to the strategic depth or regeneration capacities of the Army; and

(2) to the Army National Guard in its role as the combat reserve of the Army.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”.

SEC. 2002. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

(a) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER THREE YEARS.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), all authorizations contained in titles XXI through XXVII and title XXIX of this division for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor) shall expire on the later of—

(1) October 1, 2017; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before the later of—

(1) October 1, 2017; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for fiscal year 2018 for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2101. Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2102. Family housing.

Sec. 2103. Authorization of appropriations, Army.

Sec. 2104. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project.

Sec. 2105. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 projects.

Sec. 2106. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project.

Sec. 2107. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

Sec. 2108. Limitation on construction of cadet barracks at United States Military Academy, New York.

Sec. 2109. Limitation on funding for family housing construction at Camp Walker, Republic of Korea.

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) **INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2103(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
California	Concord	\$15,200,000
	Fort Irwin	\$45,000,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	\$89,000,000
Hawaii	Fort Shafter	\$311,400,000
Kentucky	Blue Grass Army Depot	\$15,000,000

Army: Inside the United States—Continued

State	Installation or Location	Amount
New York	Fort Campbell	\$23,000,000
.....	Fort Drum	\$27,000,000
Pennsylvania	Letterkenny Army Depot	\$16,000,000
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	\$52,000,000
Texas	Fort Hood	\$46,000,000
Virginia	Fort Lee	\$86,000,000
.....	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	\$7,700,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2103(a) and available for military construc-

tion projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out the military con-

struction project for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Guantanamo Bay	Guantanamo Bay	\$23,800,000
Japan	Kadena Air Base	\$10,600,000

SEC. 2102. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section

2103(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family hous-

ing units (including land acquisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, in the number of units, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Army: Family Housing

State/Country	Installation	Units	Amount
Illinois	Rock Island	Family Housing New Construction	\$19,500,000
Korea	Camp Walker	Family Housing New Construction	\$57,800,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2103(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$1,309,000.

SEC. 2103. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2101 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$226,400,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for a Command and Control Facility at Fort Shafter, Hawaii).

(3) \$46,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for a Simulations Center at Fort Hood, Texas).

(4) \$86,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for an Ad-

vanced Individual Training Barracks Complex, Ph 3, at Fort Lee, Virginia).

(5) \$6,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2119) for cadet barracks at the United States Military Academy, New York).

(6) \$78,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2119), as amended by section 2105(d) of this Act, for a Secure Administration/Operations Facility at Fort Belvoir, Virginia).

SEC. 2104. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2004 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108-136; 117 Stat. 1697) for Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, for construction of an Explosives Research and Development Loading Facility at the installation, the Secretary of the Army may use available unobligated balances of amounts appropriated for military construction for the Army to complete work on the project within the scope specified for the project in the justification data provided to Congress as part of the request for authorization of the project.

SEC. 2105. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) FORT DRUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In executing the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of

Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2119) for Fort Drum, New York, for construction of an Aircraft Maintenance Hangar at the installation, the Secretary of the Army may provide a capital contribution to a public or private utility company in order for the utility company to extend the utility company's gas line to the installation boundary.

(2) NO CHANGE IN SCOPE.—The capital contribution under subsection (a) shall not be construed as a change in the scope of work under section 2853 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) FORT LEONARD WOOD.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2119) for Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, for construction of Battalion Complex Facilities at the installation, the Secretary of the Army may construct the Battalion Headquarters with classrooms for a unit other than a Global Defense Posture Realignment unit.

(c) FORT MCNAIR.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2119) for Fort McNair, District of Columbia, for construction of a Vehicle Storage Building at the installation, the Secretary of the Army may construct up to 20,227 square feet of vehicle storage.

(d) FORT BELVOIR.—The table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2119) is amended in the item relating to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, by striking “\$94,000,000” in the amount column and inserting “\$172,000,000”.

SEC. 2106. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2011 PROJECT.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4436), the au-

thorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101 of that Act (124 Stat. 4437) and extended by section 2109 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 988), shall remain

in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) **TABLE.**—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Army: Extension of 2011 Project Authorization

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Georgia	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	\$12,200,000

SEC. 2107. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of

Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101 of that Act (125 Stat. 1661), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment

of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) **TABLE.**—The table referred to in subsection (a) as follows:

Army: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Georgia	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	\$5,100,000
North Carolina	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	\$25,000,000
Texas	Fort Bragg	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hanger	\$54,000,000
Virginia	Fort Bliss	Applied Instruction Building	\$8,300,000
	Fort Bliss	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	\$19,000,000
	Fort Hood	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hanger	\$47,000,000
	Fort Belvoir	Road and Infrastructure Improvements	\$25,000,000

SEC. 2108. LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION OF CADET BARRACKS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, NEW YORK.

No amounts may be obligated or expended for the construction of increment 3 of the Cadet Barracks at the United States Military Academy, New York, as authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2119), until the Secretary of the Army certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary intends to award a contract for the renovation of the MacArthur Long Barracks at the United States Military Academy concurrent with assuming beneficial occupancy of the renovated MacArthur Short Barracks at the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 2109. LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION AT CAMP WALKER, REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for construction of military family housing units at Camp Walker, Republic of Korea, may be obligated or expended until 30 days following the delivery of the report required under subsection (b).

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than March 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Commander, U.S. Forces Korea, shall submit to the congressional de-

fense committees a report on future military family housing requirements in the Republic of Korea and potential courses of action for meeting those requirements.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall, at a minimum—

(A) identify the number of authorized Command Sponsored Families, by location, in the Republic of Korea;

(B) validate that the number of authorized Command Sponsored Families identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) is necessary for operational effectiveness;

(C) identify and validate each key and essential Command Sponsored Family billet requiring on-post housing in the Republic of Korea;

(D) identify and validate the number of authorized Command Sponsored Families in excess of key and essential requiring on-post housing in the Republic of Korea;

(E) identify the number and estimated cost of on-post family housing units required to support the validated requirements;

(F) contain a plan for meeting the on-post family housing requirements in the Republic of Korea, including the source of funding; and

(G) contain a prioritized list of planned military construction projects to be funded with Special Measures Agreement funds over the future-years defense plan, including a certification that each proposed project is a higher priority than family housing.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2201. Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2202. Family housing.

Sec. 2203. Improvements to military family housing units.

Sec. 2204. Authorization of appropriations, Navy.

Sec. 2205. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

Sec. 2206. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project.

Sec. 2207. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects.

Sec. 2208. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

SEC. 2201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) **INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Arizona	Yuma	\$16,608,000
California	Bridgeport	\$16,180,000
	Lemoore	\$38,985,000
	San Diego	\$47,110,000
District of Columbia	Naval Support Activity Washington	\$31,735,000
Florida	Jacksonville	\$30,235,000
	Mayport	\$20,520,000
Guam	Joint Region Marianas	\$50,651,000
Hawaii	Kaneohe Bay	\$53,382,000
	Pearl Harbor	\$9,698,000

Inside the United States—Continued

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Maryland	Annapolis	\$120,112,000
	Indian Head	\$15,346,000
	Patuxent River	\$9,860,000
Nevada	Fallon	\$31,262,000
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	\$50,706,000
	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	\$41,588,000
	Philadelphia	\$23,985,000
Pennsylvania	Charleston	\$35,716,000
South Carolina	Dahlgren	\$27,313,000
Virginia	Norfolk	\$39,274,000
	Portsmouth	\$9,743,000
	Quantico	\$12,613,000
Washington	Yorktown	\$26,988,000
	Bangor	\$13,833,000
	Bremerton	\$16,401,000
	Port Angeles	\$20,638,000
	Whidbey Island	\$24,390,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military construc-

tion projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction

projects for the installation or location outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Bahrain Island	Southwest Asia	\$27,826,000
Djibouti	Camp Lemonier	\$9,923,000
Japan	Iwakuni	\$6,415,000
	Kadena Air Base	\$19,411,000
	Marine Corps Air Station Futenma	\$4,639,000
	Okinawa	\$35,685,000
Spain	Rota	\$20,233,000

SEC. 2202. FAMILY HOUSING.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$472,000.

SEC. 2203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a) and available for military family housing functions as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$15,940,000.

SEC. 2204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2201 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$90,112,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(a) for a Center for Cyber Security Studies Building at Annapolis, Maryland).

(3) \$274,099,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1666) for an explosive handling wharf at Kitsap, Washington).

(4) \$68,196,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2633) for ramp parking at Joint Region Marianas, Guam).

SEC. 2205. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) YUMA.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1666), for Yuma, Arizona, for construction of a Double Aircraft Maintenance Hangar, the Secretary of the Navy may construct up to approximately 70,000 square feet of additional apron to be utilized as a taxi-lane using amounts appropriated for this project pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204 of such Act (125 Stat. 1667).

(b) CAMP PENDELTON.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1666), for Camp Pendleton, California, for construction of an Infantry Squad Defense Range, the Secretary of the Navy may construct up to 9,000 square feet of vehicular bridge using amounts appropriated for this project pursu-

ant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204 of such Act (125 Stat. 1667).

(c) KINGS BAY.—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1666), for Kings Bay, Georgia, for construction of a Crab Island Security Enclave, the Secretary of the Navy may expand the enclave fencing system to three layers of fencing and construct two elevated fixed fighting positions with associated supporting facilities using amounts appropriated for this project pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204 of such Act (125 Stat. 1667).

SEC. 2206. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 989), for Yorktown, Virginia, for construction of Small Arms Ranges, the Secretary of the Navy may construct 240 square meters of armory, 48 square meters of Safety Officer/Target Storage Building, and 667 square meters of Range Operations Building using appropriations available for the project pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204 of such Act (127 Stat. 990).

SEC. 2207. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2011 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4436), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act (124 Stat. 4441) and extended by section

2207 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 991), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of

an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Navy: Extension of 2011 Project Authorizations

State/Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Bahrain	South West Asia	Navy Central Command Ammunition Magazines	\$89,280,000
Guam	Naval Activities, Guam	Defense Access Roads Improvements	\$66,730,000

SEC. 2208. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2201 of that Act (125 Stat. 1666), shall remain in effect until

October 1, 2015, or the date of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Navy: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

State/Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
California	Camp Pendelton	North Area Waste Water Conveyance	\$78,271,000
	Camp Pendelton	Infantry Squad Defense Range	\$29,187,000
	Twentynine Palms	Land Expansion	\$8,665,000
Florida	Jacksonville	P-8A Hangar Upgrades	\$6,085,000
Georgia	Kings Bay	Crab Island Security Enclave	\$52,913,000
	Kings Bay	WRA Land/Water Interface	\$33,150,000
Maryland	Patuxent River	Aircraft Prototype Facility Phase 2	\$45,844,000

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2301. Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2302. Authorization of appropriations, Air Force.

Sec. 2303. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2008 project.

Sec. 2304. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project.

Sec. 2305. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2012 project.

SEC. 2301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the au-

thorization of appropriations in section 2302(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alaska	Clear Air Force Station	\$11,500,000
Arizona	Luke Air Force Base	\$26,800,000
Guam	Joint Region Marianas	\$47,800,000
Kansas	McConnell Air Force Base	\$34,400,000
Massachusetts	Hanscom Air Force Base	\$13,500,000
Nevada	Nellis Air Force Base	\$53,900,000
New Jersey	Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst	\$5,900,000
Oklahoma	Tinker Air Force Base	\$111,000,000
Texas	Joint Base San Antonio	\$5,800,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2302(a) and available for military construc-

tion projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out the military con-

struction project for the installation or location outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
United Kingdom	Royal Air Force Croughton	\$92,223,000

SEC. 2302. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other

cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2301 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$107,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 992) for the CYBERCOM Joint Operations Center at Fort Meade, Maryland).

SEC. 2303. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2008 PROJECT.

In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 515), for Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, for base infrastructure at that location, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire fee or lesser real property interests in approximately 11.5 acres of land contiguous to Shaw Air Force Base for the

project using funds appropriated to the Department of the Air Force for construction in years prior to fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 2304. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2011 PROJECT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4436), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2301 of that Act (124 Stat. 4444) and extended by section 2307 of the Military Construction Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 994), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Air Force: Extension of 2011 Project Authorization

Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Bahrain	Shaikh Isa Air Base	North Apron Expansion	\$45,000,000.

SEC. 2305. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2301 of that Act (125 Stat. 1670), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment

of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Air Force: Extension of 2012 Project Authorization

State/Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Italy	Signonella Naval Air Station	UAS SATCOM Relay Pads and Facility	\$15,000,000

**TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**

Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations

Sec. 2401. Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2402. Authorized energy conservation projects.

Sec. 2403. Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies.

Sec. 2404. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects.

Sec. 2405. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

Sec. 2406. Limitation on project authorization to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 projects pending submission of report.

Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations

Sec. 2411. Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide.

Sec. 2412. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 project.

Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for military construction projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Arizona	Fort Huachuca	\$1,871,000
California	Camp Pendleton	\$11,841,000
	Coronado	\$70,340,000
	Lemoore	\$52,500,000
Colorado	Peterson Air Force Base	\$15,200,000
Georgia	Hunter Army Airfield	\$7,692,000
	Robins Air Force Base	\$19,900,000
Hawaii	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	\$52,900,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell	\$18,000,000
Maryland	Fort Meade	\$54,207,000
	Joint Base Andrews	\$18,300,000
Michigan	Selfridge Air National Guard Base	\$35,100,000
Mississippi	Stennis	\$27,547,000
Nevada	Fallon	\$20,241,000
New Mexico	Cannon Air Force Base	\$23,333,000
North Carolina	Camp Lejeune	\$52,748,000
	Fort Bragg	\$93,136,000
	Seymour Johnson AFB	\$8,500,000
South Carolina	Beaufort	\$40,600,000
South Dakota	Ellsworth Air Force Base	\$8,000,000
Texas	Joint Base San Antonio	\$38,300,000
Virginia	Craney Island	\$36,500,000
	Defense Distribution Depot Richmond	\$5,700,000
	Fort Belvoir	\$7,239,000
	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	\$41,200,000
	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek-Story	\$39,588,000
	Pentagon	\$15,100,000

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States—Continued

State	Installation or Location	Amount
CONUS Classified	Classified Location	\$53,073,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for military construc-

tion projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction

projects for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Australia	Geraldton	\$9,600,000
Belgium	Brussels	\$79,544,000
Guantanamo Bay	Guantanamo Bay	\$76,290,000
Japan	Misawa Air Base	\$37,775,000
	Okinawa	\$170,901,000
	Sasebo	\$37,681,000

SEC. 2402. AUTHORIZED ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section

2403(a) and available for energy conservation projects inside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy con-

servation projects under chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Energy Conservation Projects: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
California	Edwards Air Force Base	\$4,500,000
	Fort Hunter Liggett	\$13,500,000
	Vandenberg Air Force Base	\$2,965,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	\$3,000,000
Florida	Eglin Air Force Base	\$3,850,000
Georgia	Moody Air Force Base	\$3,600,000
Hawaii	Marine Corps Base Hawaii	\$8,460,000
Illinois	Great Lakes Naval Station	\$2,190,000
Maine	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	\$2,740,000
Maryland	Fort Detrick	\$2,100,000
Nebraska	Offutt Air Force Base	\$2,869,000
Oklahoma	Tinker Air Force Base	\$3,609,000
Oregon	Oregon City Armory	\$9,400,000
Utah	Dugway Proving Ground	\$15,400,000
Virginia	Naval Station Norfolk	\$11,360,000
	Pentagon	\$2,120,000
Various Locations	Various Locations	\$25,112,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2403(a) and available for energy conservation

projects outside the United States as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy conservation projects under chapter 173 of

title 10, United States Code, for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Energy Conservation Projects: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Diego Garcia	Naval Support Facility	\$14,620,000
Japan	Fleet Activities Yokosuka	\$8,030,000
Germany	Spangdahlem	\$4,800,000
Various Locations	Various Locations	\$5,776,000

SEC. 2403. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2013, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of

title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2401 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$79,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239;

126 Stat. 2128) for NSAW Recapitalize Building #1 at Fort Meade, Maryland).

(3) \$20,800,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2129) for the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex at Deveselu, Romania).

(4) \$141,039,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-

81; 125 Stat. 1672), as amended by section 2404(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2130), for a data center at Fort Meade, Maryland).

(5) \$50,500,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1672) for an Ambulatory Care Center at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland).

(6) \$54,300,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1672) for an Ambulatory Care Center at Joint Base San Antonio, Texas).

(7) \$526,168,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1673) for a hospital at the Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany).

(8) \$281,325,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2640) for a hospital at Fort Bliss, Texas).

(9) \$123,827,000 (the balance of the amount authorized as a Military Construction, Defense-Wide project by title X of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law

111-32; 123 Stat. 1888) for a data center at Camp Williams, Utah).

SEC. 2404. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2011 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4436), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2401 of that Act (124 Stat. 4446), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2011 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
District of Columbia	Bolling Air Force Base	Cooling Tower Expansion	\$2,070,000
		DIAC Parking Garage	\$13,586,000
		Electrical Upgrades	\$1,080,000

SEC. 2405. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of

Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2401 of that Act (125 Stat. 1672), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment

of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2012 Project Authorizations

State/Country	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
California	Coronado	SOF Support Activity Operations Facility	\$42,000,000
Germany	USAG Baumholder	Wetzel-Smith Elementary School	\$59,419,000
Italy	USAG Vicenza	Vicenza High School	\$41,864,000
Japan	Yokota Air Base	Yokota High School	\$49,606,000
Virginia	Pentagon Reservation	Heliprot Control Tower and Fire Station	\$6,457,000
		Pedestrian Plaza	\$2,285,000

SEC. 2406. LIMITATION ON PROJECT AUTHORIZATION TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2015 PROJECTS PENDING SUBMISSION OF REPORT.

(a) LIMITATION.—No amounts may be obligated or expended for the military construction projects described in subsection (b) and otherwise authorized by section 2401(a) until the report described in subsection (c) has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) COVERED PROJECTS.—The limitation imposed by subsection (a) applies to the following military construction projects:

(1) The construction of a human performance center facility at Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek–Story, Virginia.

(2) The construction of a squadron operations facility at Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico.

(c) REPORT DESCRIBED.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is the report on the review of Department of Defense efforts regarding the prevention of suicide among members of United States Special Operations Forces and their dependents required by section 582 of this Act.

Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations

SEC. 2411. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014, for military construction and land acquisition for chemical demili-

tarization, as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under subsection (a) and the project described in paragraph (2) of this subsection may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$2,049,000 (the balance of the amount authorized for ammunition demilitarization at Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 835), as most recently amended by section 2412 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4450) and section 2412 of this Act.

SEC. 2412. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2000 PROJECT.

(a) MODIFICATION.—The table in section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 835), as amended by section 2405 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107-107; 115 Stat. 1298), section 2405 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107-314; 116 Stat. 2698), section 2414 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4697), and section 2412 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4450), is further amended by striking “\$723,200,000” and inserting “\$757,200,000”.

B of Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4697), and section 2412 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4450), is amended—

(1) in the item relating to Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, by striking “\$746,000,000” in the amount column and inserting “\$780,000,000”; and

(2) by striking the amount identified as the total in the amount column and inserting “\$1,237,920,000”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2405(b)(3) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 839), as amended by section 2405 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107-107; 115 Stat. 1298), section 2405 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107-314; 116 Stat. 2698), section 2414 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4697), and section 2412 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4450), is further amended by striking “\$723,200,000” and inserting “\$757,200,000”.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Sec. 2501. Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2502. Authorization of appropriations, NATO.

SEC. 2501. AUTHORIZED NATO CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the sum of the amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in section 2502 and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

SEC. 2502. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program authorized by section 2501 as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES**Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations**

Sec. 2601. Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2602. Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2603. Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2604. Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2605. Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2606. Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Sec. 2611. Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects.

Sec. 2612. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 projects.

Sec. 2613. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project.

Sec. 2614. Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 projects.

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations**SEC. 2601. AUTHORIZED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.**

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Army National Guard locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army National Guard

State	Location	Amount
Delaware	Dagsboro	\$10,800,000
Maine	Augusta	\$32,000,000
Maryland	Havre De Grace	\$12,400,000
Montana	Helena	\$38,000,000
New Mexico	Alamogordo	\$5,000,000
North Dakota	Valley City	\$10,800,000
Vermont	North Hyde Park	\$4,400,000
Washington	Yakima	\$19,000,000

SEC. 2602. AUTHORIZED ARMY RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in sec-

tion 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in the funding table in section 4601, the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry

out military construction projects for the Army Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army Reserve

State	Location	Amount
California	Fresno	\$22,000,000
Colorado	March Air Force Base	\$25,000,000
Illinois	Fort Carson	\$5,000,000
Mississippi	Arlington Heights	\$26,000,000
New Jersey	Starkville	\$9,300,000
New York	Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst	\$26,000,000
Virginia	Mattydale	\$23,000,000
	Fort Lee	\$16,000,000

SEC. 2603. AUTHORIZED NAVY RESERVE AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in sec-

tion 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in section 4601, the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and

Marine Corps Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve

State	Location	Amount
Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh	\$17,650,000
Washington	Naval Station Everett	\$47,869,000
	Whidbey Island	\$27,755,000

SEC. 2604. AUTHORIZED AIR NATIONAL GUARD CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in sec-

tion 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military

construction projects for the Air National Guard locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air National Guard

State	Location	Amount
Arkansas	Fort Smith Municipal Airport	\$13,200,000
Connecticut	Bradley International Airport	\$16,306,000
Iowa	Des Moines Municipal Airport	\$8,993,000
Michigan	W.K. Kellogg Regional Airport	\$6,000,000
New Hampshire	Pease International Trade Port	\$41,902,000
Pennsylvania	Horsham Air Guard Station (Willow Grove)	\$5,662,000

SEC. 2605. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in sec-

tion 2606(a) and available for the National Guard and Reserve as specified in section 4601, the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military

construction projects for the Air Force Reserve locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force Reserve

State	Location	Amount
Arizona	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	\$14,500,000
Georgia	Robins Air Force Base	\$27,700,000
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	\$9,800,000
Texas	Forth Worth	\$3,700,000

SEC. 2606. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(b) **LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.**—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under sections 2601 through 2605 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

(2) \$10,800,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2601 for a National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop at Dagsboro, Delaware).

(3) \$19,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2601 for an Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training at Yakima, Washington).

(4) \$26,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2602 for an Army Reserve Center at Arlington Heights, Illinois).

(5) \$9,300,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2602 for an Army Reserve Center at Starkville, Mississippi).

Subtitle B—Other Matters**SEC. 2611. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2012 PROJECTS.**

(a) **KANSAS CITY.**—

(1) **MODIFICATION.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1678), for Kansas City, Kansas, for construction of an Army Reserve Center at that location, the Secretary of the Army may, instead of constructing a new facility in Kansas City, construct a new facility in the vicinity of Kansas City, Kansas.

(2) **DURATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorization set forth in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) **ATTLEBORO.**—

(1) **MODIFICATION.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1678), for Attleboro, Massachusetts, for construction of an Army Reserve Center at that location, the Secretary of the Army may, instead of constructing a new facility in Attleboro, construct a new facility in the vicinity of Attleboro, Massachusetts.

(2) **DURATION OF AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1660), the authorization set forth in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

SEC. 2612. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROJECTS.

(a) **STORMVILLE.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2601 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public

Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2133) for Stormville, New York, for construction of a Combined Support Maintenance Shop Phase I, the Secretary of the Army may instead construct the facility at Camp Smith, New York, and build a 53,760 square foot maintenance facility in lieu of a 75,156 square foot maintenance facility.

(b) **TUSTIN.**—In the case of the authorization contained in the table in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2135) for Tustin, California, for construction of an Army Reserve Center, the Secretary of the Army may construct the facility in the vicinity of Tustin instead of constructing the facility in Tustin.

SEC. 2613. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2014 PROJECT.

The table in section 2604 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1002) is amended in the item relating to Martin State Airport, Maryland, for construction of a CYBER/ISR Facility by striking “\$8,000,000” in the amount column and inserting “\$12,900,000”.

SEC. 2614. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2011 PROJECTS.

(a) **EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding section 2002 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4436), the authorizations set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in sections 2601 and 2602 of that Act (124 Stat. 4452, 4453) and extended by section 2612 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1003), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

(b) **TABLE.**—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Extension of 2011 National Guard and Reserve Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Puerto Rico	Camp Santiago	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	\$9,200,000
Virginia	Fort Story	Army Reserve Center	\$11,000,000

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations
 Sec. 2701. Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account.

Subtitle B—Prohibition on Additional BRAC Round

Sec. 2711. Prohibition on conducting additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Sec. 2721. Modification of property disposal procedures under base realignment and closure process.

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations
SEC. 2701. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES FUNDED THROUGH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014, for base realignment and closure activities, including real property acquisition and military construction projects, as authorized by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and funded through the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 2906 of such Act (as amended by section 2711 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2140)), as specified in the funding table in section 4601.

Subtitle B—Prohibition on Additional BRAC Round

SEC. 2711. PROHIBITION ON CONDUCTING ADDITIONAL BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE (BRAC) ROUND.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 2721. MODIFICATION OF PROPERTY DISPOSAL PROCEDURES UNDER BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE PROCESSES.

(a) **REPORT ON EXCESS PROPERTY.**—Section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

“(f) **REPORT ON DESIGNATION OF PROPERTY AS EXCESS INSTEAD OF SURPLUS.**—(1) Not later than 180 days after the date on which real property located at a military installation closed or realigned under this part is declared excess, but not surplus, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report identifying the property and including the information required by paragraph (2). The Secretary shall update the report every 180 days thereafter until the property is either declared surplus or transferred to another Federal agency.

“(2) Each report under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

“(A) The reason for the excess designation.

“(B) The nature of the contemplated transfer.

“(C) The proposed timeline for the transfer.

“(D) Any impediments to completing the Federal agency screening process.”.

(b) **EFFECT OF LACK OF RECOGNIZED REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.**—Section 2910(9) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “The term” and inserting “(A) The term”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) If no redevelopment authority referred to in subparagraph (A) exists with respect to a military installation, the term shall include the following:

“(i) The local government in whose jurisdiction the military installation is wholly located.

“(ii) A local government agency or State government agency designated by the chief executive officer of the State in which the military installation is located under subparagraph (B) of section 2905(b)(3) for the purpose of the consultation required by subparagraph (A) of such section.”.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Sec. 2801. Congressional notification of construction projects, land acquisitions, and defense access road projects conducted under authorities other than a Military Construction Authorization Act.

Sec. 2802. Modification of authority to carry out unspecified minor military construction.

Sec. 2803. Clarification of authorized use of payments-in-kind and in-kind contributions.

Sec. 2804. Use of one-step turn-key contractor selection procedures for additional facility projects.

Sec. 2805. Limitations on military construction in European Command area of responsibility and European Reassurance Initiative.

Sec. 2806. Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States.

Sec. 2807. Application of residential building construction standards.

Sec. 2808. Limitation on construction of new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Sec. 2811. Renewals, extensions, and succeeding leases for financial institutions operating on military installations.

Sec. 2812. Deposit of reimbursed funds to cover administrative expenses relating to certain real property transactions.

Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment

Sec. 2821. Realignment of Marines Corps forces in Asia-Pacific region.

Sec. 2822. Establishment of surface danger zone, Ritidian Unit, Guam National Wildlife Refuge.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

Sec. 2831. Land conveyance, Gordo Army Reserve Center, Gordo, Alabama.

Sec. 2832. Land conveyance, West Nome Tank Farm, Nome, Alaska.

Sec. 2833. Land conveyance, former Air Force Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point, Norwalk, California.

Sec. 2834. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction and alternative land conveyance authority, former Walter Reed Army Hospital, District of Columbia.

Sec. 2835. Land conveyance, former Lynn Haven fuel depot, Lynn Haven, Florida.

Sec. 2836. Transfers of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Frank D. Merrill and Lake Lanier, Georgia.

Sec. 2837. Land conveyance, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii.

Sec. 2838. Modification of conditions on land conveyance, Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Illinois.

Sec. 2839. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Gruber, Oklahoma.

Sec. 2840. Conveyance, Joint Base Charleston, South Carolina.

Sec. 2841. Land exchanges, Arlington County, Virginia.

Subtitle E—Military Memorials, Monuments, and Museums

Sec. 2851. Acceptance of in-kind gifts on behalf of Heritage Center for the National Museum of the United States Army.

Sec. 2852. Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial, San Diego, California.

Sec. 2853. Establishment of memorial to the victims of the shooting at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013.

Subtitle F—Designations

Sec. 2861. Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

Sec. 2871. Report on physical security at Department of Defense facilities.

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

SEC. 2801. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS, LAND ACQUISITIONS, AND DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD PROJECTS CONDUCTED UNDER AUTHORITIES OTHER THAN A MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT.

Section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e)(1) If a construction project, land acquisition, or defense access road project described in paragraph (2) will be carried out pursuant to a provision of law other than a Military Construction Authorization Act, the Secretary concerned shall—

“(A) comply with the congressional notification requirement contained in the provision of law under which the construction project, land acquisition, or defense access road project will be carried out; or

“(B) in the absence of such a congressional notification requirement, submit to the congressional defense committees, in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title, a report describing the construction project, land acquisition, or defense access road project at least 15 days before commencing the construction project, land acquisition, or defense access road project.

“(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), a construction project, land acquisition, or defense access road project subject to the notification requirement imposed by paragraph (1) is a construction project, land acquisition, or defense access road project that—

“(A) is not specifically authorized in a Military Construction Authorization Act;

“(B) will be carried out by a military department, Defense Agency, or Department of Defense Field Activity; and

“(C) will be located on a military installation.

“(3) This subsection does not apply to a construction project, land acquisition, or defense access road project described in paragraph (2) whose cost is less than or equal to the threshold amount specified in section 2805(b) of this title.”.

SEC. 2802. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DESCRIBED.**—Subsection (a)(2) of section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “\$3,000,000” and inserting “\$4,000,000”.

(b) **INCREASED THRESHOLD FOR APPLICATION OF SECRETARY APPROVAL AND CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by striking “\$750,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

(c) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO BE USED FOR PROJECTS.**—Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking “\$750,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

SEC. 2803. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORIZED USE OF PAYMENTS-IN-KIND AND IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) **PAYMENTS-IN-KIND AND IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.**—Subsection (f) of section 2687a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(f) **AUTHORIZED USE OF PAYMENTS-IN-KIND AND IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.**—(1) A military construction project, as defined in chapter 159 of this title, may be accepted as payment-in-kind or as an in-kind contribution required by a bilateral agreement with a host country only if that military construction project is authorized by law.

“(2) Operations of United States forces may be funded through payment-in-kind or an in-kind contribution required by a bilateral agreement with a host country under this section only if the costs covered by such payment or contribution are included in the budget justification documents for the Department of Defense submitted to Congress in connection with the budget submitted under 1105 of title 31.

“(3) If funds previously appropriated for a military construction project or operating costs are subsequently addressed in an agreement for payment-in-kind or by an in-kind contribution required by a bilateral agree-

ment with a host country, the Secretary of Defense shall return to the Treasury funds in the amount equal to the value of the appropriated funds.

“(4) This subsection does not apply to a military construction project that—

“(A) was specified in a bilateral agreement with a host country that was entered into before December 26, 2013;

“(B) was the subject of negotiation between the United States and a host country as of the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015;

“(C) was accepted as payment-in-kind for the residual value of improvements made by the United States at military installations released to the host country under section 2921 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (division B of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) before December 26, 2013; or

“(D) subject to paragraph (6), will cost less than the cost specified in subsection (a)(2) of section 2805 of this title for certain unspecified minor military construction projects.

“(5) This subsection does not apply to an in-kind contribution toward operating costs that—

“(A) was specified in a bilateral agreement with a host country that was entered into before December 26, 2013;

“(B) was the subject of negotiation between the United States and a host country as of the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; or

“(C) was accepted as an in-kind contribution for the residual value of improvements made by the United States at military installations released to the host country under section 2921 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (division B of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) before December 26, 2013.

“(6) In the case of a military construction project excluded pursuant to paragraph (4)(D) whose cost will exceed the cost specified in subsection (b) of section 2805 of this title for certain unspecified minor military construction projects, the congressional notification requirements and waiting period specified in paragraph (2) of such subsection shall apply.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 2802(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “payment-in-kind contributions” and inserting “payments-in-kind or in-kind contributions”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(3) This subsection does not apply to a military construction project covered by one of the exceptions in section 2687a(f)(4) of this title.”; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “paragraph (3)(C)” and inserting “paragraph (3), by reference to section 2687a(f)(4)(D) of this title.”.

(c) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—

(1) **NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the effective date specified in subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a written notification, at least 30 days before the initiation date for any military construction project to be built for Department of Defense personnel outside the United States using payments-in-kind or in-kind contributions.

(2) **ELEMENTS OF NOTICE.**—A written notification under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The requirements for, and purpose and description of, the proposed military construction project.

(B) The cost of the proposed military construction project.

(C) The scope of the proposed military construction project.

(D) The schedule for the proposed military construction project.

(E) Such other details as the Secretary considers relevant.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the later of—

(1) September 30, 2016; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017.

SEC. 2804. USE OF ONE-STEP TURN-KEY CONTRACTOR SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR ADDITIONAL FACILITY PROJECTS.

Section 2862 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 2862. Turn-key selection procedures

“(a) **AUTHORITY TO USE FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.**—The Secretary concerned may use one-step turn-key selection procedures for the purpose of entering into a contract for any of the following purposes:

“(1) The construction of an authorized military construction project.

“(2) A repair project (as defined in section 2811(e) of this title) with an approved cost equal to or less than \$4,000,000.

“(3) The construction of a facility as part of an authorized security assistance activity.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘one-step turn-key selection procedures’ means procedures used for the selection of a contractor on the basis of price and other evaluation criteria to perform, in accordance with the provisions of a firm fixed-price contract, both the design and construction of a facility using performance specifications supplied by the Secretary concerned.

“(2) The term ‘security assistance activity’ means—

“(A) humanitarian and civic assistance authorized by sections 401 and 2561 of this title;

“(B) foreign disaster assistance authorized by section 404 of this title;

“(C) foreign military construction sales authorized by section 29 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2769);

“(D) foreign assistance authorized under sections 607 and 632 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2357, 2392); and

“(E) other international security assistance specifically authorized by law.”.

SEC. 2805. LIMITATIONS ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION IN EUROPEAN COMMAND AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY AND EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE.

(a) **EXTENSION OF CURRENT LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.**—Section 2809 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1013) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “or the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015” after “this division”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “the date of the enactment of this Act” and inserting “December 26, 2013”.

(b) **LIMITATION RELATED TO EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE.**—The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department shall not award any contract in connection with a construction project authorized in title XXIX of this division to be carried out at an installation operated in the

European Command area of responsibility until—

(1) the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a project notification that—

(A) includes a completed military construction project data sheet (DD 1391); and

(B) certifies that a pre-financing statement for eligible projects has been submitted through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program; and

(2) subject to subsection (c), the expiration of the 21-day period beginning on the date the notification is received by the committees or, if earlier, the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of title 10, United States Code.

(c) **RELATION TO CURRENT LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.**—The limitation imposed by subsection (b) is in addition to the limitation on construction projects carried out in the European Command area of responsibility imposed by section 2809 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1013), as amended by subsection (a).

SEC. 2806. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY, LIMITED AUTHORITY TO USE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN CERTAIN AREAS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108-136; 117 Stat. 1723), as most recently amended by section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 127 Stat. 1012), is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “shall not exceed \$100,000,000 between October 1, 2014, and the earlier of December 31, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military activities of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016.”; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2015”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “fiscal year 2015” and inserting “fiscal year 2016”.

SEC. 2807. APPLICATION OF RESIDENTIAL BUILDING CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS.

If a residential building project (including repair or remodeling project) is authorized by this Act or will be carried out using amounts appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in this Act and the project will be designed and constructed to meet an above code green building standard or rating system, the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned may use the ICC 700 National Green Building Standard, the LEED Green Building Standard System, the Green Globes Green Building Certification System, or an equivalent protocol developed using a voluntary consensus standard, as defined in Office of Management and Budget Circular Number A-119.

SEC. 2808. LIMITATION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES AT GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) **LIMITATION.**—None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Defense may be used to construct new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense com-

mittees that any new construction of facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has enduring military value independent of a high value detention mission.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed as limiting the ability of the Department of Defense to obligate or expend available funds to correct a deficiency that is life-threatening, health-threatening, or safety-threatening.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

SEC. 2811. RENEWALS, EXTENSIONS, AND SUCCEEDING LEASES FOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS OPERATING ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

Section 2667(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) Paragraph (1) does not apply to a renewal, extension, or succeeding lease by the Secretary concerned with a financial institution selected in accordance with the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation providing for the selection of financial institutions to operate on military installations if each of the following applies:

“(i) The on-base financial institution was selected before the date of the enactment of this paragraph or competitive procedures are used for the selection of any new financial institutions.

“(ii) A current and binding operating agreement is in place between the installation commander and the selected on-base financial institution.

“(B) The renewal, extension, or succeeding lease shall terminate upon the termination of the operating agreement described in subparagraph (A)(ii) associated with that lease.”.

SEC. 2812. DEPOSIT OF REIMBURSED FUNDS TO COVER ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES RELATING TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO CREDIT REIMBURSED FUNDS TO ACCOUNTS CURRENTLY AVAILABLE.**—Section 2695(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “(1) Amounts collected by the Secretary of a military department under subsection (a) for administrative expenses shall be credited, at the option of the Secretary—

“(A) to the appropriation, fund, or account from which the expenses were paid; or

“(B) to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available to the Secretary for the purposes for which the expenses were paid.”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “Amounts so credited” and inserting the following:

“(2) Amounts credited under paragraph (1).”.

(b) **PROSPECTIVE APPLICABILITY.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply to administrative expenses related to a real property transaction referred to in section 2695(b) of title 10, United States Code, that were covered by the Secretary of a military department using amounts appropriated to the Secretary before the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment

SEC. 2821. REALIGNMENT OF MARINES CORPS FORCES IN ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) **LIMITATION BASED ON COST ESTIMATES.**—

(1) **LIMITATION AMOUNT.**—Pursuant to the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the “Guam and Commonwealth of

the Northern Mariana Islands Military Relocation (2012 Roadmap Adjustments)”, the total amount obligated or expended from funds appropriated or otherwise made available for military construction for implementation of the Record of Decision for the relocation of Marine Corps forces to Guam associated with such Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement may not exceed \$8,725,000,000, subject to such adjustment as may be made under paragraph (2).

(2) **ADJUSTMENT OF LIMITATION AMOUNT.**—The Secretary of the Navy may adjust the amount specified in paragraph (1) by the following:

(A) The amounts of increases or decreases in costs attributable to economic inflation after September 30, 2014.

(B) The amounts of increases or decreases in costs attributable to compliance with changes in Federal, Guam or Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or local laws enacted after September 30, 2014.

(3) **WRITTEN NOTICE OF ADJUSTMENT.**—At the same time that the budget for a fiscal year is submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees written notice of any adjustment to the amount specified in paragraph (1) made by the Secretary during the preceding fiscal year pursuant to the authority provided by paragraph (2).

(b) **RESTRICTION ON DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE.**—

(1) **RESTRICTION.**—If the Secretary of Defense determines that any grant, cooperative agreement, transfer of funds to another Federal agency, or supplement of funds available under Federal programs administered by agencies other than the Department of Defense will result in the development (including repair, replacement, renovation, conversion, improvement, expansion, acquisition, or construction) of public infrastructure on Guam, the Secretary of Defense may not carry out such grant, transfer, cooperative agreement, or supplemental funding unless such grant, transfer, cooperative agreement, or supplemental funding—

(A) is specifically authorized by law; and

(B) will be used to carry out a public infrastructure project included in the report prepared by the Secretary of Defense under section 2822(d)(2) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1017), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “public infrastructure” means any utility, method of transportation, item of equipment, or facility under the control of a public entity or State or local government that is used by, or constructed for the benefit of, the general public.

(c) **REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED LAW.**—Section 2822 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1016) is repealed. The repeal of such section does not affect the validity of the amendment made by subsection (f) of such section or the responsibilities of the Economic Adjustment Committee and the Secretary of Defense under subsection (d) of such section, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2822. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURFACE DANGER ZONE, RITIDIAN UNIT, GUAM NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) **AGREEMENT TO ESTABLISH.**—In order to accommodate the operation of a live-fire

training range complex on Andersen Air Force Base-Northwest Field and the management of the adjacent Ritidian Unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior, notwithstanding the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), may enter into an agreement providing for the establishment and operation of a surface danger zone which overlays the Ritidian Unit or such portion thereof as the Secretaries consider necessary.

(b) **ELEMENTS OF AGREEMENT.**—The agreement to establish a surface danger zone over all or a portion of the Ritidian Unit of the Guam National Wildlife Refuge shall include—

(1) measures to maintain the purposes of the Refuge; and

(2) as appropriate, measures, funded by the Secretary of the Navy from funds appropriated after the date of enactment of this Act and otherwise available to the Secretary, for the following purposes:

(A) Relocation and reconstruction of structures and facilities of the Refuge in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) Mitigation of impacts to wildlife species present on the Refuge or to be reintroduced in the future in accordance with applicable laws.

(C) Use of Department of Defense personnel to undertake conservation activities within the Ritidian Unit normally performed by Department of the Interior personnel, including habitat maintenance, maintaining the boundary fence, and conducting the brown tree snake eradication program.

(D) Openings and closures of the surface danger zone to the public as may be necessary.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

SEC. 2831. LAND CONVEYANCE, GORDO ARMY RESERVE CENTER, GORDO, ALABAMA.

(a) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the Army may convey, without consideration, to the town of Gordo, Alabama (in this section referred to as the “Town”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 3.79 acres and containing the Gordo Army Reserve Center located at 25226 Highway 82 in Gordo, Alabama, for the purpose of permitting the Town to use the parcel for municipal government purposes, including use by municipal utilities management, the municipal police department, and municipal officials and use as a community center and polling place.

(b) **REVERSIONARY INTEREST.**—If the Secretary of the Army determines at any time that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in subsection (a), all right, title, and interest in and to such real property, including any improvements thereto, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to and become the property of the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto such real property. A determination by the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(c) **ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERATION OPTION.**—

(1) **CONSIDERATION OPTION.**—In lieu of exercising the reversionary interest under subsection (b), if the Secretary of the Army determines that the property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance, the

Secretary may require the Town to pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the property, excluding the value of any improvements on the property constructed by the Town, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **TREATMENT OF CONSIDERATION RECEIVED.**—Consideration received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the special account in the Treasury established for the Secretary under subsection (e) of section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, and shall be available to the Secretary for the same uses and subject to the same limitations as provided in that section.

(d) **PAYMENT OF COST OF CONVEYANCE.**—

(1) **PAYMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Army shall require the Town to cover costs (except costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation related to the conveyance, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the Town in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Town.

(2) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.**—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance or, if the period of availability for obligations for that appropriation has expired, to the appropriations or fund that is currently available to the Secretary for the same purpose. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

(f) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2832. LAND CONVEYANCE, WEST NOME TANK FARM, NOME, ALASKA.

(a) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey, without consideration, to the City of Nome, Alaska (in this section referred to as the “City”) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately seven acres, including improvements thereon, known as the USAF West Nome Tank Farm, and located adjacent to the City’s port facilities along Port Road in Nome, Alaska, for the purpose of permitting the City to use the property for municipal purposes, including municipal office space, port development, fuel storage for the municipal power plant, and municipal public utility facilities.

(b) **INTERIM LEASE.**—Until such time as the real property described in subsection (a) may be conveyed to the City by deed, the Secretary of the Air Force may lease, without consideration, all or part of the real property to the City for municipal purposes, as described in such subsection.

(c) **REVERSIONARY INTEREST AND ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERATION OPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary of the Air Force determines at any time that the real property conveyed or leased to the City under this section is not being used for municipal purposes, then, at the option of the Secretary—

(A) all right, title, and interest in and to the real property, including any improvement thereto, shall revert to and become the property of the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto the property; or

(B) the Secretary may require the City to pay the Secretary an amount equal to the then current fair market value of the property, excluding the value of any improvements on the property constructed by the City, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **DETERMINATION PROCESS.**—A determination by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(3) **TREATMENT OF CASH PAYMENTS RECEIVED.**—Any cash payment received by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(B) shall be deposited in the special account in the Treasury established for the Secretary under section 2667(e) of title 10, United States Code, and shall be available to the Secretary for the same uses and subject to the same limitations as provided in that section.

(d) **PAYMENT OF COSTS.**—

(1) **PAYMENT REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Air Force shall require the City to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out a conveyance or lease under this section, including survey costs, cost for environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the conveyance or lease. If amount are collected from the City in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance or lease, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) **TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.**—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance or lease or, if the period of availability for obligations for that appropriation has expired, to the appropriations or fund that is currently available to the Secretary for the same purpose. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed or leased under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(f) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance or lease under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2833. LAND CONVEYANCE, FORMER AIR FORCE NORWALK DEFENSE FUEL SUPPLY POINT, NORWALK, CALIFORNIA.

(a) **CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey, without consideration, to the City of Norwalk, California (in this section referred to as the “City”), all right, title, and interest of the

United States in and to the real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 15 acres at the former Norwalk Defense Fuel Supply Point for the purpose of permitting the City to use the property for public purposes.

(b) PAYMENT OF COST OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall require the City to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation related to the conveyance, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the City in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance or, if the period of availability for obligations for that appropriation has expired, to the appropriations or fund that is currently available to the Secretary for the same purpose. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2834. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION AND ALTERNATIVE LAND CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY, FORMER WALTER REED ARMY HOSPITAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION AUTHORIZED.—

(1) TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of State a parcel of real property at former Walter Reed Army Hospital in the District of Columbia consisting of approximately 43.53 acres for the purpose of permitting the Secretary of State to develop a Foreign Missions Center on the property.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The property authorized for transfer under this subsection includes the following:

(A) Building 3 (attached parking structure).

(B) Buildings 19, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, 29a, 30, 35 (residences).

(C) Building 20 (Mologne House).

(D) Building 32 (Wagner Physical Fitness Center).

(E) Building 40 (Army Medical School—Walter Reed Institute of Research).

(F) Building 41 (Red Cross).

(G) Building 52 (warehouse and outpatient clinic).

(H) Building 53 (former post theater).

(I) Building 54 (The Armed Forces Institute of Pathology Building and former Military Medical Museum).

(J) Buildings 55 and 56 (Fisher Houses).

(K) Building 57 (Memorial Chapel).

(b) ALTERNATIVE CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—

(1) CONVEYANCE FOR PROTECTION OF PUBLIC HEALTH, INCLUDING RESEARCH.—If the transfer of administrative jurisdiction authorized by subsection (a) does not occur, the Secretary of the Army may convey, without consideration, to an authorized recipient described in paragraph (2) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and a parcel of real property at former Walter Reed Army Hospital consisting of approximately 13.25 acres and containing of the buildings specified in subparagraphs (A), (G), (H), and (I) of subsection (a) for the purpose of permitting the recipient to use the parcel for the protection of public health, including research.

(2) AUTHORIZED RECIPIENTS.—The conveyance authorized by this subsection may be made to the District of Columbia, a political subdivision or instrumentality of the District of Columbia, a tax-supported medical institution, or a hospital or similar institution not operated for profit that has been exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—If the Secretary of the Army determines at any time that real property conveyed under this subsection is not being used in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to such real property, including any improvements thereto, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to and become the property of the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto such real property. A determination by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(4) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(A) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall require the recipient of the property under this subsection to cover costs (except costs for environmental remediation of the property) to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under this subsection, including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the recipient of the property.

(B) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under subparagraph (A) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(5) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—Section 2905(b) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to real property conveyed under this subsection.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTIES.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be transferred or conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Army may require such

additional terms and conditions in connection with a transfer or conveyance under this section as the Secretary of the Army considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2835. LAND CONVEYANCE, FORMER LYNN HAVEN FUEL DEPOT, LYNN HAVEN, FLORIDA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey to the City of Lynn Haven, Florida (in this section referred to as the “City”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 144 acres at the former Lynn Haven Fuel Depot in Bay County, Florida.

(2) EXCLUDED PROPERTY.—The real property to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall not include the portion of the former Lynn Haven Fuel Depot authorized to be conveyed by the Secretary to Florida State University by section 2843 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110-181; 122 Stat. 553).

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a)(1), the City shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the real property to be conveyed, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

(2) TREATMENT OF CONSIDERATION RECEIVED.—Consideration received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the special account in the Treasury established for the Secretary under subsection (e) of section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, and shall be available to the Secretary for the same uses and subject to the same limitations as provided in that section.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a)(1) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2836. TRANSFERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, CAMP FRANK D. MERRILL AND LAKE LANIER, GEORGIA.

(a) TRANSFERS REQUIRED.—

(1) CAMP FRANK D. MERRILL.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Agriculture shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army for required Army force protection measures certain Federal land administered as part of the Chattahoochee National Forest, but permitted to the Secretary of the Army for Camp Frank D. Merrill in Dahlonga, Georgia, consisting of approximately 282 acres identified in the permit numbers 0018-01.

(2) LAKE LANIER PROPERTY.—In exchange for the land transferred under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers) shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture certain Federal land administered by the Army Corps of Engineers and consisting of approximately 10 acres adjacent to Lake Lanier at 372 Dunlap Landing Road, Gainesville, Georgia.

(b) USE OF TRANSFERRED LAND.—

(1) CAMP FRANK D. MERRILL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of the land under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of the Army shall—

(i) continue to use the land for military purposes;

(ii) maintain a public access road through the land or provide for alternative public access in coordination with the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(iii) make accommodations for public access and enjoyment of the land, when such public use is consistent with Army mission and force protection requirements.

(B) RETURN OF JURISDICTION.—The land transferred under subsection (a)(1) shall return to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, based on the best interests of the United States, if the Secretary of the Army determines that the transferred land is no longer needed for military purposes.

(2) LAKE LANIER PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of the land under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of Agriculture shall use the land for administrative purposes.

(B) SALE OF LAND.—The Secretary of Agriculture may—

(i) sell or exchange land transferred under subsection (a)(2);

(ii) deposit the proceeds of a sale or exchange under clause (i) in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the Sisk Act; 16 U.S.C. 484a); and

(iii) retain the proceeds for future acquisition of land within the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest, with the proceeds to remain available for expenditure without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

(C) USE AND OCCUPANCY OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—Use and occupancy of National Forest System land by the Department of the Army, other than land transferred pursuant to this Act, shall continue to be subject to all laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System.

(d) ENDANGERED SPECIES.—

(1) CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATION FOR DARTERS.—Nothing in the transfer required by subsection (a)(1) shall affect the prior designation of land within the Chattahoochee National Forest as critical habitat for the Etowah darter (*Etheostoma etowahae*) and the Holiday darter (*Etheostoma brevistrum*).

(2) FUTURE CRITICAL HABITAT LISTINGS AND DESIGNATIONS.—Nothing in the transfer required by subsection (a)(1) shall affect the operation of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) for future listing or designations of critical habitat.

(e) LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND MAP.—

(1) PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the Federal Register a legal description and map of both parcels of land to be transferred under subsection (a).

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The legal description and map filed under paragraph (1) for a parcel of land shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretaries may correct errors in the legal description and map.

(f) REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS.—The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse the Secretary of Agriculture for all costs related to the transfer required by subsection (a), including, at a minimum, any costs incurred by the Secretary of Agriculture to assist in the preparation of the legal description and maps required by subsection (e).

SEC. 2837. LAND CONVEYANCE, JOINT BASE PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM, HAWAII.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey, without consideration, to the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation (in this section re-

ferred to as the “Honolulu Authority”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 1.2 acres at or in the nearby vicinity of Radford Drive and the Makalapa Gate of Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, for the purpose of permitting the Honolulu Authority to use the property as the location for a rail platform for the public benefit.

(b) CONDITION ON USE OF REVENUES.—If the property conveyed under subsection (a) is used, consistent with such subsection, for a public purpose that results in the generation of revenue for the Honolulu Authority, the Honolulu Authority shall agree to use the generated revenue only for passenger rail transit purposes by depositing the revenue in a fund designated for passenger rail transit use.

(c) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Navy shall require the Honolulu Authority to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs for environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the Honolulu Authority in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Honolulu Authority.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Navy may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2838. MODIFICATION OF CONDITIONS ON LAND CONVEYANCE, JOLIET ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, ILLINOIS.

Section 2922(c)(2) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104-106; 110 Stat. 605), as added by section 2842 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 863), is amended in the second sentence by striking “23 years of operation” and inserting “38 years of operation”.

SEC. 2839. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, CAMP GRUBER, OKLAHOMA.

(a) TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—Upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that the parcel of property at Camp Gruber, Oklahoma, conveyed by the war asset deed dated June 29, 1949, between the United States of America and the State of Oklahoma, or any portion thereof, is needed for national defense purposes, including military training, and that the transfer of the parcel is in the best interest of the Department of the Army,

the Administrator of General Services shall execute the reversionary clause in the deed and immediately transfer administrative jurisdiction to the Department of the Army.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of any real property to be transferred under subsection (a) may be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERM AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Army may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a transfer under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2840. CONVEYANCE, JOINT BASE CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey to the City of Hanahan (in this section referred to as the “City”) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 53 total acres at Joint Base Charleston, South Carolina, for the purpose of accommodating the City’s recreation needs.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the City shall provide the United States with consideration in an amount that is acceptable to the Secretary, whether by cash payment, in-kind consideration as described under paragraph (2), or a combination thereof.

(2) IN-KIND CONSIDERATION.—In-kind consideration provided by the City under paragraph (1) may include the acquisition, construction, provision, improvement, maintenance, repair, or restoration (including environmental restoration), or combination thereof, of any facilities or infrastructure relating to the needs of Joint Base Charleston, South Carolina, that the Secretary considers acceptable.

(3) PUBLIC BENEFIT CONVEYANCE.—A public benefit conveyance may also be used to transfer the property under subsection (a) to the City for public use. The property use must benefit the community as a whole, including use for parks and recreation.

(c) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require the City to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts paid to the Secretary in advance exceed the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the City.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—

Amounts received under paragraph (1) as reimbursement for costs incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Air Force.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may require

such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2841. LAND EXCHANGES, ARLINGTON COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

(a) EXCHANGES AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may convey—

(A) to Arlington County, Virginia (in this section referred to as the “County”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to one or more parcels of real property, together with any improvements thereon, located south of Columbia Pike and west of South Joyce Street in Arlington County, Virginia; and

(B) to the Commonwealth of Virginia (in this section referred to as the “Commonwealth”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to one or more parcels of property east of Joyce Street in Arlington County, Virginia, necessary for the realignment of Columbia Pike and the Washington Boulevard-Columbia Pike interchange, as well as for future improvements to Interstate 395 ramps.

(2) PHASING.—The conveyances authorized by this subsection may be accomplished through a phasing of several exchanges if necessary.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyances of real property under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall receive—

(1) from the County, all right, title, and interest of the County in and to one or more parcels of real property in the area known as the Southgate Road right-of-way, Columbia Pike right-of-way, and South Joyce Street right-of-way located in Arlington County, Virginia; and

(2) from the Commonwealth, all right, title, and interest of the Commonwealth in and to one or more parcels of property in the area known as the Columbia Pike right-of-way, and the Washington Boulevard-Columbia Pike interchange.

(c) SELECTION OF PROPERTY FOR CONVEYANCE.—The Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of the Army and Arlington County signed in January 2013 shall be used as a guide in determining the properties to be exchanged under this section. After consultation with the Commonwealth and the County, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the exact parcels to be exchanged, and such determination shall be final. In selecting the properties to be exchanged under subsections (a) and (b), the parties shall, within their respective authorities, seek—

(1) to remove existing barriers to contiguous expansion of Arlington National Cemetery north of Columbia Pike through a realignment of Southgate Road to the western boundary of the former Navy Annex site;

(2) to provide the County with sufficient property to construct a museum that honors the history of Freedman’s Village, as well as any other County or public use that is compatible with a location immediately adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery; and

(3) to support the realignment and straightening of Columbia Pike, a redesign of the Washington Boulevard-Columbia Pike interchange, and future improvements to the Interstate 395 ramps.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commonwealth and the County.

(e) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyances of real property authorized under this section shall be accomplished by one or more exchange agreements upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary of Defense, the Commonwealth, and the County.

(f) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE AUTHORITY.—Section 2881 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (division B of Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 2153) is repealed. The repeal of such section does not affect the amendments made by subsections (g) and (h) of such section.

Subtitle E—Military Memorials, Monuments, and Museums

SEC. 2851. ACCEPTANCE OF IN-KIND GIFTS ON BEHALF OF HERITAGE CENTER FOR THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

Section 4772(c)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “accept funds from the Army Historical Foundation” and insert “accept funds and in-kind gifts, including services, construction materials, and equipment used in construction, from the Army Historical Foundation and other persons”.

SEC. 2852. MT. SOLEDAD VETERANS MEMORIAL, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO CONVEY MT. SOLEDAD VETERANS MEMORIAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (d), the Secretary of Defense shall convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial in San Diego, California, to the Mount Soledad Memorial Association, Inc.

(b) CONTINGENCIES.—The requirement under subsection (a) to convey the Memorial to the Association is contingent upon—

(1) an agreement between the Association and the Secretary of the Defense regarding consideration to be paid by the Association as described in subsection (c); and

(2) the Association’s agreement to accept the Memorial subject to the conditions described in subsection (d).

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) DETERMINATION OF CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall convey the Memorial to the Association for consideration that, as determined by the Secretary, reasonably reflects—

(A) the price paid by the United States to purchase the Memorial pursuant to Public Law 109-272 (16 U.S.C. 431 note);

(B) significant reductions in the market value of the Memorial as a result of the conditions imposed by subsection (d); and

(C) any additional equities the Association may have, such as prior occupancy and any improvements made to the Memorial.

(2) TIME FOR PAYMENT.—The amount of consideration determined under paragraph (1) need not be received by the United States in full before conveyance of the Memorial. The consideration may be paid over a period of time or through installments, or such other financial instruments or arrangements, as may be reasonably convenient for the Secretary and the Association.

(d) CONDITIONS OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance of the Memorial under subsection (a) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) The Memorial shall be accepted in its condition at the time of the conveyance, commonly known as conveyance “as is”.

(2) The Association, and any successive owner of the Memorial, shall maintain and use the Memorial as a veterans memorial in perpetuity.

(3) If the Secretary of Defense determines that the Memorial is ever put to a use other

than as a veterans memorial, the United States shall have the right, at its election, to reacquire all right, title, and interest in and to the Memorial without any right of compensation to the owner or any other person. Any election to reacquire the Memorial under the authority of this paragraph shall be temporary and solely for the purpose of conveying, as expeditiously as practicable, the Memorial to another entity subject to the same conditions in this subsection.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “Association” means the Mount Soledad Memorial Association, Inc.

(2) The terms “Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial” and “Memorial” mean the memorial in San Diego, California, acquired by the United States pursuant to Public Law 109-272 (16 U.S.C. 431 note).

(3) The term “veterans memorial” means a display of commemorative objects, such as tablets, statuary, and other fixtures, that—

(A) pays tribute to those persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) is unencumbered by structures not intended for the purpose specified in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 2853. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEMORIAL TO THE VICTIMS OF THE SHOOTING AT THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2013.

(a) MEMORIAL AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may permit a third party to establish and maintain a memorial dedicated to the victims of the shooting attack at the Washington Navy Yard that occurred on September 16, 2013.

(b) LOCATION OF MEMORIAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may permit the memorial authorized by subsection (a) to be established at the Washington Navy Yard.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNT.—An account shall be established on the books of the Treasury for the purpose of managing contributions received pursuant to paragraph (d).

(d) ACCEPTANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary of the Navy may establish procedures under which the Secretary may solicit and accept monetary contributions or gifts of property for the purpose of the activities described in subsection (a).

(e) DEPOSIT OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—Without regard to the limitations set forth under section 2601(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, amounts collected by the Secretary of the Navy under subsection (d) shall be—

(1) credited as discretionary offsetting collections in the account established under subsection (c); and

(2) available, to the extent and in amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts, until expended for the purposes described in subsection (a).

(f) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PROHIBITED.—Federal funds may not be used to design, procure, prepare, install, or maintain the memorial authorized by subsection (a).

(g) CONDITION.—The memorial authorized by subsection (a) may not be established until the Secretary of the Navy determines that an assured source of non-Federal funding has been established for the design, procurement, installation, and maintenance of the memorial in perpetuity.

(h) DESIGN OF MEMORIAL.—The final design of the memorial authorized by subsection (a) shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Subtitle F—Designations**SEC. 2861. REDESIGNATION OF THE ASIA-PACIFIC CENTER FOR SECURITY STUDIES AS THE DANIEL K. INOUE ASIA-PACIFIC CENTER FOR SECURITY STUDIES.**

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The Department of Defense regional center for security studies known as the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies is hereby renamed the “Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REFERENCE TO REGIONAL CENTERS FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES.—Section 184(b)(2)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies” and inserting “Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies”.

(2) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—Section 2611(a)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking “Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies” and inserting “Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies”.

(c) REFERENCES.—Any reference to the Department of Defense Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed to be a ref-

erence to the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

Subtitle G—Other Matters**SEC. 2871. REPORT ON PHYSICAL SECURITY AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES.**

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than April 30, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth a summary of the actions taken by the Department of Defense to respond to recommendations resulting from the reviews of security standards following the November 2009 shootings at Fort Hood, Texas, and the September 2013 shootings at the Washington Navy Yard, District of Columbia, which included an assessment of the ability of the Department to detect, prevent, and respond to future incidents of violence at Department facilities.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A summary of the recommendations resulting from the security standards reviews referred to in subsection (a).

(2) A description of the actions taken on each recommendation.

(3) An assessment of current and planned physical security capabilities at Department

facilities, and their ability to meet Department physical security requirements.

(4) An identification and assessment of known and potential physical security shortfalls at Department facilities.

(5) An assessment of the ability of the Department to eliminate or mitigate shortfalls in physical security at Department facilities, including recommendations on means to increase physical security at such facilities and the funding required to implement such means.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 2901. Authorized Army construction and land acquisition project.

Sec. 2902. Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2903. Authorized Defense Agency construction and land acquisition project.

Sec. 2904. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2901. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT.

The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out the military construction project for the installation outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

Country	Installation	Amount
Romania	Mihail Kogalniceanu	\$37,000,000

SEC. 2902. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out the mili-

tary construction projects for the installations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Outside the United States

Country	Installation	Amount
Bulgaria	Graf Ignatievo	\$3,200,000
Estonia	Amari	\$24,780,000
Italy	Camp Darby	\$44,450,000
Latvia	Lielvarde	\$10,710,000
Lithuania	Siauliai	\$13,120,000
Poland	Lask	\$22,400,000
Romania	Camp Turzii	\$2,900,000

SEC. 2903. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT.

The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out the military con-

struction project for the installation outside the United States, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agency: Outside the United States

Installation	Defense Agency	Amount
Worldwide Classified	National Security Agency	\$46,000,000

SEC. 2904. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2014, for the military construction projects outside the United States authorized by this title as specified in the funding table in section 4602.

TITLE XXX—NATURAL RESOURCES RELATED GENERAL PROVISIONS**Subtitle A—Land Conveyances and Related Matters**

Sec. 3001. Land conveyance, Wainwright, Alaska.

Sec. 3002. Sealaska land entitlement finalization.

Sec. 3003. Southeast Arizona land exchange and conservation.

Sec. 3004. Land exchange, Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, Arizona, and Bureau of Land Management land in Riverside County, California.

Sec. 3005. Special rules for Inyo National Forest, California, land exchange.

Sec. 3006. Land exchange, Trinity Public Utilities District, Trinity County, California, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service.

Sec. 3007. Idaho County, Idaho, shooting range land conveyance.

Sec. 3008. School District 318, Minnesota, land exchange.

Sec. 3009. Northern Nevada land conveyances.

Sec. 3010. San Juan County, New Mexico, Federal land conveyance.

- Sec. 3011. Land conveyance, Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest, Utah.
 Sec. 3012. Conveyance of certain land to the city of Fruit Heights, Utah.
 Sec. 3013. Land conveyance, Hanford Site, Washington.
 Sec. 3014. Ranch A Wyoming consolidation and management improvement.

Subtitle B—Public Lands and National Forest System Management

- Sec. 3021. Bureau of Land Management permit processing.
 Sec. 3022. Internet-based onshore oil and gas lease sales.
 Sec. 3023. Grazing permits and leases.
 Sec. 3024. Cabin user and transfer fees.

Subtitle C—National Park System Units

- Sec. 3030. Addition of Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light to the Apostle Islands National Seashore.
 Sec. 3031. Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park.
 Sec. 3032. Coltsville National Historical Park.
 Sec. 3033. First State National Historical Park.
 Sec. 3034. Gettysburg National Military Park.
 Sec. 3035. Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park, Maryland.
 Sec. 3036. Harriet Tubman National Historical Park, Auburn, New York.
 Sec. 3037. Hinchliffe Stadium addition to Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park.
 Sec. 3038. Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site.
 Sec. 3039. Manhattan Project National Historical Park.
 Sec. 3040. North Cascades National Park and Stephen Mather Wilderness.
 Sec. 3041. Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve.
 Sec. 3042. San Antonio Missions National Historical Park.
 Sec. 3043. Valles Caldera National Preserve, New Mexico.

- Sec. 3044. Vicksburg National Military Park.
 Subtitle D—National Park System Studies, Management, and Related Matters

- Sec. 3050. Revolutionary War and War of 1812 American battlefield protection program.
 Sec. 3051. Special resource studies.
 Sec. 3052. National heritage areas and corridors.
 Sec. 3053. National historic site support facility improvements.
 Sec. 3054. National Park System donor acknowledgment.
 Sec. 3055. Coin to commemorate 100th anniversary of the National Park Service.
 Sec. 3056. Commission to study the potential creation of a National Women's History Museum.
 Sec. 3057. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Subtitle E—Wilderness and Withdrawals

- Sec. 3060. Alpine Lakes Wilderness additions and Pratt and Middle Fork Snoqualmie Rivers protection.
 Sec. 3061. Columbine-Hondo Wilderness.
 Sec. 3062. Hermosa Creek watershed protection.
 Sec. 3063. North Fork Federal lands withdrawal area.
 Sec. 3064. Pine Forest Range Wilderness.
 Sec. 3065. Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area and wilderness additions.

- Sec. 3066. Wovoka Wilderness.
 Sec. 3067. Withdrawal area related to Wovoka Wilderness.
 Sec. 3068. Withdrawal and reservation of additional public land for Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California.

Subtitle F—Wild and Scenic Rivers

- Sec. 3071. Illabot Creek, Washington, wild and scenic river.
 Sec. 3072. Missisquoi and Trout wild and scenic rivers, Vermont.
 Sec. 3073. White Clay Creek wild and scenic river expansion.
 Sec. 3074. Studies of wild and scenic rivers.

Subtitle G—Trust Lands

- Sec. 3077. Land taken into trust for benefit of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.
 Sec. 3078. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Badger Army Ammunition Plant, Baraboo, Wisconsin.

Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Access and Property Issues

- Sec. 3081. Ensuring public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument.
 Sec. 3082. Anchorage, Alaska, conveyance of reversionary interests.
 Sec. 3083. Release of property interests in Bureau of Land Management land conveyed to the State of Oregon for establishment of Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center.

Subtitle I—Water Infrastructure

- Sec. 3087. Bureau of Reclamation hydropower development.
 Sec. 3088. Toledo Bend Hydroelectric Project.
 Sec. 3089. East Bench Irrigation District contract extension.

Subtitle J—Other Matters

- Sec. 3091. Commemoration of centennial of World War I.
 Sec. 3092. Miscellaneous issues related to Las Vegas valley public land and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.
 Sec. 3093. National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial.
 Sec. 3094. Extension of legislative authority for establishment of commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams.
 Sec. 3095. Refinancing of Pacific Coast groundfish fishing capacity reduction loan.
 Sec. 3096. Payments in lieu of taxes.

Subtitle A—Land Conveyances and Related Matters

SEC. 3001. LAND CONVEYANCE, WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CORPORATION.—The term “Corporation” means the Olgoonik Corporation, an Alaska Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) CONVEYANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after the date of completion of the appraisal required under subsection (d)(1)(B), the Secretary shall convey to the Corporation by quitclaim deed, for the amount of consideration determined under subsection (d)(1), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property described in subsection (c).

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The parcel to be conveyed under subsection (b) consists of approximately 1,518 acres and improvements comprising a former Distant Early Warning Line site in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska near Wainwright, Alaska, and described as United States Survey Number 5252 located within the Umiat Meridian.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of the property under subsection (b), the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to not less than the fair market value of the conveyed property, to be determined as provided in subparagraph (B).

(B) APPRAISAL.—The fair market value of the property to be conveyed under subsection (b) shall be determined based on an appraisal that is conducted—

(i) by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary; and

(ii) in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 3002. SEALASKA LAND ENTITLEMENT FINALIZATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAPS.—The term “maps” means the maps entitled “Sealaska Land Entitlement Finalization”, numbered 1 through 18, and dated June 14, 2013.

(2) SEALASKA.—The term “Sealaska” means the Sealaska Corporation, a Regional Native Corporation established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Alaska.

(b) FINALIZATION OF ENTITLEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary receives a corporate resolution adopted by the board of directors of Sealaska agreeing to accept the conveyance of land described in paragraph (2) in accordance with this section as full and final satisfaction of the remaining land entitlement of Sealaska under section 14(h) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)), the Secretary shall—

(A) implement the provisions of this section; and

(B) charge the entitlement pool under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)) 70,075 acres, reduced by the number of acres deducted under paragraph (2)(B), in fulfillment of the remaining land entitlement for Sealaska under that Act, notwithstanding whether the surveyed acreage of the 18 parcels of land generally depicted on the maps as “Sealaska Selections” and patented under subsection (c) is less than or more than 69,585 acres, reduced by the number of acres deducted under paragraph (2)(B).

(2) FINAL ENTITLEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the 70,075 acres of land described in paragraph (1) shall consist of—

(i) the 18 parcels of Federal land comprising approximately 69,585 acres that is generally depicted as “Sealaska Selections” on the maps; and

(ii) a total of not more than 490 acres of Federal land for cemetery sites and historical places comprised of parcels that are applied for in accordance with subsection (d).

(B) DEDUCTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall deduct from the number of acres of Federal land described in subparagraph (A)(i) the number of acres of Federal land for which the Secretary has issued a conveyance under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)) during the period beginning on August 1, 2012, and ending on the date of receipt of the resolution under paragraph (1).

(ii) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Sealaska shall negotiate in good faith to make a mutually agreeable adjustment to the parcel of Federal land generally depicted on the maps numbered 1 and 18 to implement the deduction of acres required by clause (i).

(3) EFFECT OF ACCEPTANCE.—The resolution filed by Sealaska in accordance with paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be final and irrevocable; and

(B) without any further administrative action by the Secretary, result in—

(i) the relinquishment of all existing selections made by Sealaska under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)); and

(ii) the termination of all withdrawals by section 16 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615), except to the extent a selection by a Village Corporation under subsections (b) and (d) of section 16 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615) remains pending, until the date on which those selections are resolved.

(4) FAILURE TO ACCEPT.—If Sealaska fails to file the resolution in accordance with paragraph (1)—

(A) the provisions of this section shall cease to be effective, except as otherwise provided in this subsection;

(B) the Secretary shall, not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, complete the interim conveyance of the remaining land entitlement to Sealaska under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)) from prioritized selections on file with the Secretary on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C)(i) the remaining land entitlement of Sealaska under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)) shall be 70,075 acres, provided that the Secretary shall deduct the number of acres of Federal land for which the Secretary has issued a conveyance under section 14(h)(8) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)) during the period beginning on August 1, 2012, and ending 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) if the Governor of the State does not approve the prioritized selections of Sealaska in the Saxman or Yakutat withdrawal areas as required by section 14(h)(8)(B) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)(B)) by the date that is 42 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall reject those selections and fulfill the remaining land entitlement of Sealaska from the remaining prioritized selections on file with the Secretary on the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) SCOPE OF LAW.—Except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (6), this section provides the exclusive authority under which the remaining land entitlement of Sealaska under section 14(h) of the Alaska Native Claims

Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)) may be fulfilled.

(6) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section affects any land that is—

(A) the subject of an application under subsection (h)(1) of section 14 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613) that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) conveyed in accordance with that subsection.

(c) CONVEYANCES TO SEALASKA.—

(1) INTERIM CONVEYANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), subsection (b)(2), and subsection (e)(1), the Secretary shall complete the interim conveyance of the 18 parcels of Federal land comprising approximately 69,585 acres generally depicted on the maps by the date that is 60 days after the date of receipt of the resolution under subsection (b)(1), subject to the Secretary identifying and reserving, by the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, any easement under section 17(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1616(b)) that could have been reserved prior to the interim conveyance.

(B) FAILURE TO RESERVE EASEMENTS BY DEADLINE.—If the Secretary does not complete the reservation of easements under subparagraph (A) by the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall reserve the easements as soon as practicable after that date.

(2) WITHDRAWAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land described in paragraph (1) is withdrawn from—

(i) all forms of appropriation under the public land laws;

(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws;

(iii) disposition under laws relating to mineral or geothermal leasing; and

(iv) selection under the Act of July 7, 1958 (commonly known as the “Alaska Statehood Act”) (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21; Public Law 85–508).

(B) TERMINATION.—The withdrawal under subparagraph (A) shall remain in effect until—

(i) if Sealaska fails to file a resolution in accordance with subsection (b)(1), the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) the date on which the Federal land is conveyed under paragraph (1).

(3) TREATMENT OF LAND CONVEYED.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, any land conveyed to Sealaska under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) considered to be land conveyed by the Secretary under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)); and

(B) subject to all laws (including regulations) applicable to entitlements under section 14(h)(8) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(8)), including section 907(d) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (43 U.S.C. 1636(d)).

(4) EASEMENTS.—

(A) PUBLIC EASEMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The interim conveyance and patents for the land under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the reservation of public easements under section 17(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1616(b)).

(ii) TERMINATION.—No public easement reserved on land conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be terminated without publication of notice of the proposed termination in the Federal Register.

(iii) RESERVATION OF EASEMENTS.—In the interim conveyance and patents for the land under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall reserve the right of the Secretary to amend the interim conveyance and patents to include reservations of public easements under section 17(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1616(b)) until the completion of the easement reservation process.

(B) CONSERVATION EASEMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the interim conveyance and patents for the land under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall reserve a conservation easement to protect the aquatic and riparian habitat extending 100 feet on each side of the anadromous water bodies depicted as “100 Foot Conservation Easement” on the maps numbered 3, 4, and 6.

(ii) PROHIBITION.—The commercial harvest of timber within the conservation easements described in clause (i) shall be prohibited, except that Sealaska may, for the purpose of harvesting timber outside of the conservation easement—

(I) maintain roads within the conservation easement that are in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(II) construct temporary roads and yarding corridors across the conservation easements in accordance with the applicable National Forest System construction standards.

(iii) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall administer the conservation easements described in clause (i).

(C) RESEARCH EASEMENT.—In the interim conveyance and patent for the land generally depicted on the map numbered 7, the Secretary shall reserve an easement—

(i) to access and continue Forest Service research activities on the study plots located on the land; and

(ii) that shall remain in effect for a 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(D) KOSCUISKO ISLAND ROAD EASEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Concurrently with the conveyance of land under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall grant to Sealaska an easement on Koscuisko Island providing access to and use by Sealaska of the sort yard and all other upland facilities at the sort yard that are associated with the transfer of logs to the marine environment, subject to—

(I) the agreement under clause (iii); and

(II) the agreement under subsection (e)(2).

(ii) SCOPE OF THE EASEMENT.—The easement under clause (i) shall enable Sealaska—

(I) to construct, use, and maintain a road connecting the National Forest System Road known as “Cape Pole Road” to the National Forest System Road known as “South Shipley Bay Road” within the corridor depicted on the map numbered 3;

(II) to use, maintain, and if necessary, reconstruct the National Forest System Road known as “South Shipley Bay Road” referred to in subclause (I) to access the sort yard and associated upland facilities at Shipley Bay; and

(III) to use, maintain, and expand the sort yard and associated upland facilities at Shipley Bay that are within the area depicted on the map numbered 3.

(iii) ROADS AND FACILITIES USE AGREEMENT.—In addition to the agreement under subsection (e)(2), the Secretary of Agriculture and Sealaska shall enter into an agreement relating to the access, use, maintenance, and improvement of the roads and facilities under this subparagraph.

(iv) EFFECT.—Nothing in this subparagraph preempts or otherwise affects State or local regulatory authority.

(5) HUNTING, FISHING, AND RECREATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any land conveyed under paragraph (1) that is located outside a withdrawal area designated under section 16(a) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615(a)) shall remain open and available to subsistence uses, noncommercial recreational hunting and fishing, and other noncommercial recreational uses by the public under applicable law—

(i) without liability on the part of Sealaska, except for willful acts, to any user as a result of the use; and

(ii) subject to—

(I) any reasonable restrictions that may be imposed by Sealaska on the public use—

(aa) to ensure public safety;

(bb) to minimize conflicts between recreational and commercial uses;

(cc) to protect cultural resources;

(dd) to conduct scientific research; or

(ee) to provide environmental protection; and

(II) the condition that Sealaska post on any applicable property, in accordance with State law, notices of the restrictions on use.

(B) EFFECT.—Access provided to any individual or entity under subparagraph (A) shall not—

(i) create an interest in any third party in the land conveyed under paragraph (1); or

(ii) provide standing to any third party in any review of, or challenge to, any determination by Sealaska with respect to the management or development of the land conveyed under paragraph (1), except as against Sealaska for the management of public access under subparagraph (A).

(d) CEMETERY SITES AND HISTORICAL PLACES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 14(h)(1)(E) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)(E)), Sealaska may submit applications for the conveyance under section 14(h)(1)(A) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)(A)) of not more than 76 cemetery sites and historical places—

(A) that are listed in the document entitled “Sealaska Cemetery Sites and Historical Places” and dated October 17, 2012;

(B) that are cemetery sites and historical places included in the report by Wilsey and Ham, Inc., entitled “1975 Native Cemetery and Historic Sites of Southeast Alaska (Preliminary Report)” and dated October 1975;

(C) for which Sealaska has not previously submitted an application; and

(D) that are not located within a conservation system unit (as defined in section 102 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3102)).

(2) PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATING APPLICATIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the Secretary shall consider all applications submitted under this subsection in accordance with the criteria and procedures set forth in applicable regulations in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) CONVEYANCE.—If approved under the procedures described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall convey cemetery sites and historical places that result in the conveyance of a total of approximately 490 acres of Federal land comprised of parcels that are—

(A) applied for in accordance with this subsection; and

(B) subject to—

(i) valid existing rights;

(ii) the public access provisions of paragraph (7);

(iii) the condition that the conveyance of land for the site listed under paragraph

(1)(A) as “Bay of Pillars Portage” is limited to not more than 25 acres in T.60 S., R.72 E., Sec. 28, Copper River Meridian; and

(iv) the condition that any access to or use of the cemetery sites and historical places shall be consistent with the management plans for adjacent public land, if the management plans are more restrictive than the laws (including regulations) applicable under paragraph (9).

(4) TIMELINE.—No application for a cemetery site or historical place may be submitted under paragraph (1) after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) CONSULTATION WITH RECOGNIZED TRIBAL ENTITY.—Sealaska shall—

(A) consult with any affected federally recognized Indian tribe before submitting any application for a cemetery site or historical place located within the vicinity of the Indian tribe; and

(B) include with each application described in subparagraph (A) a statement that the required consultation was carried out in accordance with that subparagraph.

(6) SELECTION OF ADDITIONAL CEMETERY SITES.—If Sealaska submits timely applications to the Secretary in accordance with paragraphs (1), (4), and (5), for all 76 sites listed under paragraph (1)(A), and the Secretary rejects any of those applications in whole or in part—

(A) not later than 2 years after the date on which the Secretary completes the conveyance of eligible cemetery sites and historical places applied for under paragraph (1), and subject to paragraph (5), Sealaska may submit applications for the conveyance under section 14 (h)(1)(A) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)(A)) of additional cemetery sites that are not located in a conservation system unit described in paragraph (1)(D), the total acreage of which, together with the cemetery sites and historical places previously conveyed by the Secretary under paragraph (3), shall not exceed 490 acres; and

(B) the Secretary shall—

(i) consider any applications for the conveyance of additional cemetery sites in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(ii) if the applications are approved, provide for the conveyance of the sites in accordance with paragraph (3).

(7) PUBLIC ACCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), any land conveyed under this subsection shall be subject to—

(i) the reservation of public easements under section 17(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1616(b));

(ii) public access across the conveyed land in cases in which no reasonable alternative access around the land is available, without liability to Sealaska, except for willful acts, to any user by reason of the use; and

(iii) public access to and along any Class I stream described in section 705(e) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 539d(e)) for noncommercial recreational and subsistence fishing, without liability to Sealaska, except for willful acts, to any user by reason of the use.

(B) LIMITATIONS.—The public access and use under clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall be subject to—

(i) any reasonable restrictions that may be imposed by Sealaska on the public access and use—

(I) to ensure public safety;

(II) to protect and conduct research on the historic, archaeological, and cultural resources of the conveyed land; or

(III) to provide environmental protection;

(ii) the condition that Sealaska post on any applicable property, in accordance with State law, notices of the restrictions on the public access and use; and

(iii) the condition that the public access and use shall not be incompatible with or in derogation of the values of the area as a cemetery site or historical place, as provided in section 2653.11 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(C) EFFECT.—Access provided to any individual or entity by subparagraph (A) shall not—

(i) create an interest in any third party in the land conveyed under this subsection; or

(ii) provide standing to any third party in any review of, or challenge to, any determination by Sealaska with respect to the management or development of the land conveyed under this subsection, except as against Sealaska for the management of public access under subparagraph (B).

(8) PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OR LOSS.—

(A) PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Sealaska shall not—

(i) alienate, transfer, assign, mortgage, or pledge any cemetery site or historical place conveyed under this subsection to any person or entity other than the United States; or

(ii) permit development or improvement of the cemetery site or historical place for any use which is incompatible with, or is in derogation of, the values of the area as a cemetery site or historical place.

(B) PROHIBITION ON LOSS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any cemetery site or historical place conveyed to Sealaska under this subsection shall be exempt from—

(i) adverse possession and similar claims based on estoppel;

(ii) title 11 of the United States Code or a successor law, any other insolvency or moratorium law, or any other law generally affecting creditors' rights;

(iii) judgments in any action at law or in equity to recover sums owed or penalties incurred by Sealaska or any employee, officer, director, or shareholder of Sealaska, except for liens from real property taxes; and

(iv) involuntary distributions or conveyances to any person or entity other than the United States related to the involuntary dissolution of Sealaska.

(9) TREATMENT OF LAND CONVEYED.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, any land conveyed to Sealaska under this subsection shall be—

(A) considered land conveyed by the Secretary under section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)); and

(B) subject to all laws (including regulations) applicable to conveyances under section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(1)), including section 907(d) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (43 U.S.C. 1636(d)).

(e) MISCELLANEOUS.—

(1) SPECIAL USE AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On the conveyance of land to Sealaska under subsection (c)(1)—

(i) any guiding or outfitting special use authorization issued by the Forest Service for the use of the conveyed land shall terminate; and

(ii) as a condition of the conveyance and consistent with section 14(g) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(g)), Sealaska shall issue the holder of the special use authorization terminated under clause (i) an authorization to continue

the authorized use, subject to the terms and conditions that were in the special use authorization issued by the Forest Service, for—

(I) the remainder of the term of the authorization; and

(II) 1 additional consecutive 10-year renewal period.

(B) NOTICE OF COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES.—Sealaska and any holder of a guiding or outfitting authorization under this paragraph shall have a mutual obligation, subject to the guiding or outfitting authorization, to inform the other party of any commercial activities prior to engaging in the activities on the land conveyed to Sealaska under subsection (c)(1).

(C) NEGOTIATION OF NEW TERMS.—Nothing in this paragraph precludes Sealaska and the holder of a guiding or outfitting authorization from negotiating a new mutually agreeable guiding or outfitting authorization.

(D) LIABILITY.—Neither Sealaska nor the United States shall bear any liability, except for willful acts of Sealaska or the United States, regarding the use and occupancy of any land conveyed to Sealaska under this section, as provided in any outfitting or guiding authorization under this paragraph.

(2) ROADS AND FACILITIES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and Sealaska shall negotiate in good faith to develop a binding agreement—

(A) for the use of National Forest System roads and related transportation facilities by Sealaska; and

(B) the use of Sealaska roads and related transportation facilities by the Forest Service.

(3) TRADITIONAL TRADE AND MIGRATION ROUTES.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION OF ROUTES.—

(i) THE INSIDE PASSAGE.—The route from Yakutat to Dry Bay, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Traditional Trade and Migration Route, Neix naax aan nax—The Inside Passage” and dated April 22, 2013, shall be known as “Neix naax aan nax” (“The Inside Passage”).

(ii) CANOE ROAD.—The route from the Bay of Pillars to Port Camden, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Traditional Trade and Migration Route, Yakwdeiyi—Canoe Road” and dated April 22, 2013, shall be known as “Yakwdeiyi” (“Canoe Road”).

(iii) THE PEOPLE’S ROAD.—The route from Portage Bay to Duncan Canal, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Traditional Trade and Migration Route, Lingit Deyi—The People’s Road” and dated April 22, 2013, shall be known as “Lingit Deyi” (“The People’s Road”).

(B) ACCESS TO TRADITIONAL TRADE AND MIGRATION ROUTES.—The culturally and historically significant trade and migration routes described in subparagraph (A) shall be open to travel by Sealaska and the public in accordance with applicable law, subject to such terms, conditions, and special use authorizations as the Secretary of Agriculture may require.

(4) TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST YOUNG GROWTH MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (m) of section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) and in addition to the authority provided under that subsection and the terms of section 705(a) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 539d(a)), the Secretary of Agriculture may allow the harvest of trees prior to the culmination of mean annual increment of

growth in areas that are available for commercial timber harvest under the Tongass National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan to facilitate the transition from commercial timber harvest of old growth stands.

(B) LIMITATION.—Any sale of trees pursuant to the authority granted under subparagraph (A) shall not—

(i) exceed 15,000 acres during the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, with an annual maximum of 3,000 acres sold;

(ii) exceed a total of 50,000 acres, with an annual maximum of 5,000 acres sold after the first 10-year period;

(iii) be advertised if the indicated rate is deficit (defined as the value of the timber is not sufficient to cover all logging and stumpage costs and provide a normal profit and risk allowance under the appraisal process of the Forest Service) when appraised using a residual value appraisal; or

(iv) apply to land withdrawn under subsection (c)(2).

(C) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the requirement under section 705(a) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 539d(a)) that the Forest Service seek to meet demand for timber from the Tongass National Forest.

(5) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section delays the duty of the Secretary to convey land to—

(i) the State under the Act of July 7, 1958 (commonly known as the “Alaska Statehood Act”) (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21; Public Law 85-508); or

(ii) a Native Corporation under—

(I) the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); or

(II) the Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act (43 U.S.C. 1611 note; Public Law 108-452).

(B) CONVEYANCES.—The Secretary shall promptly proceed with the conveyance of all land necessary to fulfill the final entitlement of all Native Corporations in accordance with—

(i) the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); and

(ii) the Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act (43 U.S.C. 1611 note; Public Law 108-452).

(C) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this section enlarges or diminishes the responsibility and authority of the State with respect to the management of fish and wildlife on public land in the State.

(6) ESCROW FUNDS.—If Sealaska files the resolution in accordance with subsection (b)(1)—

(A) the escrow requirements of section 2 of Public Law 94-204 (43 U.S.C. 1613 note) shall apply to proceeds (including interest) derived from the land withdrawn under subsection (c)(2) from the date of receipt of the resolution; and

(B) Sealaska shall have no right to any proceeds (including interest) held pursuant to the escrow requirements of section 2 of Public Law 94-204 (43 U.S.C. 1613 note) that were derived from land originally withdrawn for selection by section 16 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1615), but not conveyed.

(7) MAPS.—

(A) AVAILABILITY.—Each map referred to in this section shall be available in the appropriate offices of the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture.

(B) CORRECTIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture may make any necessary correction to a clerical or typographical error in a map referred to in this section.

(f) CONSERVATION AREAS.—

(1) LUD II MANAGEMENT AREAS.—If Sealaska files a resolution in accordance with subsection (b)(1), section 508 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487; 104 Stat. 4428) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) BAY OF PILLARS.—Certain land which comprises approximately 20,863 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Bay of Pillars LUD II Management Area—Proposed’ and dated June 14, 2013.

“(14) KUSHNEAHIN CREEK.—Certain land which comprises approximately 33,613 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Kushneahin Creek LUD II Management Area—Proposed’ and dated June 14, 2013.

“(15) NORTHERN PRINCE OF WALES.—Certain land which comprises approximately 8,728 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Northern Prince of Wales LUD II Management Area—Proposed’ and dated June 14, 2013.

“(16) WESTERN KOSCIUSKO.—Certain land which comprises approximately 8,012 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Western Kosciusko LUD II Management Area—Proposed’ and dated June 14, 2013.

“(17) EASTERN KOSCIUSKO.—Certain land which comprises approximately 1,664 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Eastern Kosciusko LUD II Management Area—Proposed’ and dated June 14, 2013.

“(18) SARKAR LAKES.—Certain land which comprises approximately 24,509 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Sarkar Lakes LUD II Management Area—Proposed’ and dated June 14, 2013.

“(19) HONKER DIVIDE.—Certain land which comprises approximately 19,805 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Honker Divide LUD II Management Area—Proposed’ and dated June 14, 2013.

“(20) EEK LAKE AND SUKKWAN ISLAND.—Certain land which comprises approximately 34,873 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Eek Lake and Sukkwan Island LUD II Management Area—Proposed’ and dated June 14, 2013.”.

(2) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The designation of the conservation areas by paragraphs (13) through (20) of section 508 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487; 104 Stat. 4428) (as added by paragraph (1)) (referred to in this subsection as the “conservation areas”) is not intended to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around the conservation areas.

(B) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that activities outside of the conservation areas are not consistent with the purposes of the conservation areas or can be seen or heard within the conservation areas shall not preclude the activities or uses outside the boundary of the conservation areas.

(g) REINSTATEMENT TO SEALASKA CORPORATION.—

(1) DEFINITION OF AFFECTED INDIVIDUAL.—In this subsection, the term “affected individual” means Michael G. Faber, who—

(A) is a former resident of the State of Alaska; and

(B) was previously enrolled in Sealaska under roll number 13-752-39665-01.

(2) REVOCATION OF MEMBERSHIP IN METLAKATLA INDIAN COMMUNITY.—Effective on the date on which the affected individual submits written notice to the Metlakatla Indian Community revoking the membership of the affected individual in the Metlakatla Indian Community, the membership of the affected individual in the Metlakatla Indian

Community shall be considered to be revoked.

(3) **REINSTATEMENT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, pursuant to section 5 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1604), the Secretary shall, immediately after the affected individual submits the notice under paragraph (2), update the shareholder roll of Sealaska to include the affected individual.

(4) **SHAREHOLDER STATUS.**—As of the date on which the affected individual is added to the shareholder roll of Sealaska under paragraph (3), it is the intent of Congress that Sealaska—

(A) reinstate the affected individual to the shareholder roll of Sealaska; and

(B) ensure the provision to the affected individual of the number of shares originally allocated to the affected individual by Sealaska.

(5) **EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.**—Nothing in this subsection provides to the affected individual any retroactive benefit relating to membership in—

(A) Sealaska; or

(B) the Metlakatla Indian Community.

SEC. 3003. SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the exchange of land between Resolution Copper and the United States.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APACHE LEAP.**—The term “Apache Leap” means the approximately 807 acres of land depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Apache Leap” and dated March 2011.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 2,422 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Federal Parcel–Oak Flat” and dated March 2011.

(3) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(4) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “non-Federal land” means the parcels of land owned by Resolution Copper that are described in subsection (d)(1) and, if necessary to equalize the land exchange under subsection (c), subsection (c)(5)(B)(i)(I).

(5) **OAK FLAT CAMPGROUND.**—The term “Oak Flat Campground” means the approximately 50 acres of land comprising approximately 16 developed campsites depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Oak Flat Campground” and dated March 2011.

(6) **OAK FLAT WITHDRAWAL AREA.**—The term “Oak Flat Withdrawal Area” means the approximately 760 acres of land depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Oak Flat Withdrawal Area” and dated March 2011.

(7) **RESOLUTION COPPER.**—The term “Resolution Copper” means Resolution Copper Mining, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, including any successor, assign, affiliate, member, or joint venturer of Resolution Copper Mining, LLC.

(8) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(9) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Arizona.

(10) **TOWN.**—The term “Town” means the incorporated town of Superior, Arizona.

(11) **RESOLUTION MINE PLAN OF OPERATIONS.**—The term “Resolution mine plan of

operations” means the mine plan of operations submitted to the Secretary by Resolution Copper in November, 2013, including any amendments or supplements.

(c) **LAND EXCHANGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the provisions of this section, if Resolution Copper offers to convey to the United States all right, title, and interest of Resolution Copper in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary is authorized and directed to convey to Resolution Copper, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(2) **CONDITIONS ON ACCEPTANCE.**—Title to any non-Federal land conveyed by Resolution Copper to the United States under this section shall be in a form that—

(A) is acceptable to the Secretary, for land to be administered by the Forest Service and the Secretary of the Interior, for land to be administered by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) conforms to the title approval standards of the Attorney General of the United States applicable to land acquisitions by the Federal Government.

(3) **CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall engage in government-to-government consultation with affected Indian tribes concerning issues of concern to the affected Indian tribes related to the land exchange.

(B) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Following the consultations under paragraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with Resolution Copper and seek to find mutually acceptable measures to—

(i) address the concerns of the affected Indian tribes; and

(ii) minimize the adverse effects on the affected Indian tribes resulting from mining and related activities on the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under this section.

(4) **APPRAISALS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and Resolution Copper shall select an appraiser to conduct appraisals of the Federal land and non-Federal land in compliance with the requirements of section 254.9 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), an appraisal prepared under this paragraph shall be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(I) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(II) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(ii) **FINAL APPRAISED VALUE.**—After the final appraised values of the Federal land and non-Federal land are determined and approved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall not be required to reappraise or update the final appraised value—

(I) for a period of 3 years beginning on the date of the approval by the Secretary of the final appraised value; or

(II) at all, in accordance with section 254.14 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), after an exchange agreement is entered into by Resolution Copper and the Secretary.

(iii) **IMPROVEMENTS.**—Any improvements made by Resolution Copper prior to entering into an exchange agreement shall not be included in the appraised value of the Federal land.

(iv) **PUBLIC REVIEW.**—Before consummating the land exchange under this section, the Secretary shall make the appraisals of the

land to be exchanged (or a summary thereof) available for public review.

(C) **APPRAISAL INFORMATION.**—The appraisal prepared under this paragraph shall include a detailed income capitalization approach analysis of the market value of the Federal land which may be utilized, as appropriate, to determine the value of the Federal land, and shall be the basis for calculation of any payment under subsection (e).

(5) **EQUAL VALUE LAND EXCHANGE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The value of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section shall be equal or shall be equalized in accordance with this paragraph.

(B) **SURPLUS OF FEDERAL LAND VALUE.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the final appraised value of the Federal land exceeds the value of the non-Federal land, Resolution Copper shall—

(I) convey additional non-Federal land in the State to the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, consistent with the requirements of this section and subject to the approval of the applicable Secretary;

(II) make a cash payment to the United States; or

(III) use a combination of the methods described in subclauses (I) and (II), as agreed to by Resolution Copper, the Secretary, and the Secretary of the Interior.

(ii) **AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.**—The Secretary may accept a payment in excess of 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests conveyed, notwithstanding section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(iii) **DISPOSITION AND USE OF PROCEEDS.**—Any amounts received by the United States under this subparagraph shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90–171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”; 16 U.S.C. 484a) and shall be made available to the Secretary for the acquisition of land or interests in land in Region 3 of the Forest Service.

(C) **SURPLUS OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land exceeds the value of the Federal land—

(i) the United States shall not make a payment to Resolution Copper to equalize the value; and

(ii) except as provided in subsection (h), the surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered to be a donation by Resolution Copper to the United States.

(6) **OAK FLAT WITHDRAWAL AREA.**—

(A) **PERMITS.**—Subject to the provisions of this paragraph and notwithstanding any withdrawal of the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area from the mining, mineral leasing, or public land laws, the Secretary, upon enactment of this Act, shall issue to Resolution Copper—

(i) if so requested by Resolution Copper, within 30 days of such request, a special use permit to carry out mineral exploration activities under the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area from existing drill pads located outside the Area, if the activities would not disturb the surface of the Area; and

(ii) if so requested by Resolution Copper, within 90 days of such request, a special use permit to carry out mineral exploration activities within the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area (but not within the Oak Flat Campground), if the activities are conducted from a single exploratory drill pad which is located to reasonably minimize visual and noise impacts on the Campground.

(B) **CONDITIONS.**—Any activities undertaken in accordance with this paragraph shall be subject to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(C) **TERMINATION.**—The authorization for Resolution Copper to undertake mineral exploration activities under this paragraph shall remain in effect until the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area land is conveyed to Resolution Copper in accordance with this section.

(7) **COSTS.**—As a condition of the land exchange under this section, Resolution Copper shall agree to pay, without compensation, all costs that are—

(A) associated with the land exchange and any environmental review document under paragraph (9); and

(B) agreed to by the Secretary.

(8) **USE OF FEDERAL LAND.**—The Federal land to be conveyed to Resolution Copper under this section shall be available to Resolution Copper for mining and related activities subject to and in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws pertaining to mining and related activities on land in private ownership.

(9) **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Secretary shall carry out the land exchange in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(B) **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.**—Prior to conveying Federal land under this section, the Secretary shall prepare a single environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), which shall be used as the basis for all decisions under Federal law related to the proposed mine and the Resolution mine plan of operations and any related major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, including the granting of any permits, rights-of-way, or approvals for the construction of associated power, water, transportation, processing, tailings, waste disposal, or other ancillary facilities.

(C) **IMPACTS ON CULTURAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**—The environmental impact statement prepared under subparagraph (B) shall—

(i) assess the effects of the mining and related activities on the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under this section on the cultural and archeological resources that may be located on the Federal land; and

(ii) identify measures that may be taken, to the extent practicable, to minimize potential adverse impacts on those resources, if any.

(D) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this paragraph precludes the Secretary from using separate environmental review documents prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or other applicable laws for exploration or other activities not involving—

(i) the land exchange; or

(ii) the extraction of minerals in commercial quantities by Resolution Copper on or under the Federal land.

(10) **TITLE TRANSFER.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of publication of the final environmental impact statement, the Secretary shall convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land to Resolution Copper.

(d) **CONVEYANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCE.**—On receipt of title to the Federal land, Resolution Copper shall simultaneously convey—

(A) to the Secretary, all right, title, and interest that the Secretary determines to be acceptable in and to—

(i) the approximately 147 acres of land located in Gila County, Arizona, depicted on

the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Non-Federal Parcel–Turkey Creek” and dated March 2011;

(ii) the approximately 148 acres of land located in Yavapai County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Non-Federal Parcel–Tangle Creek” and dated March 2011;

(iii) the approximately 149 acres of land located in Maricopa County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Non-Federal Parcel–Cave Creek” and dated March 2011;

(iv) the approximately 640 acres of land located in Coconino County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Non-Federal Parcel–East Clear Creek” and dated March 2011; and

(v) the approximately 110 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Non-Federal Parcel–Apache Leap South End” and dated March 2011; and

(B) to the Secretary of the Interior, all right, title, and interest that the Secretary of the Interior determines to be acceptable in and to—

(i) the approximately 3,050 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Non-Federal Parcel–Lower San Pedro River” and dated July 6, 2011;

(ii) the approximately 160 acres of land located in Gila and Pinal Counties, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Non-Federal Parcel–Dripping Springs” and dated July 6, 2011; and

(iii) the approximately 940 acres of land located in Santa Cruz County, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011–Non-Federal Parcel–Appleton Ranch” and dated July 6, 2011.

(2) **MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.**—

(A) **LAND ACQUIRED BY THE SECRETARY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Land acquired by the Secretary under this section shall—

(I) become part of the national forest in which the land is located; and

(II) be administered in accordance with the laws applicable to the National Forest System.

(ii) **BOUNDARY REVISION.**—On the acquisition of land by the Secretary under this section, the boundaries of the national forest shall be modified to reflect the inclusion of the acquired land.

(iii) **LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.**—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–9), the boundaries of a national forest in which land acquired by the Secretary is located shall be deemed to be the boundaries of that forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

(B) **LAND ACQUIRED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.**—

(i) **SAN PEDRO NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—The land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under paragraph (1)(B)(i) shall be added to, and administered as part of, the San Pedro National Conservation Area in accordance with the laws (in-

cluding regulations) applicable to the Conservation Area.

(II) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the land is acquired, the Secretary of the Interior shall update the management plan for the San Pedro National Conservation Area to reflect the management requirements of the acquired land.

(ii) **DRIPPING SPRINGS.**—Land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under paragraph (1)(B)(ii) shall be managed in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and applicable land use plans.

(iii) **LAS CIENEGAS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.**—Land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under paragraph (1)(B)(iii) shall be added to, and administered as part of, the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area in accordance with the laws (including regulations) applicable to the Conservation Area.

(e) **VALUE ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT TO UNITED STATES.**—

(1) **ANNUAL PRODUCTION REPORTING.**—

(A) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—As a condition of the land exchange under this section, Resolution Copper shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior an annual report indicating the quantity of locatable minerals produced during the preceding calendar year in commercial quantities from the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under subsection (c). The first report is required to be submitted not later than February 15 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of commencement of production of valuable locatable minerals in commercial quantities from such Federal land. The reports shall be submitted February 15 of each calendar year thereafter.

(B) **SHARING REPORTS WITH STATE.**—The Secretary shall make each report received under subparagraph (A) available to the State.

(C) **REPORT CONTENTS.**—The reports under subparagraph (A) shall comply with any recordkeeping and reporting requirements prescribed by the Secretary or required by applicable Federal laws in effect at the time of production.

(2) **PAYMENT ON PRODUCTION.**—If the cumulative production of valuable locatable minerals produced in commercial quantities from the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under subsection (c) exceeds the quantity of production of locatable minerals from the Federal land used in the income capitalization approach analysis prepared under subsection (c)(4)(C), Resolution Copper shall pay to the United States, by not later than March 15 of each applicable calendar year, a value adjustment payment for the quantity of excess production at the same rate assumed for the income capitalization approach analysis prepared under subsection (c)(4)(C).

(3) **STATE LAW UNAFFECTED.**—Nothing in this subsection modifies, expands, diminishes, amends, or otherwise affects any State law relating to the imposition, application, timing, or collection of a State excise or severance tax.

(4) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

(A) **SEPARATE FUND.**—All funds paid to the United States under this subsection shall be deposited in a special fund established in the Treasury and shall be available, in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior only for the purposes authorized by subparagraph (B).

(B) **AUTHORIZED USE.**—Amounts in the special fund established pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be used for maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation projects for Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management assets.

(f) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, Apache Leap and any land acquired by the United States under this section are withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(g) **APACHE LEAP SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.**—

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—To further the purpose of this section, the Secretary shall establish a special management area consisting of Apache Leap, which shall be known as the “Apache Leap Special Management Area” (referred to in this subsection as the “special management area”).

(2) **PURPOSE.**—The purposes of the special management area are—

(A) to preserve the natural character of Apache Leap;

(B) to allow for traditional uses of the area by Native American people; and

(C) to protect and conserve the cultural and archeological resources of the area.

(3) **SURRENDER OF MINING AND EXTRACTION RIGHTS.**—As a condition of the land exchange under subsection (c), Resolution Copper shall surrender to the United States, without compensation, all rights held under the mining laws and any other law to commercially extract minerals under Apache Leap.

(4) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the special management area in a manner that furthers the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(B) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—The activities that are authorized in the special management area are—

(i) installation of seismic monitoring equipment on the surface and subsurface to protect the resources located within the special management area;

(ii) installation of fences, signs, or other measures necessary to protect the health and safety of the public; and

(iii) operation of an underground tunnel and associated workings, as described in the Resolution mine plan of operations, subject to any terms and conditions the Secretary may reasonably require.

(5) **PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with affected Indian tribes, the Town, Resolution Copper, and other interested members of the public, shall prepare a management plan for the Apache Leap Special Management Area.

(B) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In preparing the plan under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consider whether additional measures are necessary to—

(1) protect the cultural, archaeological, or historical resources of Apache Leap, including permanent or seasonal closures of all or a portion of Apache Leap; and

(ii) provide access for recreation.

(6) **MINING ACTIVITIES.**—The provisions of this subsection shall not impose additional restrictions on mining activities carried out by Resolution Copper adjacent to, or outside of, the Apache Leap area beyond those otherwise applicable to mining activities on pri-

vately owned land under Federal, State, and local laws, rules and regulations.

(h) **CONVEYANCES TO TOWN OF SUPERIOR, ARIZONA.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCES.**—On request from the Town and subject to the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall convey to the Town the following:

(A) Approximately 30 acres of land as depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011—Federal Parcel—Fairview Cemetery” and dated March 2011.

(B) The reversionary interest and any reserved mineral interest of the United States in the approximately 265 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, as depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011—Federal Reversionary Interest—Superior Airport” and dated March 2011.

(C) The approximately 250 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, as depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011—Federal Parcel—Superior Airport Contiguous Parcels” and dated March 2011.

(2) **PAYMENT.**—The Town shall pay to the Secretary the market value for each parcel of land or interest in land acquired under this subsection, as determined by appraisals conducted in accordance with subsection (c)(4).

(3) **SISK ACT.**—Any payment received by the Secretary from the Town under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”) (16 U.S.C. 484a) and shall be made available to the Secretary for the acquisition of land or interests in land in Region 3 of the Forest Service.

(4) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The conveyances under this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(i) **MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **REVOCACTION OF ORDERS; WITHDRAWAL.**—

(A) **REVOCACTION OF ORDERS.**—Any public land order that withdraws the Federal land from appropriation or disposal under a public land law shall be revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the land.

(B) **WITHDRAWAL.**—On the date of enactment of this Act, if the Federal land or any Federal interest in the non-Federal land to be exchanged under subsection (c) is not withdrawn or segregated from entry and appropriation under a public land law (including mining and mineral leasing laws and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.)), the land or interest shall be withdrawn, without further action required by the Secretary concerned, from entry and appropriation. The withdrawal shall be terminated—

(i) on the date of consummation of the land exchange; or

(ii) if Resolution Copper notifies the Secretary in writing that it has elected to withdraw from the land exchange pursuant to section 206(d) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1716(d)).

(C) **RIGHTS OF RESOLUTION COPPER.**—Nothing in this section shall interfere with, limit, or otherwise impair, the unpatented mining claims or rights currently held by Resolution Copper on the Federal land, nor in any way change, diminish, qualify, or otherwise impact Resolution Copper's rights and ability to conduct activities on the Federal land under such unpatented mining claims and the general mining laws of the United States, including the permitting or authorization of such activities.

(2) **MAPS, ESTIMATES, AND DESCRIPTIONS.**—

(A) **MINOR ERRORS.**—The Secretary concerned and Resolution Copper may correct, by mutual agreement, any minor errors in any map, acreage estimate, or description of any land conveyed or exchanged under this section.

(B) **CONFLICT.**—If there is a conflict between a map, an acreage estimate, or a description of land in this section, the map shall control unless the Secretary concerned and Resolution Copper mutually agree otherwise.

(C) **AVAILABILITY.**—On the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file and make available for public inspection in the Office of the Supervisor, Tonto National Forest, each map referred to in this section.

(3) **PUBLIC ACCESS IN AND AROUND OAK FLAT CAMPGROUND.**—As a condition of conveyance of the Federal land, Resolution Copper shall agree to provide access to the surface of the Oak Flat Campground to members of the public, including Indian tribes, to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with health and safety requirements, until such time as the operation of the mine precludes continued public access for safety reasons, as determined by Resolution Copper.

SEC. 3004. LAND EXCHANGE, CIBOLA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, ARIZONA, AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) **MAP 1.**—The term “Map 1” means the map entitled “Specified Parcel of Public Land in California” and dated July 18, 2014.

(2) **MAP 2.**—The term “Map 2” means the map entitled “River Bottom Farm Lands” and dated July 18, 2014.

(b) **LAND EXCHANGE.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.**—In exchange for the land described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to River Bottom Farms of La Paz County, Arizona, all right, title and interest of the United States in and to certain Federal land administered by the Secretary through the Bureau of Land Management consisting of a total of approximately 80 acres in Riverside County, California, identified as “Parcel A” on Map 1. The conveyed land shall be subject to valid existing rights, including easements, rights-of-way, utility lines, and any other valid encumbrances on the land as of the date of the conveyance under this section.

(2) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal land under paragraph (1), River Bottom Farms shall convey to the United States all right, title, and interest of River Bottom Farms in and to two parcels of land contiguous to the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge in La Paz County, Arizona, consisting of a total of approximately 40 acres in La Paz County, Arizona, identified as “Parcel 301-05-005B-9” and “Parcel 301-05-008-0” on Map 2.

(3) **EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.**—The values of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this section shall be equal or equalized by the payment of cash to the Secretary by River Bottom Farms, if appropriate, pursuant to section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)). The value of the land shall be determined by the Secretary through an appraisal performed by a qualified appraiser mutually agreed to by the Secretary and River Bottom Farms and performed in conformance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (U.S. Department of Justice, December 2000). If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land (“Parcel 301-

05-005B-9” and “Parcel 301-05-008-0” on Map 2) exceeds the value of the Federal land (“Parcel A” on Map 1), the surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered to be a donation by River Bottom Farms to the United States.

(4) **EXCHANGE TIMETABLE.**—The Secretary shall complete the land exchange under this section not later than 1 year after the date of the expiration of any existing Bureau of Land Management lease agreement or agreements affecting the Federal land (“Parcel A” on Map 1) to be exchanged under this section, unless the Secretary and River Bottom Farms mutually agree to extend such deadline.

(5) **ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.**—The land acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (2) shall become part of the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge and be administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to the National Wildlife Refuge System.

SEC. 3005. SPECIAL RULES FOR INYO NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA, LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT LANDS OUTSIDE BOUNDARIES OF INYO NATIONAL FOREST.**—In any land exchange involving the conveyance of certain National Forest System land located within the boundaries of Inyo National Forest in California, as shown on the map titled “Federal Parcel Mammoth Base Facility” and dated June 29, 2011, the Secretary of Agriculture may accept for acquisition in the exchange certain non-Federal lands in California lying outside the boundaries of Inyo National Forest, as shown on the maps titled “DWP Parcel – Interagency Visitor Center Parcel” and “DWP Parcel – Town of Bishop Parcel” and dated June 29, 2011, if the Secretary determines that acquisition of the non-Federal lands is desirable for National Forest System purposes.

(b) **CASH EQUALIZATION PAYMENT; USE.**—In an exchange described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture may accept a cash equalization payment in excess of 25 percent. Any such cash equalization payment shall be deposited into the account in the Treasury of the United States established by Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the Sisk Act; 16 U.S.C. 484a) and shall be made available to the Secretary for the acquisition of land for addition to the National Forest System.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to grant the Secretary of Agriculture new land exchange authority. This section modifies the use of land exchange authorities already available to the Secretary as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3006. LAND EXCHANGE, TRINITY PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT, TRINITY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND THE FOREST SERVICE.

(a) **LAND EXCHANGE REQUIRED.**—If not later than three years after enactment of this Act, the Utilities District conveys to the Secretary of the Interior all right, title, and interest of the Utilities District in and to Parcel A, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may require, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey Parcel B to the Utilities District, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may require, including the reservation of easements for all roads and trails considered to be necessary for administrative purposes and to ensure public access to National Forest System lands.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**—Maps are entitled “Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014 – Parcel

A” and “Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014 – Parcel B”, both dated March 24, 2014. The maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service and the appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management. With the agreement of the parties to the conveyances under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may make technical corrections to the maps and legal descriptions.

(c) **EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.**—

(1) **LAND EXCHANGE PROCESS.**—The land exchange under this section shall be an equal value exchange. Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the land exchange in accordance with section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716).

(2) **APPRAISAL OF PARCELS.**—The values of Parcel A and Parcel B shall be determined by appraisals performed by a qualified appraiser mutually agreed to by the parties to the conveyances under subsection (a). The appraisals shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and conducted in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land.

(3) **CASH EQUALIZATION.**—If the values of Parcel A and Parcel B are not equal, the values may be equalized through the use of a cash equalization payment, however, if the final appraised value of Parcel A exceeds the value of Parcel B, the surplus value of Parcel A shall be considered to be a donation by the Utilities District. Notwithstanding section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)), a cash equalization payment may be made in excess of 25 percent of the appraised value of the Parcel B.

(d) **DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any cash equalization payment received by the United States under subsection (c) shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (16 U.S.C. 484a; commonly known as the Sisk Act).

(2) **USE OF PROCEEDS.**—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, without further appropriation and until expended, for the improvement, maintenance, reconstruction, or construction of a facility or improvement for the National Forest System.

(e) **SURVEY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of Parcel A and Parcel B shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

(f) **COSTS.**—As a condition of the land exchange under subsection (a), the Utilities District shall pay the costs associated with—

- (1) the surveys described in subsection (e);
- (2) the appraisals described in subsection (c)(2); and

(3) any other reasonable administrative or remediation cost determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(g) **MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.**—Upon the acquisition of Parcel A, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Redding Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, shall administer Parcel A as public land in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and the laws and regulations applicable to public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, except that public recreation and public access to and for recreation shall be the highest and best use of Parcel A.

(h) **COMPLETION OF LAND EXCHANGE.**—Once the Utilities District offers to convey Parcel A to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture shall complete the conveyance of Parcel B not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(i) **DEFINITIONS.**—For the purposes of this section:

(1) **PARCEL A.**—The term “Parcel A” means the approximately 47 acres of land, known as the “Sky Ranch parcel”, adjacent to public land administered by the Redding Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management as depicted on the map entitled “Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014 – Parcel A”, dated March 24, 2014, more particularly described as a portion of Mineral Survey 178, south Highway 299, generally located in the S1/2 of the S1/2 of Section 7 and the N1/2 of the N1/2 of Section 8, Township 33 North, Range 10 West, Mount Diablo Meridian.

(2) **PARCEL B.**—The term “Parcel B” means the approximately 100 acres land in the Shasta-Trinity National Forest in the State of California near the Weaverville Airport in Trinity County as depicted on the map entitled “Trinity County Land Exchange Act of 2014 – Parcel B” dated March 24, 2014, more particularly described as Lot 8, SW1/4 SE1/4, and S1/2 N1/2 SE, Section 31, Township 34 North, Range 9 West, Mount Diablo Meridian.

(3) **UTILITIES DISTRICT.**—The term “Utilities District” means the Trinity Public Utilities District of Trinity County, California.

SEC. 3007. IDAHO COUNTY, IDAHO, SHOOTING RANGE LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COUNTY.**—The term “County” means Idaho County in the State of Idaho.

(2) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Idaho County Land Conveyance” and dated April 11, 2014.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO IDAHO COUNTY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after notification by the County and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall convey to the County, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (2).

(2) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The land referred to in paragraph (1) consists of approximately 31 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and generally depicted on the map as “Conveyance Area”.

(3) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this section.

(B) **MINOR ERRORS.**—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

- (i) the map; or
- (ii) the legal description.

(C) **AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(4) **USE OF CONVEYED LAND.**—The land conveyed under this section shall be used only—

- (A) as a shooting range; or
- (B) for any other public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(5) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The Secretary shall require the County to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of

any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in paragraph (2).

(6) **CONDITIONS.**—As a condition of the conveyance under paragraph (1), the County shall agree—

(A) to pay any administrative costs associated with the conveyance including the costs of any environmental, wildlife, cultural, or historical resources studies;

(B) to release and indemnify the United States from any claims or liabilities that may arise from uses carried out on the land described in paragraph (2) on or before the date of the enactment of this Act by the United States or any person; and

(C) to accept such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary.

(7) **REVERSION.**—If the land conveyed under this section ceases to be used for a public purpose in accordance with paragraph (4), the land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

SEC. 3008. SCHOOL DISTRICT 318, MINNESOTA, LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to provide greater safety to the students of the Robert J. Elkington Middle School and the families of those students in Grand Rapids, Minnesota; and

(2) to promote the mission of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **DISTRICT.**—The term “District” means Minnesota Independent School District number 318 in Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “Federal land” means the parcel of approximately 1.3 acres of United States Geological Survey land identified as USGS Parcel 91-016-4111 on the map, which was transferred to the Department of the Interior by the General Services Administration by a letter dated July 22, 1965.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term “Federal land” includes any structures on the land described in subparagraph (A).

(3) **MAP.**—The term “map” means each of the maps entitled “USGS and School Parcel Locations” and dated January 15, 2014.

(4) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “non-Federal land” means the parcel of approximately 1.6 acres of District land identified as School Parcel 91-540-1210 on the map.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term “non-Federal land” includes any structures on the land described in subparagraph (A).

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF EXCHANGE.**—If the District offers to convey to the United States all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall—

(1) accept the offer; and

(2) convey to the District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(d) **VALUATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The value of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under subsection (c) shall be determined—

(A) by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary; and

(B) in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(2) **APPROVAL.**—Appraisals conducted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Secretary for approval.

(3) **CASH EQUALIZATION PAYMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the value of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under subsection (c) is not of equal value, the value shall be equalized through a cash equalization payment.

(B) **USE OF AMOUNTS.**—Amounts received by the United States under subparagraph (A) shall be deposited in the Treasury and credited to miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3009. NORTHERN NEVADA LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) **LAND CONVEYANCE TO YERINGTON, NEVADA.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **CITY.**—The term “City” means the city of Yerington, Nevada.

(B) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the land located in Lyon County and Mineral County, Nevada, that is identified on the map as “City of Yerington Sustainable Development Conveyance Lands”.

(C) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Yerington Land Conveyance” and dated December 19, 2012.

(D) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) **CONVEYANCES OF LAND TO CITY OF YERINGTON, NEVADA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights and to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the City, subject to the agreement of the City, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map.

(B) **APPRAISAL TO DETERMINE FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land to be conveyed—

(i) in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(ii) based on an appraisal that is conducted in accordance with—

(I) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition; and

(II) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(C) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(D) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Beginning on the date on which the Federal land is conveyed to the City, the development of and conduct of activities on the Federal land shall be subject to all applicable Federal laws (including regulations).

(E) **COSTS.**—As a condition of the conveyance of the Federal land under subparagraph (A), the City shall pay—

(i) an amount equal to the appraised value determined in accordance with subparagraph (B); and

(ii) all costs related to the conveyance, including all surveys, appraisals, and other administrative costs associated with the conveyance of the Federal land to the City under subparagraph (A).

(3) **NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.**—Nothing in this subsection alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe.

(b) **CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND TO CITY OF CARLIN, NEVADA.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **CITY.**—The term “City” means the City of Carlin, Nevada.

(B) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 1,329 acres of land located in the City of Carlin, Nevada, that is identified on the map as “Carlin Selected Parcels”.

(C) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Proposed Carlin, Nevada Land Sales” map dated October 25, 2013.

(D) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) **CONVEYANCE.**—Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the City all right, title, and interest of the United States to and in the Federal land.

(3) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for the conveyance authorized under paragraph (2), the City shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the appraised value of the Federal land, as determined under paragraph (4).

(4) **APPRAISAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct an appraisal of the Federal land in accordance with—

(A) the Uniform Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(5) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(6) **COSTS.**—At closing for the conveyance authorized under paragraph (2) the City shall pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized under such paragraph, including the costs of title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(7) **RELEASE OF UNITED STATES.**—Upon making the conveyance under paragraph (2), notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal land in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

(8) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land identified for conveyance shall be withdrawn from all forms of—

(A) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials and geothermal leasing laws.

(c) **CONVEYANCE TO THE CITY OF FERNLEY, NEVADA.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **CITY.**—The term “City” means the city of Fernley, Nevada.

(B) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the land located in the City that is identified as “Proposed Sale Parcels” on the map.

(C) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Proposed Fernley, Nevada, Land Sales” and dated January 25, 2013.

(D) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a request from the City for the conveyance of the Federal land, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States to and in the Federal land.

(3) USE OF CONVEYED LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal land conveyed under paragraph (2)—

(i) may be used by the City for any public purposes consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.); and

(ii) shall not be disposed of by the City.

(B) REVERSION.—If the City ceases to use a parcel of the Federal land conveyed under paragraph (2) in accordance with subparagraph (A)—

(i) title to the parcel shall revert to the Secretary, at the option of the Secretary; and

(ii) the City shall be responsible for any reclamation necessary to revert the parcel to the United States.

(4) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(5) RESERVATION OF EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The City and the Commissioner of Reclamation may retain easements or rights-of-way on the Federal land to be conveyed, including easements or rights-of-way that the Commissioner of Reclamation determines are necessary to carry out—

(A) the operation and maintenance of the Truckee Canal Irrigation District Canal; or

(B) the Newlands Project.

(6) COSTS.—At closing for the conveyance authorized under paragraph (2), the City shall pay or reimburse the Secretary, as appropriate, for the reasonable transaction and administrative personnel costs associated with the conveyance authorized under that paragraph, including the costs of title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(7) RELEASE OF UNITED STATES.—On conveyance of the Federal land under paragraph (2), notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials, or mining related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) on the Federal land in existence before or on the date of the conveyance.

(8) ACQUISITION OF FEDERAL REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—

(A) REQUEST.—After the date of conveyance of the Federal land under paragraph (2), the City may submit to the Secretary a request to acquire the Federal reversionary interest in all or any portion of the Federal land.

(B) APPRAISAL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of a request under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the Federal reversionary interest in the Federal land re-

quested by the City under that subparagraph.

(ii) REQUIREMENT.—The appraisal under clause (i) shall be completed in accordance with—

(I) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(II) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(C) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—If, by the date that is 1 year after the date of completion of the appraisal under subparagraph (B), the City submits to the Secretary an offer to acquire the Federal reversionary interest requested under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall, not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the offer is submitted, convey to the City the reversionary interest covered by the offer.

(D) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal reversionary interest under subparagraph (C), the City shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the appraised value of the Federal reversionary interest, as determined under subparagraph (B).

(E) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition of the conveyance under subparagraph (C), all costs associated with the conveyance (including the cost of the appraisal under subparagraph (B)), shall be paid by the City.

(d) CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND, STOREY COUNTY, NEVADA.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Storey County, Nevada.

(B) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 1,745 acres of Federal land identified on the map as “BLM Owned-County Request Transfer”.

(C) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Restoring Storey County Act” and dated November 20, 2012.

(D) MINING TOWNSITE.—The term “mining townsite” means the real property—

(i) located in the Virginia City townsite within the County;

(ii) owned by the Federal Government; and

(iii) on which improvements were constructed based on the belief that—

(I) the property had been or would be acquired from the Federal Government by the entity operating the relevant mine on the date of construction; or

(II) the individual or entity that made the improvements had a valid claim for acquiring the property from the Federal Government.

(E) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) MINING CLAIM VALIDITY REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out an expedited program to examine each unpatented mining claim (including each unpatented mining claim for which a patent application has been filed) within the mining townsite.

(B) DETERMINATION OF VALIDITY.—With respect to a mining claim described in subparagraph (A), if the Secretary determines that the elements of a contest are present, the Secretary shall immediately determine the validity of the mining claim.

(C) DECLARATION BY SECRETARY.—If the Secretary determines a mining claim to be invalid under subparagraph (B), as soon as practicable after the date of the determination, the Secretary shall declare the mining claim to be null and void.

(D) TREATMENT OF VALID MINING CLAIMS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Each mining claim that the Secretary determines to be valid under subparagraph (B) shall be maintained in compliance with the general mining laws and paragraph (3)(B)(ii).

(ii) EFFECT ON HOLDERS.—A holder of a mining claim described in clause (i) shall not be entitled to a patent.

(E) ABANDONMENT OF CLAIM.—The Secretary shall provide—

(i) a public notice that each mining claim holder may affirmatively abandon the claim of the mining claim holder prior to the validity review under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) to each mining claim holder an opportunity to abandon the claim of the mining claim holder before the date on which the land that is subject to the mining claim is conveyed.

(3) CONVEYANCE TO COUNTY.—

(A) CONVEYANCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), after completing the mining claim validity review under paragraph (2)(B), if requested by the County, the Secretary shall convey to the County, by quitclaim deed, all surface rights of the United States in and to the Federal land, including any improvements on the Federal land, in accordance with this paragraph.

(ii) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.—All mineral and geothermal rights in and to the Federal land are reserved to the United States

(B) VALID MINING CLAIMS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each parcel of land located in a mining townsite subject to a valid mining claim, the Secretary shall—

(I) reserve the mineral rights in and to the mining townsite; and

(II) otherwise convey, without consideration, the remaining right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the mining townsite (including improvements to the mining townsite), as identified for conveyance on the map.

(ii) PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS.—Each valid mining claim shall be subject to each procedure and requirement described in section 9 of the Act of December 29, 1916 (43 U.S.C. 299) (commonly known as the “Stockraising Homestead Act of 1916”) (including regulations).

(4) RECIPIENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a mining townsite conveyed under paragraph (3)(B)(i)(II) for which a valid interest is proven by 1 or more individuals in accordance with chapter 244.2825 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, the County shall reconvey the property to the 1 or more individuals by appropriate deed or other legal conveyance in accordance with that chapter.

(B) AUTHORITY OF COUNTY.—The County shall not be required to recognize a claim under this paragraph that is submitted on a date that is later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.—The conveyance of a mining townsite under paragraph (3) shall be subject to valid existing rights, including any easement or other right-of-way or lease in existence as of the date of the conveyance.

(6) WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, and except as otherwise provided in this Act, the mining townsite is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) disposition under all laws pertaining to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(7) **SURVEY.**—A mining townsite to be conveyed by the United States under paragraph (3) shall be sufficiently surveyed as a whole to legally describe the land for patent conveyance.

(8) **CONVEYANCE OF TERMINATED MINING CLAIMS.**—If a mining claim determined by the Secretary to be valid under paragraph (2)(B) is abandoned, invalidated, or otherwise returned to the Bureau of Land Management, the mining claim shall be—

(A) withdrawn in accordance with paragraph (6); and

(B) subject to the agreement of the owner, conveyed to the owner of the surface rights covered by the mining claim.

(9) **RELEASE.**—On completion of the conveyance of a mining townsite under paragraph (3), the United States shall be relieved from liability for, and shall be held harmless from, any claim arising from the presence of an improvement or material on the mining townsite.

(10) **SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DEADLINE FOR REVIEW AND CONVEYANCES.**—It is the sense of Congress that the examination of the unpatented mining claims under paragraph (2) and the conveyances under paragraph (3) should be completed by not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) **ELKO MOTOCROSS LAND CONVEYANCE.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **COUNTY.**—The term “county” means the county of Elko, Nevada.

(B) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Elko Motocross Park” and dated April 19, 2013.

(C) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF CONVEYANCE.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to valid existing rights and the provisions of this subsection, if requested by the county the Secretary shall convey to the county, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3).

(3) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The land referred to in paragraph (2) consists of approximately 275 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Elko District, Nevada, as generally depicted on the map as “Elko Motocross Park”.

(4) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this subsection.

(B) **MINOR ERRORS.**—The Secretary may correct any minor error in the map or the legal description.

(C) **AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(5) **USE OF CONVEYED LAND.**—The land conveyed under this subsection shall be used only as a motocross, bicycle, off-highway vehicle, or stock car racing area, or for any other public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(6) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—The Secretary shall require the county to pay all survey costs and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in paragraph (3).

(f) **LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE TE-MOAK TRIBE OF WESTERN SHOSHONE INDIANS OF NEVADA (ELKO BAND).**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Te-moak Tribal Land Expansion” and dated April 19, 2013.

(B) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(C) **TRIBE.**—The term “Tribe” means the Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada (Elko Band).

(2) **LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit and use of the Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(3) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 373 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, as generally depicted on the map as “Expansion Area”.

(4) **MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(5) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under paragraph (2).

(6) **USE OF TRUST LAND.**—

(A) **GAMING.**—Land taken into trust under paragraph (2) shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(B) **GENERAL USES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Tribe shall use the land taken into trust under paragraph (2) only for—

(I) traditional and customary uses;

(II) stewardship conservation for the benefit of the Tribe; or

(III) residential or recreational development.

(ii) **OTHER USES.**—If the Tribe uses any portion of the land taken into trust under paragraph (2) for a purpose other than a purpose described in clause (i), the Tribe shall pay to the Secretary an amount that is equal to the fair market value of the portion of the land, as determined by an appraisal.

(C) **THINNING; LANDSCAPE RESTORATION.**—With respect to the land taken into trust under paragraph (2), the Secretary, in consultation and coordination with the Tribe, may carry out any fuels reduction and other landscape restoration activities on the land that is beneficial to the Tribe and the Bureau of Land Management.

(g) **NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON LAND CONVEYANCE.**—

(1) **TRANSFER OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR LAND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall transfer to the Secretary of the Navy, without reimbursement, the Federal land described in subparagraph (B).

(B) **DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL LAND.**—The Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) is the parcel of approximately 400 acres of land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior that—

(i) is adjacent to Naval Air Station Fallon in Churchill County, Nevada; and

(ii) was withdrawn under Public Land Order 6834 (NV-943-4214-10; N-37875).

(C) **MANAGEMENT.**—On transfer of the Federal land described under subparagraph (B) to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy shall have full jurisdiction, custody, and control of the Federal land.

(2) **WATER RIGHTS.**—

(A) **WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(i) to establish a reservation in favor of the United States with respect to any water or water right on land transferred by this subsection; or

(ii) to authorize the appropriation of water on land transferred by this subsection except in accordance with applicable State law.

(B) **EFFECT ON PREVIOUSLY ACQUIRED OR RESERVED WATER RIGHTS.**—This subsection shall not be construed to affect any water rights acquired or reserved by the United States before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3010. SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICO, FEDERAL LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 19 acres of Federal surface estate generally depicted as “Lands Authorized for Conveyance” on the map.

(2) **LANDOWNER.**—The term “landowner” means the plaintiffs in the case styled *Blancett v. United States Department of the Interior, et al.*, No. 10-cv-00254-JAP-KBM, United States District Court for the District of New Mexico.

(3) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “San Juan County Land Conveyance” and dated June 20, 2012.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of New Mexico.

(b) **CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—On request of the landowner, the Secretary shall, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe and subject to valid existing rights, convey to the landowner all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any portion of the Federal land (including any improvements or appurtenances to the Federal land) by sale.

(2) **SURVEY; ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—

(A) **SURVEY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the Federal land to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

(B) **COSTS.**—The administrative costs associated with the conveyance shall be paid by the landowner.

(3) **CONSIDERATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal land under paragraph (1), the landowner shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the Federal land conveyed, as determined under subparagraph (B).

(B) **APPRAISAL.**—The fair market value of any Federal land that is conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by an appraisal acceptable to the Secretary that is performed in accordance with—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(iii) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(4) **DISPOSITION AND USE OF PROCEEDS.**—

(A) **DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.**—The Secretary shall deposit the proceeds of any conveyance of Federal land under paragraph (1)

in a special account in the Treasury for use in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) USE OF PROCEEDS.—Amounts deposited under subparagraph (A) shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and until expended, for the acquisition of land or interests in land from willing sellers in the State or the State of Arizona for bald eagle habitat protection.

(5) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions for a conveyance under paragraph (1) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(6) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land is withdrawn from—

(A) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(B) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

SEC. 3011. LAND CONVEYANCE, UINTA-WASATCH-CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—On the request of Brigham Young University submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey, not later than one year after receiving the request, to Brigham Young University all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to an approximately 80-acre parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in the State of Utah, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Upper Y Mountain Trail and Y Conveyance Act” and dated June 6, 2013, subject to valid existing rights and by quitclaim deed.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) CONSIDERATION REQUIRED.—As consideration for the land conveyed under subsection (a), Brigham Young University shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the land, as determined by an appraisal approved by the Secretary and conducted in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716).

(2) DEPOSIT.—The consideration received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury to reduce the Federal deficit.

(c) PUBLIC ACCESS TO Y MOUNTAIN TRAIL.—After the conveyance under subsection (a), Brigham Young University will—

(1) continue to allow the same reasonable public access to the trailhead and portion of the Y Mountain Trail already owned by Brigham Young University as of the date of the enactment of this Act that Brigham Young University has historically allowed; and

(2) allow that same reasonable public access to the portion of the Y Mountain Trail and the “Y” symbol located on the land described in subsection (a).

(d) SURVEY AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. Brigham Young University shall pay the reasonable costs of survey, appraisal, and any administrative analyses required by law.

SEC. 3012. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF FRUIT HEIGHTS, UTAH.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term “City” means the city of Fruit Heights, Utah.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Proposed Fruit Heights City Conveyance” and dated September 13, 2012.

(3) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The term “National Forest System land” means the approximately 100 acres of National Forest System land, as depicted on the map.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the National Forest System land.

(c) SURVEY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If determined by the Secretary to be necessary, the exact acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

(2) COSTS.—The City shall pay the reasonable survey and other administrative costs associated with a survey conducted under paragraph (1).

(d) EASEMENT.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (b), the Secretary shall reserve an easement to the National Forest System land for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

(e) USE OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (b), the City shall use the National Forest System land only for public purposes.

(f) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—In the quitclaim deed to the City for the National Forest System land, the Secretary shall provide that the National Forest System land shall revert to the Secretary, at the election of the Secretary, if the National Forest System land is used for other than a public purpose.

SEC. 3013. LAND CONVEYANCE, HANFORD SITE, WASHINGTON.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Energy shall convey to the Community Reuse Organization of the Hanford Site (in this section referred to as the “Organization”) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two parcels of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 1,341 acres and 300 acres, respectively, of the Hanford Reservation, as requested by the Organization on May 31, 2011, and October 13, 2011, and as depicted within the proposed boundaries on the map titled “Attachment 2-Revised Map” included in the October 13, 2011, letter.

(2) MODIFICATION OF CONVEYANCE.—Upon the agreement of the Secretary and the Organization, the Secretary may adjust the boundaries of one or both of the parcels specified for conveyance under paragraph (1).

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the Organization shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the estimated fair market value of the conveyed real property, as determined by the Secretary of Energy, except that the Secretary may convey the property without consideration or for consideration below the estimated fair market value of the property if the Organization—

(1) agrees that the net proceeds from any sale or lease of the property (or any portion thereof) received by the Organization during at least the seven-year period beginning on the date of such conveyance will be used to support the economic redevelopment of, or related to, the Hanford Site; and

(2) executes the agreement for such conveyance and accepts control of the real property within a reasonable time.

(c) EXPEDITED NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Except as provided in subsection (d)(2), the

enactment of this section shall be construed to satisfy any notice to Congress otherwise required for the land conveyance required by this section.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(2) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—If the Secretary uses the authority provided by paragraph (1) to impose a term or condition on the conveyance, the Secretary shall submit to Congress written notice of the term or condition and the reason for imposing the term or condition.

SEC. 3014. RANCH A WYOMING CONSOLIDATION AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Wyoming.

(b) CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the State submitted to the Secretary not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the State, without consideration and by quitclaim deed, all right, title and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of National Forest System land described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcel of land referred to in paragraph (1) is approximately 10 acres of National Forest System land located on the Black Hills National Forest, in Crook County, State of Wyoming more specifically described as the E½ NE¼ NW¼ SE¼ less the south 50 feet, W½ NW¼ NE¼ SE¼ less the south 50 feet, Section 24, Township 52 North, Range 61 West Sixth P.M.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) subject to valid existing rights; and

(B) made notwithstanding the requirements of subsection (a) of section 1 of Public Law 104-276.

(4) SURVEY.—If determined by the Secretary to be necessary, the exact acreage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey that is approved by the Secretary and paid for by the State.

(c) AMENDMENTS.—Section 1 of the Act of October 9, 1996 (Public Law 104-276) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b); and

(2) by designating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

Subtitle B—Public Lands and National Forest System Management

SEC. 3021. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PERMIT PROCESSING.

(a) PROGRAM TO IMPROVE FEDERAL PERMIT COORDINATION.—Section 365 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15924) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “PILOT”;

(2) by striking “Pilot Project” each place it appears and inserting “Project”;

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico” and inserting “the States in which Project offices are located”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “PILOT”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) Any other State, district, or field office of the Bureau of Land Management determined by the Secretary.”;

(5) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than February 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and each February 1 thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Chairman and ranking minority Member of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, which shall include—

“(1) the allocation of funds to each Project office for the previous fiscal year; and

“(2) the accomplishments of each Project office relating to the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations during that fiscal year.”;

(6) in subsection (h), by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6) the States in which Project offices are located.”;

(7) by striking subsection (i); and

(8) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (i).

(b) BLM OIL AND GAS PERMIT PROCESSING FEE.—Section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) BLM OIL AND GAS PERMIT PROCESSING FEE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2026, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall collect a fee for each new application for a permit to drill that is submitted to the Secretary.

“(2) AMOUNT.—The amount of the fee shall be \$9,500 for each new application, as indexed for United States dollar inflation from October 1, 2015 (as measured by the Consumer Price Index).

“(3) USE.—Of the fees collected under this subsection for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall transfer—

“(A) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019—

“(i) 15 percent to the field offices that collected the fees and used to process protests, leases, and permits under this Act, subject to appropriation; and

“(ii) 85 percent to the BLM Permit Processing Improvement Fund established under subsection (c)(2)(B) (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Fund’); and

“(B) for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2026, all of the fees to the Fund.

“(4) ADDITIONAL COSTS.—During each of fiscal years of 2016 through 2026, the Secretary shall not implement a rulemaking that would enable an increase in fees to recover additional costs related to processing applications for permits to drill.”.

(c) BLM PERMIT PROCESSING IMPROVEMENT FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 35(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) USE OF FUND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Fund shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure, without further appropriation and without fiscal year limitation, for the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations on onshore Federal and Indian trust mineral estate land.

“(B) ACCOUNTS.—The Secretary shall divide the Fund into—

“(i) a Rental Account (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Rental Account’) comprised of rental receipts collected under this section; and

“(ii) a Fee Account (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Fee Account’) comprised of fees collected under subsection (d).

“(4) RENTAL ACCOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use the Rental Account for—

“(i) the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations on onshore Federal and Indian trust mineral estate land under the jurisdiction of the Project offices identified under section 365(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15924(d)); and

“(ii) training programs for development of expertise related to coordinating and processing oil and gas use authorizations.

“(B) ALLOCATION.—In determining the allocation of the Rental Account among Project offices for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall consider—

“(i) the number of applications for permit to drill received in a Project office during the previous fiscal year;

“(ii) the backlog of applications described in clause (i) in a Project office;

“(iii) publicly available industry forecasts for development of oil and gas resources under the jurisdiction of a Project office; and

“(iv) any opportunities for partnership with local industry organizations and educational institutions in developing training programs to facilitate the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations.

“(5) FEE ACCOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use the Fee Account for the coordination and processing of oil and gas use authorizations on onshore Federal and Indian trust mineral estate land.

“(B) ALLOCATION.—The Secretary shall transfer not less than 75 percent of the revenues collected by an office for the processing of applications for permits to the State office of the State in which the fees were collected.”.

(2) INTEREST ON OVERPAYMENT ADJUSTMENT.—Section 111(h) of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1721(h)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “the rate” and all that follows through the period at the end of the sentence and inserting “a rate equal to the sum of the Federal short-term rate determined under section 6621(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 plus 1 percentage point.”.

SEC. 3022. INTERNET-BASED ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 17(b)(1) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the third sentence, by inserting “, except as provided in subparagraph (C)” after “by oral bidding”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) In order to diversify and expand the Nation’s onshore leasing program to ensure the best return to the Federal taxpayer, reduce fraud, and secure the leasing process, the Secretary may conduct onshore lease sales through Internet-based bidding methods. Each individual Internet-based lease sale shall conclude within 7 days.”.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the tenth Internet-based lease sale conducted under the amendment made by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall analyze the first 10 such lease sales and report to Congress the findings of the analysis. The report shall include—

(1) estimates on increases or decreases in such lease sales, compared to sales conducted by oral bidding, in—

(A) the number of bidders;

(B) the average amount of bid;

(C) the highest amount bid; and

(D) the lowest bid;

(2) an estimate on the total cost or savings to the Department of the Interior as a result of such sales, compared to sales conducted by oral bidding; and

(3) an evaluation of the demonstrated or expected effectiveness of different structures for lease sales which may provide an opportunity to better maximize bidder participation, ensure the highest return to the Federal taxpayers, minimize opportunities for fraud or collusion, and ensure the security and integrity of the leasing process.

SEC. 3023. GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

Section 402 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1752) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(B) by striking “So long as” and inserting the following:

“(1) RENEWAL OF EXPIRING OR TRANSFERRED PERMIT OR LEASE.—During any period in which”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CONTINUATION OF TERMS UNDER NEW PERMIT OR LEASE.—The terms and conditions in a grazing permit or lease that has expired, or was terminated due to a grazing preference transfer, shall be continued under a new permit or lease until the date on which the Secretary concerned completes any environmental analysis and documentation for the permit or lease required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable laws.

“(3) COMPLETION OF PROCESSING.—As of the date on which the Secretary concerned completes the processing of a grazing permit or lease in accordance with paragraph (2), the permit or lease may be canceled, suspended, or modified, in whole or in part.

“(4) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS.—The Secretary concerned shall seek to conduct environmental reviews on an allotment or multiple allotment basis, to the extent practicable, if the allotments share similar ecological conditions, for purposes of compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable laws.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (j); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The issuance of a grazing permit or lease by the Secretary concerned may be categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) if—

“(A) the issued permit or lease continues the current grazing management of the allotment; and

“(B) the Secretary concerned—

“(i) has assessed and evaluated the grazing allotment associated with the lease or permit; and

“(ii) based on the assessment and evaluation under clause (i), has determined that the allotment—

“(I) with respect to public land administered by the Secretary of the Interior—

“(aa) is meeting land health standards; or
 “(bb) is not meeting land health standards due to factors other than existing livestock grazing; or

“(II) with respect to National Forest System land administered by the Secretary of Agriculture—

“(aa) is meeting objectives in the applicable land and resource management plan; or

“(bb) is not meeting the objectives in the applicable land resource management plan due to factors other than existing livestock grazing.

“(2) TRAILING AND CROSSING.—The trailing and crossing of livestock across public land and National Forest System land and the implementation of trailing and crossing practices by the Secretary concerned may be categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(i) PRIORITY AND TIMING FOR COMPLETION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES.—The Secretary concerned, in the sole discretion of the Secretary concerned, shall determine the priority and timing for completing each required environmental analysis with respect to a grazing allotment, permit, or lease based on—

“(1) the environmental significance of the grazing allotment, permit, or lease; and

“(2) the available funding for the environmental analysis.”.

SEC. 3024. CABIN USER AND TRANSFER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall establish a fee in accordance with this section for the issuance of a special use permit for the use and occupancy of National Forest System land for recreational residence purposes.

(b) INTERIM FEE.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the last day of the calendar year during which the current appraisal cycle is completed under subsection (c), the Secretary shall assess an interim annual fee for recreational residences on National Forest System land that is an amount equal to the lesser of—

(1) the fee determined under the Cabin User Fee Fairness Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), subject to the requirement that any increase over the fee assessed during the previous year shall be limited to not more than 25 percent; or

(2) \$5,600.

(c) COMPLETION OF CURRENT APPRAISAL CYCLE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the current appraisal cycle, including receipt of timely second appraisals, for recreational residences on National Forest System land in accordance with the Cabin User Fee Fairness Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) (referred to in this section as the “current appraisal cycle”).

(d) LOT VALUE.—Only appraisals conducted and approved by the Secretary in accordance with the Cabin User Fee Fairness Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) during the current appraisal cycle shall be used to establish the base value assigned to the lot, subject to the adjustment in subsection (e). If a second appraisal—

(1) was approved by the Secretary, the value established by the second appraisal shall be the base value assigned to the lot; or

(2) was not approved by the Secretary, the value established by the initial appraisal shall be the base value assigned to the lot.

(e) ADJUSTMENT.—On the date of completion of the current appraisal cycle, and before assessing a fee under subsection (f), the Secretary shall make a 1-time adjustment to the value of each appraised lot on which a recreational residence is located to reflect any change in value occurring after the date of the most recent appraisal for the lot, in accordance with the 4th quarter of 2012 National Association of Homebuilders/Wells Fargo Housing Opportunity Index.

(f) ANNUAL FEE.—

(1) BASE.—After the date on which appraised lot values have been adjusted in accordance with subsection (e), the annual fee assessed prospectively by the Secretary for recreational residences on National Forest System land shall be in accordance with the following tiered fee structure:

Fee Tier	Approximate Percent of Permits Nationally	Fee Amount
Tier 1	6 percent	\$650
Tier 2	16 percent	\$1,150
Tier 3	26 percent	\$1,650
Tier 4	22 percent	\$2,150
Tier 5	10 percent	\$2,650
Tier 6	5 percent	\$3,150
Tier 7	5 percent	\$3,650
Tier 8	3 percent	\$4,150
Tier 9	3 percent	\$4,650
Tier 10	3 percent	\$5,150
Tier 11	1 percent	\$5,650

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall increase or decrease the annual fees set forth in the table under paragraph (1) to reflect changes in the Implicit Price Deflator for the Gross Domestic Product published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce, applied on a 5-year rolling average.

(3) ACCESS AND OCCUPANCY ADJUSTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation establish criteria pursuant to which the annual fee determined in accordance with this section may be suspended or reduced temporarily if access to, or the occupancy of, the recreational residence is significantly restricted.

(B) APPEAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation grant the cabin owner the right of an administrative appeal of the determination made in accordance with subparagraph (A) whether to suspend or reduce temporarily the annual fee.

(g) PERIODIC REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that—

(A) analyzes the annual fees set forth in the table under subsection (f) to ensure that the fees reflect fair value for the use of the land for recreational residence purposes, taking into account all use limitations and restrictions (including any limitations and restrictions imposed by the Secretary); and

(B) includes any recommendations of the Secretary with respect to modifying the fee system.

(2) LIMITATION.—The use of appraisals shall not be required for any modifications to the fee system based on the recommendations under paragraph (1)(B).

(h) CABIN TRANSFER FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a fee in the amount of \$1,200 for the issuance of a new recreational residence permit due to a change of ownership of the recreational residence.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall annually increase or decrease the transfer fee established under paragraph (1) to reflect changes in the Implicit Price Deflator for the Gross Domestic Product published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce, applied on a 5-year rolling average.

(i) EFFECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section limits or restricts any right, title, or inter-

est of the United States in or to any land or resource in the National Forest System.

(2) ALASKA.—The Secretary shall not establish or impose a fee or condition under this section for permits in the State of Alaska that is inconsistent with section 1303(d) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3193(d)).

(j) RETENTION OF FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary may retain, and expend, for the purposes described in paragraph (2), any fees collected under this section without further appropriation.

(2) USE.—Amounts made available under paragraph (1) shall be used to administer the recreational residence program and other recreation programs carried out on National Forest System land.

(k) REPEAL OF CABIN USER FEE FAIRNESS ACT OF 2000.—Effective on the date of the assessment of annual permit fees in accordance with subsection (f) (as certified to Congress by the Secretary), the Cabin User Fee Fairness Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) is repealed.

Subtitle C—National Park System Units**SEC. 3030. ADDITION OF ASHLAND HARBOR BREAKWATER LIGHT TO THE APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE.**

Public Law 91-424 (16 U.S.C. 460w et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In the first section as follows:

(A) In the matter preceding subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “islands and shoreline” and inserting “islands, shoreline, and light stations”; and

(ii) by inserting “historic,” after “scenic,”.

(B) In subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “the area” and inserting “The area”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

(C) In subsection (b), by striking the final period.

(D) By inserting after “1985.” the following:

“(C) ASHLAND HARBOR BREAKWATER LIGHT.—

“(1) The Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light generally depicted on the map titled ‘Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light Addition to Apostle Islands National Lakeshore’ and dated February 11, 2014, located at the end of the breakwater on Chequamegon Bay, Wisconsin.

“(2) Congress does not intend for the designation of the property under paragraph (1) to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the boundary of that property.”.

(2) In section 6 as follows:

(A) By striking “The lakeshore” and inserting:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The lakeshore”.

(B) By inserting “this section and” before “the provisions of”.

(C) By adding after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) FEDERAL USE.—Notwithstanding subsection (c) of the first section—

“(1) the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may operate, maintain, keep, locate, inspect, repair, and replace any Federal aid to navigation located at the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light for as long as such aid is needed for navigational purposes; and

“(2) in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (1), such Secretary may enter, at any time, the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light or any Federal aid to navigation at the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, for as long as such aid is needed for navigational purposes, without notice to the extent that it is not possible to provide advance notice.

“(c) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—Pursuant to existing authorities, the Secretary may enter into agreements with the City of Ashland, County of Ashland, and County of Bayfield, Wisconsin, for the purpose of cooperative law enforcement and emergency services within the boundaries of the lakeshore.”.

SEC. 3031. BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park—

(1) to help preserve, protect, and interpret the nationally significant resources that exemplify the industrial heritage of the Blackstone River Valley for the benefit and inspiration of future generations;

(2) to support the preservation, protection, and interpretation of the urban, rural, and agricultural landscape features (including the Blackstone River and Canal) of the region that provide an overarching context for the industrial heritage of the Blackstone River Valley;

(3) to educate the public about—

(A) the nationally significant sites and districts that convey the industrial history of the Blackstone River Valley; and

(B) the significance of the Blackstone River Valley to the past and present of the United States; and

(4) to support and enhance the network of partners in the protection, improvement, management, and operation of related resources and facilities throughout the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR.—The term “National Heritage Corridor” means the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor.

(2) PARK.—The term “Park” means the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park established by subsection (c)(1).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATES.—The term “States” means—

(A) the State of Massachusetts; and

(B) the State of Rhode Island.

(c) BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the States a unit of the National Park System, to be known as the “Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park”.

(2) HISTORIC SITES AND DISTRICTS.—The Park shall include—

(A) Blackstone River State Park; and

(B) the following resources, as described in Management Option 3 of the study entitled “Blackstone River Valley Special Resource Study—Study Report 2011”:

(i) Old Slater Mill National Historic Landmark District.

(ii) Slatersville Historic District.

(iii) Ashton Historic District.

(iv) Whitinsville Historic District.

(v) Hopedale Village Historic District.

(vi) Blackstone River and the tributaries of Blackstone River.

(vii) Blackstone Canal.

(3) ACQUISITION OF LAND; PARK BOUNDARY.—

(A) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land or interests in land that are considered contributing historic resources in the historic sites and districts described in paragraph (2)(B) for inclusion in the Park boundary by donation, purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

(ii) NO CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land may be acquired for the Park by condemnation.

(B) PARK BOUNDARY.—On a determination by the Secretary that a sufficient quantity of land or interests in land has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit, the Secretary shall establish a boundary for the Park by publishing a boundary map in the Federal Register.

(C) OTHER RESOURCES.—The Secretary may include in the Park boundary any resources that are the subject of an agreement with the States or a subdivision of the States entered into under paragraph (4)(D).

(D) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On the acquisition of additional land or interests in land under subparagraph (A), or on entering an agreement under subparagraph (C), the boundary of the Park shall be adjusted to reflect the acquisition or agreement by publishing a Park boundary map in the Federal Register.

(E) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The maps referred to in this paragraph shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(F) ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES.—The Secretary may acquire not more than 10 acres in Woonsocket, Rhode Island for the development of administrative, curatorial, maintenance, or visitor facilities for the Park.

(G) LIMITATION.—Land owned by the States or a political subdivision of the States may be acquired under this paragraph only by donation.

(4) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer land within the boundary of the Park in accordance with—

(i) this subsection; and

(ii) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(I) the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(II) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(B) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the Park—

(I) in consultation with the States and other interested parties; and

(II) in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)).

(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall consider ways to use preexisting or planned visitor facilities and recreational opportunities developed in the National Heritage Corridor, including—

(I) the Blackstone Valley Visitor Center, Pawtucket, Rhode Island;

(II) the Captain Wilbur Kelly House, Blackstone River State Park, Lincoln, Rhode Island;

(III) the Museum of Work and Culture, Woonsocket, Rhode Island;

(IV) the River Bend Farm/Blackstone River and Canal Heritage State Park, Uxbridge, Massachusetts;

(V) the Worcester Blackstone Visitor Center, located at the former Washburn & Moen wire mill facility, Worcester, Massachusetts;

(VI) the Route 295 Visitor Center adjacent to Blackstone River State Park; and

(VII) the Blackstone River Bikeway.

(C) RELATED SITES.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, visitor services, interpretive tours, and educational programs to sites and resources in the National Heritage Corridor that are located outside the boundary of the Park and associated with the purposes for which the Park is established.

(D) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—To further the purposes of this subsection and notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the States, political subdivisions of the States, nonprofit organizations (including the local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Corridor), and other interested parties—

(I) to provide technical assistance, interpretation, and educational programs in the historic sites and districts described in paragraph (2)(B); and

(II) subject to the availability of appropriations and clauses (ii) and (iii), to provide not more than 50 percent of the cost of any natural, historic, or cultural resource protection project in the Park that is consistent with the general management plan prepared under subparagraph (B).

(ii) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—As a condition of the receipt of funds under clause (i)(II), the Secretary shall require that any

Federal funds made available under a cooperative agreement entered into under this paragraph are to be matched on a 1-to-1 basis by non-Federal funds.

(iii) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—Any payment made by the Secretary under clause (i)(ii) shall be subject to an agreement that the conversion, use, or disposal of the project for purposes that are inconsistent with the purposes of this subsection, as determined by the Secretary, shall result in a right of the United States to reimbursement of the greater of—

(I) the amount provided by the Secretary to the project under clause (i)(II); or

(II) an amount equal to the increase in the value of the project that is attributable to the funds, as determined by the Secretary at the time of the conversion, use, or disposal.

(iv) **PUBLIC ACCESS.**—Any cooperative agreement entered into under this subparagraph shall provide for reasonable public access to the resources covered by the cooperative agreement.

(5) **DEDICATION; MEMORIAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Congress dedicates the Park to John H. Chafee, the former United States Senator from Rhode Island, in recognition of—

(i) the role of John H. Chafee in the preservation of the resources of the Blackstone River Valley and the heritage corridor that bears the name of John H. Chafee; and

(ii) the decades of the service of John H. Chafee to the people of Rhode Island and the United States.

(B) **MEMORIAL.**—The Secretary shall display a memorial at an appropriate location in the Park that recognizes the role of John H. Chafee in preserving the resources of the Blackstone River Valley for the people of the United States.

SEC. 3032. COLTSVILLE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CITY.**—The term “city” means the city of Hartford, Connecticut.

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Coltsville National Historical Park Advisory Commission established by subsection (k)(1).

(3) **HISTORIC DISTRICT.**—The term “Historic District” means the Coltsville Historic District.

(4) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Coltsville National Historical Park—Proposed Boundary”, numbered T25/102087, and dated May 11, 2010.

(5) **PARK.**—The term “park” means the Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut.

(6) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Connecticut.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), there is established in the State a unit of the National Park System to be known as the “Coltsville National Historical Park”.

(2) **CONDITIONS FOR ESTABLISHMENT.**—The park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that—

(A) the Secretary has acquired by donation sufficient land or an interest in land within the boundary of the park to constitute a manageable unit;

(B) the State, city, or private property owner, as appropriate, has entered into a written agreement with the Secretary to donate at least 10,000 square feet of space in the East Armory which would include facilities for park administration and visitor services; and

(C) the Secretary has entered into a written agreement with the State, city, or other

public entity, as appropriate, providing that land owned by the State, city, or other public entity within the Coltsville Historic District shall be managed consistent with this section.

(3) **NOTICE.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the park.

(c) **BOUNDARIES.**—The park shall include and provide appropriate interpretation and viewing of the following sites, as generally depicted on the map:

(1) The East Armory.

(2) The Church of the Good Shepherd.

(3) The Caldwell/Colt Memorial Parish House.

(4) Colt Park.

(5) The Potsdam Cottages.

(6) Armsmear.

(7) The James Colt House.

(d) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(e) **COLLECTIONS.**—The Secretary may enter into a written agreement with the State of Connecticut State Library, Wadsworth Athenaeum, and the Colt Trust, or other public entities, as appropriate, to gain appropriate access to Colt-related artifacts for the purposes of having items routinely on display in the East Armory or within other areas of the park to enhance the visitor experience.

(f) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall administer the park in accordance with—

(A) this section; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(ii) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) **STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTION.**—Nothing in this section enlarges, diminishes, or modifies any authority of the State, or any political subdivision of the State (including the city)—

(A) to exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction; or

(B) to carry out State laws (including regulations) and rules on non-Federal land located within the boundary of the park.

(g) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As the Secretary determines to be appropriate to carry out this section, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements to carry out this section, under which the Secretary may identify, interpret, restore, rehabilitate, and provide technical assistance for the preservation of nationally significant properties within the boundary of the park.

(2) **RIGHT OF ACCESS.**—A cooperative agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall provide that the Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall have the right of access at all reasonable times to all public portions of the property covered by the agreement for the purposes of—

(A) conducting visitors through the properties; and

(B) interpreting the properties for the public.

(3) **CHANGES OR ALTERATIONS.**—No changes or alterations shall be made to any properties covered by a cooperative agreement entered into under paragraph (1) unless the Secretary and the other party to the agreement agree to the changes or alterations.

(4) **CONVERSION, USE, OR DISPOSAL.**—Any payment by the Secretary under this sub-

section shall be subject to an agreement that the conversion, use, or disposal of a project for purposes contrary to the purposes of this section, as determined by the Secretary, shall entitle the United States to reimbursement in an amount equal to the greater of—

(A) the amounts made available to the project by the United States; or

(B) the portion of the increased value of the project attributable to the amounts made available under this subsection, as determined at the time of the conversion, use, or disposal.

(5) **MATCHING FUNDS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—As a condition of the receipt of funds under this subsection, the Secretary shall require that any Federal funds made available under a cooperative agreement shall be matched on a 1-to-1 basis by non-Federal funds.

(B) **FORM.**—With the approval of the Secretary, the non-Federal share required under subparagraph (A) may be in the form of donated property, goods, or services from a non-Federal source, fairly valued.

(h) **ACQUISITION OF LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary is authorized to acquire land and interests in land by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, except that land or interests in land owned by the State or any political subdivision of the State may be acquired only by donation.

(2) **NO CONDEMNATION.**—The Secretary may not acquire any land or interest in land for the purposes of this section by condemnation.

(i) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PUBLIC INTERPRETATION.**—The Secretary may provide technical assistance and public interpretation of related historic and cultural resources within the boundary of the historic district.

(j) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary, in consultation with the Commission, shall complete a management plan for the park in accordance with—

(A) section 12(b) of Public Law 91-383 (commonly known as the “National Park Service General Authorities Act”) (16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)); and

(B) other applicable laws.

(2) **COST SHARE.**—The management plan shall include provisions that identify costs to be shared by the Federal Government, the State, and the city, and other public or private entities or individuals for necessary capital improvements to, and maintenance and operations of, the park.

(3) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—On completion of the management plan, the Secretary shall submit the management plan to—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(k) **COLTSVILLE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ADVISORY COMMISSION.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a Commission to be known as the “Coltsville National Historical Park Advisory Commission”.

(2) **DUTY.**—The Commission shall advise the Secretary in the development and implementation of the management plan.

(3) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(A) **COMPOSITION.**—The Commission shall be composed of 11 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(i) 2 members shall be appointed after consideration of recommendations submitted by the Governor of the State;

(ii) 1 member shall be appointed after consideration of recommendations submitted by the State Senate President;

(iii) 1 member shall be appointed after consideration of recommendations submitted by the Speaker of the State House of Representatives;

(iv) 2 members shall be appointed after consideration of recommendations submitted by the Mayor of Hartford, Connecticut;

(v) 2 members shall be appointed after consideration of recommendations submitted by Connecticut's 2 United States Senators;

(vi) 1 member shall be appointed after consideration of recommendations submitted by Connecticut's First Congressional District Representative;

(vii) 2 members shall have experience with national parks and historic preservation;

(viii) all appointments must have significant experience with and knowledge of the Coltsville Historic District; and

(ix) 1 member of the Commission must live in the Sheldon/Charter Oak neighborhood within the Coltsville Historic District.

(B) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The Secretary shall appoint the initial members of the Commission not later than the earlier of—

(i) the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary has received all of the recommendations for appointments under subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the date that is 30 days after the park is established.

(4) TERM; VACANCIES.—

(A) TERM.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A member shall be appointed for a term of 3 years.

(ii) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member may be reappointed for not more than 1 additional term.

(B) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(5) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of—

(A) the Chairperson; or

(B) a majority of the members of the Commission.

(6) QUORUM.—A majority of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(7) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall select a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson from among the members of the Commission.

(B) VICE CHAIRPERSON.—The Vice Chairperson shall serve as Chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson.

(C) TERM.—A member may serve as Chairperson or Vice Chairperson for not more than 1 year in each office.

(8) COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(A) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

(ii) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duty of the Commission.

(B) STAFF.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide the Commission with any staff members and technical assistance that the Secretary, after consultation with the Commission, determines to be appropriate to enable the Commission to carry out the duty of the Commission.

(ii) DETAIL OF EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary may accept the services of personnel detailed

from the State or any political subdivision of the State.

(9) FACIA NONAPPLICABILITY.—Section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

(10) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Unless extended under subparagraph (B), the Commission shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) EXTENSION.—

(i) RECOMMENDATION.—Eight years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall make a recommendation to the Secretary if a body of its nature is still necessary to advise on the development of the park.

(ii) TERM OF EXTENSION.—If, based on a recommendation under clause (i), the Secretary determines that the Commission is still necessary, the Secretary may extend the life of the Commission for not more than 10 years.

SEC. 3033. FIRST STATE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term “historical park” means the First State National Historical Park.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map with pages numbered 1–6 entitled “First State National Historical Park, New Castle, Kent, Sussex Counties, DE and Delaware County, PA, Proposed Boundary”, numbered T19/80,000G, and dated October 2014.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) REDESIGNATION OF FIRST STATE NATIONAL MONUMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The First State National Monument is redesignated as the First State National Historical Park, as generally depicted on the map.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Any funds available for purposes of the First State National Monument shall be available for purposes of the historical park.

(C) REFERENCES.—Any references in a law, regulation, document, record, map, or other paper of the United States to the First State National Monument shall be considered to be a reference to the historical park.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the historical park are to preserve, protect, and interpret the nationally significant cultural and historic resources that are associated with—

(A) early Dutch, Swedish, and English settlement of the Colony of Delaware and portions of the Colony of Pennsylvania; and

(B) the role of Delaware—

(i) in the birth of the United States; and

(ii) as the first State to ratify the Constitution.

(3) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL HISTORIC SITES.—In addition to sites included in the historical park (as redesignated by paragraph (1)(A)) as of the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary may include the following sites within the boundary of the historical park, as generally depicted on the map:

(A) Fort Christina National Historic Landmark in New Castle County, Delaware, as depicted on page 3 of 6 of the map.

(B) Old Swedes Church National Historic Landmark in New Castle County, Delaware, as depicted on page 3 of 6 of the map.

(C) John Dickinson Plantation National Historic Landmark in Kent County, Delaware, as depicted on page 5 of 6 of the map.

(D) Ryves Holt House in Sussex County, Delaware, as depicted on page 6 of 6 of the map.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with—

(A) this section; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(ii) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) METHODS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary may acquire all or a portion of any of the sites described in subsection (b)(3), including easements or other interests in land, by purchase from a willing seller, donation, or exchange.

(ii) DONATION ONLY.—The Secretary may acquire only by donation all or a portion of the property identified as “Area for Potential Addition by Donation” on page 2 of 6 of the map.

(iii) LIMITATION.—No land or interest land may be acquired for inclusion in the historical park by condemnation.

(B) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On acquisition of land or an interest in land under subparagraph (A), the boundary of the historical park shall be adjusted to reflect the acquisition.

(3) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources in the State that are located outside the boundary of the historical park and associated with the purposes for which the historical park is established, including—

(A) Fort Casimir;

(B) DeVries Monument;

(C) Amstel House;

(D) Dutch House; and

(E) Zwaanendael Museum.

(4) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with the State of Delaware, political subdivisions of the State of Delaware, institutions of higher education, nonprofit organizations, and individuals to mark, interpret, and restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources within the boundaries of the historical park, if the cooperative agreement provides for reasonable public access to the resources.

(B) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under a cooperative agreement entered into under subparagraph (A) shall be not more than 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(5) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary shall complete a management plan for the historical park.

(B) APPLICABLE LAW.—The management plan shall be prepared in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)) and other applicable laws.

(d) NATIONAL LANDMARK STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall complete a study assessing the historical significance of additional properties in the State of Delaware that are associated with the purposes of historical park.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The study prepared under paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the potential for designating the additional properties as National Historic Landmarks.

(e) OFFSET.—Section 7302(f) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 469n(f)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, except that the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not appropriated as of the date of enactment of the First State National Historical Park Act shall be reduced by \$6,500,000”.

SEC. 3034. GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

(a) BOUNDARY REVISION.—Section 1(b) of Public Law 101-377 (16 U.S.C. 430g-4(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “include the” and insert “include—

“(1) the”;

(2) at the end of paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (1)), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) the properties depicted as ‘Proposed Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Gettysburg National Military Park Proposed Boundary Addition’, numbered 305/80,045, and dated January, 2010 (2 sheets), including—

“(A) the property commonly known as the ‘Gettysburg Train Station’; and

“(B) the property located adjacent to Plum Run in Cumberland Township.”.

(b) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—Section 2(a) of Public Law 101-377 (16 U.S.C. 430g-5(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE LAND.—The Secretary”;

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “In acquiring” and inserting the following:

“(2) MINIMUM FEDERAL INTERESTS.—In acquiring”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) METHOD OF ACQUISITION FOR CERTAIN LAND.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary may acquire the properties added to the park by section 1(b)(2) only by donation.”.

SEC. 3035. HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MARYLAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term “historical park” means the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park, Proposed Boundary and Authorized Acquisition Areas”, numbered T20/80,001A, and dated March 2014.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Maryland.

(b) HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is established as a unit of the National Park System the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in the State, consisting of the area depicted on the map as “Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park Boundary”.

(B) BOUNDARY.—The boundary of the historical park shall consist of—

(i) the land described in subparagraph (A); and

(ii) any land and interests in land acquired under paragraph (3).

(C) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the historical park is to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(3) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the areas depicted on the map as “Authorized Acquisition Areas for the National Historical Park” only by purchase from willing sellers, donation, or exchange.

(B) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not acquire land or an interest in land for purposes of this section by condemnation.

(C) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On acquisition of land or an interest in land under subparagraph (A), the boundary of the historical park shall be adjusted to reflect the acquisition.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park and the portion of the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Monument administered by the National Park Service as a single unit of the National Park System, which shall be known as the “Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park”.

(2) APPLICABLE LAW.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with this section, Presidential Proclamation Number 8943 (78 Fed. Reg. 18763), and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(3) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Park Service and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall enter into an agreement to allow the National Park Service to provide for archeological research and the public interpretation of historic resources located within the boundary of the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge that are associated with the life of Harriet Tubman, consistent with the management requirements of the Refuge.

(4) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources located outside the boundary of the historical park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, relating to the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(5) LAND USES AND AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section affects—

(A) land within the boundaries of the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge;

(B) agreements between the Secretary and private landowners regarding hunting, fishing, farming, or other activities; or

(C) land use rights of private property owners within or adjacent to the historical park or the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Monument, including activities or uses on private land that can be seen or heard within the historical park or the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Monument.

(6) AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the State, political

subdivisions of the State, colleges and universities, non-profit organizations, and individuals—

(i) to mark, interpret, and restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources relating to the life of Harriet Tubman or the Underground Railroad within the boundaries of the historical park, if the agreement provides for reasonable public access; or

(ii) to conduct research relating to the life of Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad.

(B) VISITOR CENTER.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement to design, construct, operate, and maintain a joint visitor center on land owned by the State—

(i) to provide for National Park Service visitor and interpretive facilities for the historical park; and

(ii) to provide to the Secretary, at no additional cost, sufficient office space to administer the historical park.

(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out an activity under this paragraph may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park Service General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The general management plan shall be prepared in consultation with the State (including political subdivisions of the State).

(3) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Secretary shall—

(A) hold not less than 1 public meeting in the area of the historical park on the proposed general management plan, including opportunity for public comment; and

(B) publish the draft general management plan on the internet and provide an opportunity for public comment on the plan.

(4) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the preparation and implementation of the management plan with—

(A) the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge;

(B) the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park established by section 3(b)(1)(A); and

(C) the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

SEC. 3036. HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, AUBURN, NEW YORK.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term “historical park” means the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) HOME.—The term “Home” means The Harriet Tubman Home, Inc., located in Auburn, New York.

(3) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Harriet Tubman National Historical Park”, numbered T18/80,000, and dated March 2009.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of New York.

(b) HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), there is established the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, as a unit of the National Park System.

(B) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The historical park shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land, or interests in land, has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(C) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the historical park.

(D) MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) BOUNDARY.—The historical park shall include the Harriet Tubman Home, the Tubman Home for the Aged, the Thompson Memorial AME Zion Church and Rectory, and associated land, as identified in the area entitled “National Historical Park Proposed Boundary” on the map.

(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the historical park is to preserve and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the historical, cultural, and natural resources associated with the life of Harriet Tubman.

(4) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the areas depicted on the map by purchase from a willing seller, donation, or exchange.

(B) NO CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land within the areas depicted on the map may be acquired by condemnation.

(C) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historical park in accordance with this section and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(A) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(B) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may provide interpretive tours to sites and resources located outside the boundary of the historical park in Auburn, New York, relating to the life of Harriet Tubman.

(3) AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the owner of any land within the historical park to mark, interpret, or restore nationally significant historic or cultural resources relating to the life of Harriet Tubman, if the agreement provides that—

(i) the Secretary shall have the right of access to any public portions of the land covered by the agreement to allow for—

(I) access at reasonable times by historical park visitors to the land; and

(II) interpretation of the land for the public; and

(ii) no changes or alterations shall be made to the land except by mutual agreement of the Secretary and the owner of the land.

(B) RESEARCH.—The Secretary may enter into an agreement with the State, political subdivisions of the State, institutions of higher education, the Home and other non-profit organizations, and individuals to conduct research relating to the life of Harriet Tubman.

(C) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity carried out under this paragraph shall not exceed 50 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share may be in the form of in-kind contributions or goods or services fairly valued.

(D) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Attorney General for review any agreement under this paragraph involving religious property or property owned by a religious institution.

(ii) FINDING.—No agreement subject to review under this subparagraph shall take effect until the date on which the Attorney General issues a finding that the proposed agreement does not violate the Establishment Clause of the first amendment to the Constitution.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the historical park in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park Service General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7(b)).

(2) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the preparation and implementation of the management plan with—

(A) the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park established by section 2(b)(1); and

(B) the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom.

(e) OFFSET.—Section 101(b)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–303; 110 Stat. 3667) is amended by striking “\$53,852,000” and inserting “\$29,852,000”.

SEC. 3037. HINCHLIFFE STADIUM ADDITION TO PATERSON GREAT FALLS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) PATERSON GREAT FALLS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—Section 7001 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 4101ll) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b)(3)—

(A) by striking “The Park shall” and inserting “(A) The Park shall”; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (G) as clauses (i) through (vii), respectively; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) In addition to the lands described in subparagraph (A), the Park shall include the approximately 6 acres of land containing Hinchliffe Stadium and generally depicted as the ‘Boundary Modification Area’ on the map entitled ‘Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, Proposed Boundary Modification’, numbered T03/120,155, and dated April 2014, which shall be administered as part of the Park in accordance with subsection (c)(1) and section 3 of the Hinchliffe Stadium Heritage Act.”

(2) In subsection (b)(4), by striking “The Map” and inserting “The Map and the map referred to in paragraph (3)(B)”.

(3) In subsection (c)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary”; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) HINCHLIFFE STADIUM.—The Secretary may not acquire fee title to Hinchliffe Stadium, but may acquire a preservation easement in Hinchliffe Stadium if the Secretary determines that doing so will facilitate resource protection of the stadium.”

(b) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR HINCHLIFFE STADIUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In administering the approximately 6 acres of land containing

Hinchliffe Stadium and generally depicted as the “Boundary Modification Area” on the map entitled “Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, Proposed Boundary Modification”, numbered T03/120,155, and dated April 2014, the Secretary of the Interior—

(A) may not include non-Federal property within the approximately 6 acres of land as part of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park without the written consent of the owner;

(B) may not acquire by condemnation any land or interests in land within the approximately 6 acres of land; and

(C) shall not construe the inclusion of Hinchliffe Stadium made by this section to create buffer zones outside the boundaries of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park.

(2) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that activities can be seen or heard from within the approximately 6 acres of land described in paragraph (1) shall not preclude such activities outside the boundary of the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park.

SEC. 3038. LOWER EAST SIDE TENEMENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

Public Law 105–378 is amended—

(1) in section 101(a)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking “the Lower East Side Tenement at 97 Orchard Street in New York City is an outstanding survivor” and inserting “the Lower East Side Tenements at 97 and 103 Orchard Street in New York City are outstanding survivors”; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “the Lower East Side Tenement is” and inserting “the Lower East Side Tenements are”; and

(2) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “Lower East Side Tenement found at 97 Orchard Street” and inserting “Lower East Side Tenements found at 97 and 103 Orchard Street”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “which owns and operates the tenement building at 97 Orchard Street” and inserting “which owns and operates the tenement buildings at 97 and 103 Orchard Street”; and

(3) in section 103(a), by striking “the Lower East Side Tenement at 97 Orchard Street, in the City of New York, State of New York, is designated” and inserting “the Lower East Side Tenements at 97 and 103 Orchard Street, in the City of New York, State of New York, are designated”; and

(4) in section 104(d), by striking “the property at 97 Orchard Street” and inserting “the properties at 97 and 103 Orchard Street”.

SEC. 3039. MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to preserve and protect for the benefit of present and future generations the nationally significant historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project;

(2) to improve public understanding of the Manhattan Project and the legacy of the Manhattan Project through interpretation of the historic resources associated with the Manhattan Project;

(3) to enhance public access to the Historical Park consistent with protection of public safety, national security, and other aspects of the mission of the Department of Energy; and

(4) to assist the Department of Energy, Historical Park communities, historical societies, and other interested organizations and individuals in efforts to preserve and protect the historically significant resources associated with the Manhattan Project.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term “Historical Park” means the Manhattan Project National Historical Park established under subsection (c).

(2) MANHATTAN PROJECT.—The term “Manhattan Project” means the Federal military program to develop an atomic bomb ending on December 31, 1946.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) DATE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System the Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

(B) AREAS INCLUDED.—The Historical Park shall consist of facilities and areas listed under paragraph (2) as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary shall include the area referred to in paragraph (2)(C)(i), the B Reactor National Historic Landmark, in the Historical Park.

(2) ELIGIBLE AREAS.—The Historical Park may only be comprised of one or more of the following areas, or portions of the areas, as generally depicted in the map titled “Manhattan Project National Historical Park Sites”, numbered 540/108,834-C, and dated September 2012:

(A) OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE.—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(i) Buildings 9204-3 and 9731 at the Department of Energy Y-12 National Security Complex;

(ii) the X-10 Graphite Reactor at the Department of Energy Oak Ridge National Laboratory;

(iii) the K-25 Building site at the Department of Energy East Tennessee Technology Park;

(iv) the former Guest House located at 210 East Madison Road; and

(v) at other sites in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, that are not depicted on the map but are determined by the Secretary to be suitable and appropriate for inclusion in the Historical Park, except that sites administered by the Secretary of Energy may be included only with the concurrence of the Secretary of Energy.

(B) LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO.—Facilities, land, or interests in land that are—

(i) within the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory National Historic Landmark District, or any addition to the Landmark District proposed in the National Historic Landmark Nomination—Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory (LASL) NHL District (Working Draft of NHL Revision), Los Alamos National Laboratory document LA-UR 12-00387 (January 26, 2012);

(ii) the former East Cafeteria located at 1670 Nectar Street; and

(iii) the former dormitory located at 1725 17th Street.

(C) HANFORD, WASHINGTON.—Facilities, land, or interests in land on the Department of Energy Hanford Nuclear Reservation that are—

(i) the B Reactor National Historic Landmark;

(ii) the Hanford High School in the town of Hanford and Hanford Construction Camp Historic District;

(iii) the White Bluffs Bank building in the White Bluffs Historic District;

(iv) the warehouse at the Bruggemann's Agricultural Complex;

(v) the Hanford Irrigation District Pump House; and

(vi) the T Plant (221-T Process Building).

(d) AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy (acting through the Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Richland site offices) shall enter into an agreement governing the respective roles of the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy in administering the facilities, land, or interests in land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of Energy that is to be included in the Historical Park under subsection (c)(2), including provisions for enhanced public access, management, interpretation, and historic preservation.

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—Any agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that the Secretary shall—

(A) have decisionmaking authority for the content of historic interpretation of the Manhattan Project for purposes of administering the Historical Park; and

(B) ensure that the agreement provides an appropriate advisory role for the National Park Service in preserving the historic resources covered by the agreement.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—Any agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that the Secretary of Energy—

(A) shall ensure that the agreement appropriately protects public safety, national security, and other aspects of the ongoing mission of the Department of Energy at the Oak Ridge Reservation, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Hanford Site;

(B) may consult with and provide historical information to the Secretary concerning the Manhattan Project;

(C) shall retain responsibility, in accordance with applicable law, for any environmental remediation or activities relating to structural safety that may be necessary in or around the facilities, land, or interests in land governed by the agreement; and

(D) shall retain authority and legal obligations for historic preservation and general maintenance, including to ensure safe access, in connection with the Department's Manhattan Project resources.

(4) AMENDMENTS.—The agreement under paragraph (1) may be amended, including to add to the Historical Park facilities, land, or interests in land within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) that are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Energy.

(e) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall consult with interested State, county, and local officials, organizations, and interested members of the public—

(A) before executing any agreement under subsection (d); and

(B) in the development of the general management plan under subsection (f)(2).

(2) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which an agreement under subsection (d) is entered into, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the Historical Park, including an official boundary map.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The official boundary map published under paragraph (2) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service. The map shall be updated to reflect any additions to the Historical Park from eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2).

(4) ADDITIONS.—Any land, interest in land, or facility within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) that is acquired by the Secretary or included in an amendment to

the agreement under subsection (d)(4) shall be added to the Historical Park.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the Historical Park in accordance with—

(A) this section; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(i) the National Park System Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(ii) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(2) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this subsection, the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Energy, with respect to land administered by the Secretary of Energy, and in consultation and collaboration with the Oak Ridge, Los Alamos and Richland Department of Energy site offices, shall complete a general management plan for the Historical Park in accordance with section 12(b) of Public Law 91-383 (commonly known as the National Park Service General Authorities Act; 16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)).

(3) INTERPRETIVE TOURS.—The Secretary may, subject to applicable law, provide interpretive tours of historically significant Manhattan Project sites and resources in the States of Tennessee, New Mexico, and Washington that are located outside the boundary of the Historical Park.

(4) LAND ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the eligible areas described in subsection (c)(2) by—

(i) transfer of administrative jurisdiction from the Department of Energy by agreement between the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy;

(ii) donation;

(iii) exchange; or

(iv) in the case of land and interests in land within the eligible areas described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(2), purchase from a willing seller.

(B) NO USE OF CONDEMNATION.—The Secretary may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest in land under this section.

(C) FACILITIES.—The Secretary may acquire land or interests in land in the vicinity of the Historical Park for visitor and administrative facilities.

(5) DONATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) FEDERAL FACILITIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into one or more agreements with the head of a Federal agency to provide public access to, and management, interpretation, and historic preservation of, historically significant Manhattan Project resources under the jurisdiction or control of the Federal agency.

(ii) DONATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may accept donations from, and enter into cooperative agreements with, State governments, units of local government, tribal governments, organizations, or individuals to further the purpose of an interagency agreement entered into under clause (i) or to provide visitor services and administrative facilities within reasonable proximity to the Historical Park.

(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance to State, local, or tribal governments, organizations, or individuals for the management, interpretation, and historic preservation of historically significant Manhattan Project resources not included within the Historical Park.

(C) DONATIONS TO DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—For the purposes of this section, or for the purpose of preserving and providing access to historically significant Manhattan Project resources, the Secretary of Energy may accept, hold, administer, and use gifts, bequests, and devises (including labor and services).

(g) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the boundary of the Historical Park.

(2) ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE BOUNDARY OF THE HISTORICAL PARK.—The fact that an activity or use on land outside the boundary of the Historical Park can be seen or heard from within the boundary shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the Historical Park.

(h) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a cause of action with respect to activities outside or adjacent to the established boundary of the Historical Park.

SEC. 3040. NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK AND STEPHEN MATHER WILDERNESS.

Title II of the Washington Park Wilderness Act of 1988 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 100-668) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 207. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR ROAD.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may adjust the boundaries of the North Cascades National Park and the Stephen Mather Wilderness in order to provide a 100-foot-wide corridor along which the Stehekin Valley Road may be rebuilt—

“(1) outside of the floodplain between milepost 12.9 and milepost 22.8;

“(2) within the boundaries of the North Cascades National Park; and

“(3) outside of the boundaries of the Stephen Mather Wilderness.

“(b) NO NET LOSS OF LANDS.—The boundary adjustments made under this section shall be such that equal acreage amounts are exchanged between the Stephen Mather Wilderness and the North Cascades National Park, resulting in no net loss of acreage to either the Stephen Mather Wilderness or the North Cascades National Park.”

SEC. 3041. OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve”, numbered 150/80,023, and dated May 2010.

(2) MONUMENT.—The term “Monument” means the Oregon Caves National Monument established by Presidential Proclamation Number 876 (36 Stat. 2497), dated July 12, 1909.

(3) NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE.—The term “National Monument and Preserve” means the Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve designated by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(4) NATIONAL PRESERVE.—The term “National Preserve” means the National Preserve designated by subsection (b)(1)(B).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service), with respect to National Forest System land; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(7) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Oregon.

(b) DESIGNATIONS; LAND TRANSFER; BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) DESIGNATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Monument and the National Preserve shall be administered as a single unit of the National Park System and collectively known and designated as the “Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve”.

(B) NATIONAL PRESERVE.—The approximately 4,070 acres of land identified on the map as “Proposed Addition Lands” shall be designated as a National Preserve.

(2) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land designated as a National Preserve under paragraph (1)(B) is transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary, to be administered as part of the National Monument and Preserve.

(B) EXCLUSION OF LAND.—The boundaries of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest are adjusted to exclude the land transferred under subparagraph (A).

(3) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the National Monument and Preserve is modified to exclude approximately 4 acres of land—

(A) located in the City of Cave Junction; and

(B) identified on the map as the “Cave Junction Unit”.

(4) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(5) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Monument shall be considered to be a reference to the “Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve”.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the National Monument and Preserve in accordance with—

(A) this section;

(B) Presidential Proclamation Number 876 (36 Stat. 2497), dated July 12, 1909; and

(C) any law (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

(2) FIRE MANAGEMENT.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) revise the fire management plan for the Monument to include the land transferred under subsection (b)(2)(A); and

(B) in accordance with the revised plan, carry out hazardous fuel management activities within the boundaries of the National Monument and Preserve.

(3) EXISTING FOREST SERVICE CONTRACTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(i) allow for the completion of any Forest Service stewardship or service contract executed as of the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the National Preserve; and

(ii) recognize the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of administering a contract described in clause (i) through the completion of the contract.

(B) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—All terms and conditions of a contract described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall remain in place for the duration of the contract.

(C) LIABILITY.—The Forest Service shall be responsible for any liabilities relating to a contract described in subparagraph (A)(i).

(4) GRAZING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may allow the grazing of

livestock within the National Preserve to continue as authorized under permits or leases in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) APPLICABLE LAW.—Grazing under subparagraph (A) shall be—

(i) at a level not greater than the level at which the grazing exists as of the date of enactment of this Act, as measured in Animal Unit Months; and

(ii) in accordance with each applicable law (including National Park Service regulations).

(5) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on land and waters within the National Preserve in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws, except that the Secretary may, in consultation with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, designate zones in which, and establish periods during which, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance by the Secretary with any applicable law (including regulations).

(d) VOLUNTARY GRAZING LEASE OR PERMIT DONATION PROGRAM.—

(1) DONATION OF LEASE OR PERMIT.—

(A) ACCEPTANCE BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The Secretary concerned shall accept a grazing lease or permit that is donated by a lessee or permittee for—

(i) the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment located in the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest; and

(ii) the Billy Mountain Grazing Allotment located on a parcel of land that is managed by the Secretary (acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management).

(B) TERMINATION.—With respect to each grazing permit or lease donated under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(i) terminate the grazing permit or lease; and

(ii) ensure a permanent end to grazing on the land covered by the grazing permit or lease.

(2) EFFECT OF DONATION.—A lessee or permittee that donates a grazing lease or grazing permit (or a portion of a grazing lease or grazing permit) under this section shall be considered to have waived any claim to any range improvement on the associated grazing allotment or portion of the associated grazing allotment, as applicable.

(e) WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(208) RIVER STYX, OREGON.—The subterranean segment of Cave Creek, known as the River Styx, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a scenic river.”

(2) POTENTIAL ADDITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(141) OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE, OREGON.—

“(A) CAVE CREEK, OREGON.—The 2.6-mile segment of Cave Creek from the headwaters at the River Styx to the boundary of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest.

“(B) LAKE CREEK, OREGON.—The 3.6-mile segment of Lake Creek from the headwaters at Bigelow Lakes to the confluence with Cave Creek.

“(C) NO NAME CREEK, OREGON.—The 0.6-mile segment of No Name Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with Cave Creek.

“(D) PANTHER CREEK.—The 0.8-mile segment of Panther Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with Lake Creek.

“(E) UPPER CAVE CREEK.—The segment of Upper Cave Creek from the headwaters to the confluence with River Styx.”.

(B) STUDY; REPORT.—Section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(20) OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE, OREGON.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

“(A) complete the study of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve segments described in subsection (a)(141); and

“(B) submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study.”.

SEC. 3042. SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Section 201 of Public Law 95-629 (16 U.S.C. 410ee) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 201. (a) In order” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 201. SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order”; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking “The park shall also” and inserting the following:

“(2) ADDITIONAL LAND.—The park shall also”; and

(B) in the third sentence, by striking “After advising the” and inserting the following:

“(4) REVISIONS.—After advising the”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) (as designated by subparagraph (A)) the following:

“(3) BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the park is modified to include approximately 137 acres, as depicted on the map entitled ‘San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Proposed Boundary Addition’, numbered 472/113,006A, and dated June 2012.

“(B) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

“(C) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—The Secretary of the Interior may acquire the land or any interest in the land described in subparagraph (A) only by donation or exchange.”.

SEC. 3043. VALLES CALDERA NATIONAL PRESERVE, NEW MEXICO.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—The term “eligible employee” means a person who was a full-time or part-time employee of the Trust during the 180-day period immediately preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) FUND.—The term “Fund” means the Valles Caldera Fund established by section 106(h)(2) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-4(h)(2)).

(3) PRESERVE.—The term “Preserve” means the Valles Caldera National Preserve in the State.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of New Mexico.

(6) TRUST.—The term “Trust” means the Valles Caldera Trust established by section 106(a) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-4(a)).

(b) DESIGNATION OF VALLES CALDERA NATIONAL PRESERVE AS A UNIT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To protect, preserve, and restore the fish, wildlife, watershed, natural, scientific, scenic, geologic, historic, cultural, archaeological, and recreational values of

the area, the Valles Caldera National Preserve is designated as a unit of the National Park System.

(2) BOUNDARY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Preserve shall consist of approximately 89,900 acres of land as depicted on the map entitled “Valles Caldera National Preserve Proposed Boundary”, numbered P80/102,036C, and dated November 4, 2014.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—

(A) APPLICABLE LAW.—The Secretary shall administer the Preserve in accordance with—

(i) this section; and

(ii) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(I) the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.); and

(II) the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(B) MANAGEMENT COORDINATION.—The Secretary may coordinate the management and operations of the Preserve with the Banderelier National Monument.

(C) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are made available to implement this subparagraph, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the Preserve.

(ii) APPLICABLE LAW.—The management plan shall be prepared in accordance with—

(I) section 12(b) of Public Law 91-383 (commonly known as the “National Park Service General Authorities Act”) (16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)); and

(II) any other applicable laws.

(iii) CONSULTATION.—The management plan shall be prepared in consultation with—

(I) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(II) State and local governments;

(III) Indian tribes and pueblos, including the Pueblos of Jemez, Santa Clara, and San Ildefonso; and

(IV) the public.

(4) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire land and interests in land within the boundaries of the Preserve by—

(i) purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated funds; or

(ii) donation.

(B) PROHIBITION OF CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land within the boundaries of the Preserve may be acquired by condemnation.

(C) ADMINISTRATION OF ACQUIRED LAND.—On acquisition of any land or interests in land under subparagraph (A), the acquired land or interests in land shall be administered as part of the Preserve.

(5) SCIENCE AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(i) until the date on which a management plan is completed in accordance with paragraph (3)(C), carry out the science and education program for the Preserve established by the Trust; and

(ii) beginning on the date on which a management plan is completed in accordance with paragraph (3)(C), establish a science and education program for the Preserve that—

(I) allows for research and interpretation of the natural, historic, cultural, geologic and other scientific features of the Preserve;

(II) provides for improved methods of ecological restoration and science-based adaptive management of the Preserve; and

(III) promotes outdoor educational experiences in the Preserve.

(B) SCIENCE AND EDUCATION CENTER.—As part of the program established under subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary may establish a science and education center outside the boundaries of the Preserve in Jemez Springs, New Mexico.

(6) GRAZING.—The Secretary shall allow the grazing of livestock within the Preserve to continue—

(A) at levels and locations determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, consistent with this section; and

(B) to the extent the use furthers scientific research or interpretation of the ranching history of the Preserve.

(7) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall permit hunting, fishing, and trapping on land and water within the Preserve in accordance with applicable Federal and State law.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may designate areas in which, and establish limited periods during which, no hunting, fishing, or trapping shall be permitted under subparagraph (A) for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable law.

(C) AGENCY AGREEMENT.—Except in an emergency, regulations closing areas within the Preserve to hunting, fishing, or trapping under this paragraph shall be made in consultation with the appropriate agency of the State having responsibility for fish and wildlife administration.

(D) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section affects any jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the Preserve.

(8) ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall undertake activities to improve the health of forest, grassland, and riparian areas within the Preserve, including any activities carried out in accordance with title IV of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.).

(B) AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into agreements with adjacent pueblos to coordinate activities carried out under subparagraph (A) on the Preserve and adjacent pueblo land.

(9) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all land and interests in land within the boundaries of the Preserve are withdrawn from—

(A) entry, disposal, or appropriation under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing laws, geothermal leasing laws, and mineral materials laws.

(10) VOLCANIC DOMES AND OTHER PEAKS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), for the purposes of preserving the natural, cultural, religious, archaeological, and historic resources of the volcanic domes and other peaks in the Preserve described in subparagraph (B) within the area of the domes and peaks above 9,600 feet in elevation or 250 feet below the top of the dome, whichever is lower—

(i) no roads or buildings shall be constructed; and

(ii) no motorized access shall be allowed.

(B) DESCRIPTION OF VOLCANIC DOMES.—The volcanic domes and other peaks referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) Redondo Peak;

(ii) Redondito;

(iii) South Mountain;

(iv) San Antonio Mountain;

(v) Cerro Seco;

- (vi) Cerro San Luis;
- (vii) Cerros Santa Rosa;
- (viii) Cerros del Abrigo;
- (ix) Cerro del Medio;
- (x) Rabbit Mountain;
- (xi) Cerro Grande;
- (xii) Cerro Toledo;
- (xiii) Indian Point;
- (xiv) Sierra de los Valles; and
- (xv) Cerros de los Posos.

(C) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply in cases in which construction or motorized access is necessary for administrative purposes (including ecological restoration activities or measures required in emergencies to protect the health and safety of persons in the area).

(1) TRADITIONAL CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS SITES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with Indian tribes and pueblos, shall ensure the protection of traditional cultural and religious sites in the Preserve.

(B) ACCESS.—The Secretary, in accordance with Public Law 95-341 (commonly known as the “American Indian Religious Freedom Act”) (42 U.S.C. 1996)—

(i) shall provide access to the sites described in subparagraph (A) by members of Indian tribes or pueblos for traditional cultural and customary uses; and

(ii) may, on request of an Indian tribe or pueblo, temporarily close to general public use 1 or more specific areas of the Preserve to protect traditional cultural and customary uses in the area by members of the Indian tribe or pueblo.

(C) PROHIBITION ON MOTORIZED ACCESS.—The Secretary shall maintain prohibitions on the use of motorized or mechanized travel on Preserve land located adjacent to the Santa Clara Indian Reservation, to the extent the prohibition was in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(12) CALDERA RIM TRAIL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, affected Indian tribes and pueblos, and the public, shall study the feasibility of establishing a hiking trail along the rim of the Valles Caldera on—

(i) land within the Preserve; and

(ii) National Forest System land that is adjacent to the Preserve.

(B) AGREEMENTS.—On the request of an affected Indian tribe or pueblo, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall seek to enter into an agreement with the Indian tribe or pueblo with respect to the Caldera Rim Trail that provides for the protection of—

(i) cultural and religious sites in the vicinity of the trail; and

(ii) the privacy of adjacent pueblo land.

(13) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section affects valid existing rights.

(C) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the Preserve is transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Trust to the Secretary, to be administered as a unit of the National Park System, in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) EXCLUSION FROM SANTA FE NATIONAL FOREST.—The boundaries of the Santa Fe National Forest are modified to exclude the Preserve.

(3) INTERIM MANAGEMENT.—

(A) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Trust shall enter into a memorandum of

agreement to facilitate the orderly transfer to the Secretary of the administration of the Preserve.

(B) EXISTING MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Notwithstanding the repeal made by subsection (d)(1), until the date on which the Secretary completes a management plan for the Preserve in accordance with subsection (b)(3)(C), the Secretary may administer the Preserve in accordance with any management activities or plans adopted by the Trust under the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v et seq.), to the extent the activities or plans are consistent with subsection (b)(3)(A).

(C) PUBLIC USE.—The Preserve shall remain open to public use during the interim management period, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(4) VALLES CALDERA TRUST.—

(A) TERMINATION.—The Trust shall terminate 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act unless the Secretary determines that the termination date should be extended to facilitate the transitional management of the Preserve.

(B) ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.—

(i) ASSETS.—On termination of the Trust—

(I) all assets of the Trust shall be transferred to the Secretary; and

(II) any amounts appropriated for the Trust shall remain available to the Secretary for the administration of the Preserve.

(ii) ASSUMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—On termination of the Trust, the Secretary shall assume all contracts, obligations, and other liabilities of the Trust.

(II) NEW LIABILITIES.—

(aa) BUDGET.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Trust shall prepare a budget for the interim management of the Preserve.

(bb) WRITTEN CONCURRENCE REQUIRED.—The Trust shall not incur any new liabilities not authorized in the budget prepared under item (aa) without the written concurrence of the Secretary.

(C) PERSONNEL.—

(i) HIRING.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may hire employees of the Trust on a noncompetitive basis for comparable positions at the Preserve or other areas or offices under the jurisdiction of the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture.

(ii) SALARY.—Any employees hired from the Trust under clause (i) shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53, title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(iii) INTERIM RETENTION OF ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES.—For a period of not less than 180 days beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, all eligible employees of the Trust shall be—

(I) retained in the employment of the Trust;

(II) considered to be placed on detail to the Secretary; and

(III) subject to the direction of the Secretary.

(iv) TERMINATION FOR CAUSE.—Nothing in this subparagraph precludes the termination of employment of an eligible employee for cause during the period described in clause (iii).

(D) RECORDS.—The Secretary shall have access to all records of the Trust pertaining to the management of the Preserve.

(E) VALLES CALDERA FUND.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall

assume the powers of the Trust over the Fund.

(ii) AVAILABILITY AND USE.—Any amounts in the Fund as of the date of enactment of this Act shall be available to the Secretary for use, without further appropriation, for the management of the Preserve.

(d) REPEAL OF VALLES CALDERA PRESERVATION ACT.—

(1) REPEAL.—On the termination of the Trust, the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v et seq.) is repealed.

(2) EFFECT OF REPEAL.—Notwithstanding the repeal made by paragraph (1)—

(A) the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire mineral interests under section 104(e) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-2(e)) is transferred to the Secretary and any proceeding for the condemnation of, or payment of compensation for, an outstanding mineral interest pursuant to the transferred authority shall continue;

(B) the provisions in section 104(g) of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v-2(g)) relating to the Pueblo of Santa Clara shall remain in effect; and

(C) the Fund shall not be terminated until all amounts in the Fund have been expended by the Secretary.

(3) BOUNDARIES.—The repeal of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 698v et seq.) shall not affect the boundaries as of the date of enactment of this Act (including maps and legal descriptions) of—

(A) the Preserve;

(B) the Santa Fe National Forest (other than the modification made by subsection (c)(2));

(C) Bandelier National Monument; and

(D) any land conveyed to the Pueblo of Santa Clara.

SEC. 3044. VICKSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

(a) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) may acquire the land or any interests in land within the area identified as “Modified Core Battlefield” for the Port Gibson Unit, the Champion Hill Unit, and the Raymond Unit as generally depicted on the map entitled “Vicksburg National Military Park—Proposed Battlefield Additions”, numbered 306/100986A (4 sheets), and dated July 2012.

(2) METHODS OF ACQUISITION.—Land may be acquired under paragraph (1) by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, except that land owned by the State of Mississippi or any political subdivisions of the State may be acquired only by donation.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in subsection (a)(1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—On the acquisition of land by the Secretary under this section—

(1) the acquired land shall be added to Vicksburg National Military Park;

(2) the boundary of the Vicksburg National Military Park shall be adjusted to reflect the acquisition of the land; and

(3) the acquired land shall be administered as part of the Vicksburg National Military Park in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

Subtitle D—National Park System Studies, Management, and Related Matters

SEC. 3050. REVOLUTIONARY WAR AND WAR OF 1812 AMERICAN BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 7301(c) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11) is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) BATTLEFIELD REPORT.—The term ‘battlefield report’ means, collectively—

“(i) the report entitled ‘Report on the Nation’s Civil War Battlefields’, prepared by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission, and dated July 1993; and

“(ii) the report entitled ‘Report to Congress on the Historic Preservation of Revolutionary War and War of 1812 Sites in the United States’, prepared by the National Park Service, and dated September 2007.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking “Battlefield Report” and inserting “battlefield report”.

(2) In paragraph (2), by inserting “eligible sites or” after “acquiring”.

(3) In paragraph (3), by inserting “an eligible site or” after “acquire”.

(4) In paragraph (4), by inserting “an eligible site or” after “acquiring”.

(5) In paragraph (5), by striking “An” and inserting “An eligible site or an”.

(6) By redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (9).

(7) By inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraphs:

“(6) WILLING SELLERS.—Acquisition of land or interests in land under this subsection shall be from willing sellers only.

“(7) REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the activities carried out under this subsection, including a description of—

“(A) preservation activities carried out at the battlefields and associated sites identified in the battlefield report during the period between publication of the battlefield report and the report required under this paragraph;

“(B) changes in the condition of the battlefields and associated sites during that period; and

“(C) any other relevant developments relating to the battlefields and associated sites during that period.

“(8) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING.—None of the funds provided pursuant to this section shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress.”.

(8) In paragraph (9) (as redesignated by paragraph (6)), by striking “2013” and inserting “2021”.

SEC. 3051. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) shall conduct a special resource study regarding each area, site, and issue identified in subsection (b) to evaluate—

(1) the national significance of the area, site, or issue; and

(2) the suitability and feasibility of designating such an area or site as a unit of the National Park System.

(b) STUDIES.—The areas, sites, and issues referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER, LOUISIANA.—Sites along the lower Mississippi River in

the State of Louisiana, including Fort St. Philip, Fort Jackson, the Head of Passes, and any related and supporting historical, cultural, or recreational resource located in Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana.

(2) BUFFALO SOLDIERS.—The role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the National Park System, including an evaluation of appropriate ways to enhance historical research, education, interpretation, and public awareness of the story of the stewardship role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the National Parks, including ways to link the story to the development of National Parks and the story of African-American military service following the Civil War.

(3) ROTA, COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.—Prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on the island of Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(4) PRISON SHIP MONUMENT, NEW YORK.—The Prison Ship Martyrs’ Monument in Fort Greene Park, Brooklyn, New York.

(5) FLUSHING REMONSTRANCE, NEW YORK.—The John Bowne House, located at 3701 Bowne Street, Queens, New York, the Friends Meeting House located at 137-17 Northern Boulevard, Queens, New York, and other resources in the vicinity of Flushing, New York, relating to the history of religious freedom during the era of the signing of the Flushing Remonstrance.

(6) WEST HUNTER STREET BAPTIST CHURCH, GEORGIA.—The historic West Hunter Street Baptist Church, located at 775 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, SW, Atlanta, Georgia, and the block on which the church is located.

(7) MILL SPRINGS BATTLEFIELD, KENTUCKY.—The area encompassed by the National Historic Landmark designations relating to the 1862 Battle of Mill Springs located in Pulaski and Wayne Counties in the State of Kentucky.

(8) NEW PHILADELPHIA, ILLINOIS.—The New Philadelphia archeological site and surrounding land in the State of Illinois.

(c) CRITERIA.—In conducting a study under this section, the Secretary shall use the criteria for the study of areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System described in section 8(c) of Public Law 91-383 (commonly known as the “National Park System General Authorities Act”) (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)).

(d) CONTENTS.—Each study authorized by this section shall—

(1) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the applicable area or site as a unit of the National Park System;

(2) include cost estimates for any necessary acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance of the applicable area or site;

(3) include an analysis of the effect of the applicable area or site on—

(A) existing commercial and recreational activities;

(B) the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production and transmission or other infrastructure in the area; and

(C) the authority of State and local governments to manage those activities;

(4) include an identification of any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal land if the applicable area or site is designated as a unit of the National Park System; and

(5) identify alternatives for the management, administration, and protection of the applicable area or site.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out a study authorized by this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report the describes—

(1) the findings and recommendations of the study; and

(2) any applicable recommendations of the Secretary.

SEC. 3052. NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS AND CORRIDORS.

(a) EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA AUTHORITIES.—

(1) EXTENSIONS.—

(A) Section 12 of Public Law 100-692 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 102 Stat. 4558; 112 Stat. 3258; 123 Stat. 1292; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314) is amended—

(i) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “2015” and inserting “2021”; and

(ii) in subsection (d), by striking “2015” and inserting “2021”.

(B) Division II of Public Law 104-333 (16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended by striking “2015” each place it appears in the following sections and inserting “2021”:

(i) Section 107 (110 Stat. 4244; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314).

(ii) Section 408 (110 Stat. 4256; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314).

(iii) Section 507 (110 Stat. 4260; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314).

(iv) Section 707 (110 Stat. 4267; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314).

(v) Section 809 (110 Stat. 4275; 122 Stat. 826; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314).

(vi) Section 910 (110 Stat. 4281; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314).

(C) Section 109 of Public Law 105-355 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 112 Stat. 3252) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2021”.

(D) Public Law 106-278 (16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended—

(i) in section 108 (114 Stat. 818; 127 Stat. 420; 128 Stat. 314), by striking “2015” and inserting “2021”; and

(ii) in section 209 (114 Stat. 824), by striking “the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this title” and inserting “September 30, 2021”.

(E) Section 157(i) of Public Law 106-291 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 114 Stat. 967) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2021”.

(F) Section 7 of Public Law 106-319 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 114 Stat. 1284) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2021”.

(G) Title VIII of division B of H.R. 5666 (Appendix D) as enacted into law by section 1(a)(4) of Public Law 106-554 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 114 Stat. 2763, 2763A-295; 123 Stat. 1294) is amended—

(i) in section 804(j), by striking “the day occurring 15 years after the date of enactment of this title” and inserting “September 30, 2021”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 811. TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE.

“The authority of the Secretary to provide financial assistance under this title shall terminate on September 30, 2021.”.

(H) Section 106(b) of Public Law 103-449 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 108 Stat. 4755; 113 Stat. 1726; 123 Stat. 1291) is amended, by striking “2015” and inserting “2021”.

(2) CONDITIONAL EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) (other than the amendments made by clauses (iii) and (iv) of paragraph (1)(B)), shall apply only through September 30, 2020, unless the Secretary of the

Interior (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”)—

(i) conducts an evaluation of the accomplishments of the national heritage areas extended under paragraph (1), in accordance with subparagraph (B); and

(ii) prepares a report in accordance with subparagraph (C) that recommends a future role for the National Park Service with respect to the applicable national heritage area.

(B) EVALUATION.—An evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A)(i) shall—

(i) assess the progress of the local management entity with respect to—

(I) accomplishing the purposes of the authorizing legislation for the national heritage area; and

(II) achieving the goals and objectives of the approved management plan for the national heritage area;

(ii) analyze the investments of Federal, State, tribal, and local government and private entities in each national heritage area to determine the impact of the investments; and

(iii) review the management structure, partnership relationships, and funding of the national heritage area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the national heritage area.

(C) REPORT.—Based on the evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A)(i), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that includes recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service with respect to the national heritage area.

(b) JOHN H. CHAFEE BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR AMENDMENTS.—Public Law 99-647 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; 100 Stat. 3625) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of section 2 (110 Stat. 4202), by striking “the map entitled ‘Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Boundary Map’, numbered BRV-80-80,011, and dated May 2, 1993” and inserting “the map entitled ‘John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor—Proposed Boundary’, numbered 022/111530, and dated November 10, 2011”;

(2) in section 7 (120 Stat. 1858; 125 Stat. 155)—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “TERMINATION OF COMMISSION” and inserting “TERMINATION OF COMMISSION; DESIGNATION OF LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY”;

(B) by striking “The Commission” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—

“(1) DESIGNATION.—The Commission shall select, subject to the approval of the Secretary, a qualified nonprofit organization to be the local coordinating entity for the Corridor (referred to in this section as the ‘local coordinating entity’).

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The local coordinating entity shall assume the duties of the Commission for the implementation of the Cultural Heritage and Land Management Plan developed and approved under section 6.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—For the purposes of carrying out the management plan, the local coordinating entity may use amounts made available under this Act—

“(1) to make grants to the States of Massachusetts and Rhode Island (referred to in this section as the ‘States’), political subdivisions of the States, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

“(2) to enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to the States, political subdivisions of the States, nonprofit organizations, Federal agencies, and other interested parties;

“(3) to hire and compensate staff, including individuals with expertise in—

“(A) natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resource conservation;

“(B) economic and community development; or

“(C) heritage planning;

“(4) to obtain funds or services from any source, including funds and services provided under any other Federal law or program;

“(5) to contract for goods or services; and

“(6) to support activities of partners and any other activities that further the purposes of the Corridor and are consistent with the approved management plan.”;

(3) in section 8 (120 Stat. 1858)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the local coordinating entity selected under paragraph (1) and other public or private entities for the purpose of—

“(A) providing technical assistance; or

“(B) implementing the plan under section 6(c).”; and

(B) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) TRANSITION MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the local coordinating entity to ensure—

“(1) the appropriate transition of management of the Corridor from the Commission to the local coordinating entity; and

“(2) coordination regarding the implementation of the Cultural Heritage and Land Management Plan.”;

(4) in section 10 (104 Stat. 1018; 120 Stat. 1858)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “in which the Commission is in existence” and inserting “until September 30, 2021”; and

(B) by striking subsection (c); and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 11. REFERENCES TO THE COMMISSION.

“For purposes of sections 6, 8 (other than section 8(d)(1)), 9, and 10, a reference to the ‘Commission’ shall be considered to be a reference to the local coordinating entity.”.

(c) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA REDESIGNATIONS.—

(1) REDESIGNATION OF THE LAST GREEN VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 103-449) is amended—

(i) in section 103—

(I) in the heading, by striking “QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR” and inserting “LAST GREEN VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR”; and

(II) in subsection (a), by striking “the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor” and inserting “The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor”; and

(ii) in section 108(2), by striking “the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor under” and inserting “The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor established by”.

(B) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor shall be deemed to be a reference to the “The Last Green Valley National Heritage Corridor”.

(2) REDESIGNATION OF MOTORCITIES NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Automobile National Heritage Area Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 105-355) is amended—

(i) in section 102—

(I) in subsection (a)—

(aa) in paragraph (7), by striking “Automobile National Heritage Area Partnership” and inserting “MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership”; and

(bb) in paragraph (8), by striking “Automobile National Heritage Area” each place it appears and inserting “MotorCities National Heritage Area”; and

(II) in subsection (b)—

(aa) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Automobile National Heritage Area” and inserting “MotorCities National Heritage Area”; and

(bb) in paragraph (2), by striking “Automobile National Heritage Area” and inserting “MotorCities National Heritage Area”;

(i) in section 103—

(I) in paragraph (2), by striking “Automobile National Heritage Area” and inserting “MotorCities National Heritage Area”; and

(II) in paragraph (3), by striking “Automobile National Heritage Area Partnership” and inserting “MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership”;

(iii) in section 104—

(I) in the heading, by striking “AUTOMOBILE NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA” and inserting “MOTORCITIES NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA”; and

(II) in subsection (a), by striking “Automobile National Heritage Area” and inserting “MotorCities National Heritage area”; and

(iv) in section 106, in the heading, by striking “AUTOMOBILE NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA PARTNERSHIP” and inserting “MOTORCITIES NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA PARTNERSHIP”.

(B) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Automobile National Heritage Area shall be deemed to be a reference to the “MotorCities National Heritage Area”.

SEC. 3053. NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE SUPPORT FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IMPROVEMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), may make improvements to a support facility, including a visitor center, for a National Historic Site operated by the National Park Service if the project—

(1) is conducted using amounts included in the budget of the National Park Service in effect on the date on which the project is authorized;

(2) is subject to a 50 percent non-Federal cost-sharing requirement; and

(3) is conducted in an area in which the National Park Service was authorized by law in effect before the date of enactment of this Act to establish a support facility.

(b) OPERATION AND USE.—The Secretary may operate and use all or part of a support facility, including a visitor center, for a National Historic Site operated by the National Park Service—

(1) to carry out duties associated with operating and supporting the National Historic Site; and

(2) only in accordance with an agreement between the Secretary and the unit of local

government in which the support facility is located.

SEC. 3054. NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM DONOR ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **DONOR ACKNOWLEDGMENT.**—The term “donor acknowledgment” means an appropriate statement or credit acknowledging a donation.

(2) **NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.**—The term “National Park System” includes each program and individual unit of the National Park System.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **DONOR ACKNOWLEDGMENTS IN UNITS OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may authorize a donor acknowledgment to recognize a donation to—

- (A) the National Park Service; or
- (B) the National Park System.

(2) **RESTRICTIONS.**—A donor acknowledgment shall not be used to state or imply—

(A) recognition of the donor or any product or service of the donor as an official sponsor, or any similar form of recognition, of the National Park Service or the National Park System;

(B) a National Park Service endorsement of the donor or any product or service of the donor; or

(C) naming rights to any unit of the National Park System or a National Park System facility, including a visitor center.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DISPLAY.**—A donor acknowledgment shall be displayed—

- (i) in a manner that is approved by the Secretary; and
- (ii) for a period of time, as determined by the Secretary, that is commensurate with the amount of the contribution and the life of the structure.

(B) **GUIDELINES.**—The Secretary shall establish donor acknowledgment guidelines that take into account the unique requirements of individual units and programs of the National Park System.

(C) **USE OF SLOGANS PROHIBITED.**—A donor acknowledgment shall not permit the use of—

- (i) an advertising slogan; or
- (ii) a statement or credit promoting or opposing a political candidate or issue.

(4) **PLACEMENT.**—

(A) **VISITOR AND ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES.**—A donor acknowledgment may be located on or inside a visitor center or administrative facility of the National Park System (including in a specific room or section) or any other appropriate location, such as on a donor recognition wall or plaque.

(B) **OUTSIDE.**—A donor acknowledgment may be located in an area outside of a visitor or administrative facility described in subparagraph (A), including a bench, brick, pathway, area of landscaping, or plaza.

(C) **PROJECTS.**—A donor acknowledgment may be located near a park construction or restoration project, if the donation directly relates to the project.

(D) **VEHICLES.**—A donor acknowledgment may be placed on a National Park Service vehicle, if the donation directly relates to the vehicle.

(E) **LIMITATION.**—Any donor acknowledgment associated with a historic structure or placed outside a park restoration project—

- (i) shall be freestanding; and
- (ii) shall not obstruct a natural or historical site or view.

(5) **PRINTED, DIGITAL, AND MEDIA PLATFORMS.**—The Secretary may authorize the

use of donor acknowledgments under this subsection to include donor acknowledgments on printed, digital, and media platforms, including brochures or Internet websites relating to a specific unit of the National Park System.

(c) **COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT AMENDMENTS.**—Section 8905 of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking paragraph (7); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS.**—

“(1) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DONOR CONTRIBUTION.**—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the Secretary of the Interior or Administrator of General Services, as applicable, may permit a sponsor to acknowledge donor contributions at the commemorative work.

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—An acknowledgment under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be displayed—

- “(i) inside an ancillary structure associated with the commemorative work; or
- “(ii) as part of a manmade landscape feature at the commemorative work; and

“(B) conform to applicable National Park Service or General Services Administration guidelines for donor recognition, as applicable.

“(3) **LIMITATIONS.**—An acknowledgment under paragraph (1) shall—

- “(A) be limited to an appropriate statement or credit recognizing the contribution;
- “(B) be displayed in a form in accordance with National Park Service and General Services Administration guidelines;
- “(C) be displayed for a period of up to 10 years, with the display period to be commensurate with the level of the contribution, as determined in accordance with the plan and guidelines described in subparagraph (B);

“(D) be freestanding; and

“(E) not be affixed to—

- “(i) any landscape feature at the commemorative work; or
- “(ii) any object in a museum collection.

“(4) **COST.**—The sponsor shall bear all expenses related to the display of donor acknowledgments under paragraph (1).

“(5) **APPLICABILITY.**—This subsection shall apply to any commemorative work dedicated after January 1, 2010.”

(d) **EFFECT OF SECTION.**—Nothing in this section or an amendment made by this section—

(1) requires the Secretary to accept a donation; or

(2) modifies section 145 of Public Law 108–16 (16 U.S.C. 1a–1 note; 117 Stat. 1280).

SEC. 3055. COIN TO COMMEMORATE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

(a) **COIN SPECIFICATIONS.**—

(1) **DENOMINATIONS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue the following coins:

(A) **\$5 GOLD COINS.**—Not more than 100,000 \$5 coins, which shall—

- (i) weigh 8.359 grams;
- (ii) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and
- (iii) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(B) **\$1 SILVER COINS.**—Not more than 500,000 \$1 coins, which shall—

- (i) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (ii) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (iii) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(C) **HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.**—Not more

than 750,000 half dollar coins, which shall—

- (i) weigh 11.34 grams;

(ii) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(iii) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins, contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(2) **LEGAL TENDER.**—The coins minted under this section shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this section shall be considered to be numismatic items.

(b) **DESIGN OF COINS.**—

(1) **DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The design of the coins minted under this section shall be emblematic of the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service.

(B) **DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.**—On each coin minted under this section there shall be—

- (i) a designation of the face value of the coin;
- (ii) an inscription of the year “2016”; and
- (iii) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(2) **SELECTION.**—The design for the coins minted under this section shall be—

(A) selected by the Secretary after consultation with—

- (i) the National Park Service;
 - (ii) the National Park Foundation; and
 - (iii) the Commission of Fine Arts; and
- (B) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

(c) **ISSUANCE OF COINS.**—

(1) **QUALITY OF COINS.**—Coins minted under this section shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(2) **PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.**—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this section only during the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2016.

(d) **SALE OF COINS.**—

(1) **SALE PRICE.**—The coins issued under this section shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

- (A) the face value of the coins;
- (B) the surcharge provided in subsection (e)(1) with respect to the coins; and

(C) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(2) **BULK SALES.**—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this section at a reasonable discount.

(3) **PREPAID ORDERS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this section before the issuance of such coins.

(B) **DISCOUNT.**—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under subparagraph (A) shall be at a reasonable discount.

(e) **SURCHARGES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—All sales of coins minted under this section shall include a surcharge as follows:

- (A) A surcharge of \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin.
- (B) A surcharge of \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin.
- (C) A surcharge of \$5 per coin for the half dollar coin.

(2) **DISTRIBUTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges which are received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this section shall

be promptly paid by the Secretary to the National Park Foundation for projects and programs that help preserve and protect resources under the stewardship of the National Park Service and promote public enjoyment and appreciation of those resources.

(B) PROHIBITION ON LAND ACQUISITION.—Surcharges paid to the National Park Foundation pursuant to subparagraph (A) may not be used for land acquisition.

(3) AUDITS.—The National Park Foundation shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received by the Foundation under paragraph (2).

(4) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this section of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this paragraph.

(f) FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.—The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this section will not result in any net cost to the United States Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in subsection (e) until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this section (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

(g) BUDGET COMPLIANCE.—The budgetary effects of this section, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this section, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SEC. 3056. COMMISSION TO STUDY THE POTENTIAL CREATION OF A NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum established by subsection (b)(1).

(2) MUSEUM.—The term “Museum” means the National Women's History Museum.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be composed of 8 members, of whom—

(A) 2 members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(B) 2 members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(C) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and

(D) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed to the Commis-

sion from among individuals, or representatives of institutions or entities, who possess—

(A)(i) a demonstrated commitment to the research, study, or promotion of women's history, art, political or economic status, or culture; and

(ii)(I) expertise in museum administration; (II) expertise in fundraising for nonprofit or cultural institutions;

(III) experience in the study and teaching of women's history;

(IV) experience in studying the issue of the representation of women in art, life, history, and culture at the Smithsonian Institution; or

(V) extensive experience in public or elected service;

(B) experience in the administration of, or the planning for, the establishment of, museums; or

(C) experience in the planning, design, or construction of museum facilities.

(4) PROHIBITION.—No employee of the Federal Government may serve as a member of the Commission.

(5) DEADLINE FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT.—The initial members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(6) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission—

(A) shall not affect the powers of the Commission; and

(B) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(7) CHAIRPERSON.—The Commission shall, by majority vote of all of the members, select 1 member of the Commission to serve as the Chairperson of the Commission.

(c) DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.—

(1) REPORTS.—

(A) PLAN OF ACTION.—The Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report containing the recommendations of the Commission with respect to a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Women's History Museum in Washington, DC.

(B) REPORT ON ISSUES.—The Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report that addresses the following issues:

(i) The availability and cost of collections to be acquired and housed in the Museum.

(ii) The impact of the Museum on regional women history-related museums.

(iii) Potential locations for the Museum in Washington, DC, and its environs.

(iv) Whether the Museum should be part of the Smithsonian Institution.

(v) The governance and organizational structure from which the Museum should operate.

(vi) Best practices for engaging women in the development and design of the Museum.

(vii) The cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Museum.

(C) DEADLINE.—The reports required under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be submitted not later than the date that is 18 months after the date of the first meeting of the Commission.

(2) FUNDRAISING PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall develop a fundraising plan to support the establishment, operation, and maintenance of the Museum through contributions from the public.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the fundraising plan under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider—

(i) the role of the National Women's History Museum (a nonprofit, educational orga-

nization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that was incorporated in 1996 in Washington, DC, and dedicated for the purpose of establishing a women's history museum) in raising funds for the construction of the Museum; and

(ii) issues relating to funding the operations and maintenance of the Museum in perpetuity without reliance on appropriations of Federal funds.

(C) INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—The Commission shall obtain an independent review of the viability of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) and such review shall include an analysis as to whether the plan is likely to achieve the level of resources necessary to fund the construction of the Museum and the operations and maintenance of the Museum in perpetuity without reliance on appropriations of Federal funds.

(D) SUBMISSION.—The Commission shall submit the plan developed under subparagraph (A) and the review conducted under subparagraph (C) to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, House Administration, Natural Resources, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Rules and Administration, Energy and Natural Resources, and Appropriations of the Senate.

(3) LEGISLATION TO CARRY OUT PLAN OF ACTION.—Based on the recommendations contained in the report submitted under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1), the Commission shall submit for consideration to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, House Administration, Natural Resources, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Rules and Administration, Energy and Natural Resources, and Appropriations of the Senate recommendations for a legislative plan of action to establish and construct the Museum.

(4) NATIONAL CONFERENCE.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the initial members of the Commission are appointed under subsection (b), the Commission may, in carrying out the duties of the Commission under this subsection, convene a national conference relating to the Museum, to be comprised of individuals committed to the advancement of the life, art, history, and culture of women.

(d) DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION.—

(1) DIRECTOR AND STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may employ and compensate an executive director and any other additional personnel that are necessary to enable the Commission to perform the duties of the Commission.

(B) RATES OF PAY.—Rates of pay for persons employed under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with the rates of pay allowed for employees of a temporary organization under section 3161 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) NOT FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—Any individual employed under this section shall not be considered a Federal employee for the purpose of any law governing Federal employment.

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), on request of the Commission, the head of a Federal agency may provide technical assistance to the Commission.

(B) PROHIBITION.—No Federal employees may be detailed to the Commission.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

(1) COMPENSATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Commission—

(i) shall not be considered to be a Federal employee for any purpose by reason of service on the Commission; and

(ii) shall serve without pay.

(B) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the Commission shall be allowed a per diem allowance for travel expenses, at rates consistent with those authorized under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) GIFTS, BEQUESTS, DEVISES.—The Commission may solicit, accept, use, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or devises of money, services, or real or personal property for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Commission.

(3) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Commission shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(f) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the final versions of the reports required under section (c)(1) are submitted.

(g) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the Commission.

(2) PROHIBITION.—No Federal funds may be obligated to carry out this section.

SEC. 3057. CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FINAL RULE.—The term “Final Rule” means the final rule entitled “Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore—Off-Road Vehicle Management” (77 Fed. Reg. 3123 (January 23, 2012)).

(2) NATIONAL SEASHORE.—The term “National Seashore” means the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of North Carolina.

(b) REVIEW AND ADJUSTMENT OF WILDLIFE PROTECTION BUFFERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall review and modify wildlife buffers in the National Seashore in accordance with this subsection and any other applicable law.

(2) BUFFER MODIFICATIONS.—In modifying wildlife buffers under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, using adaptive management practices—

(A) ensure that the buffers are of the shortest duration and cover the smallest area necessary to protect a species, as determined in accordance with peer-reviewed scientific data; and

(B) designate pedestrian and vehicle corridors around areas of the National Seashore closed because of wildlife buffers, to allow access to areas that are open.

(3) COORDINATION WITH STATE.—The Secretary, after coordinating with the State, shall determine appropriate buffer protections for species that are not listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but that are identified for protection under State law.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO FINAL RULE.—The Secretary shall undertake a public process to consider, consistent with management requirements at the National Seashore, the following changes to the Final Rule:

(1) Opening beaches at the National Seashore that are closed to night driving restrictions, by opening beach segments each

morning on a rolling basis as daily management reviews are completed.

(2) Extending seasonal off-road vehicle routes for additional periods in the Fall and Spring if off-road vehicle use would not create resource management problems at the National Seashore.

(3) Modifying the size and location of vehicle-free areas.

(d) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW VEHICLE ACCESS POINTS.—The Secretary shall construct new vehicle access points and roads at the National Seashore—

(1) as expeditiously as practicable; and

(2) in accordance with applicable management plans for the National Seashore.

(e) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to Congress within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act on measures taken to implement this section.

Subtitle E—Wilderness and Withdrawals

SEC. 3060. ALPINE LAKES WILDERNESS ADDITIONS AND PRATT AND MIDDLE FORK SNOQUALMIE RIVERS PROTECTION.

(a) EXPANSION OF ALPINE LAKES WILDERNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System certain Federal land in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest in the State of Washington comprising approximately 22,173 acres that is within the Proposed Alpine Lakes Wilderness Additions Boundary, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Alpine Lakes Wilderness Additions” and dated December 3, 2009, which is incorporated in and shall be considered to be a part of the Alpine Lakes Wilderness.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the land designated as wilderness by paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) MAP AND DESCRIPTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of the land designated as wilderness by paragraph (1) with—

(I) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(II) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(ii) FORCE OF LAW.—A map and legal description filed under clause (i) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct minor errors in the map and legal description.

(iii) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under clause (i) shall be filed and made available for public inspection in the appropriate office of the Forest Service.

(3) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.—Any land or interests in land within the Proposed Alpine Lakes Wilderness Additions Boundary, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Alpine Lakes Wilderness Additions” and dated December 3, 2009, that is acquired by the United States shall—

(A) become part of the wilderness area; and

(B) be managed in accordance with paragraph (2)(A).

(b) WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (208), as added by section 3040(e), the following:

“(209) MIDDLE FORK SNOQUALMIE, WASHINGTON.—The 27.4-mile segment from the headwaters of the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River near La Bohn Gap in NE ¼ sec. 20, T. 24 N., R. 13 E., to the northern boundary of sec. 11, T. 23 N., R. 9 E., to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classifications:

“(A) The approximately 6.4-mile segment from the headwaters of the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River near La Bohn Gap in NE ¼ sec. 20, T. 24 N., R. 13 E., to the west section line of sec. 3, T. 23 N., R. 12 E., as a wild river.

“(B) The approximately 21-mile segment from the west section line of sec. 3, T. 23 N., R. 12 E., to the northern boundary of sec. 11, T. 23 N., R. 9 E., as a scenic river.

“(210) PRATT RIVER, WASHINGTON.—The entirety of the Pratt River in the State of Washington, located in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.”.

(2) NO CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land within the boundary of the river segment designated by paragraph (209) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) may be acquired by condemnation.

(3) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in paragraph (209) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone outside the designated boundary of the river segment designated by that paragraph.

(B) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that an activity or use can be seen or heard within the boundary of the river segment designated by paragraph (209) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the river segment.

SEC. 3061. COLUMBINE-HONDO WILDERNESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) RED RIVER CONVEYANCE MAP.—The term “Red River Conveyance Map” means the map entitled “Town of Red River Town Site Act Proposal” and dated April 19, 2012.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of New Mexico.

(4) TOWN.—The term “Town” means the town of Red River, New Mexico.

(5) VILLAGE.—The term “Village” means the village of Taos Ski Valley, New Mexico.

(6) WILDERNESS.—The term “Wilderness” means the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness designated by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(7) WILDERNESS MAP.—The term “Wilderness Map” means the map entitled “Columbine-Hondo, Wheeler Peak Wilderness” and dated April 25, 2012.

(b) ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.—

(1) DESIGNATION OF THE COLUMBINE-HONDO WILDERNESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the approximately 45,000 acres of land in the Carson National Forest in the State, as generally depicted on the Wilderness Map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, which shall be known as the “Columbine-Hondo Wilderness”.

(B) MANAGEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered

by the Secretary in accordance with this section and the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(II) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within the Wilderness shall not preclude the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(C) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.—Any land or interest in land that is within the boundary of the Wilderness that is acquired by the United States shall—

(i) become part of the Wilderness; and

(ii) be managed in accordance with—

(I) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.);

(II) this subsection; and

(III) any other applicable laws.

(D) GRAZING.—Grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, where established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue in accordance with—

(i) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(ii) the guidelines set forth in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617).

(E) COLUMBINE-HONDO WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—

(i) FINDING.—Congress finds that, for purposes of section 103(a)(2) of Public Law 96-550 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 94 Stat. 3223), any Federal land in the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness Study Area administered by the Forest Service that is not designated as wilderness by subparagraph (A) has been adequately reviewed for wilderness designation.

(ii) APPLICABILITY.—The Federal land described in clause (i) is no longer subject to subsections (a)(2) and (b) of section 103 of Public Law 96-550 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 94 Stat. 3223).

(F) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare maps and legal descriptions of the Wilderness.

(ii) FORCE OF LAW.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under clause (i) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(iii) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under clause (i) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(G) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife located on public land in the State, except that the Secretary may designate areas in which, and establish periods during which, for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws, no hunting, fishing, or trapping will be permitted in the Wilderness.

(ii) CONSULTATION.—Except in emergencies, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate State agency and notify the public before taking any action under clause (i).

(H) WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land described in subparagraphs (A) and (E)(i) and any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States in the Wilderness after the date of enactment of this Act is withdrawn from—

(i) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(iii) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(2) WHEELER PEAK WILDERNESS BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Wheeler Peak Wilderness in the State is modified as generally depicted in the Wilderness Map.

(B) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, any Federal land added to or excluded from the boundary of the Wheeler Peak Wilderness under subparagraph (A) is withdrawn from—

(i) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(iii) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(C) LAND CONVEYANCES AND SALES.—

(1) TOWN OF RED RIVER LAND CONVEYANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this paragraph, the Secretary shall convey to the Town, without consideration and by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the one or more parcels of Federal land described in subparagraph (B) for which the Town submits a request to the Secretary by the date that is not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcels of Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) are the parcels of National Forest System land (including any improvements to the land) in Taos County, New Mexico, that are identified as “Parcel 1”, “Parcel 2”, “Parcel 3”, and “Parcel 4” on the Red River Conveyance Map.

(C) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to—

(i) valid existing rights;

(ii) public rights-of-way through “Parcel 1”, “Parcel 3”, and “Parcel 4”;

(iii) an administrative right-of-way through “Parcel 2” reserved to the United States; and

(iv) such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(D) USE OF LAND.—As a condition of the conveyance under subparagraph (A), the Town shall use—

(i) “Parcel 1” for a wastewater treatment plant;

(ii) “Parcel 2” for a cemetery;

(iii) “Parcel 3” for a public park; and

(iv) “Parcel 4” for a public road.

(E) REVERSION.—In the quitclaim deed to the Town under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide that any parcel of Federal land conveyed to the Town under subparagraph (A) shall revert to the Secretary, at the election of the Secretary, if the parcel of Federal land is used for a purpose other than the purpose for which the parcel was conveyed, as required under subparagraph (D).

(F) SURVEY; ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

(i) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land conveyed under subparagraph (A) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

(ii) COSTS.—The Town shall pay the reasonable survey and other administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

(2) VILLAGE OF TAOS SKI VALLEY LAND CONVEYANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this paragraph, the Secretary shall convey to the Village, without consideration and by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of Federal land described in subparagraph (B) for which the Village submits a request to the Secretary by the date that is not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcel of Federal land referred to in subparagraph (A) is the parcel comprising approximately 4.6 acres of National Forest System land (including any improvements to the land) in Taos County generally depicted as “Parcel 1” on the map entitled “Village of Taos Ski Valley Town Site Act Proposal” and dated April 19, 2012.

(C) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to—

(i) valid existing rights;

(ii) an administrative right-of-way through the parcel of Federal land described in subparagraph (B) reserved to the United States; and

(iii) such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(D) USE OF LAND.—As a condition of the conveyance under subparagraph (A), the Village shall use the parcel of Federal land described in subparagraph (B) for a wastewater treatment plant.

(E) REVERSION.—In the quitclaim deed to the Village, the Secretary shall provide that the parcel of Federal land conveyed to the Village under subparagraph (A) shall revert to the Secretary, at the election of the Secretary, if the parcel of Federal land is used for a purpose other than the purpose for which the parcel was conveyed, as described in subparagraph (D).

(F) SURVEY; ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

(i) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land conveyed under subparagraph (A) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

(ii) COSTS.—The Village shall pay the reasonable survey and other administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF SALE OF CERTAIN NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this paragraph and in exchange for consideration in an amount that is equal to the fair market value of the applicable parcel of National Forest System land, the Secretary may convey—

(i) to the holder of the permit numbered “QUE302101” for use of the parcel, the parcel of National Forest System land comprising approximately 0.2 acres that is generally depicted as “Parcel 5” on the Red River Conveyance Map; and

(ii) to the owner of the private property adjacent to the parcel, the parcel of National Forest System land comprising approximately 0.1 acres that is generally depicted as “Parcel 6” on the Red River Conveyance Map.

(B) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—Any amounts received by the Secretary as consideration for a conveyance under subparagraph (A) shall be—

(i) deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”) (16 U.S.C. 484a); and

(ii) available to the Secretary, without further appropriation and until expended, for

the acquisition of land or interests in land in Region 3 of the Forest Service.

(C) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to—

(i) valid existing rights; and
(ii) such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(D) SURVEY; ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—

(i) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land conveyed under subparagraph (A) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

(ii) COSTS.—The reasonable survey and other administrative costs associated with the conveyance shall be paid by the holder of the permit or the owner of the private property, as applicable.

SEC. 3062. HERMOSA CREEK WATERSHED PROTECTION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CITY.—The term “City” means the city of Durango, Colorado.

(2) COUNTY.—The term “County” means La Plata County, Colorado.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term “Special Management Area” means the Hermosa Creek Special Management Area designated by subsection (b)(1).

(5) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Colorado.

(b) DESIGNATION OF HERMOSA CREEK SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest comprising approximately 70,650 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Hermosa Creek Special Management Area and Proposed Hermosa Creek Wilderness Area” and dated November 12, 2014, is designated as the “Hermosa Creek Special Management Area”.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Special Management Area is to conserve and protect for the benefit of present and future generations the watershed, geological, cultural, natural, scientific, recreational, wildlife, riparian, historical, educational, and scenic resources of the Special Management Area.

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the Special Management Area—

(i) in a manner that conserves, protects, and manages the resources of the Special Management Area described in paragraph (2); and

(ii) in accordance with—

(I) the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(II) this Act; and

(III) any other applicable laws.

(B) USES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall allow only such uses of the Special Management Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(ii) MOTORIZED AND MECHANIZED VEHICLES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II) and as needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency, the use of motorized or mechanized vehicles in the Special Management Area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated by the Secretary for use by those vehicles.

(II) OVERSNOW VEHICLES.—The Secretary shall authorize the use of snowmobiles and other oversnow vehicles within the Special Management Area—

(aa) when there exists adequate snow coverage; and

(bb) subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(iii) GRAZING.—The Secretary shall permit grazing within the Special Management Area, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to all applicable laws (including regulations) and Executive orders.

(iv) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—Within the area of the Special Management Area identified as “East Hermosa Area” on the map entitled “Proposed Hermosa Creek Special Management Area and Proposed Hermosa Creek Wilderness Area” and dated November 12, 2014, the following activities shall be prohibited:

(I) New permanent or temporary road construction or the renovation of existing non-system roads, except as allowed under the final rule entitled “Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation; Applicability to the National Forests in Colorado” (77 Fed. Reg. 39576 (July 3, 2012)).

(II) Projects undertaken for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber (other than activities relating to the harvest of merchantable products that are byproducts of activities conducted for ecological restoration or to further the purposes described in this section).

(4) STATE AND FEDERAL WATER MANAGEMENT.—Nothing in this subsection affects the potential for development, operation, or maintenance of a water storage reservoir at the site in the Special Management Area that is identified in—

(A) pages 17 through 20 of the Statewide Water Supply Initiative studies prepared by the Colorado Water Conservation Board and issued by the State in November 2004; and

(B) page 27 of the Colorado Dam Site Inventory prepared by the Colorado Water Conservation Board and dated August 1996.

(5) WITHDRAWAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Federal land within the Special Management Area is withdrawn from—

(i) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(iii) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The withdrawal under subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the areas identified as parcels A and B on the map entitled “Proposed Hermosa Creek Special Management Area and Proposed Hermosa Creek Wilderness Area” and dated November 12, 2014.

(6) WINTER SKIING AND RELATED WINTER ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this subsection alters or limits—

(A) a permit held by a ski area;

(B) the implementation of the activities governed by a ski area permit; or

(C) the authority of the Secretary to modify or expand an existing ski area permit.

(7) VEGETATION MANAGEMENT.—Nothing in this subsection prevents the Secretary from conducting vegetation management projects within the Special Management Area—

(A) subject to—

(i) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary determines to be appropriate; and

(ii) all applicable laws (including regulations); and

(B) in a manner consistent with—

(i) the purposes described in paragraph (2); and

(ii) this subsection.

(8) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with this subsection, the Secretary may—

(A) carry out any measures that the Secretary determines to be necessary to manage wildland fire and treat hazardous fuels, insects, and diseases in the Special Management Area; and

(B) coordinate those measures with the appropriate State or local agency, as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(9) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a management plan for the long-term protection and management of the Special Management Area that—

(A) takes into account public input; and

(B) provides for recreational opportunities to occur within the Special Management Area, including skiing, biking, hiking, fishing, hunting, horseback riding, snowmobiling, motorcycle riding, off-highway vehicle use, snowshoeing, and camping.

(10) TRAIL AND OPEN AREA SNOWMOBILE USAGE.—Nothing in this subsection affects the use or status of trails authorized for motorized or mechanized vehicle or open area snowmobile use on the date of enactment of this Act.

(11) STATE WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subsection affects access to, use of, or allocation of any absolute or conditional water right that is—

(A) decreed under the laws of the State; and

(B) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) HERMOSA CREEK WILDERNESS.—

(1) DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS.—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 107 Stat. 756; 114 Stat. 1955; 116 Stat. 1055) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(22) Certain land within the San Juan National Forest that comprises approximately 37,236 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Hermosa Creek Special Management Area and Proposed Hermosa Creek Wilderness Area’ and dated November 12, 2014, which shall be known as the ‘Hermosa Creek Wilderness’.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any reference contained in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of administering the wilderness area designated by section 2(a)(22) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 107 Stat. 756; 114 Stat. 1955; 116 Stat. 1055) (as added by paragraph (1)).

(3) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), within the wilderness areas designated by section 2(a)(22) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 107 Stat. 756; 114 Stat. 1955; 116 Stat. 1055) (as added by paragraph (1)), the Secretary may carry out any measure that the Secretary determines to be necessary to control fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) DURANGO AREA MINERAL WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the land and mineral interests described in paragraph (2) are withdrawn from all forms of—

(A) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral leasing, geothermal leasing, or mineral materials.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAND AND MINERAL INTERESTS.—The land and mineral interests referred to in paragraph (1) are the Federal land and mineral interests generally depicted within the areas designated as “Withdrawal Areas” on the map entitled “Perins Peak & Animas City Mountain, Horse Gulch and Lake Nighthorse Mineral Withdrawal” and dated April 5, 2013.

(3) PUBLIC PURPOSE CONVEYANCE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Interior may convey any portion of the land described in paragraph (2) that is administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the City, the County, or the State—

(A) pursuant to the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.); or

(B) by exchange in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(e) CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND TO COUNTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the expiration of the permit numbered COC 64651 (09) and dated February 24, 2009, on request and agreement of the County, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the County, without consideration and subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (2), subject to—

(A) paragraph (3);

(B) the condition that the County shall pay all administrative and other costs associated with the conveyance; and

(C) such other terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior determines to be necessary.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (1) consists of approximately 82 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, Tres Rios District, Colorado, as generally depicted on the map entitled “La Plata County Grandview Conveyance” and dated May 5, 2014.

(3) USE OF CONVEYED LAND.—The Federal land conveyed pursuant to this subsection may be used by the County for any public purpose, in accordance with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(4) REVERSION.—If the County ceases to use a parcel of the Federal land conveyed pursuant to this subsection in accordance with paragraph (1), title to the parcel shall revert to the Secretary of the Interior, at the option of the Secretary of the Interior.

(f) MOLAS PASS RECREATION AREA; WILDERNESS STUDY AREA RELEASE; WILDERNESS STUDY AREA TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) MOLAS PASS RECREATION AREA.—

(A) DESIGNATION.—The approximately 461 acres of land in San Juan County, Colorado, that is generally depicted as “Molas Pass Recreation Area” on the map entitled “Molas Pass Recreation Area and Molas Pass Wilderness Study Area” and dated November 13, 2014, is designated as the “Molas Pass Recreation Area”.

(B) USE OF SNOWMOBILES.—The use of snowmobiles shall be authorized in the Molas Pass Recreation Area—

(i) during periods of adequate snow coverage;

(ii) in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and other applicable laws (including regulations);

(iii) on designated trails for winter motorized travel and grooming;

(iv) in designated areas for open area motorized travel; and

(v) subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(C) OTHER RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.—In addition to the uses authorized under subparagraph (B), the Secretary may authorize other recreational uses in the Molas Pass Recreation Area.

(2) MOLAS PASS WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—

(A) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land generally depicted as “Molas Pass Wilderness Study Area” on the map entitled “Molas Pass Recreation Area and Molas Pass Wilderness Study Area”, and dated November 13, 2014, is transferred from the Bureau of Land Management to the Forest Service.

(B) ADMINISTRATION.—The Federal land described in subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) be known as the “Molas Pass Wilderness Study Area”; and

(ii) be administered by the Secretary, so as to maintain the wilderness character and potential of the Federal land for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(3) RELEASE.—

(A) FINDING.—Congress finds that the land described in subparagraph (C) has been adequately studied for wilderness designation under section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782).

(B) RELEASE.—Effective beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the land described in subparagraph (C)—

(i) shall not be subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c));

(ii) shall be managed in accordance with land management plans adopted under section 202 of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1712); and

(iii) shall not be subject to Secretarial Order 3310 issued on December 22, 2010.

(C) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) is the approximately 461 acres located in the West Needles Contiguous Wilderness Study Area of San Juan County, Colorado, that is generally depicted as “Molas Pass Recreation Area” on the map entitled “Molas Pass Recreation Area and Molas Pass Wilderness Study Area” and dated November 13, 2014.

(g) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with regard to fish and wildlife in the State.

(2) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, shall prepare maps and legal descriptions of—

(i) the Special Management Area;

(ii) the wilderness area designated by the amendment made by subsection (c)(1);

(iii) the withdrawal pursuant to subsection (d);

(iv) the conveyance pursuant to subsection (e);

(v) the recreation area designated by subsection (f)(1); and

(vi) the wilderness study area designated by subsection (f)(2)(B)(i).

(B) FORCE OF LAW.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary concerned may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(C) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for

public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around—

(i) the Special Management Area;

(ii) the wilderness area designated by an amendment made by subsection (c)(1); or

(iii) the wilderness study area designated by subsection (f)(2)(B)(i).

(B) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use can be seen or heard from areas within the wilderness area designated by an amendment made by subsection (c)(1) or the wilderness study area designated by subsection (f)(2)(B)(i) shall not preclude the conduct of the activity or use outside the boundary of the wilderness area or wilderness study area.

(4) MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this section restricts or precludes—

(A) any low-level overflight of military aircraft over an area designated as a wilderness area under an amendment made by this section, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within the wilderness area;

(B) flight testing or evaluation; or

(C) the designation or establishment of—

(i) new units of special use airspace; or

(ii) any military flight training route over a wilderness area described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 3063. NORTH FORK FEDERAL LANDS WITHDRAWAL AREA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE FEDERAL LAND.—The term “eligible Federal land” means—

(A) any federally owned land or interest in land depicted on the Map as within the North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area; or

(B) any land or interest in land located within the North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area that is acquired by the Federal Government after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) MAP.—The term “Map” means the Bureau of Land Management map entitled “North Fork Federal Lands Withdrawal Area” and dated June 9, 2010.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the eligible Federal land is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(2) disposition under all laws relating to mineral leasing and geothermal leasing.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Map shall be made available to the public at each appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(d) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section prohibits the Secretary of the Interior from taking any action necessary to complete any requirement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) required for permitting surface-disturbing activity to occur on any lease issued before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3064. PINE FOREST RANGE WILDERNESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Humboldt County, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Proposed Pine Forest Wilderness Area” and dated October 28, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Nevada.

(5) WILDERNESS.—The term “Wilderness” means the Pine Forest Range Wilderness designated by section (b)(1).

(b) ADDITION TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the approximately 26,000 acres of Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the “Pine Forest Range Wilderness”.

(2) BOUNDARY.—

(A) ROAD ACCESS.—The boundary of any portion of the Wilderness that is bordered by a road shall be 100 feet from the edge of the road.

(B) ROAD ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

(i) reroute the road running through Long Meadow to the west to remove the road from the riparian area;

(ii) reroute the road currently running through Rodeo Flat/Corral Meadow to the east to remove the road from the riparian area;

(iii) close, except for administrative use, the road along Lower Alder Creek south of Bureau of Land Management road #2083; and

(iv)(I) leave open the Coke Creek Road to Little Onion Basin; but

(II) close spur roads connecting to the roads described in subclause (I).

(C) RESERVOIR ACCESS.—The boundary of the Wilderness shall be 160 feet downstream from the dam at Little Onion Reservoir.

(3) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Wilderness.

(B) EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(A) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) any reference in the Wilderness Act to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary.

(2) LIVESTOCK.—The grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue, subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers to be necessary in accordance with—

(A) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(B) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101-405).

(3) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(B) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen, heard, or detected from areas within the Wilderness shall not limit or preclude the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(4) MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this section restricts or precludes—

(A) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the Wilderness, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within the Wilderness;

(B) flight testing and evaluation; or

(C) the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace, or the establishment of military flight training routes, over the Wilderness.

(5) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take such measures in the Wilderness as are necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases (including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency).

(6) WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS.—Nothing in this section precludes a Federal, State, or local agency from conducting wildfire management operations (including operations using aircraft or mechanized equipment).

(7) WATER RIGHTS.—

(A) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this paragraph is to protect the wilderness values of the land designated as wilderness by this section by means other than a federally reserved water right.

(B) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section—

(i) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Wilderness;

(ii) affects any water rights in the State (including any water rights held by the United States) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(iii) establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations;

(iv) affects the interpretation of, or any designation made under, any other Act; or

(v) limits, alters, modifies, or amends any interstate compact or equitable apportionment decree that apportions water among and between the State and other States.

(C) NEVADA WATER LAW.—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the Wilderness.

(D) NEW PROJECTS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In this subparagraph, the term “water resource facility” means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(II) EXCLUSION.—In this subparagraph, the term “water resource facility” does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(ii) RESTRICTION ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, neither the President nor any other officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within a wilderness area, any portion of which is located in the County.

(d) RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the land described in paragraph (3) has been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(2) RELEASE.—Any public land described in paragraph (3) that is not designated as wilderness by this section—

(A) is no longer subject to—

(i) section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); or

(ii) Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary on December 22, 2010; and

(B) shall be managed in accordance with the applicable land use plans adopted under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712).

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) consists of the portions of the Blue Lakes and Alder Creek wilderness study areas not designated as wilderness by subsection (b)(1), including the approximately 990 acres in the following areas:

(A) Lower Alder Creek Basin.

(B) Little Onion Basin.

(C) Lands east of Knott Creek Reservoir.

(D) Portions of Corral Meadow and the Blue Lakes Trailhead.

(e) WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this section affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the Wilderness.

(2) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities in the Wilderness that are necessary to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support the populations, if the activities are carried out—

(A) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(ii) the guidelines set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101-405), including the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness values with the minimal impact necessary to reasonably accomplish those tasks.

(3) EXISTING ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with the guidelines set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives

accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101-405), the State may continue to use aircraft, including helicopters, to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife populations in the Wilderness.

(4) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may designate areas in which, and establish periods during which, for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws, no hunting, fishing, or trapping will be permitted in the Wilderness.

(B) CONSULTATION.—Except in emergencies, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate State agency and notify the public before taking any action under subparagraph (A).

(5) AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the Wilderness—

(i) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled “Memorandum of Understanding between the Bureau of Land Management and the Nevada Department of Wildlife Supplement No. 9” and signed November and December 2003, including any amendments to the agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State; and

(ii) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

(B) REFERENCES; CLARK COUNTY.—For the purposes of this paragraph, any reference to Clark County in the agreement described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall be considered to be a reference to the Wilderness.

(f) LAND EXCHANGES.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means Federal land in the County that is identified for disposal by the Secretary through the Winnemucca Resource Management Plan.

(B) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term “non-Federal land” means land identified on the Map as “non-Federal lands for exchange”.

(2) ACQUISITION OF LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.—Consistent with applicable law and subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary may exchange the Federal land for non-Federal land.

(3) CONDITIONS.—Each land exchange under paragraph (1) shall be subject to—

(A) the condition that the owner of the non-Federal land pay not less than 50 percent of all costs relating to the land exchange, including the costs of appraisals, surveys, and any necessary environmental clearances; and

(B) such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(4) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS IN LAND.—Any non-Federal land or interest in the non-Federal land within the boundary of the Wilderness that is acquired by the United States under this subsection after the date of enactment of this Act shall be added to and administered as part of the Wilderness.

(5) DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF LAND EXCHANGE.—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchanges under this subsection be completed by not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.—Nothing in this section alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).

SEC. 3065. ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREA AND WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term “Conservation Management Area” means the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area established by subsection (b)(1)(A).

(2) DECOMMISSION.—The term “decommission” means—

(A) to reestablish vegetation on a road; and
(B) to restore any natural drainage, watershed function, or other ecological processes that are disrupted or adversely impacted by the road by removing or hydrologically disconnecting the road prism.

(3) DISTRICT.—The term “district” means the Rocky Mountain Ranger District of the Lewis and Clark National Forest.

(4) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act” and dated October 27, 2011.

(5) NONMOTORIZED RECREATION TRAIL.—The term “nonmotorized recreation trail” means a trail designed for hiking, bicycling, or equestrian use.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means—

(A) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Montana.

(b) ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREA.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, there is established the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area in the State.

(B) AREA INCLUDED.—The Conservation Management Area shall consist of approximately 195,073 acres of Federal land managed by the Forest Service and 13,087 acres of Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the State, as generally depicted on the map.

(C) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land or interest in land that is located in the Conservation Management Area and is acquired by the United States from a willing seller shall—

(i) become part of the Conservation Management Area; and

(ii) be managed in accordance with—

(I) in the case of land managed by the Forest Service—
(aa) the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the “Weeks Law”) (16 U.S.C. 552 et seq.); and

(bb) any laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System;

(II) in the case of land managed, by the Bureau of Land Management, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(III) this subsection; and

(IV) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Conservation Management Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the recreational, scenic, historical, cultural, fish, wildlife, roadless, and ecological values of the Conservation Management Area.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Conservation Management Area—

(i) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the resources of the Conservation Management Area; and

(ii) in accordance with—

(I) the laws (including regulations) and rules applicable to the National Forest System for land managed by the Forest Service;

(II) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for land managed by the Bureau of Land Management;

(III) this subsection; and

(IV) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(B) USES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Conservation Management Area that the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(ii) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The use of motorized vehicles in the Conservation Management Area shall be permitted only on existing roads, trails, and areas designated for use by such vehicles as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(II) NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—Except as provided in subclause (III), no new or temporary roads shall be constructed within the Conservation Management Area.

(III) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in subclause (I) or (II) prevents the Secretary from—

(aa) rerouting or closing an existing road or trail to protect natural resources from degradation, as determined to be appropriate by the Secretary;

(bb) constructing a temporary road on which motorized vehicles are permitted as part of a vegetation management project in any portion of the Conservation Management Area located not more than ¼ mile from the Teton Road, South Teton Road, Sun River Road, Beaver Willow Road, or Benchmark Road;

(cc) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes (including noxious weed eradication or grazing management); or

(dd) responding to an emergency.

(IV) DECOMMISSIONING OF TEMPORARY ROADS.—The Secretary shall decommission any temporary road constructed under subclause (III)(bb) not later than 3 years after the date on which the applicable vegetation management project is completed.

(iii) GRAZING.—The Secretary shall permit grazing within the Conservation Management Area, if established on the date of enactment of this Act—

(I) subject to—

(aa) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(bb) all applicable laws; and

(II) in a manner consistent with—

(aa) the purposes described in paragraph (2); and

(bb) the guidelines set forth in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617).

(iv) VEGETATION MANAGEMENT.—Nothing in this section prevents the Secretary from conducting vegetation management projects within the Conservation Management Area—

(I) subject to—

(aa) such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(bb) all applicable laws (including regulations); and

(II) in a manner consistent with the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(4) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The designation of the Conservation Management Area shall not create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Conservation Management Area.

(B) EFFECT.—The fact that activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within the Conservation Management Area shall not preclude the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Conservation Management Area.

(c) DESIGNATION OF WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the following Federal land in the State is designated as wilderness and as additions to existing components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(A) BOB MARSHALL WILDERNESS.—Certain land in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, comprising approximately 50,401 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be added to and administered as part of the Bob Marshall Wilderness designated under section 3 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1132).

(B) SCAPEGOAT WILDERNESS.—Certain land in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, comprising approximately 16,711 acres, as generally depicted on the map, which shall be added to and administered as part of the Scapegoat Wilderness designated by the first section of Public Law 92-395 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note).

(2) MANAGEMENT OF WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—Subject to valid existing rights, the land designated as wilderness additions by paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date of that Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) LIVESTOCK.—The grazing of livestock and the maintenance of existing facilities relating to grazing in the wilderness additions designated by this subsection, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue in accordance with—

(A) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(B) the guidelines set forth in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617).

(4) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), within the wilderness additions designated by this subsection, the Secretary may take any measures that the Secretary determines to be necessary to control fire, insects, and diseases, including, as the Secretary determines appropriate, the coordination of those activities with a State or local agency.

(5) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The designation of a wilderness addition by this subsection shall not create any protective perimeter or buffer zone around the wilderness area.

(B) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a wilderness addition designated by this subsection shall not preclude the conduct of those activities or uses outside the boundary of the wilderness area.

(d) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare maps and legal de-

scriptions of the Conservation Management Area and the wilderness additions designated by subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct typographical errors in the map and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The maps and legal descriptions prepared under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

(e) NOXIOUS WEED MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a comprehensive management strategy for preventing, controlling, and eradicating noxious weeds in the district.

(2) CONTENTS.—The management strategy shall—

(A) include recommendations to protect wildlife, forage, and other natural resources in the district from noxious weeds;

(B) identify opportunities to coordinate noxious weed prevention, control, and eradication efforts in the district with State and local agencies, Indian tribes, nonprofit organizations, and others;

(C) identify existing resources for preventing, controlling, and eradicating noxious weeds in the district;

(D) identify additional resources that are appropriate to effectively prevent, control, or eradicate noxious weeds in the district; and

(E) identify opportunities to coordinate with county weed districts in Glacier, Pondera, Teton, and Lewis and Clark Counties in the State to apply for grants and enter into agreements for noxious weed control and eradication projects under the Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 7781 et seq.).

(3) CONSULTATION.—In developing the management strategy required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior;

(B) appropriate State, tribal, and local governmental entities; and

(C) members of the public.

(f) NONMOTORIZED RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with interested parties, shall conduct a study to improve nonmotorized recreation trail opportunities (including mountain bicycling) on land not designated as wilderness within the district.

(g) MANAGEMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE; HUNTING AND FISHING.—Nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management (including the regulation of hunting and fishing) on public land in the State.

(h) OVERFLIGHTS.—

(1) JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration with respect to the airspace above the wilderness or the Conservation Management Area.

(2) BENCHMARK AIRSTRIP.—Nothing in this section affects the continued use, maintenance, and repair of the Benchmark (3U7) airstrip.

(i) RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43

U.S.C. 1782(c)), the Zook Creek and Buffalo Creek wilderness study areas in the State have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(2) RELEASE.—The Zook Creek and Buffalo Creek wilderness study areas—

(A) are no longer subject to—

(i) section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); or

(ii) Secretarial Order 3310 issued on December 22, 2010; and

(B) shall be managed in accordance with the applicable land use plans adopted under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712).

(j) ASSESSMENT UPDATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall review and update the assessment for oil and gas potential for the following wilderness study areas in the State:

(A) Bridge Coulee.

(B) Musselshell Breaks.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the review is completed under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that describes the oil and gas potential for the wilderness study areas.

SEC. 3066. WOVOKA WILDERNESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Lyon County, Nevada.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Wovoka Wilderness Area” and dated December 18, 2012.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Nevada.

(5) WILDERNESS.—The term “Wilderness” means the Wovoka Wilderness designated by subsection (b)(1).

(b) WOVOKA WILDERNESS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Federal land managed by the Forest Service, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as wilderness and as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, to be known as the “Wovoka Wilderness”.

(2) BOUNDARY.—The boundary of any portion of the Wilderness that is bordered by a road shall be 150 feet from the centerline of the road.

(3) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Wilderness.

(B) EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that any reference in that Act to the effective date shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) LIVESTOCK.—The grazing of livestock in the Wilderness, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue, subject to such reasonable regulations, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers to be necessary, in accordance with—

(A) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(B) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101-405).

(3) INCORPORATION OF ACQUIRED LAND AND INTERESTS.—Any land or interest in land within the boundary of the Wilderness that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall be added to and administered as part of the Wilderness.

(4) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness to create a protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Wilderness.

(B) NONWILDERNESS ACTIVITIES.—The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within the Wilderness shall not preclude the conduct of the activities or uses outside the boundary of the Wilderness.

(5) OVERFLIGHTS.—

(A) MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this section restricts or precludes—

(i) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the Wilderness, including military overflights that can be seen or heard within the Wilderness;

(ii) flight testing and evaluation; or

(iii) the designation or creation of new units of special airspace, or the establishment of military flight training routes, over the Wilderness.

(B) EXISTING AIRSTRIPS.—Nothing in this section restricts or precludes low-level overflights by aircraft originating from airstrips in existence on the date of enactment of this Act that are located within 5 miles of the proposed boundary of the Wilderness.

(6) WILDFIRE, INSECT, AND DISEASE MANAGEMENT.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may take any measures in the Wilderness that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, including, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the coordination of the activities with a State or local agency.

(7) WATER RIGHTS.—

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(i) the Wilderness is located—

(I) in the semiarid region of the Great Basin; and

(II) at the headwaters of the streams and rivers on land with respect to which there are few—

(aa) actual or proposed water resource facilities located upstream; and

(bb) opportunities for diversion, storage, or other uses of water occurring outside the land that would adversely affect the wilderness values of the land;

(ii) the Wilderness is generally not suitable for use or development of new water resource facilities; and

(iii) because of the unique nature of the Wilderness, it is possible to provide for proper management and protection of the wilderness and other values of land in ways different from those used in other laws.

(B) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this paragraph is to protect the wilderness values of the Wilderness by means other than a federally reserved water right.

(C) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph—

(i) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water rights with respect to the Wilderness;

(ii) affects any water rights in the State (including any water rights held by the United States) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(iii) establishes a precedent with regard to any future wilderness designations;

(iv) affects the interpretation of, or any designation made under, any other Act; or

(v) limits, alters, modifies, or amends any interstate compact or equitable apportionment decree that apportions water among and between the State and other States.

(D) NEVADA WATER LAW.—The Secretary shall follow the procedural and substantive requirements of State law in order to obtain and hold any water rights not in existence on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the Wilderness.

(E) NEW PROJECTS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF WATER RESOURCE FACILITY.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In this subparagraph, the term “water resource facility” means irrigation and pumping facilities, reservoirs, water conservation works, aqueducts, canals, ditches, pipelines, wells, hydropower projects, transmission and other ancillary facilities, and other water diversion, storage, and carriage structures.

(II) EXCLUSION.—In this subparagraph, the term “water resource facility” does not include wildlife guzzlers.

(i) RESTRICTION ON NEW WATER RESOURCE FACILITIES.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, no officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall fund, assist, authorize, or issue a license or permit for the development of any new water resource facility within the Wilderness, any portion of which is located in the County.

(II) EXCEPTION.—If a permittee within the Bald Mountain grazing allotment submits an application for the development of water resources for the purpose of livestock watering by the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a water development permit within the non-wilderness boundaries of the Bald Mountain grazing allotment for the purposes of carrying out activities under paragraph (2).

(8) NONWILDERNESS ROADS.—Nothing in this section prevents the Secretary from implementing or amending a final travel management plan.

(d) WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with section 4(d)(7) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(7)), nothing in this section affects or diminishes the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife management, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, and trapping, in the Wilderness.

(2) MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES.—In furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), the Secretary may conduct any management activities in the Wilderness that are necessary

to maintain or restore fish and wildlife populations and the habitats to support the populations, if the activities are carried out—

(A) consistent with relevant wilderness management plans; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(ii) the guidelines set forth in Appendix B of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (House Report 101-405), including the occasional and temporary use of motorized vehicles and aircraft, if the use, as determined by the Secretary, would promote healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations that would enhance wilderness values with the minimal impact necessary to reasonably accomplish those tasks.

(3) EXISTING ACTIVITIES.—Consistent with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)) and in accordance with the guidelines set forth in Appendix B of House Report 101-405, the State may continue to use aircraft, including helicopters, to survey, capture, transplant, monitor, and provide water for wildlife populations in the Wilderness.

(4) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may designate areas in which, and establish periods during which, for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws, no hunting, fishing, or trapping will be permitted in the Wilderness.

(B) CONSULTATION.—Except in emergencies, the Secretary shall consult with the appropriate State agency and notify the public before making any designation under subparagraph (A).

(5) AGREEMENT.—The State, including a designee of the State, may conduct wildlife management activities in the Wilderness—

(A) in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the agreement between the Secretary and the State entitled “Memorandum of Understanding: Intermountain Region USDA Forest Service and the Nevada Department of Wildlife State of Nevada” and signed by the designee of the State on February 6, 1984, and by the designee of the Secretary on January 24, 1984, including any amendments, appendices, or additions to the agreement agreed to by the Secretary and the State or a designee; and

(B) subject to all applicable laws (including regulations).

(e) WILDLIFE WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary shall authorize structures and facilities, including existing structures and facilities, for wildlife water development projects (including guzzlers) in the Wilderness if—

(1) the structures and facilities will, as determined by the Secretary, enhance wilderness values by promoting healthy, viable, and more naturally distributed wildlife populations; and

(2) the visual impacts of the structures and facilities on the Wilderness can reasonably be minimized.

(f) NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.—Nothing in this section alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe.

SEC. 3067. WITHDRAWAL AREA RELATED TO WOVOKA WILDERNESS.

(a) DEFINITION OF WITHDRAWAL AREA.—In this section, the term “Withdrawal Area” means the land administered by the Forest Service and identified as “Withdrawal Area”

on the map entitled “Wovoka Wilderness Area” and dated December 18, 2012.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the Withdrawal Area is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral laws, geothermal leasing laws, and mineral materials laws.

(c) MOTORIZED AND MECHANICAL VEHICLES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), use of motorized and mechanical vehicles in the Withdrawal Area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for the use of those vehicles, unless the use of those vehicles is needed—

(A) for administrative purposes; or

(B) to respond to an emergency.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to aircraft (including helicopters).

(d) NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS USES.—Nothing in this section alters or diminishes the treaty rights of any Indian tribe.

SEC. 3068. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF ADDITIONAL PUBLIC LAND FOR NAVAL AIR WEAPONS STATION, CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2971(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 1044) is amended—

(1) by striking “subsection (a) is the Federal land” and inserting the following: “subsection (a) is—

“(1) the Federal land”; and

(2) by striking “section 2912.” and inserting the following: “section 2912;

“(2) approximately 7,556 acres of public land described at Public Law 88–46 and commonly known as the Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range; and

“(3) approximately 4,480 acres comprised of all the public lands within: Sections 31 and 32 of Township 29S, Range 43E; Sections 12, 13, 24, and 25 of Township 30S, Range 42E; and Section 5 and the northern half of Section 6 of Township 31S, Range 43E, Mount Diablo Meridian, in the county of San Bernardino in the State of California, (but excluding the parcel identified as ‘AF Fee Simple’) as depicted on the map entitled: ‘Cuddeback Area of the Golden Valley Proposed Wilderness Additions, June 2014’.”.

(b) EXPIRATIONAL REPEAL.—The Act entitled “An Act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, California, for defense purposes”, as approved June 21, 1963 (Public Law 88–46; 77 Stat. 69), is repealed.

Subtitle F—Wild and Scenic Rivers

SEC. 3071. ILLABOT CREEK, WASHINGTON, WILD AND SCENIC RIVER.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (210), as added by section 3060(b), the following:

“(211) ILLABOT CREEK, WASHINGTON.—

“(A) The 14.3-mile segment from the headwaters of Illabot Creek to the northern terminus as generally depicted on the map titled ‘Illabot Creek Proposed WSR—Northern Terminus’, dated September 15, 2009, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

“(i) The 4.3-mile segment from the headwaters of Illabot Creek to the boundary of Glacier Peak Wilderness Area as a wild river.

“(ii) The 10-mile segment from the boundary of Glacier Peak Wilderness to the northern terminus as generally depicted on the map titled ‘Illabot Creek Proposed WSR—Northern Terminus’, dated September 15, 2009, as a recreational river.

“(B) Action required to be taken under subsection (d)(1) for the river segments designated under this paragraph shall be completed through revision of the Skagit Wild and Scenic River comprehensive management plan.”.

(b) NO CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land within the boundary of the river segment designated by paragraph (211) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) may be acquired by condemnation.

(c) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in paragraph (211) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone outside the designated boundary of the river segment designated by that paragraph.

(2) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that an activity or use can be seen or heard within the boundary of the river segment designated by paragraph (211) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the river segment.

SEC. 3072. MISSISQUOI AND TROUT WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS, VERMONT.

(a) DESIGNATION OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SEGMENTS.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (211), as added by section 3071(a), the following:

“(212) MISSISQUOI RIVER AND TROUT RIVER, VERMONT.—The following segments in the State of Vermont, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as a recreational river:

“(A) The 20.5-mile segment of the Missisquoi River from the Lowell/Westfield town line to the Canadian border in North Troy, excluding the property and project boundary of the Troy and North Troy hydroelectric facilities.

“(B) The 14.6-mile segment of the Missisquoi River from the Canadian border in Richford to the upstream project boundary of the Enosburg Falls hydroelectric facility in Sampsonville.

“(C) The 11-mile segment of the Trout River from the confluence of the Jay and Wade Brooks in Montgomery to where the Trout River joins the Missisquoi River in East Berkshire.”.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The river segments designated by paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall be managed in accordance with—

(i) the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Management Plan developed during the study described in section 5(b)(19) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)(19)) (referred to in this subsection as the “management plan”); and

(ii) such amendments to the management plan as the Secretary of the Interior determines are consistent with this section and as are approved by the Upper Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic Committee (referred to in this subsection as the “Committee”).

(B) COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The management plan, as finalized in March 2013, and as amended, shall be considered to satisfy the requirements for a comprehensive

management plan pursuant to section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)).

(C) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone outside the designated boundary of the river segments designated by that paragraph.

(ii) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that an activity or use can be seen or heard within the boundary of the river segments designated by paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the river segments.

(2) COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall coordinate management responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior under this section with the Committee, as specified in the management plan.

(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to provide for the long-term protection, preservation, and enhancement of the river segments designated by paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), the Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements pursuant to sections 10(e) and 11(b)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1281(e), 1282(b)(1)) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act with—

(i) the State of Vermont;

(ii) the municipalities of Berkshire, Enosburg Falls, Enosburgh, Montgomery, North Troy, Richford, Troy, and Westfield; and

(iii) appropriate local, regional, statewide, or multi-state planning, environmental, or recreational organizations.

(B) CONSISTENCY.—Each cooperative agreement entered into under this paragraph shall be consistent with the management plan and may include provisions for financial or other assistance from the United States.

(4) EFFECT ON EXISTING HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The designation of the river segments by paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), does not—

(i) preclude the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission from licensing, relicensing, or otherwise authorizing the operation or continued operation of the Troy Hydroelectric, North Troy, or Enosburg Falls hydroelectric project under the terms of licenses or exemptions in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) limit modernization, upgrade, or other changes to the projects described in clause (i), subject to written determination by the Secretary of the Interior that the changes are consistent with the purposes of the designation.

(B) HYDROPOWER PROCEEDINGS.—Resource protection, mitigation, or enhancement measures required by Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hydropower proceedings—

(i) shall not be considered to be project works for purposes of this section; and

(ii) may be located within the river segments designated by paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), subject to a written determination by the Secretary that the measures are consistent with the purposes of the designation.

(5) LAND MANAGEMENT.—

(A) ZONING ORDINANCES.—For the purpose of the segments designated by paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic

Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), the zoning ordinances adopted by the towns of Berkshire, Enosburg Falls, Enosburgh, Montgomery, North Troy, Richford, Troy, and Westfield in the State of Vermont, including provisions for conservation of floodplains, wetlands, and watercourses associated with the segments, shall be considered to satisfy the standards and requirements of section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1277(c)).

(B) ACQUISITIONS OF LAND.—The authority of the Secretary to acquire land for the purposes of the segments designated by paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) shall be—

(i) limited to acquisition by donation or acquisition with the consent of the owner of the land; and

(ii) subject to the additional criteria set forth in the management plan.

(C) NO CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land within the boundary of the river segments designated by paragraph (212) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) may be acquired by condemnation.

(6) RELATION TO NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.—Notwithstanding section 10(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(c)), the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers shall not be administered as part of the National Park System or be subject to regulations that govern the National Park System.

SEC. 3073. WHITE CLAY CREEK WILD AND SCENIC RIVER EXPANSION.

(a) DESIGNATION OF SEGMENTS OF WHITE CLAY CREEK, AS SCENIC AND RECREATIONAL RIVERS.—Section 3(a)(163) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(163)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “190 miles” and inserting “199 miles”; and

(B) by striking “the recommended designation and classification maps (dated June 2000)” and inserting “the map entitled ‘White Clay Creek Wild and Scenic River Designated Area Map’ and dated July 2008, the map entitled ‘White Clay Creek Wild and Scenic River Classification Map’ and dated July 2008, and the map entitled ‘White Clay Creek National Wild and Scenic River Proposed Additional Designated Segments—July 2008’”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) 22.4 miles of the east branch beginning at the southern boundary line of the Borough of Avondale, including Walnut Run, Broad Run, and Egypt Run, outside the boundaries of the White Clay Creek Preserve, as a recreational river.”; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (H) and inserting the following:

“(H) 14.3 miles of the main stem, including Lamborn Run, that flow through the boundaries of the White Clay Creek Preserve, Pennsylvania and Delaware, and White Clay Creek State Park, Delaware, beginning at the confluence of the east and middle branches in London Britain Township, Pennsylvania, downstream to the northern boundary line of the City of Newark, Delaware, as a scenic river.”.

(b) ADMINISTRATION OF WHITE CLAY CREEK.—Sections 4 through 8 of Public Law 106-357 (16 U.S.C. 1274 note; 114 Stat. 1393), shall be applicable to the additional segments of White Clay Creek designated by the amendments made by subsection (a).

(c) NO CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land within the boundary of the additional

segments of White Clay Creek designated by the amendments made by subsection (a) may be acquired by condemnation.

(d) ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in the amendments made by subsection (a) creates a protective perimeter or buffer zone outside the designated boundary of the additional segments of White Clay Creek designated by the amendments made by that subsection.

(2) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that an activity or use can be seen or heard within the boundary of the additional segments of White Clay Creek designated by the amendments made by subsection (a) shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the segment.

SEC. 3074. STUDIES OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.

(a) DESIGNATION FOR STUDY.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (141), as added by section 3041(e), the following:

“(142) BEAVER, CHIPUXET, QUEEN, WOOD, AND PAWCATUCK RIVERS, RHODE ISLAND AND CONNECTICUT.—The following segments:

“(A) The approximately 10-mile segment of the Beaver River from the headwaters in Exeter, Rhode Island, to the confluence with the Pawcatuck River.

“(B) The approximately 5-mile segment of the Chipuxet River from Hundred Acre Pond to the outlet into Worden Pond.

“(C) The approximately 10-mile segment of the upper Queen River from the headwaters to the Usquepaugh Dam in South Kingstown, Rhode Island, including all tributaries of the upper Queen River.

“(D) The approximately 5-mile segment of the lower Queen (Usquepaugh) River from the Usquepaugh Dam to the confluence with the Pawcatuck River.

“(E) The approximately 11-mile segment of the upper Wood River from the headwaters to Skunk Hill Road in Richmond and Hopkinton, Rhode Island, including all tributaries of the upper Wood River.

“(F) The approximately 10-mile segment of the lower Wood River from Skunk Hill Road to the confluence with the Pawcatuck River.

“(G) The approximately 28-mile segment of the Pawcatuck River from Worden Pond to Nooseneck Hill Road (Rhode Island Rte 3) in Hopkinton and Westerly, Rhode Island.

“(H) The approximately 7-mile segment of the lower Pawcatuck River from Nooseneck Hill Road to Pawcatuck Rock, Stonington, Connecticut, and Westerly, Rhode Island.

“(143) NASHUA RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—The following segments:

“(A) The approximately 19-mile segment of the mainstem of the Nashua River from the confluence with the North and South Nashua Rivers in Lancaster, Massachusetts, north to the Massachusetts-New Hampshire State line, excluding the approximately 4.8-mile segment of the mainstem of the Nashua River from the Route 119 bridge in Groton, Massachusetts, downstream to the confluence with the Nissitissit River in Pepperell, Massachusetts.

“(B) The 10-mile segment of the Squannacook River from the headwaters at Ash Swamp downstream to the confluence with the Nashua River in the towns of Shirley and Ayer, Massachusetts.

“(C) The 3.5-mile segment of the Nissitissit River from the Massachusetts-New Hampshire State line downstream to the confluence with the Nashua River in Pepperell, Massachusetts.

“(144) YORK RIVER, MAINE.—The segment of the York River that flows 11.25 miles from

the headwaters of the York River at York Pond to the mouth of the river at York Harbor, and any associated tributaries.”.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—Section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (20), as added by section 3041(e), the following:

“(21) BEAVER, CHIPUXET, QUEEN, WOOD, AND PAWCATUCK RIVERS, RHODE ISLAND AND CONNECTICUT; NASHUA RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS; YORK RIVER, MAINE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

“(i) complete each of the studies described in paragraphs (142), (143), and (144) of subsection (a); and

“(ii) submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes the results of each of the studies.

“(B) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—In assessing the potential additions to the wild and scenic river system, the report submitted under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall—

“(i) determine the effect of the designation on—

“(I) existing commercial and recreational activities, such as hunting, fishing, trapping, recreational shooting, motor boat use, and bridge construction;

“(II) the authorization, construction, operation, maintenance, or improvement of energy production, transmission, or other infrastructure; and

“(III) the authority of State and local governments to manage the activities described in subclauses (I) and (II);

“(ii) identify any authorities that, in a case in which an area studied under paragraph (142), (143), or (144) of subsection (a) is designated under this Act—

“(I) would authorize or require the Secretary of the Interior—

“(aa) to influence local land use decisions, such as zoning; or

“(bb) to place restrictions on non-Federal land if designated under this Act; and

“(II) the Secretary of the Interior may use to condemn property; and

“(iii) identify any private property located in an area studied under paragraph (142), (143), or (144) of subsection (a).”.

Subtitle G—Trust Lands

SEC. 3077. LAND TAKEN INTO TRUST FOR BENEFIT OF THE NORTHERN CHEYENNE TRIBE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FUND.—The term “Fund” means the Northern Cheyenne Trust Fund identified in the June 7, 1999 Agreement Settling Certain Issues Relating to the Tongue River Dam Project, which was entered into by the Tribe, the State, and delegates of the Secretary, and managed by the Office of Special Trustee in the Department of the Interior.

(2) GREAT NORTHERN PROPERTIES.—The term “Great Northern Properties” means the Great Northern Properties Limited Partnership, which is a Delaware limited partnership.

(3) PERMANENT FUND.—The term “Permanent Fund” means the Northern Cheyenne Tribe Permanent Fund managed by the Tribe pursuant to the Plan for Investment, Management and Use of the Fund, as amended by vote of the tribal membership on November 2, 2010.

(4) RESERVATION.—The term “Reservation” means the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Montana.

(7) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.

(b) TRIBAL FEE LAND TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe the approximately 932 acres of land depicted on—

(A) the map entitled “Northern Cheyenne Lands Act – Fee-to-Trust Lands” and dated April 22, 2014; and

(B) the map entitled “Northern Cheyenne Lands Act – Fee-to-Trust Lands – Lame Deer Townsite” and dated April 22, 2014.

(2) LIMITATION.—Any land located in the State of South Dakota that is included on the maps referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall not be taken into trust pursuant to that paragraph.

(c) MINERAL RIGHTS TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST.—

(1) COMPLETION OF MINERAL CONVEYANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the notification described in paragraph (3), in a single transaction—

(i) Great Northern Properties shall convey to the Tribe all right, title, and interest of Great Northern Properties, consisting of coal and iron ore mineral interests, underlying the land on the Reservation generally depicted as “Great Northern Properties” on the map entitled “Northern Cheyenne Land Act – Coal Tracts” and dated April 22, 2014; and

(ii) subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall convey to Great Northern Properties all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the coal mineral interests underlying the land generally depicted as “Bull Mountains” and “East Fork” on the map entitled “Northern Cheyenne Federal Tracts” and dated April 22, 2014.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall ensure that the deed for the conveyance authorized by subparagraph (A)(ii) shall include a covenant running with the land that—

(i) precludes the coal conveyed from being mined by any method other than underground mining techniques until any surface owner (as defined in section 714(e) of Public Law 95-87 (30 U.S.C. 1304(e))) for a specific tract has provided to Great Northern Properties written consent to enter the specific tract and commence surface mining;

(ii) shall not create any property interest in the United States or any surface owner (as defined in section 714(e) of Public Law 95-87 (30 U.S.C. 1304(e))); and

(iii) shall not affect, abridge, or amend any valid existing rights of any surface owner of a specific tract or any adjacent tracts.

(2) TREATMENT OF LAND TRANSFERRED TO TRIBE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the Tribe, the Secretary shall take into trust for the benefit of the Tribe the mineral interests conveyed to the Tribe under paragraph (1)(A)(i).

(B) NO STATE TAXATION.—The mineral interests conveyed to the Tribe under paragraph (1)(A)(i) shall not be subject to taxation by the State (including any political subdivision of the State).

(3) REVENUE SHARING AGREEMENT.—The Tribe shall notify the Secretary, in writing, that—

(A) consistent with a settlement agreement entered into between the Tribe and the State in 2002, the Tribe and Great Northern

Properties have agreed on a formula for sharing revenue from development of the mineral interests described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii) if those mineral interests are developed;

(B) the revenue sharing agreement remains in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) Great Northern Properties has offered to convey the mineral interests described in paragraph (1)(A)(i) to the Tribe.

(4) WAIVER OF LEGAL CLAIMS.—As a condition of the conveyances of mineral interests under paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) the Tribe shall waive any and all claims relating to the failure of the United States to acquire and take into trust on behalf of the Tribe the mineral interests described in paragraph (1)(A)(i), as directed by Congress in 1900; and

(B) Great Northern Properties shall waive any and all claims against the United States relating to the value of the coal mineral interests described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

(5) RESCISSION OF MINERAL CONVEYANCES.—If any portion of the mineral interests conveyed under paragraph (1)(A) is invalidated by final judgment of a court of the United States—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date on which the final judgment is rendered, the Secretary or Great Northern Properties may agree to rescind the conveyances under paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) if the conveyances are rescinded under subparagraph (A), the waivers under paragraph (4) shall no longer apply.

(d) TRANSFER OF NORTHERN CHEYENNE TRUST FUND TO TRIBE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, all amounts in the Fund shall be deposited in the Permanent Fund.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS.—Of the amounts transferred to the Permanent Fund under paragraph (1)—

(A) the portion that is attributable to the principal of the Fund shall be maintained in perpetuity; and

(B) any interest earned on the amounts described in subparagraph (A) shall be used in the same manner as interest earned on amounts in the Permanent Fund may be used.

(3) WAIVER OF LEGAL CLAIMS.—As a condition of the transfer under paragraph (1), the Tribe shall waive any and all claims arising from the management of the Fund by the United States.

(e) LAND CONSOLIDATION AND FRACTIONATION REPORTING.—

(1) INVENTORY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Tribe, shall prepare an inventory of fractionated land interests held by the United States in trust for the benefit of—

(i) the Tribe; or

(ii) individual Indians on the Reservation.

(B) AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES.—The inventory prepared by the Secretary under this paragraph shall include details currently available about fractionated land on the Reservation suitable for agricultural purposes.

(C) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit the inventory prepared under this paragraph to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives by not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Tribe, shall prepare peri-

odic reports regarding obstacles to consolidating trust land ownership on the Reservation.

(B) CONTENTS.—The reports under this paragraph shall include—

(i) a description of existing obstacles to consolidating trust land ownership, including the extent of fractionation;

(ii) a description of progress achieved by the Tribe toward reducing fractionation and increasing trust land ownership;

(iii) an analysis of progress achieved by the Tribe toward making agricultural use economical on trust land; and

(iv) any applicable outcomes and lessons learned from land consolidation activities undertaken pursuant to the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.).

(C) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit the reports under this paragraph to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives not less frequently than once each calendar year for the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER FEDERAL BENEFITS.—The transfer under subsection (d) shall not result in the reduction or denial of any Federal service, benefit, or program to the Tribe or to any member of the Tribe to which the Tribe or member is entitled or eligible because of—

(1) the status of the Tribe as a federally recognized Indian tribe; or

(2) the status of the member as a member of the Tribe.

SEC. 3078. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, BARABOO, WISCONSIN.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “Property” means approximately 1,553 acres, including federally owned structures thereon, located within the boundary of the former Badger Army Ammunition Plant near Baraboo, Wisconsin.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the Property is hereby transferred from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STRUCTURES.—Upon receipt by the Secretary of the Interior of a resolution from the Ho-Chunk Nation accepting title to the structures, all federally owned structures on the Property are hereby transferred to the Ho-Chunk Nation in fee.

(3) TRUST STATUS.—The Property, less the structures thereon, shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the Ho-Chunk Nation and shall be a part of the reservation of the Ho-Chunk Nation.

(4) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—As soon as practicable after the transfer, the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Army, shall publish in the Federal Register a legal description of the Property.

(c) RETENTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE RESPONSIBILITIES BY THE ARMY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the transfer of the Property by subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army shall be responsible—

(A) for obtaining final case closure and no-action-required remedial determinations for the Property from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; and

(B) for any additional remedial actions, with respect to any hazardous substance remaining on the Property, found to be necessary to protect human health and the environment to support the recreational and

grazing land reuse (including agricultural activities necessary to sustain such reuse) considered for the final case closure and no-action-required determinations of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The responsibility described in paragraph (1) is limited to the remediation of releases of hazardous substances resulting from the activities of the Department of Defense that occurred before the date on which administrative jurisdiction of the Property is transferred under this section.

(3) **OTHER USES OF THE PROPERTY BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR OR THE HO-CHUNK NATION.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall not take any action to authorize, nor shall the Ho-Chunk Nation undertake or allow, any activity on or use of the Property inconsistent with the case closure conditions required by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources except as provided in this paragraph. Nothing in this section shall preclude the Ho-Chunk Nation from undertaking, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and without any cost to the Department of Defense or the Department of the Interior, such additional action necessary to allow for uses of the Property other than uses that are consistent with the case closure conditions required by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

(4) **ACCESS BY THE UNITED STATES.**—(A) The United States retains and reserves a perpetual and assignable easement and right of access on, over, and through the Property, to enter upon the Property in any case in which an environmental response or corrective action is found to be necessary on the part of the United States, without regard to whether such environmental response or corrective action is on the Property or on adjoining or nearby lands. Such easement and right of access includes, without limitation, the right to perform any environmental investigation, survey, monitoring, sampling, testing, drilling, boring, coring, testpitting, installing monitoring or pumping wells or other treatment facilities, response action, corrective action, or any other action necessary for the United States to meet its responsibilities under applicable laws and as provided for in this section.

(B) In exercising such easement and right of access, the United States shall provide the property holder or owner and their successors or assigns, as the case may be, with reasonable notice of its intent to enter upon the Property and exercise its rights under this clause, which notice may be severely curtailed or even eliminated in emergency situations. The United States shall use reasonable means to avoid and to minimize interference with the property holder's or owner's and their successors' and assigns', as the case may be, quiet enjoyment of the Property. At the completion of work, the work site shall be reasonably restored. Such easement and right of access includes the right to obtain and use utility services, including water, gas, electricity, sewer, and communications services available on the Property at a reasonable charge to the United States. Excluding the reasonable charges for such utility services, no fee, charge, or compensation will be due the property holder or owner, their successors and assigns, for the exercise of the easement and right of access hereby retained and reserved by the United States.

(C) In exercising such easement and right of access, neither the Ho-Chunk Nation nor its successors and assigns, as the case may be, shall have any claim at law or equity

against the United States or any officer, employee, agent, contractor of any tier, or servant of the United States based on actions taken by the United States or its officers, employees, agents, contractors of any tier, or servants pursuant to and in accordance with this clause: Provided, however, that nothing in this paragraph shall be considered as a waiver by the Ho-Chunk Nation, its successors and assigns, of any remedy available to them under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

(d) **TREATMENT OF EXISTING EASEMENTS, PERMIT RIGHTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The transfer of administrative jurisdiction under this section recognizes and preserves, in perpetuity and without the right of revocation except as provided in paragraph (2), easements, permit rights, and rights-of-way and access to such easements and rights-of-way of any applicable utility service provider in existence at the time of the conveyance prior to the date of enactment of this Act. The rights recognized and preserved include the right to upgrade applicable utility services.

(2) **TERMINATION.**—An easement, permit right, or right-of-way recognized and preserved under paragraph (1) shall terminate only—

(A) on the relocation of an applicable utility service referred to in paragraph (1), and then only with respect to that portion of those utility facilities that are relocated; or

(B) with the consent of the holder of the easement, permit right, or right-of-way.

(3) **ADDITIONAL EASEMENTS.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall grant to a utility service provider, without consideration, such additional easements across the property transferred under this section as the Secretary considers necessary to accommodate the relocation or reconnection of a utility service existing prior to the date of enactment of this section on property held by the Secretary of the Interior in trust for the Ho-Chunk Nation.

(e) **PROHIBITION ON GAMING.**—Any real property taken into trust under this section shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(f) **LIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES UNCHANGED.**—Nothing in this section shall diminish or increase the liability of the United States or otherwise affect the liability of the United States under any provision of law.

Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Access and Property Issues

SEC. 3081. ENSURING PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE SUMMIT OF RATTLESNAKE MOUNTAIN IN THE HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall provide public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument for educational, recreational, historical, scientific, cultural, and other purposes, including—

(1) motor vehicle access; and

(2) pedestrian and other nonmotorized access.

(b) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements to facilitate access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain—

(1) with the Secretary of Energy, the State of Washington, or any local government agency or other interested persons, for guided tours, including guided motorized tours to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain; and

(2) with the Secretary of Energy, and with the State of Washington or any local government agency or other interested persons, to maintain the access road to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain.

SEC. 3082. ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, CONVEYANCE OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CITY.**—The term “City” means the municipality of Anchorage, Alaska.

(2) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “non-Federal land” means certain parcels of land located in the City and owned by the City, which are more particularly described as follows:

(A) Block 42, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 1.93 acres, commonly known as the Egan Center, Petrovich Park, and Old City Hall.

(B) Lots 9, 10, and 11, Block 66, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 0.48 acres, commonly known as the parking lot at 7th Avenue and I Street.

(C) Lot 13, Block 15, Original Townsite of Anchorage, Anchorage Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska, consisting of approximately 0.24 acres, an unimproved vacant lot located at H Street and Christensen Drive.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **CONVEYANCE OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall convey to the City, without consideration, the reversionary interests of the United States in and to the non-Federal land for the purpose of unencumbering the title to the non-Federal land to enable economic development of the non-Federal land.

(2) **LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the exact legal descriptions of the non-Federal land shall be determined in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(3) **COSTS.**—The City shall pay all costs associated with the conveyance under paragraph (1), including the costs of any surveys, recording costs, and other reasonable costs.

SEC. 3083. RELEASE OF PROPERTY INTERESTS IN BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF OREGON FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF HERMISTON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAP.**—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center” and dated April 7, 2014.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(3) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Oregon (acting through the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Oregon State University).

(b) **RELEASE OF RETAINED INTERESTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any reservation or reversionary interest retained by the United States to the approximately 290 acres in Hermiston, Oregon, depicted as “Reversionary Interest Area” on the Map, is hereby released without consideration.

(2) **INSTRUMENT OF RELEASE.**—The Secretary shall execute and file in the appropriate office a deed of release, amended deed, or other appropriate instrument reflecting the release of retained interests under paragraph (1).

(c) **CONVEYANCE OF ORPHAN PARCEL.**—Notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43

U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a request from the State, the Secretary shall convey to the State, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States to and in the approximately 6 acres identified on the Map as "Bureau of Land Management Administered Land".

Subtitle I—Water Infrastructure

SEC. 3087. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION HYDRO-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Section 9 of the Act of August 11, 1939 (commonly known as the "Water Conservation and Utilization Act") (16 U.S.C. 590z-7) is amended—

(1) by striking "In connection with" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—In connection with"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) CERTAIN LEASES AUTHORIZED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary—

"(A) may enter into leases of power privileges for electric power generation in connection with any project constructed pursuant to this Act; and

"(B) shall have authority over any project constructed pursuant to this Act in addition to and alternative to any existing authority relating to a particular project.

"(2) PROCESS.—In entering into a lease of power privileges under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall use the processes, terms, and conditions applicable to a lease under section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)).

"(3) FINDINGS NOT REQUIRED.—No findings under section 3 shall be required for a lease under paragraph (1).

"(4) RIGHTS RETAINED BY LESSEE.—Except as otherwise provided under paragraph (5), all right, title, and interest in and to installed power facilities constructed by non-Federal entities pursuant to a lease under paragraph (1), and any direct revenues derived from that lease, shall remain with the lessee.

"(5) LEASE CHARGES.—Notwithstanding section 8, lease charges shall be credited to the project from which the power is derived.

"(6) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section alters or affects any agreement in effect on the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 for the development of hydropower projects or disposition of revenues."

SEC. 3088. TOLEDO BEND HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT.

Notwithstanding section 3(2) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796(2)), Federal land within the Sabine National Forest or the Indian Mounds Wilderness Area occupied by the Toledo Bend Hydroelectric Project numbered 2305 shall not be considered to be—

(1) a reservation, for purposes of section 4(e) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 797(e));

(2) land or other property of the United States for purposes of recompensing the United States for the use, occupancy, or enjoyment of the land under section 10(e)(1) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)(1)); or

(3) land of the United States, for purposes of section 24 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 818).

SEC. 3089. EAST BENCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONTRACT EXTENSION.

Section 2(1) of the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act (Public Law 112-139; 126 Stat. 390) is amended by striking "4 years" and inserting "10 years".

Subtitle J—Other Matters

SEC. 3091. COMMEMORATION OF CENTENNIAL OF WORLD WAR I.

(a) LIBERTY MEMORIAL AS WORLD WAR I MUSEUM AND MEMORIAL.—

(1) DESIGNATION OF LIBERTY MEMORIAL.—The Liberty Memorial of Kansas City at America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, is hereby designated as a "World War I Museum and Memorial".

(2) CEREMONIES.—The World War I Centennial Commission (in this section referred to as the "Commission") may plan, develop, and execute ceremonies to recognize the designation of the Liberty Memorial of Kansas City as a World War I Museum and Memorial.

(b) PERSHING PARK AS WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL.—

(1) REDESIGNATION OF PERSHING PARK.—Pershing Park in the District of Columbia is hereby redesignated as a "World War I Memorial".

(2) CEREMONIES.—The Commission may plan, develop, and execute ceremonies for the rededication of Pershing Park, as it approaches its 50th anniversary, as a World War I Memorial and for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work as authorized by paragraph (3).

(3) AUTHORITY TO ENHANCE COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may enhance the General Pershing Commemorative Work by constructing on the land designated by paragraph (1) as a World War I Memorial appropriate sculptural and other commemorative elements, including landscaping, to further honor the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I.

(B) GENERAL PERSHING COMMEMORATIVE WORK DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "General Pershing Commemorative Work" means the memorial to the late John J. Pershing, General of the Armies of the United States, who commanded the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, and to the officers and men under his command, as authorized by Public Law 89-786 (80 Stat. 1377).

(4) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, applies to the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under this subsection.

(B) WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SITE SELECTION FOR MEMORIAL.—Section 8905 of such title does not apply with respect to the selection of the site for the World War I Memorial.

(2) CERTAIN CONDITIONS.—Section 8908(b) of such title does not apply to this subsection.

(3) NO INFRINGEMENT UPON EXISTING MEMORIAL.—The World War I Memorial designated by paragraph (1) may not interfere with or encroach on the District of Columbia War Memorial.

(4) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—

(A) USE FOR OTHER WORLD WAR I COMMEMORATIVE ACTIVITIES.—If, upon payment of all expenses for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under this subsection (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for such purpose, the Commission may use the amount of the balance for other commemorative activities authorized under the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272; 126 Stat. 2448).

(B) USE FOR OTHER COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—If the authority for enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work and the authority of the Commission to plan and conduct commemorative activities under the World War I Centennial Commission Act have expired and there remains a

balance of funds received for the enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work, the Commission shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior following the process provided in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under section 8906(b)(3) of such title, except that funds in such account may only be obligated subject to appropriation.

(7) AUTHORIZATION TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION AFTER TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—Section 8 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "The Centennial Commission" and inserting "Except as provided in subsection (c), the Centennial Commission"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) EXCEPTION FOR COMPLETION OF WORLD WAR I MEMORIAL.—The Centennial Commission may perform such work as is necessary to complete the rededication of a World War I Memorial and enhancement of the General Pershing Commemorative Work under section 3091(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, subject to section 8903 of title 40, United States Code."

(c) ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT.—

(1) EX OFFICIO AND OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.—Section 4 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272; 126 Stat. 2449) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) EX OFFICIO AND OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.—

"(1) POWERS.—The individuals listed in paragraphs (2) and (3), or their designated representative, shall serve on the Centennial Commission solely to provide advice and information to the members of the Centennial Commission appointed pursuant to subsection (b)(1), and shall not be considered members for purposes of any other provision of this Act.

"(2) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The following individuals shall serve as ex officio members:

"(A) The Archivist of the United States.

"(B) The Librarian of Congress.

"(C) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

"(D) The Secretary of Education.

"(E) The Secretary of State.

"(F) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

"(G) The Administrator of General Services.

"(3) OTHER ADVISORY MEMBERS.—The following individuals shall serve as other advisory members:

"(A) Four members appointed by the Secretary of Defense in the following manner: One from the Navy, one from the Marine Corps, one from the Army, and one from the Air Force.

"(B) Two members appointed by the Secretary of Homeland Security in the following manner: One from the Coast Guard and one from the United States Secret Service.

"(C) Two members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, including one from the National Parks Service.

"(4) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in a member position under paragraph (3) shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made."

(2) PAYABLE RATE OF STAFF.—Section 7(c)(2) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272; 126 Stat. 2451) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “level IV” and inserting “level II”.

(3) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(A) LIMITATION.—Section 9 of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272; 126 Stat. 2453) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

“No Federal funds may be obligated or expended for the designation, establishment, or enhancement of a memorial or commemorative work by the World War I Centennial Commission.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7(f) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272; 126 Stat. 2452) is repealed.

(C) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 9 in the table of contents of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272; 126 Stat. 2448) is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 9. Limitation on obligation of Federal funds.”.

SEC. 3092. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES RELATED TO LAS VEGAS VALLEY PUBLIC LAND AND TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COUNCIL.—The term “Council” means the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Advisory Council established by paragraph (6)(A).

(B) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Clark County, Nevada.

(C) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term “local government” means the City of Las Vegas, City of North Las Vegas, or the County.

(D) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “management plan” means the management plan for the Monument developed under paragraph (3)(E).

(E) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Proposed Boundary”, numbered 963/123,142, and dated December 2013.

(F) MONUMENT.—The term “Monument” means the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument established by paragraph (2)(A).

(G) PUBLIC LAND.—The term “public land” has the meaning given the term “public lands” in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(H) PUBLIC WATER AGENCY.—The term “public water agency” means a regional wholesale water provider that is engaged in the acquisition of water on behalf of, or the delivery of water to, water purveyors who are member agencies of the public water agency.

(I) QUALIFIED ELECTRIC UTILITY.—The term “qualified electric utility” means any public or private utility determined by the Secretary to be technically and financially capable of developing the high-voltage transmission facilities described in paragraph (4).

(J) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(K) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Nevada.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to conserve, protect, interpret, and enhance for the benefit

of present and future generations the unique and nationally important paleontological, scientific, educational, and recreational resources and values of the land described in this paragraph, there is established in the State, subject to valid existing rights, the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument.

(B) BOUNDARIES.—The Monument shall consist of approximately 22,650 acres of public land in the County identified as “Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument”, as generally depicted on the Map.

(C) MAP; LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall prepare an official map and legal description of the boundaries of the Monument.

(ii) LEGAL EFFECT.—The map and legal description prepared under clause (i) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this subsection, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the legal description or the map.

(iii) AVAILABILITY OF MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The map and legal description prepared under clause (i) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service.

(D) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Secretary may acquire land or interests in land within the boundaries of the Monument by donation, purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from another Federal agency.

(ii) LIMITATIONS.—

(I) ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LAND.—Land or interests in land that are owned by the State or a political subdivision of the State may be acquired under clause (i) only by donation or exchange.

(II) PROHIBITION OF CONDEMNATION.—No land or interest in land may be acquired under clause (i) by condemnation.

(E) WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraphs (4) and (5), any land within the Monument or any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States for inclusion in the Monument after the date of enactment of this section is withdrawn from—

(i) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(ii) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(iii) operation of the mineral leasing laws, geothermal leasing laws, and minerals materials laws.

(F) RELATIONSHIP TO CLARK COUNTY MULTISPECIES HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN.—

(i) AMENDMENT TO PLAN.—The Secretary shall credit, on an acre-for-acre basis, approximately 22,650 acres of the land conserved for the Monument under this section toward the development of additional non-Federal land within the County through an amendment to the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

(ii) EFFECT ON PLAN.—Nothing in this section otherwise limits, alters, modifies, or amends the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

(G) TERMINATION OF UPPER LAS VEGAS WASH CONSERVATION TRANSFER AREA.—The Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area established by the Record of Decision dated October 21, 2011, for the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, is terminated.

(3) ADMINISTRATION OF MONUMENT.—

(A) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 22,650 acres of public land depicted on the Map as “Tule Springs Fossil Bed National Monument” is transferred from the Bureau of Land Management to the National Park Service.

(B) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall administer the Monument—

(i) in a manner that conserves, protects, interprets, and enhances the resources and values of the Monument; and

(ii) in accordance with—

(I) this subsection;

(II) the provisions of laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System (including the National Park Service Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.)); and

(III) any other applicable laws.

(C) BUFFER ZONES.—The establishment of the Monument shall not—

(i) lead to the creation of express or implied protective perimeters or buffer zones around or over the Monument;

(ii) preclude disposal or development of public land adjacent to the boundaries of the Monument, if the disposal or development is consistent with other applicable law; or

(iii) preclude an activity on, or use of, private land adjacent to the boundaries of the Monument, if the activity or use is consistent with other applicable law.

(D) AIR AND WATER QUALITY.—Nothing in this section alters the standards governing air or water quality outside the boundary of the Monument.

(E) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this subparagraph, the Secretary shall develop a management plan that provides for the long-term protection and management of the Monument.

(ii) COMPONENTS.—The management plan—

(I) shall—

(aa) be prepared in accordance with section 12(b) of the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)); and

(bb) consistent with this subsection and the purposes of the Monument, allow for continued scientific research at the Monument; and

(II) may—

(aa) incorporate any appropriate decisions contained in an existing management or activity plan for the land designated as the Monument under paragraph (2)(A); and

(bb) use information developed in any study of land within, or adjacent to, the boundary of the Monument that was conducted before the date of enactment of this section.

(iii) PUBLIC PROCESS.—In preparing the management plan, the Secretary shall—

(I) consult with, and take into account the comments and recommendations of, the Council;

(II) provide an opportunity for public involvement in the preparation and review of the management plan, including holding public meetings;

(III) consider public comments received as part of the public review and comment process of the management plan; and

(IV) consult with governmental and non-governmental stakeholders involved in establishing and improving the regional trail system to incorporate, where appropriate, trails in the Monument that link to the regional trail system.

(F) INTERPRETATION, EDUCATION, AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for public interpretation of, and education and scientific research on, the paleontological resources of the Monument, with priority given to the onsite exhibition and curation of the resources, to the extent practicable.

(ii) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State, political subdivisions of the State, nonprofit organizations, and appropriate public and private entities to carry out clause (i).

(4) RENEWABLE ENERGY TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of a complete application from a qualified electric utility, the Secretary, in accordance with applicable laws (including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.)), shall issue to the qualified electric utility a 400-foot-wide right-of-way for the construction and maintenance of high-voltage transmission facilities depicted on the map entitled “North Las Vegas Valley Overview” and dated November 5, 2013, as “Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor” if the high-voltage transmission facilities do not conflict with other previously authorized rights-of-way within the corridor.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The high-voltage transmission facilities shall—

(I) be used—

(aa) primarily, to the maximum extent practicable, for renewable energy resources; and

(bb) to meet reliability standards set by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the Western Electricity Coordinating Council, or the public utilities regulator of the State; and

(II) employ best management practices identified as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to limit impacts on the Monument.

(ii) CAPACITY.—The Secretary shall consult with the qualified electric utility that is issued the right-of-way under subparagraph (A) and the public utilities regulator of the State to seek to maximize the capacity of the high-voltage transmission facilities.

(C) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The issuance of a notice to proceed on the construction of the high-voltage transmission facilities within the right-of-way under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to terms and conditions that the Secretary (in consultation with the qualified electric utility), as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), determines appropriate to protect and conserve the resources for which the Monument is managed.

(D) EXPIRATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY.—The right-of-way issued under subparagraph (A) shall expire on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this section if construction of the high-voltage transmission facilities described in subparagraph (A) has not been initiated by that date, unless the Secretary determines that it is in the public interest to continue the right-of-way.

(5) WATER CONVEYANCE FACILITIES.—

(A) WATER CONVEYANCE FACILITIES CORRIDOR.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of 1 or more complete applications from a public water agency and except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary, in accordance with applicable laws (including the National Environmental

Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.)), shall issue to the public water agency a 100-foot-wide right-of-way for the construction, maintenance, repair, and replacement of a buried water conveyance pipeline and associated facilities within the “Water Conveyance Facilities Corridor” and the “Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor” depicted on the map entitled “North Las Vegas Valley Overview” and dated November 5, 2013.

(ii) LIMITATION.—A public water agency right-of-way shall not be granted under clause (i) within the portion of the Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor that is located along the Moccasin Drive alignment, which is generally between T. 18 S. and T. 19 S., Mount Diablo Baseline and Meridian.

(B) BURIED WATER CONVEYANCE PIPELINE.—On receipt of 1 or more complete applications from a unit of local government or public water agency, the Secretary, in accordance with applicable laws (including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761 et seq.)), shall issue to the unit of local government or public water agency a 100-foot-wide right-of-way for the construction, operation, maintenance, repair, and replacement of a buried water conveyance pipeline to access the existing buried water pipeline turnout facility and surge tank located in the NE¼ sec. 16 of T. 19 S. and R. 61 E.

(C) REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.—The water conveyance facilities shall employ best management practices identified as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to limit the impacts of the water conveyance facilities on the Monument.

(ii) CONSULTATIONS.—The water conveyance facilities within the “Renewable Energy Transmission Corridor” shall be sited in consultation with the qualified electric utility to limit the impacts of the water conveyance facilities on the high-voltage transmission facilities.

(D) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The issuance of a notice to proceed on the construction of the water conveyance facilities within the right-of-way under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to any terms and conditions that the Secretary, in consultation with the public water agency, as part of the compliance of the Secretary with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), determines appropriate to protect and conserve the resources for which the Monument is managed.

(6) TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—To provide guidance for the management of the Monument, there is established the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Advisory Council.

(B) MEMBERSHIP.—

(i) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall consist of 10 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(I) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the County Commission;

(II) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the city council of Las Vegas, Nevada;

(III) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the city council of North Las Vegas, Nevada;

(IV) 1 member shall be a member of, or be nominated by, the tribal council of the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe;

(V) 1 member shall be a representative of the conservation community in southern Nevada;

(VI) 1 member shall be a representative of Nellis Air Force Base;

(VII) 1 member shall be nominated by the State;

(VIII) 1 member shall reside in the County and have a background that reflects the purposes for which the Monument was established; and

(IX) 2 members shall reside in the County or adjacent counties, both of whom shall have experience in the field of paleontology, obtained through higher education, experience, or both.

(ii) INITIAL APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall appoint the initial members of the Council in accordance with clause (i).

(C) DUTIES OF COUNCIL.—The Council shall advise the Secretary with respect to the preparation and implementation of the management plan.

(D) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for serving on the Council.

(E) CHAIRPERSON.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), the Council shall elect a Chairperson from among the members of the Council.

(ii) LIMITATION.—The Chairperson shall not be a member of a Federal or State agency.

(iii) TERM.—The term of the Chairperson shall be 3 years.

(F) TERM OF MEMBERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term of a member of the Council shall be 3 years.

(ii) SUCCESSORS.—Notwithstanding the expiration of a 3-year term of a member of the Council, a member may continue to serve on the Council until—

(I) the member is reappointed by the Secretary; or

(II) a successor is appointed.

(G) VACANCIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A vacancy on the Council shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(ii) APPOINTMENT FOR REMAINDER OF TERM.—A member appointed to fill a vacancy on the Council—

(I) shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor was appointed; and

(II) may be nominated for a subsequent term.

(H) TERMINATION.—Unless an extension is jointly recommended by the Director of the National Park Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, the Council shall terminate on the date that is 6 years after the date of enactment of this section.

(7) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the land identified on the Map as “BLM Withdrawn Lands” is withdrawn from—

(A) entry under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, geothermal leasing, and mineral materials laws.

(b) ADDITION OF LAND TO RED ROCK CANYON NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) CONSERVATION AREA.—The term “Conservation Area” means the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area established by the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area Establishment Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 460ccc et seq.).

(B) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “North Las Vegas Valley Overview” and dated November 5, 2013.

(C) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) ADDITION OF LAND TO CONSERVATION AREA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Conservation Area is expanded to include the land depicted on the Map as “Additions to Red Rock NCA”.

(B) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the land is acquired, the Secretary shall update the management plan for the Conservation Area to reflect the management requirements of the acquired land.

(C) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this subsection.

(ii) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(I) the Map; or

(II) the legal description.

(iii) AVAILABILITY.—The Map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(c) CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND TO NORTH LAS VEGAS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “North Las Vegas Valley Overview” and dated November 5, 2013.

(B) NORTH LAS VEGAS.—The term “North Las Vegas” means the city of North Las Vegas, Nevada.

(C) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section and subject to valid existing rights, upon the request of North Las Vegas, the Secretary shall convey to North Las Vegas, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3).

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) consists of the land managed by the Bureau of Land Management described on the Map as the “North Las Vegas Job Creation Zone” (including the interests in the land).

(4) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this subsection.

(B) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(i) the Map; or

(ii) the legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—The Map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(5) USE OF LAND FOR NONRESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—North Las Vegas may sell any portion of the land described in paragraph (3) for nonresidential development.

(B) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale of land under subparagraph (A) shall be carried out—

(i) through a competitive bidding process; and

(ii) for not less than fair market value.

(C) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the

land under subparagraph (B)(ii) based on an appraisal that is performed in accordance with—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practices; and

(iii) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(D) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—The gross proceeds from the sale of land under subparagraph (A) shall be distributed in accordance with section 4(e) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2345; 116 Stat. 2007; 117 Stat. 1317; 118 Stat. 2414; 120 Stat. 3045).

(6) USE OF LAND FOR RECREATION OR OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—North Las Vegas may retain a portion of the land described in paragraph (3) for public recreation or other public purposes consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.) by providing written notice of the election to the Secretary.

(B) REVOCATION.—If North Las Vegas retains land for public recreation or other public purposes under subparagraph (A), North Las Vegas may—

(i) revoke that election; and

(ii) sell the land in accordance with paragraph (5).

(7) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—North Las Vegas shall pay all appraisal costs, survey costs, and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in paragraph (3).

(8) REVERSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If any parcel of land described in paragraph (3) is not conveyed for nonresidential development under this subsection or reserved for recreation or other public purposes under paragraph (6) by the date that is 30 years after the date of enactment of this section, the parcel of land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(B) INCONSISTENT USE.—If North Las Vegas uses any parcel of land described in paragraph (3) in a manner that is inconsistent with this subsection—

(i) at the discretion of the Secretary, the parcel shall revert to the United States; or

(ii) if the Secretary does not make an election under clause (i), North Las Vegas shall sell the parcel of land in accordance with this subsection.

(d) CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND TO LAS VEGAS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) LAS VEGAS.—The term “Las Vegas” means the city of Las Vegas, Nevada.

(B) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “North Las Vegas Valley Overview” and dated November 5, 2013.

(C) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, subject to valid existing rights, and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to Las Vegas, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3).

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) consists of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management described on the Map as “Las Vegas Job Creation Zone” (including interests in the land).

(4) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall finalize the legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under this subsection.

(B) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(i) the Map; or

(ii) the legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—The Map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(5) USE OF LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Las Vegas may sell any portion of the land described in paragraph (3) for nonresidential development.

(B) METHOD OF SALE.—The sale of land under subparagraph (A) shall be carried out, after consultation with the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe—

(i) through a competitive bidding process; and

(ii) for not less than fair market value.

(C) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the land under subparagraph (B)(ii) based on an appraisal that is performed in accordance with—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practices; and

(iii) any other applicable law (including regulations).

(D) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—The gross proceeds from the sale of land under subparagraph (A) shall be distributed in accordance with section 4(e) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2345; 116 Stat. 2007; 117 Stat. 1317; 118 Stat. 2414; 120 Stat. 3045).

(6) USE OF LAND FOR RECREATION OR OTHER PUBLIC PURPOSES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Las Vegas may retain a portion of the land described in paragraph (3) for public recreation or other public purposes consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.) by providing written notice of the election to the Secretary.

(B) REVOCATION.—If Las Vegas retains land for public recreation or other public purposes under subparagraph (A), Las Vegas may—

(i) revoke that election; and

(ii) sell the land in accordance with paragraph (5).

(7) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Las Vegas shall pay all appraisal costs, survey costs, and other administrative costs necessary for the preparation and completion of any patents for, and transfers of title to, the land described in paragraph (3).

(8) REVERSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If any parcel of land described in paragraph (3) is not conveyed for nonresidential development under this subsection or reserved for recreation or other public purposes under paragraph (6) by the date that is 30 years after the date of enactment of this section, the parcel of land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(B) INCONSISTENT USE.—If Las Vegas uses any parcel of land described in paragraph (3) in a manner that is inconsistent with this subsection—

(i) at the discretion of the Secretary, the parcel shall revert to the United States; or

(ii) if the Secretary does not make an election under clause (i), Las Vegas shall sell the parcel of land in accordance with this subsection.

(e) EXPANSION OF CONVEYANCE TO LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT.—Section 703 of the Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-282; 116 Stat. 2013) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and, subject to valid existing rights, the parcel of land identified as ‘Las Vegas Police Shooting Range’ on the map entitled ‘North Las Vegas Valley Overview’ and dated November 5, 2013”.

(f) SPRING MOUNTAINS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA WITHDRAWAL.—Section 8 of the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area Act (16 U.S.C. 460hh-6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “for lands described” and inserting “as provided”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), $W\frac{1}{2}E\frac{1}{2}$ and $W\frac{1}{2}$ sec. 27, T. 23 S., R. 58 E., Mt. Diablo Meridian is not subject to withdrawal under that subsection.

“(2) EFFECT OF ENTRY UNDER PUBLIC LAND LAWS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the following are not subject to withdrawal under that paragraph:

“(A) Any Federal land in the Recreation Area that qualifies for conveyance under Public Law 97-465 (commonly known as the ‘Small Tracts Act’) (16 U.S.C. 521c et seq.), which, notwithstanding section 7 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 521i), may be conveyed under that Act.

“(B) Any Federal land in the Recreation Area that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for conveyance by exchange for non-Federal land within the Recreation Area under authorities generally providing for the exchange of National Forest System land.”.

(g) SOUTHERN NEVADA PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1998 AMENDMENTS.—Section 4 of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2344; 116 Stat. 2007) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a), by striking “dated October 1, 2002” and inserting “dated September 17, 2012”; and

(2) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) Notwithstanding paragraph (4), subject to paragraphs (1) through (3), Clark County may convey to a unit of local government or regional governmental entity, without consideration, land located within the Airport Environs Overlay District, as identified in the Cooperative Management Agreement described in section 3(3) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 112 Stat. 2343), if the land is used for a water or wastewater treatment facility or any other public purpose consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ‘Recreation and Public Purposes Act’) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).”.

(h) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) BOARD OF REGENTS.—The term “Board of Regents” means the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education.

(B) CAMPUSES.—The term “Campuses” means the Great Basin College, College of Southern Nevada, and University of Las Vegas, Nevada, campuses.

(C) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means—

(i) the approximately 40 acres to be conveyed for the College of Southern Nevada, identified as “Parcel to be Conveyed”, as generally depicted on the map entitled “College of Southern Nevada Land Conveyance” and dated June 26, 2012;

(ii) the approximately 2,085 acres to be conveyed for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, identified as “UNLV North Campus”, as generally depicted on the map entitled “North Las Vegas Valley Overview” and dated November 5, 2013; and

(iii) the approximately 285 acres to be conveyed for the Great Basin College, identified as “Parcel to be Conveyed”, as generally depicted on the map entitled “College of Southern Nevada Land Conveyance” and dated June 26, 2012.

(D) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(E) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Nevada.

(F) SYSTEM.—The term “System” means the Nevada System of Higher Education.

(2) CONVEYANCES OF FEDERAL LAND TO SYSTEM.—

(A) CONVEYANCES.—Notwithstanding section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) and section 1(c) of the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869(c)), and subject to all valid existing rights and such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary, the Secretary shall—

(i) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, convey to the System, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to—

(I) the Federal land identified on the map entitled “Great Basin College Land Conveyance” and dated June 26, 2012, for the Great Basin College; and

(II) the Federal land identified on the map entitled “College of Southern Nevada Land Conveyance” and dated June 26, 2012, for the College of Southern Nevada, subject to the requirement that, as a precondition of the conveyance, the Board of Regents shall, by mutual assent, enter into a binding development agreement with the City of Las Vegas that—

(aa) provides for the orderly development of the Federal land to be conveyed under this item; and

(bb) complies with State law; and

(ii) convey to the System, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land identified on the map entitled “North Las Vegas Valley Overview” and dated November 5, 2013, for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, if the area identified as “Potential Utility Schedule” on the map is reserved for use for a potential 400-foot-wide utility corridor of certain rights-of-way for transportation and public utilities.

(B) CONDITIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of the conveyance under subparagraph (A), the Board of Regents shall agree in writing—

(I) to pay any administrative costs associated with the conveyance, including the costs of any environmental, wildlife, cultural, or historical resources studies;

(II) to use the Federal land conveyed for educational and recreational purposes; and

(III) to release and indemnify the United States from any claims or liabilities that may arise from uses carried out on the Federal land on or before the date of enactment of this section by the United States or any person.

(ii) AGREEMENT WITH NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Federal land conveyed to the System under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be used in accordance with the agreement entitled the “Cooperative Interlocal Agreement between the Board of

Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education, on Behalf of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and the 99th Air Base Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada” and dated June 19, 2009.

(II) MODIFICATIONS.—Any modifications to the agreement described in subclause (I) or any related master plan shall require the mutual assent of the parties to the agreement.

(III) LIMITATION.—In no case shall the use of the Federal land conveyed under subparagraph (A)(ii) compromise the national security mission or navigation rights of Nellis Air Force Base.

(C) USE OF FEDERAL LAND.—The System may use the Federal land conveyed under subparagraph (A) for any public purposes consistent with uses allowed under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(D) REVERSION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Federal land or any portion of the Federal land conveyed under subparagraph (A) ceases to be used for the System, the Federal land, or any portion of the Federal land shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(ii) UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS.—If the System fails to complete the first building or show progression toward development of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus on the applicable parcels of Federal land by the date that is 50 years after the date of receipt of certification of acceptable remediation of environmental conditions, the parcels of the Federal land described in paragraph (1)(C)(ii) shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(iii) COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN NEVADA.—If the System fails to complete the first building or show progression toward development of the College of Southern Nevada campus on the applicable parcels of Federal land by the date that is 12 years after the date of conveyance of the applicable parcels of Federal land to the College of Southern Nevada, the parcels of the Federal land described in paragraph (1)(C)(i) shall, at the discretion of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(i) LAND CONVEYANCE FOR SOUTHERN NEVADA SUPPLEMENTAL AIRPORT.—

(1) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(A) flood mitigation infrastructure is critical to the safe and uninterrupted operation of the proposed Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport authorized by the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act (Public Law 106-362; 114 Stat. 1404); and

(B) through proper engineering, the land described in this subsection for flood mitigation infrastructure for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport may be consistent with the role of the Bureau of Land Management—

(i) to protect and prevent irreparable damage to—

(I) important historic, cultural, or scenic values;

(II) fish and wildlife resources; or

(III) other natural systems or processes; or

(ii) to protect life and safety from natural hazards in the County and nearby areas.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Clark County, Nevada.

(B) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Land Conveyance for Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport” and dated June 26, 2012.

(C) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) LAND CONVEYANCE.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF CONVEYANCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date described in subparagraph (B), subject to valid existing rights and subparagraph (C), and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the County, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (4), subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

(ii) COSTS.—The County shall be responsible for all costs associated with the conveyance under clause (i).

(B) DATE ON WHICH CONVEYANCE MAY BE MADE.—The Secretary shall not make the conveyance described in subparagraph (A) until the later of the date on which the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration has—

(i) approved an airport layout plan for an airport to be located in the Ivanpah Valley; and

(ii) with respect to the construction and operation of an airport on the site conveyed to the County pursuant to section 2(a) of the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act (Public Law 106-362; 114 Stat. 1404), issued a record of decision after the preparation of an environmental impact statement or similar analysis required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(C) RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS.—In conveying the public land under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall reserve the mineral estate, except for purposes related to flood mitigation (including removal from aggregate flood events).

(D) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the public land to be conveyed under subparagraph (A) is withdrawn from—

(i) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(ii) operation of the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws.

(E) USE.—The public land conveyed under subparagraph (A) shall be used for the development of flood mitigation infrastructure for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport.

(F) REVERSION AND REENTRY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the land conveyed to the County under the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act (Public Law 106-362; 114 Stat. 1404) reverts to the United States, the land conveyed to the County under this subsection shall revert, at the option of the Secretary, to the United States.

(ii) USE OF LAND.—If the Secretary determines that the County is not using the land conveyed under this subsection for a purpose described in subparagraph (D), all right, title, and interest of the County in and to the land shall revert, at the option of the Secretary, to the United States.

(4) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (3) consists of the approximately 2,320 acres of land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and described on the Map as the “Conveyance Area”.

(5) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall prepare an official legal description and map of the parcel to be conveyed under this subsection.

(B) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct any minor error in—

(i) the map prepared under subparagraph (A); or

(ii) the legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—The map prepared under subparagraph (A) and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(j) NELLIS DUNES OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE RECREATION AREA.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) CITY.—The term “City” means the city of North Las Vegas, Nevada.

(B) CLARK COUNTY OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE RECREATION PARK.—The term “Clark County Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Park” means the approximately 960 acres of land identified on the Map as “Clark County Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Park”.

(C) COUNTY.—The term “County” means Clark County, Nevada.

(D) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Nellis Dunes OHV Recreation Area” and dated December 17, 2013.

(E) NELLIS DUNES OFF-HIGHWAY RECREATION AREA.—The term “Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Recreation Area” means the approximately 10,035 acres of land identified on the Map as “Nellis Dunes OHV Recreation Area”.

(F) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(G) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Nevada.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO COUNTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall convey to the County, subject to valid existing rights and subparagraph (B), without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Clark County Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Park.

(B) RESERVATION OF MINERAL ESTATE.—In conveying the parcels of Federal land under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall reserve the mineral estate, except for purposes related to flood mitigation (including removal from aggregate flood events).

(C) USE OF CONVEYED LAND.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The parcels of land conveyed under subparagraph (A) may be used by the County for any public purposes described in clause (ii), consistent with the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(ii) AUTHORIZED USES.—The land conveyed under subparagraph (A)—

(I) shall be used by the County—

(aa) to provide a suitable location for the establishment of a centralized off-road vehicle recreation park in the County;

(bb) to provide the public with opportunities for off-road vehicle recreation, including a location for races, competitive events, training and other commercial services that directly support a centralized off-road vehicle recreation area and County park;

(cc) to provide a designated area and facilities that would discourage unauthorized use of off-highway vehicles in areas that have been identified by the Federal Government, State government, or County government as containing environmentally sensitive land; and

(II) shall not be disposed of by the County.

(iii) REVERSION.—If the County ceases to use any parcel of land conveyed under subparagraph (A) for the purposes described in clause (ii)—

(I) title to the parcel shall revert to the Secretary, at the option of the Secretary; and

(II) the County shall be responsible for any reclamation necessary to revert the parcel to the United States.

(iv) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary of the Air Force and the County, may develop a special management plan for the land conveyed under subparagraph (A)—

(I) to enhance public safety and safe off-highway vehicle recreation use in the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area;

(II) to ensure compatible development with the mission requirements of the Nellis Air Force Base; and

(III) to avoid and mitigate known public health risks associated with off-highway vehicle use in the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area.

(D) AGREEMENT WITH NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Before the Federal land may be conveyed to the County under subparagraph (A), the Clark County Board of Commissioners and Nellis Air Force Base shall enter into an interlocal agreement for the Federal land and the Nellis Dunes Recreation Area—

(I) to enhance safe off-highway recreation use; and

(II) to ensure that development of the Federal land is consistent with the long-term mission requirements of Nellis Air Force Base.

(ii) LIMITATION.—The use of the Federal land conveyed under subparagraph (A) shall not compromise the national security mission of Nellis Air Force Base.

(E) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—With respect to the conveyance of Federal land under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) DESIGNATION OF NELLIS DUNES OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE RECREATION AREA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The approximately 10,035 acres of land identified on the Map as the “Nellis Dunes OHV Recreation Area” shall be known and designated as the “Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area”.

(B) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The Secretary may develop a special management plan for the Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Recreation Area to enhance the safe use of off-highway vehicles for recreational purposes.

(k) WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF LAND FOR NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE EXPANSION.—

(1) WITHDRAWALS.—Section 3011(b) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 886) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “comprise approximately” and inserting the following: “comprise—

“(A) approximately”;

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) approximately 710 acres of land in Clark County, Nevada, identified as ‘Addition to Nellis Air Force Base’ on the map entitled ‘Nellis Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area’ and dated June 26, 2012; and

“(C) approximately 410 acres of land in Clark County, Nevada, identified as ‘Addition to Nellis Air Force Base’ on the map entitled ‘North Las Vegas Valley Overview’ and dated November 5, 2013.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) EXISTING MINERAL MATERIALS CONTRACTS.—

“(A) APPLICABILITY.—Section 3022 shall not apply to any mineral material resource authorized for sale by the Secretary of the Interior under a valid contract for the duration of the contract.

“(B) ACCESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary of

the Air Force shall allow adequate and reasonable access to mineral material resources authorized for sale by the Secretary of the Interior under a valid contract for the duration of the contract.”.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 3022 of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-65; 113 Stat. 897) is amended by striking “section 3011(b)(5)(B)” and inserting “paragraphs (5)(B) and (6) of section 3011(b)”.

(1) **MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that military aircraft testing and training activities in the State of Nevada—

(A) are an important part of the national defense system of the United States; and

(B) are essential in order to secure an enduring and viable national defense system for the current and future generations of people of the United States.

(2) **OVERFLIGHTS.**—Nothing in this section restricts or precludes any military overflight, including—

(A) low-level overflights of military aircraft over the Federal land;

(B) flight testing and evaluation; and

(C) the designation or creation of new units of special airspace, or the use or establishment of military flight training routes, over—

(i) the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument established by subsection (a)(2)(A); or

(ii) the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area established by the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area Establishment Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 460ccc et seq.) (as modified by subsection (b)).

SEC. 3093. NATIONAL DESERT STORM AND DESERT SHIELD MEMORIAL.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ASSOCIATION.**—The term “Association” means the National Desert Storm Memorial Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Arkansas and described in section 501(c)(3) and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) **MEMORIAL.**—The term “memorial” means the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial authorized to be established under subsection (b).

(b) **MEMORIAL TO COMMEMORATE.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.**—The Association may establish the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial as a commemorative work, on Federal land in the District of Columbia to commemorate and honor those who, as a member of the Armed Forces, served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

(2) **COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.**—The establishment of the commemorative work shall be in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”).

(3) **USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PROHIBITED.**—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the memorial. The Association shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the memorial.

(4) **DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If upon payment of all expenses for the establishment of the memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Association

shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Interior for deposit in the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

(B) **ON EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—If upon expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Association shall transmit the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation for memorials, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator (as appropriate) following the process provided in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under section 8906(b)(2) or (3) of title 40, United States Code.

SEC. 3094. EXTENSION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMEMORATIVE WORK IN HONOR OF FORMER PRESIDENT JOHN ADAMS.

Section 1 of Public Law 107-62 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note), as amended by Public Law 111-169, is amended—

(1) by striking “2013” and inserting “2020” in subsection (c); and

(2) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) **DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS FOR ESTABLISHED MEMORIAL.**—

“(1) If upon payment of all expenses for the establishment of the memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Adams Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

“(2) If upon expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Adams Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation for memorials, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator (as appropriate) following the process provided for in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under section 8906(b)(2) or (3) of title 40, United States Code.”.

SEC. 3095. REFINANCING OF PACIFIC COAST GROUND-FISH FISHING CAPACITY REDUCTION LOAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Commerce, upon receipt of such assurances as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, shall issue a loan to refinance the existing debt obligation funding the fishing capacity reduction program for the West Coast ground-fish fishery implemented under section 212 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003 (title II of division B of Public Law 108-7; 117 Stat. 80).

(b) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Secretary shall issue the loan under this section in accordance with subsections (b) through (e) of section 312 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861a) and sections 53702 and 53735 of title 46, United States Code.

(c) **LOAN TERM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 53735(c)(4) of title 46, United States Code, a loan under this section shall have a maturity that expires at the end of the 45-year period beginning on the date of issuance of the loan.

(2) **EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) and if there is an outstanding balance on the loan after the period described in paragraph (1), a loan under this section shall have a maturity of 45 years or until the loan is repaid in full.

(d) **LIMITATION ON FEE AMOUNT.**—Notwithstanding section 312(d)(2)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861a(d)(2)(B)), the fee established by the Secretary with respect to a loan under this section shall not exceed 3 percent of the ex-vessel value of the harvest from each fishery for which the loan is issued.

(e) **INTEREST RATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 53702(b)(2) of title 46, United States Code, the annual rate of interest an obligor shall pay on a direct loan obligation under this section is the percent the Secretary must pay as interest to borrow from the Treasury the funds to make the loan.

(2) **SUBLOANS.**—Each subloan under the loan authorized by this section—

(A) shall receive the interest rate described in paragraph (1); and

(B) may be paid off at any time notwithstanding subsection (c)(1).

(f) **EX-VESSEL LANDING FEE.**—

(1) **CALCULATIONS AND ACCURACY.**—The Secretary shall set the ex-vessel landing fee to be collected for payment of the loan under this section—

(A) as low as possible, based on recent landings value in the fishery, to meet the requirements of loan repayment;

(B) upon issuance of the loan in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(C) on a regular interval not to exceed every 5 years beginning on the date of issuance of the loan.

(2) **DEADLINE FOR INITIAL EX-VESSEL LANDINGS FEE CALCULATION.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of issuance of the loan under this section, the Secretary shall recalculate the ex-vessel landing fee based on the most recent value of the fishery.

(g) **AUTHORIZATION.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce to carry out this section an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount of the loan authorized under this section for purposes of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.).

SEC. 3096. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.

For payments in lieu of taxes under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, which shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior—

(1) \$33,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

(2) \$37,000,000 to be available for obligation and payment beginning on October 1, 2015.

Funds available for obligation and payment under paragraph (2) shall be paid in October 2015.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Sec. 3101. National Nuclear Security Administration.

Sec. 3102. Defense environmental cleanup.

Sec. 3103. Other defense activities.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Sec. 3111. Design and use of prototypes of nuclear weapons for intelligence purposes.

- Sec. 3112. Plutonium pit production capacity.
- Sec. 3113. Life-cycle cost estimates of certain atomic energy defense capital assets.
- Sec. 3114. Expansion of requirement for independent cost estimates on life extension programs and new nuclear facilities.
- Sec. 3115. Definition of baseline and threshold for stockpile life extension project.
- Sec. 3116. Authorized personnel levels of National Nuclear Security Administration.
- Sec. 3117. Cost estimation and program evaluation by National Nuclear Security Administration.
- Sec. 3118. Cost containment for Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project.
- Sec. 3119. Production of nuclear warhead for long-range standoff weapon.
- Sec. 3120. Disposition of weapons-usable plutonium.
- Sec. 3121. Limitation on availability of funds for Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security.
- Sec. 3122. Limitation on availability of funds for certain nonproliferation activities between the United States and the Russian Federation.
- Sec. 3123. Identification of amounts required for uranium technology sustainment in budget materials for fiscal year 2016.
- Subtitle C—Plans and Reports
- Sec. 3131. Analysis and report on W88 Alt 370 program high explosives options.
- Sec. 3132. Analysis of existing facilities and sense of Congress with respect to plutonium strategy.
- Sec. 3133. Plan for verification and monitoring of proliferation of nuclear weapons and fissile material.
- Sec. 3134. Comments of Administrator for Nuclear Security and Chairman of Nuclear Weapons Council on final report of Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

- Sec. 3141. Establishment of Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health; extension of authority of Office of Ombudsman for Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program.
- Sec. 3142. Technical corrections to Atomic Energy Defense Act.
- Sec. 3143. Technical corrections to National Nuclear Security Administration Act.
- Sec. 3144. Technology Commercialization Fund.

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

SEC. 3101. NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2015 for the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF NEW PLANT PROJECTS.—From funds referred to in subsection (a) that are available for carrying

out plant projects, the Secretary of Energy may carry out new plant projects for the National Nuclear Security Administration as follows:

Project 15-D-613, Emergency Operations Center, Y-12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, \$2,000,000.

Project 15-D-612, Emergency Operations Center, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, \$2,000,000.

Project 15-D-611, Emergency Operations Center, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$4,000,000.

Project 15-D-302, TA-55 Reinvestment Project Phase III, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$16,062,000.

Project 15-D-301, High Explosive Science and Engineering Facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, \$11,800,000.

Project 15-D-904, Overpack Storage Expansion 3, Naval Reactors Facility, Idaho, \$400,000.

Project 15-D-903, Fire System Upgrade, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Schenectady, New York, \$600,000.

Project 15-D-902, Engine Room Team Trainer Facility, Kesselring Site, West Milton, New York, \$1,500,000.

Project 15-D-901, Central Office and Prototype Staff Building, Kesselring Site, West Milton, New York, \$24,000,000.

SEC. 3102. DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2015 for defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF NEW PLANT PROJECTS.—From funds referred to in subsection (a) that are available for carrying out plant projects, the Secretary of Energy may carry out, for defense environmental cleanup activities, the following new plant projects:

Project 15-D-401, KW Basin Sludge Removal Project, Hanford, Washington, \$26,290,000.

Project 15-D-402, Saltstone Disposal Unit #6, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, \$34,642,000.

Project 15-D-405, Sludge Processing Facility Build Out, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, \$4,200,000.

Project 15-D-406, Hexavalent Chromium Pump and Treatment Remedy Project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, \$28,600,000.

Project 15-D-409, Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford, Washington, \$23,000,000.

SEC. 3103. OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2015 for other defense activities in carrying out programs as specified in the funding table in section 4701.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 3111. DESIGN AND USE OF PROTOTYPES OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS FOR INTELLIGENCE PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 4509 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2660) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PROTOTYPES.—(1) Not later than the date on which the President submits to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the budget for fiscal year 2016, the directors of the national security laboratories shall jointly develop a multiyear plan to design and build prototypes of nuclear weapons to further intelligence estimates

with respect to foreign nuclear weapons activities and capabilities.

“(2) Not later than the date on which the President submits to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the budget for an even-numbered fiscal year occurring after fiscal year 2017, the directors shall jointly develop an update to the plan developed under paragraph (1).

“(3)(A) The directors shall jointly submit to the Secretary of Energy and the Director of National Intelligence the plan and each update developed under paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

“(B) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the directors submit the plan or an update under subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

“(i) shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees the plan or update, as the case may be, without change; and

“(ii) may include, with the plan or update submitted under clause (i), the views of the Secretary with respect to the plan or update.

“(4)(A) The Secretary, in coordination with the directors, shall carry out the plan developed under paragraph (1), including the updates to the plan developed under paragraph (2).

“(B) The Secretary may determine the manner in which the designing and building of prototypes of nuclear weapons is carried out under such plan.

“(C) The Secretary shall promptly submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees written notification of any changes the Secretary makes to such plan pursuant to subparagraph (B), including justifications for such changes.”

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—(1) The directors shall ensure that the plan developed and updated under subsection (a) provides increased information upon which to base intelligence assessments and emphasizes the competencies of the national security laboratories with respect to designing and building prototypes of nuclear weapons.

“(2) To carry out paragraph (1), the plan developed and updated under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(A) Design and system engineering activities of full-scale engineering prototypes (using surrogate special nuclear materials), including weaponization features as required.

“(B) Design, system engineering, and experimental testing (using surrogate special nuclear materials) of above-ground experiment test hardware.

“(C) Design and system engineering of scaled or subcomponent experimental test articles (using special nuclear materials) for conducting experiments at the Nevada National Security Site.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended by striking “subsection (a), the Administrator” and inserting “this section, the Secretary”.

SEC. 3112. PLUTONIUM PIT PRODUCTION CAPACITY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the requirement to create a modern, responsive nuclear infrastructure that includes the capability and capacity to produce, at

minimum, 50 to 80 pits per year, is a national security priority;

(2) delaying creation of a modern, responsive nuclear infrastructure until the 2030s is an unacceptable risk to the nuclear deterrent and the national security of the United States; and

(3) timelines for creating certain capacities for production of plutonium pits and other nuclear weapons components must be driven by the requirement to hedge against technical and geopolitical risk and not solely by the needs of life extension programs.

(b) PIT PRODUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XLII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4219. PLUTONIUM PIT PRODUCTION CAPACITY.”

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—Consistent with the requirements of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy shall ensure that the nuclear security enterprise—

“(1) during 2021, begins production of qualification plutonium pits;

“(2) during 2024, produces not less than 10 war reserve plutonium pits;

“(3) during 2025, produces not less than 20 war reserve plutonium pits;

“(4) during 2026, produces not less than 30 war reserve plutonium pits; and

“(5) during a pilot period of not less than 90 days during 2027 (subject to subsection (b)), demonstrates the capability to produce war reserve plutonium pits at a rate sufficient to produce 80 pits per year.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF TWO-YEAR DELAY OF DEMONSTRATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense may jointly delay, for not more than two years, the requirement under subsection (a)(5) if—

“(1) the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing—

“(A) the justification for the proposed delay;

“(B) the effects of the proposed delay on stockpile stewardship and modernization, life extension programs, future stockpile strategy, and dismantlement efforts; and

“(C) whether the proposed delay is consistent with national policy regarding creation of a responsive nuclear infrastructure; and

“(2) the Commander of the United States Strategic Command submits to the congressional defense committees a report containing the assessment of the Commander with respect to the potential risks to national security of the proposed delay in meeting—

“(A) the nuclear deterrence requirements of the United States Strategic Command; and

“(B) national requirements related to creation of a responsive nuclear infrastructure.

“(c) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Not later than March 1, 2015, and each year thereafter through 2027 (or, if the authority under subsection (b) is exercised, 2029), the Secretary of Energy shall certify to the congressional defense committees and the Secretary of Defense that the programs and budget of the Secretary of Energy will enable the nuclear security enterprise to meet the requirements under subsection (a).

“(d) PLAN.—If the Secretary of Energy does not make a certification under subsection (c) by March 1 of any year in which a certification is required under that subsection, by not later than May 1 of such year, the Chair-

man of the Nuclear Weapons Council shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to enable the nuclear security enterprise to meet the requirements under subsection (a). Such plan shall include identification of the resources of the Department of Energy that the Chairman determines should be redirected to support the plan to meet such requirements.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4218 the following new item:

“Sec. 4219. Plutonium pit production capacity.”.

SEC. 3113. LIFE-CYCLE COST ESTIMATES OF CERTAIN ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE CAPITAL ASSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title XLVII of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2741 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 4714. LIFE-CYCLE COST ESTIMATES OF CERTAIN ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE CAPITAL ASSETS.”

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall ensure that an independent life-cycle cost estimate under Department of Energy Order 413.3 (relating to program management and project management for the acquisition of capital assets) of each capital asset described in subsection (b) is conducted before the asset achieves critical decision 2 in the acquisition process.

“(b) CAPITAL ASSETS DESCRIBED.—A capital asset described in this subsection is an atomic energy defense capital asset—

“(1) the total project cost of which exceeds \$100,000,000; and

“(2) the purpose of which is to perform a limited-life, single-purpose mission.

“(c) INDEPENDENT DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘independent’, with respect to a life-cycle cost estimate of a capital asset, means that the life-cycle cost estimate is prepared by an organization independent of the project sponsor, using the same detailed technical and procurement information as the sponsor, to determine if the life-cycle cost estimate of the sponsor is accurate and reasonable.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4713 the following new item:

“Sec. 4714. Life-cycle cost estimates of certain atomic energy defense capital assets.”.

SEC. 3114. EXPANSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATES ON LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAMS AND NEW NUCLEAR FACILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 4217 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2537) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, two ems to the right;

(2) in clause (iii), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “critical decision 2” and inserting “critical decision 1 and before such facility achieves critical decision 2”;

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking “an independent cost estimate of”;

(4) by inserting before clause (i), as so redesignated, the following:

“(A) An independent cost estimate of the following:”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) An independent cost review of each nuclear weapon system undergoing life extension at the completion of phase 6.2, relating to study of feasibility and down-select.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “ESTIMATES ON” and inserting “ESTIMATES AND REVIEWS OF”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND REVIEWS” after “ESTIMATES”; and

(B) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by inserting “or review” after “estimate” each place it appears.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 4217 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 4217. Selected Acquisition Reports and independent cost estimates and reviews of life extension programs and new nuclear facilities.”.

SEC. 3115. DEFINITION OF BASELINE AND THRESHOLD FOR STOCKPILE LIFE EXTENSION PROJECT.

Section 4713 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2753) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by adding after the period the following new sentence: “In addition to the requirement under subparagraph (B), the cost and schedule baseline of a nuclear stockpile life extension project established under this subparagraph shall be the cost and schedule as described in the first Selected Acquisition Report submitted under section 4217(a) for the project.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “200” and inserting “150”.

SEC. 3116. AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS OF NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT PERSONNEL LEVELS.—Subsection (a) of section 3241A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”; and

(B) by striking “1,825” and inserting “1,690”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “2015” and inserting “2016”; and

(B) by striking “1,825” and inserting “1,690”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR EMPLOYEES.—In this section, the term ‘Office of the Administrator’, with respect to the employees of the Administration, includes employees whose funding is derived from an account of the Administration titled ‘Federal Salaries and Expenses’.”.

SEC. 3117. COST ESTIMATION AND PROGRAM EVALUATION BY NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

Section 3221(h) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2411(h)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph (1):

“(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The term ‘Administration’, with respect to any authority, duty, or responsibility provided by this section, does not include the Office of Naval Reactors.”.

SEC. 3118. COST CONTAINMENT FOR URANIUM CAPABILITIES REPLACEMENT PROJECT.

Section 3123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public

Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2177), as amended by section 3126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1063), is further amended—

- (1) by striking subsections (g) and (h);
- (2) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively; and
- (3) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(d) **COST OF PHASE I.**—

“(1) **LIMITATION.**—The total cost of Phase I under subsection (a) of the project referred to in that subsection may not exceed \$4,200,000,000.

“(2) **ADJUSTMENT.**—If the Secretary determines the total cost of Phase I under subsection (a) of the project referred to in that subsection will exceed the amount set forth in paragraph (1), the Secretary may adjust that amount if, by not later than March 1, 2015, the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a detailed justification for the adjustment, including—

“(A) the amount of the adjustment and the proposed total cost of Phase I;

“(B) a detailed justification for the adjustment, including a description of the changes to the project that would be required for Phase I to not exceed the total cost set forth in paragraph (1);

“(C) a detailed description of the actions taken to hold appropriate contractors, employees of contractors, and employees of the Federal Government accountable for the repeated failures within the project;

“(D) a description of the clear lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability for the project as the project continues, including descriptions of the roles and responsibilities for each key Federal and contractor position; and

“(E) a detailed description of the structural reforms planned or implemented by the Secretary to ensure Phase I is executed on time and on schedule.

“(3) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than March 1 of each year through 2025, the Secretary shall certify in writing to the congressional defense committees and the Secretary of Defense that Phase I under subsection (a) of the project referred to in that subsection will—

“(A) not exceed the total cost set forth in paragraph (1) (as adjusted pursuant to paragraph (2), if so adjusted); and

“(B) meet a schedule that enables, by not later than 2025—

“(i) uranium operations in building 9212 to cease; and

“(ii) uranium operations in a new facility constructed under the project to begin.

“(4) **REPORT.**—If the Secretary of Energy does not make a certification under paragraph (3) by March 1 of any year in which a certification is required under that paragraph, by not later than May 1 of that year, the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that identifies the resources of the Department of Energy that the Chairman determines should be redirected to enable the Department of Energy to meet the total cost and schedule requirements described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of that paragraph.

“(e) **TECHNOLOGY READINESS LEVELS DURING PHASE I.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Critical decision 3 in the acquisition process may not be approved for Phase I under subsection (a) of the project referred to in that subsection until all processes (or substitute processes) that require Category I and II special nuclear material protection and are actively used to support the stockpile in building 9212—

“(A) are present in the facility to be built under Phase I with a technology readiness level of 7 or higher; or

“(B) can be accommodated in other facilities of the Y-12 National Security Complex with a technology readiness level of 7 or higher.

“(2) **TECHNOLOGY READINESS LEVEL DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘technology readiness level’ has the meaning given that term in Department of Energy Guide 413.3-4A (relating to technology readiness assessment).”; and

(4) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than March 1, 2015, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the implementation of paragraphs (1) and (2), including—

“(A) a description of the program management, oversight, design, and other responsibilities for the project referred to in subsection (a) that are provided to the Commander of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command pursuant to paragraph (1); and

“(B) a description of the funding used by the Secretary under paragraph (2) to carry out paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 3119. PRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR WARHEAD FOR LONG-RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON.

(a) **FIRST PRODUCTION UNIT.**—The Secretary of Energy shall deliver a first production unit for a nuclear warhead for the long-range standoff weapon by not later than September 30, 2025.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF ONE-YEAR DELAY.**—The Secretary may delay the requirement under subsection (a) by not more than one year if the Commander of the United States Strategic Command certifies to the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council (established by section 179 of title 10, United States Code) and the congressional defense committees that the delay—

(1) is in the interest of national security; and

(2) does not negatively affect the ability of the Commander to meet nuclear deterrence and assurance requirements.

(c) **PLAN.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT.**—The Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly develop a plan to carry out subsection (a).

(2) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees the plan developed under paragraph (1).

(d) **NOTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT.**—

(1) **NOTIFICATION.**—If at any time the Secretary of Energy determines that the Secretary will not deliver a first production unit for a nuclear warhead for the long-range standoff weapon by not later than September 30, 2025 (or, if the authority under subsection (b) is exercised, September 30, 2026), the Secretary shall—

(A) notify the congressional defense committees, the Secretary of Defense, and the Commander of the United States Strategic Command of such determination; and

(B) include in the notification under subparagraph (A) an explanation for why the delivery will be delayed.

(2) **ASSESSMENT.**—If the Secretary of Energy makes a notification under paragraph (1)(A), the Commander of the United States Strategic Command shall submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment

of the delay described in the notification, including—

(A) the effects of such delay to national security and nuclear deterrence and assurance; and

(B) any mitigation options available.

(e) **BRIEFING.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on the justification for the long-range standoff weapon, including—

(1) why such weapon is needed, including any potential redundancies with existing weapons;

(2) the estimated cost of such weapon; and

(3) what warhead, existing or otherwise, is planned to be used for such weapon.

SEC. 3120. DISPOSITION OF WEAPONS-USABLE PLUTONIUM.

(a) **MIXED OXIDE FUEL FABRICATION FACILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Using funds described in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Energy shall carry out construction and project support activities relating to the MOX facility.

(2) **FUNDS DESCRIBED.**—The funds described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the National Nuclear Security Administration for the MOX facility for construction and project support activities.

(B) Funds authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2015 for the National Nuclear Security Administration for the MOX facility for construction and project support activities that are unobligated as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct a study to assess and validate the analysis of the Secretary with respect to surplus weapon-grade plutonium options.

(2) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the federally funded research and development center conducting the study under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary a report on the study, including any findings and recommendations.

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **PLAN.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the study conducted under subsection (b)(1).

(2) **ELEMENTS INCLUDED.**—The report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The report of the federally funded research and development center under subsection (b)(2), without change.

(B) Identification of the alternatives to the MOX facility considered by the Secretary, including a life-cycle cost analysis for each such alternative.

(C) Identification of the portions of such life cycle cost analyses that are common to all such alternatives.

(D) Discussion on continuation of the MOX facility, including a future funding profile or a detailed discussion of selected alternatives determined appropriate by the Secretary for such discussion.

(E) Discussion of the issues regarding implementation of such selected alternatives,

including all regulatory and public acceptance issues, including interactions with affected States.

(F) Explanation of how the alternatives to the MOX facility conform with the Plutonium Disposition Agreement, and if an alternative does not so conform, what measures must be taken to ensure conformance.

(G) Identification of steps the Secretary would have to take to close out all activities related to the MOX facility, as well as the associated cost.

(H) Any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

(d) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN OPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The study under subsection (b)(1) and the report under subsection (c)(1) shall not include any assessment or discussion of options that involve moving plutonium to a State where the Federal Government—

(A) is not meeting all legally binding deadlines and milestones required under the Tri-Party Agreement and the Consent Decree;

(B) has provided notification that any element of the Tri-Party Agreement or the Consent Decree is at risk of being breached; or

(C) is in dispute resolution with the State regarding the Tri-Party Agreement or the Consent Decree.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) The term “Tri-Party Agreement” means the comprehensive cleanup and compliance agreement between the Secretary, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Washington entered into on May 15, 1989.

(B) The term “Consent Decree” means the legal agreement between the Secretary and the State of Washington finalized in 2010.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “MOX facility” means the mixed-oxide fuel fabrication facility at the Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina.

(2) The term “Plutonium Disposition Agreement” means the Agreement Concerning the Management and Disposition of Plutonium Designated As No Longer Required for Defense Purposes and Related Cooperation, signed at Moscow and Washington August 29 and September 1, 2000, and entered into force July 13, 2011 (TIAS 11-713.1), between the United States and the Russian Federation.

(3) The term “project support activities” means activities that support the design, long-lead equipment procurement, and site preparation of the MOX facility.

SEC. 3121. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by section 3101 and available for the Office of the Administrator as specified in the funding table in section 4701, or otherwise made available for that Office for that fiscal year, not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until—

(1) the President transmits to Congress the matters required to be transmitted during 2015 under section 4205(f)(2) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2525(f)(2));

(2) the President transmits to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the matters—

(A) required to be transmitted during 2015 under section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1576), as most recently amended by section 1054 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal

Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 861); and

(B) with respect to which the Secretary of Energy is responsible;

(3) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives the report required to be submitted during 2015 under section 3122(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1710); and

(4) the Administrator for Nuclear Security submits to the congressional defense committees the detailed report on the stockpile stewardship, management, and infrastructure plan required to be submitted during 2015 under section 4203(b)(2) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2523(b)(2)).

(b) OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Office of the Administrator”, with respect to accounts of the National Nuclear Security Administration, includes any account from which funds are derived for “Federal Salaries and Expenses”.

SEC. 3122. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN NON-PROLIFERATION ACTIVITIES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should carry out nuclear nonproliferation activities in the Russian Federation only if those activities are consistent with and in support of the security interests of the United States; and

(2) in carrying out any such activities after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy should focus on only those activities that—

(A) are in support of the arms control obligations of the United States and the Russian Federation; or

(B) will reduce the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction and related materials and technology to the United States and countries in the Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian regions.

(b) COMPLETION OF MATERIAL PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING ACTIVITIES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) or specifically authorized by Congress, international material protection, control, and accounting activities in the Russian Federation shall be completed not later than fiscal year 2018.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The limitation in paragraph (1) shall not apply to international material protection, control, and accounting activities in the Russian Federation associated with the Agreement Concerning the Management and Disposition of Plutonium Designated As No Longer Required for Defense Purposes and Related Cooperation, signed at Moscow and Washington August 29 and September 1, 2000, and entered into force July 13, 2011 (TIAS 11-713.1), between the United States and the Russian Federation.

(c) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF MILES TECHNOLOGY.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2015 for the National Nuclear Security Administration may be used for the transfer of Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System technology between the United States and the Russian Federation.

SEC. 3123. IDENTIFICATION OF AMOUNTS REQUIRED FOR URANIUM TECHNOLOGY SUSTAINMENT IN BUDGET MATERIALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

The Administrator for Nuclear Security shall include, in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the budget of the President for fiscal year 2016 (as submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code), specific identification, as a budgetary line item, of the amounts required for uranium technology sustainment in support of the nuclear weapons stockpile in a manner that minimizes the use of plant-directed research and development funds for full-scale technology development past a technology readiness level of 5 (as defined in Department of Energy Guide 413.3-4A (relating to technology readiness assessment)).

Subtitle C—Plans and Reports

SEC. 3131. ANALYSIS AND REPORT ON W88 ALT 370 PROGRAM HIGH EXPLOSIVES OPTIONS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy, the Administrator for Nuclear Security, and the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council (established by section 179 of title 10, United States Code) shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the W88 Alt 370 program that contains analyses of the costs, benefits, risks, and feasibility of each of the following options:

(1) Incorporating a refresh of the conventional high explosives of the W88 warhead as part of such program.

(2) Not incorporating such a refresh as part of such program.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include, for each option described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), an analysis of the following:

(1) Near-term and lifecycle cost estimates, including costs to both the Navy and the National Nuclear Security Administration.

(2) Potential cost avoidance.

(3) Operational effects to the Navy and to the capacity and throughput of the nuclear security enterprise (as defined in section 4002 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501)) of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

(4) The expected longevity of the W88 warhead.

(5) Near-term and long-term safety and security risks and potential risk-mitigation measures.

(6) Any other matters the Secretary, the Administrator, or the Chairman considers appropriate.

SEC. 3132. ANALYSIS OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO PLUTONIUM STRATEGY.

(a) ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—The Administrator for Nuclear Security shall include, as part of the Administrator's planned analysis of alternatives to support the plutonium strategy of the National Nuclear Security Administration, an analysis of using or modifying existing facilities of the nuclear security enterprise (as defined in section 4002 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501)) to support that strategy, as part of critical decision 1 in the acquisition process for the design and construction of modular structures associated with operations of the PF-4 facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The analysis required by subsection (a) shall include an analysis of the following:

(1) The costs, benefits, cost savings, risks, and effects of using or modifying existing facilities of the nuclear security enterprise to

support the plutonium strategy of the Administration.

(2) Such other matters as the Administrator considers appropriate.

(c) **SUBMISSION.**—The Administrator shall submit the analysis required by subsection (a) to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after completing the analysis.

(d) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the requirement to create a modern, responsive plutonium infrastructure is a national security priority, and that the Administrator must fulfill the obligations of the Administrator under section 3114(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (50 U.S.C. 2535 note), as well as the commitment made by the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council (established by section 179 of title 10, United States Code) in the letter of the Chairman, dated July 25, 2014, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to carry out a modular building strategy for plutonium capabilities that—

(1) meets the requirements for maintaining the nuclear weapons stockpile over a 30-year period;

(2) meets the requirements for implementation of a responsive infrastructure, including meeting plutonium pit production requirements; and

(3) includes plans to construct two modular structures that will achieve full operating capability not later than 2027.

SEC. 3133. PLAN FOR VERIFICATION AND MONITORING OF PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND FISSILE MATERIAL.

(a) **PLAN.**—The President, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall develop an interagency plan for verification and monitoring relating to the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons, components of such weapons, and fissile material.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan developed under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An interagency plan and road map for verification and monitoring, with respect to policy, operations, and research, development, testing, and evaluation, including—

(A) identifying requirements (including funding requirements) for such verification and monitoring; and

(B) identifying and integrating roles, responsibilities, and planning for such verification and monitoring.

(2) An engagement plan for building cooperation and transparency to improve inspections and monitoring.

(3) A research and development program to—

(A) improve monitoring, detection, and in-field inspection and analysis capabilities, including persistent surveillance, remote monitoring, and rapid analysis of large data sets, including open-source data; and

(B) coordinate technical and operational requirements early in the process.

(4) Engagement of relevant departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the military departments (including the Open Source Center and the United States Atomic Energy Detection System), national laboratories, industry, and academia.

(c) **SUBMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than September 1, 2015, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the plan developed under subsection (a).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term

“appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(A) The congressional defense committees.

(B) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(C) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(D) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(E) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3134. COMMENTS OF ADMINISTRATOR FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY AND CHAIRMAN OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS COUNCIL ON FINAL REPORT OF CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORY PANEL ON THE GOVERNANCE OF THE NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council (established by section 179 of title 10, United States Code) shall each submit to the congressional defense committees the comments of the Administrator or the Chairman, as the case may be, with respect to the findings, conclusions, and recommendations included in the final report of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise under section 3166(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2209), as amended by section 3142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 1069).

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 3141. ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND WORKER HEALTH; EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF OFFICE OF OMBUDSMAN FOR ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) **ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND WORKER HEALTH.**—Subtitle E of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7385o et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 3687. ADVISORY BOARD ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND WORKER HEALTH.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—(1) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall establish and appoint an Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health (in this section referred to as the ‘Board’).

“(2) The President shall make appointments to the Board in consultation with organizations with expertise on worker health issues in order to ensure that the membership of the Board reflects a proper balance of perspectives from the scientific, medical, and claimant communities.

“(3) The President shall designate a Chair of the Board from among its members.

“(b) **DUTIES.**—The Board shall—

“(1) advise the Secretary of Labor with respect to—

“(A) the site exposure matrices of the Department of Labor;

“(B) medical guidance for claims examiners for claims under this subtitle with respect to the weighing of the medical evidence of claimants;

“(C) evidentiary requirements for claims under subtitle B related to lung disease; and

“(D) the work of industrial hygienists and staff physicians and consulting physicians of the Department and reports of such hygienists and physicians to ensure quality, objectivity, and consistency; and

“(2) coordinate exchanges of data and findings with the Advisory Board on Radiation and Worker Health established under section 3624 to the extent necessary.

“(c) **STAFF AND POWERS.**—(1) The President shall appoint a staff to facilitate the work of the Board. The staff of the Board shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed under subchapter VIII of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) The President may authorize the detail of employees of Federal agencies to the Board as necessary to enable the Board to carry out its duties under this section. The detail of such personnel may be on a nonreimbursable basis.

“(3) The Secretary may employ outside contractors and specialists to support the work of the Board.

“(d) **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.**—No member, employee, or contractor of the Board shall have any financial interest, employment, or contractual relationship (other than a routine consumer transaction) with any person that has provided, or sought to provide during the two years preceding the appointment or during the service of the member, employee, or contractor under this section, goods or services related to medical benefits under this title.

“(e) **EXPENSES.**—Members of the Board, other than full-time employees of the United States, while attending meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the President, and while serving away from their homes or regular places of business, shall be allowed travel and meal expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence (as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code) for individuals in the Federal Government serving without pay.

“(f) **SECURITY CLEARANCES.**—(1) The Secretary of Energy shall ensure that the members and staff of the Board, and the contractors performing work in support of the Board, are afforded the opportunity to apply for a security clearance for any matter for which such a clearance is appropriate.

“(2) The Secretary of Energy should, not later than 180 days after receiving a completed application for a security clearance for an individual under this subsection, make a determination of whether or not the individual is eligible for the clearance.

“(3) For fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Energy budget for that fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code) a report specifying the number of applications for security clearances under this subsection, the number of such applications granted, and the number of such applications denied.

“(g) **INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of Energy shall, in accordance with law, provide to the Board and the contractors of the Board, access to any information that the Board considers relevant to carry out its responsibilities under this section, including information such as Restricted Data (as defined in section 11 y. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(y))) and information covered by section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Privacy Act’).

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

“(2) TREATMENT AS DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—Amounts appropriated to carry out this section—

“(A) shall not be appropriated to the account established under subsection (a) of section 151 of title I of division B of Appendix D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106-554; 114 Stat. 2763A-251); and

“(B) shall not be subject to subsection (b) of that section.

“(i) SUNSET.—The Board shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this section.”.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN ANNUAL REPORT; EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Section 3686 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 7385s-15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “February 15” and inserting “July 30”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Not later than 180 days after the submission to Congress of the annual report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress in writing, and post on the public Internet website of the Department of Labor, a response to the report that—

“(A) includes a statement of whether the Secretary agrees or disagrees with the specific issues raised by the Ombudsman in the report;

“(B) if the Secretary agrees with the Ombudsman on those issues, describes the actions to be taken to correct those issues; and

“(C) if the Secretary does not agree with the Ombudsman on those issues, describes the reasons the Secretary does not agree.”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”.

SEC. 3142. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 4002(3) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501(3)) is amended by striking “Executive Order No. 12333 of December 4, 1981 (50 U.S.C. 401 note), Executive Order No. 12958 of April 17, 1995 (50 U.S.C. 435 note),” and inserting “Executive Order No. 12333 of December 4, 1981 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note), Executive Order No. 12958 of April 17, 1995 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note), Executive Order No. 13526 of December 29, 2009 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note).”.

(b) MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE.—Section 4102(b)(3) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2512(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “for improving the”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “for improving the” before “governance”; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “relating to” before “any other”.

(c) STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP.—Section 4203(d)(4)(A)(i) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2523(d)(4)(A)(i)) is amended by striking “50 U.S.C. 404a” and inserting “50 U.S.C. 3043”.

(d) REPORTS ON STOCKPILE.—Section 4205(b)(2) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2525(b)(2)) is amended by striking “commander” and inserting “Commander”.

(e) ADVICE ON RELIABILITY OF STOCKPILE.—Section 4218 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2538) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “commander” and inserting “Commander”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “representatives” and inserting “a representative”.

(f) DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PLUTONIUM.—Section 4306 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2566) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(6)(C), by striking “paragraph (A)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)”;

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “2002” and inserting “2002.”; and

(3) in subsection (d)(3), by inserting “of Energy” after “Department”.

(g) DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—Section 4406(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2586(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting an em dash after “useful for”;

(2) by realigning paragraphs (1) and (2) so as to be indented two ems from the left margin; and

(3) in paragraph (1), by striking “, and” and inserting “; and”.

(h) REPORT ON HANFORD TANK SAFETY.—Section 4441 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2621) is amended by striking subsection (d).

(i) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS IN RELATION TO F-CANYON FACILITY.—Section 4454 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2638) is amended in paragraphs (1) and (2) by inserting “of” after “assessment”.

(j) INSPECTIONS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.—Section 4501(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2651(a)) is amended by striking “nuclear weapons facility” and inserting “national security laboratory or nuclear weapons production facility”.

(k) NOTICE RELATING TO CERTAIN FAILURES.—Section 4505 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2656) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking the subsection heading and inserting the following: “SIGNIFICANT ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE LOSSES”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “50 U.S.C. 413” and inserting “50 U.S.C. 3091”.

(l) REVIEW OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS BEFORE DECLASSIFICATION AND RELEASE.—Section 4521(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2671(b)) is amended by striking “Executive Order 12958” and inserting “Executive Order No. 13526 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note)”.

(m) PROTECTION AGAINST RELEASE OF RESTRICTED DATA.—Section 4522 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2672) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Executive Order No. 12958 (50 U.S.C. 435 note)” and inserting “Executive Order No. 13526 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note)”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “Executive Order No. 12958” and inserting “Executive Order No. 13526”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(2), by striking “Executive Order No. 12958” and inserting “Executive Order No. 13526”.

(n) IDENTIFICATION OF DECLASSIFICATION ACTIVITIES IN BUDGET MATERIALS.—Section 4525(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2675(a)) is amended by striking “Executive Order No. 12958 (50 U.S.C. 435 note)” and inserting “Executive Order No. 13526 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note)”.

(o) WORKFORCE RESTRUCTURING PLAN.—Section 4604(f)(3) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2704(f)(3)) is amended by striking “Nevada and” and inserting “Nevada, and”.

(p) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Section 4709(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2749(b)) is amended by striking “authorization” and inserting “authorization”.

(q) TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP FUNDS.—Section 4710(b)(3)(B) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2750(b)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “management” and inserting “cleanup”.

(r) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PAY CERTAIN PENALTIES.—Section 4722 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2762) is amended—

(1) by inserting an em dash after “Department of Energy if”;

(2) by realigning paragraphs (1) and (2) so as to be indented two ems from the left margin; and

(3) in paragraph (1), by striking “, or” and inserting “; or”.

(s) ENHANCED PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 4806(g)(1) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2786(g)(1)) is amended by striking “the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014” and inserting “June 24, 2014”.

(t) CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 4813(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2794(a)) is amended by striking “that atomic energy defense activities research on, and development of, any dual-use critical technology” and inserting “that research on and development of dual-use critical technology carried out through atomic energy defense activities”.

(u) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BY CERTAIN FACILITIES.—Section 4832(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2812(a)) is amended by striking “for Nuclear Security”.

(v) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 4710 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 4710. Transfer of defense environmental cleanup funds.”.

SEC. 3143. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION ACT.

(a) STATUS OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL.—Section 3220(c) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2410(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting an em dash after “activities between”;

(2) by realigning paragraphs (1) and (2) so as to be indented two ems from the left margin; and

(3) in paragraph (1), by striking “, and” and inserting “; and”.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—Section 3236(a)(2)(B)(iv) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 2426(a)(2)(B)(iv)) is amended—

(1) by inserting an em dash after “program for”;

(2) by realigning subclauses (I), (II), and (III) so as to be indented six ems from the left margin;

(3) in subclause (I), by striking “year,” and inserting “year.”; and

(4) in subclause (II), by striking “, and” and inserting “; and”.

SEC. 3144. TECHNOLOGY COMMERCIALIZATION FUND.

Section 1001(e) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16391(e)) is amended by inserting “based on future planned activities and the amount of the appropriations for the fiscal year” after “fiscal year”.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sec. 3201. Authorization.

Sec. 3202. Inspector General of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

Sec. 3203. Number of employees of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

SEC. 3201. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015, \$29,150,000 for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board under chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286 et seq.).

SEC. 3202. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD.

Subsection (a) of section 322 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286k(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall

serve as the Inspector General of the Board, in accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).”

SEC. 3203. NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 313(b)(1)(A) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286b(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “150 full-time employees” and inserting “130 full-time employees”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2015.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Sec. 3401. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 3401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AMOUNT.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy \$19,950,000 for fiscal year 2015 for the purpose of carrying out activities under chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the naval petroleum reserves.

(b) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 3501. Authorization of appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal year 2015.

Sec. 3502. Floating dry docks.

Sec. 3503. Sense of Congress on the role of domestic maritime industry in national security.

Sec. 3504. United States Merchant Marine Academy Board of Visitors.

SEC. 3501. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY ASPECTS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015, to be available without fiscal year limitation if so provided in appropriations Acts, for the use of the Department of Transportation for Maritime Administration programs associated with maintaining national security aspects of the merchant marine, as follows:

(1) For expenses necessary for operations of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, \$79,790,000, of which—

(A) \$65,290,000 shall remain available until expended for Academy operations;

(B) \$14,500,000 shall remain available until expended for capital asset management at the Academy.

(2) For expenses necessary to support the State maritime academies, \$17,650,000, of which—

(A) \$2,400,000 shall remain available until expended for student incentive payments;

(B) \$3,600,000 shall remain available until expended for direct payments to such academies;

(C) \$11,300,000 shall remain available until expended for maintenance and repair of State maritime academy training vessels; and

(D) \$350,000 shall remain available until expended for improving the monitoring of graduates’ service obligation.

(3) For expenses necessary to support Maritime Administration operations and programs, \$50,960,000.

(4) For expenses necessary to dispose of vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, \$4,800,000, to remain available until expended.

(5) For expenses to maintain and preserve a United States-flag merchant marine to

serve the national security needs of the United States under chapter 531 of title 46, United States Code, \$186,000,000.

(6) For the cost (as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5)) of loan guarantees under the program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, \$73,100,000, of which \$3,100,000 shall remain available until expended for administrative expenses of the program.

SEC. 3502. FLOATING DRY DOCKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 551 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 55122. Floating dry docks

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 55102 of this title does not apply to the movement of a floating dry dock if—

“(1) the floating dry dock—

“(A) is being used to launch or raise a vessel in connection with the construction, maintenance, or repair of that vessel;

“(B) is owned and operated by—

“(i) a shipyard located in the United States that is an eligible owner specified under section 12103(b) of this title; or

“(ii) an affiliate of such a shipyard; and

“(C) was owned or contracted for purchase by such shipyard or affiliate prior to the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; and

“(2) the movement occurs within 5 nautical miles of the shipyard or affiliate that owns and operates such floating dry dock.

“(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘floating dry dock’ means equipment with wing walls and a fully submersible deck.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 551 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“§55122. Floating dry docks.”

SEC. 3503. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE ROLE OF DOMESTIC MARITIME INDUSTRY IN NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the United States domestic maritime industry carries hundreds of million of tons of cargo annually, supports nearly 500,000 jobs, and provides nearly 100 billion in annual economic output;

(2) the Nation’s military sealift capacity will benefit from one of the fastest growing segments of the domestic trades, 14 domestic trade tankers that are on order to be constructed at United States shipyards as of February 1, 2014;

(3) the domestic trades’ vessel innovations that transformed worldwide maritime commerce include the development of container-ships, self-unloading vessels, articulated tug-barges, trailer barges, chemical parcel tankers, railroad-on-barge carfloats, and river flotilla towing systems;

(4) the national security benefits of the domestic maritime industry are unquestioned as the Department of Defense depends on United States domestic trades’ fleet of container ships, roll-on/roll-off ships, and product tankers to carry military cargoes;

(5) the Department of Defense benefits from a robust commercial shipyard and ship repair industry and current growth in that sector is particularly important as Federal budget cuts may reduce the number of new constructed military vessels; and

(6) the domestic fleet is essential to national security and was a primary source of mariners needed to crew United States Government-owned sealift vessels activated from reserve status during Operations Enduring

Freedom and Iraqi Freedom in the period 2002 through 2010.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that United States coastwise trade laws promote a strong domestic trade maritime industry, which supports the national security and economic vitality of the United States and the efficient operation of the United States transportation system.

SEC. 3504. UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY BOARD OF VISITORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 51312 of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 51312. Board of Visitors

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy (referred to in this section as the ‘Board’ and the ‘Academy’, respectively) to provide independent advice and recommendations on matters relating to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall be composed of—

“(A) 2 Senators appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate in consultation with the ranking member of such Committee;

“(B) 3 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in consultation with the ranking member of such Committee;

“(C) 1 Senator appointed by the Vice President, who shall be a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(D) 2 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Minority Leader, at least 1 of whom shall be a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

“(E) 5 individuals appointed by the President; and

“(F) as ex officio members—

“(i) the Commander of the Military Sealift Command;

“(ii) the Deputy Commandant for Operations of the Coast Guard;

“(iii) the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

“(iv) the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

“(v) the chairman of the Advisory Board to the Academy established under section 51313; and

“(vi) the Member of the House of Representatives for the congressional district in which the Academy is located, as a non-voting member, unless such Member of the House of Representatives is appointed as a voting member of the Board under subparagraph (B) or (D).

“(2) PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES.—Of the individuals appointed by the President under paragraph (1)(E)—

“(A) at least 2 shall be graduates of the Academy;

“(B) at least 1 shall be a senior corporate officer from a United States maritime shipping company that participates in the Maritime Security Program, or in any Maritime Administration program providing incentives for companies to register their vessels in the United States, and this appointment shall rotate biennially among such companies; and

“(C) 1 or more may be a Senate-confirmed Presidential appointee, a member of the Senior Executive Service, or an officer of flag-

rank who from the Coast Guard, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or any of the military services that commission graduates of the Academy, other than the individuals who are members of the Board under clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(F).

“(3) TERM OF SERVICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), each member of the Board, other than an ex officio member under paragraph (1)(F), shall serve for a term of 2 years commencing at the beginning of each Congress.

“(B) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE.—Any member described in subparagraph (A) whose term on the Board has expired, other than a member appointed under any of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (1) who is no longer a Member of Congress, shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

“(4) VACANCIES.—If a member of the Board is no longer able to serve on the Board or resigns, the Designated Federal Officer selected under subsection (g)(2) shall immediately notify the person who appointed such member. Not later than 60 days after that notification, such person shall designate a replacement to serve the remainder of such member's term.

“(5) DESIGNATION AND RESPONSIBILITY OF SUBSTITUTE BOARD MEMBERS.—

“(A) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—A member of the Board under clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(F) or appointed under subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (2) may, if unable to attend or participate in an activity described in subsection (d), (e), or (f), designate another individual to serve as a substitute member of the Board, on a temporary basis, to attend or participate in such activity.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—A substitute member of the Board designated under subparagraph (A) shall be—

“(i) an individual serving in a position for which the individual was appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate;

“(ii) a member of the Senior Executive Service; or

“(iii) an officer of flag-rank who is employed by—

“(I) the Coast Guard; or

“(II) the Military Sealift Command.

“(C) PARTICIPATION.—A substitute member of the Board designated under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall be permitted by the Board to fully participate in the proceedings and activities of the Board;

“(ii) shall report to the member that designated the substitute member on the Board's activities not later than 15 days following the substitute member's participation in such activities; and

“(iii) shall be permitted by the Board to participate in the preparation of reports described in paragraph (j) related to any proceedings or activities of the Board in which such substitute member participates.

“(c) CHAIRPERSON.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On a biennial basis and subject to paragraph (2), the Board shall select from among its members a Member of the House of Representatives or a Senator to serve as the Chairperson.

“(2) ROTATION.—A Member of the House of Representatives and a Member of the Senate shall alternately be selected as the Chairperson of the Board.

“(3) TERM.—An individual may not serve as Chairperson for consecutive terms.

“(d) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet as provided for in the Charter adopted under paragraph (2)(B), including at least 1 meeting held at the Academy.

“(2) CHAIRPERSON AND CHARTER.—The Designated Federal Officer selected under subsection (g)(2) shall organize a meeting of the Board for the purposes of—

“(A) selecting a Chairperson under subsection (c); and

“(B) adopting an official Charter for the Board, which shall establish the schedule of meetings of the Board.

“(e) VISITING THE ACADEMY.—

“(1) ANNUAL VISIT.—The Board shall visit the Academy annually on a date selected by the Board, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and the Superintendent of the Academy.

“(2) OTHER VISITS.—In cooperation with the Superintendent, the Board or its members may make other visits to the Academy in connection with the duties of the Board.

“(3) ACCESS.—While visiting the Academy under this subsection, members of the Board shall have reasonable access to the grounds, facilities, midshipmen, faculty, staff, and other personnel of the Academy for the purpose of carrying out the duties of the Board.

“(f) RESPONSIBILITY.—The Board shall inquire into the state of morale and discipline, the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, and academic methods of the Academy, and other matters relating to the Academy that the Board decides to consider.

“(g) DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall—

“(1) provide support as deemed necessary by the Board for the performance of the Board's functions;

“(2) select a Designated Federal Officer to support the performance of the Board's functions; and

“(3) in cooperation with the Maritime Administrator and the Superintendent of the Academy, advise the Board of any institutional issues, consistent with applicable laws concerning the disclosure of information.

“(h) STAFF.—Each of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives may designate staff members of such Committee to serve, without additional reimbursement (except as provided in subsection (i)), as staff for the Board.

“(i) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—While serving away from his or her home or regular place of business, a member of the Board or a staff member designated under subsection (h) shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

“(j) REPORTS.—

“(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after each annual visit required under subsection (e)(1), the Board shall submit to the President a written report of its actions, views, and recommendations pertaining to the Academy.

“(2) OTHER REPORTS.—If the members of the Board visit the Academy under subsection (e)(2), the Board may—

“(A) prepare a report on such visit; and

“(B) if approved by a majority of the members of the Board, submit such report to the President not later than 60 days after the date of the approval.

“(3) ADVISORS.—The Board may call in advisers—

“(A) for consultation regarding the execution of the Board's responsibility under subsection (f); or

“(B) to assist in the preparation of a report described in paragraph (1) or (2).

“(4) SUBMISSION.—A report submitted to the President under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be concurrently submitted to—

“(A) the Secretary of Transportation;

“(B) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

“(C) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) DEADLINES.—

(1) SELECTION OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICER.—The Secretary of Transportation shall select a Designated Federal Officer under subsection (g)(2) of section 51312 of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this Act, by not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—Appointments under subsection (b)(1) of such section shall be completed by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) ORGANIZATION OF FIRST MEETING.—Such Designated Federal Officer shall organize a meeting of the Board under section (d)(2) of such section by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE OF CURRENT MEMBERS.—Each member of the Board of Visitors serving as a member of the Board on the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue to serve on the Board for the remainder of such member's term.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

SEC. 4001. AUTHORIZATION OF AMOUNTS IN FUNDING TABLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever a funding table in this division specifies a dollar amount authorized for a project, program, or activity, the obligation and expenditure of the specified dollar amount for the project, program, or activity is hereby authorized, subject to the availability of appropriations.

(b) MERIT-BASED DECISIONS.—A decision to commit, obligate, or expend funds with or to a specific entity on the basis of a dollar amount authorized pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(1) be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures; and

(2) comply with other applicable provisions of law.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO TRANSFER AND PROGRAMMING AUTHORITY.—An amount specified in the funding tables in this division may be transferred or reprogrammed under a transfer or reprogramming authority provided by another provision of this Act or by other law. The transfer or reprogramming of an amount specified in such funding tables shall not count against a ceiling on such transfers or reprogrammings under section 1001 or section 1522 of this Act or any other provision of law, unless such transfer or reprogramming would move funds between appropriation accounts.

(d) APPLICABILITY TO CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—This section applies to any classified annex that accompanies this Act.

(e) ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.—No oral or written communication concerning any amount specified in the funding tables in this division shall supersede the requirements of this section.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT (In Thousands of Dollars)			
Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY			
FIXED WING			
002	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	13,617	13,617
003	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	185,090	136,290
	Program decrease		[-48,800]
004	MQ-1 UAV	190,581	239,581
	Extended range modifications Per Army UFR		[49,000]
005	RQ-11 (RAVEN)	3,964	3,964
ROTARY			
006	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	416,617	416,617
007	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	494,009	494,009
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	157,338	157,338
012	UH-60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	1,237,001	1,340,027
	ARNG Modernization-6 additional UH-60M aircraft		[103,026]
013	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	132,138	132,138
014	CH-47 HELICOPTER	892,504	892,504
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	102,361	102,361
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT			
016	MQ-1 PAYLOAD (MIP)	26,913	26,913
018	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)	14,182	14,182
019	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)	131,892	131,892
020	AH-64 MODS	181,869	181,869
021	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	32,092	32,092
022	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	15,029	15,029
023	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	76,515	76,515
025	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN	114,182	114,182
026	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE	115,795	115,795
027	GATM ROLLUP	54,277	54,277
028	RQ-7 UAV MODS	125,380	125,380
GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS			
029	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	66,450	98,850
	Army requested realignment		[32,400]
030	SURVIVABILITY CM		7,800
	Army requested realignment		[7,800]
031	CMWS	107,364	60,364
	Army requested reduction		[-47,000]
OTHER SUPPORT			
032	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,847	6,847
033	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	29,231	29,231
034	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	48,081	48,081
035	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	127,232	127,232
036	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	1,203	1,203
037	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	2,931	2,931
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	5,102,685	5,199,111
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY			
SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM			
002	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD)	110,300	110,300
003	MSE MISSILE	384,605	384,605
AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM			
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	4,452	4,452
ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS			
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	77,668	77,668
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	50,368	50,368
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	19,984	19,984
008	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	127,145	127,145
009	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	21,274	21,274
MODIFICATIONS			
012	PATRIOT MODS	131,838	131,838
013	STINGER MODS	1,355	1,355
014	AVENGER MODS	5,611	5,611
015	ITAS/TOW MODS	19,676	19,676
016	MLRS MODS	10,380	10,380
017	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS	6,008	6,008
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
018	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	36,930	36,930
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES			
019	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	3,657	3,657
020	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES)	1,522	1,522
021	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	4,710	4,710
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,017,483	1,017,483
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY			
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES			
001	STRYKER VEHICLE	385,110	435,110

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	Unfunded requirement—fourth DVH brigade set		[50,000]
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
002	STRYKER (MOD)	39,683	39,683
003	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	26,759	26,759
004	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)	107,506	144,506
	Army unfunded priority and industrial base risk mitigation		[37,000]
005	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	45,411	45,411
006	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	247,400	247,400
007	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	50,451	126,364
	Army unfunded priority and industrial base risk mitigation		[75,913]
008	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)	2,473	2,473
009	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	36,583	36,583
010	M88 FOV MODS	1,975	1,975
011	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	49,462	34,362
	Early to need		[–15,100]
012	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	237,023	237,023
013	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		120,000
	Industrial Base initiative		[120,000]
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
014	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	6,478	6,478
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		
016	MORTAR SYSTEMS	5,012	5,012
017	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	28,390	28,390
018	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM	148	148
019	CARBINE	29,366	20,616
	Army requested realignment		[–8,750]
021	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	8,409	8,409
022	HANDGUN	3,957	3,957
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH		
024	M777 MODS	18,166	18,166
025	M4 CARBINE MODS	3,446	6,446
	Army requested realignment		[3,000]
026	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS	25,296	25,296
027	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS	5,546	5,546
028	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS	4,635	2,635
	Army requested realignment		[–2,000]
029	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS	4,079	4,079
030	M119 MODIFICATIONS	72,718	72,718
031	M16 RIFLE MODS	1,952	0
	At Army request transfer to WTCV 31 and RDTEA 70 and 86		[–1,952]
032	MORTAR MODIFICATION	8,903	8,903
033	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	2,089	2,089
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
034	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	2,005	2,005
035	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	8,911	8,911
036	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	414	414
037	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	1,682	1,682
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,471,438	1,729,549
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION		
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	34,943	34,943
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	12,418	12,418
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES	9,655	9,655
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	29,304	29,304
006	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	8,181	8,181
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	52,667	52,667
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	40,904	40,904
	MORTAR AMMUNITION		
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	41,742	41,742
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	42,433	42,433
011	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	39,365	39,365
	TANK AMMUNITION		
012	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES	101,900	101,900
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION		
013	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES	37,455	37,455
014	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	47,023	47,023
015	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	35,672	35,672
016	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	94,010	74,010
	Precision Guided Kits Schedule Delay		[–20,000]
	ROCKETS		
019	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	945	945
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	27,286	27,286
	OTHER AMMUNITION		
021	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	22,899	22,899
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	22,751	22,751
023	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	7,082	7,082
024	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	11,638	11,638
	MISCELLANEOUS		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
025	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	3,594	3,594
027	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	5,430	5,430
028	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (AMMO)	8,337	8,337
029	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	14,906	14,906
030	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	14,349	14,349
031	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	111	111
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		
032	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	148,092	148,092
033	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION	113,881	113,881
034	ARMS INITIATIVE	2,504	2,504
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,031,477	1,011,477
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	7,987	7,987
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	160	160
004	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	164,615	164,615
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)		50,000
	Additional FMTVs – Industrial Base initiative		[50,000]
006	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP	8,415	8,415
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	28,425	78,425
	Additional HEMTT ESP Vehicles-Industrial Base initiative		[50,000]
008	PLS ESP	89,263	89,263
013	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	38,226	38,226
014	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	91,173	83,173
	Early to need		[-8,000]
015	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS	14,731	14,731
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES		
016	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	175	175
017	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	1,338	1,338
018	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER	11,101	11,101
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS		
019	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	763,087	638,087
	Point of Presence (POP) and Soldier Network Extension (SNE) delay		[-125,000]
020	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	21,157	21,157
021	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY	7,915	7,915
022	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	5,440	5,440
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
023	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	118,085	118,085
024	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS	13,999	13,999
025	SHF TERM	6,494	6,494
026	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	1,635	1,635
027	SMART-T (SPACE)	13,554	13,554
028	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS	18,899	18,899
029	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	2,849	2,849
030	ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC)	100,000	100,000
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS		
033	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	175,711	125,711
	Unobligated balances		[-50,000]
034	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	9,692	4,692
	Unobligated balances		[-5,000]
035	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)	17,136	17,136
037	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	22,099	22,099
038	TRACTOR DESK	3,724	3,724
039	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	969	969
040	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS	294	294
041	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM	24,354	24,354
042	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE	17,445	17,445
043	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY	1,028	1,028
044	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE	22,614	22,614
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM		
046	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	1,519	1,519
047	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	12,478	12,478
	INFORMATION SECURITY		
050	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	2,113	2,113
051	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	69,646	69,646
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS		
052	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	28,913	28,913
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS		
053	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	97,091	97,091
054	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	246	246
055	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	5,362	5,362
056	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	79,965	79,965
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)		
060	JTT/CIBS-M	870	870
061	PROPHET GROUND	55,896	55,896
063	DCGS-A (MIP)	128,207	128,207
064	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	5,286	5,286
065	TROJAN (MIP)	12,614	12,614

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
066	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	3,901	3,901
067	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	7,392	7,392
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)		
068	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	24,828	24,828
070	AIR VIGILANCE (AV)	7,000	7,000
072	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	1,285	1,285
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)		
075	SENTINEL MODS	44,305	44,305
076	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	160,901	160,901
078	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	18,520	18,520
080	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS	68,296	68,296
081	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS)	49,205	34,205
	Early to need		[-15,000]
082	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	4,896	4,896
083	PROFILER	3,115	3,115
084	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)	4,186	4,186
085	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	97,892	87,892
	Schedule delay		[-10,000]
086	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS)	27,450	27,450
087	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	14,085	14,085
088	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	29,040	29,040
089	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	209,050	159,050
	Excessive LRIP/concurrency costs		[-50,000]
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS		
092	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	13,823	13,823
095	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	27,374	27,374
097	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	2,508	2,508
099	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE	21,524	21,524
100	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	95,455	95,455
101	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)	118,600	118,600
102	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP)	32,970	32,970
104	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	10,113	10,113
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION		
105	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	9,015	9,015
106	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	155,223	152,282
	Reduce IT procurement		[-2,941]
107	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM	16,581	16,581
108	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)	65,252	65,252
110	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	17,631	17,631
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)		
112	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	5,437	5,437
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT		
113	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	426	426
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
114A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,707	3,707
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT		
115	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	937	937
116	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	1,930	1,930
117	CBRN DEFENSE	17,468	17,468
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT		
119	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	5,442	5,442
120	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP	11,013	11,013
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT		
121	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)	37,649	33,249
	Early to need		[-4,400]
122	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS)	18,545	18,545
123	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)	4,701	4,701
124	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION	6,346	6,346
125	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	15,856	15,856
126	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	4,485	4,485
127	< \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	4,938	4,938
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
128	HEATERS AND ECU'S	9,235	9,235
130	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	1,677	1,677
131	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	16,728	16,728
132	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	84,761	84,761
134	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	15,179	15,179
135	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	28,194	28,194
137	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	41,967	41,967
138	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (ENG SPT)	20,090	20,090
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT		
139	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	1,435	1,435
140	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	40,692	40,692
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		
141	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	46,957	46,957
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT		
142	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	23,758	23,758
143	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ)	2,789	2,789
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
144	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)	5,827	5,827
145	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	14,926	14,926
147	COMPACTOR	4,348	4,348
148	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	4,938	4,938
149	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	34,071	34,071
150	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	4,938	4,938
151	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	667	667
153	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP	14,924	14,924
154	CONST EQUIP ESP	15,933	15,933
155	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	6,749	6,749
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT		
156	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP	10,509	10,509
157	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	2,166	2,166
	GENERATORS		
158	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	115,190	105,190
	Cost savings from new contract		[-10,000]
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
160	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	14,327	14,327
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
161	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	65,062	65,062
162	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	101,295	101,295
163	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	13,406	13,406
164	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	14,440	14,440
165	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING	10,165	10,165
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)		
166	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	5,726	5,726
167	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	37,482	37,482
168	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	16,061	16,061
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
170	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,380	2,380
171	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	30,686	30,686
172	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT	1,008	1,008
173	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	98,559	83,559
	Early to need—watercraft C4ISR		[-15,000]
174	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	1,697	1,697
175	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	25,394	25,394
176	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	12,975	12,975
	OPA2		
180	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	50,032	50,032
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	4,893,634	4,698,293
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE		
004	OPERATIONS	115,058	0
	Transfer of JIEDDO to Overseas Contingency Operations		[-65,463]
	Unjustified request		[-49,595]
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND	115,058	0
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT		
001	EA-18G	43,547	493,547
	Additional EA-18G aircraft		[450,000]
005	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	610,652	610,652
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	29,400	29,400
007	JSF STOVL	1,200,410	1,200,410
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	143,885	143,885
009	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	1,487,000	1,487,000
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	45,920	45,920
011	H-1 UPGRADES (UH-1Y/AH-1Z)	778,757	778,757
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	80,926	75,626
	Advance procurement efficiencies		[-5,300]
013	MH-60S (MYP)	210,209	210,209
015	MH-60R (MYP)	933,882	878,882
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[-53,400]
	Shutdown funding ahead of need		[-1,600]
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	106,686	106,686
017	P-8A POSEIDON	2,003,327	1,985,927
	Anticipated unit price savings		[-11,300]
	Unjustified growth—production engineering support		[-6,100]
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	48,457	48,457
019	E-2D ADV HAWKEYE	819,870	819,870
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	225,765	225,765
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
023	KC-130J	92,290	92,290
026	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	37,445	37,445
027	MQ-8 UAV	40,663	40,663
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
029	EA-6 SERIES	10,993	10,993
030	AEA SYSTEMS	34,768	34,768

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
031	AV-8 SERIES	65,472	65,472
032	ADVERSARY	8,418	8,418
033	F-18 SERIES	679,177	679,177
034	H-46 SERIES	480	480
036	H-53 SERIES	38,159	38,159
037	SH-60 SERIES	108,850	108,850
038	H-1 SERIES	45,033	45,033
039	EP-3 SERIES	32,890	32,890
040	P-3 SERIES	2,823	2,823
041	E-2 SERIES	21,208	21,208
042	TRAINER A/C SERIES	12,608	12,608
044	C-130 SERIES	40,378	40,378
045	FEWSG	640	640
046	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	4,635	4,635
047	E-6 SERIES	212,876	212,876
048	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	71,328	71,328
049	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	21,317	21,317
050	T-45 SERIES	90,052	90,052
051	POWER PLANT CHANGES	19,094	19,094
052	JPATS SERIES	1,085	1,085
054	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	155,644	155,644
055	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	157,531	157,531
056	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM	1,958	1,958
057	ID SYSTEMS	38,880	38,880
058	P-8 SERIES	29,797	29,797
059	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION	14,770	14,770
060	MQ-8 SERIES	8,741	8,741
061	RQ-7 SERIES	2,542	2,542
062	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	135,584	135,584
063	F-35 STOVL SERIES	285,968	285,968
064	F-35 CV SERIES	20,502	20,502
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
065	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,229,651	1,107,506
	Reduce rate of growth in replenishment spares		[-122,145]
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES		
066	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	418,355	398,488
	Unobligated balances		[-19,867]
067	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	23,843	23,843
068	WAR CONSUMABLES	15,939	15,939
069	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	5,630	5,630
070	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	65,839	65,839
071	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	1,768	1,768
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	13,074,317	13,304,605
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
001	TRIDENT II MODS	1,190,455	1,185,455
	Guidance hardware cost growth		[-5,000]
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	5,671	5,671
	STRATEGIC MISSILES		
003	TOMAHAWK	194,258	276,258
	Minimum sustaining rate increase		[82,000]
	TACTICAL MISSILES		
004	AMRAAM	32,165	22,165
	Program decrease		[-10,000]
005	SIDEWINDER	73,928	71,948
	Block II AUR cost growth		[-1,980]
006	JSOW	130,759	128,200
	AUR cost growth		[-2,559]
007	STANDARD MISSILE	445,836	444,836
	Installation, checkout, and training growth		[-1,000]
008	RAM	80,792	80,792
011	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	1,810	1,810
012	AERIAL TARGETS	48,046	48,046
013	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	3,295	3,295
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		
014	ESSM	119,434	119,434
015	HARM MODS	111,739	106,489
	AUR kit cost growth		[-3,250]
	Tooling and test equipment growth		[-2,000]
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		
016	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	2,531	2,531
017	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	208,700	206,700
	Excess to need		[-2,000]
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
018	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	73,211	73,211
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP		
019	SSTD	6,562	6,562

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
020	MK-48 TORPEDO	14,153	14,153
021	ASW TARGETS	2,515	2,515
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP		
022	MK-54 TORPEDO MODS	98,928	98,928
023	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	46,893	46,893
024	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	6,966	6,966
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
025	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	52,670	52,670
026	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	3,795	3,795
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		
027	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	3,692	3,692
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS		
028	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	13,240	13,240
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS		
029	CIWS MODS	75,108	75,108
030	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	18,948	18,948
031	GUN MOUNT MODS	62,651	62,651
033	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	15,006	15,006
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
035	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	74,188	74,188
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	3,217,945	3,272,156
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		
	NAVY AMMUNITION		
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	107,069	107,069
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	70,396	70,396
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	20,284	20,284
004	PRACTICE BOMBS	26,701	26,701
005	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	53,866	53,866
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	59,294	59,294
007	JATOS	2,766	2,766
008	LRLAP 6" LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE	113,092	113,092
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	35,702	35,702
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	36,475	26,837
	MK-296 57MM contract delay		[-9,638]
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	43,906	43,906
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	51,535	51,535
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	11,652	11,652
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	4,473	4,473
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	31,708	31,708
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	692	692
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES	13,630	13,630
018	60MM, ALL TYPES	2,261	2,261
019	81MM, ALL TYPES	1,496	1,496
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	14,855	14,855
022	GRENADERS, ALL TYPES	4,000	4,000
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	16,853	16,853
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	14,772	14,772
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	9,972	9,972
027	NON LETHALS	998	998
028	AMMO MODERNIZATION	12,319	12,319
029	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	11,178	11,178
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	771,945	762,307
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		
	OTHER WARSHIPS		
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1,300,000	1,300,000
002	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	3,553,254	3,553,254
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	2,330,325	2,330,325
004	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		483,600
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[483,600]
006	DDG 1000	419,532	419,532
007	DDG-51	2,671,415	2,671,415
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	134,039	134,039
009	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	1,427,049	1,427,049
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		
010	LPD-17	12,565	812,565
	Incremental funding for LPD-28		[800,000]
014	LHA REPLACEMENT ADVANCE PROCURMENT (CY)	29,093	29,093
015	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL	4,590	0
	Program closeout ahead of need		[-4,590]
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST		
016	MOORED TRAINING SHIP	737,268	737,268
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	64,388	64,388
018	OUTFITTING	546,104	521,104
	Early to need		[-25,000]
019	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR	123,233	123,233
020	LCAC SLEP	40,485	40,485

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
021	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	1,007,285	1,007,285
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	14,400,625	15,654,635
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		
001	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	7,822	7,822
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	2,155	2,155
003	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)	22,704	19,278
	Excess installation funding		[-1,926]
	Modification funding ahead of need		[-1,500]
	GENERATORS		
004	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E	29,120	26,664
	Surface Combatant HM&E		[-2,456]
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		
005	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	45,431	44,894
	AN/WSN-9 procurement ahead of need		[-537]
	PERISCOPES		
006	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	60,970	57,221
	Excess installation funding		[-649]
	Interim contractor support carryover		[-3,100]
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		
007	DDG MOD	338,569	338,569
008	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	15,486	15,486
009	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	2,219	2,219
010	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE	17,928	17,928
011	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM	22,025	22,025
012	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	12,607	12,607
013	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	16,492	16,492
014	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	74,129	74,129
015	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	36,206	36,206
016	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	37,352	37,352
017	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	49,095	44,562
	HM&E mechanical modifications ahead of need		[-2,778]
	SWAN CANES procurement ahead of need		[-1,755]
018	ELECTRONIC DRY AIR	2,996	2,996
019	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	11,558	11,558
020	DSSP EQUIPMENT	5,518	5,518
022	LCAC	7,158	7,158
023	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	58,783	53,783
	MK-18 UUV retrofit kits and ancillary equipment contract delay		[-5,000]
024	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	68,748	68,748
025	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	2,937	2,937
026	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	8,385	8,385
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT		
027	REACTOR POWER UNITS		298,200
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[298,200]
028	REACTOR COMPONENTS	288,822	288,822
	OCEAN ENGINEERING		
029	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	10,572	10,572
	SMALL BOATS		
030	STANDARD BOATS	129,784	126,445
	7M RIB contract delay		[-772]
	Large force protection boat contract delay		[-791]
	Medium workboat contract delay		[-1,776]
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
031	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	17,152	17,152
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		
032	OPERATING FORCES IPE	39,409	39,409
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT		
033	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	118,129	118,129
034	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT	37,413	33,817
	MPCE cost growth		[-1,026]
	SUW support and shipping container cost growth		[-2,570]
035	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES	15,270	15,270
036	LCS ASW MISSION MODULES	2,729	2,729
037	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES	44,208	39,697
	Gun module cost growth		[-3,080]
	Maritime security module cost growth		[-1,431]
038	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	42,276	42,276
	SHIP SONARS		
040	SPQ-9B RADAR	28,007	28,007
041	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	79,802	79,802
042	SSN ACOUSTICS	165,655	165,655
043	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	9,487	9,487
044	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	11,621	11,621
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
046	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	24,221	24,221
047	SSTD	12,051	12,051
048	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	170,831	170,831

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
049	SURTASS	9,619	9,619
050	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNSAISANCE FORCE	14,390	14,390
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT		
051	AN/SLQ-32	214,582	214,582
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT		
052	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	124,862	124,862
053	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	164	164
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		
054	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	45,362	45,362
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
055	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	33,939	33,939
056	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	324	324
057	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	18,192	18,192
058	ATDLS	16,768	16,768
059	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	5,219	5,219
060	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	42,108	41,499
	AN/SQQ-32 integration cost growth		[-609]
062	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	15,232	15,232
063	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	4,524	4,524
064	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	6,382	6,382
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
065	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	46,122	44,058
	BFTT installation kit cost growth		[-2,064]
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
066	MATCALS	16,999	16,999
067	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,366	9,366
068	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	21,357	21,357
069	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	26,639	26,639
070	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	9,214	9,214
071	LANDING SYSTEMS	13,902	13,902
072	ID SYSTEMS	34,901	34,901
073	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	13,950	13,950
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
074	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL	1,205	1,205
075	MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	3,447	3,447
076	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	16,766	16,766
077	DCGS-N	23,649	23,649
078	CANES	357,589	357,589
079	RADIAC	8,343	8,343
080	CANES-INTELL	65,015	65,015
081	GPETE	6,284	6,284
082	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	4,016	4,016
083	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	4,113	4,113
084	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	45,053	45,053
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS		
085	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	14,410	14,410
086	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	20,830	20,830
088	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M	14,145	14,145
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS		
089	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	11,057	11,057
090	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	67,852	67,852
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
091	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	13,218	13,218
092	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	272,076	272,076
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		
093	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	4,369	4,369
094	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	1,402	1,402
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		
095	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	110,766	110,766
096	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM	979	979
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		
097	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	11,502	11,502
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT		
098	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	2,967	2,967
	SONOBUOYS		
100	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES	182,946	182,946
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
101	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	47,944	47,944
103	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	76,683	76,683
106	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	12,575	12,875
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[300]
107	DCRS/DPL	1,415	1,415
109	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	23,152	23,152
114	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	52,555	52,555
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT		
115	SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT	5,572	5,572
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		
118	SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	165,769	165,769
123	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	61,462	61,462

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
126	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	229,832	229,832
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
127	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	66,020	60,804
	688 T104 installation cost growth		[-5,216]
128	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,559	7,559
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
132	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	20,619	20,619
133	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	11,251	11,251
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE		
137	TRAINING DEVICE MODS	84,080	84,080
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
138	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	2,282	2,282
139	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	547	547
140	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	8,949	8,949
141	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,621	14,621
142	TACTICAL VEHICLES	957	957
143	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	8,187	8,187
144	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	2,942	2,942
145	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION	17,592	16,143
	Emergency response truck cost growth		[-1,449]
146	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	1,177	1,177
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
147	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	10,937	10,937
148	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,374	10,374
149	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	5,668	5,668
150	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	90,921	90,921
	TRAINING DEVICES		
151	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	22,046	22,046
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
152	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	24,208	24,208
153	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	874	874
154	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,634	2,634
156	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,573	3,573
157	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,997	3,997
158	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	9,638	9,638
159	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	21,001	21,001
160	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	94,957	94,957
161	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	87,214	87,214
	OTHER		
164	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE	116,165	116,165
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
164A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	10,847	10,847
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
165	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	325,084	325,084
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	5,975,828	6,233,843
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
001	AAV7A1 PIP	16,756	16,756
002	LAV PIP	77,736	77,736
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS		
003	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	5,742	642
	Per Marine Corps excess to need		[-5,100]
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	4,532	4,532
005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	19,474	19,474
006	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION	7,250	7,250
	OTHER SUPPORT		
007	MODIFICATION KITS	21,909	21,909
008	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	3,208	3,208
	GUIDED MISSILES		
009	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE	31,439	31,439
010	JAVELIN	343	343
011	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW	4,995	4,995
012	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)	1,589	1,589
	OTHER SUPPORT		
013	MODIFICATION KITS	5,134	5,134
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS		
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	9,178	9,178
015	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C	12,272	12,272
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	30,591	30,591
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)		
017	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,385	2,385
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)		
019	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	4,205	4,205
020	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	8,002	8,002
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
021	RADAR SYSTEMS	19,595	19,375

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	Sustainment—unjustified growth		[-220]
022	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	89,230	89,230
023	RQ-21 UAS	70,565	70,565
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
024	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	11,860	11,860
025	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	44,340	42,550
	Unjustified program growth		[-1,790]
028	RQ-11 UAV	2,737	2,737
030	DCGS-MC	20,620	20,620
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
031	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	9,798	9,798
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)		
032	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN)	2,073	2,073
033	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	33,570	33,570
034	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	38,186	38,186
035	RADIO SYSTEMS	64,494	64,494
036	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	72,956	64,325
	Unjustified program growth		[-8,631]
037	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	43,317	43,317
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
037A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,498	2,498
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES		
038	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	332	332
039	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	11,035	11,035
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
040	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	57,255	37,255
	Early to need		[-20,000]
041	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	938	938
044	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	7,500	7,500
045	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS	10,179	10,179
	OTHER SUPPORT		
046	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	11,023	11,023
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		
047	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	994	994
048	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	1,256	1,256
049	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	3,750	3,750
050	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	8,985	8,985
051	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,418	4,418
052	EOD SYSTEMS	6,528	6,528
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
053	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	26,510	26,510
054	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)	1,910	1,910
055	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	8,807	8,807
056	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	128	128
	GENERAL PROPERTY		
058	TRAINING DEVICES	3,412	3,412
059	CONTAINER FAMILY	1,662	1,662
060	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	3,669	3,669
	OTHER SUPPORT		
062	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	4,272	4,272
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	16,210	16,210
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	983,352	947,611
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	TACTICAL FORCES		
001	F-35	3,553,046	3,553,046
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	291,880	291,880
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT		
003	KC-46A TANKER	1,582,685	1,582,685
	OTHER AIRLIFT		
004	C-130J	482,396	482,396
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	140,000	140,000
006	HC-130J	332,024	332,024
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	50,000	50,000
008	MC-130J	190,971	190,971
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	80,000	80,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT		
012	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	2,562	2,562
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
013	TARGET DRONES	98,576	98,576
016	RQ-4	54,475	44,475
	MPRTIP Sensor Trainer reduction		[-10,000]
017	AC-130J	1	1
018	MQ-9	240,218	338,218
	Program increase		[120,000]
	Use available prior year funds for FY 15 requirements		[-22,000]
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT		
020	B-2A	23,865	23,865

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
021	B-1B	140,252	140,252
022	B-52	180,148	180,148
023	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES	13,159	13,159
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT		
025	F-15	387,314	387,314
026	F-16	12,336	12,336
027	F-22A	180,207	180,207
028	F-35 MODIFICATIONS	187,646	187,646
029	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	28,500	28,500
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		
030	C-5	14,731	14,731
031	C-5M	331,466	281,466
	Program execution delay		[-50,000]
033	C-17A	127,494	127,494
034	C-21	264	264
035	C-32A	8,767	8,767
036	C-37A	18,457	18,457
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT		
038	GLIDER MODS	132	132
039	T-6	14,486	14,486
040	T-1	7,650	7,650
041	T-38	34,845	34,845
044	KC-10A (ATCA)	34,313	34,313
045	C-12	1,960	1,960
048	VC-25A MOD	1,072	1,072
049	C-40	7,292	7,292
050	C-130	35,869	124,269
	C-130 8-Bladed Propeller upgrade		[30,000]
	C-130 AMP		[35,800]
	T-56 3.5 Engine Mod		[22,600]
051	C-130J MODS	7,919	7,919
052	C-135	63,568	63,568
053	COMPASS CALL MODS	57,828	57,828
054	RC-135	152,746	152,746
055	E-3	16,491	16,491
056	E-4	22,341	22,341
058	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	160,284	160,284
059	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	32,026	32,026
060	H-1	8,237	8,237
061	H-60	60,110	60,110
062	RQ-4 MODS	21,354	21,354
063	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS	1,902	1,902
064	OTHER AIRCRAFT	32,106	32,106
065	MQ-1 MODS	4,755	4,755
066	MQ-9 MODS	155,445	155,445
069	CV-22 MODS	74,874	74,874
069A	EJECTION SEAT RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		2,500
	Initial aircraft installation		[2,500]
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
070	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	466,562	466,562
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
071	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	22,470	22,470
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		
074	B-2A	44,793	44,793
075	B-52	5,249	5,249
077	C-17A	20,110	20,110
078	CV-22 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	16,931	16,931
080	C-135	4,414	4,414
081	F-15	1,122	1,122
082	F-16	10,994	10,994
083	F-22A	5,929	5,929
084	OTHER AIRCRAFT	27	27
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		
085	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS	21,363	21,363
	WAR CONSUMABLES		
086	WAR CONSUMABLES	82,906	82,906
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		
087	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	1,007,276	1,007,276
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
087A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	69,380	69,380
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	11,542,571	11,671,471
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC		
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	80,187	80,187
	TACTICAL		
003	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE	337,438	337,438
004	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	132,995	132,995
005	AMRAAM	329,600	329,600

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	33,878	33,878
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	70,578	50,578
	Delay in Milestone C and contract award		[-20,000]
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		
008	INDUSTRI'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION	749	749
	CLASS IV		
009	MM III MODIFICATIONS	28,477	28,477
010	AGM-65D MAVERICK	276	276
011	AGM-88A HARM	297	297
012	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	16,083	16,083
013	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	6,924	6,924
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
014	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	87,366	87,366
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
015	ADVANCED EHF	298,890	298,890
016	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)	38,971	36,071
	Unjustified growth		[-2,900]
017	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	235,397	235,397
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	57,000	57,000
019	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	16,201	16,201
020	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	52,090	52,090
021	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	87,000	87,000
022	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH (INFRASST.)	750,143	715,143
	Excess growth		[-35,000]
023	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	630,903	630,903
024	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	450,884	450,884
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		
028	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	60,179	60,179
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
028A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	888,000	888,000
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	4,690,506	4,632,606
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
	ROCKETS		
001	ROCKETS	4,696	4,696
	CARTRIDGES		
002	CARTRIDGES	133,271	133,271
	BOMBS		
003	PRACTICE BOMBS	31,998	31,998
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	148,614	148,614
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	101,400	101,400
	OTHER ITEMS		
006	CAD/PAD	29,989	29,989
007	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)	6,925	6,925
008	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	494	494
009	MODIFICATIONS	1,610	1,610
010	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	4,237	4,237
	FLARES		
011	FLARES	86,101	86,101
	FUZES		
012	FUZES	103,417	103,417
	SMALL ARMS		
013	SMALL ARMS	24,648	24,648
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	677,400	677,400
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	6,528	6,528
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES		
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	7,639	7,639
003	CAP VEHICLES	961	961
004	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	11,027	11,027
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES		
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	4,447	4,447
006	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	693	693
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES	10,152	10,152
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
008	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	15,108	15,108
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT		
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP	10,212	10,212
010	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	57,049	57,049
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)		
011	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	106,182	104,093
	VACM modernization devices unit cost growth		[-2,089]
012	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	1,363	1,363
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS		
013	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	2,832	2,832

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
014	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT	32,329	32,329
016	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	15,649	15,649
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS		
017	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS	42,200	30,000
	D-ILS program restructure funds early to need		[-12,200]
018	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	6,333	6,333
019	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED	2,708	2,708
020	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS	50,033	50,033
021	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	16,348	16,348
022	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	139,984	139,984
023	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	20,101	20,101
026	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN)	9,060	9,060
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
027	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	39,100	39,100
028	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	19,010	19,010
029	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	11,462	11,462
030	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	37,426	37,426
031	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	26,634	26,634
032	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N	1,289	1,289
033	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	11,508	11,508
034	GCSS-AF FOS	3,670	3,670
035	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM	15,298	15,298
036	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	9,565	9,565
037	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	25,772	25,772
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		
038	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	81,286	112,586
	Air Force requested program transfer from AFNET		[31,300]
039	AFNET	122,228	90,928
	Air Force requested program transfer to BITI		[-31,300]
041	USCENTCOM	16,342	16,342
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
042	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	60,230	60,230
043	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	26,100	26,100
044	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	2,075	2,075
045	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	4,656	4,656
046	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	54,630	54,630
047	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	69,713	69,713
048	MILSATCOM SPACE	41,355	41,355
049	SPACE MODS SPACE	31,722	31,722
050	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	61,603	61,603
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
051	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	50,335	50,335
053	RADIO EQUIPMENT	14,846	14,846
054	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	3,635	3,635
055	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	79,607	79,607
	MODIFICATIONS		
056	COMM ELECT MODS	105,398	105,398
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
057	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	12,577	12,577
058	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	31,209	31,209
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ		
059	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	7,670	7,670
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
060	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	14,125	14,125
061	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	16,744	16,744
062	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	2,495	2,495
063	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	10,573	10,573
064	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	5,462	5,462
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
066	DARP RC135	24,710	24,710
067	DCGS-AF	206,743	206,743
069	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	537,370	537,370
070	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	77,898	77,898
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
070A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,990,196	13,990,196
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
072	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	32,813	32,813
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	16,566,018	16,551,729
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA		
001	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	1,594	1,594
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA		
002	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	4,325	4,325
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA		
003	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	17,268	17,268
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA		
008	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	10,491	10,491

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
010	TELEPORT PROGRAM	80,622	80,622
011	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	14,147	14,147
012	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	1,921	1,921
013	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK	80,144	80,144
015	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	8,755	8,755
016	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY	33,737	33,737
017	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE	32,544	32,544
018	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT	13,300	13,300
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA		
020	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	7,436	7,436
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT		
021	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	11,640	11,640
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA		
022	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS	1,269	1,269
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS		
024	VEHICLES	1,500	1,500
025	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	1,039	1,039
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY		
026	VEHICLES	50	50
027	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	7,639	7,639
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY		
028	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	68,880	0
	Transfer to line 30 for All Up Round procurement		[-68,880]
029	THAAD	464,424	464,424
030	AEGIS BMD	435,430	534,430
	Program increase		[99,000]
031	BMDS AN/TPY-2 RADARS	48,140	48,140
032	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III	225,774	225,774
034	IRON DOME	175,972	0
	Program increase for Iron Dome		[175,000]
	Realignment of Iron Dome to Overseas Contingency Operations		[-350,972]
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA		
041	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	3,448	3,448
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		
042	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	43,708	43,708
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		
044	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	10,783	10,783
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		
046	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	29,599	29,599
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
046A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	540,894	540,894
	AVIATION PROGRAMS		
047	MC-12	40,500	0
	Unjustified Request		[-40,500]
048	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	112,226	112,226
049	MH-60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,021	3,021
050	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	48,200	48,200
052	MH-47 CHINOOK	22,230	22,230
053	RQ-11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	6,397	6,397
054	CV-22 MODIFICATION	25,578	25,578
056	MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	15,651	15,651
057	STUASL0	1,500	1,500
058	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE	145,929	145,929
059	AC/MC-130J	65,130	65,130
061	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	39,563	39,563
	SHIPBUILDING		
063	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	25,459	25,459
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS		
065	ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M	144,336	144,336
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS		
068	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	81,001	81,001
070	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	17,323	17,323
071	OTHER ITEMS <\$5M	84,852	84,852
072	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	51,937	51,937
074	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	31,017	31,017
075	TACTICAL VEHICLES	63,134	63,134
076	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M	192,448	192,448
078	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	19,984	19,984
081	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	5,044	5,044
082	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	38,126	38,126
088	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	243,849	243,849
	CBDP		
095	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS	170,137	170,137
096	CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION	150,392	150,392
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	4,221,437	4,035,085
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	20,000	0

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	Unjustified request		[-20,000]
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	20,000	0
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS		
010	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS	-265,685	0
	Denied Prior Year Rescission request		[265,685]
	TOTAL PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS	-265,685	0
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	89,508,034	91,399,361

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	FIXED WING		
003	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	36,000	36,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	36,000	36,000
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM		
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	32,136	32,136
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	32,136	32,136
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION		
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	35,000	35,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION		
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	5,000	5,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION		
013	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES	10,000	10,000
014	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	15,000	15,000
	ROCKETS		
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	66,905	66,905
	OTHER AMMUNITION		
021	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	3,000	3,000
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	1,000	1,000
023	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	5,000	5,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	140,905	140,905
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	95,624	95,624
008	PLS ESP	60,300	60,300
010	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	192,620	192,620
015	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS	197,000	197,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)		
063	DCGS-A (MIP)	63,831	63,831
065A	TROJAN SPIRIT—TERMINALS (TIARA)	2,600	2,600
067	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	6,910	6,910
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)		
071	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE	32,083	32,083
072	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	47,535	47,535
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
114A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,000	1,000
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
133	FORCE PROVIDER	51,500	51,500
135	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	2,580	2,580
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
170	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	25,000	25,000
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	778,583	778,583
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		
	NETWORK ATTACK		
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK	189,700	189,700
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT		
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE	94,600	94,600
	FORCE TRAINING		
003	TRAIN THE FORCE	15,700	15,700
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE		
004	OPERATIONS	79,000	144,463
	Transfer from Base		[65,463]
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND	379,000	444,463

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT		
011	H-1 UPGRADES (UH-1Y/AH-1Z)	30,000	30,000
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
027	MQ-8 UAV	40,888	40,888
028A	STUASLO UAV	55,000	55,000
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		
039	EP-3 SERIES	34,955	34,955
049	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	2,548	2,548
054	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	31,920	31,920
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES		
067	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	936	936
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	196,247	196,247
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	STRATEGIC MISSILES		
003	TOMAHAWK	45,500	45,500
	TACTICAL MISSILES		
010	LASER MAVERICK	16,485	16,485
011	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	4,800	4,800
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	66,785	66,785
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		
	NAVY AMMUNITION		
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	7,596	7,596
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	8,862	8,862
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	3,473	3,473
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	29,376	29,376
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	3,919	3,919
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	3,561	3,561
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	2,913	2,913
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	2,764	2,764
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	9,475	9,475
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	8,843	8,843
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES	7,098	7,098
018	60MM, ALL TYPES	5,935	5,935
019	81MM, ALL TYPES	9,318	9,318
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	6,921	6,921
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	3,218	3,218
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	7,642	7,642
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	30,289	30,289
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	1,255	1,255
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	2,061	2,061
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	154,519	154,519
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		
023	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	8,210	8,210
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
078	CANES		400
	ERI: Information Sharing with Coalition Partners		[400]
084	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	5,870	5,870
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS		
088	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M	1,100	1,100
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
132	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	207,860	207,860
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
138	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	1,063	1,063
139	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	152	152
142	TACTICAL VEHICLES	26,300	26,300
145	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION	3,300	3,300
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
152	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,745	10,745
157	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,331	3,331
158	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	35,923	36,073
	ERI: Black Sea Information Sharing Initiatives		[150]
159	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	514	514
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
164A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,400	2,400
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	306,768	307,318
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
	OTHER SUPPORT		
007	MODIFICATION KITS	3,190	3,190
	GUIDED MISSILES		
010	JAVELIN	17,100	17,100
	OTHER SUPPORT		
013	MODIFICATION KITS	13,500	13,500

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	980	980
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)		
019	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	996	996
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
025	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	1,450	1,450
028	RQ-11 UAV	1,740	1,740
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
031	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	134	134
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)		
036	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	3,119	3,119
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
042	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	584	584
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		
052	EOD SYSTEMS	5,566	5,566
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
055	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	3,230	3,230
	GENERAL PROPERTY		
058	TRAINING DEVICES	2,000	2,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	53,589	53,589
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	OTHER AIRLIFT		
004	C-130J	70,000	70,000
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
018	MQ-9	192,000	192,000
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT		
021	B-1B	91,879	91,879
	OTHER AIRCRAFT		
050	C-130	47,840	47,840
051	C-130J MODS	18,000	18,000
053	COMPASS CALL MODS	24,800	24,800
063	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS	44,300	44,300
064	OTHER AIRCRAFT	111,990	111,990
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
070	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	45,410	45,410
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	646,219	646,219
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	TACTICAL		
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	125,469	125,469
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	10,720	10,720
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	136,189	136,189
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		
	CARTRIDGES		
002	CARTRIDGES	2,469	2,469
	BOMBS		
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	56,293	56,293
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	117,039	117,039
	FLARES		
011	FLARES	19,136	19,136
	FUZES		
012	FUZES	24,848	24,848
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	219,785	219,785
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES		
004	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	3,000	3,000
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES		
006	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	1,878	1,878
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
008	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	5,131	5,131
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT		
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP	1,734	1,734
010	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	22,000	22,000
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
027	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	3,857	3,857
033	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	900	900
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
048	MILSATCOM SPACE	19,547	19,547
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
055	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	1,970	1,970
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
057	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	765	765
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
060	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	2,030	2,030
061	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	99,590	99,590
063	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	107,361	107,361

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
064	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	10,975	10,975
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
070	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	6,100	6,100
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
070A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,143,936	3,143,936
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	3,430,774	3,430,774
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA		
010	TELEPORT PROGRAM	4,330	4,330
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY		
034	IRON DOME		350,972
	Realignment of Iron Dome to Overseas Contingency Operations		[350,972]
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
046A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	65,829	65,829
	AVIATION PROGRAMS		
056	MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		5,700
	MQ-9 Capability Enhancements		[5,700]
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS		
065	ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M	28,873	28,873
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS		
068	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	13,549	13,549
071	OTHER ITEMS <\$5M	32,773	32,773
076	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M	78,357	78,357
088	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	4,175	4,175
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	227,886	584,558
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	50,000	0
	Program decrease		[-50,000]
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	50,000	0
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT		
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
007	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		1,250,000
	Program increase		[1,250,000]
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT		1,250,000
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS		
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS		
010	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS	-117,000	0
	Denied Prior Year Rescission request		[117,000]
	TOTAL PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS	-117,000	0
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	6,738,385	8,478,070

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	13,464	13,464
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	238,167	238,167
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	69,808	89,808
		Basic research program increase		[20,000]
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	102,737	102,737
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	424,176	444,176
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	28,006	28,006
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	33,515	33,515
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	16,358	16,358
008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	63,433	63,433
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,502	18,502
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	46,194	46,194
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	28,528	28,528
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	27,435	27,435
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	72,883	72,883
014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	85,597	85,597
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,971	3,971
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,853	6,853

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	38,069	38,069
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	56,435	56,435
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	38,445	38,445
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	25,939	25,939
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	23,783	23,783
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	15,659	15,659
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	33,817	33,817
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	10,764	10,764
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	63,311	63,311
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	23,295	23,295
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	25,751	28,330
		Joint Service Combat Feeding Technology		[2,579]
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	76,068	76,068
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	862,611	865,190
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	65,139	65,813
		Joint Service Combat Feeding Tech Demo		[674]
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	67,291	67,291
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	88,990	88,990
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,931	57,931
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	110,031	110,031
034	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,883	6,883
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,580	13,580
036	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,871	44,871
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	7,492	7,492
038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	16,749	16,749
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	14,483	14,483
041	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,270	24,270
042	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	3,440	3,440
043	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,406	2,406
044	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,057	26,057
045	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,957	44,957
046	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	11,105	11,105
047	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	181,609	181,609
048	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,074	13,074
049	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,321	7,321
050	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,138	44,138
051	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	9,197	9,197
052	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	17,613	17,613
053	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	39,164	39,164
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	917,791	918,465
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
054	0603305A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	12,797	12,797
055	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	13,999	13,999
058	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	29,334	29,334
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	9,602	11,002
		Food Advanced Development		[1,400]
061	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	8,953	8,953
062	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,052	3,052
063	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	7,830	7,830
065	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,954	2,954
067	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	13,386	13,386
069	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	23,659	23,659
070	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	6,830	9,830
		Army requested realignment—Caliber Config Study		[3,000]
072	0604100A	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	9,913	9,913
073	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	74,740	74,740
074	0604120A	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT)	9,930	9,930
076	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2—INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	96,177	71,177
		Program delay and funds requested early to need		[–25,000]
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	323,156	302,556
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
079	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	37,246	37,246
081	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	6,002	6,002
082	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	9,832	9,832
083	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	9,730	9,730
084	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	5,532	5,532
085	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	19,929	19,929
086	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	27,884	34,586
		Army requested realignment		[6,702]
087	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	210	210
088	0604611A	JAVELIN	4,166	4,166
089	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	12,913	12,913
090	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	16,764	16,764
091	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	6,770	6,770
092	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	65,333	65,333

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
093	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	1,335	1,897
		Military Subsistence Systems		[562]
094	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	8,945	8,945
096	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	15,906	15,906
097	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,394	4,394
098	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	11,084	11,084
099	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	10,027	10,027
100	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	42,430	42,430
101	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	105,279	105,279
102	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	15,006	15,006
103	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	24,581	24,581
104	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	4,433	4,433
105	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	30,397	30,397
106	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	57,705	57,705
108	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	29,683	29,683
109	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	5,224	5,224
111	0604823A	FIREFINDER	37,492	37,492
112	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	6,157	6,157
113	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	1,912	1,912
116	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	69,761	69,761
117	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	138,465	138,465
118	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	92,353	92,353
119	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	8,440	8,440
120	0605031A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN)	17,999	17,999
121	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM)	145,409	145,409
122	0605350A	WIN-T INCREMENT 3—FULL NETWORKING	113,210	113,210
123	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	6,882	6,882
124	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	83,838	83,838
125	0605456A	PAC-3/MSE MISSILE	35,009	35,009
126	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	142,584	142,584
127	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	49,160	49,160
128	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	17,748	17,748
129	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	15,212	15,212
130	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH.	45,718	45,718
131	0605830A	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,041	10,041
132	0210609A	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	83,300	83,300
133	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	983	983
134	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	8,961	8,961
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	1,719,374	1,726,638
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
135	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	18,062	18,062
136	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,040	10,040
137	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	60,317	60,317
138	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,612	20,612
139	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	176,041	176,041
140	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	19,439	19,439
142	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	275,025	275,025
143	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	45,596	45,596
144	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	33,295	33,295
145	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,700	4,700
146	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,413	6,413
147	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	20,746	20,746
148	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	7,015	7,015
149	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	49,221	49,221
150	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	55,039	55,039
151	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	1,125	1,125
152	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	64,169	64,169
153	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	32,319	32,319
154	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	49,052	49,052
155	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	2,612	2,612
156	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	49,592	49,592
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	1,000,430	1,000,430
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
158	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	17,112	17,112
159	0607141A	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION	3,654	3,654
160	0607664A	BIOMETRIC ENABLING CAPABILITY (BEC)	1,332	1,332
161	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	152,991	152,991
162	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	54,076	41,576
		Funding ahead of need		[-12,500]
163	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	22,374	22,374
164	0203728A	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOCS)	24,371	24,371
165	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	295,177	321,177
		Stryker ECP risk mitigation		[26,000]
166	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	45,092	45,092
167	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	264,887	264,887
168	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	381	381

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
169	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	10,912	10,912
170	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	5,115	5,115
171	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	49,848	44,848
		Contract delay for ATACMS		[-5,000]
172	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	22,691	22,691
173	0205402A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	4,364	4,364
174	0205410A	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	834	834
175	0205412A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	280	280
176	0205456A	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM	78,758	78,758
177	0205778A	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS)	45,377	45,377
178	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	10,209	10,209
181	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	12,525	12,525
182	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	14,175	14,175
183	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	4,527	4,527
184	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	11,011	11,011
185	0303150A	WWWCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	2,151	2,151
187	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	22,870	22,870
188	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	20,155	20,155
189	0305219A	MQ-1C GRAY EAGLE UAS	46,472	46,472
191	0305233A	RQ-7 UAV	16,389	16,389
192	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	1,974	1,974
193	0310349A	WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING	3,249	3,249
194	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	76,225	76,225
194A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,802	4,802
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,346,360	1,354,860
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	6,593,898	6,612,315
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	113,908	133,908
		Basic research program increase		[20,000]
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,734	18,734
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	443,697	443,697
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	576,339	596,339
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	95,753	95,753
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	139,496	139,496
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	45,831	45,831
007	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	43,541	43,541
008	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	46,923	46,923
009	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	107,872	107,872
010	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,388	65,388
		Service Life extension for the AGOR ships		[20,000]
011	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	5,887	5,887
012	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	86,880	86,880
013	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	170,786	170,786
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	32,526	32,526
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	820,883	840,883
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
015	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,734	37,734
016	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,831	25,831
017	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,623	64,623
018	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	128,397	128,397
019	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,506	11,506
020	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	256,144	256,144
021	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,838	4,838
022	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,985	9,985
023	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	53,956	53,956
024	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,000	2,000
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	595,014	595,014
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
025	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	40,429	40,429
026	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	4,325	4,325
027	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	2,991	2,991
028	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	12,651	12,651
029	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,782	7,782
030	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	5,275	5,275
031	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,646	1,646
032	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	100,349	100,349
033	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	52,781	52,781
034	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,959	5,959
035	0603525N	PILOT FISH	148,865	148,865
036	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	25,365	25,365
037	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	80,477	80,477
038	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	669	669

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
039	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	1,060	1,060
040	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	70,551	70,551
041	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	8,044	8,044
042	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	17,864	17,864
043	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	23,716	20,411
		CSC contract award delay		[-3,305]
044	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	499,961	499,961
045	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	21,026	21,026
046	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	542,700	542,700
047	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	88,734	88,734
048	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	20,881	20,881
049	0603595N	OHIO REPLACEMENT	849,277	849,277
050	0603596N	LCS MISSION MODULES	196,948	173,348
		Program execution		[-23,600]
051	0603597N	AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST (ATRT)	8,115	8,115
052	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	7,603	7,603
053	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	105,749	105,749
054	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,342	1,342
055	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	21,399	21,399
056	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	43,578	42,578
		Common array block antenna program growth		[-1,000]
057	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,764	7,764
058	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	13,200	13,200
059	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	69,415	69,415
060	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	2,588	2,588
061	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	176,301	176,301
062	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,873	3,873
063	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	376,028	376,028
064	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	272,096	272,096
065	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	42,233	42,233
066	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	46,504	46,504
067	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	25,109	25,109
068	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,659	9,659
069	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	318	318
070	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	40,912	40,912
071	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	54,896	41,896
		Program delay		[-13,000]
073	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	58,696	58,696
074	0604112N	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80)	43,613	43,613
075	0604122N	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	21,110	21,110
076	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	5,657	5,657
077	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	8,033	5,923
		Unjustified request for test assets		[-2,110]
078	0604454N	LX (R)	36,859	36,859
079	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	15,227	15,227
081	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	22,393	22,393
082	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	202,939	202,939
083	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH.	11,450	11,450
084	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	6,495	6,495
085	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	332	332
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	4,591,812	4,548,797
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
086	0603208N	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	25,153	25,153
087	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	46,154	46,154
088	0604214N	AV-8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	25,372	25,372
089	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	53,712	53,712
090	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	11,434	11,434
091	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	2,164	2,164
092	0604221N	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,710	1,710
093	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	9,094	9,094
094	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	70,248	62,140
		64-bit architecture phasing		[-3,000]
		Program execution		[-5,108]
095	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	193,200	193,200
096	0604245N	H-1 UPGRADES	44,115	44,115
097	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	23,227	23,227
098	0604262N	V-22A	61,249	61,249
099	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	15,014	15,014
100	0604269N	EA-18	18,730	18,730
101	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	28,742	28,742
102	0604273N	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	388,086	388,086
103	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	246,856	246,856
104	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	7,106	7,106
105	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	189,112	189,112
106	0604311N	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	376	376
107	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	71,849	61,849
		Small diameter bomb II integration program growth		[-10,000]

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
108	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	53,198	53,198
109	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	38,941	38,941
110	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIA-TION.	7,832	7,832
111	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	15,263	15,263
112	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM.	403,017	403,017
113	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	20,409	20,409
114	0604503N	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	71,565	71,565
115	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	29,037	29,037
116	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	122,083	122,083
118	0604522N	ADVANCED MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM	144,706	144,706
119	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	72,695	72,695
120	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	38,985	38,985
121	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	48,470	48,470
122	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,935	3,935
123	0604580N	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM)	132,602	132,602
124	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	19,067	14,067
		Mine Development program growth		[-5,000]
125	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	25,280	25,280
126	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,985	8,985
127	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	7,669	7,669
128	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	4,400	4,400
129	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	56,889	56,889
130	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	96,937	96,937
131	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	134,564	121,339
		SEWIP block 3 preliminary design contract delay		[-13,225]
132	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	200	200
133	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	8,287	8,287
134	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	29,504	29,504
135	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	513,021	513,021
136	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	516,456	516,456
137	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,887	2,887
138	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	66,317	66,317
139	0605212N	CH-53K RDTE	573,187	573,187
140	0605220N	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC)	67,815	67,815
141	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	6,300	6,300
142	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	308,037	319,037
		Spiral 2 government systems engineering program growth		[-4,000]
		Wideband Communication Development		[15,000]
143	0204202N	DDG-1000	202,522	202,522
144	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	1,011	1,011
145	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	10,357	10,357
146	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	23,975	23,975
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	5,419,108	5,393,775
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
147	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	45,272	45,272
148	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	79,718	69,718
		GQM-173A program delay		[-10,000]
149	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	123,993	123,993
150	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	4,960	4,960
151	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	8,296	8,296
152	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	45,752	45,752
154	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	876	876
155	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	72,070	72,070
156	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,237	3,237
157	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	73,033	73,033
158	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	138,304	138,304
159	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	336,286	336,286
160	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	16,658	16,658
161	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,505	2,505
162	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	8,325	8,325
163	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	17,866	17,866
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	977,151	967,151
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
168	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT.	35,949	35,949
169	0604766M	MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS	215	215
170	0605525N	CARRIER ONBOARD DELIVERY (COD) FOLLOW ON	8,873	8,873
172	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	96,943	96,943
173	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	30,057	30,057
174	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	4,509	4,509
175	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	13,676	13,676
176	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	12,480	12,480
177	0204136N	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	76,216	76,216
179	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	27,281	27,281
180	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	2,878	2,878

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
181	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	32,385	32,385
182	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	39,371	39,371
183	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	4,609	4,609
184	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	99,106	92,106
		Unjustified cost growth		[-7,000]
185	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	39,922	39,922
186	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,157	1,157
187	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	22,067	22,067
188	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	17,420	17,420
189	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	151,208	151,208
190	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	26,366	26,366
191	0205632N	MK-48 ADCAP	25,952	25,952
192	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	106,936	106,936
194	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	104,023	104,023
195	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	77,398	77,398
196	0206335M	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S)	32,495	32,495
197	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	156,626	156,626
198	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	20,999	20,999
199	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	14,179	14,179
200	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	47,258	47,258
201	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	10,210	10,210
206	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	41,829	41,829
207	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	22,780	22,780
208	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,053	23,053
209	0303150M	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	296	296
212	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	359	359
213	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	6,166	6,166
214	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,505	8,505
216	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	11,613	11,613
217	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	18,146	18,146
218	0305220N	RQ-4 UAV	498,003	463,003
		Milestone C delay		[-35,000]
219	0305231N	MQ-8 UAV	47,294	47,294
220	0305232M	RQ-11 UAV	718	718
221	0305233N	RQ-7 UAV	851	851
222	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	4,813	4,813
223	0305239M	RQ-21A	8,192	8,192
224	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	22,559	18,664
		Program execution		[-3,895]
225	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)	2,000	2,000
226	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	4,719	4,719
227	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	21,168	21,168
228	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	37,169	37,169
229	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	4,347	4,347
229A	999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,162,684	1,162,684
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,286,028	3,240,133
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	16,266,335	16,182,092
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	314,482	314,482
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	127,079	147,079
		Basic research program increase		[20,000]
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	12,929	12,929
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	454,490	474,490
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	105,680	105,680
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	105,747	105,747
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	81,957	81,957
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	172,550	172,550
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	118,343	118,343
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	98,229	98,229
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	87,387	87,387
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	125,955	125,955
012	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	147,789	147,789
013	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	37,496	37,496
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	1,081,133	1,081,133
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
014	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	32,177	42,177
		Metals Affordability Initiative		[10,000]
015	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	15,800	15,800
016	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	34,420	34,420
017	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	91,062	91,062
018	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	124,236	124,236
019	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	47,602	47,602
020	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	69,026	69,026

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
021	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	14,031	14,031
022	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	21,788	21,788
023	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	42,046	42,046
024	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	23,542	23,542
025	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	42,772	42,772
026	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	35,315	35,315
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	593,817	603,817
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
027	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,408	5,408
031	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	6,075	6,075
032	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	10,980	10,980
033	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,392	2,392
034	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	833	833
035	0603830F	SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM	32,313	32,313
037	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	30,885	30,885
039	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL	1,798	1,798
040	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	913,728	913,728
042	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,669	2,669
045	0604422F	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON	39,901	39,901
049	0604800F	F-35—EMD	4,976	0
		Transfer F-35 EMD: Air Force requested to line #75		[-4,976]
050	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE		20,000
		Program Increase		[20,000]
051	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	59,004	59,004
054	0207110F	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE	15,722	15,722
055	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	88,825	88,825
056	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	156,659	156,659
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	1,372,168	1,387,192
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
059	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	13,324	13,324
060	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,965	1,965
061	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	39,110	39,110
062	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,926	3,926
063	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	68,759	68,759
064	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	23,746	23,746
065	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	9,462	9,462
066	0604426F	SPACE FENCE	214,131	200,131
		Program delay		[-14,000]
067	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	30,687	30,687
068	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	319,501	311,501
		Wide field of view test bed		[-8,000]
069	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	31,112	31,112
070	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,543	2,543
071	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	46,340	46,340
072	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	8,854	8,854
073	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	10,129	10,129
075	0604800F	F-35—EMD	563,037	568,013
		Transfer F-35 EMD: Air Force requested from line #49		[4,976]
077	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD		220,000
		Rocket propulsion system		[220,000]
078	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	4,938	3,438
		Execution adjustment		[-1,500]
079	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	59,826	59,826
080	0605030F	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	78	78
081	0605213F	F-22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	173,647	173,647
082	0605214F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	5,332	5,332
083	0605221F	KC-46	776,937	776,937
084	0605223F	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING	8,201	8,201
086	0605278F	HC/MC-130 RECAP RDT&E	7,497	7,497
087	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	314,378	314,378
088	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	103,552	103,552
089	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	31,425	31,425
090	0605458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E	85,938	85,938
091	0605931F	B-2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	98,768	98,768
092	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	198,357	198,357
094	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	8,831	8,831
095	0307581F	NEXTGEN JSTARS	73,088	73,088
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	3,337,419	3,538,895
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
097	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,418	24,418
098	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	47,232	47,232
099	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	30,443	30,443
101	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	12,266	12,266
102	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	689,509	689,509
103	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	34,364	34,364
104	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	21,161	21,161

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
105	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT ...	46,955	46,955
106	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	32,965	32,965
107	0606017F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	13,850	13,850
108	0606116F	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT	19,512	19,512
110	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	181,727	177,800
		Personnel costs excess to need		[-3,927]
111	0308602F	ENTREPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS)	4,938	4,938
112	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	18,644	18,644
113	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,425	1,425
114	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,790	3,790
114A	XXXXXX-XF	EJECTION SEAT RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		3,500
		Initial Aircraft Qualification		[3,500]
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	1,183,199	1,182,772
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
115	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	299,760	299,760
116	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE		2,000
		Implementation of the Secretary's Cruise Missile Defense Program		[2,000]
118	0604618F	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,469	2,469
119	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	90,218	60,218
		Delayed contract award		[-30,000]
120	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	34,815	34,815
122	0101113F	B-52 SQUADRONS	55,457	55,457
123	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	450	450
124	0101126F	B-1B SQUADRONS	5,353	4,353
		Execution adjustment		[-1,000]
125	0101127F	B-2 SQUADRONS	131,580	111,580
		Flexible Strike execution delay		[-20,000]
126	0101213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	139,109	139,109
127	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	35,603	35,603
128	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	32	32
130	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,522	1,522
131	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	3,134	3,134
133	0205219F	MQ-9 UAV	170,396	170,396
136	0207133F	F-16 SQUADRONS	133,105	133,105
137	0207134F	F-15E SQUADRONS	261,969	251,969
		Execution adjustment		[-10,000]
138	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,831	14,831
139	0207138F	F-22A SQUADRONS	156,962	151,962
		Unjustified increase—laboratory test and operations		[-5,000]
140	0207142F	F-35 SQUADRONS	43,666	43,666
141	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	29,739	29,739
142	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	82,195	82,195
144	0207171F	F-15 EPAWSS	68,944	53,444
		Delays in pre-EMD phase		[-15,500]
145	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	5,095	5,095
146	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	883	883
147	0207247F	AF TENCAP	5,812	5,812
148	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,081	1,081
149	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	14,411	14,411
150	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	109,664	109,664
151	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	15,897	15,897
152	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	41,066	41,066
153	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	552	552
154	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	180,804	180,804
155	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	3,754	3,754
157	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	7,891	7,891
158	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	5,891	5,891
159	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,782	1,782
161	0207452F	DCAPES	821	821
163	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	23,844	23,844
164	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	16,723	16,723
165	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,956	5,956
166	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,457	4,457
167	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	60,679	60,679
169	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	67,057	67,057
170	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	13,355	13,355
171	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	5,576	5,576
179	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	12,218	12,218
180	0302015F	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	28,778	22,978
		Low Frequency Transmit System—delay to contract award		[-5,800]
181	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	81,035	81,035
182	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	70,497	70,497
183	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	692	692
185	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	55,208	55,208
187	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	106,786	106,786
190	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,157	4,157
193	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	20,806	20,806

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
194	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	25,102	25,102
195	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	23,516	23,516
196	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	8,639	8,639
199	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	498	498
200	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	13,222	13,222
201	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	360	360
206	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,674	3,674
207	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,480	2,480
208	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	8,592	8,592
209	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	13,462	13,462
210	0305202F	DRAGON U-2	5,511	5,511
212	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	28,113	38,113
		Per Air Force UFR		[10,000]
213	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,516	13,516
214	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	27,265	27,265
215	0305219F	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	1,378	1,378
216	0305220F	RQ-4 UAV	244,514	244,514
217	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	11,096	11,096
218	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK (CDL)	36,137	36,137
219	0305238F	NATO AGS	232,851	232,851
220	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	20,218	20,218
221	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	212,571	212,571
222	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	73,779	73,779
223	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	4,102	4,102
225	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	20,468	20,468
226	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	11,596	11,596
227	0306250F	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,938	4,938
228	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	1,212	1,212
230	0401119F	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	38,773	38,773
231	0401130F	C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	83,773	83,773
232	0401132F	C-130J PROGRAM	26,715	26,715
233	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCIM)	5,172	5,172
234	0401219F	KC-10S	2,714	2,714
235	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	27,784	27,784
236	0401318F	CV-22	38,719	38,719
237	0401319F	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)	11,006	11,006
238	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	8,405	8,405
239	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,407	1,407
241	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	109,685	109,685
242	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,209	16,209
243	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	987	987
244	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	126	126
245	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	2,603	2,603
246	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	1,589	1,589
247	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	5,026	5,026
248	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,394	1,394
249	0901279F	FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE	3,798	3,798
250	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	107,314	102,685
		Defense Enterprise Accounting Management System Increment 2		[-4,629]
250A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,441,120	11,412,120
		Classified program reduction		[-29,000]
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	15,717,666	15,608,737
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	23,739,892	23,877,036
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW		
		BASIC RESEARCH		
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	37,778	37,778
002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	312,146	332,146
		Basic research program increase		[20,000]
003	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	44,564	34,564
		National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowship program		[-10,000]
004	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	49,848	49,848
005	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	45,488	55,488
		Military Child STEM Education programs		[10,000]
006	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	24,412	34,412
		Program increase		[10,000]
007	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	48,261	48,261
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	562,497	592,497
		APPLIED RESEARCH		
008	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	20,065	20,065
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	112,242	112,242
011	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,875	51,875
012	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	41,965	41,965
013	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	334,407	334,407
015	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	44,825	44,825
016	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	226,317	226,317
018	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	15,000	15,000

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
020	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	305,484	305,484
021	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	160,389	160,389
022	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	179,203	179,203
023	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	151,737	151,737
024	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	9,156	9,156
025	1160401BB	SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	39,750	39,750
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	1,692,415	1,692,415
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		
026	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	26,688	26,688
027	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,682	8,682
028	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	69,675	89,675
		Program emphasis for CT and Irregular Warfare Programs		[20,000]
029	0603133D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	30,000	24,000
		Program decrease		[-6,000]
030	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT ...	283,694	283,694
032	0603176C	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	8,470	8,470
033	0603177C	DISCRIMINATION SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	45,110	43,110
		Unjustified growth		[-2,000]
034	0603178C	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	14,068	14,068
035	0603179C	ADVANCED C4ISR	15,329	15,329
036	0603180C	ADVANCED RESEARCH	16,584	16,584
037	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	19,335	19,335
038	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	2,544	2,544
039	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	51,033	51,033
040	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	129,723	129,723
041	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	179,883	179,883
042	0603288D8Z	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS	12,000	12,000
043	0603289D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS	60,000	50,000
		Program reduction		[-10,000]
044	0603294C	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	25,639	25,639
045	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	132,674	132,674
046	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	10,965	10,965
047	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	131,960	121,960
		Program reduction		[-10,000]
052	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	91,095	91,095
053	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	33,706	33,706
054	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	16,836	16,836
055	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	29,683	29,683
056	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	57,796	57,796
057	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	72,144	72,144
058	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,405	7,405
059	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	92,246	92,246
060	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	243,265	243,265
062	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	386,926	386,926
063	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	312,821	312,821
064	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,692	10,692
065	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	15,776	15,776
066	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	69,319	64,319
		Program decrease		[-5,000]
068	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	3,000	3,000
071	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	81,148	81,148
072	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	31,800	31,800
073	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	46,066	46,066
074	1160402BB	SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	57,622	57,622
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,933,402	2,920,402
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES		
077	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	41,072	41,072
079	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	90,558	90,558
080	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM	15,518	19,518
		Continue important test programs		[4,000]
081	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	51,462	51,462
082	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	299,598	292,798
		THAAD 2.0 early to need		[-6,800]
083	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,003,768	1,043,768
		GMD reliability and maintenance improvements		[40,000]
084	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	179,236	179,236
085	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	392,893	392,893
086	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	410,863	410,863
087	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	310,261	310,261
088	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	929,208	929,208
089	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	31,346	31,346
090	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	6,389	6,389
091	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI.	443,484	431,484
		Spiral 8.2-3—unjustified growth without baseline		[-12,000]
092	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	46,387	46,387
093	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	58,530	58,530

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
094	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	16,199	16,199
095	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	64,409	64,409
096	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	96,803	270,603
		Program increase for Israeli Cooperative Programs		[173,800]
097	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	386,482	366,482
		Test efficiencies		[-20,000]
098	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	485,294	485,294
099	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	10,194	10,194
100	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	10,139	10,139
101	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	2,907	7,907
		Program increase		[5,000]
102	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	190,000	170,000
		Program decrease		[-20,000]
103	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	3,702	3,702
104	0604445J	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	53,000	53,000
106	0604775D8Z	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM		75,000
		Program increase		[75,000]
107	0604787J	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	7,002	7,002
108	0604828J	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	7,102	7,102
109	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM-3 (LBSM3)	123,444	123,444
110	0604881C	AEGIS SM-3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	263,695	263,695
113	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	12,500	12,500
114	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	2,656	2,656
115	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	961	961
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES	6,047,062	6,286,062
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION		
116	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	7,936	7,936
117	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	70,762	70,762
118	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	345,883	345,883
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	25,459	25,459
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	17,562	17,562
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	6,887	6,887
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,530	12,530
123	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	286	286
124	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	3,244	3,244
125	0605027D8Z	OSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	6,500	6,500
126	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	15,326	15,326
127	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	19,351	19,351
128	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INITIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	41,465	41,465
129	0605090S	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS)	10,135	10,135
130	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	9,546	9,546
131	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	14,241	14,241
132	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EIM)	3,660	3,660
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	610,773	610,773
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
133	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	5,616	5,616
134	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	3,092	3,092
135	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	254,503	254,503
136	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	21,661	21,661
138	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	27,162	27,162
139	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	24,501	24,501
142	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	43,176	43,176
145	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	44,246	44,246
146	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	2,665	2,665
147	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,366	4,366
148	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	27,901	27,901
149	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	2,855	2,855
150	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	105,944	105,944
156	0605502KA	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	400	400
159	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	1,634	1,634
160	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	12,105	12,105
161	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	50,389	50,389
162	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	8,452	8,452
163	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	15,187	19,187
		Program increase		[4,000]
164	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	71,362	71,362
165	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,100	4,100
166	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	1,956	1,956
167	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	10,321	10,321
170	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	11,552	11,552
172	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	6,748	6,748
174	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	44,005	44,005
175	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	36,998	36,998
176	0901598D8W	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS WHS	612	612
177A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	44,367	44,367

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	887,876	891,876
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT		
178	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	3,988	3,988
179	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA.	1,750	1,750
180	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	286	286
181	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	14,778	14,778
182	0607310D8Z	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	2,953	2,953
183	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS).	10,350	10,350
184	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	28,496	28,496
185	0607828J	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	11,968	11,968
186	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	1,842	1,842
187	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	63,558	63,558
189	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	3,931	3,931
193	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	924	924
194	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	9,657	9,657
195	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	25,355	25,355
196	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	12,671	12,671
197	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	222	222
198	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	32,698	32,698
199	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	11,304	11,304
200	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	125,854	155,854
		Accelerate SHARKSEER deployment		[30,000]
202	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	33,793	33,793
203	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	13,423	13,423
204	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	3,774	3,774
205	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	951	951
206	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	2,697	2,697
208	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	19,294	19,294
212	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	3,234	3,234
213	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	8,846	8,846
217	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	7,065	7,065
218	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	23,984	23,984
221	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,286	5,286
224	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,400	3,400
229	0305327V	INSIDER THREAT	8,670	8,670
230	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,110	2,110
239	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	22,366	22,366
240	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,574	1,574
241	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	4,409	4,409
242	1105219BB	MQ-9 UAV	9,702	9,702
243	1105232BB	RQ-11 UAV	259	259
245	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	164,233	164,233
247	1160405BB	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	9,490	9,490
248	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	75,253	75,253
252	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	24,661	24,661
253	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	20,908	20,908
259	1160480BB	SO F TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,672	3,672
262	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	57,905	57,905
264	1160489BB	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,788	3,788
265	1160490BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	16,225	16,225
265A	999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,118,502	3,118,502
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	4,032,059	4,062,059
		UNDISTRIBUTED		
266	999999999	UNDISTRIBUTED		–69,000
		DARPA undistributed reduction		[–69,000]
		SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		–69,000
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	16,766,084	16,987,084
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	74,583	74,583
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	45,142	45,142
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	48,013	48,013
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	167,738	167,738
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	167,738	167,738
		TOTAL RDT&E	63,533,947	63,826,265

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS (In Thousands of Dollars)				
Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY				
ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES				
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	4,500	4,500
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	4,500	4,500
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	4,500	4,500
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY				
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT				
225	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)	940	940
229A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	35,080	35,080
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	36,020	36,020
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	36,020	36,020
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF				
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT				
250A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,706	14,706
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	14,706	14,706
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	14,706	14,706
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW				
APPLIED RESEARCH				
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	112,000	112,000
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	112,000	112,000
OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT				
242	1105219BB	MQ-9 UAV		5,200
		MQ-9 enhancements		[5,200]
248	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	6,000	6,000
265A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	163,447	163,447
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	169,447	174,647
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	281,447	286,647
		TOTAL RDT&E	336,673	341,873

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (In Thousands of Dollars)				
Line		Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY				
OPERATING FORCES				
010		MANEUVER UNITS	969,281	969,281
020		MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	61,990	61,990
030		ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	450,987	450,987
040		THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	545,773	545,773
050		LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,057,453	1,057,453
060		AVIATION ASSETS	1,409,347	1,409,347
070		FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,592,334	3,524,334
		Fully fund two Combat Training Center rotations—Army requested transfer to OM,ARNG and MP,ARNG		[-68,000]
080		LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	411,388	411,388
090		LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,001,232	1,001,232
100		BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,428,972	7,428,972
110		FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,066,434	2,154,434
		Facilities Sustainment		[18,750]
		Readiness funding increase—fully funds 6% CIP		[94,250]
		Transfer to Arlington National Cemetery		[-25,000]
120		MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	411,863	411,863
130		COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	179,399	179,399
170		COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	432,281	432,281
		SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	20,018,734	20,038,734
MOBILIZATION				
180		STRATEGIC MOBILITY	316,776	316,776
190		ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	187,609	187,609
200		INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,463	86,463
		Industrial Base Initiative-Body Armor		[80,000]
		SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	510,848	590,848

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	124,766	124,766
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	51,968	51,968
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	43,735	43,735
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	456,563	456,563
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	886,529	886,529
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	890,070	890,070
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	193,291	193,291
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	552,359	552,359
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	466,927	466,927
300	EXAMINING	194,588	194,588
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	205,782	205,782
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	150,571	150,571
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	169,784	169,784
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	4,386,933	4,386,933
ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	541,877	541,877
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	722,291	722,291
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	602,034	602,034
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	422,277	422,277
390	ADMINISTRATION	405,442	405,442
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,624,742	1,624,742
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	289,771	289,771
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	390,924	390,924
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,118,540	1,118,540
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	241,234	241,234
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	243,509	243,509
460	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS	200,615	200,615
470	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	462,591	462,591
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	27,375	27,375
520A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,030,411	1,030,411
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	8,323,633	8,323,633
UNDISTRIBUTED			
530	UNDISTRIBUTED		-296,400
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[-48,900]
	Program decrease—overestimate of civilian personnel		[-247,500]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-296,400
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	33,240,148	33,043,748
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES OPERATING FORCES			
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	15,200	15,200
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	502,664	502,664
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	107,489	107,489
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	543,989	543,989
060	AVIATION ASSETS	72,963	72,963
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	360,082	360,082
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	72,491	72,491
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	58,873	58,873
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	388,961	388,961
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	228,597	233,597
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	39,590	39,590
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	2,390,899	2,395,899
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,608	10,608
140	ADMINISTRATION	18,587	18,587
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	6,681	6,681
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	9,192	9,192
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	54,602	54,602
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	99,670	99,670
UNDISTRIBUTED			
180	UNDISTRIBUTED		-13,800
	Overestimation of civilian FTE targets		[-13,800]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-13,800
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	2,490,569	2,481,769
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	660,648	683,648
	Transfer funding for 2 CTC rotations		[23,000]
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	165,942	165,942
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	733,800	733,800

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	83,084	83,084
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	22,005	22,005
060	AVIATION ASSETS	920,085	920,085
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	680,887	680,887
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	69,726	69,726
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	138,263	138,263
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	804,517	794,517
	Remove one-time fiscal year 2014 funding increase		[-10,000]
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	490,205	495,205
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	872,140	872,140
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	5,641,302	5,659,302
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	6,690	6,690
140	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	1,765	1,765
150	ADMINISTRATION	63,075	63,075
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	37,372	37,372
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	6,484	6,484
180	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	274,085	260,285
	Program decrease for advertising		[-13,800]
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	389,471	375,671
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	6,030,773	6,034,973
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,947,202	4,947,202
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,647,943	1,647,943
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	37,050	37,050
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	96,139	96,139
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	363,763	363,763
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	814,770	824,870
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[10,100]
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	36,494	36,494
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	350,641	350,641
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,865,379	3,865,379
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	711,243	711,243
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,296,408	5,330,108
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[33,700]
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,339,077	1,339,377
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[300]
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	708,634	708,634
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	91,599	91,599
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	207,038	207,038
160	WARFARE TACTICS	432,715	432,715
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	338,116	338,116
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	892,316	892,316
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	128,486	128,486
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,472	2,472
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	101,200	101,200
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	188,920	188,920
230	CRUISE MISSILE	109,911	109,911
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,172,823	1,172,823
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	104,139	104,139
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	490,911	490,911
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	324,861	324,861
290	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	936,743	936,743
300	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,483,495	1,587,495
	Facilities Sustainment		[18,750]
	Readiness funding increase—fully funds 6% CIP		[85,250]
310	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,398,667	4,398,667
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	31,619,155	31,767,255
	MOBILIZATION		
320	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	526,926	526,926
330	READY RESERVE FORCE	195	195
340	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,704	6,704
350	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	251,538	205,538
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[-46,000]
360	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	124,323	124,323
370	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,323	2,323
380	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	20,333	20,333
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	932,342	886,342
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
390	OFFICER ACQUISITION	156,214	156,214
400	RECRUIT TRAINING	8,863	8,963
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[100]

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
410	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	148,150	148,150
420	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	601,501	608,701
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[7,200]
430	FLIGHT TRAINING	8,239	8,239
440	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	164,214	165,214
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[1,000]
450	TRAINING SUPPORT	182,619	183,519
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[900]
460	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	230,589	231,737
	Naval Sea Cadet Corps		[1,148]
470	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	115,595	115,595
480	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	79,606	79,606
490	JUNIOR ROTC	41,664	41,664
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	1,737,254	1,747,602
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
500	ADMINISTRATION	858,871	858,871
510	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	12,807	12,807
520	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	119,863	119,863
530	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	356,113	357,013
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[900]
540	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	255,605	255,605
550	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	339,802	339,802
570	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	172,203	172,203
590	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	283,621	283,621
600	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,111,464	1,111,464
610	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	43,232	43,232
620	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	25,689	25,689
630	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	73,159	73,159
640	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	548,640	548,640
700	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,713	4,713
720A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	531,324	531,324
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	4,737,106	4,738,006
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
730	UNDISTRIBUTED		-154,200
	Civilian personnel underexecution		[-80,000]
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[-74,200]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-154,200
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	39,025,857	38,985,005
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	905,744	939,544
	Crisis Response Operations Unfunded Requirement		[33,800]
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	921,543	921,543
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	229,058	229,058
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	87,660	87,660
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	573,926	592,676
	Facilities Sustainment		[18,750]
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,983,118	1,983,118
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	4,701,049	4,753,599
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	18,227	18,227
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	948	948
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	98,448	98,448
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	42,305	42,305
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	330,156	330,156
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	161,752	161,752
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	19,137	19,137
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,277	23,277
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	694,250	694,250
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	36,359	36,359
160	ADMINISTRATION	362,608	353,508
	Marine Museum Unjustified Growth		[-9,100]
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	70,515	70,515
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	44,706	44,706
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	514,188	505,088
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		-28,400
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[-28,400]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-28,400
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	5,909,487	5,924,537

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	565,842	573,742
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[7,900]
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	5,948	5,948
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	82,636	84,936
	CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[2,300]
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	353	353
060	AVIATION LOGISTICS	7,007	7,007
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	8,190	8,190
080	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	556	556
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,571	4,571
100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	14,472	14,472
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	119,056	119,056
120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	1,852	1,852
130	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	25,354	25,354
140	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	48,271	53,098
	Facilities Sustainment		[4,827]
150	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	101,921	101,921
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	986,029	1,001,056
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
160	ADMINISTRATION	1,520	1,520
170	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	12,998	12,998
180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,395	3,395
190	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,158	3,158
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	21,071	21,071
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	1,007,100	1,022,127
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	93,093	93,093
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,377	18,377
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	29,232	33,132
	Facilities Sustainment		[3,900]
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	106,447	106,447
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	247,149	251,049
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	914	914
060	ADMINISTRATION	11,831	11,831
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,688	8,688
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	21,433	21,433
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	268,582	272,482
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,163,457	3,172,057
	Nuclear Force Improvement Program—Security Forces		[8,600]
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,694,339	1,694,339
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,579,178	1,579,178
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,119,522	6,028,400
	RC/OC-135 Contractor Logistics Support Unjustified Growth		[-8,000]
	Unjustified program growth		[-83,122]
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,453,589	1,475,739
	Facilities Sustainment		[18,750]
	Nuclear Force Improvement Program—Installation Surety		[3,400]
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,599,419	2,589,419
	Remove one-time fiscal year 2014 funding increase		[-10,000]
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	908,790	908,790
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	856,306	865,906
	Nuclear Force Improvement Program—ICBM Training Hardware		[9,600]
090	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	800,689	800,689
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	282,710	282,710
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	397,818	397,818
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	871,840	860,840
	Program decrease—classified program		[-11,000]
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	237,348	237,348
130A	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM		34,600
	Retain current AWACS fleet		[34,600]
130B	A-10 FLYING HOURS		188,400
	Retain current A-10 fleet		[188,400]
130C	A-10 WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUSTAINMENT		68,100
	Retain current A-10 fleet		[68,100]
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	20,965,005	21,184,333

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
MOBILIZATION			
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,968,810	1,968,810
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	139,743	125,670
	Inflation pricing requested as program growth		[-14,073]
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,534,560	1,534,560
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	173,627	173,627
180	BASE SUPPORT	688,801	688,801
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	4,505,541	4,491,468
TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	82,396	82,396
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	19,852	19,852
210	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	76,134	76,134
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	212,226	212,226
230	BASE SUPPORT	759,809	759,809
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	356,157	356,157
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	697,594	697,594
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	219,441	219,441
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	91,001	91,001
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	316,688	316,688
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	73,920	73,920
300	EXAMINING	3,121	3,121
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	181,718	181,718
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	147,667	147,667
330	JUNIOR ROTC	63,250	63,250
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	3,300,974	3,300,974
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,003,513	997,379
	Inflation pricing requested as program growth		[-6,134]
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	843,449	836,210
	Defense Finance and Accounting Services rate adjustment requested as program growth		[-7,239]
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	78,126	78,126
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	247,677	247,677
380	BASE SUPPORT	1,103,442	1,103,442
390	ADMINISTRATION	597,234	597,234
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	506,840	506,840
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	892,256	892,256
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL	24,981	24,981
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	92,419	92,419
450A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,169,736	1,164,376
	Classified adjustment		[-5,360]
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	6,559,673	6,540,940
UNDISTRIBUTED			
460	UNDISTRIBUTED		-131,900
	Civilian personnel underexecution		[-80,000]
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[-51,900]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		-131,900
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	35,331,193	35,385,815
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,719,467	1,719,467
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	211,132	211,132
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	530,301	530,301
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	85,672	90,672
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]
050	BASE SUPPORT	367,966	367,966
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	2,914,538	2,919,538
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	59,899	59,899
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,509	14,509
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	20,345	20,345
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,551	6,551
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	101,304	101,304
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	3,015,842	3,020,842
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,367,729	3,367,729
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	718,295	718,295
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,528,695	1,528,695
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	137,604	142,604
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]
050	BASE SUPPORT	581,536	581,536

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	6,333,859	6,338,859
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES		
060	ADMINISTRATION	27,812	27,812
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	31,188	31,188
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	59,000	59,000
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	6,392,859	6,397,859
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	462,107	462,107
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	4,762,245	4,770,947
	MSV—USSOCOM Maritime Support Vessel		[–20,298]
	NCR—USSOCOM National Capitol Region Office		[–5,000]
	POTFF—transfer to DHP		[–14,800]
	POTFF—transfer to DHRA for Office Suicide Prevention		[–4,000]
	RSCC—Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers		[–3,600]
	UFR Flying Hours		[36,400]
	UFR Unit Readiness Training		[20,000]
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	5,224,352	5,233,054
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	135,437	135,437
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	80,082	80,082
050	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING	371,620	371,620
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	587,139	587,139
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	119,888	175,888
	STARBASE		[25,000]
	Youth Challenge		[31,000]
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	556,493	556,493
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,340,374	1,299,874
	Civilian personnel compensation—justification does not match summary of price and program changes		[–20,500]
	Civilian personnel compensation hiring lag		[–20,000]
100	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	633,300	636,070
	Civilian personnel compensation hiring lag		[–1,230]
	Suicide Prevention—transfer from SOCOM		[4,000]
110	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,263,678	1,263,678
130	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	26,710	26,710
140	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	381,470	394,170
	PTAP funding increase		[12,700]
150	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	194,520	194,520
160	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	21,485	21,485
170	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	544,786	552,386
	Program decrease—Combatting terrorism fellowship		[–2,400]
	Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership For Peace		[10,000]
180	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	527,812	527,812
200	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	32,787	32,787
230	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,566,424	2,566,424
240	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	416,644	416,644
260	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	186,987	106,391
	Office of Economic Adjustment		[–80,596]
265	OFFICE OF NET ASSESSMENT		18,944
	Program increase		[10,000]
	Transfer from line 270		[8,944]
270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,891,163	1,873,419
	BRAC 2015 Round Planning and Analyses		[–4,800]
	DOD Rewards Program Underexecution		[–4,000]
	Transfer funding for Office of Net Assessment to line 265		[–8,944]
280	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES	87,915	87,915
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	610,982	608,462
	Civilian personnel compensation hiring lag		[–2,520]
290A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,983,323	13,983,323
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	25,386,741	25,343,395
	UNDISTRIBUTED		
300	UNDISTRIBUTED		12,500
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–17,500]
	Impact Aid		[25,000]
	Impact Aid for Children with Severe Disabilities		[5,000]
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		12,500
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	31,198,232	31,176,088
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS		
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS		
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,723	13,723

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
020	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	100,000	100,000
030	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	365,108	365,108
040	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	212,875	83,034
	Program decrease		[-129,841]
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	201,560	201,560
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	277,294	277,294
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	408,716	408,716
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	8,547	8,547
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	208,353	208,353
100	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000	0
	Program decrease		[-5,000]
110	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFENSE	10,000	5,700
	Unjustified program increase		[-4,300]
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	1,811,176	1,672,035
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	1,811,176	1,672,035
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	165,721,818	165,417,280

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	77,419	187,419
	ERI: Armored Brigade Combat Team Presence		[110,000]
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	3,827	3,827
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	22,353	22,353
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,405,102	1,405,102
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	452,332	467,332
	ERI: Increased Global Response Force Exercises		[15,000]
060	AVIATION ASSETS	47,522	47,522
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,050,683	1,147,183
	ERI: Increase Range Capacities and Operation, and Upgrade Training Sites		[96,500]
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	166,725	166,725
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	87,636	273,236
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[185,600]
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	291,977	291,977
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	7,316,967	7,407,261
	ERI: NATO Exercises		[13,100]
	ERI: Strengthen the Capacity of NATO and NATO Partners		[3,000]
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15-02 reprogramming		[74,194]
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	10,000	10,000
160	RESET	2,861,655	2,861,655
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	13,794,198	14,291,592
	MOBILIZATION		
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS		59,000
	ERI: Armored Brigade Combat Team presence		[40,000]
	ERI: Army Prepo Infrastructure Projects		[19,000]
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION		59,000
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES		
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	1,806,267	1,806,267
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	45,537	45,537
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	32,264	32,264
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	98,171	98,171
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	99,694	99,694
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	137,053	137,053
520A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,122,092	1,106,192
	Program decrease		[-15,900]
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	3,341,078	3,325,178
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	17,135,276	17,675,770
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	4,285	4,285
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,428	1,428
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	699	699
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	35,120	35,120
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	41,532	41,532
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	41,532	41,532

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	12,593	13,793
	ERI: Leverage State Partnership Program		[1,200]
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	647	647
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	6,670	6,670
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	664	664
060	AVIATION ASSETS	22,485	22,485
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	14,560	14,560
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE		49,600
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[49,600]
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	13,923	13,923
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	4,601	4,601
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	76,143	126,943
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	ADMINISTRATION	318	318
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	318	318
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	76,461	127,261
AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND			
MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			
010	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	2,915,747	2,915,747
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	2,915,747	2,915,747
MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
020	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	1,161,733	1,161,733
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	1,161,733	1,161,733
DETAINEE OPS			
030	IRAQ TRAINING FACILITY	31,853	31,853
	SUBTOTAL DETAINEE OPS	31,853	31,853
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	4,109,333	4,109,333
IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
010	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	1,618,000	1,618,000
	SUBTOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	1,618,000	1,618,000
	TOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	1,618,000	1,618,000
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	573,123	576,123
	ERI: Seabreeze and European Multinational Exercises		[3,000]
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,600	2,600
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	22,035	22,035
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	192,411	303,411
	Aviation Depot Maintenance		[111,000]
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,116	1,116
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	33,900	33,900
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,153,500	1,158,450
	ERI: Black Sea Multinational Exercises		[4,950]
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	20,068	20,068
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,922,829	2,072,829
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[150,000]
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	31,303	31,303
160	WARFARE TACTICS	26,229	26,229
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	20,398	20,398
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	676,555	685,675
	ERI: BALTOPS Multinational Exercises		[500]
	ERI: Black Sea Information Sharing Initiatives		[620]
	ERI: EUCOM Information Sharing Initiatives		[8,000]
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	10,662	10,662
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	90,684	90,684
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	233,696	233,696
300	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	16,220	16,420
	ERI: European Multinational Exercise Infrastructure Support		[200]
310	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	88,688	88,688
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	5,116,017	5,394,287
MOBILIZATION			
360	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	5,307	5,307
380	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	213,319	213,319
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	218,626	218,626

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
420	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	48,270	48,270
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	48,270	48,270
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
500	ADMINISTRATION	2,464	2,464
510	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	520	520
530	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,205	5,205
540	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,439	1,439
570	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	186,318	186,318
590	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	1,350	1,350
600	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	11,811	11,811
640	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,468	1,468
720A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,380	6,380
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	216,955	216,955
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	5,599,868	5,878,138
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	477,406	490,616
	ERI: BALTOPS Multinational Exercises		[1,500]
	ERI: Black Sea Rotational Force Increased Presence		[8,910]
	ERI: Cold Response Multinational Exercises		[800]
	ERI: NATO Multinational Exercises		[2,000]
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	353,334	353,334
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	426,720	436,720
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[10,000]
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	12,036	12,036
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	1,269,496	1,292,706
TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	52,106	52,106
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	52,106	52,106
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	162,980	162,980
160	ADMINISTRATION	1,322	1,322
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,870	1,870
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	166,172	166,172
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	1,487,774	1,510,984
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	16,133	16,133
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,150	6,150
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	12,475	12,475
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,700	2,700
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	8,418	8,418
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	45,876	45,876
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	45,876	45,876
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	9,740	9,740
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	800	800
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	10,540	10,540
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	10,540	10,540
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,352,604	1,419,934
	ERI: Baltic Air Policing		[10,000]
	ERI: Eastern European Countries Exercise Support		[2,300]
	ERI: Retain Air Superiority Presence		[55,000]
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15-02 reprogramming		[30]
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	893,939	898,339
	ERI: Baltic Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance		[4,400]
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	8,785	8,785
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,146,099	1,146,099
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	78,000	105,890
	ERI: Improve Airfield Infrastructure		[9,890]
	ERI: Improve Support Infrastructure		[400]
	ERI: Improve Weapons Storage Facilities		[17,600]
060	BASE SUPPORT	1,226,834	1,226,834
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	92,109	92,109

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	168,269	168,269
090	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	26,337	26,337
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	852	852
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	4,942	4,942
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	99,400	99,568
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15-02 reprogramming		[168]
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	5,098,170	5,197,958
MOBILIZATION			
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,894,280	2,896,880
	ERI: Persistent MAF Capability		[2,000]
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15-02 reprogramming		[600]
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	138,043	138,043
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	437,279	597,279
	Restore Critical Depot Maintenance		[160,000]
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,801	2,801
180	BASE SUPPORT	15,370	15,370
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	3,487,773	3,650,373
TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	39	39
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	432	432
230	BASE SUPPORT	1,617	1,617
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	2,145	2,145
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	163	163
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	4,396	4,396
ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	85,016	85,016
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	934	934
380	BASE SUPPORT	6,923	6,923
390	ADMINISTRATION	151	151
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	162,106	164,356
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15-02 reprogramming		[2,250]
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	246,256	246,256
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	60	60
450A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	17,408	5,910
	Program decrease		[-11,498]
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	518,854	509,606
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	9,109,193	9,362,333
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
OPERATING FORCES			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	72,575	72,575
050	BASE SUPPORT	5,219	5,219
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	77,794	77,794
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	77,794	77,794
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS		2,300
	ERI: Eastern European Countries Exercise Support		[2,000]
	ERI: Leverage State Partnership Program		[300]
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	20,300	20,300
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	20,300	22,600
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	20,300	22,600
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF		100
	ERI: EUCOM Support to NATO Exercises in Chairman's Joint Exercise Program		[100]
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	2,490,648	2,648,963
	ERI: Increased Partnership Activities in Central and Eastern Europe		[10,557]
	Replenishment of source funds in FY15-02 reprogramming		[147,758]
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	2,490,648	2,649,063
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	22,847	22,847
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	21,516	21,516
110	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	36,416	36,416
130	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	105,000	105,000
150	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	6,251	6,251
170	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,660,000	1,660,000
230	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	93,000	93,000
270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	115,664	125,664
	ERI: Intelligence and Warning		[10,000]

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	2,424	2,424
290A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,617,659	1,613,059
	Program decrease		[-4,600]
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	3,680,777	3,686,177
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	6,171,425	6,335,240
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	45,503,372	46,815,401

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	128,957,593	128,479,608
AGR Pay and Allowance—projected underexecution		[-84,500]
CVN 73 Refueling and Complex Overhaul (RCOH)		[48,000]
Inactive Duty Training—projected underexecution		[-79,000]
Individual Clothing and Uniform Allowance—excess to requirement		[-10,000]
Lower than budgeted average strength levels		[-66,500]
Military Personnel Historical Underexecution		[-628,000]
Non-Prior Service Enlistment Bonus—excess to requirement		[-4,000]
Operational training excess to requirement		[-3,000]
Operational travel excess to requirement		[-10,800]
Recalculation from CPI-1 to CPI		[215,300]
Retain current A-10 fleet		[74,615]
Retain current AWACS fleet		[24,900]
Transfer funding for 2 CTC rotations: Army-requested from line 121, O&M Army		[45,000]
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	6,236,092	6,236,092
Total, Military Personnel	135,193,685	134,715,700

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	5,536,340	5,537,840
ERI: Strengthen the Capacity of NATO and NATO Partners		[1,500]
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	58,728	58,728
Total, Military Personnel Appropriations	5,595,068	5,596,568

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY		
PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	13,727	13,727
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	13,727	13,727
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE		
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (MEDICAL/DENTAL)	61,717	61,717
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	61,717	61,717
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	44,293	44,293
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	44,293	44,293
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA		
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,114,731	1,214,731
Restore Commissary Reduction		[100,000]
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,114,731	1,214,731

CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	222,728	222,728
RDT&E	595,913	595,913
PROCUREMENT	10,227	10,227
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	828,868	828,868
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF		
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	719,096	719,096
DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	101,591	101,591
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	820,687	820,687
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	310,830	310,830
PROCUREMENT	1,000	1,000
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	311,830	311,830
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
IN-HOUSE CARE	8,799,086	8,849,171
Implementation of Benefit Reform Proposal		[-56,715]
Restoration of MHS Modernization		[92,000]
USSOCOM Behavioral Health and Warrior Care Management Program		[14,800]
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	15,412,599	14,317,599
Historical underexecution		[-855,000]
Implementation of Benefit Reform Proposal		[-58,000]
Pharmaceutical drugs—excess growth		[-182,000]
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,462,096	2,358,396
Historical underexecution		[-100,000]
Travel excess growth		[-3,700]
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,557,347	1,557,347
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	366,223	366,223
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	750,866	750,866
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,683,694	1,683,694
R&D UNDISTRIBUTED		
R&D RESEARCH	10,317	10,317
R&D EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	49,015	49,015
R&D ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	226,410	226,410
R&D DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	97,787	97,787
R&D ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	217,898	217,898
R&D MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	38,075	38,075
R&D CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	15,092	15,092
UNDISTRIBUTED		
PROC INITIAL OUTFITTING	13,057	13,057
PROC REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	283,030	283,030
PROC THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM	3,145	3,145
PROC IEHR	9,181	9,181
UNDISTRIBUTED	-161,857	-161,857
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	31,833,061	30,684,446
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	35,028,914	33,980,299

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE		
C-17 CLS ENGINE COST INCREASE		
FUEL	5,000	5,000
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	5,000	5,000
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE		
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	86,350	86,350
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	86,350	86,350
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF		
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	189,000	209,000
SOUTHCOM ISR		[20,000]
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	189,000	209,000
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	7,968	7,968
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	7,968	7,968
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		
IN-HOUSE CARE	65,902	65,902
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	214,259	214,259
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	15,311	15,311

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	5,059	5,059
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	300,531	300,531
EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE		
EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE	925,000	370,713
ERI: Military Assistance and Support for Ukraine		[75,000]
ERI: Transfer out to appropriations for proper execution		[-629,287]
TOTAL EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE	925,000	370,713
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND		
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	4,000,000	1,300,000
Funding ahead of need		[-2,700,000]
TOTAL COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	4,000,000	1,300,000
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	5,513,849	2,279,562
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	5,513,849	2,279,562

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Army	California			
Army	Concord	Access Control Point	9,900	9,900
Army	Concord	General Purpose Maintenance Shop	5,300	5,300
Army	Fort Irwin	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	45,000	45,000
Army	Colorado			
Army	Fort Carson	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	60,000	60,000
Army	Fort Carson	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	29,000	29,000
Army	Guantanamo Bay, Cuba			
Army	Guantanamo Bay	Dining Facility	12,000	12,000
Army	Guantanamo Bay	Health Clinic	11,800	11,800
Army	Guantanamo Bay	High Value Detainee Complex	0	0
Army	Hawaii			
Army	Fort Shafter	Command and Control Facility Complex	96,000	85,000
Army	Japan			
Army	Kadena AB	Missile Magazine	10,600	10,600
Army	Kentucky			
Army	Blue Grass Army Depot	Shipping and Receiving Building	0	15,000
Army	Fort Campbell	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	23,000	23,000
Army	New York			
Army	Fort Drum	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	27,000	27,000
Army	U.S. Military Academy	Cadet Barracks, Incr 3	58,000	58,000
Army	Pennsylvania			
Army	Letterkenny Army Depot	Rebuild Shop	16,000	16,000
Army	South Carolina			
Army	Fort Jackson	Trainee Barracks Complex 3, Ph1	52,000	52,000
Army	Texas			
Army	Fort Hood	Simulations Center	0	0
Army	Virginia			
Army	Fort Lee	Adv. Individual Training Barracks Complex, Phase 3	0	0
Army	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Tactical Vehicle Hardstand	7,700	7,700
Army	Worldwide Unspecified			
Army	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Host Nation Support FY15	33,000	33,000
Army	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Minor Construction FY15	25,000	25,000
Army	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Planning and Design FY15	18,127	18,127
Military Construction, Army Total			539,427	543,427
Navy	Arizona			
Navy	Yuma	Aviation Maintenance and Support Complex	16,608	16,608
Navy	Bahrain Island			
Navy	SW Asia	P-8A Hangar	27,826	27,826
Navy	California			
Navy	Bridgeport	E-LMR Communications Towers	16,180	16,180
Navy	Lemoore	F-35C Facility Addition and Modification	0	16,594
Navy	Lemoore	F-35C Operational Training Facility	0	22,391
Navy	San Diego	Steam Distribution System Decentralization	47,110	47,110
Navy	District of Columbia			
Navy	District of Columbia	Electronics Science and Technology Laboratory	31,735	31,735
Navy	Djibouti			
Navy	Camp Lemonier	Entry Control Point	9,923	9,923

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Navy	Florida			
Navy	Jacksonville	MH60 Parking Apron	8,583	8,583
Navy	Jacksonville	P-8A Runway Thresholds and Taxiways	21,652	21,652
Navy	Mayport	LCS Operational Training Facility	20,520	20,520
Navy	Guam			
Navy	Joint Region Marianas	GSE Shops at North Ramp	21,880	21,880
Navy	Joint Region Marianas	MWSS Facilities at North Ramp	28,771	28,771
Navy	Hawaii			
Navy	Kaneohe Bay	Facility Modifications for VMU, MWSD, & CH53E	51,182	51,182
Navy	Kaneohe Bay	Road and Infrastructure Improvements	2,200	2,200
Navy	Pearl Harbor	Submarine Maneuvering Room Trainer Facility	9,698	9,698
Navy	Japan			
Navy	Iwakuni	Security Mods DPRI MC167-T (CVW-5 E2D EA-18G)	6,415	6,415
Navy	Kadena AB	Aircraft Maint Hangar Alterations and SAP-F	19,411	19,411
Navy	MCAS Futenma	Hangar & Rinse Facility Modernizations	4,639	4,639
Navy	Okinawa	LHD Practice Site Improvements	35,685	35,685
Navy	Maryland			
Navy	Annapolis	Center for Cyber Security Studies Building	120,112	30,000
Navy	Indian Head	Advanced Energetics Research Lab Complex Ph 2	15,346	15,346
Navy	Patuxent River	Atlantic Test Range Facility	9,860	9,860
Navy	Nevada			
Navy	Fallon	Air Wing Training Facility	27,763	27,763
Navy	Fallon	Facility Alteration for F-35 Training Mission	3,499	3,499
Navy	North Carolina			
Navy	Camp Lejeune	2nd Radio BN Complex Phase 1	0	50,706
Navy	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Water Treatment Plant Replacement	41,588	41,588
Navy	Pennsylvania			
Navy	Philadelphia	Ohio Replacement Power & Propulsion Facility	23,985	23,985
Navy	South Carolina			
Navy	Charleston	Nuclear Power Operational Support Facility	35,716	35,716
Navy	Spain			
Navy	Rota	Ship Berthing Power Upgrades	20,233	20,233
Navy	Virginia			
Navy	Dahlgren	Missile Support Facility	27,313	27,313
Navy	Norfolk	EOD Consolidated Ops & Logistics Facilities	39,274	39,274
Navy	Portsmouth	Submarine Maintenance Facility	9,743	9,743
Navy	Quantico	Ammunition Supply Point Expansion	12,613	12,613
Navy	Yorktown	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	19,152	19,152
Navy	Yorktown	Fast Company Training Facility	7,836	7,836
Navy	Washington			
Navy	Bangor	Regional Ship Maintenance Support Facility	0	13,833
Navy	Bremerton	Integrated Water Treatment Syst. Dd 1, 2, & 5	16,401	16,401
Navy	Kitsap	Explosives Handling Wharf #2 (Inc)	83,778	83,778
Navy	Port Angeles	TPS Port Angeles Forward Operating Location	20,638	20,638
Navy	Whidbey Island	P-8A Aircraft Apron and Supporting Facilities	24,390	24,390
Navy	Worldwide Unspecified			
Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	F-35C Facility Addition and Modification	16,594	0
Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	F-35C Operational Training Facility	22,391	0
Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCON Design Funds	33,366	33,366
Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,163	7,163
Military Construction, Navy Total			1,018,772	993,199
AF	Alaska			
AF	Clear AFS	Emergency Power Plant Fuel Storage	11,500	11,500
AF	Arizona			
AF	Luke AFB	F-35 Aircraft Mx Hangar—Sqdn #2	11,200	11,200
AF	Luke AFB	F-35 Flightline Fillstands	15,600	15,600
AF	Guam			
AF	Joint Region Marianas	Guam Strike Fuel Systems Maint. Hangar Inc 2	64,000	64,000
AF	Joint Region Marianas	PAR Low Observable/Corrosion Control/Composite Repair Shop	0	34,400
AF	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—Combat Comm Infrastr Facility	3,750	3,750
AF	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—Red Horse Logistics Facility	3,150	3,150
AF	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—Satellite Fire Station	6,500	6,500
AF	Kansas			
AF	McConnell AFB	KC-46A Adal Mobility Bag Strg Expansion	2,300	2,300
AF	McConnell AFB	KC-46A Adal Regional Mx Tng Facility	16,100	16,100
AF	McConnell AFB	KC-46A Alter Composite Mx Shop	4,100	4,100
AF	McConnell AFB	KC-46A Alter Taxiway Foxtrot	5,500	5,500
AF	McConnell AFB	KC-46A Fuselage Trainer	6,400	6,400
AF	Maryland			
AF	Fort Meade	Cybercom Joint Operations Center, Increment 2	166,000	166,000
AF	Massachusetts			
AF	Hanscom AFB	Dormitory (72 Rm)	13,500	13,500
AF	Nebraska			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
AF	Offutt AFB	Usstratcom Replacement Facility- Incr 4	180,000	180,000
	Nevada			
AF	Nellis AFB	F-22 Flight Simulator Facility	14,000	14,000
AF	Nellis AFB	F-35 Aircraft Mx Unit—4 Bay Hangar	31,000	31,000
AF	Nellis AFB	F-35 Weapons School Facility	8,900	8,900
	New Jersey			
AF	Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst	Fire Station	5,900	5,900
	Oklahoma			
AF	Tinker AFB	KC-46A Depot Maint Complex Spt Infrastr	48,000	48,000
AF	Tinker AFB	KC-46A Two-Bay Depot Mx Hangar	63,000	63,000
	Texas			
AF	Joint Base San Antonio	Fire Station	5,800	5,800
	United Kingdom			
AF	RAF Croughton	JIAC Consolidation—Phase 1	92,223	92,223
	Worldwide Unspecified			
AF	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	10,738	10,738
AF	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Military Construction	22,613	22,613
Military Construction, Air Force Total			811,774	846,174
	Arizona			
Def-Wide	Port Huachuca	JITC Building 52120 Renovation	1,871	1,871
	Australia			
Def-Wide	Geraldton	Combined Communications Gateway Geraldton	9,600	9,600
	Belgium			
Def-Wide	Brussels	Brussels Elementary/High School Replacement	41,626	41,626
Def-Wide	Brussels	NATO Headquarters Facility	37,918	37,918
	California			
Def-Wide	Camp Pendleton	SOF Comm/Elec Maintenance Facility	11,841	11,841
Def-Wide	Coronado	SOF Logistics Support Unit 1 Ops Facility #1	41,740	41,740
Def-Wide	Coronado	SOF Support Activity Ops Facility #2	28,600	28,600
Def-Wide	Lemoore	Replace Fuel Storage & Distribution Fac.	52,500	52,500
	Colorado			
Def-Wide	Peterson AFB	Dental Clinic Replacement	15,200	15,200
	Conus			
Def-Wide	Various Locations	East Coast Missile Site Planning and Design	0	0
	Conus Classified			
Def-Wide	Classified Location	SOF Skills Training Facility	53,073	53,073
	Georgia			
Def-Wide	Hunter Army Airfield	SOF Company Operations Facility	7,692	7,692
Def-Wide	Robins AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	19,900	19,900
	Germany			
Def-Wide	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Medical Center Replacement Incr 4	259,695	189,695
	Guantanamo Bay, Cuba			
Def-Wide	Guantanamo Bay	Replace Fuel Tank	11,100	11,100
Def-Wide	Guantanamo Bay	W.T. Sampson E/M and HS Consolid./Replacement	65,190	65,190
	Hawaii			
Def-Wide	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Replace Fuel Tanks	3,000	3,000
Def-Wide	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Upgrade Fire Suppression & Ventilation Sys.	49,900	49,900
	Japan			
Def-Wide	Misawa AB	Edgren High School Renovation	37,775	37,775
Def-Wide	Okinawa	Killin Elementary Replacement/Renovation	71,481	71,481
Def-Wide	Okinawa	Kubasaki High School Replacement/Renovation	99,420	99,420
Def-Wide	Sasebo	E.J. King High School Replacement/Renovation	37,681	37,681
	Kentucky			
Def-Wide	Fort Campbell	SOF System Integration Maintenance Office Fac	18,000	18,000
	Maryland			
Def-Wide	Fort Meade	NSAW Campus Feeders Phase 1	54,207	54,207
Def-Wide	Fort Meade	NSAW Recapitalize Building #1/Site M Inc 3	45,521	45,521
Def-Wide	Joint Base Andrews	Construct Hydrant Fuel System	18,300	18,300
	Michigan			
Def-Wide	Selfridge ANGB	Replace Fuel Distribution Facilities	35,100	35,100
	Mississippi			
Def-Wide	Stennis	SOF Applied Instruction Facility	10,323	10,323
Def-Wide	Stennis	SOF Land Acquisition Western Maneuver Area	17,224	17,224
	Nevada			
Def-Wide	Fallon	SOF Tactical Ground Mob. Vehicle Maint Fac.	20,241	20,241
	New Mexico			
Def-Wide	Cannon AFB	SOF Squadron Operations Facility (STS)	23,333	23,333
	North Carolina			
Def-Wide	Camp Lejeune	Lejeune High School Addition/Renovation	41,306	41,306
Def-Wide	Camp Lejeune	SOF Intel/Ops Expansion	11,442	11,442
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	SOF Battalion Operations Facility	37,074	37,074
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility	8,000	8,000
Def-Wide	Fort Bragg	SOF Training Command Building	48,062	48,062
Def-Wide	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	8,500	8,500
	South Carolina			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Def-Wide	Beaufort	Replace Fuel Distribution Facilities	40,600	40,600
Def-Wide	South Dakota			
	Ellsworth AFB	Construct Hydrant System	8,000	8,000
	Texas			
Def-Wide	Fort Bliss	Hospital Replacement Incr 6	131,500	131,500
Def-Wide	Joint Base San Antonio	Medical Clinic Replacement	38,300	38,300
	Virginia			
Def-Wide	Crane Island	Replace & Alter Fuel Distribution Facilities	36,500	36,500
Def-Wide	Def Distribution Depot Rich-	Replace Access Control Point	5,700	5,700
	mond			
Def-Wide	Fort Belvoir	Parking Lot	7,239	7,239
Def-Wide	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Hospital Addition/Cup Replacement	41,200	41,200
Def-Wide	Joint Expeditionary Base Lit-	SOF Human Performance Center	11,200	11,200
	tle Creek—Story			
Def-Wide	Joint Expeditionary Base Lit-	SOF Indoor Dynamic Range	14,888	14,888
	tle Creek—Story			
Def-Wide	Joint Expeditionary Base Lit-	SOF Mobile Comm Det Support Facility	13,500	13,500
	tle Creek—Story			
Def-Wide	Pentagon	Redundant Chilled Water Loop	15,100	15,100
	Worldwide Unspecified			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Contingency Construction	9,000	0
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	ECIP Design	10,000	10,000
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Energy Conservation Investment Program	150,000	150,000
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Exercise Related Minor Construction	8,581	8,581
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Planning and Design	599	599
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Planning and Design	38,704	38,704
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Planning and Design	42,387	42,387
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Planning and Design	745	745
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Planning and Design	24,425	4,425
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Planning and Design	1,183	1,183
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,932	5,932
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Unspecified Minor Construction	10,334	10,334
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000	2,000
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,846	6,846
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,100	4,100
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,700	2,700
	tions			
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca-	Unspecified Minor Milcon	2,994	2,994
	tions			
Def-Wide	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	24,197	24,197
Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total			2,061,890	1,962,890
	Kentucky			
Chem Demil	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Ph XV	38,715	38,715
Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense Total			38,715	38,715
	Worldwide Unspecified			
NATO	NATO Security Investment	NATO Security Investment Program	199,700	174,700
	Program			
NATO Security Investment Program Total			199,700	174,700
	Delaware			
Army NG	Dagsboro	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	0	0
	Maine			
Army NG	Augusta	National Guard Reserve Center	30,000	32,000
	Maryland			
Army NG	Havre de Grace	National Guard Readiness Center	12,400	12,400
	Montana			
Army NG	Helena	National Guard Readiness Center Add/Alt	38,000	38,000
	New Mexico			
Army NG	Alamogordo	Readiness Center Add/Alt	0	5,000
Army NG	Alamogordo	National Guard Readiness Center	0	0
	North Dakota			
Army NG	Valley City	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	10,800	10,800

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation	Project Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Army NG	Vermont North Hyde Park	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	4,400	4,400
Army NG	Washington Yakima	Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training	0	0
Army NG	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Planning and Design	17,600	17,600
Army NG	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Unspecified Minor Construction	13,720	13,720
Military Construction, Army National Guard Total			126,920	133,920
Army Res	California Fresno	Army Reserve Center/AMSA	22,000	22,000
Army Res	March (Riverside)	Army Reserve Center	0	25,000
Army Res	Colorado Fort Carson	Training Building Addition	5,000	5,000
Army Res	Illinois Arlington Heights	Army Reserve Center	0	0
Army Res	Mississippi Starkville	Army Reserve Center	0	0
Army Res	New Jersey Joint Base McGuire-Dix- Lakehurst	Army Reserve Center	26,000	26,000
Army Res	New York Mattydale	Army Reserve Center/AMSA	23,000	23,000
Army Res	Virginia Fort Lee	Tass Training Center	16,000	16,000
Army Res	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Planning and Design	8,337	8,337
Army Res	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,609	3,609
Military Construction, Army Reserve Total			103,946	128,946
N/MC Res	Pennsylvania Pittsburgh	Reserve Training Center—Pittsburgh, PA	17,650	17,650
N/MC Res	Washington Everett	Joint Reserve Intelligence Center	0	47,869
N/MC Res	Whidbey Island	C-40 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	27,755	27,755
N/MC Res	Worldwide Unspecified Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	MCNR Planning & Design	2,123	2,123
N/MC Res	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	MCNR Unspecified Minor Construction	4,000	4,000
Military Construction, Naval Reserve Total			51,528	99,397
Air NG	Arkansas Fort Smith Municipal Airport	Consolidated SCIF	0	13,200
Air NG	Connecticut Bradley IAP	Construct C-130 Fuel Cell and Corrosion Contr	16,306	16,306
Air NG	Iowa Des Moines MAP	Remotely Piloted Aircraft and Targeting Group	8,993	8,993
Air NG	Michigan W. K. Kellogg Regional Airport	RPA Beddown	6,000	6,000
Air NG	New Hampshire Pease International Trade Port	KC-46A Adal Airfield Pavements & Hydrant Syst	7,100	7,100
Air NG	Pease International Trade Port	KC-46A Adal Fuel Cell Building 253	16,800	16,800
Air NG	Pease International Trade Port	KC-46A Adal Maint Hangar Building 254	18,002	18,002
Air NG	Pennsylvania Willow Grove ARF	RPA Operations Center	5,662	5,662
Air NG	Worldwide Unspecified Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	7,700	7,700
Air NG	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	8,100	6,100
Military Construction, Air National Guard Total			94,663	105,863
AF Res	Arizona Davis-Monthan AFB	Guardian Angel Operations	0	14,500
AF Res	Georgia Robins AFB	AFRC Consolidated Mission Complex, Ph I	27,700	27,700
AF Res	North Carolina Seymour Johnson AFB	KC-135 Tanker Parking Apron Expansion	9,800	9,800
AF Res	Texas Fort Worth	EOD Facility	3,700	3,700
AF Res	Worldwide Unspecified Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	6,892	6,892
AF Res	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Military Construction	1,400	1,400
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve Total			49,492	63,992
	Illinois			

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation			Project Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
FH Con Army	Rock Island			Family Housing New Construction	19,500	19,500
FH Con Army	Korea			Family Housing New Construction	57,800	57,800
FH Con Army	Worldwide Unspecified					
FH Con Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Family Housing P & D	1,309	1,309
Family Housing Construction, Army Total					78,609	78,609
FH Ops Army	Worldwide Unspecified					
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings	14,136	14,136
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Leased Housing	112,504	112,504
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance of Real Property Facilities	65,245	65,245
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	3,117	3,117
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	43,480	43,480
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Military Housing Privatization Initiative	20,000	20,000
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Miscellaneous	700	700
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Services	9,108	9,108
FH Ops Army	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities	82,686	82,686
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Army Total					350,976	350,976
FH Ops AF	Worldwide Unspecified					
FH Ops AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings Account	38,543	38,543
FH Ops AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Housing Privatization	40,761	40,761
FH Ops AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Leasing	43,651	43,651
FH Ops AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance	99,934	99,934
FH Ops AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	47,834	47,834
FH Ops AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Miscellaneous Account	1,993	1,993
FH Ops AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Services Account	12,709	12,709
FH Ops AF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities Account	42,322	42,322
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Air Force Total					327,747	327,747
FH Con Navy	Worldwide Unspecified					
FH Con Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Design	472	472
FH Con Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Improvements	15,940	15,940
Family Housing Construction, Navy And Marine Corps Total					16,412	16,412
FH Ops Navy	Worldwide Unspecified					
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings Account	17,881	17,881
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Leasing	65,999	65,999
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance of Real Property	97,612	97,612
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	55,124	55,124
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Miscellaneous Account	366	366
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Privatization Support Costs	27,876	27,876
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Services Account	18,079	18,079
FH Ops Navy	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities Account	71,092	71,092
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Navy And Marine Corps Total					354,029	354,029
FH Ops DW	Worldwide Unspecified					
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings Account	3,362	3,362

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/Country and Installation			Project Title	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings Account	20	20
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Furnishings Account	746	746
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Leasing	42,083	42,083
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Leasing	11,179	11,179
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance of Real Property	344	344
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Maintenance of Real Property	2,128	2,128
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Management Account	378	378
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Services Account	31	31
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities Account	170	170
FH Ops DW	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Utilities Account	659	659
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Defense-Wide Total					61,100	61,100
Worldwide Unspecified						
FHIF	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,662	1,662
DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund Total					1,662	1,662
Worldwide Unspecified						
BRAC	Base Realignment & Closure,			Base Realignment and Closure	84,417	84,417
Army						
Base Realignment and Closure—Army Total					84,417	84,417
Worldwide Unspecified						
BRAC	Base Realignment & Closure,			Base Realignment & Closure	57,406	57,406
Navy						
BRAC	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-100: Planing, Design and Management	7,682	7,682
BRAC	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-101: Various Locations	21,416	21,416
BRAC	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-138: NAS Brunswick, ME	904	904
BRAC	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-157: Mcsa Kansas City, MO	40	40
BRAC	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA	6,066	6,066
BRAC	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DON-84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg Ap	1,178	1,178
Base Realignment and Closure—Navy Total					94,692	94,692
Worldwide Unspecified						
BRAC	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	DoD BRAC Activities—Air Force	90,976	90,976
tions						
Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force Total					90,976	90,976
Worldwide Unspecified						
PYS	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	42 USC 3374	0	0
tions						
PYS	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	Army	0	0
tions						
PYS	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	NATO Security Investment Program	0	0
tions						
Prior Year Savings Total					0	0
Worldwide Unspecified						
GR	Unspecified	Worldwide	Loca-	General Reductions	0	0
tions						
General Reductions Total					0	0
Total Military Construction					6,557,447	6,551,843

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS (In Thousands of Dollars)				
Service	Country and Location	Project	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Army	Mihail Kogalniceanu	ERI: Fuel Storage Capacity	0	15,000
Army	Mihail Kogalniceanu	ERI: Hazardous Cargo Ramp	0	5,000
Army	Mihail Kogalniceanu	ERI: Multi Modal Improvements	0	17,000
Military Construction, Army Total			0	37,000
AF	Graf Ignatievo	ERI: Improve Airfield Infrastructure	0	3,200
AF	Amari	ERI: Improve Airfield Infrastructure	0	24,780
AF	Camp Darby	ERI: Improve Weapons Storage Facility	0	44,450
AF	Lielvarde	ERI: Improve Airfield Infrastructure	0	10,710
AF	Siauliai	ERI: Improve Airfield Infrastructure	0	13,120
AF	Lask	ERI: Improve Support Infrastructure	0	22,400
AF	Camp Turzii	ERI: Improve Airfield Infrastructure	0	2,900
AF	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	ERI: Planning and Design	0	11,500
Military Construction, Air Force Total			0	133,060
Def-Wide	Classified Location	Classified Project	46,000	46,000
Def-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide Loca- tions	ERI: Unspecified Minor Construction	0	4,350
Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total			46,000	50,350
Total, Military Construction, OCO Funding			46,000	220,410

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS (In Thousands of Dollars)				
Program			FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation				
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies				
Appropriation Summary:				
Energy Programs				
Nuclear Energy			104,000	104,000
Advisory Board				
Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health			0	2,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities				
National nuclear security administration:				
Weapons activities			8,314,902	8,210,560
Defense nuclear nonproliferation			1,555,156	1,774,758
Naval reactors			1,377,100	1,377,100
Federal salaries and expenses			410,842	386,863
Total, National nuclear security administration			11,658,000	11,749,281
Environmental and other defense activities:				
Defense environmental cleanup			5,327,538	4,884,538
Other defense activities			753,000	754,000
Total, Environmental & other defense activities			6,080,538	5,638,538
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities			17,738,538	17,387,819
Total, Discretionary Funding			17,842,538	17,493,819
Nuclear Energy				
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security			104,000	104,000
Advisory Board				
Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health			0	2,000
Weapons Activities				
Directed stockpile work				
Life extension programs				
B61 Life extension program			643,000	643,000
W76 Life extension program			259,168	259,168
W88 Alt 370			165,400	165,400
Cruise missile warhead life extension program			9,418	17,018
Total, Life extension programs			1,076,986	1,084,586
Stockpile systems				
B61 Stockpile systems			109,615	109,615
W76 Stockpile systems			45,728	45,728
W78 Stockpile systems			62,703	62,703
W80 Stockpile systems			70,610	70,610
B83 Stockpile systems			63,136	63,136
W87 Stockpile systems			91,255	91,255
W88 Stockpile systems			88,060	88,060

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Total, Stockpile systems	531,107	531,107
Weapons dismantlement and disposition		
Operations and maintenance	30,008	40,008
Stockpile services		
Production support	350,942	350,942
Research and development support	29,649	25,500
R&D certification and safety	201,479	160,000
Management, technology, and production	241,805	226,000
Plutonium sustainment	144,575	144,575
Tritium readiness	140,053	140,053
Total, Stockpile services	1,108,503	1,047,070
Total, Directed stockpile work	2,746,604	2,702,771
Campaigns:		
Science campaign		
Advanced certification	58,747	58,747
Primary assessment technologies	112,000	112,000
Dynamic materials properties	117,999	110,000
Advanced radiography	79,340	79,340
Secondary assessment technologies	88,344	88,344
Total, Science campaign	456,430	448,431
Engineering campaign		
Enhanced surety	52,003	52,003
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	20,832	20,832
Nuclear survivability	25,371	25,371
Enhanced surveillance	37,799	37,799
Total, Engineering campaign	136,005	136,005
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign		
Ignition	77,994	77,994
Support of other stockpile programs	23,598	23,598
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	61,297	61,297
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	5,024	5,024
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	9,100	9,100
Facility operations and target production	335,882	335,882
Undistributed	0	0
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	512,895	512,895
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	610,108	610,108
Nonnuclear Readiness Campaign	125,909	70,000
Total, Campaigns	1,841,347	1,777,439
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)		
Operations of facilities		
Kansas City Plant	125,000	125,000
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	71,000	71,000
Los Alamos National Laboratory	198,000	198,000
Nevada National Security Site	89,000	89,000
Pantex	75,000	75,000
Sandia National Laboratory	106,000	106,000
Savannah River Site	81,000	81,000
Y-12 National security complex	151,000	151,000
Total, Operations of facilities	896,000	896,000
Program readiness	136,700	101,000
Material recycle and recovery	138,900	138,900
Containers	26,000	26,000
Storage	40,800	40,800
Maintenance and repair of facilities	205,000	220,000
Recapitalization	209,321	231,321
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	756,721	758,021
Construction:		
15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12	2,000	2,000
15-D-612 Emergency Operations Center, LLNL	2,000	2,000
15-D-611 Emergency Operations Center, SNL	4,000	4,000
15-D-301 HE Science & Engineering Facility, PX	11,800	11,800
15-D-302, TA-55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL	16,062	16,062
12-D-301 TRU waste facilities, LANL	6,938	6,938
11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL	10,000	10,000
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	15,000	15,000
06-D-141 PED/Construction, Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project Y-12	335,000	335,000
Total, Construction	402,800	402,800
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	2,055,521	2,056,821

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Secure transportation asset		
Operations and equipment	132,851	132,851
Program direction	100,962	100,962
Total, Secure transportation asset	233,813	233,813
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	173,440	182,440
Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs	76,901	70,000
Site stewardship		
Environmental projects and operations	53,000	53,000
Nuclear materials integration	16,218	16,218
Minority serving institution partnerships program	13,231	13,231
Total, Site stewardship	82,449	82,449
Defense nuclear security		
Operations and maintenance	618,123	618,123
Total, Defense nuclear security	618,123	618,123
Information technology and cybersecurity	179,646	179,646
Legacy contractor pensions	307,058	307,058
Total, Weapons Activities	8,314,902	8,210,560
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation		
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs		
Global threat reduction initiative	333,488	383,488
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D		
Operations and maintenance		
Nonproliferation and verification	360,808	393,401
Total, Operations and Maintenance	360,808	393,401
Nonproliferation and international security	141,359	144,246
International material protection and cooperation	305,467	294,589
Fissile materials disposition		
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition		
Operations and maintenance		
U.S. plutonium disposition	85,000	85,000
U.S. uranium disposition	25,000	25,000
Total, Operations and maintenance	110,000	110,000
Construction:		
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	196,000	341,000
99-D-141-02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC	5,125	5,125
Total, Construction	201,125	346,125
Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	311,125	456,125
Total, Fissile materials disposition	311,125	456,125
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs	1,452,247	1,671,849
Legacy contractor pensions	102,909	102,909
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,555,156	1,774,758
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,555,156	1,774,758
Naval Reactors		
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	412,380	412,380
Naval reactors development	425,700	425,700
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	156,100	156,100
S8G Prototype refueling	126,400	126,400
Program direction	46,600	46,600
Construction:		
15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3	400	400
15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade	600	600
15-D-902 KS Engineerroom team trainer facility	1,500	1,500
15-D-901 KS Central office building and prototype staff facility	24,000	24,000
14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	141,100	141,100
13-D-905 Remote-handled low-level waste facility, INL	14,420	14,420
13-D-904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO	20,100	20,100
10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL	7,400	7,400
08-D-190 Expanded Core Facility M-290 receiving/discharge station,		
Naval Reactor Facility, ID	400	400
Total, Construction	209,920	209,920
Total, Naval Reactors	1,377,100	1,377,100

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Federal Salaries And Expenses		
Program direction	410,842	386,863
Total, Office Of The Administrator	410,842	386,863
Defense Environmental Cleanup		
Closure sites:		
Closure sites administration	4,889	4,889
Hanford site:		
River corridor and other cleanup operations	332,788	352,788
Central plateau remediation	474,292	474,292
Construction:		
15-D-401 Containerized sludge (RI-0012)	26,290	26,290
Total, Central plateau remediation	833,370	853,370
Richland community and regulatory support	14,701	14,701
Total, Hanford site	848,071	868,071
Idaho National Laboratory:		
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	364,293	364,293
Idaho community and regulatory support	2,910	2,910
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	367,203	367,203
NNSA sites		
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,366	1,366
Nevada	64,851	64,851
Sandia National Laboratories	2,801	2,801
Los Alamos National Laboratory	196,017	196,017
Construction:		
15-D-406 Hexavalent chromium D & D (VI-Lanl-0030)	28,600	28,600
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	293,635	293,635
Oak Ridge Reservation:		
OR Nuclear facility D & D		
OR Nuclear facility D & D	73,155	73,155
Construction:		
14-D-403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility	9,400	9,400
Total, OR Nuclear facility D & D	82,555	82,555
U233 Disposition Program	41,626	41,626
OR cleanup and disposition:		
OR cleanup and disposition	71,137	71,137
Construction:		
15-D-405—Sludge Buildout	4,200	4,200
Total, OR cleanup and disposition	75,337	75,337
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,365	4,365
Solid waste stabilization and disposition,		
Oak Ridge technology development	3,000	3,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	206,883	206,883
Office of River Protection:		
Waste treatment and immobilization plant		
01-D-416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction	575,000	575,000
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility	115,000	115,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	690,000	690,000
Tank farm activities		
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	522,000	522,000
Construction:		
15-D-409 Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford	23,000	23,000
Total, Tank farm activities	545,000	545,000
Total, Office of River protection	1,235,000	1,235,000
Savannah River sites:		
Savannah River risk management operations	416,276	416,276
SR community and regulatory support	11,013	11,013
Radioactive liquid tank waste:		
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	553,175	553,175
Construction:		
15-D-402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6	34,642	34,642
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	135,000	135,000
Total, Construction	169,642	169,642
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	722,817	722,817
Total, Savannah River site	1,150,106	1,150,106
Waste isolation pilot plant	216,020	216,020

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Agreement Authorized
Program direction	280,784	280,784
Program support	14,979	14,979
Safeguards and Security:		
Oak Ridge Reservation	16,382	16,382
Paducah	7,297	7,297
Portsmouth	8,492	8,492
Richland/Hanford Site	63,668	63,668
Savannah River Site	132,196	132,196
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,455	4,455
West Valley	1,471	1,471
Technology development	13,007	13,007
Use of prior-year balances	0	0
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	4,864,538	4,884,538
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000	0
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,327,538	4,884,538
Other Defense Activities		
Specialized security activities	202,152	203,152
Environment, health, safety and security		
Environment, health, safety and security	118,763	118,763
Program direction	62,235	62,235
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security	180,998	180,998
Independent enterprise assessments		
Independent enterprise assessments	24,068	24,068
Program direction	49,466	49,466
Total, Independent enterprise assessments	73,534	73,534
Office of Legacy Management		
Legacy management	158,639	158,639
Program direction	13,341	13,341
Total, Office of Legacy Management	171,980	171,980
Defense-related activities		
Defense related administrative support		
Chief financial officer	46,877	46,877
Chief information officer	71,959	71,959
Total, Defense related administrative support	118,836	118,836
Office of hearings and appeals	5,500	5,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities	753,000	754,000
Total, Other Defense Activities	753,000	754,000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 770, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3979.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act.

The NDAA is how Congress fulfills its constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense. This year will mark the 53rd consecutive year that we have completed our work.

What makes this bill such an important piece of legislation are the vital authorities contained within. It provides resources for the mission in Afghanistan. It funds our military operations against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. It pays our troops and their families. It keeps our Navy fleet sailing and our military aircraft flying. It maintains a strong nuclear deterrent.

The NDAA is much broader than this, but I will close in the interest of time. Before I do, I would like to thank Ranking Member SMITH, all of the members of our Armed Services Committee, and my colleagues in this body

for all of their efforts to get us to this point.

□ 1115

Every year for the past 52 years Congress has passed an NDAA. I am grateful for the hardworking chairs and ranking members of the HASC, but also to all Members of the body for recognizing the importance of this vital piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to join with the chairman in urging the body to pass this important piece of legislation. This bill every year helps our military do its job. It provides pay increases for the people who serve in the military, it provides for military construction, and it provides for the necessary authorities that the men and women who serve in our military need to perform the missions that our country asks them to do.

This is particularly important as we continue to fight in Afghanistan and as we continue to try to figure out how to deal with the challenge in Syria and Iraq. I think this bill is of even more importance because it contains within it the train and equip authority to help deal with ISIS and Syria and Iraq.

I really wish to emphasize for this body that that train and equip mission is just that. It in no way, shape, manner, or form authorizes the use of military force, and I think it is the best approach.

I don't want U.S. troops fighting this war. We have learned that U.S. troops cannot win the battle against the evil ideology that al Qaeda and ISIS have promoted. We need local partners. That is what this bill helps us do: train and equip those local partners so that they can fight ISIS on their home turf locally and in a far more successful way.

I will say that this bill is deficient in one regard. We have a smaller defense budget than we ever anticipated that we would have. If sequestration comes to pass, it will be smaller still.

There are very difficult decisions in terms of what equipment to procure, what equipment to set aside, how to cut personnel costs. The Pentagon has wrestled with all of those issues and made a series of proposals to us about how to make those cuts. We rejected pretty much all of them.

That is not going to happen in the future. In 2016–2017 we are going to have to make some choices, because if we don't make choices, readiness gets hurt. It is the last thing that they can cut. They do not fix equipment. They do not train troops as much. They do not pay for ammunition and fuel to do the training. If we don't make the decisions on how to make rational cuts in the budget in light of how much that budget has shrunk, readiness gets hurt. So in the future, I hope we will make those decisions.

I applaud the chairman for his fine work. I want to thank him for an excellent working relationship. I wish him the best. He has been an excellent chairman. He has upheld the tradition of bipartisanship on the House Armed Services Committee as well as anybody. I really appreciate that working relationship. I thank you for the work on this bill, and I urge its passage.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), my friend and colleague, the incoming chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. As we have already heard, there are Members who have concerns

about various provisions of this bill. I think many Members have concerns about the process which brought this bill to us. It was certainly messy, which was inevitable when the Senate never passed a bill.

When you look at this measure as a whole, despite any imperfections, it is better for the country, better for our security, better for the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces to pass this bill rather than to reject this bill, and I hope Members will support it strongly.

In fact, there are many good, important provisions in it. Within the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities, we have provisions dealing with cyber operations, with defense intelligence, special operations, and human rights training of foreign militaries. I am very grateful to my partner Mr. LANGEVIN, who has worked with me throughout the formulation of these provisions and throughout the past 4 years on those issues.

Mr. Speaker, finally, it is very appropriate that this bill be named in honor of Chairman BUCK McKEON, not just for the work he has done on this measure, but for the work he has done to promote our country's security throughout his tenure and for the commitment that he has shown to the men and women who serve our country in the military.

He has made substantial contributions substantively and, I agree with Mr. SMITH, collaboratively in working in a bipartisan way, which is also good for the country, good for the men and women who serve. We will certainly miss him, but we appreciate very much all his contributions, and naming this bill for him is one way to help recognize those.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), the ranking member on the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to also echo my thanks to Chairman McKEON. I had the pleasure not only of working with him on this committee, but also the Education Committee when we were on that. You will be missed here in the Congress, BUCK, but as a Californian, I hope you will come back and help California even more.

An important role of the Armed Services Committee is to conduct aggressive oversight on the hundreds of billions that the Department of Defense spends each year. And while the DOD needs strong funding support from Congress, there are still a lot of areas of wasteful spending, areas that need to be cut, areas where more funding might be needed than requested in the budget, and I am pleased that this final NDAA includes numerous measures to reduce or restrict funding for DOD pro-

grams that are behind schedule, not performing, or judged to be of lower priorities.

In the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee part of the bill, there are almost \$800 million in funding reductions to such programs, and we did that in a bipartisan manner. There is also oversight legislation on several critical programs.

The final NDAA provides funding at the President's budget level for most major programs, including more than \$8 billion for the 34 F-35 aircraft and also for continued research and development.

And finally, the NDAA also includes significant funding in high-priority areas. For example, the Growler aircraft, \$450 million; an additional \$98 million for additional MQ-9 aircraft; an additional \$103 million for UH-60 helicopters for our Army National Guard; an additional \$382 million for Army ground vehicles.

Also, I am very pleased that my provisions to further integrate women into the military were included in this final bill. I strongly urge the Department of Defense to ensure that there are no delays in expanding opportunities for female servicemembers who are out there on the front lines.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), my friend and colleague who is a member of the Armed Services Committee and is the chairman of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I continue to be impressed with the bipartisan effort that was used to create this bill.

I want to thank Chairman McKEON for his leadership and service to our Nation. His time and effort to support our men and women in uniform and to guide our national security will be sorely missed. But he leaves the committee in good hands with the gentleman from Texas, Chairman THORNBERRY, who will bring two decades of experience and leadership to help navigate our committee through the challenges ahead.

I do have to express concern for service provisions included in this bill relating to servicemember entitlements. More specifically, I am disappointed with the cuts to military housing allowances, commissaries, and the pharmaceutical copay increase. While the bill takes important steps forward in honoring our commitment to those who wear our Nation's uniform, I remain concerned that these provisions send the wrong signal to our warriors and their families who have already sacrificed so much for our country. Despite these concerns, I believe that this bill is a strong one and should be broadly supported.

As to the Seapower Subcommittee, I am pleased with the provisions in this

bill, including the continued funding of the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of the USS *George Washington*, construction of two Virginia class submarines, two Arleigh Burke class destroyers, and three Littoral Combat Ships. We were also successful in authorizing the construction of LPD-28, continuing the Tomahawk missile production line, retaining the existing cruiser force structure, and providing thorough oversight of the requirements for the Navy's UCLASS program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members of the Armed Services Committee, especially the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), the ranking member of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, for his long service and unyielding support for our men and women in uniform.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), the ranking member of the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my good friend from Virginia, Subcommittee Chairman RANDY FORBES. He has not only been an exceptional partner on this subcommittee but, more importantly, has been a dear friend throughout my entire time in Congress, and he has been an exceptional leader also of the Congressional Prayer Caucus, with whom I have enjoyed serving as co-chairman. I know that the gentleman from Virginia will continue the great tradition of bipartisanship on this subcommittee, and I wish him, as well as those with whom we have served on our great subcommittee, the best in the future as they continue to serve our men and women in uniform.

This bill contains \$15.65 billion for shipbuilding that will authorize two Virginia class submarines, two Arleigh Burke class destroyers, three Littoral Combat Ships, and provides an additional \$800 million for a twelfth San Antonio class amphibious ship.

This bill also reaffirms Congress' support of an 11-ship aircraft carrier fleet, with the addition of nearly \$800 million for the refueling and overhaul of the USS *George Washington*, something that I know Chairman FORBES and I share a passion about. These ships are critical to the United States' ability to project power and presence anywhere in the world.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, continues the long tradition of bipartisan support for our troops, for which this committee is known.

I am very humbled and honored to have been able to serve on this important committee for our Nation's security, and I want to thank the colleagues that I have served with over these last 18 years.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member ADAM

SMITH, my classmate, for their steady leadership throughout this process. Both of these gentlemen have been great partners, and without them, we would not be here now to vote on this bill.

It has, indeed, been a privilege to serve with them, to serve with the committee members, and, most importantly, to serve our great men and women in uniform who serve all of us throughout this country and, indeed, around the world.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

May God's blessings be with those who serve our country and continue to stand night and day for our freedom. Let's show them our support. Let's support this bill and get it done today. God bless all of them, and God bless our Nation.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), my friend and colleague who is a member of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Military Personnel Subcommittee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from California, Chairman McKEON, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, America appreciates Chairman BUCK McKEON and his wife, Patricia, for their extraordinary dedicated service to promoting a strong military defense and the well-being of servicemembers and their military families. I wish them Godspeed for their future success. The chairman will be greatly missed.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Personnel—and I am very grateful that I have had the privilege of working with Ranking Member SUSAN DAVIS of California—I am grateful to have served with Chairman McKEON in drafting this bill.

Supporting our servicemembers and providing the necessary resources for our military families and veterans is the primary function of the Federal Government. With the hopeful passage today of the National Defense Authorization Act, we will help achieve this goal and ensure that our national security remains in tact.

Included in today's bill are provisions that the House and Senate have agreed upon that will help keep American families safe and make sure that our brave men and women in uniform are given the resources they have earned and deserve.

□ 1130

Included in today's bill are provisions that the House and Senate have agreed upon that will help keep American families safe and make sure that our brave men and women in uniform are given the resources they have earned and deserve.

Key provisions:

Awards the Purple Heart to members of the Armed Forces like those at Fort Hood who were wounded or killed in domestic terrorist attacks on our home soil; mandates new criminal sexual assault reforms to prevent future crimes from occurring and offers support to victims in need; additional behavioral and psychological health programs will be made available to address and prevent military suicides; a bipartisan prohibition on the transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States and prevents construction of terrorist detention facilities at home; and supports operations to support peace in the Middle East by supporting our allies in the region. In the future, we will work to enhance pay benefits and commissary proposals.

As a 31-year veteran of the Army National Guard, I am pleased that Congressman BILL ENYART of Illinois and I were able to support the National Guard's readiness and capabilities by preventing the transfer of any Apache helicopters in the coming year. Apart from assisting the States when disaster strikes, the National Guard serves as the combat reserve force for our Active Duty Army and Air Force. Their accomplishments are crucial for the security of our country.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), the ranking member of the Military Personnel Subcommittee.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Carl Levin and Howard "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

As the ranking member of the Military Personnel Subcommittee, I am pleased that this bill includes a number of provisions that continue our commitment to our Armed Forces. I certainly want to thank Chairman JOE WILSON for working with me in a bipartisan manner to support our servicemembers and their families. I would also recognize and thank our retiring chairman, BUCK McKEON, and, of course, ADAM SMITH, the ranking member, for their leadership.

I am pleased that the final agreement continues the committee's focus on sexual assault. These provisions include requiring the judicial panel to assess the impact of using mental health records by the defense in preliminary hearings and a comparison between the civilian use of mental health records in civilian criminal proceedings; requiring the Secretary of Defense to consider the victims of sexual assault's preference regarding whether the offense should be prosecuted by court-martial or in a civilian court; and requiring performance appraisals of a commanding officer to include whether the officer has established a command climate in which allegations of sexual

assault are properly managed and victims feel free to report a sexual assault without fear of retaliation.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement also includes several health care provisions that continue to improve the mental health of the force. Although the agreement includes a modest, one-time change to the TRICARE pharmacy copay rates and a decrease by 1 percent in the housing allowance, it does not include the full savings proposed by the Department of Defense. As a result, the Department will need to address the savings it already took in the fiscal year 2015 budget.

As Mr. SMITH has pointed out, the discussion on compensation that led to this agreement is a beginning to the conversations we must have. As we look to the next Congress, I hope that the results of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission due in February 2015 will inform this important discussion. We all know these are difficult times, particularly with full sequestration ahead in FY16. Ignoring the issue will only lead the Department to take significant cuts to end-strength and readiness. These difficult decisions will need to be made in order to sustain our all-volunteer force.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), my friend and colleague. He is a member of the Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee and the sponsor of the child protection amendment that he has worked on for 7 years.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2015, the 53rd consecutive National Defense Authorization Act.

I want to personally thank the chairman and Ranking Member SMITH; our staff director, Bob Simmons; my MLA, Morley Greene; Senator INHOFE and the ranking member; and, of course, Secretary Hagel for having included in this bill important legislation that will protect the custody rights of our men and women in uniform. This has been a battle for 7 years, and I greatly appreciate their tenacity and their support over what has been a long battle. No longer will random family law courts across the Nation be able to penalize our men and women in uniform by taking custody of their children away as a result of their having served their Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of serving as the chairman of the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee as well as the cochair of the Military Sexual Assault Prevention Caucus. Under the full committee leadership of Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH, with my ranking member, LORETTA SANCHEZ, we have done a bipartisan ef-

fort in this bill. It supports the men and women, and it also helps retain defense technology superiority, sustains our critical defense industrial base, and helps to maintain continued modernization for our military.

Additionally, we provide full funding for the Joint Strike Fighter and the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle programs, and the bill includes additional funding for National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment modernization, Abrams tanks, Bradley Fighting Vehicles, Stryker combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, body armor, and unmanned aerial systems.

I also believe that this bill is incredibly important because of the provisions that are in this bill with respect to sexual assault. I want to thank my cochair, Representative TSONGAS, Military Personnel Subcommittee Chairman JOE WILSON, and the ranking member, SUSAN DAVIS, for her help on the issues of sexual assault in the military and also custody. These provisions are incredibly important and will provide additional protections to our men and women in uniform.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), the ranking member of the Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their work on this bill. The NDAA gets done year after year not because it is easy but because it is absolutely critical to our national security, and it is absolutely critical to honoring and supporting our men and women in uniform who have put themselves in harm's way every day to keep our Nation safe.

Mr. Speaker, this year I am particularly proud of what Chairman THORNBERRY and I were able to accomplish in the Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee. I thank Mr. THORNBERRY for his partnership, especially on issues relating to intelligence and cybersecurity issues, and I congratulate him on becoming the incoming chairman of the full committee.

This bill supports important investments in areas from emerging technologies such as electric weapons, including railguns and lasers, to broad-based R&D that will support the next generation of disruptive technologies and to the STEM education efforts that will inspire the innovators of the future.

It will also strengthen DOD's cybersecurity posture by identifying the tools needed to recruit and retain a qualified workforce, further our understanding of the threats we face in cyberspace, enable access to test and training ranges, and provide for operational and ready force. It extends critically needed special operations au-

thorities while working to combat the alarmingly high rate of suicide among our Nation's special operators. Finally it strongly supports the critical undersea programs such as the Virginia-class submarines that continue to be so important to our security.

I also applaud the inclusion of language to address economic or industrial espionage in the United States. Earlier this year I successfully advocated for efforts to understand how we as a nation should diagnose and respond to economic warfare, which is abetted on a large scale by the freedom of cyberspace and is an insidious and pervasive threat to our national wellbeing.

I also note the valuable inclusion not just of public lands legislation important in my home State of Rhode Island but also the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act. While more must be done to address our challenges in cyberspace, this long-needed update to existing law is important progress.

With that, again, I applaud the chairman, the ranking member, and the committee, especially the staff, for their efforts, and I urge support of the legislation.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which provides our men and women in uniform the equipment and training they need to get their jobs done. I wish to thank my esteemed colleague and ranking member from Guam, MADELEINE BORDALLO, and all the members of the subcommittee for their great efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this bill accomplishes three important national security and military readiness imperatives. First, it prohibits DOD from conducting another base realignment and closure round at a time when our national security strategy is in flux, our requirements uncertain, and the future unclear. We have asked the military to simultaneously draw down operations in Afghanistan, build partnership capacity in the Asia Pacific, and execute operations in Iraq. We should not divert their attention away from these important missions to pursue ill-advised objectives driven by budgets rather than sound strategy.

Second, we have increased funding to more than \$1 billion to pay for critical operation and maintenance activities, including depot maintenance, ship and aircraft sustainment, and basic and advanced training for our troops. This bill also funds the refueling and overhaul of CVN 73, National Guard training center rotations lost due to sequestration, critically needed upgrades for our training ranges, long overdue military construction projects, and delayed

facility sustainment and modernization requirements.

Finally, this bill funds our Nation's most pressing missions, including those focused on support for our European allies against increasing Russian aggression and fighting ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

As I close I wish to join my colleagues in congratulating Chairman McKEON for getting this bill across the finish line and for his exemplary service to our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen.

Mr. Chairman, everyone acknowledges your formidable record on defense policy and your leadership of this committee, but I want to recognize another legacy that shouldn't be overlooked. As Members of Congress, we have no greater responsibility than to be the leading advocate and voice in this Chamber for our constituents. Without question, Mr. Chairman, you have done your duty for the people of the 25th District. It is an honor to serve with you. I wish you fair winds and following seas, and may God bless you, your family, and our great Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), the ranking member of the Readiness Subcommittee.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you, Ranking Member SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the FY15 NDAA.

As the ranking member of the Readiness Subcommittee, I appreciate that the bill provides our men and women in uniform with the resources they need to remain trained, equipped, and ready to execute the full range of missions and operations that face our modern military.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, the bill is a significant improvement over the House-passed measure and restores \$818 million in cuts to the baseline operations and maintenance account. These funds will ensure that necessary repairs and upgrades to airfields and other mission-critical facilities occur. Among many other important provisions the bill also provides an additional \$23 million for two additional combat training center rotations for the Army National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, this bill finally lifts the restrictions on the obligation and expenditure of Government of Japan direct contributions and U.S. military construction funds that directly support the realignment of Marines from Okinawa to Guam. Finally, Mr. Speaker, we can say that the military buildup on Guam is back on track, and this critical component of our rebalanced strategy will begin in earnest soon.

Over the past year there has been significant progress on the realignment, including the signing of a landfill permit by the Okinawan governor, the completion of a draft supplemental EIS

document on Guam, and the delivery of a master plan to Congress. The actions we take in this bill fulfill the U.S. Congress' obligation to keep this progress on track. More importantly, we finally demonstrate to our allies in Japan that we value their leadership and role in moving this realignment forward on their end.

I cannot emphasize this enough: this bill moves the military buildup forward and is critical to our overall rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region.

I thank Chairman McKEON, Ranking Member SMITH, our readiness chairman, my chairman, Mr. ROB WITTMAN, and all the members of the committee for their support. I thank committee staff, particularly Vickie Plunkett and Brian Garrett, for their hard work. I urge my colleagues to pass this very important bill.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. HECK, General HECK, JOE HECK, my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

□ 1145

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), for his years of service to the Nation and this body. He is a great leader, a great friend, and a great mentor. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors, and he should know he will truly be missed.

I also rise to urge my colleagues to support the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. Passing this bill is critical to our national security and for ensuring that our men and women in uniform have the necessary resources to maintain a high state of readiness.

There are many important personnel-related provisions in this bill, including combating and preventing sexual assault in the military, decreasing the suicide rate within our ranks, and finally recognizing the victims of the 2009 Fort Hood shooting with the Purple Heart.

While I appreciate the continued efforts to prioritize the health and welfare of our servicemembers, I do want to express my frustration with the Senate's insistence on including administration proposals to increase pharmaceutical copays, decrease the housing allowance, and shortchange our troops on their pay increase. Although fiscal realities and constrained resources force us to make difficult decisions, now is not the time to make changes to personnel compensation and benefits.

In last year's NDAA, Congress established the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to evaluate and analyze potential reforms to pay and benefits and then re-

port back to Congress. The House bill did not include the administration's proposals because we reject piecemeal reforms that undermine the work of the Commission. Any attempts to change pay and benefits before we receive its report, expected in February of next year, are premature and ill-advised.

I applaud the chairman's successful efforts to prevent even larger benefit cuts. We can't continue to balance the budget on the backs of our servicemembers and their families.

My concerns notwithstanding, on the whole, passing the bill is critical to our national security and providing the authorizations needed for the Department of Defense to carry out its critical functions; therefore, I intend to support the bill, urge my colleagues to do the same, and look forward to addressing the personnel compensation issues in the next NDAA.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act. This bill makes needed investments in our military capability that are critical to the security of our Nation and of our allies.

I would like to specifically thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill and specifically for extending the authorization to pay overtime to public shipyard employees working on the forward deployed aircraft carrier in Japan; not only would this authorization allow the carrier to be maintained and returned to the fleet more quickly, it is also a necessary demonstration of support to our Federal workers.

Following pay freezes, government shutdowns, and sequestration-related furloughs, our Federal employees have endured enough hardship. It is not fair to ask them to leave their families for months on end to do the same job they do at home and earn less money.

I am grateful that Congress is doing the right thing in this case and acknowledging that supporting Federal employees and supporting national security are one and the same.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support of this provision. I thank them both for their terrific service to this Congress and to this country.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, title 30 of the NDAA represents a bipartisan agreement on provisions under the jurisdiction of the House Natural Resources Committee

and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. This agreement represents a balanced approach to public lands management.

It will create thousands of new jobs, support energy and mineral production, transfer land out of Federal ownership, and protect treasured lands through the establishment of several locally-supported parks and wilderness areas.

A few highlights of this agreement include: opening the world's third largest undeveloped copper resource in Arizona, boosting American energy production on Federal lands by reducing bureaucratic permit processing delays, reducing grazing permit backlogs on Federal lands, and increasing private funding of national parks.

The agreement designates less than 250,000 acres of wilderness. The designations, however, protect private property and are balanced with economic development opportunities on other public lands. For example, the agreement provides for over 110,000 acres of land to be conveyed out of Federal ownership to be utilized for economic and community development. It also releases approximately 26,000 acres of current wilderness study areas.

Additionally, it provides for an unprecedented study of two Montana wilderness areas, or WSAs, for oil and gas potential. Tremendous credit goes to Mr. DAINES of Montana for securing the thousands of acres of WSA release and this new energy study. He has broken important new ground. It includes a number of items important to my district in the State of Washington.

Lastly, I want to emphasize that all of the bills included in this agreement have undergone public review in the House or the Senate. It includes nearly three dozen House-passed suspension bill that have languished in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take my final time here to thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH and their respective staffs for their work on this. Without that collaboration with my staff, we wouldn't have gotten this done; and I, too, want to add my congratulations to Chairman McKEON for his service, well-served to this House and to the country.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes training and equipping Syrians and Iraqis to fight ISIS, authorizes \$63 billion for warfighting, and it does all this without a debate or a vote by Congress to authorize the use of military force in this conflict; instead, we are still relying on the obsolete 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

This is an evasion of Congress' solemn constitutional responsibility to the American people to decide on the

question of war and peace and not to leave that to the President alone.

We were told that we would debate these issues after the election. Now, once again, we sidestep these questions. In the meantime, the President has begun a bombing campaign of Syria. I don't recall this Congress ever authorizing a bombing campaign in Syria.

Again, these are questions for Congress, and we must assert our constitutional power to authorize or reject the use of force in Syria after a real debate. I, therefore, cannot acquiesce by voting for these funds.

In addition, this bill continues the shameful prohibition on closing the detention center at Guantanamo Bay or transferring its inmates to prisons in the United States. It is beyond shameful that we are holding prisoners, some of whom are alleged terrorists, for 13 years so far, without any charges or trial or prospect of trial. This violates every principle of human rights and every principle of American liberty. These prisoners should be charged and tried and convicted or else released. The bill prohibits this elementary justice.

I am astonished, frankly, that I would hear on the floor of the United States Congress, as I did last time we discussed this, someone say that these people might be acquitted if they were tried; therefore, they should be held in jail forever because maybe the evidence doesn't exist that they are, in fact, terrorists, and because someone in the government—in the all-powerful, all-mighty, all-knowing bureaucracy—says that an individual is a terrorist, that person must be held in jail indefinitely because, after all, we don't have the proof. That is not America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2015 NDAA, and I want to thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for bringing this important bill to the floor. I am pleased that Congress came together in a bicameral, bipartisan effort to pass this critical bill for the 53rd consecutive year.

This legislation gives our brave troops the resources needed to combat the national security threats we face as a Nation. This bill works to provide the necessary tools to our troops, even though we face a scarcity of funds under sequestration.

I am happy that we were able, I believe, to keep the Apaches with the National Guard and secure additional funding for the E/A-18 Growlers. I am particularly pleased that the A-10 will be spared from retirement. The men and women defending our national se-

curity deserve the Nation's best close air support aircraft, and the A-10 is simply unmatched in this category.

This bill is a fitting tribute to Chairman McKEON as his final act leading the House Armed Services Committee. He has been a tireless advocate for our national defense and our men and women in the military, and I am honored to have served with him.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding time to me, and I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. As the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for working with Chairman ROYCE and me in a productive manner on many of the international provisions contained in title 12 of this legislation.

The State Department and other civilian foreign affairs agencies work side by side with the U.S. military in protecting the national security of the United States, and it is very important that our two committees do the same.

Mr. Speaker, this NDAA underscores the complex challenges and dangers we confront around the world, in the Middle East, South Asia, Europe, Africa, and East Asia. There are many important provisions in this bill, but I would like to take a moment to highlight section 1209, which would reauthorize the Pentagon's train-and-equip program for the moderate, vetted Syrian opposition.

For far too long, the moderate opposition in Syria has been waiting for our support. They are now fighting a three-front war against the Assad regime, ISIL, and the al Qaeda-backed Nusra front. To defeat ISIL and create the conditions necessary for a political transition in Syria, we need the moderate opposition to serve as "boots on the ground" in Syria.

The Free Syrian Army is far from perfect, but they are the best we have got, and we need to get the train-and-equip program ramped up as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express my support for section 1264 of the legislation, which removes the two main political parties in Iraqi Kurdistan from the terrorist list. The Kurds are some of our closest allies in the fight against ISIS, and they should be treated as such.

Finally, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member for including section 1273, which is based on an amendment I offered. Recent and ongoing conflicts in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Mali, and other countries have damaged and destroyed countless

archeological sites and historic artifacts that constitute the cultural heritage of mankind.

My amendment would simply require the Defense Department to report on their efforts to help protect cultural property in areas of armed conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation. I thank Mr. SMITH, and I thank Mr. McKEON, and let me just wish Mr. McKEON Godspeed. He has been a great Member and a good friend. I wish him the best in the future.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

There is no greater responsibility of the Federal Government than to provide for our national defense. This bill does that.

I am particularly pleased this bill appropriately provides for our Nation's Navy, including full funding for three littoral combat ships, which is consistent with the Navy's request. I truly believe the LCS is a critical component of the future fleet.

I also want to join my colleagues in thanking Chairman McKEON for his dedicated service to our men and women in uniform and for your great leadership on the committee. We are losing a true advocate for a strong national defense, and I want you to know that your leadership will be sorely missed, but the rest of us who remain will do all we can to carry on in your tradition.

I urge my colleagues to continue a long tradition of bipartisan support for the NDAA, and I encourage a "yes" vote on this critical piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3979, the National Defense Authorization Act. Congress is considering extending the authority to train and equip Syrian rebels, despite the fact that we have not yet had a debate and a vote on an authorization for use of military force against ISIS; in other words, we are digging ourselves into an unauthorized war.

Congress is, once again, rushing into another war and allowing the executive to rely on the blank check of 2001. That is why, quite frankly, I voted against the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, which was for perpetual war. I have consistently called for its repeal and for the repeal of the 2002 AUMF against Iraq.

All of us agree that ISIS is a global threat and must be addressed, but that

does not mean that we replace one blank check with another. The American people deserve to know the costs and consequences of engaging in another long-term war in the Middle East.

That is why I have called and will continue to call for Congress to live up to its constitutional responsibility and have a full debate on an authorization for any use of military force in Iraq or Syria.

The American people want us to do our job. Unfortunately, once again, Congress is getting us off the hook. This bill expands our involvement in an unauthorized war.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

□ 1200

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly in opposition to this bill based on my admiration for you as a chair and for your work—the committee's work, frankly—in, I think, instituting a great bill that has important forms in projecting force around the world, in sustaining troop levels, and in ultimately defending our country.

But I do believe, as was just mentioned by the last speaker, that there is still a glaring problem in that it continues this process of ceding power and authority from the legislative branch over the executive branch, which means, for me, as good as this bill is—and I think it is a great bill—there is still this larger constitutional question about the balance of power in our system of government at the Federal level.

For me, what I would say is, I don't know how we condemn the President for taking unilateral action with regard to immigration and yet endorse a bill that authorizes and offers funds for his ability to take unilateral actions with regard to war in the Middle East. As has already been noted, he has burned through his 60 days in the War Powers Act. There is no declaration of war, and, in this case, there is no current authorization for these two wars.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), my friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of FY15 NDAA, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

I want to say congratulations to Chairman BUCK McKEON on delivering the 53rd consecutive NDAA to our men and women and this institution. This institution will be much worse off for you not being here after you leave. We

thank you and your family for your service to our country and to this institution.

This bill is replete with important policies that have been clear and undeniable in their impact on the security of the American people:

It funds the development of a new rocket engine to be available by 2019, which will allow us to responsibly break our dependency on the Russian engines;

It reduces red tape and bureaucracy at the National Nuclear Security Administration, which is a critical organization with men and women who do important work to provide the American people with its only true security guarantee: its nuclear deterrent;

It introduces commonsense reforms, using public-private partnerships, to procure commercial satellite services for the military in a more cost-efficient manner;

It funds critical missile defense cooperation with Israel, and includes continued direction of coproduction of these capabilities in the United States with its American workers;

It ensures the administration can not overlook Russia's destabilizing and provocative arms control cheating, as in the case of the INF treaty, and it will not allow the administration to continue to cave to Russian demands on the Open Skies Treaty that pose a direct threat to our national security.

I urge my colleagues to support this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I want to, first of all, thank all the people who worked so hard to pull this bill together. The staffs on both the House and the Senate side do an amazing job that most people do not understand just how many long hours they put into this.

The process has been made more and more difficult in recent years by the fact that the Senate either doesn't pass a bill or waits until the absolute last minute to pass a bill, so then we have to work through the committee process. So there have been fits and starts back and forth, and the committee has done a fabulous job. This is a very lengthy, very complicated piece of legislation. Without the expertise of our staff, there is no way on Earth we would be able to accomplish it.

I also want to point out, again, how important this piece of legislation is. This is the 53rd consecutive year that we have passed an authorizing bill. I think that recognizes how important national security is and how it is one of the central duties of the United States Congress to make sure every year we give the authorities to our men and women who are serving in the armed services to do the jobs that we ask them to do. So I thank our staff for that. I really want to recognize their leadership.

I also want to particularly recognize the leadership of Chairman McKEON, as this is his last time as chairman and as a Member of Congress.

Our committee has tried to have two basic core principles: one, we get our bill done; two, we work in a bipartisan fashion. When you look around this body today, you have greater appreciation for how difficult those two things are. We are not naturally bipartisan, and we are not naturally inclined to pass legislation because there is always something about any piece of legislation that somebody would prefer to be just a little bit different. That is not any less true in our bill, but we recognize the necessity of getting it done.

The ability to do those two things starts with the chair of the committee. When I arrived here, Floyd Spence was the chairman of the committee, and he and everyone right up through Ike Skelton, who was Mr. McKEON's predecessor, have made it a priority to, number one, work with the other side. BUCK, from the very moment he was elected and the moment I was elected as ranking, reached out to me and made sure that that bipartisanship started at the top and flowed down throughout the entire committee.

And the second piece of it is the absolute commitment to getting the bill done no matter what. Again, Chairman McKEON has just been outstanding in that regard. It has been a tough, tough, long 4 years. Many challenges have cropped up, but we have met every one of them and been able to get the bill done, so I thank him for his leadership.

I also want to thank Chairman LEVIN on the Senate side, as he is retiring as well. This is his last year as chairman. He showed a similar commitment, and he had an even more difficult time over there. In fact, he and Senator INHOFE had a conversation a couple of days ago as we were trying to figure out how to do this in which they were trying to explain to us the Senate rules. I said: Look, I am never going to understand them. Just don't explain them. There is nothing I can do about it. That is up to you. You guys figure it out as best you can. So Senator LEVIN has shown outstanding leadership as well.

On the whole, I think this is a very good piece of legislation. We have to remember that we face a wide variety of national security threats at this point. We still have troops in Afghanistan. We now again have troops in Iraq. We have North Korea, which is very unpredictable. We have the challenge of dealing with Iran and all of its levels. We have Russia and Vladimir Putin that are messing around in Ukraine and a variety of different other areas. This is probably as dangerous a time as we have had since the end of the cold war. Our national security strategy, funding, and the decisions we make could not possibly be more important.

At the same time, we have a huge budget challenge. We have sequestra-

tion, and we have this rampant desire to cut, cut, cut, cut everything from government, not contemplate any new revenue, not contemplate any possibility of spending more money; and our national security strategy has to try to wrestle with that, so that makes it very, very difficult.

I will say again what I think is going to be most important in the next few years. I don't think sequestration is going away. I am going to continue to argue that it should, but given the majorities in the House and the Senate and given the last election, it is unlikely to go away, which means that the military is going to have to live with a dramatically lower amount of money than they thought they were going to have. They are also going to have to live with all those national security challenges that I mentioned and, undoubtedly, a few that I didn't.

So how do we do that? Right now, unfortunately, Congress is doing it the old way, which is parochial. We all have an interest. We don't want our base closed. We have an airplane or a ship that is stationed in our district or a particular defense contractor that is invested in a particular piece of equipment. So whenever the Pentagon comes up and says, "We need to cut this," you have a predictable group of people who will rally and say, "Here is why we shouldn't"; and by and large, the rest of Congress has gone along with that group of people.

I am here to tell you that is just not going to continue to work. It is not. The very small minor personnel cuts that are in this bill are things that none of us would have liked to do. We would love to have more money, but we don't. On the A-10, on the retirement of the cruisers and the amphib vehicles—I am sorry, not the retirement, the refurbishment, the layup of those vehicles—on the changes to the Guard and Reserve that have been proposed, all of these are things that we would prefer not to do. But we have the money that we have, and until this Congress decides to change that and provide more, it is the absolute worst thing we can do to reject every single change.

We have had things as minor as a guard unit wanting to move five C-130s from a base in one State to a base in another and proposals on our bill to disallow them from doing that because the people in that State don't want them to be moved. I understand that, but that is not a sustainable defense strategy in this environment.

We are going to have to make some difficult choices that we don't want to make if we are going to properly protect our military because, again, what happens when we don't make those choices, money doesn't magically appear to pay for these things. The Pentagon has got to reshuffle the deck and make cuts elsewhere to try to figure out how to make it work, and the cuts always come from readiness.

We have always said that the worst thing that we can do is create a hollow force, a force that does not have the training and the equipment to do the missions that we ask them to do. That is precisely what we do when we reject reasonable cuts—we don't do a BRAC, for instance—and leave the military with no choice but to reduce training and equipment, because that is all that is left. That is the last thing on the table. So I hope that we will start making some of those tough decisions in the next year.

Again, I thank the chairman; I thank the staff; I wish Senator LEVIN the best in his retirement as well; and I urge passage of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would, at the outset, like to thank Mr. SMITH. I agree with probably about everything he said. He has been a tremendous partner to work with. He just had hip surgery a few weeks ago, and in these last few weeks with all these meetings and all the time and all the effort he has had to put forth in great pain, I really commend you for your integrity, for your steadfastness in your commitment to serving your district, the members of our armed services, and this Nation. It has been a great experience working with you, and I enjoyed just about every minute of it.

There are times when we have disagreed, but we have really done that at a high level and tried to keep it always on the issue, never, never personal, and it has been great.

I want to join him in thanking our staff. We get all the credit; they do all the work. Both sides of the aisle, frankly, most of the staff, I don't know if they are on the minority or the majority side because they work so closely together. That is just the culture of this committee, and I am sure it will continue.

As you have heard through other debate, this legislation addresses a wide variety of policy issues, including supporting operations in Afghanistan, funding the war against ISIL in Iraq and Syria, reinforcing our capabilities in the Pacific, and maintaining the Nation's nuclear deterrent. But many challenges remain.

Next year, the Armed Services Committee will be in excellent hands. Mr. THORNBERRY and I have sat next to each other now for 20 years on the committee. He will be the chairman next year. Mr. SMITH will continue to be the ranking member. They will have their work cut out for them, but they are more than up to the task. I wish them all the best because the security of our Nation lies in their hands, along with all of the members of the committee and all of the Members of this body.

I hope sometime next year a compromise can come to the floor that will

end sequestration. There isn't a magical solution that Republicans can support and the President can sign without sacrifice on both sides. When that solution comes, it will be a tough vote on both sides.

□ 1215

I pray that our colleagues will hold this one thought in their heart when that vote comes: remember the great sacrifice that our troops and their families and loved ones at home are making around the world.

Right now, they are walking in the mountains of Afghanistan. They are at sea, within missile range of Iran. They are flying wingtip-to-wingtip against Russian bombers over the North Sea. They are nose-to-nose with the North Koreans. They are sweating in the equatorial heat of Africa, fighting a horrible disease. They are standing on the sands of Iraq, risking everything against a brutal enemy.

They take those risks and they make those sacrifices because of you. They do it for you. They do it for us, for their families, for their flag, and for our freedom. How have we repaid them? With equipment that is falling apart, by laying them off while they are off in war zones, by docking their pay and their medical benefits, by throwing them out of the service and onto a broken economy.

I have met our forces on the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan, dirty and sweaty from fighting. I have watched too many families, as have all of you, spend long months waiting for those returning from deployment. I have seen too many heroes put into the ground. They never failed us, not once, so shame on us if we are unwilling to pay back the debt we owe them. Shame on all of us, from the White House down, if we cannot make far less a sacrifice than we ask of them on their behalf.

My road in Congress is coming to an end. It will be up to the next Congress and the President to make these injustices right. Please show our troops the respect they deserve. Give them the tools they need. Help keep them safe. Honor their sacrifice with your service. I know that you will do the right thing.

I am in the twilight of a 22-year career here in Congress. It has been mentioned that we passed this bill 53 times. I want to tell you I was not here for all 53 of those, nor was ADAM. He is much younger than I am. You might think that I have been here 53. It has been the history of the committee to get this done every year because it so important.

I have come to know many of you as friends and family. To the Armed Services Committee staff, once again—that is, minority and majority—you are all veterans, you are professionals, you are tireless, but I just think of you as the best.

To my personal staff, I did not want to give this speech, not because I have any regrets, but I just have this problem. Thankfully, the Speaker has it a lot worse than I do, and he gets all the attention, but I have the same problem.

We hear a lot about government workers and how we spend money on government workers and they don't do anything. I just want to tell the people of America that all of these people that work here spend countless hours, and they do so much for so many people. I have some constituent workers at home that have helped thousands of people, and every one of these government workers here deserve our gratitude and thanks for all that they do.

I want to thank all my colleagues for the many wonderful things they have said. I made a comment the other day that my funeral is going to be somewhat anticlimactic. I have heard speeches saying what a wonderful person I am. Fortunately, I am old enough that I don't take any of that personally or too seriously.

I understand that this is a responsibility that was given to me by colleagues. I have enjoyed it. It has been a great experience, but I know it is not about me. It is about what we do here.

I want to thank my family. People say, "Boy, we love your Christmas card." We have 6 children, 30 grandchildren, and now one great-grandchild, and they are all great. I am going to spend a little bit more time with them. I think I would like to teach some of my grandchildren how to fish, if somebody will teach me how to fish.

My wife has stood by my side for 52 years now. She is a tremendous person who I look up to so much.

Now, I am a McKeon, so that means I am of Irish heritage. I would like to part with an Irish blessing for all of you:

May the road rise up to meet you. May the wind be ever at your back. May the Sun shine warm upon your face and the rain fall softly on your fields, and until we meet again, may God hold you in the hollow of his hand.

To this great body and to our troops, wherever you may be, may God bless you and keep you. May God bless America.

Now, for hopefully the last time, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and would like to address the following language included in the Joint Explanatory Statement (JES) to accompany the bill:

As operations in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility draw down, there will be reduced demand for airlift.

The CRAF program was created to ensure the nation can address airlift requirements despite fluctuations in requirements over time.

During this transition back to pre-1990 levels of demand for airlift services, we believe it is imperative to maintain both organic and commercial capacities to meet operational demands and unknown future requirements.

Therefore, we direct the Department of Defense (DOD) to work closely with CRAF program partners to ensure that DOD establishes "appropriate levels for peacetime cargo airlift augmentation in order to promote the effectiveness of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet and provide training within the military aircraft system," as directed in the National Airlift Policy.

The Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) has proven critical to assisting the Department of Defense (DOD) meet its defense mobilization and deployment requirements and its humanitarian and disaster relief missions. For that reason, I support the language included in the JES.

The provision states that it is imperative that airlift requirements include both organic and commercial capacities to meet operational demands and unknown future requirements. The JES also directs DOD to work closely with CRAF program partners to ensure that DOD establishes "appropriate levels for peacetime cargo airlift augmentation in order to promote the effectiveness of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet and provide training within the military aircraft system," as directed in the National Airlift Policy.

Maintaining interoperability between CRAF civil air carriers and DOD is key to ensuring the military's readiness to respond to both national and international crises. Therefore, I look forward to working with the Committee on Armed Services and DOD during the next Congress to ensure the effectiveness and viability of the CRAF air cargo program.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2015 includes several small business sections, including Section 825 which was taken from my legislation H.R. 2452, The Women's Procurement Program Equalization Act of 2013. This bill was considered by the full Small Business Committee, of which I am the Ranking Member, and passed out by voice vote. This bill is an expansion of the Women's Procurement Program that was created as a result of legislation that I authored almost fifteen years ago and was passed by Congress in 2000. It increases the opportunities for legitimate women-owned small businesses to participate in the Federal marketplace and increase their share of federally awarded dollars. The legislation creates a level playing field between the existing small business government contracting programs under the Small Business Act by allowing contracting officers to award contracts to these businesses through a sole source mechanism, similar to those that exist for the HUBZone and Service-Disabled Veterans programs. Additionally, the language of the legislation eliminates the ability for businesses to self-certify for the Women's Procurement Program, thereby reducing the potential for fraud and increasing the dollars that genuine small businesses receive. As the author of the provisions, I would like to provide some background to be taken into consideration as we move forward to implement the legislation.

The number and economic contributions of women-owned firms continue to grow. For example, the rate of growth in the number of women-owned enterprises over the past 16 years remains higher than the national average. Between 1997 and 2013, when the number of businesses in the U.S. increased by 41%, women-owned firms grew by 59%—about 1½ times the national average. Furthermore, over the past six years, since the depth of the U.S. recession, privately held majority women-owned firms have provided a net increase in employment.

Yet, during this time women-owned small businesses continue to face challenges in the Federal marketplace. In 1994, the Federal government established a five percent procurement goal for women-owned businesses. However, twenty years later that goal has never been achieved. In FY 2013 year, women-owned small businesses received \$15.4 billion, or 4.33 percent of contracting dollars, missing their goal by 3 percent—a loss of over \$2.6 billion. It has been estimated that if women-owned small businesses received their 5 percent of the market, more than 673,000 jobs could be created; thus, not only helping their business but also the national economy.

One of the primary obstacles facing women-owned businesses that wish to do business with the government was the failure to implement for 10 years the section 8(m) of the Small Business Act, the Women's Procurement Program. That obstacle was removed in 2011 when the final regulations for the Program were released and implemented. Through this program, women-owned small businesses are eligible for contracts through restricted competition in eighty-three industries that have historically had underutilization of women-owned businesses. Nonetheless, three years after its implementation we have seen little improvement in awards to these businesses as the mechanisms currently at the disposal of contracting officers are limited compared to other programs. While other program participants regularly receive in the billions of Federal contracting dollars, since its implementation this program has seen awards only in the millions. In FY2013, the government only awarded 1,249 contracts worth \$101.1 million, approximately 0.120% of small business dollars and 0.021% of all contracting dollars, through the Women's Procurement Program's existing mechanisms. Thus, changes are necessary to increase the participation of this group of businesses and ensure that they receive their fair share of contracting dollars.

The regulations of the program currently allow for either self-certification or third-party certification. Because of the lack of involvement in the certification, there is a high likelihood of fraud. In numerous reports, GAO has highlighted these issues of fraud in other self-certification programs like the service-disabled veteran-owned small business program. That program has seen several millions of dollars awarded to companies who self-certified they met program criteria when they were filing misleading or false statements to contracting officers in order to qualify for the contracts. This has made contracting officers weary of award to businesses as they are required to

review self-certifications and determine their validity, taking them away from the other contracts they oversee. Also, in the implementation of the self-certification of the Women's Procurement Program, SBA requested only 1 million dollars to fund the document repository, eligibility examinations, as well as processing protests. Yet, the agency has not subsequently requested additional funds to maintain and provide oversight for these items further increasing the potential for fraudulent actions.

The bill, therefore, requires that businesses be certified by the Small Business Administration (SBA), among other entities. This ensures that the entity charged with determining the size of a business, SBA, has full control of the certification process. This provision puts the program on par with other small business contracting programs such as the 8(a) Business Development Program and the HUBZone program that rely on SBA certification. By having their own certification departments, the agency has been able to stop many ineligible businesses from entering their programs due to the vast amount of resources and manpower it has compared to other certifying entities. With these tools, SBA has the ability to provide greater oversight and quality control over the certification process.

Additionally, the bill eliminates the self-certification mechanism in the program. Removing this provision allows contracting officers the ability to focus on awarding contracts and limits fraudulent businesses from entering the program. While some may argue that the program will not function as a result of this change, this is not the case as the law still allows for certification from third-party certifiers.

The provisions in this subsection will increase the mechanisms available to contracting officers for awarding contracts through this program and equalize the small business programs by providing the ability for award of sole source contracts to women-owned small businesses. Currently, the Women's Procurement Program is the only small business contracting program under the Small Business Act that does not allow the award of sole source contracts. The provision would thus level the playing field between the small businesses groups and ensure equal participation when possible as well as more opportunities to award women-owned small business contracts than are currently available.

However, it is important to note that this bill and H.R. 2452 both retain the so-called "Rule of Two" in which sole source mechanisms can only be used if there is not a reasonable expectation that two or more businesses in the small business group will compete for award. The rule exists in all set-aside programs and while there have been calls by some to eliminate it, nothing in the language of this bill or the underlying bill should be taken to support that proposition. The Rule of Two plays a vital part in not only allowing more small businesses to participate in the Federal marketplace but also by providing the government the best value from its vendors. Furthermore, this has been the lynchpin in guarding against challenges of the constitutionality of these set-aside programs.

This subsection requires for detailed reporting on contracts awarded by sole source contracts to women-owned small businesses. This

is to increase the transparency of the award of these contracts, provide better oversight, and determine why certain industries do not receive these contracts so as to better focus outreach efforts.

In the implementation of these provisions, it is vital that there is no delay by the Small Business Administration (SBA). Regulations for the sole source provision should be enacted immediately and must be completed within 90 days. Additional regulations associated with this section should be released when ready and not held for completion of the entirety of the section's regulations. It is imperative that small businesses are involved in developing the regulations through outreach meetings and that their input is taken into consideration during the drafting process. Additionally, SBA should present draft regulations to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and have regularly briefings to update the Committees on the progress of implementation of this section. When the regulations are released, the SBA should conduct outreach with relevant stakeholders, such as contracting officers and Offices of Small Disadvantaged Business Utilization, about how the new tools can be used to maximize women-owned small business participation at individual agencies.

Regarding certification provisions, it is of the utmost importance and the number one priority to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse in small business contracting and ensure only qualified women-owned small businesses enter the Women's Procurement Program. These businesses have been put at a disadvantage in the Federal marketplace for many years, and their ability to compete and receive their fair share of contracting dollars should not be diminished due to awards to unscrupulous businesses looking to cheat the system. Therefore, we fully expect the SBA to implement a robust certification program and to request full funding for such in their annual budget submission in February. The original intent of the authorizing legislation passed in 2000 for the Women's Procurement Program was to have the SBA conducting the certification process. However, the agency did not follow through with this intent. By statute, the SBA is the only entity capable of making a size determination. While properly approved third-party certifiers will play an important role in determining eligibility for this program, the agency should not rely solely on such entities to make certification decisions as to a business's eligibility. Therefore, the intent of this legislation is to reiterate that the SBA must create its own certification process to ensure a properly functioning program.

In the interim, the SBA should work with the other certifying entities to manage the increased number of applicants as a result of the loss of self-certification. Furthermore, SBA should approve and ramp in additional third-party certifiers in order to prevent a backlog of applications. In expanding the pool of certifiers, SBA should utilize the same process it used in selecting previous third-party certifiers. SBA must also create safeguard mechanisms in this certification process to limit the opportunity of fraudulent businesses to enter the

program. In particular, protections should be put into place to prevent businesses from shopping around for a third-party certifier that will verify the company after they have already been determined to be ineligible for the program. Yet, after a reasonable time has passed, businesses should be allowed to re-apply for the program to demonstrate that they have made corrective action on their eligibility requirements. SBA should also conduct random quality control checks on third-party certifiers to ensure that their process adheres to certification guidelines and has precautions to limit fraud, waste, and abuse.

However, it is important to note that while we are requesting additional third-party certifiers and safeguards to handle the influx of applicants to the program, these measures do not release SBA from its obligation to create its own program. As previously stated, we fully expect that the SBA create its own certification program within the agency within the next year.

Inclusion of Section 825 of the NDAA will ensure maximum and equal participation by women-owned small business in the Federal marketplace by providing a contracting mechanism available to other small business contracting programs and reduce the ability of fraud to enter the program by providing proper certification oversight.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, which provides for concurrence to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979, the text of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I appreciate the efforts of Chairman BUCK McKEON, Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, Chairman CARL LEVIN, and Ranking Member JIM INHOFE for their work to ensure we have a compromise package that keeps our 53 year streak of passing defense authorization bills alive. It is unfortunate that the Senate was unable to proceed under regular order to complete its defense bill, which would have allowed for a true Conference Committee to negotiate outcomes. Nevertheless, while this compromise package is not perfect, it does contain many elements that are critical for supporting our service members and our nation's defense posture.

This year's defense bill builds off the progress made last year on the realignment of Marines from Okinawa to Guam. The bill removes any restriction on the obligation and expenditure of Government of Japan and U.S. military construction funds for projects related to the realignment. Removal of the restrictions ensures that the realignment of Marines from Okinawa to Guam is back on track. While I have concerns about the precedence of putting a cost cap on the entire realignment program, the overall outcome in this bill is very positive. The U.S. is finally living up to its commitment under the Guam International Agreement, as amended in 2012.

Over the past year, there has been significant progress in Japan and in the United States regarding this relocation effort. Of greatest importance was the Okinawan Governor's signing of a landfill permit on December 27, 2014. The signing of the landfill permit, under the original agreement, signaled so-called "tangible progress" on the Japanese side for the development of the Futenma Re-

placement Facility in the Henoko area of Okinawa. It took decades to reach this milestone, but last December, the Governor signed the permit which allows for the beginning of construction of a new runway and replacement facility. Furthermore, the Department of Defense (DoD) released its draft supplemental environmental impact statement (DSEIS) for the Marine Corps main cantonment area and live-fire training complex on Guam earlier this spring. The DoD is now developing a final EIS with the intent of signing a record of decision early next spring. DoD also finally submitted a master plan to Congress that outlined the cost of the Marine realignment and provided the fidelity that Congress was seeking on a wide range of details about the relocation effort. All these together enabled us to prevail in Conference Committee and eliminate all the restrictions.

Our alliance with Japan is the cornerstone of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. We have shared values economically and in security matters. It was critical that we uphold our end of the agreement this year. The bill finally makes good on our commitment and helps to further strengthen our relationship.

Unfortunately, this bill does not provide authorization for operations and maintenance funds to support civilian infrastructure requirements on Guam. There is a historical context for DoD providing local governments with support for civilian infrastructure requirements, like at Kings Bay, Georgia and Bangor, Washington, and I fundamentally disagree with the opposition to this funding because it will support our military servicemembers. It is important to ensure that local infrastructure is able to support and sustain the additional military presence on Guam, and I believe the time is right to make these investments now, so that when Marines arrive on Guam, the overall island infrastructure is ready. I will continue to work with my House colleagues and the Senate to advocate for authorizing previously appropriated funds in future years.

I also greatly support the additional \$1.148 million in funding for the Sea Cadet Corps program. This funding is in addition to \$1.7 million that was programmed by the U.S. Navy in the Fiscal Year 2015 budget. The Sea Cadet program facilitates professional development for almost 9,000 Sea Cadets aged 11–17, in 387 units across the country. The Naval Sea Cadet Corps instills in every Cadet a sense of patriotism, courage and the foundation of personal honor, and it has significance in assisting to promote the Navy and Coast Guard, particularly in those areas of the U.S. where these Services have little presence.

Finally, I have some concerns about the provision that changes how the Directors of the Army and Air National Guard are appointed in the Department of Defense. A cohesive leadership team is essential to the productivity of any military organization. The Conference version of this provision is an improvement but still leaves much to be desired and the possibility that this process will continue to be abused.

Currently, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau (CNGB) is not by statute or by regulation part of the selection process for his own leadership team and yet, the CNGB is the De-

partment of Defense's official channel of communication regarding all matters relating to the National Guard, the Governors and State Adjutants General. As the National Guard Bureau is now a joint activity of the Department of Defense, the Chief's responsibilities within the Department of Defense and to the Secretary and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have grown. The CNGB should be allowed to create a leadership team that can provide unified representation of the National Guard within the Department of Defense and before Congress.

The provision will now only require consultation with the CNGB on the appointment of the Director and Deputy Directors of the Army and Air National Guard. There is a significant difference between consultation and giving the CNGB the authority he or she needs to have an effective and cohesive leadership team. We cannot neglect the importance of professional experience, knowledge, and understanding in our leadership positions. As a seasoned Guard member, the CNGB possesses a distinct perspective that can accurately identify the appropriate skill sets essential to fulfilling the requirements of senior level officers within the National Guard. We must remember that our National Guard fulfills a unique dual-hatted role in meeting their Title 10 responsibilities for federal missions and a state role in supporting disaster relief and homeland defense. The CNGB is in the perfect position to best understand how to balance these sometimes competing paradigms and is best positioned to ensure that these Army and Air National Guard leadership teams can execute and balance these requirements in their role at NGB and in working with the Army and Air Force.

The reason this provision did not achieve our ultimate goals is rooted in the antiquated way in which many senior leaders in DoD still view the role of the National Guard. When legislation asking for the Chief to be included in recommending his own staff meets such vocal opposition, it becomes easier to understand just how hard it is for the National Guard within the Service and Pentagon decision making processes and why there is discord on key initiatives. The Congress and both Presidents Bush and Obama have elevated the CNGB to a four-star position, also placing the Chief on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The empowerment of the National Guard was critical to ensuring that our nation's leaders had direct guidance and input on the capabilities that the National Guard can bring to the table in solving a wide range of national security challenges and allows for better coordination of federal and state homeland missions and response. However, the current process of choosing the Director and Deputy Directors of the Army and Air National Guard has been used to leave the CNGB out of the process and push personalities rather than individuals with the joint capabilities to make the entire organization function within its new roles and missions. As such, I will continue to work with my colleagues to watch implementation of this provision and ensure that it is not abused by each respective service and work to improve this provision in future years.

The defense bill is a year long process and is put together with the help and assistance of our outstanding staff. In particular, I appreciate

the hard work and coordination of the entire House and Senate Armed Services staffs. I support this bill and urge my colleagues to pass this measure.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I applaud today's House passage of H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2015 which extends our strong commitment to our military. With growing threats around the world it is critical that we ensure our men and women in uniform are equipped and trained to get their jobs done to defend America. While passage of the defense bill is critical to protecting our national security, I am concerned with several provisions relating to military compensation and allowances.

Our nation's veterans and service members deserve our enduring commitment to maintain the disability, health, education and other benefits they have earned. I applaud Chairman McKEON and the House of Representatives for standing against the Senate and Department of Defense (DoD) proposal to significantly increase pharmacy copays and reduce the basic housing allowance. The Senate supported DoD's proposal to significantly increase pharmacy copays and cut the housing allowance by five percent. Under the Administration and Senate proposal, pharmacy copay rates for generic drugs would have increased each year up to \$14. The compromise adopted today by the House would limit select pharmacy copays to a \$3 increase for one year, which is only \$2 more than the \$1 increase that DOD is allowed to do under the current law. The cost for mail-order generic drugs would remain \$0. The final bill's basic allowance for housing only includes a one percent decrease, which is a better option than the Senate's proposal to cut it by five percent.

Due to the House's determination and leadership in fighting against unreasonable changes, the FY15 NDAA avoids significant reductions in compensation. I agree with Vice Adm. Norb Ryan (USN-Ret), President of the Military Officers Association of America (MOAA), when he said that, "With time running out, it would have been easy for the House to just cave to the Senate" and that the work of the House "helped blunt the blow to military families and retired beneficiaries."

However, without comprehensive review and recommendations from the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission report, it is premature to adjust the benefits of service members or their families. While I object to any reduction in service members or veterans benefits, today's passage of the defense bill is critical to our national security, and I will continue to support our service members, veterans and military families.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for various provisions of the Senate's Amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. While the underlying bill will strengthen our national defense and benefit my home state of Rhode Island, ultimately I was unable to support it because it contained a provision to extend for two years the training and arming of Syrian rebels, a program that shows little evidence it will be successful and may well be the first step toward direct U.S. involvement in

the Syrian Civil War. Without this provision, I would have been proud to cast my vote in favor of this legislation. However, after voting only two months ago against a temporary authorization to train and arm Syrian rebels, I could not, in good conscience, vote for a bill to commit more U.S. resources and increased military involvement in an unwise program that presents the danger of deepening our involvement in a sectarian civil war.

The agreement that passed today included the designation of the Blackstone River Valley in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution, as a National Park. As the lead sponsor of the House bill creating the Blackstone National Park, it is an issue for which I have fought throughout my time in Congress. In addition, this agreement authorizes robust funding for the continued construction of the Virginia Class Submarine, which employs more than 3,400 jobs in my home state. It includes a one percent pay increase for members of our Armed Forces, provides additional funding for psychological and behavioral health for servicemembers, strengthens our nation's cybersecurity capabilities, and strengthens our relationship with Israel through significant funding for the Iron Dome missile defense program. Finally, this agreement makes great strides in combatting sexual assault in our Armed Forces by eliminating the "good soldier defense", and assessing a commanding officer's handling of sexual assault cases as part of his or her performance evaluation. I strongly support all of these provisions.

Unfortunately, with the inclusion of language authorizing military involvement in Syria, I believe that this legislation places the United States on a dangerous path that could lead to the engagement of our troops in yet another endless war in the region, an act that the American people have made very clear they oppose. I remain concerned that this program will be difficult to carry out, impossible to effectively evaluate and monitor, and that there is a lack of a clear end-game. In November of this year, the Washington Post reported that U.S. trained Syrian rebels were routed by the al Qaeda affiliated rebel fighters. Reports indicated mass surrenders and defections by U.S. trained rebels, as well as significant amounts of U.S. supplied weapons falling into the hands of terrorists. It should be noted that earlier this year, the CIA expressed doubts about the effectiveness of training and equipping rebel forces, citing unsuccessful attempts to do so in the past in countries such as Nicaragua and Somalia.

Additionally, there is no explicit limit to the amount of money authorized for this program, rather, this bill allows the Administration to tap into the nearly \$64 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations Funds authorized for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. These funds are not only exempt from statutory budget caps, but the bill provides no limit for the amount of funds that may be reprogrammed for these operations. This would be in addition to the \$500 million spent on this program since September. These are federal dollars that we should invest in our priorities we face here at home, such as rebuilding our roads and bridges, improving our education system, and investing in the creation of jobs.

When this policy was authorized for three months in September of this year, it received rigorous debate on the House floor before it was included in the Continuing Resolution. However, this two year reauthorization is being included in essential legislation, which totals more than 1,600 pages, without any debate under a closed rule. I believe that we are moving forward with this policy without a clear understanding of with whom we are partnering, and without a clearly defined goal or an articulated strategy for achieving these goals. Without this understanding, I remain gravely concerned that this two year extension could be the first step into wider, more entrenched involvement in yet another war in the Middle East.

Instead, we should be placing our focus on building a stable government in Iraq, a policy that must include ensuring they have the support they need to prevent the spread of the Islamic State. Indeed, the Iraqis have made great strides in stabilizing their government and unifying fractious segments of their population. This week, the Iraqi government signed an historic agreement with its autonomous Kurdish region in which the two sides agreed to share oil revenues, and will allow for greater cooperation in equipping Kurdish pesh merga forces in combatting the Islamic State. We should continue to press the new Iraqi government to fulfill its responsibility to defeat the Islamic State and maintain a viable and inclusive government.

We have been and will continue to be a leader in the world's fight against terrorism and those who wish to harm this country. But we should not allow our responsibility to defeat terrorism draw us into an unwise, expensive, and risky military engagement in the Middle East. Because of my grave concerns about moving forward with a hasty and in my view incomplete program to arm rebels in Syria, despite the other favorable provisions included in this legislation, I could not vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reluctantly oppose the National Defense Authorization Act, both because we as a Congress and the President have failed to honor our men and women in uniform by properly recognizing and authorizing the current actions against ISIS, and because this legislation wrongly begins to roll back the pay and benefits our service members rightfully deserve.

It's been nearly two months since the President announced his military campaign against ISIS. Our military has flown thousands of sorties and we have thousands of our men and women in uniform with their boots on the ground. The President calls them military advisors but they are Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Marines. We are engaged against an enemy that has taken American lives, and enemy that has said they want to penetrate our homeland, an enemy the President has identified by name and declared that our national strategy is to destroy this enemy.

And yet the President has yet to propose an Authorization to Use Military Force, and this body has yet to bring one up. We each have failed in our Constitutional responsibility to have an honest debate about whether we are a nation indeed at war, and whether we are a nation prepared to accept the human sacrifice

that comes from conflict, and very importantly how we as a nation will responsibly pay for this conflict.

Instead, we have considered only the President's proposal to arm moderate Syrians—an elusive strategy that will do little to combat the war on ISIS, only complicates our geo-political strategy as it relates to Syria, Iran, Russia and other hostile nations, and a strategy most likely to fail.

Two months ago we had a debate over approving the President's strategy to arm and train Syrian rebels, but not a broad Authorization to Use Military Force as we should have. I voted against the President's plan then, and today I most reluctantly rise to oppose this National Defense Authorization Act because quietly tucked into this legislation is a renewal of this authority for two years. While our men and women in uniform continue to commit their lives to fighting our enemy and protect our homeland, we quietly approved for two years the weakest part of an already questionable military strategy.

To make matters worse, the President and the Senate included in this legislation a cut to the housing allowance for our military, and increase in pharmaceutical co-pays, and a rejection to the pay increase proposed by this House of 1.8%.

This is wrong.

Earlier this summer, this body passed a National Defense Authorization Act that rejected the President's proposals. Our body rejected the President's proposed pay increase of 1% and instead passed a raise of 1.8%. We rejected the President's proposal to require a 5% reduction in personnel housing allowance, we rejected changes to the commissary program that would increase costs on military families, and we rejected new pharmaceutical copays proposed by the President. I was pleased to vote for this measure because it was right for our men and women in uniform, it recognized their sacrifices by rejecting proposals that would have had a significant negative impact on the quality of life of those who serve us every day.

Despite our efforts, the President and the Senate prevailed in implementing these cuts through this legislation—and most insultingly, at a time when we are asking our military to confront ISIS and tenor elements around the globe, and at a time when the Commander in Chief has decided it important to commit military troops to battle the scourge of Ebola.

This President and this Congress can do better. We should vote down this measure, return to negotiations with the President and the Senate, and do what is right for our men and women in uniform and what is required of this Congress Constitutionally—to debate and decide if we are today a nation at war with ISIS and if we are a nation with a clearly defined strategy that will be effective in combatting this growing threat to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this measure and demand better.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their work on the NDAA. I also want to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their work on the Public Lands portion of the bill.

Included in this bipartisan, bicameral legislation is my bill to allow the Department of

Treasury to authorize the minting of a series of commemorative coins to celebrate the 100th Anniversary of the National Park Service in 2016.

Our national parks are America's crown jewels and our greatest natural resources that deserve to be celebrated and preserved, so future generations can enjoy the beauty and history of our country.

Today, the National Park Service comprises 401 areas, covering more than 84 million acres in every state, DC, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Minnesota is home to 5 national parks that are visited by more than 650,000 people each year and they contribute \$34 million to the economy.

I grew up in a family that often vacationed in our National Parks. And I've carried on this tradition with my four daughters and wife, where we enjoy camping, hiking, fishing and seeing America's beauty. Just this past August we camped in Glacier National Park—one of the girls' favorites.

Proceeds from this commemorative coin program would go to the National Park Foundation, which is responsible for preserving and protecting resources under the stewardship of the National Park Service and promoting public enjoyment and appreciation of those resources. These funds will be critical to prepare for the celebration of the centennial. I want to emphasize that this bill will not cost the taxpayers money.

This is an important step to help us honor our country's important heritage. I look forward to its passage and appreciate its inclusion in this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment with a House Amendment to H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

This legislation authorizes \$495.5 billion in discretionary spending for the base budget for the Department of Defense and \$17.9 billion in discretionary spending for the defense-related activities of the Department of Energy in Fiscal Year 2015, totaling \$513.4 billion, which is \$31 billion less than authorized in Fiscal Year 2014.

The legislation also authorizes \$63.7 billion in Fiscal 2015 for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO).

I thank Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH and the members of the Armed Services Committee for their work on this important legislation.

I especially wish to thank Chairman McKEON for his friendship and his service to the nation as he concludes his long and distinguished tenure as a member of the People's House.

The National Defense Authorization Act's purpose is to address the threats our nation must deal with not just today, but into the future. This makes the work on this bill vital to our national interest and it should reflect our strong commitment to ensure that the men and women of our Armed Services receive the benefits and support that they deserve for their unwavering service to this great nation.

This is the 53rd consecutive National Defense Authorization Act, which speaks to the

long term commitment of the Congress and successive Administrations to provide for the defense of our nation.

The bill encompasses a number of initiatives designed to confront sexual assault in the military, making more efficient the work of protecting America, addresses the mental health needs of men and women in the armed services, and extends economic opportunity to small minority and women owned businesses.

There is much in the legislation before us that I strongly support. For example, the House-Senate agreement:

1. Significantly improves readiness by restoring \$818 million in cuts made by House Republicans to the readiness accounts below what was requested by the President;

2. Supports a 1.0 percent pay raise for the troops for FY 2015, equal to the President's request;

3. Authorizes the awarding of the Purple Heart Medal to those killed domestically as a result of a foreign terrorist attack like the tragedies that occurred at Fort Hood in my home state of Texas;

4. Creates a flexible \$1.3 billion Counter Terrorism Partnership Fund that supports partner nation operations and U.S. Building Partnership Capacity programs to combat terrorism in the Middle East and Africa and bring to heel notorious terrorist organizations such as Boko Haram;

5. The bill also addresses serious health and well-being challenges faced by our men and women in the armed services such as post-traumatic stress disorders by requiring the Department of Defense to report on improvements in the identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces, as well as providing a person-to-person mental health assessment for active duty and selected reserve members each year and, through 2018, a person-to-person mental health screening once during each 180-day period in which a member is deployed;

6. Requires the establishment of a Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Military, eliminates the "good soldier defense," which allows alleged attackers to avoid charges by showcasing a positive military record in court, and builds upon the provisions included in the FY 2012, FY 2013, and FY 2014 Defense Authorization bills that contained dozens of provisions, including stripping commanding officers of the unilateral authority to dismiss a finding by a court martial; prohibiting commanding officers from reducing guilty findings by a court martial to guilty of a lesser offense; and requiring that service members found guilty of sexual offenses, including rape or sexual assault, be dismissed or honorably discharged;

7. Authorizes \$622 million for Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense Programs, which is \$349 million more than the President's request, a total that includes \$350 million for Israel's "Iron Dome" short-range rocket defense system, which is \$175 million more than the President's request;

8. Includes provisions to allow the Department of Defense to reprogram funds to carry out both the Syria train-and-equip program and the Iraq Train and Equip program to combat ISIL; and

9. Creates the National Commission on the Future of the U.S. Army, which will have four members appointed by the President and four appointed by Congress that is tasked to report back to Congress with recommendations for optimizing Army and National Guard Force Structure by February 1, 2016.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important lessons we learned from the long war in Iraq is the importance of military readiness which imposes on the Congress the obligation of ensuring that every woman and man sent into battle in defense of our nation must be properly trained and equipped.

This is why I will not forget the troops killed and wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan when their vehicles were attacked by "improvised explosive devices."

To ensure that the Armed Forces of the United States remains the best trained, best equipped fighting force in the world, we must provide them the resources needed to adapt and meet any challenge they may face, from global military conflicts to an Ebola virus outbreak.

I am also pleased that the bill includes authorization for awarding the Purple Heart Medal to those killed or wounded in domestic terrorist attacks, like the attack at Ft. Hood.

The Army National Guard is a critical component of our national defense structure.

The men and women of the National Guard serve our nation as a reserve force in times of military conflict and at home in responding public emergencies natural disasters.

Mr. Speaker, the threat posed by the terrorist organization Boko Haram be addressed before it becomes become a problem of the level of ISIS to our national interests.

For this reason I offered an amendment to the House version of this bill that was adopted as Section 1266, which would have required the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the nature and extent of the crimes against humanity committed by Boko Haram in Nigeria.

I am disappointed that Section 1266 of the House bill was not included in the final version of the bill but I am pleased the legislation reauthorizes the Africom command and recognizes the importance of combating terrorist activity on the continent of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, the threat posed by ISIS is serious and real and the President has reached out to Congress to work with him to develop a unified and international response to meet the threat.

For this reason I support the provision in the legislation authorizing \$3.4 billion for sustaining U.S. personnel forward-deployed to the Middle East, providing enablers such as intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms, replenishing munitions expended while conducting airstrikes against ISIL, and financing operations and maintenance costs for air, ground and naval operations to date.

Specifically, I support the provision authorizing the President's \$1.6 billion request to train and equip Iraqi security forces to re-build the capability and capacity of our Iraqi partners in the region so they can sustain the long-term fight to defeat ISIL and provide security and stability to the Iraqi people, so that large numbers of U.S. combat forces are not required.

The \$1.6 billion is being provided to fund a two-year program with robust oversight and notification requirements to support Peshmerga, Sunni tribes, and other forces beyond the traditional Iraqi Security Forces.

The legislation also extends the McKeon Amendment, which I supported, that provides funding to train and equip moderate Syrian forces to combat ISIL.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to emphasize that nothing in the legislation before authorizing the training and equipping of Iraqi and Syrian forces by U.S. advisors to combat ISIS derives from the 2002 Iraq AUMF.

The decision to send American men and women into harm's way is the most consequential decision the Constitution vests in the President and the Congress.

For this reason, the Constitution wisely divides the responsibility of deciding when to use military force to protect the nation and its interests between the President and the Congress, the representatives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I remain strongly opposed to the deployment of the U.S. Armed Forces inside the territorial borders of Syria without a vote of Congress explicitly authorizing such action.

Moreover, any vote regarding the authorization to use military force against Syria must be preceded by meaningful, substantive, and thoughtful dialogue and robust debate governed by a rule that affords Members of the House the opportunity to offer and debate amendments.

I must stress that before any vote is held, Members of Congress must be apprised of all facts material to the decision and have access to relevant documentation, classified and otherwise, and afforded the opportunity to meet in small groups and in secure locations with senior members of the Administration's national security team who can answer detailed and pointed questions and provide requested information.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq taught this nation the importance of having accurate and reliable information when deciding whether to use military force and the painful costs in lives and treasure of acting precipitously.

We cannot and dare not repeat that mistake.

That is why it is essential that all Members of Congress have access to the relevant information and the responsible Administration officials before any vote to authorize the use of military force to defeat ISIS is scheduled.

Mr. Speaker, the health and well-being of our men and women in uniform on and off the battlefield is of critical importance.

The House version of the National Defense Authorization Act included an amendment I introduced authorizing an increase of \$10 million in breast cancer research funding and directing the Department of Defense to identify specific genetic and molecular targets and biomarkers for Triple Negative Breast Cancer (TNBC).

I am disappointed that the Jackson Lee Amendment was not included in the final version of the legislation because my amendment would save lives that may otherwise be lost.

Mr. Speaker, breast cancer has been as brutal on women in the military as combat.

More than 800 women have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to the Army Times; 874 military women were diagnosed with breast cancer just between 2000 and 2011, and according to that same study, more are suspected.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, however, provided funding for the additional research that is desperately needed since women are joining the Armed Services in increasing numbers and serving longer, ascending to leadership.

Within increased age comes increased risk and incidence of breast cancer.

Not only is breast cancer striking relatively young military women at an alarming rate, but male service members, veterans and their dependents are at risk as well.

With a younger and generally healthier population, those in the military tend to have a lower risk for most cancers than civilians—including significantly lower colorectal, lung and cervical—but breast cancer is a different story.

Military people in general, and in some cases very specifically, are at a significantly greater risk for contracting breast cancer because life in the military can mean exposure to a witch's brew of risk factors directly linked to greater chances of getting breast cancer.

With the expansion of women in the military, it is extremely important that more funding be allocated for research for early detection, treatment, and cure of breast cancer, including TNBC.

I will continue fighting until this objective is achieved.

I strongly support the provisions in the legislation before us intended to combat the epidemic of sexual assaults in the military, including the elimination of the "good soldier defense," which is defined as a consideration of general military character toward the probability of innocence in sexual assault prosecutions.

Houston is home to one of the largest populations of military service members and their families in the nation.

There are over 200,000 veterans of military service who live and work in Houston; more than 13,000 are veterans from the Iraq and Afghanistan.

Although some of a soldier's wounds are invisible to the naked eye they are still wounds that should be properly treated.

Another important component of the legislation that I strongly support is are the provisions designed to increase the number of medical facilities and mental health professionals who are available to serve the active duty personnel and veterans.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me express again my appreciation to Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member SMITH for their work in crafting a Defense Authorization bill that strives to enhance the readiness of our troops, provides for the care of our military personnel and their families, and authorizes the investments needed to keep our nation strong, safe, and respected in the world.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Authorization Act provides critical authorities for our men and women in uniform. It provides for their pay, addresses issues of mental health and suicide, protects victims of sexual assault and ensures they are

well equipped and trained to conduct the missions that the country asks of them. I am proud that my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee and in the House could come to bipartisan agreement on this legislation to ensure that our Armed Forces remain the best in the world. It is not perfect, but this year's NDAA is an example of how we can work together to keep the American people safe, save tax payer dollars and make sure our men and women in uniform get the support they deserve.

However, I remain concerned about the provision included in the NDAA to provide for authorization through 2016 for the equipping and training of Syrian rebels.

There still remain too many questions about the long term implications of arming and equipping rebel forces and how this action fits into our broader strategy of destroying ISIS. I believe, without a detailed discussion on what supporting the Syrian rebels entails, that this kind of authorization will lead to a much longer and costly level of engagement. Congress has failed to properly discuss and weigh the long term consequences of this military action. As a Member of Congress, it is my responsibility to make sure we don't commit resources, the most precious of which are our men and women in uniform, with no comprehensive plan for our involvement. Congress needs to debate and develop a new Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) before authorizing one piece of that strategy that will inevitably lead to further involvement across multiple national borders.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am voting against the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) of Fiscal Year 2015. Although this bill contains a few positive measures and provisions that I support it unfortunately creates a two year blank check for the U.S. to wage a war against the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL) in both Syria and Iraq.

I am vehemently opposed to this two year authorization to train and equip as yet unknown forces in both Syria and Iraq to combat ISIL. Tragically, Congress has once again abdicated its constitutional responsibilities under War Powers. Instead of voting on a vague authorization today, we should wait and pass judgment on a more detailed assessment on this operation and vote on a specific authorization for use of military force (AUMF). In addition to the \$5 billion already authorized to continue the fight against ISIL, this bill mistakenly allows for the reprogramming of funds as the President sees fit from the \$63.7 billion overseas contingency operations account, which has turned into a slush fund to fight unauthorized wars.

If you turned to any of my colleagues today and asked the basic question who are the 5,000 fighters that the U.S. will train and equip in Syria, they could not give you an answer. Not even our intelligence agencies know who we can trust. Before granting authorization, Congress should at least know who it is we are giving U.S. weapons to and what their ideology and political goals are. This is a complex mess of various actors, many of whom cannot be considered trustworthy allies. The Syrian opposition is made up of hundreds of thousands of fighters from various factions that are also fighting amongst each other.

In Iraq, the U.S. is looking to form an alliance with a new government whose current Prime Minister has yet to prove he will bring Sunnis back into an inclusive society and government. At the moment the Iraqi army barely exists on paper. The main Iraqi force currently fighting ISIL, Asaib Ahl al-haq, is incredibly hostile to the U.S. and was attacking our troops up to the last day of the U.S. occupation of Iraq. The enemy of our enemy is not always an ally.

That is why it is so critical that Congress be presented with a detailed plan of this "train and equip" operation including who it is that we are arming before we vote and this authorization fails to do that.

Most importantly what we are voting on today is a small part of President Obama's larger strategy to go to war with ISIL. No President can declare war without Congressional authorization. If the U.S. is going to war with ISIL as it appears that we are, then my colleagues need to vote on an AUMF. The American people did not elect us to punt the responsibility for matters of war and peace to the President. The purpose of an AUMF is to lay out in detail the scope, plan, purpose, and duration of a military operation and to provide both classified and non-classified briefings to Congress and allow them to debate and express their opinions on the merits of this. Absent an AUMF from Congress, we are committing ourselves to an open ended war, declared by the President about which we have little to no details.

Despite my disagreements with the President on defense policy, members of our armed forces must be adequately funded and get the services they deserve. The bill includes increased funding for the National Guard, a 1% pay raise for our troops, and additional funding for mental health screenings and psychological services for those who have served and suffer from post traumatic stress disorder. Additionally, this bill prevents the retirement of the A-10 Warthog, a more cost effective close air-support weapons system than the F-35 Joint Striker, contains funding for nuclear non-proliferation activities, and acquisition reform measures that take a small step in reining in the bloated Pentagon budget. I strongly support these provisions of the NDAA.

Lastly, there was a public lands package attached to this bill that include provisions that are critical to the West Coast and Oregon. The REFI Act will save West Coast fishermen millions of dollars by refinancing expensive, unfair high-interest federal loans. The expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument will boost the local economy and create needed jobs in southern Oregon, protect the unique cave system for hiking and other recreational opportunities, and it designates the River Styx—the underground stream running through Oregon Caves—as the first subterranean Wild and Scenic River in the nation. The package wasn't perfect, but it was the result of a multi-year negotiation to clear the backlog of mostly non-controversial, locally supported lands bills that have languished in this dysfunctional Congress. I didn't pick the vehicle to move these bills, and unfortunately it was attached to the NDAA.

Again, I will ultimately vote no on this legislation because it contains a two-year blank

check to fight an unauthorized war in Iraq and Syria. Congress shouldn't duck its responsibility to thoroughly debate and discuss the authorization of use of force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 770, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PREVENTING EXECUTIVE OVER-REACH ON IMMIGRATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 770, I call up the bill (H.R. 5759) to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to House Resolution 770, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of House Report 113-646 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, the Congress has the power to "establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization". As the Supreme Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, "that the formulation of . . . policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government".

(2) Under article II, section 3, of the Constitution, the President is required to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed".

(3) Historically, executive branch officials have legitimately exercised their prosecutorial discretion through their constitutional power over foreign affairs to permit individuals or narrow groups of noncitizens to remain in the United States temporarily due to extraordinary circumstances in their country of origin that pose an imminent threat to the individuals' life or physical safety.

(4) Prosecutorial discretion generally ought to be applied on a case-by-case basis and not to whole categories of persons.

(5) President Obama himself has stated at least 22 times in the past that he can't ignore existing immigration law or create his own immigration law.

(6) President Obama's grant of deferred action to more than 4,000,000 unlawfully present aliens, as directed in a November 20, 2014, memorandum issued by Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Charles Johnson, is without any constitutional or statutory basis.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other law, the executive branch of the Government shall not—

(1) exempt or defer, by Executive order, regulation, or any other means, categories of aliens considered under the immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))) to be unlawfully present in the United States from removal under such laws;

(2) treat such aliens as if they were lawfully present or had a lawful immigration status; or

(3) treat such aliens other than as unauthorized aliens (as defined in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3))).

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall apply except—

(1) to the extent prohibited by the Constitution;

(2) upon the request of Federal, State, or local law enforcement agencies, for purposes of maintaining aliens in the United States to be tried for crimes or to be witnesses at trial; or

(3) for humanitarian purposes where the aliens are at imminent risk of serious bodily harm or death.

(c) EFFECT OF EXECUTIVE ACTION.—Any action by the executive branch with the purpose of circumventing the objectives of this section shall be null and void and without legal effect.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect as if enacted on November 20, 2014, and shall apply to requests (regardless of whether the request is original or for reopening of a previously denied request) submitted on or after such date for—

(1) work authorization; or

(2) exemption from, or deferral of, removal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5759.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. YOHO's important bill, the Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act of 2014.

President Obama has just announced one of the biggest constitutional power

grabs ever by a President. He has declared unilaterally that, by his own estimation, more than 4 million unlawful immigrants will be free from the legal consequences of their lawless actions.

Not only that, he will, in addition, bestow upon them gifts such as work authorization and other immigration benefits. This despite the fact that President Obama has stated, over 20 times in the past, that he does not have the constitutional power to take such steps on his own and has repeatedly stated, "I'm not a king."

Pursuant to article I, section 8, of the Constitution, only Congress has the power to write immigration laws. Our Founding Fathers established this separation of powers to prevent tyranny. As James Madison wrote:

No political truth is certainly of greater intrinsic value or is stamped with the authority of more enlightened patrons of liberty than that . . . the accumulation of all powers legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

President Obama is, in effect, rewriting our immigration laws by granting deferred action to more than 4 million unlawful aliens.

Pursuant to article II, section 3, of the Constitution, the President is required to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed"; yet President Obama is refusing to enforce our immigration laws for these millions of unlawful aliens.

President Obama justifies his actions by claiming that his administration is merely exercising the power of prosecutorial discretion; yet as Clinton administration INS Commissioner Doris Meissner told her agency, "Exercising prosecutorial discretion does not lessen the INS' commitment to enforce the immigration laws to the best of our ability."

While previous Presidents have provided immigration relief to groups of aliens, usually their actions were based on emergencies in foreign countries, thereby relying upon the broad constitutional power given to a President to conduct foreign affairs.

Without any such foreign crisis and in granting deferred action to a totally unprecedented number of aliens, President Obama has clearly exceeded his constitutional authority.

I commend Mr. YOHO for introducing his bill, which undoes the damage to our constitutional system that President Obama's actions are causing. The bill reaffirms the constitutional principles that only Congress has the power to write immigration laws and that the President must enforce those laws.

Mr. YOHO's bill prevents President Obama or any future President from exempting or deferring the removal of categories of unlawful aliens, except to the extent that the President is relying on his constitutional powers over for-

eign affairs or utilizing exceptions provided for in the bill for exceptional humanitarian and law enforcement circumstances.

The bill prevents President Obama or any future President from considering such aliens to be lawfully present in the United States and thus ineligible for the rights and privileges available to lawfully present aliens.

□ 1230

It prevents President Obama or any future President from granting work authorization to such aliens.

Finally, the bill takes effect as if enacted on November 20, 2014, thus nullifying the President's recent executive actions. I, again, urge my colleagues to vote for this necessary bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in 1 week this 113th Congress will expire without having considered a single piece of legislation to fix our Nation's broken immigration system.

It has been 525 days since the Senate passed bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform legislation that would have made meaningful and long overdue reforms. But our Chamber here has still steadfastly refused to allow an up-or-down vote on that measure.

No one questions that our immigration system is broken. It is failing our economy and millions of families and our businesses. And yet, rather than deal with these critical issues, we are here today to vote on yet another symbolic, anti-immigrant measure that has absolutely no chance of consideration in the Senate.

I want to be clear. H.R. 5759 is politically motivated, hastily drafted, and an attempt, once again, to attack our President, as well as immigrant families who contribute to our communities and our economy.

By blocking the protections offered by the President's actions, the legislation would deprive nearly 5 million immigrants and their families of the hope that they might finally live without constant fear of separation and deportation.

It would undermine the administration's efforts to devote greater resources toward securing our borders and deporting felons and not families. This would mean millions of undocumented immigrants would not be asked to pass national security and criminal background checks and pay their fair share of taxes in order to register for temporary protection from deportation.

Now, H.R. 5759 falsely claims that President Obama's assertion of authority is unlawful. The constitutionality of the President's executive order is recognized by both liberal and conservative legal experts. In a letter written

last month, 11 prominent scholars explained that the President's actions "are within the power of the executive branch and that they represent a lawful exercise of the President's authority."

This letter was signed—I was amazed at the list of constitutional authorities: Walter Dellinger; David Strauss, formerly with the Solicitor General's Office; Laurence Tribe; and even conservative professors like Eric Posner.

Five days later, 135 immigration law professors echoed that conclusion and provided substantial constitutional, statutory, and regulatory authority for these actions; not to mention that the President himself was a professor of constitutional law.

Finally, this measure, H.R. 5759, goes well beyond preventing the President from expanding deferred action for childhood arrivals or creating a program to protect the parents of U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents from deportation.

It would not only prevent this President, but any future President from protecting discrete categories of individuals facing unique dangers and challenges. This means that no future administration would be able to parole in place the undocumented parents or spouses and children of military personnel and veterans, or facilitate enlistment in our armed services by American citizens who have undocumented family members, or grant deferred action to victims of a crime or serious forms of human trafficking.

For these and other reasons, this legislation is opposed by many organizations that care about our immigration system and are working to protect the vulnerable among us, including the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the AFL-CIO, the Service Workers International Union, and the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women.

Let's think this through carefully, and I urge you to oppose this very dangerous anti-immigrant measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to clarify a couple of things.

First of all, it is not true that the House of Representatives has not acted to fix our broken immigration system. First of all, last summer, we passed two bills, one from the Appropriations Committee and one under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, that did just that, that provided resources to secure our borders to stop the surge of illegal immigrants coming into our country and make sure that the similarly unconstitutional DACA program that the President implemented earlier was frozen and could not proceed further. So, to me, that is simply not true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds to say that the fact of the matter is that when you talk about taxes, there is no requirement in the President's executive order that anyone who qualifies as an unlawful alien must get this administrative legalization to pay back taxes. There is none.

They have to pay taxes moving forward, but one of the benefits is they qualify for the earned income tax credit. So this could cost the taxpayers of the country even more.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work that you have done on this, and I appreciate the attention that this has brought.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of consternation about this bill. I stand here today, obviously, in support of my bill, H.R. 5759, the Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act of 2014. It is a simple bill. It is four pages, but yet, it has caused a lot of debate.

It just simply states that the President, Mr. Obama, does not have the constitutional authority to grant amnesty by issuing work visas to 5 million people here illegally.

I have got a list of scholars too that back up the claim that this is unconstitutional.

This bill doesn't talk about deporting anybody, as you might hear later on today that it is going to deport 9 million people. It doesn't talk about that. It doesn't talk about granting amnesty. It just stops an unconstitutional action by our President, who has taken an oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States, just like the rest of us in this body have.

To vote "no" against this bill is to vote "no" against the Constitution.

HARRY REID has already said he will not bring up this bill for a vote. The President says he will veto this if it makes it to his desk.

My question is, to not bring up this bill, or to not sign it, is that not a vote against our Constitution?

It is important that we address the true debate here, and that is the separation of powers. This bill is not about border security, work visas, E-Verify, or immigration reform. This is about the administration overstepping its bounds and unilaterally challenging the laws of this great Nation of ours.

Article II, section 3 of our Constitution makes very clear that the duty of the President is to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Despite this straightforward charge, the administration is refusing to enforce our existing immigration laws for millions of unlawful aliens.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution clearly states, "Only Congress has the power to write immigration laws." And our Founding Fathers established

this separation of powers to prevent an overreaching executive.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court found in *Galvan v. Press* "that the formulation of policies pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here is entrusted exclusively to Congress, and it has become about as firmly embedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government."

Preserving article I, the legislative powers, this is not a partisan issue. It is not Republican or Democrat. Allowing executive action like this to slide simply because we are frustrated with a system establishes a dangerous precedent that could be abused by Presidents of both parties for any area of law they disagree with.

I would like to point out to my colleagues on the other side that if we continue to surrender, from this body, our legislative powers to the executive branch, then we could easily be standing here in 2, 5, or 10 years discussing a Republican President who refuses to enforce the employer mandate of the Affordable Care Act or uphold portions of the Voting Rights Act, and it can go on and on, and it has opened up a dangerous precedent.

Just because one might agree with the outcome does not justify overlooking or violating the process to get to that outcome.

Congress has the constitutional powers to create and write laws, and the President has a duty to faithfully execute those laws, not to pick and choose, like he does or doesn't like them. And that is according, again, to article II, section 3.

I urge Members to support H.R. 5759, restore constitutional powers to Congress, and stand on the side of the Constitution to protect this great Nation of ours.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds before I call on our distinguished gentlelady from California.

I want everyone, particularly the author of this bill, to know that, as the senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, I firmly believe and support the Constitution, the amendments, and the precedents.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee who has worked on this issue for a number of years.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, there is legal authority for the President's immigration actions derived, in part, from his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

In *Heckler v. Chaney*, the Supreme Court explained this duty does not require the President to act against every technical violation of the law. The Court said: "An agency's decision not to prosecute or enforce, whether

through civil or criminal process, is a decision generally committed to the agency's absolute discretion."

Two years ago, the Supreme Court, in *Arizona v. United States*, struck down most of Arizona's S.B. 1070 law. The Court said then the broad discretion exercised by Federal immigration officials extends to "whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all." The Court said discretion in the enforcement of immigration law embraces immediate human concerns and can turn on factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service.

When we created the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, we charged the Secretary with the duty to establish national immigration enforcement policies and priorities. That is at 6 U.S. Code 202.

□ 1245

Congress delegated that authority to the executive branch, and they are now using this authority. We enacted a law that permits the issuance of employment authorization. They are now implementing that part of the law.

This bill would block some portions of the President's recent action to keep young people from facing deportation and to prevent parents of U.S. citizen kids from being deported, but the bill harms others, too. Immigrant victims of domestic violence who seek a green card through the Violence Against Women Act are not protected from deportation while they wait for a visa. With this bill, they would face deportation.

Victims of serious crimes approved for U visas get deferred action while they wait for a visa. Under this bill, they would face deportation. The exception in the bill is insufficient because victims may assist law enforcement without appearing at trial.

Victims of severe forms of human trafficking eligible for statutorily-capped T visas could also face deportation. The bill would end the ability to parole in place the undocumented families of American military personnel and veterans. Deporting the mothers of American soldiers could be the result.

There is strong historical precedent for the President's actions. Prior Presidents were not met with such obstructionism. President Ronald Reagan created the family fairness program. Once expanded by President George H.W. Bush, that program is expected to protect 1.5 million people. The reason was to keep families together, one of the key motivations for the President's actions last month.

As some wrongly claim, the Reagan program was to carry out congressional intent in the 1986 act. That is false. When the Senate Judiciary Committee reported the bill, they said: "It is the intent of the committee that the

families of legalized aliens will obtain no special petitioning right by virtue of the legalization. They will be required to wait in line in the same manner as immediate family members of other new resident aliens." President Reagan decided otherwise.

Some wrongly argue the scope of the Reagan family fairness program was smaller, that it was not intended to provide relief to 1.5 million people, about 40 percent of the undocumented population at the time. Again, that is false. The INS Commissioner then testified before Congress that it covered 1.5 million people. An internal decision memo at the time states:

Family fairness policy provides voluntary departure and employment authorization to potentially millions of individuals.

The draft processing plan at the time said:

Current estimates are that greater than 1 million IRCA-eligible family members will file for this benefit.

Now, many Members on the other side of the aisle want to prevent the President's actions from going into effect, but the President has strong constitutional and statutory authority to take these actions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LOFGREN. He cannot change the law, and he has not done so. He does have the authority to grant temporary relief to some. We need broad reform, and to do that, we need to legislate.

It is shameful that the House has failed in its duty to legislate to fix our broken immigration system. The Judiciary Committee has reported out four bills. We have yet to see them on the floor.

I would like to enter into the RECORD the testimony by the Commissioner before the Judiciary Committee in 1990, the draft processing plan from 1990, and the decision memo from 1990 that prove the elements of the Reagan fairness plan.

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION,
REFUGEES, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MORRISON. Now, Mr. McNary, you used the number 1.5 million IRCA relatives who are undocumented but who are covered by your family fairness policy. Do I have that number right?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON. Under your recent administrative order, these 1.5 million people essentially are here to stay, with work and travel privileges. Isn't that right?

Mr. McNARY. We think you are right as to the 1.5 million being here. There is an estimate of another 1.5 million that would come as a result of this change in definition.

Mr. MORRISON. There is another 1.5 million who you think would be eligible to come?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

DRAFT PROCESSING PLAN
RPF PROCESSING OF FAMILY FAIRNESS
APPLICATIONS
UTILIZING DIRECT MAIL PROCEDURES

This proposal identifies one feasible method for accomplishing the initial receipt of documents required for an alien to request coverage under the Service's recently announced policy shift on family fairness. As a result of this change in policy, current estimates are that greater than one million IRCA-ineligible family members will file for this benefit.

Because of the anticipated scope of this workload on the Service, it is advisable to identify cost-efficient and effective methods to receive and process applications for inclusion under the Family Fairness Policy (PEP). Therefore, it is recommended that one viable option will incorporate many of the resources currently in place throughout the Service. One such plan, which can be activated with a minimum lead time and effort is to have aliens direct mail their applications to Service Regional Processing Facilities (RPF).

ALIEN MUST FILE BY MAIL WITH THEIR RPF:

1. One Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization.

Instructions are modified for this form to tell aliens to enter in the three () "F F P" located in item #16 on the I-765.

Money order or bank Check for \$35.00 made out to INS, if employment authorization is required.

Affidavit of family membership, using the required format.

THE RPF WILL USE THE LAPS SYSTEM TO DO THE FOLLOWING:

Note: Simply stated, the REF will handle the I-765 with accompanying documentation, in very much the same manner as the current I-698, used by temporary residents under §245a to apply for adjustment to permanent resident status.

1. If application is complete, as required, process. If not, it is returned to the alien until it is perfected.

2. If processable, the I-765 is forwarded to data entry. Here, a new A-number will be assigned to the application and the resulting record.

3. LAPS will be used to capture all data from the I-765 for which there is a comparable field in LAPS. For starters, the form type will be I-765, the fee amount \$35.00, etc. Information for which there is no comparable field in LAPS will not be able to be keyed until modifications are made to the system. The resulting electronic record will enable the Service to track individual cases, produce timely management reports, and send notices to the alien.

4. After data entry, all paperwork is placed in the appropriate A-file folder.

5. The fee, if indicated, is processed with monies deposited to X accounts.

6. LAPS will preempt all other interviews which have been scheduled and will schedule I-765 applicants to appear for interview instead, at the earliest practicable date.

7. LAPS prints an automated mailer to the applicant. This mailer tells the alien that their request for coverage under FFP has been received. The mailer states that it is a replacement I-689 document and grants employment authorization until the date of a scheduled interview. Suggested text:

"We have received your request for relief from deportation under the Family Fairness Policy. You must appear at the office listed below on _____ for an interview so we may make a decision on this application. If we

approve your application, you will receive employment authorization at that time. If you move, notify the INS of your new address using form I-697A, available at any INS office.”

MESSAGE REPEATS IN SPANISH—MAXIMUM MAILER LINES = 12

7A. Alternatively, if policy requires that employment authorization be instantaneous, upon processing of the I-765, the suggested language is:

“We have received your request for relief from deportation under the Family Fairness Policy. You will be notified to appear at an INS office for an interview so we may make a decision on this application. This document replaces form I-689 and, combined with proper identification, authorizes employment until _____. If you move, notify the INS of your new address using form I-697A, available at any INS office.”

MESSAGE REPEATS IN SPANISH—MAXIMUM MAILER LINES = 12

ALTEN RECEIVES NOTICE AND SHOW UP AT PHASE II OFFICE HAVING LAPS ACCESS

1. I-213 completed on alien. Decision on EVD is made.
2. Alien is interviewed to determine applicability of FFP relief and veracity of family relationship claim. Examiner uses online screen record of I-765 data.
3. If I-765 approved, alien processed at that office for EAD card.
4. If FFP coverage denied, alien notified in writing using Form I-210. LAPS screen updated to reflect status.
5. Copy of I-210, I-213 sent to district Deportation and Investigation branches for issuance of an OSC if alien does not leave the country within 30 days voluntarily, as provided on the I-210.

ESTIMATED RESOURCES REQUIRED

	Est. cost.
1. Clerical staff at RPFs: 100	\$1,348,500
2. Adjudicators at RPFs: 250	3,371,250
3. Clerical staff in Field: 250	3,371,250
4. Adjudicators in Field: 500	6,742,500
est. subtotal personnel costs: 1,100	14,833,500
est. software modification costs:	200,000
est. miscellaneous support costs:	2,000,000
Total estimated costs:	17,033,500

@1,000,000 interviewed in 100 workdays.

PRO:

Centralizes control, security and consistency.

Requires less personnel than a more distributed plan.

Buys the Service valuable time to get ready. The time normally wasted in mailing can work to our benefit.

Diminishes the potential for a “circus atmosphere” created by the media or our critics, who will be avidly looking for signs of disorganization or inconsistency at our offices.

CON:

Cost. This can be offset if the Legalization program is allowed to use the fees received from Form I-765 applications, without restriction, to accomplish this special project and to remedy disruption caused to the ongoing legalization, SAW and RAW programs.

Holds the alien, and their representative at arms length. This may be perceived as negative by the public. However, given the emotional nature of this issue, the Service cannot take the risk of exposing too much of itself to the public until we are ready to handle however many aliens come forward.

T. Andreotta (February 8, 1990)
RPF-1.FFP

DECISION MEMO

FEBRUARY 8, 1990.

To: Gene McNary, Commissioner.

Subject: The implementation of the Family Fairness Policy—Providing For Voluntary Departure under 8 CFR 242.5 and Employment Authorization under 8 CFR 274a.12 for the spouses and children of legalized aliens (section 245a and section 210).

The family fairness policy provides voluntary departure and employment authorization to potentially millions of individuals. The Service must establish specific procedures to ensure consistency of processing requests for voluntary departure and employment authorization from ineligible family members of temporary resident aliens legalized under the legalization (section 245a) and special agricultural (section 210) programs. The following processing options are submitted for consideration.

TRADITIONAL PROCESSING PURSUANT TO 8 CFR 242.5 (VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE) AND 8 CFR (274a.12 (EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION).

Request for voluntary departure will be made in writing to the district director in whose jurisdiction the ineligible spouse or child resides.

The district’s records section will create an A-file, if a file has not been previously opened.

The district’s investigations section will prepare form I-213, “Record of Deportable Alien” for each ineligible spouse or child, a determination will be made to grant or deny voluntary departure, and the aliens will be placed under docket control.

The district’s deportation section will control both granted and denied cases that have been placed under docket control. One year call-ups will be maintained for granted cases. Requests for extensions will be processed by deportation personnel. Denied cases will be processed for Orders to Show Cause if the alien has not departed the United States within the required time frame.

Application for employment authorization will be made on form I-765, “Application for Employment Authorization”, with fee.

PROS

Follows established regulatory procedures and guidelines.

Utilizes personnel experienced in processing requests for voluntary departure, employment authorization, and file creation.

Does not “link” to legalization’s promise of confidentiality and “no risk” if alien comes forward to request voluntary departure. (alien can be denied and placed into deportation proceedings, etc.)

Does not impact on legalization processing, thus complying with Congressional intent for a temporary legalization program that will continue to phase down (adjudicating the remaining 700,000+ Phase I 245a and 210 cases, the remaining 800,000 Phase II 245a cases, replacement card applications, processing the 60,000 ongoing litigation cases etc.)

Allows for maximum use of district director’s exercise of discretion.

CONS

Places large workload on in place INS structure, that will strain existing resources. Jeopardizes the Regional Commissioners and the District Directors performance goals in other operational activities.

Operational budgets do not contain sufficient funds for this effort. (a “user fee” may have to be charged generating negative publicity and charges that the Service’s policy was a ruse to raise money)

Large numbers of individuals will visit in place INS offices that already experience unacceptable crowds and long waiting times. (Again, the risk of negative publicity is great)

Congressional complaints are likely to increase as resources are diverted from other activities, slowing the disbursement of benefits and services associated with these activities)

The morale of personnel in investigations and deportation is likely to suffer in that the perception of this program will not “fit” with their regular mission assignments. (Low morale can translate into inadequate processing and poor service and consequently reflecting badly on the Service)

Not an efficient way to consistently process large numbers.

DRAFT PROCESSING PLAN

RPF PROCESSING OF FAMILY FAIRNESS APPLICATIONS

UTILIZING DIRECT MAIL PROCEDURES

This proposal identifies one feasible method for accomplishing the initial receipt of documents required for an alien to request coverage under the Service’s recently announced policy shift on family fairness. As a result of this change in policy, rent estimates are that greater than one million IRCA-ineligible family members will file for this benefit.

Because of the anticipated scope of this workload on the Service, it is advisable to identify cost-efficient and effective methods to receive and process applications for inclusion under the Family Fairness Policy (FFP). Therefore, it is recommended that one viable option will incorporate many of the resources currently in place throughout the Service. One such plan, which can be activated with a minimum lead time and effort is to have aliens direct mail their applications to Service Regional Processing Facilities (RPF).

ALIEN MUST FILE BY MAIL WITH THEIR RPF:

1. One Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization.

Instructions are modified for this form to tell aliens to enter in the three () “F F P” located in item #16 on the I-765.

Money order or bank check for \$35.00 made out to INS, if employment authorization is required.

Affidavit of family membership, using the required format.

THE RPF WILL USE THE LAPS SYSTEM TO DO THE FOLLOWING:

Note: Simply stated, the RPF will handle the I-765 with accompanying documentation, in very much the same manner as the current I-698, used by temporary residents under §245a to apply for adjustment to permanent resident status.

1. If application is complete, as required, process. If not, it is returned to the alien until it is perfected.

2. If processable, the I-765 is forwarded to data entry. Here, a new A-number will be assigned to the application and the resulting record.

3. LAPS will be used to capture all data from the I-765 for which there is a comparable field in LAPS. For starters, the form type will be I-765, the fee amount \$35.00, etc. Information for which there is no comparable field in LAPS will not be able to be keyed until modifications are made to the system. The resulting electronic record will enable the Service to track individual cases, produce timely management reports, and send notices to the alien.

4. After data entry, all paperwork is placed in the appropriate A-file folder.

5. The fee, if indicated, is processed with monies deposited to X accounts.

6. LAPS will preempt all other interviews which have been scheduled and will schedule I-765 applicants to appear for interview instead, at the earliest practicable date.

7. LAPS prints an automated mailers to the applicant. This mailer tells the alien that their request for coverage under FFP has been received. The mailer states that it is a replacement I-689 document and grants employment authorization until the date of a scheduled interview. Suggested text:

"We have received your request for relief from deportation under the Family Fairness Policy. You must appear at the office listed below on _____ for an interview so we may make a decision on this application. If we approve your application, you will receive employment authorization at that time. If you move, notify the INS of your new address using form I-697A, available at any INS office."

MESSAGE REPEATS IN SPANISH—MAXIMUM MAILER LINES = 12

7A. Alternatively, if policy requires that employment authorization be instantaneous, upon processing of the I-765, the suggested language is:

"We have received your request for relief from deportation under the Family Fairness Policy. You will be notified to appear at an INS office for an interview so we may make a decision on this application. This document replaces form I-689 and, combined with proper identification, authorizes employment until _____. If you move, notify the INS of your new address using form I-697A, available at any INS office."

MESSAGE REPEATS IN SPANISH—MAXIMUM MAILER LINES = 12

ALIEN RECEIVES NOTICE AND SHOW UP AT PHASE II OFFICE HAVING LAPS ACCESS

1. I-213 completed on alien. Decision on EVD is made.

2. Alien is interviewed to determine applicability of FFP relief and veracity of family relationship claim. Examiner uses online screen record of I-765 data.

3. If I-765 approved, alien processed at that office for EAD card.

4. If FFP coverage denied, alien notified in writing using Form I-210. LAPS screen updated to reflect status.

5. Copy of I-210, I-213 sent to district Deportation and Investigation branches for issuance of an OSC if alien does not leave the country within 30 days voluntarily, as provided on the I-210.

ESTIMATED RESOURCES REQUIRED

		est. cost
1. Clerical staff at RPFs:	100	\$1,348,500
2. Adjudicators at RPFs:	250	3,371,250
3. Clerical staff in Field:	250	3,371,250
4. Adjudicators in Field:	500	6,742,500
est. subtotal personnel costs:	1,100	14,833,500
est. software modification costs:		200,000
est. miscellaneous support costs:		2,000,000
Total estimated cost:		17,033,500

© 1,000,000 interviewed in 100 workdays.

PRO:

Centralizes control, security and consistency.

Requires less personnel than a more distributed plan.

Buys the Service valuable time to get ready. The time normally wasted in mailing can work to our benefit.

Diminishes the potential for a "circus atmosphere" created by the media or our critics,

who will be avidly looking for signs of disorganization or inconsistency at our offices.

CON:

Cost. This can be offset if the Legalization program is allowed to use the fees received from I-765 applications, without restriction, to accomplish this special project and to remedy disruption caused to the ongoing legalization, SAW and RAW programs.

Holds the alien, and their representative at arm's length. This may be perceived as negative by the public. However, given the emotional nature of this issue, the Service cannot take the risk of exposing too much of itself to the public until we are ready to handle however many aliens come forward.

T. Andreotta (February 8, 1990)

RPF-I.FFP

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would point out that the Supreme Court decision in Heckler v. Chaney in no way justifies the claim that the President of the United States has this authority to issue this enormous order.

Nor do we have a situation where it could justifiably be found that the agency has consciously and expressly adopted a general policy that is so extreme as to amount to an abdication of its statutory responsibilities.

That is what has happened here. The President has abdicated his statutory responsibilities in enforcing the law and changed the law, and that is why it cannot be upheld.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama, just last week, made the action and said, "Change the law," on immigration granting amnesty to millions of illegal aliens. The President should not be allowed to do this. In fact, article II, section 3, of the Constitution requires the President to take care that the law is being faithfully executed.

On March 28, 2011, President Obama said he would not use an executive order for amnesty, explaining that, "Temporary protective status historically has been used for special circumstances." Those are his words.

More than 20 times, the President said executive action on immigration would not be appropriate. Nothing has changed in our Constitution, but now, the administration is singing a different tune.

Mr. Speaker, I am from the Show-Me State. I would love for any of my colleagues in this body to show me in this document, the Constitution of the United States, where it grants the President the authority to change the laws. Article I of the Constitution says Congress will change the laws, not the President. The President will execute the laws—faithfully execute the laws.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly support this legislation, and I ask all my colleagues to do so to stop this action.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI), our leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I commend him for his leadership as chairman and now ranking member of the Judiciary Committee and his important work for comprehensive immigration reform.

I also salute the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN of California, who has not only chaired the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee, she has taught immigration law, she has been an immigration lawyer. She represents a very diverse district in California blessed with a strong immigrant population.

Mr. Speaker, more than 520 days ago, the Senate passed bold bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform by an overwhelming margin. It was bipartisan, it was overwhelming, 520 days ago—more than that.

Time and again, the Republican leadership of the House has promised productive action to fix our clearly broken immigration system; yet, time and again, Republicans have refused to give the American people a vote on this critical issue.

They have ignored law enforcement, the badges; faith leaders, the Bibles; and business groups—the three Bs. They have denied our country billions of dollars in economic benefits and \$1 trillion in deficit reduction, turned their backs on millions of hardworking immigrant families forced to live in daily dread of separation and deportation.

In the face of Republicans' failure to act, President Obama has used his well-established legal and constitutional authority to bring our immigration system back into line with our needs as a Nation and our values as a people.

The President's executive actions will restore accountability to our immigration enforcement: securing our borders; deporting felons, not families; and requiring undocumented immigrants to pass a criminal background check and pay taxes.

Presidents have had broad authority to defer removal when it is in the national interest, and past Presidents have regularly used this authority. President Ronald Reagan understood that immigration was the constant reinvigoration of our Nation.

As a new President in 1981, President Reagan said:

Our Nation is a nation of immigrants. More than any other country, our strength comes from our own immigrant heritage and our capacity to welcome those from other lands.

In the lead-up to the Immigration Reform and Control Act, President Reagan, again, called our Nation to action when he said:

We are also going to have compassion and legalize those who came here sometime ago and have legitimately put roots down and are living as legal residents of our country,

even though illegal. We are going to make them legal.

In his signing statement of the Immigration Reform and Control Act, President Reagan said:

We have consistently supported a legalization program which is both generous to the alien and fair to the countless thousands of people throughout the world who seek legally to come to America.

He went on to say:

The legalization provisions in this act will go far to improve the lives of a class of individuals who now must hide in the shadows without access to many of the benefits of a free and open society.

Does that sound familiar?

He went on to say:

Very soon, many of these men and women will be able to step into the sunlight, and, ultimately, if they choose, they may become Americans.

In the years immediately following the enactment of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act, President Reagan and President George Herbert Walker Bush took bold action to protect the spouses and children of people who received status under that law.

Although Congress explicitly chose not to grant status to these people, Presidents Reagan and Bush recognized that it was not in the national interest to separate families. Using their authority to establish a family fairness program by executive action, they offered spouses and children indefinite protection from deportation and gave them work authorization.

Every President since President Dwight David Eisenhower has used this same broad authority, Republicans and Democrats alike. Dating back more than 50 years, Presidents have granted Extended Voluntary Departure to nationals of more than a dozen countries, including Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Chile, Poland, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, and Uganda.

President George Herbert Walker Bush granted Deferred Enforced Departure to Chinese nationals after the Tiananmen Square massacre, even though he vetoed a similar bill passed by Congress.

I remember that well. It was my bill. He vetoed the bill because he didn't want to sign the bill, and then he issued the executive order doing exactly what the bill would do. Several years later, he granted the same status to 200,000 Salvadorans.

Thanks to President Obama's immigration accountability executive actions, in the same vein, millions of hardworking, law-abiding families will be able to celebrate the holidays with renewed hope in the future.

In response to this Presidential action of common sense and compassion, Republicans are advancing today on this floor a radical bill of appalling callousness and cruelty. With this bill, Republicans are demanding that we deport hundreds of thousands of young

DREAMers who know no country but the United States. With this bill, Republicans would tear apart millions of families and throw thousands upon thousands of American children into foster care.

With this bill, Republicans would deport the family members of our heroes in uniform who are serving overseas, deny relief and respite to victims of human trafficking and domestic violence, and reject the values that are at the heart of our heritage and our history.

This legislation is unworthy of our Nation.

Don't take it from me. That is why this bill is opposed by groups, including the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, who wrote:

Instead of traumatizing these children and young adults—the future leaders of our country—we should invest in them by ensuring that their families remain intact.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our colleagues will take the advice of the Conference of Catholic Bishops and vote against this legislation.

Democrats in the House will continue to demand comprehensive immigration reform, which honors our heritage, giving certainty to families, fueling innovation, creating jobs, and reducing the deficit. We know that the President's steps cannot be a substitute for legislation. They must be a summons to action.

Here in Congress and across the country, we will keep up the drumbeat for the progress of advancing comprehensive immigration reform. We will do so in heeding the advice of President George W. Bush, who told us as we dealt with this issue to treat the people who are affected by it with respect.

Republicans should reject this cold-hearted bill and give the American people the vote on immigration reform that they deserve.

□ 1300

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding and for his leadership on immigration issues.

I especially want to thank my colleague and friend from Florida, Congressman YOHO, for bringing forward this important piece of legislation, which just goes back and reestablishes the rule of law, Mr. Speaker. You have got a President who has consistently gone out, time and time again, and shown disregard for the Constitution and the rule of law of this Nation.

We just had an election in November. The President, himself, said this was going to be a referendum on his agenda, and the American people were crystal clear about their dislike of this

failed agenda from this President. They have told him: Get back to work. Go work with Congress to solve problems.

What is the first response? The President has to poke his finger in the eye of the American people, people who spoke loud and clear to him, in saying that he is going to disregard what they said; and he is going to ignore the rule of law and, in fact, ignore what our constitutional framework of checks and balances is. He thinks he can just sit in the Oval Office and write his own laws, and then he comes forward with this proposal to literally disregard enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws.

This isn't going to stand, Mr. Speaker. This legislation says: You can't do that, Mr. President. There is a rule of law. You need to start enforcing that law.

We came together as a House just a few months ago and passed a border security bill. Let's actually get back to the rule of law and protecting our Nation's borders. It is not just an immigration issue; it is a national security issue.

So what is the President's response to this legislation? He threatens a veto. Again, the President thinks he can just sit in the Oval Office and make up his own laws.

That is not the way our system of government works, Mr. Speaker. So we bring this legislation forward today to get us back to that rule of law and to remind the President that it is time for him to heed the message that millions of Americans across the country sent just a few weeks ago in saying: You need to start working with Congress to solve real problems.

In fact, this weekend, in my home State of Louisiana, there are three more elections on that ballot. Pay close attention, Mr. President. Pay close attention to yet another referendum on your agenda that is going to occur this Saturday with a Senate election and two more House races. The American people want you to get out of the cocoon of the Oval Office and start working with Congress to solve real problems.

We have passed legislation to solve those problems. You can try to ignore them, issue veto threats, but it is time for you to roll up your sleeves and get to work with us and solve those problems together. Pull back your executive action. This legislation ensures that happens.

I urge approval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, JUDY CHU, a dedicated member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, it seems the Republicans will do anything other

than put a bill on the floor to pass immigration reform. So far, they have refused to allow for a vote on the bipartisan H.R. 15; they are threatening another government shutdown; and they suggest impeaching the President for doing what is right.

When they did put a bill on the floor, it was to repeal DACA. It has been more than a year and a half of refusing to allow a vote on H.R. 15, even though, if it were on the floor today, it would pass. Instead, we have this bill to undo the President's executive action, a step he wouldn't have had to take had Congress done its job.

This is just another distraction when what we need are real solutions. There are real families at stake who need real immigration reform. American businesses need it. Our communities need it.

If Republicans are unhappy that the President acted, there is still an option for them—legislative. Join us in crafting and voting on a bill that will fix our broken immigration system.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this very reasonable legislation, which really simply requires that our present immigration laws be fully enforced, or at least not be violated. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH) for bringing this legislation to the floor.

The President has said he has been forced to act because the Congress has not done so. That is not correct, as Chairman GOODLATTE pointed out a few minutes ago. Congress can act in any one of three ways: writing a new law, changing an old law, or leaving present law in effect.

The administration is glossing over—or is ignoring—the fact that we have very detailed immigration laws on the books now. They may not like present law, but no one has the right or the power or the authority to pick and choose and enforce some laws but not others.

Presidential executive orders have traditionally been used almost entirely for noncontroversial, administrative-type actions. They were not meant to be a way for a President to bypass the Congress. We do not live or are not supposed to live under a system where all the power is vested in the Executive. We have a Constitution, and it should be followed.

Mr. Speaker, all of us admire those who have immigrated here legally and have contributed so much to this Nation. We have allowed many millions here legally since the Simpson-Mazzoli law of 1986, far more than any other country. But with 58 percent of the people in the world having to get by on

\$4 or less a day, that means that almost 4 billion people are hoping to get one good meal today and probably aren't.

We are blessed beyond belief to live in this Nation, but our entire infrastructure—our schools, our hospitals, our jails, our roads, our sewers—simply cannot handle the rapid influx of megamillions who would come in a relatively short time if we simply opened our borders. We have to have a legal, orderly system of immigration, and it must be enforced.

I urge my colleagues to support this very commonsense legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a distinguished member of the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with a sense of moral indignation that we would want to block parents from loving their children, children from loving their parents, and deporting persons who have no reason to criminally act in this Nation.

I join with the President in saying let us keep families and deport felons. That is a discretion that is given by the law to allow Presidents to take care and ensure that the laws are enforced properly.

This legislation is wrongheaded and misdirected. Allow me to say that this November 20 executive order is now being retroactively judged by this Congress. That is not the Congress' responsibility. The Congress, if they desire to do so, as they have done on many occasions, is to bring this to the judicial courts. But if they do so, they will find that the law has dictated that courts grant without much interest in deciding whether or not an administrative decision has been made with fault. The President, through his executive order, is making an administrative decision in terms of how laws are prosecuted.

Just yesterday, the State of Texas and a number of other States filed a lawsuit against the executive actions announced by the President on November 20. Much to my surprise—and, of course, with great joy—the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals appears to have already issued a decision, dismissing such a complaint. It did so in 1997 when Governor George W. Bush was arguing that the Federal Government's failure to enforce our immigration laws violated article I, and the court rejected Texas' argument that the Federal Government had breached a nondiscretionary duty to control immigration under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Specifically, the court said: "We are not aware of and have difficulty conceiving of any judicially discoverable standards for determining whether immigration control efforts by Congress

are constitutionally adequate." Why? Because there is an interpretation of the law and an administrative component of the law.

Likewise, in *Heckler v. Chaney*, the Court said: "An agency's decision not to take enforcement actions is unreviewable under the Administrative Procedure Act because a court has no workable standard against which to judge the agency's exercise of discretion."

The President of the United States is not exercising discretion of executive order. He is instructing and giving guidance to administrative agencies who will make decisions accordingly to the framework of making sure that those who are felons are out but families are not.

If you want to stop human trafficking, if you want to have a conscience in this Nation, if you want to protect the vulnerable, if you want to keep young people who are bright-eyed simply to serve in the United States military—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to recognize those individuals who have come here to do what is right and if you want to stop the siege of human trafficking, as I have said, where Houston is the epicenter of such, where we see it every day, where people are out of the shadows, if you want to do that, then you will vote against this misdirected law and you will read the constitutional dictates—first from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, then from the United States Supreme Court in *Arizona v. United States*—and understand that the President has the executive authority to do just what he has done, to be a moral keeper and to give discretion to the law.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule governing debate of H.R. 5759, the so-called "Preventing Executive Overreach On Immigration Act," and the underlying bill.

I oppose the rule and the underlying bill because it is nothing more than the Republican majority's latest partisan attack on the President and another diversionary tactic to avoid addressing the challenge posed by the nation's broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5759, which by all appearances was hastily introduced on November 20, 2014, without evident deliberation for the ostensible purpose of establishing a retroactive "rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief."

As originally drafted and introduced the bill provided:

No provision of the United States Constitution, the Immigration and Nationality Act, or other Federal law shall be interpreted or applied to authorize the executive branch of the Government to exempt, by Executive order,

regulation, or any other means, categories of persons unlawfully present in the United States from removal under the immigration laws (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act).

Any action by the executive branch with the purpose of circumventing the objectives of this statute shall be null and void and without legal effect.

Although the bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, upon which I have served throughout my ten terms in Congress, no hearing or markup of the bill was ever held. And it shows.

The most obvious and fatal flaw in the bill as introduced and considered by the Rules Committee is its attempt to dictate to the federal judiciary how the Constitution is to be interpreted—"No provision of the United States Constitution . . . shall be interpreted or applied to authorize the executive branch . . ."

Mr. Speaker, it has been settled law for 211 years, since 1803, when the Supreme Court decided the landmark case of *Marbury v. Madison* that the federal courts, and ultimately, the Supreme Court are the arbiters when it comes to interpreting the Constitution and the laws. As Chief Justice John Marshall stated in *Marbury*:

"It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases, must of necessity expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each."

Had regular order been followed and this ill-conceived bill been subject to hearing and markup this fatal deficiency would have been revealed and made plain and the bill likely would have died a quiet death.

Mr. Speaker, because H.R. 5759 was so poorly conceived and drafted, it would have embarrassed the Republican leadership to bring the bill to floor in its original form so the bill was amended in the Rules Committee, which made in order an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) that tries—but does not succeed—in remedying the many deficiencies of the original bill.

As amended and reported by the Rules Committee, H.R. 5759 seeks to prohibit the executive branch from exempting or deferring from deportation any immigrants considered to be unlawfully present in the United States under U.S. immigration law, and to prohibit the administration from treating those immigrants as if they were lawfully present or had lawful immigration status.

The amended bill now includes three exceptions to this prohibition:

1. "to the extent prohibited by the Constitution:"

2. "upon the request of Federal, State, or local law enforcement agencies, for purposes of maintaining aliens in the United States to be tried for crimes or to be witnesses at trial"; and

3. "for humanitarian purposes where the aliens are at imminent risk of serious bodily harm or death."

The amended bill seeks to make November 20, 2014 the effective date of these prohibitions—thereby retroactively blocking the executive actions taken on that date by President Obama to address our broken immigration

system by providing smarter enforcement at the border, prioritize deporting felons—not families—and allowing certain undocumented immigrants, including the parents of U.S. citizens and lawful residents, who pass a criminal background check and pay taxes to temporarily stay in the U.S. without fear of deportation.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly discuss why the executive actions taken by President Obama are reasonable, responsible, and within his constitutional authority.

Under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, the President, the nation's Chief Executive, "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

In addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the Take Care Clause as ensuring presidential control over those who execute and enforce the law and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws. See, e.g., *Arizona v. United States*; *Bowsher v. Synar*; *Buckley v. Valeo*; *Printz v. United States*; *Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB*.

Every law enforcement agency, including the agencies that enforce immigration laws, has "prosecutorial discretion"—the power to decide whom to investigate, arrest, detain, charge, and prosecute.

Agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), may develop discretionary policies specific to the laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize resources to meet mission critical enforcement goals.

Executive authority to take action is thus "fairly wide", indeed the federal government's discretion is extremely "broad"; as the Supreme Court held in the recent case of *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012), an opinion written Justice Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice Roberts:

"Congress has specified which aliens may be removed from the United States and the procedures for doing so. Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria set by federal law. Removal is a civil, not criminal, matter. A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. If removal proceedings commence, aliens may seek asylum and other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal." (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

The Court's decision in *Arizona v. United States*, also strongly suggests that the executive branch's discretion in matters of deportation may be exercised on an individual basis, or it may be used to protect entire classes of individuals such as "[u]nauthorized workers trying to support their families" or immigrants who originate from countries torn apart by internal conflicts:

"Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law embraces immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who

commit a serious crime. The equities of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service.

Some discretionary decisions involve policy choices that bear on this Nation's international relations. Returning an alien to his own country may be deemed inappropriate even where he has committed a removable offense or fails to meet the criteria for admission. The foreign state may be mired in civil war, complicit in political persecution, or enduring conditions that create a real risk that the alien or his family will be harmed upon return.

The dynamic nature of relations with other countries requires the Executive Branch to ensure that enforcement policies are consistent with this Nation's foreign policy with respect to these and other realities."

Mr. Speaker, in exercising his broad discretion in the area of removal proceedings, President Obama has acted responsibly and reasonably in determining the circumstances in which it makes sense to pursue removal and when it does not.

In exercising this broad discretion, President Obama has not done anything that is novel or unprecedented.

Here are just a few examples of executive action taken by several presidents, both Republican and Democratic, on issues affecting immigrants over the past 35 years:

1. In 1980, President Jimmy Carter exercised parole authority to allow Cubans to enter the U.S., and about 123,000 "Mariel Cubans" were paroled into the U.S. by 1981.

2. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan used executive action in 1987 to allow 200,000 Nicaraguans facing deportation to apply for relief from expulsion and work authorization.

3. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush issued an executive order that granted Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) to certain nationals of the People's Republic of China who were in the United States.

4. In 1992, the Bush administration granted DED to certain nationals of El Salvador.

5. In 1997, President Bill Clinton issued an executive order granting DED to certain Haitians who had arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 1995.

6. In 2010 the Obama administration began a policy of granting parole to the spouses, parents, and children of military members.

Mr. Speaker, because of the President's leadership and far-sighted executive action, 594,000 undocumented immigrants in my home state of Texas are eligible for deferred action.

If these immigrants are able to remain united with their families and receive a temporary work permit, it would lead to a \$338 million increase in tax revenues, over five years.

Mr. Speaker, the President's laudable executive actions are a welcome development but not a substitute modernizing the nation's immigration laws. Only Congress can do that.

America's borders are dynamic, with constantly evolving security challenges. Border security must be undertaken in a manner that allows actors to use pragmatism and common sense.

And as shown by the success of H.R. 17, the bipartisan "Border Security Results Act,

which I helped to write and introduced along with the senior leaders of the House Homeland Security Committee, we can do this without putting the nation at risk or rejecting our national heritage as a welcoming and generous nation.

This legislation has been incorporated in H.R. 15, the bipartisan “Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act,” legislation which reflects nearly all of the core principles announced earlier this year by House Republicans.

As a nation of immigrants, the United States has set the example for the world as to what can be achieved when people of diverse backgrounds, cultures, and experiences come together.

It is now time to open the golden symbolized by Lady Liberty’s lamp to the immigrant community of today so they can participate fully in the American Dream.

These loyal and law-abiding persons have been waiting patiently for far too long for their chance.

We can and should seize this historic opportunity to pass legislation to ensure that we have in place adequate systems and resources to secure our borders while at the same time preserving America’s character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world and to reap the hundreds of billions of dollars in economic productivity that will result from comprehensive immigration reform.

President Obama has acted boldly, responsibly, and compassionately in exercising his constitutional authority to enforce the immigration laws in an effective and humane manner.

If congressional Republicans, who have refused to debate comprehensive immigration reform legislation for more than 500 days, disapprove of the lawful actions taken by the President, an alternative course of action is readily available to them: pass a bill and send it to the President for signature.

The President has shown responsible leadership. The next step is up to congressional Republicans.

I urge all Members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying bill.

Just yesterday, the State of Texas and a number of other States filed a lawsuit challenging the executive actions announced by the President on November 20. The lawsuit, which will be known as *Texas v. United States of America*, was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

Much to my surprise, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals appears to have already issued a decision dismissing the Complaint. In the case of *Texas v. United States*—sound similar?—the Fifth Circuit in 1997 dismissed a lawsuit by then Governor George W. Bush arguing that the Federal Government’s failure to enforce our immigration laws violated Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution—the Naturalization Clause. The Fifth Circuit also rejected Texas’s argument that the Federal Government had breached a nondiscretionary duty to control immigration under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

In rejecting the Naturalization Clause argument, the Fifth Circuit wrote that “A judicial action presents a nonjusticiable political question not amenable to judicial resolution where there

is . . . a lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it.” In this case, the Court stated plainly that “We are not aware of and have difficulty conceiving of any judicially discoverable standards for determining whether immigration control efforts by Congress are constitutionally adequate.” Of course the President lawsuit challenges the enforcement actions of the President, not of Congress, but the broader point is the same.

In rejecting the statutory claim brought by Texas, the Court cited the Administrative Procedure Act and *Heckler v. Chaney*—the Supreme Court’s leading case on the non-reviewability of agency decisions not to take enforcement actions—for the proposition that “An agency’s decision not to take enforcement actions is unreviewable under the Administrative Procedure Act because a court has no workable standard against which to judge the agency’s exercise of discretion.”

At a time when illegal border crossings was at its peak—1.5 million returns each year in 1996 and 1997—the Court stated: “We reject out-of-hand the State’s contention that the federal defendants’ alleged systemic failure to control immigration is so extreme as to constitute a reviewable abdication of duty. The State does not contend that federal defendants are doing nothing to enforce the immigration laws or that they have consciously decided to abdicate their enforcement responsibilities. Real or perceived inadequate enforcement of immigration laws does not constitute a reviewable abdication of duty.”

During this President’s tenure, well over 2 million people have been formally removed from this country. Prosecutions for illegal entry and reentry after removal have increased exponentially. And even if 5 million people come forward and receive temporary protection from removal through DACA and the new Deferred Action for Parental Accountability program, there will still be well over 6 million undocumented immigrants who have received no such protection. With funds to deport no more than 400,000 people each year I assure my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the President is in no danger of “doing nothing to enforce the immigration laws” and that he had not “consciously decided to abdicate [his] enforcement responsibilities.”

The argument that the President has declared that he will no longer enforce our immigration laws is offensive to the 34,000 people—including thousands of women and children—who are sitting in detention centers today waiting for their day in court. It is also frivolous.

The lawsuit filed yesterday will fail and this bill never will become law. Rather, the President’s actions will soon take effect and will bring a small measure of sanity to our broken immigration system.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 14¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this question transcends the issue of illegal immigration. The President’s action has crossed a very bright line that separates the American Republic, which prides itself on being a nation of laws and not of men, from those unhappy regimes whose rulers boast that the law is in their mouths.

It is true that throughout the Nation’s history, Presidents have tested the limits of their authority, but this is the first time a Chief Executive, who is charged with the responsibility to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed,” has asserted the absolute power to nullify or change these laws by decree.

Under our Constitution, the President does not get to pick which laws to enforce and which laws to ignore. He does not get to pick who must obey the law and who gets to live above the law. He is forbidden from making laws himself. “All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.”

Whether we choose to recognize it or not, this is a full-fledged constitutional crisis. If this precedent is allowed to stand, it will render meaningless the separation of powers and the checks and balances that comprise the fundamental architecture of our Constitution, that have preserved our freedom for 225 years. If this precedent stands, every future President—Republican and Democrat—will cite it as justification for lawmaking by decree.

The measure before us is the first act of this Congress to restore the balance of powers within this government. The President would be well advised to heed it before sterner measures are required.

The seizure of legislative authority by the executive proved fatal to the Roman republic. Now that is happening in our own time. Let that not be the legacy of this administration.

For more than two centuries, Americans have successfully defended our Constitution, and now history requires this generation to do so again, which it does beginning with this measure today.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield now 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative CICILLINE, a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in Congress and most people in this country understand that our immigration system is broken and needs to be fixed. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have blocked a bipartisan Senate bill from coming to the floor, and President Obama has taken action that he is legally permitted and morally obligated to take.

Executive orders are not unusual. Every President since President Eisenhower has used this authority to take

action on immigration issues, including six Republican Presidents.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Florida said voting against his bill is like voting against the Constitution, I suggest it is just the opposite. The contours for the executive authority of the President are defined in the Constitution and by precedent of the courts. There is no question that the President has the authority to exercise prosecutorial discretion in this regard. So, in fact, voting for this bill undermines the Constitution because the executive authority of the President is set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

We all recognize there are 11 million undocumented residents of this country. We don't allocate resources to deport all 11 million. We allocate resources to deport about 400,000, which means, by definition, we are asking the department to set priorities in deciding whom to deport. Setting those priorities ensures that they deport the most serious offenders, people who pose threats to our communities.

That act of prosecutorial discretion is what is reflected in the President's executive order.

□ 1315

It is very important to understand that there is practically very little question from legal scholars.

I insert in the RECORD a letter which has the signature of 136 law professors who support the constitutionality of this provision, as well as a separate letter from additional titans in the legal community, beginning with President Lee Bollinger from Columbia University, Adam Cox from New York University, Walter Dellinger, and several other legal scholars.

25 NOVEMBER 2014.

We write as scholars and teachers of immigration law who have reviewed the executive actions announced by the President on November 20, 2014. It is our considered view that the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and establishment of the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA) programs are within the legal authority of the executive branch of the government of the United States. To explain, we cite federal statutes, regulations, and historical precedents. We do not express any views on the policy aspects of these two executive actions.

This letter updates a letter transmitted by 136 law professors to the White House on September 3, 2014, on the role of executive action in immigration law. We focus on the legal basis for granting certain noncitizens in the United States "deferred action" status as a temporary reprieve from deportation. One of these programs, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), was established by executive action in June 2012. On November 20, the President announced the expansion of eligibility criteria for DACA and the creation of a new program, Deferred Action for Parental Accountability (DAPA).

PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION IN IMMIGRATION LAW ENFORCEMENT

Both November 20 executive actions relating to deferred action are exercises of pros-

ecutorial discretion. Prosecutorial discretion refers to the authority of the Department of Homeland Security to decide how the immigration laws should be applied. Prosecutorial discretion is a long-accepted legal practice in practically every law enforcement context, unavoidable whenever the appropriated resources do not permit 100 percent enforcement. In immigration enforcement, prosecutorial discretion covers both agency decisions to refrain from acting on enforcement like cancelling or not serving or filing a charging document to Notice to Appear with the immigration court, as well as decisions to provide a discretionary remedy like granting a stay of removal, parole, or deferred action.

Prosecutorial discretion provides a temporary reprieve from deportation. Some forms of prosecutorial discretion, like deferred action, confer "lawful presence" and the ability to apply for work authorization. However, the benefits of the deferred action programs announced on November 20 are not unlimited. The DACA and DAPA programs, like any other exercise of prosecutorial discretion do not provide an independent means to obtain permanent residence in the United States, nor do they allow a noncitizen to acquire eligibility to apply for naturalization as a U.S. citizen. As the President has emphasized, only Congress can prescribe the qualifications for permanent resident status or citizenship.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND LONG-STANDING AGENCY PRACTICE

Focusing first on statutes enacted by Congress, §103(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA" or the "Act"), clearly empowers the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to make choices about immigration enforcement. That section provides: "The Secretary of Homeland Security shall be charged with the administration and enforcement of this Act and all other laws relating to the immigration and naturalization of aliens . . ." INA §242(g) recognizes the executive branch's legal authority to exercise prosecutorial discretion, specifically by barring judicial review of three particular types of prosecutorial discretion decisions: to commence removal proceedings, to adjudicate cases, and to execute removal orders. In other sections of the Act, Congress has explicitly recognized deferred action by name, as a tool that the executive branch may use, in the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion, to protect certain victims of abuse, crime or trafficking. Another statutory provision, INA §274A(h)(3), recognizes executive branch authority to authorize employment for noncitizens who do not otherwise receive it automatically by virtue of their particular immigration status. This provision (and the formal regulations noted below) confer the work authorization eligibility that is part of both the DACA and DAPA programs.

Based on this statutory foundation, the application of prosecutorial discretion to individuals or groups has been part of the immigration system for many years. Long-standing provisions of the formal regulations promulgated under the Act (which have the force of law) reflect the prominence of prosecutorial discretion in immigration law. Deferred action is expressly defined in one regulation as "an act of administrative convenience to the government which gives some cases lower priority" and goes on to authorize work permits for those who receive deferred action. Agency memoranda further reaffirm the role of prosecutorial discretion in immigration law. In 1976, President Ford's Immigration and Naturalization Service

(INS) General Counsel Sam Bernsen stated in a legal opinion, "The reasons for the exercise of prosecutorial discretion are both practical and humanitarian. There simply are not enough resources to enforce all of the rules and regulations presently on the books." In 2000, a memorandum on prosecutorial discretion in immigration matters issued by INS Commissioner Doris Meissner provided that [s]ervice officers are not only authorized by law but expected to exercise discretion in a judicious manner at all stages of the enforcement process," and spelled out the factors that should guide those decisions. In 2011, Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the Department of Homeland Security published guidance known as the "Morton Memo," outlining more than one dozen factors, including humanitarian factors, for employees to consider in deciding whether prosecutorial discretion should be exercised. These factors—now updated by the November 20 executive actions—include tender or elderly age, long-time lawful permanent residence, and serious health conditions.

JUDICIAL RECOGNITION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION IN IMMIGRATION CASES

Federal courts have also explicitly recognized prosecutorial discretion in general and deferred action in particular: Notably, the U.S. Supreme Court noted in its *Arizona v. United States* decision in 2012: "A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials . . . Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all . . ." In its 1999 decision in *Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee*, the Supreme Court explicitly recognized deferred action by name. This affirmation of the role of discretion is consistent with congressional appropriations for immigration enforcement, which are at an annual level that would allow for the arrest, detention, and deportation of fewer than 4 percent of the noncitizens in the United States who lack lawful immigration status.

Based on statutory authority, U.S. immigration agencies have a long history of exercising prosecutorial discretion for a range of reasons that include economic or humanitarian considerations, especially—albeit not only—when the noncitizens involved have strong family ties or long-term residence in the United States. Prosecutorial discretion, including deferred action, has been made available on both a case-by-case basis and a group basis, as are true under DACA and DAPA. But even when a program like deferred action has been aimed at a particular group of people, individuals must apply, and the agency must exercise its discretion based on the facts of each individual case. Both DACA and DAPA explicitly incorporate that requirement.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS FOR DEFERRED ACTION AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS FOR INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS

As examples of the exercise of prosecutorial discretion, numerous administrations have issued directives providing deferred action or functionally similar forms of prosecutorial discretion to groups of noncitizens, often to large groups. The administrations of Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush deferred the deportations of a then-predicted (though ultimately much lower) 1.5 million noncitizen spouses and children of immigrants who qualified for legalization under the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) of 1986, authorizing work permits for the spouses. Presidents Reagan and Bush

took these actions, even though Congress had decided to exclude them from IRCA. Among the many other examples of significant deferred action or similar programs are two during the George W. Bush administration: a deferred action program in 2005 for foreign academic students affected by Hurricane Katrina, and “Deferred Enforcement Departure” for certain Liberians in 2007.” Several decades earlier, the Reagan administration issued a form of prosecutorial discretion called “Extended Voluntary Departure” in 1981 to thousands of Polish nationals. The legal sources and historical examples of immigration prosecutorial discretion described above are by no means exhaustive, but they underscore the legal authority for an administration to apply prosecutorial discretion to both individuals and groups.

Some have suggested that the size of the group who may “benefit” from an act of prosecutorial discretion is relevant to its legality. We are unaware of any legal authority for such an assumption. Notably, the Reagan-Bush programs of the late 1980s and early 1990s were based on an initial estimated percentage of the unauthorized population (about 40 percent) that is comparable to the initial estimated percentage for the November 20 executive actions. The President could conceivably decide to cap the number of people who can receive prosecutorial discretion or make the conditions restrictive enough to keep the numbers small, but this would be a policy choice, not a legal issue. For all of these reasons, the President is not “re-writing” the immigration laws, as some of his critics have suggested. He is doing precisely the opposite—exercising a discretion conferred by the immigration laws and settled general principles of enforcement discretion.

THE CONSTITUTION AND IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT DISCRETION

Critics have also suggested that the deferred action programs announced on November 20 violate the President’s constitutional duty to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” A serious legal question would therefore arise if the executive branch were to halt all immigration enforcement, or even if the Administration were to refuse to substantially spend the resources appropriated by Congress. In either of those scenarios, the justification based on resource limitations would not apply. But the Obama administration has fully utilized all the enforcement resources Congress has appropriated. It has enforced the immigration law at record levels through apprehensions, investigations, and detentions that have resulted in over two million removals. At the same time that the President announced the November 20 executive actions that we discuss here, he also announced revised enforcement priorities to focus on removing the most serious criminal offenders and further shoring up the southern border. Nothing in the President’s actions will prevent him from continuing to remove as many violators as the resources Congress has given him permit.

Moreover, when prosecutorial discretion is exercised, particularly when the numbers are large, there is no legal barrier to formalizing that policy decision through sound procedures that include a formal application and dissemination of the relevant criteria to the officers charged with implementing the program and to the public. As DACA has shown, those kinds of procedures assure that important policy decisions are made at the leadership level, help officers to implement policy decisions fairly and consistently, and offer

the public the transparency that government priority decisions require in a democracy.

CONCLUSION

Our conclusion is that the expansion of the DACA program and the establishment of Deferred Action for Parental Accountability are legal exercises of prosecutorial discretion. Both executive actions are well within the legal authority of the executive branch of the government of the United States.

Hiroshi Motomura & Susan Westerberg Prager, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law*; Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia, Pennsylvania State University Dickinson School of Law; Stephen H. Legomsky, Washington University School of Law; David Abraham, University of Miami School of Law; Raquel Aldana, University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law; Farrin R. Anello, Seton Hall University School of Law; Deborah Anker, Harvard Law School; Sabrineh Ardalan, Harvard Law School; David C. Baluarte, Washington and Lee University School of Law; Melynda Barnhart, New York Law School; Jon Bauer, University of Connecticut School of Law; Lenni B. Benson, New York Law School; Jacqueline Bhabha, Harvard Law School;

Linda Bosniak, Rutgers University School of Law-Camden; Richard A. Boswell, U.C. Hastings College of the Law; Jason A. Cade, University of Georgia Law School; Janet Calvo, CUNY School of Law, New York; Kristina M. Campbell, University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law; Stacy Caplow, Brooklyn Law School; Benjamin Casper, University of Minnesota Law School; Linus Chan, University of Minnesota; Howard F. Chang, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Michael J. Churgin, University of Texas at Austin; Marisa Cianciarulo, Chapman University Dale E. Fowler School of Law; Evelyn Cruz, Arizona State University; Ingrid Eagly, UCLA School of Law; Philip Eichorn, Cleveland State—Cleveland Marshall School of Law;

Bram T. Elias, University of Iowa College of Law; Stella Burch Elias, University of Iowa College of Law; Jill E. Family, Widener University School of Law; Niels Frenzen, University of Southern California; Maryellen Fullerton, Brooklyn Law School; César Cuauhtémoc García Hernández, University of Denver Sturm College of Law; Lauren Gilbert, St. Thomas University School of Law; Denise L. Gilman, University of Texas School of Law; John F. Gossart, Jr., University of Maryland School of Law; P. Gulasekaram, Santa Clara University; Anju Gupta, Rutgers School of Law—Newark; Susan R. Gzesh, University of Chicago; Jonathan Hafetz, Seton Hall University; Dina Francesca Haynes, New England Law, Boston; Susan Hazeldean, Cornell Law School;

Ernesto Hernández-López, Chapman University; Laura A. Hernandez, Baylor Law School; Michael Heyman, John Marshall Law School; Barbara Hines, University of Texas School of Law; Laila L. Hlass, Boston University School of Law; Geoffrey Hoffman, University of Houston Law Center; Mary Holper, Boston College Law School; Alan Hyde, Rutgers University School of Law—Newark; Kate Jastram, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law; Kit Johnson, University of Oklahoma College of Law; Anil Kalhan, Drexel University Kline School of Law; Daniel Kanstroom, Boston College Law School; Elizabeth Keyes, University of Baltimore School of Law; Kathleen Kim, Loyola Law School Los Angeles; David C. Koelsch, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Jennifer Lee Koh, Western State College of Law;

Kevin Lapp, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles; Christopher Lasch, University of Denver Sturm College of Law; Jennifer J. Lee, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Stephen Lee, University of California, Irvine; Christine Lin, University of California, Hastings College of the Law; Beth Lyon, Villanova University School of Law; Stephen Manning, Lewis & Clark College; Lynn Marcus, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law; Miriam H. Marton, University of Tulsa College of Law; Elizabeth McCormick, University of Tulsa College of Law; M. Isabel Medina, Loyola University New Orleans College of Law; Stephen Meili, University of Minnesota Law School; Vanessa Merton, Pace University School of Law; Andrew Moore, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law; Jennifer Moore, University of New Mexico School of Law;

Daniel I. Morales, DePaul University College of Law; Nancy Morawetz, NYU School of Law; Karen Musalo, U.C. Hastings College of the Law; Alizabeth Newman, CUNY School of Law; Noah Novogrodsky, University of Wyoming College of Law; Fernando A. Nuñez, Charlotte School of Law; Mariela Olivares, Howard University School of Law; Michael A. Olivas, University of Houston Law Center; Patrick D. O’Neill, Esq., University of Puerto Rico School of Law; Sarah Paoletti, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Sunita Patel, American University, Washington College of Law; Huyen Pham, Texas A&M University School of Law; Michele R. Pistone, Villanova University School of Law; Luis F.B. Plascencia, Arizona State University; Polly J. Price, Emory University School of Law; Doris Marie Provine, Arizona State University; Nina Rabin, James E. Rogers College of Law, University of Arizona;

Jaya Ramji-Nogales, Temple University, Beasley School of Law; Renee C. Redman, University of Connecticut School of Law; Ediberto Roman, Florida International University; Victor C. Romero, Penn State Law; Joseph H. Rosen, Atlanta’s John Marshall Law School; Carrie Rosenbaum, Golden Gate University School of Law; Rachel E. Rosenbloom, Northeastern University School of Law; Rubén G. Rumbaut, University of California, Irvine; Ted Ruthizer, Columbia Law School; Leticia M. Saucedo, UC Davis School of Law; Heather Scavone, Elon University School of Law; Andrew I. Schoenholtz, Georgetown Law; Philip Schrag, Georgetown University Law Center; Bijal Shah, NYU School of Law; Ragini Shah, Suffolk University Law School; Careen Shannon, Yeshiva University, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law; Anna Williams Shavers, University of Nebraska College of Law; Bryn Siegel, Pacific Coast University School of Law;

Anita Sinha, American University, Washington College of Law; Dan R. Smulian, Brooklyn Law School; Gemma Solimene, Fordham University School of Law; Jayashri Srikantiah, Stanford Law School; Juliet Stumpf, Lewis & Clark Law School; Maureen A. Sweeney, University of Maryland Carey School of Law; Barbara Szveda, Lincoln Memorial University Duncan School of Law; Margaret H. Taylor, Wake Forest University School of Law; David Thronson, Michigan State University College of Law; Allison Brownell Tirres, DePaul University College of Law; Scott Titshaw, Mercer University School of Law; Phil Torrey, Harvard Law School; Enid Trucios-Haynes, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law, University of Louisville;

Diane Uchimiya, University of La Verne College of Law; Gloria Valencia-Weber, University of New Mexico School of Law; Sheila

I. Vélez Martínez, University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Alex Vernon, Ave Maria School of Law; Rose Cuisson Villazor, University of California at Davis School of Law; Leti Volpp, University of California, Berkeley; Jonathan Weinberg, Wayne State University; Deborah M. Weissman, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Lisa Weissman-Ward, Stanford Law School; Anna R. Welch, University of Maine School of Law; Virgil O. Wiebe, University of St. Thomas School of Law, Minneapolis; Michael J. Wishnie, Yale Law School; Stephen Yale-Loehr, Cornell University Law School; Elizabeth Lee Young, University of Arkansas School of Law.

NOVEMBER 20, 2014.

We are law professors and lawyers who teach, study, and practice constitutional law and related subjects. We have reviewed the executive actions taken by the President on November 20, 2014, to establish priorities for removing undocumented noncitizens from the United States and to make deferred action available to certain noncitizens. While we differ among ourselves on many issues relating to Presidential power and immigration policy, we are all of the view that these actions are lawful. They are exercises of prosecutorial discretion that are consistent with governing law and with the policies that Congress has expressed in the statutes that it has enacted.

1. Prosecutorial discretion—the power of the executive to determine when to enforce the law—is one of the most well-established traditions in American law. Prosecutorial discretion is, in particular, central to the enforcement of immigration law against removable noncitizens. As the Supreme Court has said, “the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials” is “[a] principal feature of the removal system.” *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012).

Even apart from this established legal tradition, prosecutorial discretion in the enforcement of immigration law is unavoidable. According to most current estimates, there are approximately 11 million undocumented noncitizens in the United States. The resources that Congress has appropriated for immigration enforcement permit the removal of approximately 400,000 individuals each year. In these circumstances, some officials will necessarily exercise their discretion in deciding which among many potentially removable individuals is to be removed.

The effect of the November 20 executive actions is to secure greater transparency by having enforcement policies articulated explicitly by high-level officials, including the President. Immigration officials and officers in the field are provided with clear guidance while also being allowed a degree of flexibility. This kind of transparency promotes the values underlying the rule of law.

2. There are, of course, limits on the prosecutorial discretion that may be exercised by the executive branch. We would not endorse an executive action that constituted an abdication of the President’s responsibility to enforce the law or that was inconsistent with the purposes underlying a statutory scheme. But these limits on the lawful exercise of prosecutorial discretion are not breached here.

Both the setting of removal priorities and the use of deferred action are well-established ways in which the executive has exercised discretion in using its removal authority. These means of exercising discretion in the immigration context have been used

many times by the executive branch under Presidents of both parties, and Congress has explicitly and implicitly endorsed their use.

The specific enforcement priorities set by the November 20 order give the highest priority to removing noncitizens who present threats to national security, public safety, or border security. These common-sense priorities are consistent with long-standing congressional policies and are reflected in Acts of Congress.

Similarly, allowing parents of citizens and permanent lawful residents to apply for deferred action will enable families to remain together in the United States for a longer period of time until they are eligible to exercise the option, already given to them by Congress, to seek to regularize the parents’ status. Many provisions of the immigration laws reflect Congress’s determination that, when possible, individuals entitled to live in the United States should not be separated from their families; the November 20 executive action reflects the same policy. The authority for deferred action, which is temporary and revocable, does not change the status of any noncitizen or give any noncitizen a path to citizenship.

In view of the practical and legal centrality of discretion to the removal system, Congress’s decision to grant these families a means of regularizing their status, and the general congressional policy of keeping families intact, we believe that the deferred action criteria established in the November 20 executive order are comfortably within the discretion allowed to the executive branch.

As a group, we express no view on the merits of these executive actions as a matter of policy. We do believe, however, that they are within the power of the Executive Branch and that they represent a lawful exercise of the President’s authority.

Lee C. Bollinger, President, Columbia University; Adam B. Cox, Professor of Law, New York University School of Law; Walter E. Dellinger III, Douglas B. Maggs Professor of Law, Duke University and O’Melveny & Myers, Washington, D.C.; Harold Hongju Koh, Sterling Professor of International Law, Yale Law School; Gillian Metzger, Stanley H. Fuld Professor of Law, Columbia Law School; Eric Posner, Kirkland and Ellis Distinguished Service Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School; Cristina Rodriguez, Leighton Homer Surbeck Professor of Law, Yale Law School; Geoffrey R. Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law, The University of Chicago; David A. Strauss, Gerald Ratner Distinguished Service Professor of Law, University of Chicago Law School; Laurence H. Tribe, Carl M. Loeb University Professor and Professor of Constitutional Law Harvard Law School.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the President’s executive order will ensure that we have a safer country, that we will grow our economy, and that we will keep families together. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this Republican proposal and to allow the President’s executive order to remain.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA).

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5759. This bill simply

says that the President cannot issue blanket amnesty. This legislation also contains language that is similar to my own bill, the Defense of Legal Workers Act, H.R. 5761. It states clearly that illegal immigrants who are granted executive amnesty are not authorized to work in the United States.

When we talk about illegal immigration, we always hear about what we should do to help the illegal immigrants. Well, what about the American workers? Who is going to stand up for them? There is a toxic intersection of this executive amnesty and the Affordable Care Act. Under the ACA, employers with 50 or more workers will have to provide health insurance or pay a \$3,000 fine. But under the President’s amnesty, illegal immigrants are exempt from the ACA. That means with their new work permits, illegal immigrants will be \$3,000 cheaper to hire. That will drive companies to hire illegal immigrants instead of legal American workers—or worse yet, get rid of American workers in exchange for cheaper replacements.

This bill is a small step, but I will vote for any bill that stops executive amnesty and that includes stopping the funding and supporting my own bill that protects American workers.

Let’s remember that we have been put in this position by a President who campaigned on a slogan of “yes we can” but governs under the philosophy of “because I want to.”

Mr. CONYERS. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided and politically motivated legislation. In fact it would be dangerous and irresponsible for this body to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from exercising prosecutorial discretion. DHS and ICE must be able to prioritize the detention and the deportation of people who pose a threat to public safety and national security, as opposed to deporting, for example, college students who were brought to this country by their parents. Or, perhaps, spouses of U.S. citizens serving in the military. It is not even a close question.

The reality is discretion is and always has been exercised by every prosecutor in this country. To my knowledge, Republicans have never questioned this, never challenged it, until the current President began prioritizing dangerous criminals for immigration enforcement.

As former Solicitor General Walter Dellinger recently wrote:

In light of how legally conservative the Justice Department opinion really is, it is a wonder that this issue has become the subject of such heated, occasionally apocalyptic commentary. Those who object to the President’s efforts to unite families should stop hiding behind unfounded legal alarms and debate the President’s actions on the merits.

That is very good advice, Mr. Speaker, and I urge defeat of this cynical and unwarranted legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I thank not only the chairman but I thank the gentleman from Florida for his hard work on this important measure because my dad used to say that at times in life it is important to call an ace an ace. And I think fundamentally what this bill does is call an ace an ace with regard to cutting off and ending unilateral actions by Presidents, whether they are Republicans or Democrats.

This is fundamentally about the balance of power in our Federal system. It is also important because it fits with what I am hearing from a lot of folks back home when they say, well, this issue of immigration reform has less to do with immigration than it has to do with the rule of law in this country and the way in which it should be applied to all folks equally. They say that it is fundamentally unfair for States to be burdened with new costs based on the unilateral action by a President. They say it is fundamentally unfair for our Federal entitlement system to be that much more wobbly based on a unilateral action by a President. And they say it is fundamentally unconstitutional for the President to take action in the pattern that he has, whether it is with the Affordable Care Act, whether it is with the Federal contracts, whether it is with war in the Middle East, or now immigration.

So is this enough ultimately? No. I think we ultimately need to defund the President's ability to move forward. But it is an important first step in that basic notion that my dad prescribed of calling an ace an ace.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this legislation, and I hope nobody expects me to.

Mr. Speaker, I am the beneficiary of the greatest executive order ever written, the Emancipation Proclamation. In 1863, when Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, the country was at war, it was being torn apart, and yet he signed that proclamation. While it did not liberate the slaves, it did lead to the passage of the 13th Amendment in 1865.

I can't agree with this legislation because Truman in 1948 signed an executive order integrating the military, and it went on to integrate the broader society because it was a part of the avant-garde effort. And I would note that at the time he did it, the Dixiecrats were formed. They split from the Democratic Party.

We have always had times of strife in this country, but great Presidents have

always stepped forward, and they have done the right thing.

Now let me address something quickly that has to be addressed: the question of this is a magnet, that it attracts a lot of people to the country. You can't be serious about this. If you were serious about the magnetic approach, you would have done something about wet-foot, dry-foot. Wet-foot, dry-foot allows any person who is from Cuba who gets one foot on American soil to come right on in and get into a pathway to legalization, just by getting one foot on. Have the other foot in the water, one on land? Come on in. And that is the policy of the United States Government. You would end that if you were serious. That is a magnet. But you don't see magnets until it comes to certain people, it seems.

Mr. President, I salute you for what you have done. I commend you, I stand with you on this issue, but more importantly, I stand with bringing people out of the shadows of life into the sunshine of a new life.

God bless you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would once again remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing again to come down to this House floor to discuss issues and to be a part of this debate. I think one of the issues that really has to come to light here is when it is being said that what we are doing is trivial, what we are doing doesn't matter, then, frankly, what does matter? Does the Constitution matter? Does the rule of law matter? What is amazing to me, and I sat through a whole 5½-hour hearing the other day in dealing with this, we used letters that were not probably used for the right context, we used other examinations, and it always came back to, well, in the end, if it just helps somebody, it is okay.

The problem I am having here with this is this problem: the ones who are coming into our country, many of them whom I have spoken with in my time as a pastor and other times dealing with missionary work, they are coming from places where rule of law is not followed and where rule of law is broken. So now what do we do? They come to a country in which rule of law is being put aside and is being expanded just to help just a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from Florida. I applaud everyone from here who is saying it doesn't matter if it is a Democrat or a Republican, what is right is what is right,

and that is what matters on the floor of this House. When we understand that, then we can get back to what really matters, and that is saying that it is a time for debate. It is not a time for exercising further outside the lines. It is a time in which we, as a group, come together and say, let's solve problems, let's not poison the well so we cannot have conversations, and we don't have the dignity which we have for those who truly want to come to our country, who have done it legally and have done it right. Why would we do that?

That is what is wrong with this debate. The problem that we are having right now is we are just simply saying, Mr. President, there are three branches of government, and you can do whatever you want to within your side, but the Congress has to do it on its side, and it listens to the people as well. I think they spoke pretty loud and clear 3 weeks ago.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, LUIS GUTIÉRREZ.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I have spent the past year speaking every year in this Chamber about the damaging effects of our broken immigration system on our security, our economy, our families, and communities. We started with such great hope at the beginning of this Congress. But here we are in the final hours of the 113th Congress, and instead of moving a piece of legislation that the majority would put forward to address the underlying problems with our immigration system, we have before us another symbolic, superficial vote that will fix absolutely nothing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will not strengthen security at our borders, including the most important gateways that are rarely mentioned, at LAX, Chicago O'Hare, or JFK. This bill will not address the labor needs of our agricultural industry or tech industry. This bill will not protect American workers by implementing E-Verify across the board to make sure there is one legal labor force in America, paying their fair share of taxes and fully protected by American labor laws. This bill does not do that.

This bill will not answer the pleas of U.S. American citizens who have a parent or a spouse who wants to get right with the law, is willing to submit to a thorough background check at their own expense and prove to the American people that they are not a threat and able to work, pay taxes, and contribute to the success of this country.

Instead of moving forward, instead of legislating actual solutions to difficult public policy issues, instead of putting the emphasis on doing what needs to be done to improve the economy, the security, and the basic human decency of our laws, we are left with a tired and

unfortunate partisan battle. It is a partisan fight based on pure fantasy, not just the fantasy that the U.S. Congress will ever appropriate enough money to jail, expel, and deport 11 million people and their families, but also the fantasy that what your side votes on today will ever become law. You know it. I know it. Apparently the majority prefers to take symbolic votes instead of legislating real and lasting solutions.

Mr. Speaker, they didn't call Ronald Reagan a tyrant. They didn't call him lawless. Yet he said, "I will protect 1½ million undocumented people that you call illegal." He protected them. When the Congress expressly said they would not be included for any benefit under the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act, he protected them. He used his Presidential power to do that. And he wasn't called a tyrant, and he wasn't called lawless. He was doing the right thing: protecting the siblings and spouses of those that would be granted legalization under that law that Congress expressly excluded.

And do you want to know something? I am happy that President Barack Obama is following in that great and proud tradition set forth by President Ronald Reagan that he would rather put family first, the demagoguery and any anti-immigrant policy always last.

□ 1330

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to me to see former President Ronald Reagan, especially here in the House Chamber. I, in fact, voted for President Reagan twice and was proud to support him.

One of the things that I remember most about President Reagan was that great debate with his opponent in one of the Presidential debates in which he said, "There he goes again," pointing out when his opponent said something inaccurate about him.

Well, there they go again because what we have today is something that is very, very different than what President Reagan did. President Reagan signed a law—a bill passed by the Congress and signed it into law, and then he found some things that he didn't think were correct, so he then took action.

In today's Washington Post, which I would cite for the gentleman from Illinois, its headline, The Washington Post editorial today, "An action without precedent," so when he cites President Reagan as a precedent here, The Washington Post clearly refutes that by pointing out how small that was and how it was done in response to a specific, identifiable concern about legislation that had been passed. Guess what? The Congress then subsequently fixed it as well.

That is not what is occurring here today, and as The Washington Post

notes, it is plain that the White House's numbers—the 1.5 million claim—are indefensible, and it is similarly plain that the scale of Mr. Obama's move goes far beyond anything his predecessors attempted and without legislation that had been passed to found it upon.

No, this is power grab of enormous proportion. It is unconstitutional. It is clearly what he said he was going to do when he came to this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

When he came to this body almost 3 years ago with his list of things that he wanted done, he said, "If you don't do it, I will." On that occasion, some Members on that side of the aisle stood up and applauded.

Guess what? Since then, in health care reform, in the environment, in enforcement of our drug laws and in a whole host of other things, that is exactly what he has done, and he said he was going to do it. He said, "I have my pen and my phone, and I will do it myself."

Well, in this case, he has, on more than 20 occasions, said he did not have the authority to do it. Now, the folks on the other side of the aisle are saying, "Oh, he didn't change the law."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

He didn't have the authority to change the law, but guess what? When he signed the order, here is what he said:

What you are not paying attention to is that I just took action to change the law.

To change the law. Article I of the Constitution says the law is only changed by the United States Congress. Article III says the President shall faithfully execute the law. His actions are unconstitutional and they are unprecedented.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I, in my opening remarks, did note the uncanny similarity between the action that President Reagan and the first President Bush took and the action that President Obama has now taken.

I would note that I used the official record as a source of information instead of chat and articles, and I submitted for the record the internal decision memorandum in the INS, dated February 8, 1990, indicating that 1.5 million, 40 percent of the undocumented population, in contravention to the orders of Congress, were going to be given deferred action.

The Commissioner of the INS testified that 40 percent of the undocu-

mented population were going to be given, in contradiction to the Congress' explicit decision, were going to be given deferred action. I also have the draft processing plan that says millions of people would be given, in contravention to the act of Congress, deferred action. They even have the amount of money that they were going to make off the estimated filing fees.

I would recommend that people take a look at the documents, and they will see that what President Reagan did is almost exactly the same as what President Obama did—40 percent of the population.

I don't think that President Reagan could get the Republican nomination today, but that does not diminish the validity of his action at that time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot of feigned outrage from the other side, but I want to point out a few things.

Number one, it was the President himself who said, over 20 times, why this action is illegal. I would invite the Democrats to read his remarks. There are over 20 different instances of it.

Number two, they talk about prosecutorial discretion, and this is okay, but as I understand it, you have that discretion when you run out of money and maybe you can't implement a finer point of a law, something that you are prosecuting. It doesn't mean you change the law.

I would invite the Democrats who think that we disproportionately pick on this President, I would invite them to look at the 1950s case during the Truman administration in which President Truman nationalized the steel business by executive order in order to avoid a strike.

It went to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court found on a 6-3 vote that you could not change the law of such magnitude by executive order, and that was not a case of picking on poor little old Harry Truman. It was a case of standing up for the United States Constitution.

I would also like to invite the Democrats to look at the lawsuit that 17 States have now joined in saying that the President has violated article II, section 3, the part of the Constitution that talks about taking care to execute the laws, which this President seems to think is a pick-and-choose operation run out of his political office.

I would also invite the Democrats to go to Central America and talk to so many of the immigrants that I have. I have been to Honduras. I have been to El Salvador. I have been to Guatemala. I have talked to people, and one of our earlier speakers said that, "You think there is some sort of magnet, that they come here because we changed the law, you are out of your mind."

I would say go to Central America and talk to the folks. That is exactly why they come: because they get the word that it is easier to come here under those circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. For those who think that relaxing our laws does not create a magnet, they need to go to Central America and talk to the people who would be taking advantage of this.

Finally, let me say this about leadership: in split government with three branches, equal branches, you don't get what you want. Leadership is pulling together the coalitions to talk to people and ask: "What part of this law can we agree on? And what can we do about it?"

That is what leadership is about. The President has that opportunity to show leadership now that he is going to have a new Congress and a new Senate to work with. The way to get things done is to reach out and work with people and not to be in your face against them.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

I don't hear anyone disagreeing that our immigration system is broken. It is broken for our commerce as businesses try to figure out how to do the best business across the border, as they try to figure out who they can employ and not employ. It is broken. I don't think anyone contests that.

We need to have as much security here at home as we can because we know, abroad, there are folks who would like to hurt us. If we don't have a Department of Homeland Security with laws that work well, our security is broken.

Certainly, the whole discussion here makes it very clear that American families—American families—are being disrupted, separated day after day. No one wants to see that done to an American family, certainly not to a whole bunch of American citizens who want to have opportunities in the future. Our immigration system is broken. Let's just all agree on that.

So what do we do? Well, we can fix the broken immigration system, or we can put message bills on the floor of the House that are never going to get signed and become law and leave in 5 more days and end the year 2014 without having done anything and watch as we have gone more than two to three decades without fixing a broken immigration system.

Or we could finally take the bill that has been sitting here in the House for 525 days that passed in the Senate on a

bipartisan vote, 68 out of 100 Senators, Republicans and Democrats, voted to fix the broken immigration system. That has been sitting here waiting for a vote for 525 days.

We have 5 days left in this session. Within 5 days, we could fix the broken immigration system for our economy, for our families, and for our national security; or we could do a message bill as we have on the floor, which will not pass the Senate, which will not be signed by the President, which means that we leave 2014 having done nothing.

The President said in January, during his State of the Union, "Congress, let's get this done together, but if you can't do something, then I will do what I can under my executive authority."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BECERRA. The President said in his State of the Union, "If you can't do something, I will do what I can under my executive authority under the Constitution." And so he did.

Now, it is a matter of trying to make things work better and smarter, given that we have a broken immigration system. Now is not the time to double down with these social agenda matters that go nowhere. We could get this done, but we all have to be accountable. Just as we demand those immigrant families to be accountable, Congress has to be accountable.

Let's get this done. The American people have been telling us that for years. Get this done. You know the solution. Let's act. There are 5 days to go. Let's get this done. Put the Senate bipartisan bill on the floor, and we will get this done.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker remaining, and so I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior member on the Judiciary Committee, to close out our side.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the President is not changing the law, he is exercising Presidential prosecutorial choice. The very fact that only 400,000 people a year can be deported when there are admittedly 11 million undocumented people in this country says you have to make choices.

I didn't see anyone on that side of the aisle demand that President Bush—or President Obama, for that matter—deport all 11 million people and propose the appropriation to enable that to be

done. Failing that, there must be choices. The President must choose.

I will not repeat all of the legal arguments that we have heard over the last hour that the President has it well within his power to make these choices. Discretion happens—400,000 against 11 million—discretion happens.

Making that discretion systematic and sensible, prioritizing it, doesn't change the law. The Republicans admit the law is broken, but they haven't brought any bills to this floor in 4 years, and they have ignored the bipartisan Senate bill, so the President must act and that he acts within his power is good.

Finally, I must comment on the remarks of Mr. BARLETTA who says—and I have heard other people say it—that the undocumented aliens—or the documented aliens, for that matter—pose a threat to American jobs.

The fact is they do jobs that other people don't want, and more to the point, what poses a threat to American living standards is the fact that they can't enforce standards. The fact that an undocumented alien can't complain to an enforcement agency when he is paid below minimum wage or when he is exploited, that reduces wage levels for everyone.

If you want to help wage levels for American workers, let the undocumented people who are here and who are going to stay here, let them come out of the shadows, pass a comprehensive bill, let them work legally, and enforce the minimum wage law. It will benefit all American workers.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said repeatedly that we need to do immigration reform, and I certainly don't disagree with that, but the United States Constitution says that immigration reform must be done by the United States Congress, and the President doesn't say, nor does the Constitution say, "Hey, if the Congress doesn't do it or doesn't do it the way I like it, then I get the opportunity to do it myself." That is not what the Constitution says. It says the President shall faithfully execute the laws.

Now, the gentleman from New York, in talking about the impact of the President's executive action here says, "Oh, the people who are here illegally and are taking jobs, they are taking jobs that Americans don't want."

Well, maybe there is some truth to that, maybe some of them are not, but the fact of the matter is the President has unilaterally taken an executive order that would give every single one of the 4 million to 5 million undocumented people in the United States who take jobs, to take any job in the country they want to, as good a job, as high-paying a job as they want.

□ 1345

So, yes, we need to do immigration reform. The American people want us to do immigration reform, but they want us to start with enforcement first.

Instead, what the President has done, he has taken the law into his own hands. That is the real issue in this case and the real matter before the Congress and the real import of this legislation. It is not about where you are on immigration reform; it is about where you are on protecting the United States Constitution. Because this President's actions are unprecedented; this President's actions are beyond the pale; this President's actions are unconstitutional.

This legislation offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH) stops that. That is why every Member of the House should support this good legislation and make sure that we preserve what we are sworn under an oath to preserve, and that is the Constitution of the United States.

Ladies and gentlemen, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5759.

Almost three quarters of all undocumented immigrants in America are women and children.

Before President Obama took action to adjust the status of certain long-term U.S. residents, these women were trapped in the shadows.

They lived in fear of being deported and permanently separated from their kids.

Many remained in violent relationships because their abusers threatened to expose their immigration status.

Others were forced to work in unsafe and unsanitary conditions, unable to report their exploitative employers.

What message is this dangerous bill sending to these women and their families?

Go back to the shadows.

Stay at your dangerous job.

Continue to live in fear of losing your children.

Mr. Speaker, these women deserve better and so does our country.

The messages issued by this body should always be rooted in hope and empowerment, not fear.

Instead of playing political games with the lives of vulnerable immigrants, we should be working together to build on the President's actions by passing comprehensive immigration reform.

H.R. 5759 would have devastating consequences for millions of families with deep ties to their communities. As the Republican Leadership is well aware, this bill has no chance of being signed into law. Let's reject this callous political gimmick and finally get to work fixing our broken immigration system.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5759, the so-called Executive Amnesty Prevention Act of 2014.

Let me start by saying that I applaud our President for taking bold action to keep families together.

He acted where this Congress has failed to act.

A bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill was passed in the Senate more than 500 days ago. Yet Republican leadership in the House failed to bring the bill up for a vote in the House.

And so as a result, our President took responsibility to stop the suffering of millions of mixed-status families who have lived for years in fear and uncertainty. He did so with full legal authority, just as every President—Democrat and Republican—has done since Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Of course, the Executive Order is not perfect, and does not relieve uncertainty for every deserving family.

But I am pleased that some 5 million people will be able to step out of the shadows, contribute to our economy, and pursue the American dream. This Congress still needs to pass a comprehensive bill to truly fix our broken immigration system.

Instead of voting on this misguided and cruel bill, we should be having a vote on the comprehensive plan that we know would pass this House.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule governing debate of H.R. 5759, the so-called "Preventing Executive Overreach On Immigration Act," and the underlying bill.

I oppose the rule and the underlying bill because it is nothing more than the Republican majority's latest partisan attack on the President and another diversionary tactic to avoid addressing the challenge posed by the nation's broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5759, which by all appearances was hastily introduced on November 20, 2014, without evident deliberation for the ostensible purpose of establishing a retroactive "rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief."

As originally drafted and introduced the bill provided:

No provision of the United States Constitution, the Immigration and Nationality Act, or other Federal law shall be interpreted or applied to authorize the executive branch of the Government to exempt, by Executive order, regulation, or any other means, categories of persons unlawfully present in the United States from removal under the immigration laws (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act).

Any action by the executive branch with the purpose of circumventing the objectives of this statute shall be null and void and without legal effect.

Although the bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, upon which I have served throughout my ten terms in Congress, no hearing or markup of the bill was ever held. And it shows.

The most obvious and fatal flaw in the bill as introduced and considered by the Rules Committee is its attempt to dictate to the federal judiciary how the Constitution is to be interpreted—"No provision of the United States Constitution . . . shall be interpreted or applied to authorize the executive branch . . ."

Mr. Speaker, it has been settled law for 211 years, since 1803, when the Supreme Court

decided the landmark case of *Marbury v. Madison* that the federal courts, and ultimately, the Supreme Court are the arbiters when it comes to interpreting the Constitution and the laws. As Chief Justice John Marshall stated in *Marbury*:

It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases, must of necessity expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each.

Had regular order been followed and this ill-conceived bill been subject to hearing and markup this fatal deficiency would have been revealed and made plain and the bill likely would have died a quiet death.

Mr. Speaker, because H.R. 5759 was so poorly conceived and drafted, it would have embarrassed the Republican leadership to bring the bill to floor in its original form so the bill was amended in the Rules Committee, which made in order an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) that tries—but does not succeed—in remedying the many deficiencies of the original bill.

As amended and reported by the Rules Committee, H.R. 5759 seeks to prohibit the executive branch from exempting or deferring from deportation any immigrants considered to be unlawfully present in the United States under U.S. immigration law, and to prohibit the administration from treating those immigrants as if they were lawfully present or had lawful immigration status.

The amended bill now includes three exceptions to this prohibition:

1. "to the extent prohibited by the Constitution;"
2. "upon the request of Federal, State, or local law enforcement agencies, for purposes of maintaining aliens in the United States to be tried for crimes or to be witnesses at trial"; and
3. "for humanitarian purposes where the aliens are at imminent risk of serious bodily harm or death."

The amended bill seeks to make November 20, 2014 the effective date of these prohibitions—thereby retroactively blocking the executive actions taken on that date by President Obama to address our broken immigration system by providing smarter enforcement at the border, prioritizing deporting felons—not families—and allowing certain undocumented immigrants, including the parents of U.S. citizens and lawful residents, who pass a criminal background check and pay taxes to temporarily stay in the U.S. without fear of deportation.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly discuss why the executive actions taken by President Obama are reasonable, responsible, and within his constitutional authority.

Under Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, the President, the nation's Chief Executive, "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

In addition to establishing the President's obligation to execute the law, the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted the Take Care Clause as ensuring presidential control over those who execute and enforce the law and the authority to decide how best to enforce the laws. See, e.g., *Arizona v. United*

States; *Bowsher v. Synar*; *Buckley v. Valeo*; *Printz v. United States*; *Free Enterprise Fund v. PCAOB*.

Every law enforcement agency, including the agencies that enforce immigration laws, has “prosecutorial discretion”—the power to decide whom to investigate, arrest, detain, charge, and prosecute.

Agencies, including the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), may develop discretionary policies specific to the laws they are charged with enforcing, the population they serve, and the problems they face so that they can prioritize resources to meet mission critical enforcement goals.

Executive authority to take action is thus “fairly wide,” indeed the federal government’s discretion is extremely “broad” as the Supreme Court held in the recent case of *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012), an opinion written Justice Kennedy and joined by Chief Justice Roberts:

Congress has specified which aliens may be removed from the United States and the procedures for doing so. Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria set by federal law. Removal is a civil, not criminal, matter. A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials. Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all. If removal proceedings commence, aliens may seek asylum and other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal. (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

The Court’s decision in *Arizona v. United States*, also strongly suggests that the executive branch’s discretion in matters of deportation may be exercised on an individual basis, or it may be used to protect entire classes of individuals such as “[u]nauthorized workers trying to support their families” or immigrants who originate from countries torn apart by internal conflicts:

Discretion in the enforcement of immigration law embraces immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger than alien smugglers or aliens who commit a serious crime. The equities of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United States, long ties to the community, or a record of distinguished military service.

Some discretionary decisions involve policy choices that bear on this Nation’s international relations. Returning an alien to his own country may be deemed inappropriate even where he has committed a removable offense or fails to meet the criteria for admission. The foreign state may be mired in civil war, complicit in political persecution, or enduring conditions that create a real risk that the alien or his family will be harmed upon return.

The dynamic nature of relations with other countries requires the Executive Branch to ensure that enforcement policies are consistent with this Nation’s foreign policy with respect to these and other realities.

Mr. Speaker, in exercising his broad discretion in the area of removal proceedings, President Obama has acted responsibly and reasonably in determining the circumstances in

which it makes sense to pursue removal and when it does not.

In exercising this broad discretion, President Obama has not done anything that is novel or unprecedented.

Here are a just a few examples of executive action taken by several presidents, both Republican and Democratic, on issues affecting immigrants over the past 35 years:

1. In 1980, President Jimmy Carter exercised parole authority to allow Cubans to enter the U.S., and about 123,000 “Mariel Cubans” were paroled into the U.S. by 1981.

2. In 1987, President Ronald Reagan used executive action in 1987 to allow 200,000 Nicaraguans facing deportation to apply for relief from expulsion and work authorization.

3. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush issued an executive order that granted Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) to certain nationals of the People’s Republic of China who were in the United States.

4. In 1992, the Bush administration granted DED to certain nationals of El Salvador.

5. In 1997, President Bill Clinton issued an executive order granting DED to certain Haitians who had arrived in the United States before Dec. 31, 1995.

6. In 2010 the Obama administration began a policy of granting parole to the spouses, parents, and children of military members.

Mr. Speaker, because of the President’s leadership and far-sighted executive action, 594,000 undocumented immigrants in my home state of Texas are eligible for deferred action.

If these immigrants are able to remain united with their families and receive a temporary work permit, it would lead to a \$338 million increase in tax revenues, over five years.

Mr. Speaker, the President’s laudable executive actions are a welcome development but not a substitute modernizing the nation’s immigration laws. Only Congress can do that.

America’s borders are dynamic, with constantly evolving security challenges. Border security must be undertaken in a manner that allows actors to use pragmatism and common sense.

And as shown by the success of H.R. 17, the bipartisan “Border Security Results Act, which I helped to write and introduced along with the senior leaders of the House Homeland Security Committee, we can do this without putting the nation at risk or rejecting our national heritage as a welcoming and generous nation.

This legislation has been incorporated in H.R. 15, the bipartisan “Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act,” legislation which reflects nearly all of the core principles announced earlier this year by House Republicans.

As a nation of immigrants, the United States has set the example for the world as to what can be achieved when people of diverse backgrounds, cultures, and experiences come together.

It is now time to open the golden symbolized by Lady Liberty’s lamp to the immigrant community of today so they can participate fully in the American Dream.

These loyal and law-abiding persons have been waiting patiently for far too long for their chance.

We can and should seize this historic opportunity and pass legislation to ensure that we have in place adequate systems and resources to secure our borders while at the same time preserving America’s character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world and to reap the hundreds of billions of dollars in economic productivity that will result from comprehensive immigration reform.

President Obama has acted boldly, responsibly, and compassionately in exercising his constitutional authority to enforce the immigration laws in an effective and humane manner.

If congressional Republicans, who have refused to debate comprehensive immigration reform legislation for more than 500 days, disapprove of the lawful actions taken by the President, an alternative course of action is readily available to them: pass a bill and send it to the President for signature.

The President has shown responsible leadership. The next step is up to congressional Republicans.

I urge all Members to join me in opposing the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5759, the so-called “Executive Amnesty Prevention Act of 2014.”

This bill is nothing more than a political stunt by my colleagues across the aisle. It seeks to restrict the President from using his executive authority—much in the same way that President Reagan and President George H.W. Bush have done before him—to further secure the border and prioritize deporting felons over families. In fact, over the last 50 years, every President has used executive authority to take action on immigration, including six Republican Presidents.

This bill would not only be limited to the President’s most recent use of executive authority but would also prevent the Administration from granting deferred action to Dreamers who are currently eligible for DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) but have not yet received it. This would effectively end the DACA program—which has already provided temporary protection for 700,000 individuals who were brought to the United States as children—and would subject hundreds of thousands Dreamers to deportation. This legislation is so broad that the Administration would not even be able to grant deferred action from deportation to family members of U.S. Military troops.

Most importantly, this bill does nothing to address our broken immigration system. It has been more than 520 days since the Senate passed a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill yet Speaker BOEHNER has refused to let us vote on this legislation. Mr. Speaker, let the People’s House vote on this important measure and let democracy work its will. Why is this House so afraid of a little democracy?

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to urge my colleagues to affirm the best of our traditions as a nation, rather than our worst partisan inclinations and oppose H.R. 5759, the Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act of 2014. After several years of delay and obstruction on the matter of comprehensive immigration reform, President Obama acted to protect American

immigrant families from the threat of forcible separation under immigration laws that are inadequate in the Twenty-First Century, by permitting parents living in the United States whose children are citizens or legal permanent residents to avoid deportation and receive authorization to work.

This legislation, H.R. 5759, exists only to allow the Republican-controlled House of Representatives to perpetuate the status quo that has done greater harm to immigrants who have been a part of our communities and criticize President Obama and the families and children he is seeking to protect. The enactment of this legislation would repudiate our commitment to the value of families.

H.R. 5759 would nullify and block implementation of the President's executive actions. If indeed the House majority were to act on the bipartisan Senate immigration reform bill. There would have been no need for the President to Act through his Executive Authority. We, in Congress, must legislate actual solutions. Congress has an obligation to pass commonsense immigration reform that offers meaningful solutions to the broken system.

It is also important to note that every president during the past 50 years has taken executive action on immigration and granted temporary immigration relief. Like his predecessors, this president has the legal authority to take these actions under the Constitution and the Immigration and Nationality Act. Unfortunately, the partisan divide in our nation's capital has created this legislation of discord.

The constituents of my district and across the United States understand that families are the foundation of our civil society. They want reform of our immigration laws that protects the interests of American immigrant families and supports the development of our nation and its people.

President Obama's executive action would provide protection to millions of immigrants, keep families together and expand our economy. I urge the rejection of this legislation. H.R. 5759 fails to uphold the ideals on which this nation was established. I urge the defeat of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 770, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I am opposed in its current form.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Murphy of Florida moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5759, to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Subsection (b) of section 3 of the bill is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "Subsection (a)" and inserting "In accordance with this subsection and subsection (e), subsection (a)".

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

(e) PROTECTING MILITARY FAMILIES, VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING, AND CUBAN NATIONALS.—The provisions of this Act shall not apply to exemptions, deferrals, or other actions that—

(1) provide relief to parents, spouses and children of U.S. citizens who are current members or veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces, the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve, or who seek to enlist in the Armed Forces;

(2) protect victims of domestic violence who have successfully petitioned for relief under the Violence Against Women Act; and victims of crimes and serious forms of human trafficking from further abuse; and

(3) protect Cuban nationals in the United States, or that arrive at or between a port of entry into the United States, or any persons of other nationality deserving of similar protections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the amended bill will immediately proceed to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would shield the unintentional victims of the bill before us, namely, military families, survivors of domestic violence and exploitation, and the Cuban people fleeing the brutal communist regime of the Castros.

First, the amendment would preserve the government's policy of protecting undocumented parents, spouses, and children of military personnel from deportation. After the Pentagon heard from many servicemembers who feared for the safety of their families back home, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services instituted a parole in place policy for respecting military families, supporting military readiness, and honoring our commitment to those who serve our Nation so bravely.

Mr. Speaker, is parole in place for military families such an abuse of power?

Surely, the majority of this House wants our brave men and women serving on the battlefield to be able to focus on the mission and not fear that their families will be taken from them. The slogan "support our troops" must at least mean that.

Next, my amendment would protect the victims of domestic violence, abuse, and severe human trafficking. We know a willingness to come forward and cooperate with law enforcement can break the cycle of violence and

make justice possible for the real criminals. USCIS developed a program to give victims of incredible violence temporary U visas for abuse and T visas for trafficking. In 2010 alone, nearly 12,000 of these visas were given out so victims can come out of the shadows.

What is it about visas for abuse victims that so enrage some in this Chamber?

American women deserve better than a policy that threatens to deport the victim while their abuser simply walks free. That is why the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women wrote that this bill "broadly sweeps large numbers of victims into its scope and ignores the best interests of victims and their children."

Finally, this motion would preserve our country's longstanding practice of granting parole and, ultimately, green cards to Cuban nationals. Those who escape the clutches of the nearly 56-year-old communist dictatorship yearn for the freedom they are so brutally denied just 90 miles from our shore.

To this day, Cuban democracy activists, including Las Damas de Blanco, remain subject to arbitrary arrest, beatings, and imprisonment. Without the protection spelled out in my amendment, fleeing survivors of the Castro regime are denied a chance at freedom and deported.

Is that what we want?

Growing up in south Florida, I can tell you that the cultural richness of the great State of Florida does not exist without Cuban American immigrants, many of whom escaped with nothing more than their lives.

To my friends across the aisle who call this a "process" argument, let me say, if this House had done its job, we wouldn't face a process question in the first place. You want a better process? Pass a bill. Dispense of this measure before us and bring up H.R. 15, a real immigration bill from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA). It will reform our broken system, secure the border, create hundreds of thousands of jobs, and reduce the deficit by nearly \$1 trillion. It has got the votes. We can make it the law by Christmas.

The American people asked for immigration reform, and this body voted to half secure the border and deport DREAMers. Now we are looking at ripping apart military families, prosecuting the victims of domestic violence and human trafficking, and sending Cuban refugees back to the brutal hands of the Castros.

I urge my colleagues, don't let this be the story of the 113th Congress. Pass this motion to recommit and defeat this mean-spirited bill before us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order, and I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO), also the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR) for the contribution he made to the language that is in this important bill to stop the President's unilateral action that is unconstitutional.

The gentleman offering the motion to recommit should note that the bill takes effect as if enacted on November 20, 2014. It nullifies the President's unlawful, unconstitutional executive order. It does not change all immigration law that provides already considerable statutory protection for our members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their families. It protects victims of domestic violence who successfully petition for relief; and Cuban nationals, as has been noted during the debate here, are already protected under the law, and this bill in no way, shape, or form harms any of those protections under the law.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and support the underlying legislation, which is needed to stop the unconstitutional actions of the President of the United States in writing an executive order that is unprecedented in its scope.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979 with an amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 225, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

YEAS—194

Adams	Bustos	Cleaver
Barber	Butterfield	Clyburn
Barrow (GA)	Capps	Cohen
Beatty	Cárdenas	Connolly
Becerra	Carney	Conyers
Bera (CA)	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Costa
Bishop (NY)	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Bonamici	Chu	Cuellar
Brady (PA)	Cielline	Cummings
Braley (IA)	Clark (MA)	Davis (CA)
Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)	Davis, Danny
Brownley (CA)	Clay	DeFazio

DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Marchant	Posey	Smith (NJ)
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Rahall	Marino	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Rangel	Massie	Reed	Southerland
DelBene	Levin	Richmond	McAllister	Reichert	Stewart
Deutch	Lewis	Roybal-Allard	McCarthy (CA)	Renacci	Stivers
Dingell	Lipinski	Ruiz	McCaul	Ribble	Stockman
Doggett	Loeb	Ruppersberger	McClintock	Rice (SC)	Stutzman
Edwards	Lofgren	Rush	McHenry	Rigell	Terry
Ellison	Lowenthal	Ryan (OH)	McKeon	Roby	Thompson (PA)
Engel	Lowey	Sánchez, Linda T.	McKinley	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
Enyart	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sanchez, Loretta	McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Tiberi
Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sarbanes	Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
Esty	Lynch	Schakowsky	Meadows	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Farr	Maffei	Schiff	Meehan	Rohrabacher	Upton
Fattah	Maloney, Carolyn	Schneider	Messer	Rokita	Valadao
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Schrader	Mica	Rooney	Wagner
Frankel (FL)	Matheson	Schwartz	Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Fudge	Matsui	Scott (VA)	Miller (MI)	Roskam	Walden
Gabbard	McCollum	Scott, David	Mullin	Ross	Walorski
Garamendi	McDermott	Serrano	Mulvaney	Rothfus	Weber (TX)
Garcia	McGovern	Sewell (AL)	Murphy (PA)	Royce	Webster (FL)
Grayson	McIntyre	Shea-Porter	Neugebauer	Runyan	Wenstrup
Green, Al	McNerney	Sherman	Noem	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
Green, Gene	Meeks	Sinema	Nugent	Salmon	Whitfield
Grijalva	Meng	Slaughter	Nunes	Sanford	Williams
Gutiérrez	Michaud	Smith (WA)	Nunnelee	Scalise	Wilson (SC)
Hahn	Miller, George	Speier	Olson	Schock	Wittman
Hanabusa	Moore	Swalwell (CA)	Palazzo	Schweikert	Wolf
Hastings (FL)	Moran	Takano	Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Womack
Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)	Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Higgins	Nadler	Thompson (MS)	Perry	Sessions	Yoder
Himes	Napolitano	Tierney	Petri	Shimkus	Yoho
Hinojosa	Neal	Titus	Pittenger	Shuster	Young (AK)
Holt	Nolan	Tonko	Pitts	Simpson	Young (IN)
Honda	Norcross	Tsongas	Poe (TX)	Smith (MO)	
Horsford	O'Rourke	Van Hollen	Pompeo	Smith (NE)	
Hoyer	Owens	Vargas			
Huffman	Pallone	Veasey			
Israel	Pascarella	Vela			
Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez			
Jeffries	Payne	Visclosky			
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Walz			
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmuter	Wasserman			
Kaptur	Peters (CA)	Schultz			
Keating	Peters (MI)	Waters			
Kelly (IL)	Peterson	Waxman			
Kennedy	Pingree (ME)	Welch			
Kildee	Pocan	Wilson (FL)			
Kilmer	Polis	Yarmuth			
Kind	Price (NC)				
Kirkpatrick					
Kuster					
Langevin					

NAYS—225

Amash	Daines	Harper
Amodei	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Bachus	Denham	Hartzer
Barletta	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Barr	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Barton	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Benishke	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Bentivolio	Duffy	Holding
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Black	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Blackburn	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Boustany	Farenthold	Hultgren
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Hunter
Brat	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Issa
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Jenkins
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Jolly
Bucshon	Fox	Jones
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Byrne	Frelinghuysen	Joyce
Calvert	Gardner	Kelly (PA)
Camp	Garrett	King (IA)
Campbell	Gerlach	King (NY)
Capito	Gibbs	Kingston
Carter	Gibson	Kinzing (IL)
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	Kline
Chabot	Gohmert	Labrador
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	LaMalfa
Clawson (FL)	Gosar	Lamborn
Coffman	Gowdy	Lance
Cole	Granger	Lankford
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Latham
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Latta
Cook	Griffin (AR)	LoBiondo
Cotton	Griffith (VA)	Long
Cramer	Grimm	Lucas
Crenshaw	Guthrie	Luetkemeyer
Culberson	Hanna	Lummis

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt	Coble	Gallego
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Hall
Bass	Crawford	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Doyle	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Duckworth	Negrete McLeod

□ 1419

Messrs. FORBES, HURT, ROGERS of Alabama, ROTHFUS, POSEY, and STIVERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, ENGEL, KEATING, CÁRDENAS, RUSH, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 549, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 197, answered “present” 3, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—219

Amash	Benishke	Brat
Amodei	Bentivolio	Bridenstine
Bachus	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Barletta	Black	Brooks (IN)
Barr	Blackburn	Broun (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Boustany	Buchanan
Barton	Brady (TX)	Bucshon

Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—197

Adams
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett

Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins

Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum

McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stutzman
Stwalley (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Gosar King (IA) Labrador

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bishop (UT)
Capuano
Coble

Crawford
Doyle
Duckworth
Hall
Johnson, E. B.

Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod

□ 1428

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to concur.
This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 119, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—300

Adams
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Billakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul

McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus

Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—119

Amash
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Brat
Broun (GA)
Capps
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Grayson

Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jones
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone

Payne
Pearce
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Simpson
Slaughter
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Tonko
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOT VOTING—15

Aderholt
Bachmann
Bishop (UT)
Capuano
Coble

Crawford
Doyle
Duckworth
Green, Gene
Hall

Johnson, E. B.
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod
Rush

□ 1437

Mr. SERRANO changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. NORCROSS, MEEKS, and HIMES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 551, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the week of December 1, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: rollcall No. 532—On final passage of H.R. 5629—"yea;" rollcall No. 533—On final passage of H.R. 3438—"yea;" rollcall No. 534—On final passage of S. 2040—"yea;" rollcall No. 535—On

final passage of H.R. 5050—"yea;" rollcall No. 536—On final passage of H.R. 3572—"yea;" rollcall No. 537—On final passage of H.R. 5739—"yea;" rollcall No. 538—On final passage of H.R. 3240—"yea;" rollcall No. 539—On final passage of H.R. 2366—"yea;" rollcall No. 540—On final passage of H. Res. 766—"nay;" rollcall No. 541—On final passage of H.R. 5769—"yea;" rollcall No. 542—On approving the Journal—"yea;" rollcall No. 543—On motion to recommit with instructions—"yea;" rollcall No. 544—On final passage of H.R. 5771—"aye;" rollcall No. 545—On final passage of H.R. 647—"yea;" rollcall No. 546—On ordering the previous question on the rule—"nay;" rollcall No. 547—On final passage of H. Res. 770—"no;" rollcall No. 548—On final passage of H. Res. 758—"yea;" rollcall No. 549—On Motion to recommit with instructions—"yea;" rollcall No. 550—On final passage of H.R. 5759—"nay;" rollcall No. 551—On motion to concur with amendment on H.R. 3979—"yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 549—"yes;" 550—"no;" 551—"yes."

Had I been present, I would have voted as listed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 549 from the Democrat Motion to Recommit on H.R. 5759 I intended to vote "no"; on rollcall vote No. 550 on H.R. 5759—Executive Amnesty Prevention Act of 2014 I intended to vote "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 551 on the passage of H.R. 3979—Carl Levin and Howard P. 'Buck' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015—Concur in the Senate Amendment with a House Amendment I intended to vote "aye"—I was away from the floor due to a family emergency.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 43. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the "Richard K. Salick Post Office".

H.R. 1391. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the "London Fallen Veterans Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3085. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3375. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

H.R. 3682. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1961 Premier Drive in Mankato, Minnesota, as the "Lyle C. Pearson Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 3957. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 4189. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4443. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building".

H.R. 4919. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 5106. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the "Philmore Graham Post Office Building".

H.R. 5681. An act to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 229. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenzo Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

S. 2523. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW., in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building".

S. 2759. An act to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport.

S. 2921. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL
H.R. 3979

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 121

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3979, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall correct the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, because of a technical malfunction, I wish to be recorded as having voted "no" on H.R. 5759.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 5759, I inadvertently missed that vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, but no votes are expected. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

On Monday, in addition to our usual suspensions, the House will consider H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, authored by my good friend, Representative DAVID VALADAO.

California is facing the worst drought in over a century, and that has a negative impact not only on our State's economy, but on the entire Nation's food supply. This legislation is critical so that we don't let precious water from current and future storms wash away to the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, the House is also expected to consider legislation to address the upcoming expiration of our current continuing resolution, as well as legislation on the expiration of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I note in his comments, with respect to next Thursday, that we do not expect to meet on Friday, which I understand, but it does not specifically reference that that will be the end of the session of this Congress and, therefore, conclude the 113th Congress.

Is the expectation, Mr. Leader, that, in fact, Thursday will be the adjournment date for the 113th Congress?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer to his question is: yes, it is.

Mr. HOYER. As the gentleman has just announced, therefore, we have 4 days left to go in this session, three of which will be voting days. I know that we have a number of things yet to come, one of which, of course, is the funding of the government.

I know there have been a lot of discussions about what form that bill will take: whether it will be an omnibus; whether it will be a CR, a continuing resolution; whether it will be a combination of those two. There is concern on our side of the aisle.

Mr. PRICE, who is the ranking member on the Homeland Security Committee, is very concerned that some of the security needs of the country will be put, if not at risk, then in doubt if there is a short-term funding of that part of the one-twelfth of the appropriations bills.

Does the gentleman know whether or not we are going to have an omnibus, which will cover all 12 of the appropriations bills and departments, or whether or not it may be a combination of some shorter-term funding and longer-term funding?

I yield to my friend.

□ 1445

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank my friend for yielding.

As my friend knows, negotiations are ongoing between the Appropriations of the House and the Senate; and as soon as the conclusion of the negotiations is done, we will notify everyone and post what comes out.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I have had a brief discussion with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), with whom I have served for, I guess, about two decades while I was on the Appropriations Committee. While you and I have had conversations—I won't disclose the substance of those conversations—I believe strongly that an omnibus will give greater sta-

bility and confidence to those who carry out the programs that the Congress has set forth.

So we are very hopeful that we can reach an agreement both on—we have already reached agreement, as you know, on funding levels in the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that related to last year's fiscal year and this year's fiscal year, fiscal year 2015. So we have agreed-upon numbers.

The only thing we need now agree on, I think, specifically, is riders. Those are legislative provisions in the appropriations bills. I know that we are having a lot of discussions about those, and I know we have negotiations about those. In those negotiations, Mr. Leader, I would urge you, as the majority leader of your party, to do what you can to provide for full-year funding for the entire government because I think that will give confidence to people.

With respect to Homeland Security, it will put us in a better security position—less doubt, more ability to plan, more ability to respond effectively. So I would hope that the leader could lend his very, very substantial influence and intellect and judgment to that process, which I think will be good for the country.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for always being willing to give advice, and as soon as we get the negotiations done, we will keep you abreast.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for being pleased that I continue to give advice, and encouraged by that, I will continue to do so.

One of the gentleman's colleagues that I know is very close to the Speaker, Senator BURR from North Carolina, said: "Shutting down the entire government over something never did make sense to the American people, still doesn't and won't in the future."

I know that you are committed and the Speaker is committed to not shutting down the government. I share that view with you and want to work towards that end. But there are those who do; and to the extent, therefore, that we get the government fully funded through September 30, we will not have that confrontation. I suggest, with all due respect to the leader, that if we delay a portion of that funding requirement, we are just going to have that fight 60 days from now or 90 days from now or however long this is put off when we have already agreed upon the numbers that those agencies will be funded at. But I understand what the gentleman says.

There are two other issues that I think are very, very important, one of which is TRIA. You referenced TRIA in your comments. We are very hopeful that we will follow the Senate in terms of a bipartisan engagement on this issue.

As you know, Mr. Leader, the Senate passed the TRIA bill, which extended

the Federal reinsurance program for 7 years by a 93–4 vote. It was not close. There was an overwhelmingly bipartisan judgment that extending this would be good for business, good for insurers, good for contractors, good for jobs, and good for our economy to give, again, confidence that there would be the insurance available so that people could undertake construction projects either in urban, suburban, or rural areas.

I would hope very much that we could bring a bill to the floor next week, Mr. Leader, that extends for no less than 2 years—I would pull that out of it because it is less than, because I know you have the chairman of the Financial Services Committee who does not want to do the 5 years or 7 years. But the way we are going to give confidence to people in this economy is to give them some ability for long-term thinking.

If TRIA ends, there are going to be many, many projects that will not be undertaken in the private sector—forget about the public sector—which I know the gentleman from California wants to see, additional economic activity in the private sector.

As you know, 45 House Republicans have written to Speaker BOEHNER, and in that they said: “We respectfully urge you to schedule action on a multiyear extension.” That would be at least 2 years. “Businesses with terrorism coverage are being told that their coverage will end if Congress fails to act, causing the sort of uncertainty that hurts economic growth.”

Those are 45 of your Members, your colleagues, our colleagues who have made the observation. I think, therefore, for all the reasons they articulated, they are right. I have said that just now.

They also indicate, Mr. Leader, that there are at least, therefore, in this Congress, over 230 votes to pass a TRIA extension with a 5-year window. I say that because every Democrat will vote for a long-term TRIA extension. Forty-five of your Members have written a letter clearly indicating they support that. That gets you well over 230 votes. I think a majority of your party would vote for that as well. So I think we would probably get closer to 300 votes. But I would hope that we would do that because I think that is in the best interest of our country.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman was correct in my announcement, I did announce that we will have legislation on TRIA on the floor next week. And I take what the gentleman said prior, about not wanting to shut the government down, and I am glad that you feel the same way. I just, at times, get concerned with the news reports that I hear from your leader—I don’t know if they are true or

not—from inside your own conference about trying to withhold votes. I hope that we can continue the working relationship that we have developed and, into the new Congress as well, work together, because no one on this side of the aisle ever wants to shut the government down. That is why we will bring forth legislation that will not shut the government down and protects it at the same time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Very frankly, I am convinced that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY)—Mrs. LOWEY being the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee; Mr. ROGERS being the Republican chair—could agree today and could bring a bill to the floor on Tuesday that would get overwhelming support.

The gentleman knows that in accommodating some in your caucus either for legislative additions to the appropriation bill for which you need a waiver—as you know having served on the Appropriations Committee, legislating on appropriation bills is not consistent with the rules, and therefore you need a waiver to accomplish that—and the, what we hear, unwillingness to fund the Homeland Security agency, which, as the gentleman from South Carolina, Senator GRAHAM, said just the other day was a bad idea and would undermine national security because of the duties of the Homeland Security Department, what the leader on our side of the aisle, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), was saying is that we cannot commit to something that, A, we don’t know what is happening fully, that hasn’t been decided yet, but, secondly, that is inconsistent with the agreement that we have on a bipartisan basis with the Ryan-Murray funding caps and that we think Mr. ROGERS and Mrs. LOWEY have agreed upon and can report out a bill that will be one that we can support fully. That, I think, is what the leader is saying. I agree with her on that.

I am, therefore, hopeful that the bill will be in a fashion that will reflect, A, the Ryan-Murray agreement on numbers, and, B, not have in it “poison pills,” as we refer to them, that will make it difficult, if not impossible, for us to support. Both of us want to keep the government open. That is the responsibility of the appropriations bills. Other extraneous legislative actions that may want to be taken which would put that at risk I would hope would not be taken; and that was, I think, what the leader was saying.

If the gentleman has nothing further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2014

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, December 8, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MARIA CORINA MACHADO

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Maria Corina Machado who is being unjustly accused, intimidated, and dragged into court under bogus charges by the regime of Nicolas Maduro in Venezuela. She has been stripped of her seat in Congress, been barred from leaving her country, and is being denied due process.

In May, the House passed my legislation aimed at denying visas, blocking property, freezing assets, and prohibiting any financial transactions to members of the Venezuelan regime who are responsible for human rights abuses against the peaceful citizens of Venezuela.

The U.S. must no longer stand still as these abuses are repeated in our own hemisphere. There are 72 students, 2 elected officials, 12 military officers, and democracy activist Leopoldo Lopez still in prison under politically motivated charges. Maria Corina must not join them, and all political prisoners in Venezuela must be freed immediately.

I CAN'T BREATHE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Black men and boys killed by police.

I can't breathe.

Impunity for the killers. No justice, no peace.

I can't breathe.

Militarized police met peaceful protesters on their knees.

I can't breathe.

Weapons of war, a show of force on our streets.

I can't breathe.

Disenfranchised youth driven to violence as speech.

I can't breathe.

Cynical media think this makes great TV.

I can't breathe.

This cowardly Congress afraid of losing our seats.

I can't breathe.

Half-hearted reform when there is more that we need.

I can't breathe.

Just thinking about the despair that it breeds.

I can't breathe.
Black lives matter. Hear my pleas.
I can't breathe.

□ 1500

LNG EXCISE TAXES

(Mr. YOUNG of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to briefly highlight an issue that I wish had been resolved this week, but unfortunately the President's veto threat of an unfinished tax extenders compromise caused this bill to remain fallow.

Under the current outdated Tax Code, LNG, liquefied natural gas, is applied the same excise tax as other fuels despite producing different energy outputs per gallon. This results in LNG users facing disproportionately higher excise tax rates than their diesel counterparts, creating a perverse inequality that artificially hinders the attractiveness of LNG as a transportation fuel.

So a truck fueling with domestic clean natural gas at Sellersburg, Indiana's LNG truck stop pays 70 percent more tax than its diesel counterpart across the street. An LNG-powered river tug fueling up at one of Ohio's river ports will, instead of paying the proposed 29 cents per gallon fuel tax for inland waterways, pay nearly 50 cents per gallon. This disparity needs to be addressed.

There has been some constructive movement by Representative THORBERRY. I applaud that effort and hope we can address this matter next year during the debate on the highway trust fund.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, our troops, our country, and our communities deserve far better than the defense bill that passed today. The hidden provision in the amended H.R. 3979 to authorize training and arming the so-called moderate Syrian rebels for the next 2 years with no limit on how much money can be spent has seriously polluted this critical piece of legislation.

I could not in good conscience vote to support the so-called moderate forces who often work hand in hand with al Qaeda or ISIS and whose personnel and weapons often end up in the hands of those terrorists. This bill continues the same failed practices of undeclared war, regime change, and nation building that have held us mired in the Middle East for over a decade.

FUNDING THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, columnist Roger Simon wrote the following in one of the Capitol Hill newspapers several weeks ago:

If you spent 13 years pounding money down a rathole with little to show for it, you might wake up one morning and say, "Hey, I am going to stop pounding money down this rathole."

Unfortunately, the U.S. Government does not think that way. The U.S. Government wakes up every morning and says, "The rathole is looking a little bit empty today, let's pound a few more billion dollars down there." And when that rathole is Afghanistan, the billions are essentially without end.

He added that we have spent several billions trying to stop opium production there but that during U.S. occupation, drug production in Afghanistan has actually increased.

By one very conservative estimate, we have spent \$753 billion on the war in Afghanistan since 2001. The defense bill today contains \$63.7 billion for the overseas contingency account, meaning many billions more for the rathole in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, when will we come to our senses?

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2673, United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act.

S. 2673 includes language from the Israel QME Enhancement Act. The Israel QME Enhancement Act is a bill that I sponsored and was supported unanimously by this body. Israel's qualitative military edge is the ability to maintain quality arms against numerically superior odds.

My bill provided for a review of Israel's QME at shorter intervals, from 4 years to 2 years, and I am honored the review language made it into the Strategic Partnership Act. Both pieces of legislation recognize Israel's residence in a neighborhood of bad actors.

Over the decades since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, it has endured several extended armed conflicts with its neighbors. From the Israeli War of Independence in 1948 through Operation Protective Edge, the latest conflict with Hamas, Israel has endured constant threats.

Another constant is that Israel has been able to depend upon the U.S. for military assistance. During the Yom

Kippur War in 1973, the U.S. conducted one of the largest airlifts in U.S. history to assist Israel.

Today, we stand on the floor of the House in support of a bill to increase its military assistance and to increase the help to our friend Israel.

DAN RAAB RETIREMENT

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize a good friend and a very important member of my hometown community of Taylorville, Illinois.

Dan Raab, the president and CEO of Taylorville Memorial Hospital, is retiring after 34 years in the healthcare industry. Dan started with Taylorville Memorial Hospital in 1995, when it was known as St. Vincent Memorial—it was also where my wife worked—and has served the community as CEO for 19 years.

With Dan's leadership and dedication, TMH has remained a staple in the Taylorville community. It is Taylorville's largest employer, and TMH has given so much back to the community. As a matter of fact, it spent \$4.9 million in community benefits just in the year 2013 alone.

TMH is one of nine critical access hospitals located in the 13th District of Illinois, and they play a vital role in ensuring that rural communities are served so that our citizens get the health care they deserve.

As Taylorville and central Illinois continue to thrive, I know that TMH will be part of that success, and that is a direct result of Dan Raab's leadership. I want to thank Dan for his 34 years of service and congratulate him on his retirement.

My wife, Shannon, and I wish him and his wife, Mary, and their two children, Joe and Emily, the best of luck in the future and with his retirement.

THE ABLE ACT

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act, also known as the ABLE Act, I rise today to commend the House for yesterday passing this important piece of legislation that will help millions of Americans reach their full potential.

As the brother of a physically disabled sister who has lived with the challenges associated with being physically handicapped—over a dozen surgeries, hip and knee replacements, walking with crutches or walkers and sometimes reliance on a wheelchair—I

know how difficult it can be for millions of Americans with disabilities and their families.

I also know from my sister, who graduated from college, went on to seminary, married her college sweetheart, adopted a beautiful little girl, and now serves others as a priest in the Episcopal church, that the challenges associated with being handicapped can be overcome.

The ABLE Act will help ease financial strains faced by millions of Americans with disabilities and their families and help them save for the future by creating tax-free savings accounts available to cover disability-related expenses. This provides families with a severely disabled child some peace of mind by allowing them to save for their child's long-term disability expenses.

We are better off as a Nation when disabled Americans are given tools like the ABLE Act to not only achieve self-sufficiency but to contribute and give back to our society.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, briefly on the floor of the House today I mentioned how many times I voted for the defense authorization bill and appreciated the underlying principles in that legislation, which is to wholly support the United States military and their families. Today, unfortunately, layered down with poisonous pills on the floor of the House, the majority did not give this Congress the opportunity to debate the questions of war and peace.

So I ask my colleagues and the leadership to let us debate this issue next week, or come back, or, as we begin 2015. Whenever we put our sons and daughters in harm's way, it is extremely important to do so.

Let me change to another topic very quickly and acknowledge and give my sympathy to the Garner family and indicate that I am going to begin an assessment of the criminal justice system that includes a review of training for our law enforcement across America that will include the utilization of stop-and-frisk citations so that racial profiling can stop, and it will be an overview of the grand jury system, which is obviously broken. My sympathy, again, to the Brown family, to the Garner family, Sean Bell, Trayvon Martin, Robbie Tolan, and many, many others.

Mr. Speaker, let me finally say this Congress cannot turn its head away from a broken criminal justice system.

EXPRESSING MY GRATITUDE TO SERVE MICHIGAN'S EIGHTH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here. I don't often come to the well of the House for 2 or 3 minutes, let alone 60 minutes. But today is special, certainly for me, for my family, my extended family, and staff who are here today. This is my chance to really say thank you, and I had a heck of a good ride serving the people of the Eighth District back home, and some thank yous upfront to my wife, Kristi, who is here, who is both my best friend and the love of my life. Thank you for being here.

Boy, this is going to be harder than maybe I imagined. To my family, Erin and John, thanks for weathering the storm for a Member of Congress who is more often gone at times when they should be home. As a matter of fact, I remember I knew I was getting in trouble when my daughter, who was going into the fifth grade, and because I would fly out to Washington from Michigan every week, I had scheduled Mondays as lunch day at her local school for years, and so I got the lecture going into her fifth grade year that I would have to stay within a zone of her when I came to lunch. I was no longer able to sit next to her at the lunchroom tables because that, after all, would be god-awful to have your father at lunch with you in the fifth grade. So I did get to sit across from her for about one more year. And going into sixth grade, by the way, that was pretty much done.

To everybody who had the great privilege to walk these Halls, including the visitors and folks at home, I hope you still have that reverence for this building and for this institution for what it means not just to America but to the world. I know I did every single day that I walked these Halls. This morning when I came in I still got that little tingle about what it meant to be a Member of Congress in this great institution.

I know I felt that with the members of my staff throughout the years. Every chief of staff, every legislative director, every staff director, and every other staff member that I have ever had, fellows and interns, stepped up to the plate and certainly I know helped me become a better Representative for the people of the Eighth District. And all the things that we were able to accomplish—all of them—happened because we had people who cared a little bit more about something bigger than themselves. They cared enough to sacrifice probably better careers with higher pay and shorter hours in the pri-

vate sector. They chose to come to Washington, DC, or work in the district offices to plow through and represent really average Americans to a big Federal bureaucracy that sometimes seems so intimidating they had nowhere else to go. They were the friends on the other side of those phone calls.

Many of these folks have graciously showed up today: Chris Cox, Matt Strawn, Andy Keiser, Andrew Hawkins, Allan Filip, Heather Strawn, Mike Ward, Diane Rinaldo, Kyle Kizzier—thanks, Kyle, for not killing me on the highway on the way to meet the Turkish newly elected prime minister, I appreciate that a lot—and Michael Allen and Darren Dick.

I think of my first crew that was right in the district office fighting it out: Tony, Penni, Katie, and Stuart, all of those folks who were so committed, again, to getting it right on behalf of the people that they represented. To my campaign team—and by the way, there were so many more people, I could take the whole 60 minutes and thank them all—a campaign team who fought it all, beat every odd, and beat every pundit's prediction that I would never stand and walk these Halls as a Member of Congress: Terri Reid, Val Tillstrom, RJ Johnson, John Nevin, Katherine Van Tiem, Joe Rachinsky, Mike Gula.

I want to thank someone who is special in all of that to me, somebody who has been with me 22 years, from the very high points to the very low points, Anne, I couldn't have done it without you. Thanks for being here today. Wow. I said I wasn't going to do this. I think of all the things that as a staff you were able to accomplish, from cancer care legislation to protect rural patients to medical devices for children, and biodefenses. We even figured out a way to make server farms more efficient without mandates. That was clever.

□ 1515

To all of the constituents that picked up the phone and found a friend at the other end, I think of the time that we all gathered up to help keep a soup kitchen operating through the holidays by getting private donors to step up for people they had never met or organizations they had never heard of to help those folks get fed through the church kitchen.

I think about all of the time we huddled all the staff in because we had one of the great, successful, painful IRS issues where, after years of trying to get this thing straightened out and, certainly, the anxiety and problems that are faced when dealing with a bureaucracy like the IRS, we got to make that phone call.

Not only did they not owe money, the IRS had made a significant mistake, and they were going to get a pretty sizable check back. There wasn't a dry

eye in the room when they made that call as the staff together.

From all of the folks that we helped with Social Security or the folks who got their medals that they earned, to see that room filled with individuals who teared up because it was the first time that they heard their loved one tell the story of how they earned those medals fighting for the defense of the United States of America—you know, it is pretty a fantastic thing that I got to be here, so the work that I did on the Intelligence Committee, I have to tell you, was some of the biggest and best privilege that I have had the opportunity to participate in.

Someone asked me at the time: “Why did you go from being an FBI agent to wanting to serve and go through the political process that we all do?” I recall a story, as a fairly young agent, we were working a case, trying to locate a young girl who had gone missing from a Western State.

She had come to Chicago. I was on the organized crime squad. We had a tip that would hopefully lead to this girl’s return to her parents. They were very concerned. She was young at the time, 15 when she left home.

The long story—the fast forward of that story is we were able to locate this particular young lady. She was operating in a house of ill-repute that was run and really protected by the local police, run by Chicago organized crime.

The proprietors of this particular establishment kept all of the ladies completely hooked on heroin. They would gather them up at the end of the night and take them to a building that they owned and lock them up, feed them heroin, and get them back the next day for their night’s work.

When we took this young lady out, she was probably 17 by the time we found, located, and started to disrupt these types of activities. I will never forget—we got her into the car. We had arranged counseling. There was a great agent, a senior agent who was always very valuable to me, a guy named Richard Davis.

As she was coming out, she didn’t have a coat, so he expropriated the money I had in my wallet when we had an opportunity to get her a coat, which we did. In the back of the car, she was immensely quiet. She didn’t say a word. Again, our goal was to get her to some counseling and try to get her life back on track.

Out of the blue—and it was very quiet in the car, and so it was very cutting when she talked. She turned her head, and in the only words she spoke, she said: “Do you know why I didn’t kill myself? Because I knew somebody cared enough to come find me.”

That certainly made a profound impact on me both as a young FBI agent and the work that I was doing there, but also what I was trying to do here as

a Member of Congress. To know that somebody is empowered to ask the hard questions, to go to the tough places, to kick and stir the pot when I believed and the people around me believed that it was important for the security and defense of the country, or saving those rural cancer patients from driving hours and hours, or making sure children had medical devices, or maybe we came up with a bill—and did—for the protection of biodefense in the United States.

One of my greatest privileges was having the ability to stand with the men and women as chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, with these folks who served all over the world in the intelligence community, the defense community.

I never forgot that story of that young lady and what it meant. I always pledged to myself that if I was ever in a position to be in authority to make that difference, maybe ask that other question, push or probe a little bit more or push a bill, that I would do that.

I think together as staff, family and friends, we have accomplished that. Congratulations to you and all of the work that you have done as well.

As I had that opportunity to stand around the world with some really brave and courageous individuals, both in our military and our intelligence community, I just have two people that I need to point out because I want them to know about the profound impact they had on me now as a member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence and, certainly, their country and the work that I hope I took into as the role of chairman.

To the rock star of the CIA, thank you for standing up for your country in the shadows, for your leadership, for doing, I think, the country’s hardest work. You have never complained. You sought no recognition, but in those shadows, you stood up at the right time to push the right policy that I believe has fundamentally made America safe. They never get to know your name, but I know it, and I thank you.

To Karzai’s favorite, thanks for having the courage to take me where you weren’t supposed to. Thanks for showing me up close and personal the very real challenges that the men and women of the CIA face in very dangerous places around the world.

Those particular early-on visits and counseling sessions set the pace for my understanding of what my role could be, to not only be tough on the Agency when it needed it, but to be supportive when the men and women of the Agency needed it as well. For that, I just want to say thank you, and thank you, again, for having the courage to stand up at the right time.

For any success I have had as chairman, I would be remiss if I didn’t thank a good friend of mine, DUTCH

RUPPERSBERGER. I know, in this town, saying you have a friend who is a Democrat as a Republican can get you thrown out. Oh, that’s right, I’m leaving.

Thanks, DUTCH, for really sitting down and putting our differences aside and working through tough and difficult issues to make the intelligence community work and work for the United States. It should happen more around here. It should happen every day around here. Sometimes, it does, and it doesn’t get noticed, but I want to thank you for that.

We have had our donnybrooks. We have fought. There may even have been some finger-pointing-in-the-chest moments during our time together on the committee, but at the end of the day, we always came to the conclusion that we both mutually agreed was in the best interest of the United States of America and the security of not only our citizens here at home, but the well-being of the men and women who serve in harm’s way. So, DUTCH, thank you for that.

In all of the travels that I have had the benefit to do and all of the things that I have just reminisced about—and, hopefully, that was the hardest part of my remarks today—something always struck me, that America is the light of the world, still, today. People still hold in reverence something special that happens here.

It was reinforced to me when I was asked to go to the 60th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge. That was a few years ago. I thought: I’m not sure. Do I want to go to Belgium and go through all that?

I wasn’t quite sure, but they hustled me up. They said, “Let’s do this. We will represent America. This will be a great event.” So I went to the Battle of the Bulge.

We got tours of the battlefield, and all of that was wonderful, but the day of the parade—so the mayor of Bastogne, a town of 15,000 now, and it was a town of about 10,000 during the war. If you recall your history, that was the town where the 101st occupied that town surrounded by the Germans. It was difficult, tough fighting.

The mayor of Bastogne brought back all of the soldiers who could still walk and march in the parade, and even those who wanted to make the trip, but couldn’t, they had a vehicle for them. You wondered: How would they remember this 60 years later? How would they remember what service and sacrifice these young kids who were from all over the country who had never been away from their farms or their retail shops, never been out of their communities, traveled all that way to fight for something so much bigger than themselves?

The town was packed. There must have been 100,000 people there. As the gentlemen marched during that parade,

it was the proudest moment I can remember, as they tried to stand straight for those that could. They even carried the American flag. People were screaming and hollering and clapping. They held signs up that said, "Thank you for saving my grandparents from a concentration camp." That was a powerful moment.

That evening, people who were children of Bastogne during the surrounding of Bastogne by the Germans who came up to offer some words at the microphone to these folks who were getting a medal from the mayor, and think about it, these would have very young gals who had grown up, and they were telling stories about these big, giant men who would come down into the basement and offer them their coats and their scarves and what little bit of food they had left, some candy, blankets. They would take off their boots and give them their socks because they had none.

Remember, these were the civilians who were trapped in this town during the ravages of war. They talked about the reverence of a country that would come that far away to stand with them at a time when they thought that their lives mattered very little in the gears of war.

You think about the fact that about \$15 billion in the United States has been spent to save a million lives in Africa through our AIDS program that started a few years ago under George Bush—1 million lives saved.

Sixty percent of food aid that goes out, that goes to people who need food security, they can't eat, let alone have a program to take care of them, comes from the United States of America—the farms of the United States of America. The next highest contributor is less than half of that, and that is the EU, combined, for world hunger.

The Marshall Plan right after World War II, many maligned, but we invested a certain amount of money, so we could provide stability across Europe. Back then, it was \$12 billion, which was a tremendous amount of money, money we probably didn't have.

Because of that—and we made the investment to keep soldiers there, not to occupy, we wanted nothing, we took nothing. We took no soil. We were invited to stay. It brought peace and stability across Europe in a way that we had never seen before. Think of the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of small and large conflicts across Europe from the 12th century on, including the 19th century.

We brought them peace and prosperity in a way that Europe never believed it could do on its own. We did it through commerce, stability, and a commitment to stay. At the end of the day, no other nation in the world could have done that. We pushed back at the ravages of a cold war.

If you think about today, you see those events, and you come back to the

United States, and you turn on the TV, and you listen to political dialogue today, you wouldn't think too awful much of the United States of America. You would think that we had become a country who didn't think that we provided much value in the world, we are going the wrong way, don't have much to offer, a nation in decline.

In fact, I had the occasion to have a meeting with a Russian general officer some time back about missile defense and some other things. When the meeting was done—this was a very large general. He was maybe the largest human being I have ever had a meeting with.

He put his arm around me. His hand hit my chest. It was about the size of a big dinner plate. He asked me to go into the library. He wanted to say something to me. As we were walking into the library, I thought: I have seen this movie, I don't think it works out all that well for me.

When we got into the library, he said something that startled me—it shouldn't have, I suppose—but he said: "It is great to finally see that America is admitting she is a nation in decline. We have been through it. We will give you all of the advice and counsel you can take."

□ 1530

He didn't come to that conclusion on his own. America—maybe our political rhetoric, maybe our own actions, maybe our own sense of isolationism is the answer for us—helped him come to that conclusion.

A few years after that, seeing the world the way it was—Putin owns 20 percent of the country of Georgia, no intention of leaving; he annexed Crimea, certainly playing games in eastern Ukraine. The world notices when we stop believing in ourselves. I can't think of a better example of that to me in recent times. For all the debate about Afghanistan—should we or shouldn't we? Should we stay? Should we not? I have, certainly, my own definite positions on that.

In 2001, the average age, the average life span of an Afghan citizen was 43 years—43 years. Last year, it was 64 years. Nine percent when we got there—9 percent—had access to any form of health care. Today, 60 percent.

We asked women to come out of the back of their homes and participate in society, because we knew as a country you cannot isolate half of your population and be great at anything; you can't even be good at anything. We asked them and said we will be here, because we knew that was a long-term investment for the state's stability and security of Afghanistan.

When we got there, there were no girls in school, or almost no girls in school. Today, 9 million Afghan girls go to school 5 days a week. Thirty-seven percent of the labor force today

are women in Afghanistan. It was about zero when we got there. One-quarter of their parliament is women.

We have these discussions about how hard it is and how difficult it is and maybe we should change direction and, I don't know, maybe that we are not the America that we used to be. And now we talk about just pulling up stakes and going home because it is easier. What a stain on our national character if we walk away from the women we asked to come out and engage oppression and brutality and ignorance because we just didn't think that we believed enough in freedom, democracy, and stability the way we used to.

I had a woman doctor I met there on the very first occasion I went who trained in America. She had been sentenced to the back of her house in Pakistan. She was an orthopedic surgeon. She had not been out of her house in 6 years. When the U.S. forces first got there and she heard the sounds of the guns, she said she took off her burka, she walked about 9 to 10 miles to the children's hospital and volunteered.

I happened to meet her at the children's hospital, a pretty tough place. They didn't have clean sheets. They didn't have antiseptic the way they needed. Remember, this is really early in the process.

I asked her if it bothered her to hear the sounds of the guns in the distance. I will never forget, because she grabbed my jacket that I was wearing and said: Last night, in this particular bed—and, by the way, there were two and three children per bed. They didn't have enough beds. And because they had chased all the nurses away, mothers would come in with their children and would have to stay in the hospital rooms. So think of small rooms, two and three children per bed, plus the mothers who provided some minimal care without the greatest of cleanliness conditions. You can imagine how tough this is.

And she grabbed my lapel and said: Last night, in that bed, I had to amputate the arm and a leg of a 9-year-old boy. I didn't have the right medical devices. I didn't have the right antiseptic. But if it weren't for the United States, he would have no chance at all, and none of the children here would have a chance at all.

So we have to ask ourselves: Are we going to let our politics become so small? We have let our politics become the thing that, if I can make you believe you hate someone else, I could get that someone else's vote.

Is that the America we are going to give to the next generations of Americans? We are going to find the one thing that divides us, or even if it doesn't, we will make it up and let you believe it does. We are going to decide that if you are of this race or of this color, you can't be for that party or

this idea. I can't think of anything more small and more petty than that.

I think of the challenges of the world that lie before us, not only just here at home. We have some big problems here at home—\$18 trillion in debt. Seventy percent of our budget now goes to entitlement programs, and it is growing. We have a Tax Code that is so convoluted, so ugly, so brutal American companies are leaving or, worse yet, they are not even starting. Social security is in financial trouble; Medicare, financial trouble.

China is now pushing out, being very aggressive in the South China Sea. It has invested 13 percent per year since 1989, 13 percent into defense and modernization of its military. Russia, you saw what they are doing. ISIS, you have seen what they are doing. They are now holding land the size of Indiana.

So many Americans don't want to be bothered with the world the way they see it. They think, if we just leave it alone and deal with some of the small and petty things that not only get debated here but get debated in State capitols and county conventions, that the world will be just all right, we will be fine. We will make our politics so entertaining it doesn't matter if we accomplish anything noteworthy. I worry about that.

Are we going to be that generation that walks away from the notion of individual freedom and personal responsibility? Are we going to be that first generation that says, you know, we rejected the idea of a big government? Is a big government big enough to give you everything that you need? Is a government big enough to take everything that you have?

This is really the only place in the world where you can start sweeping the floor, maybe not even speaking English, become the supervisor, go to school, learn a trade, become a manager, maybe own the place through your own hard work. You don't have to have a title. You don't have to know someone. You just have to be willing to try.

Are we really going to be the first generation that says that all was just too hard? Our engagement in the world was just too hard? The Marshall Plan, sending our young men and women to fight for something bigger than themselves to push back Nazi Germany, fascism, or imperialism in the East, just too hard?

There is a great story about a little town called North Platte, Nebraska, that when they had the opportunity—and remember, they were under government rationing, so they were rationing eggs and rubber and tires.

By the way, we have been in conflict for 10 years and nobody has been rationed one thing. You still get your tires and your eggs and your cheese. You can get anything you want. No show has been interrupted.

But in North Platte, Nebraska, during World War II, trains would go back and forth taking soldiers to the eastern conflict and to Europe. And that little town came together, farmers from that whole region, donated all the materials that they had—eggs and cheese and flour and their time. They met every single troop train that came through North Platte, Nebraska. They, on their own, fed 6 million meals to young soldiers and marines and airmen, sailors whom they had never met. But they believed that was their contribution and something bigger than themselves to keep America who we were.

By the way, there was no government program. Nobody told them to do it. As a matter of fact, government made it a little harder than it should have been for them to do it on their own.

This is a funny place, America. You can start out without title, without privilege. You can be the House intelligence chairman because you care enough to get involved, work hard enough. You can start out as a traveler all over the world and do different things, become President of the United States, without title, without privilege. You can start an idea in a garage, work your heart out, be smarter than the guy next to you, become one of the richest men in the country, maybe the world. You can still start a chain. You can work two jobs. You can get an education if you want to get an education.

If you turn on the TV today, would you know that we are still the last best hope in the world? I am not sure I would. I certainly see all the things that separate us, all the things that divide us, all the problems that we want to make—sometimes even though they are intimately personal and real—bigger than they are. When we do that, the world watches. The world is starting to believe that we don't believe.

I had an occasion to meet an intelligence official from a foreign country whom I befriended. And, again, after one of those long kind of meetings that we had overseas, we were walking out to the car and he said: Congressman, do me a favor. Tell your countrymen don't give up on themselves. Who will help such a small country like us and take nothing for it—the Russians? The Chinese? It can only be you, the United States of America.

We have so much to be thankful for in this country, but you wouldn't know it by listening to the quality of the debate, by the size of our ideas, by the confidence in our future.

There is a study recently that Chinese citizens believe that corporations and business lead to success and are a part of the answer at an 84 percent rate. In the United States, it was 39 percent. We have a whole generation of Americans who just turned their back on the one driver that has led the one nation to take care of more people and do so much good and ask for nothing in

return, because we spend far too much time talking about how bad we are and not how good we are or how good we can become.

You think of the debates not only in this Chamber but the Chamber aft, where they talked about a country that was ripping itself apart in a Civil War. 500,000 Americans gave their lives, again, for something bigger than themselves. And do you know what? At the end of the day, we were better for it. We became a better country.

Every time we reached one of those points in our history where we struggle, we get through it because we believe in something bigger than ourselves and we believe that tomorrow is going to be better than today and, yes, we believe that our best days are still ahead of us.

I hope we don't decide that these problems are just too big to handle anymore. I don't care if it is our domestic problem at home or our call to stand up for that last beacon of human dignity and invest in our military, not because we fight, but because we want to avoid a fight. Sometimes by showing up, you can help your neighbor and your friend by just standing there.

I have never met a diplomat yet that really likes the military engagement, and I have never met a diplomat yet that doesn't want the 101st Airborne over one shoulder and the 7th Fleet over the other. It is always the quicker way to "yes."

We have been given a gift. As we debate—and this Chamber will debate—in the months and years ahead, they will talk about what role we should play, about what big problems we should solve, about what encouragement we should provide to average Americans to stand up for both their right and their responsibility as citizens of the United States. Will we take it? Will we be the ones that click the light and let it go dark for that last shining city on the hill? I don't believe we will. I believe, as Winston Churchill noted, that America will always do the right thing after trying everything else.

We are in that process of trying everything else. But when you have had the great privilege, like I have, to meet these people all over the world, the people that work here—and it may be Peggy who keeps this place running, or Doris and Pat who keep the cloakroom functioning, or Capitol Police, or our clerks, or the people who process things, or our staff who answer the phone calls—they still believe.

You can go home and see people struggling to keep their businesses open. They still believe. You can look at the eyes of any fourth grader, fifth grader, or sixth grader—not necessarily a seventh grader because they think they have all the answers by that point—and know that they believe there is something special waiting for them. That something special they

may not be able to quantify, but we all know it. It is the United States of America, the last greatest force for good.

□ 1545

I know it by visiting those men and women in the intelligence business who are working their hearts out and, by the way, deserve our full devotion of support for the very difficult work that they do, and the young men and women in our military, or the young folks in the following story.

I had the great privilege to travel downrange. When I showed up, someone asked me if I would mind promoting one of the soldiers who happened to be there from a sergeant E-5 to a sergeant E-6. It was in a very remote place in the world. They had to culturally dress in the garb of the locals. They weren't in their uniforms.

When I got there, the sergeant going through this decided that he wanted to be promoted in uniform. So we had to go to a small room that was tucked away. He put his uniform on. The windows were darkened out. There were a lot of folks and some small gear. Some of the folks were pretty big. We had one little 3½ by 5 flag. Two of the gentlemen were fighting to see who got to hold it behind him as I posted the orders for promotion. These were pretty big dudes. I wasn't going to get in the middle of that.

They finally worked it out and decided that one would hold one corner and the other would hold the other corner. They would stand behind him. So I cracked the chem light to read the orders. There were probably eight of us jammed in this little room with gear, windows darkened, and we were doing everything in hushed tones. Somebody began to whisper "The Star Spangled Banner." I am pretty sure we were off key. I am pretty sure we even missed a verse. But I can tell you it was the most beautiful thing I have ever heard in my life.

These fine Americans who had been away from their families for about 15 months still believed in something bigger than themselves. They knew that their mission was as important as being home with their child at a baseball game, not because that is not where they wanted to be, but this is where their country needed them to be.

They are still there. We ought to be there with them. We ought to find that opportunity to stand and, in hushed tones, show courage and commitment to the United States. We ought to snap this trend of small and petty politics and stand up for one of the greatest nations on the face of the Earth. We ought to have big ideas to solve big problems and not let the small ideas be choked out. Let us find the better part of our angels in us to do something pretty amazing and pretty incredible as we move forward.

I believe in this Chamber and in this institution. I know it will happen. I know the people that I have had the privilege to serve with know it will happen. And I know that there are many ways for all of us to contribute. I certainly plan to be one of those. I hope you all decide that you will be one of those, too. Because I walk out that door in a few months no longer a Member of Congress, I will have an even more revered title in the world: citizen of the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth, the United States of America.

God bless you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

TUMULTUOUS TIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the previous speaker, my friend from Michigan, MIKE ROGERS, for his distinguished service to this Nation and to this Congress. I had the privilege of meeting MIKE when he first became a Member of this House. I remember his exuberance, the energy that he displayed, the hopeful look in his eye, and I watched him as he has matured into a great legislative leader and a leader for the Nation.

But I guess the paradox of our Nation is probably exhibited in the fact that I was kind of interested, to say the least, in the fact that MIKE ROGERS was a former FBI agent, and I had to process that fact in a rather unique way. I had not known many FBI agents prior to shaking hands with MIKE. Those that I did know, I had questions about their character and their qualities. So I was somewhat quizzical and interested in this fellow.

As I listened to his final speech before the House, the thought occurred to me that one part of me certainly agrees with his notion of a Nation that represents so much hope to the rest of the world, but I also, to be quite honest, know that the America that should be even greater has not yet found the greatness that it is called to be.

These times are tumultuous times within our Nation. These times are creating pain and suffering for far too many of our citizens. These times extinguish the hope of the young African American child. These times call into question the high ideals that should inspire us. These times are times of difficulty; times, indeed, of desperation, times of despair in the life and the hopes and aspirations of far too many of our citizens.

W.E.B. DuBois wrote a seminal classic back at the turn of the century titled, "The Souls of Black Folk," and

there was one sentence in this book that really kind of rises up to question and to challenge the Nation that the previous speaker portrayed and the Nation that is a reality for me and for so many of my constituents.

DuBois made the statement in 1903 that "the problem of the 20th century is the problem of the color line." I don't think that W.E.B. DuBois, who was an eminent scholar, a graduate of Harvard with a doctorate degree, could ever in his wildest imagination believe that this one sentence written in 1903 would still be a sentence that would define a Nation to many of its citizens. The problem of the 20th century is also the problem of the 21st century: the color line, the problem of race, the problem of discrimination, racial inequities. These are current problems, even in today's America.

Forty-five years ago, on this very same day, December 4, way back in the year 1969—45 years ago—in the wee hours of the morning at 4 a.m. in a two-bedroom apartment at 2337 West Monroe, the Chicago Police Department, in collusion with the FBI, led a raid on an apartment which resulted in the death of two young African American men, Fred Hampton and Mark Clark, and the wounding of seven others.

□ 1600

They came in the middle of the dark hours of the morning in a van, Illinois jail van. Some went to the rear of the apartment at 2337, and some went to the front door.

Members of the organization that I was proud to be a member of and am proud today to have served in, the Illinois chapter of the Black Panther Party, they were in the apartment. Fred Hampton and the mother of his son were in the back room, and other members of the Panther Party were sleeping in different parts of the apartment.

There was a knock on the door. Mark Clark answered, "Who is it?" He heard a voice from the other side of the door saying, "Tommy."

Mark asked, "Tommy who?" The other voice on the other side of the door said, "Tommy gun," and started firing into the apartment. This was at the front of the apartment.

When those police officers at the rear heard the fire from the front, they came in, burst in through the rear door, shooting wildly and recklessly. After a few quick moments, the shooting subsided.

There was a shout from the rear bedroom where Fred Hampton and Deborah Johnson had been sleeping, and there was a voice that came from a closet saying, "Stop shooting. Stop shooting. There's a pregnant woman in here."

So all the Panthers were pulled from the various areas and in the rooms.

And then Michael Voss, a member of the Chicago Police Department, went into the bedroom where Fred Hampton had been shot, said that, "Oh, he's not dead yet," and shot him pointblank in the head. He came out of that room and boasted, "He's good and dead now. He's good and dead now."

The Panthers were taken to hospitals, and some were taken straight to—well, they all were taken to the jail, Monroe Street Station.

I was supposed to have been in that apartment. The information by the informant, William O'Neal, that was given to the FBI stated that I and other leaders of the Illinois chapter of the Black Panther Party were in that apartment. And we had been there less than 5 hours before because we were having a leadership meeting.

Because we did not have enough sleeping areas, it was decided that some of us would not sleep there that night. Three members of the leadership group, two other members and myself, we went to our homes, thinking that tomorrow morning, or the next morning, that we would reconvene and continue our leadership meeting.

Fred Hampton, Mark Clark were killed.

I got a call about 4:45 that morning from another Panther Party member. Another member of the organization said that there had been a shootout at Chairman Fred's apartment, so I immediately got dressed and went to the basement apartment of Barbara Sankey, who lived in the 2200 block of West Monroe. Other members of the leadership, we gathered there, and we turned on BBM radio to see what the latest word was.

About 6:15, 6:30 that morning, we heard the news on the radio that Fred Hampton had been killed. 45 years ago, December 4, 1969.

Our thoughts—my thoughts that morning, I was 23 years old, just had made 23—my thoughts were scattered and confused because my friend had been murdered.

I immediately gathered myself, and we called our attorneys and got our attorneys on the phone, and waited awhile. Around 10:30 that morning, we emerged from that basement apartment to go a half a block west to see what had really happened.

Just as the cowardly police came in undercover, under the wraps of camouflage, they quickly, after murdering Fred and murdering Mark, they ran from the community and left this apartment open. They didn't secure the premises, left it wide open, doors open, all the evidence right there, the bloody mattress that Fred slept in, the door, the front door where it was later discovered, through grand jury testimony, that possibly one bullet came from inside of the apartment, but there were 99 bullets, 99 bullets from the outside to the inside, and one possible from the inside to the outside.

When we walked through that apartment, we saw the evidence. In later testimony given in various sources, including the special grand jury they convened a few years later, there was a machinegun used by the police, the State's Attorney police, and it showed on the walls, the evidence of where the machinegun, just almost in a diagonal form, fired up and down and up and down throughout the length of that wall, a machinegun used by the police.

Our attorneys examining the evidence secured the door that had been left behind, and with one hole in it, secured the mattress where Fred Hampton slept.

We had a toxicologist that our attorneys hired, and the toxicologist said that Fred Hampton had been drugged the night before, that he had enough Seconal in his body, enough Seconal to render an elephant unable to move. So Fred was drugged by the police and their agents, murdered in his bed.

I want to be very clear here in this House, on this 45 years later. This was the first time that I am aware of—and I read history, I love history—before or since where an American citizen has been assassinated by official Federal, State, and local law enforcement, the first and only time that an American citizen had been assassinated by law enforcement and the political status quo.

So you can understand somewhat how I felt, and how I continue to feel about the FBI. And I am not here to castigate the FBI. This is not the purpose of this colloquy or soliloquy. This is not my purpose for being here on the floor.

I am talking about the history of the FBI and the history of J. Edgar Hoover.

□ 1615

This is the FBI I grew up with. I grew up under the J. Edgar Hoover FBI, and he considered me and others like me in my organization to be the greatest threat to the security of this Nation.

I had been honorably discharged from the military for 4 years—a veteran, serving 4 years in the U.S. Army. I volunteered for the Army, and all of a sudden, some 3 years later, I am the number one threat to the security of the Nation to which I had pledged to give my life only 6 years earlier.

Why did they kill Fred? Why did they kill Fred Hampton, the Fred I knew, the Fred Hampton I spent time day in and day out with?

Fred Hampton, the man full of humor and compassion, strong-willed, but softhearted; the Fred Hampton who could move crowds with his eloquence; the Fred Hampton who wanted me and others to learn the art of speaking, who would take us and force us to listen to the speeches of African American preachers and other orators; the Fred Hampton whose laughter was infectious, strong-voiced; the Fred

Hampton who said what he meant and meant what he said; the Fred Hampton you could count on and call on, a spokesman for the voiceless—yes, Fred allowed his voice to be an instrument for those without a voice; the Fred Hampton who could take complex and philosophical thought and break them down and make them relevant to even those who were uneducated and unconcerned;

The Fred Hampton who would say, "I am so revolutionarily intoxicated that I cannot be astronomically intimidated," which meant that Fred Hampton was going to fight for the least of these;

The Fred Hampton who was the inspiration for the Rainbow Coalition—not just for Black people, but for poor people in general—the Rainbow Coalition that reached out to Appalachian Whites in the uptown area and that reached out to the Young Lords in the Hispanic west town area, and said: "Let's coalesce. We have the same kinds of interests, the same kinds of problems. So, preacher man, I am going to use my voice and speak to the problems of black lung disease and of the poverty in Appalachia, and I am going to use my voice to speak to the problems of migrant workers and the problems of the Latino community, not just for Blacks";

The Fred Hampton who told some of my liberal friends, "I understand your willingness to work, and I understand your cries for justice, and I understand how you want to sacrifice for justice, but we don't necessarily need you to organize in the Black community. You need to go and organize in the White community to tell your brothers and your sisters that we are all in this struggle together, that we are all a rainbow of a coalition for justice and equality here in America";

The Fred Hampton who loved to dance and loved to play basketball; the Fred Hampton who never smoked or drank; the Fred Hampton who loved his mother and his father and who loved his brothers and sisters;

The Fred Hampton who was tried and convicted of robbing a Good Humor Man for \$310 worth of ice cream bars on a summer's day in Maywood, Illinois. Fred would say to anyone who would hear, "I am a big man, but I can't eat 310 ice cream bars."

Even those who prosecuted Fred said that if he took the ice cream bars from the Good Humor Man, then he passed them out, that he gave them to the young people in the hot summer Sun there in Maywood, Illinois, so even those who prosecuted him had to admit that, if he did, he robbed the rich and gave to the poor.

This was the Fred Hampton I knew. This was the Fred Hampton of my life, this man who had such an unabashed commitment to the great ideals of this Nation, in that this Nation should be a

Nation where everybody is equal and everybody has the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. He was one of the better spirits that this Nation produced.

He only lived to be 21 years old. His family's loss was great, and his friends' loss was great, but this Nation's loss was even greater because, had he lived, he would have been a tremendous, incomparable, and unconquered advocate for those high ideals that inspire all segments of this society.

There was a grand jury that convened and a report that was issued that stated that 99 bullets were fired into that apartment on December 4, 1969, and possibly one fired out of that apartment.

The political machine in Chicago—the Daley machine, the political establishment, those who were in power—thought by killing Fred and Mark and wounding seven others, that they would be heralded as heroes.

Little did they know, when they left that apartment wide open—unsecured—then, step by step, person by person—men, women, and children alike—marched through that apartment and observed for themselves what had gone on and what had happened on the morning of December 4, 1969.

They reached the conclusion that Fred Hampton and Mark Clark had been murdered and that one Edward V. Hanrahan—the State's attorney who later that same morning, on December 4, went before the television cameras and cried out how his police officers had been attacked viciously by the members of the Black Panther Party, the residents of that apartment—lied; yet instead of being heralded as heroes, the very same community—the very same people—denounced him as a murderer.

In the election that came a few years later, this very same community defeated this State's attorney in his bid for reelection. He was being lifted up, and he was being paraded around as the heir to the Richard J. Daley machine.

He was going to be Mayor Richard J. Daley's successor, but the African American community—the Black community—said, “No, you will not,” and they elected a Republican State's attorney, Bernard J. Carey. It was the first time that the Black community, en masse, told the Daley machine, “No, we will not vote with you. We are going to vote against you.”

That independent action—that independent and courageous act, that astounding act—defined urban politics not only in Chicago, but in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in New York, and in many other places.

□ 1630

You see, because Fred Hampton died, then Harold Washington became the first African American mayor of the city of Chicago, which, again, as-

tounded the world. The rising up of the Black community body politic created the necessary conditions to elect Harold Washington as mayor of the city of Chicago; created the necessary conditions to elect Carol Moseley Braun as the first African American U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois and in the history of the U.S. Senate; created the conditions to elect Barack Obama as the U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois, the first African American male to be a U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois; created the conditions, yes, for Barack Obama to be elected President of the United States; created conditions for the 1984 and 1988 campaigns for the Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson when he ran for President.

Fred. Mark. 45 years ago, they assassinated Fred while he was drugged beyond any capacity to defend himself.

Even today, W.E.B. Du Bois, your statement is troubling this Nation even today.

We travel beyond the 20th century. We are in the 14th year of the 21st century, and even today the problem of the color line is still the problem of this Nation.

When we look at Ferguson, Missouri, in the case of Michael Brown and his murder and the horrendous conclusions drawn by the grand jury and the atrocious acts of the Governor of Missouri, the problem of the color line is pre-eminent. Justice for Michael Brown still has not occurred. Police brutality is still the main issue that we have regarding the establishment. Young Black men are still being murdered by police even today.

New York City, Eric Garner, a father of six, the grand jury could not even respond adequately to the evidence that everyone who has eyes to see can see that this man, Eric Garner, was choked to death by racist police in New York City.

Even today, Trayvon Martin still cries out for justice in this Nation, even today.

And there have been so many, from border to border, the North, South, East, and West. Young Black men are being murdered in the streets by law enforcement who know beyond the shadow of a doubt that they can kill young Black men and that the culture of the police across this Nation won't protect them, that they will not be called to answer for their atrocious actions for the killing of young Black men, be they students, be they fathers, be they 12-year-old babies, such as what happened in Cleveland.

When will the lunacy end? The lunacy that is in law enforcement must come to a screeching halt. The police and the police departments all across this Nation are not viewed as officer friendly, are not viewed as protectors who serve and protect. They are viewed as occupying forces who are at war

with young Black men. That is the lunacy that we are confronted with even today.

So, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for the last 45 years, I have carried in my heart, in my spirit, the pain, the agony of losing my great friend and my great leader, Fred Hampton. Yes, he inspires me in my daily walks, but there is still pain that I carry with me in my heart. I won't forget, and I won't allow this Nation to ever forget as long as there is breath in my body, the legacy and the life of this 21-year-old American revolutionary, this simple yet brilliant man, this man who had insurmountable courage, the man who could move crowds with his eloquence and his sincerity, the man who had not even reached the fruit of his promise and potential, who was murdered, assassinated after he was drugged the night before, the man who was wounded in his bed and an animal, an armed animal walked in the room and fired two bullets in his head and said: He is good and dead now.

We can't forget. We have to remember. We have to keep a fire lit.

Only when we can deal with justice for everybody can we ever achieve the greatness that we have promised each other. Don't leave young Black men, young Hispanic men, don't leave them out of the equation. When you speak about justice and the greatness of this Nation, include them in meaningful ways; not with just platitudes but with everyday practices, include them in.

Mr. Speaker, I have come this evening because we have to embrace the truth, and Scripture tells us: Know ye the truth, and the truth shall set you free.

□ 1645

Today, Mike Brown, Eric Garner, Trayvon Martin, and a young 12-year-old lad from Cleveland are crying from their graves. They want justice. The young people who are marching throughout the Nation want justice. And I want to say to those young people, fight on, march on, protest on, and don't stop. I believe in the power of the youth, the power of the youth won't stop.

Fred Hampton lives today in the hearts, the minds, and the spirits of some of these young people today who are taking to the streets in protest of police brutality here in our Nation, police murder here in our Nation.

I say to you that Chairman Fred, my friend, Chairman Fred still lives. His spirit permeates the minds and hearts of all justice-seeking people, particularly the young people, even today.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would love to ask my colleague from Chicago, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS, I yield to him.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, my friend and colleague, Congressman RUSH for calling this Special Order. I have thought that I wouldn't be able to be here, but I actually changed my schedule. I want to commend you for calling this Special Order and especially for the subject which you have addressed.

As I listened to you, I thought about the fact that the day of the assassination, my friend, Frank Lipscomb, and I went through the apartment. We saw the blood on the sheets, we saw the bullet holes, and we saw the tape. We were young schoolteachers, becoming activist-oriented, caught up in what was taking place in our country. I am so grateful that you were not there because had you been, in all probability, not only would we be talking about Fred and Mark, but we would also be talking about BOBBY RUSH. But I do believe that the good Lord spared you and somehow or another took you in another direction at that moment so that 45 years later we could look at and appreciate the many public contributions that you have made in efforts to try and make this world a better place, a more just place, a place where all life could be considered sacred.

The location is in my congressional district, the district that I represent, the district that I serve, less than a mile away. The building that I inhabit as a district office has a mural on the wall on the side of the building of Chairman Fred. His son, Fred, Jr., Fred's mother, and members of their organization come with regularity to pay homage and tribute. Of course, Fred's mother, brother, and sister live in my district in Maywood, Illinois. Never does a year go by when they don't have some event, some activity, some groupings of progressive-thinking people who come and spend time at their home talking about progressive causes and progressive issues.

It is kind of interesting that here we are 45 years later when law enforcement misconduct and police brutality are all at the forefront of issues plaguing our society today. I think the one thing that Fred's life and legacy has taught us is that freedom is a hard-won thing. Each generation has to win it and win it again. So when we look at what is taking place in St. Louis, in Chicago, in Ferguson, in Cleveland, in New York, and in Florida, all across the country, it tells us what Frederick Douglass taught, and that is that struggle, struggle, strife, and pain are the prerequisites for change. If there is no struggle, then there is no progress. Fred taught us that struggle must continue even to the last breath of injustice.

So we commend you, just as we commend your friends, Fred and Mark, for the leadership that you have provided in trying to help make America the America that has never been but all of us know must and will be.

I thank you for calling this Special Order.

Mr. RUSH. Well, I want to thank my friend and colleague, DANNY K. DAVIS, from my home State, my former city council colleague and my compatriot in all things that are in the nature of justice, equality, and standing for the goodness of not only this Nation.

I just want to say to you when you mentioned me, I just have to, in a humble way, the most humble way—and it didn't have anything to do with me. I am a devout Christian, a pastor, theologian, seminary graduate, and pastor of a church, so I know it wasn't me, but I have had to remind you and others that the very next morning after December 4, on December 5, which ironically was my mother's birthday, the police came to my apartment to kill me and shot my door down, but I had gone underground.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE EXECUTIVE AMNESTY PREVENTION ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I won't take long, but I wanted to address the bills that we took up late today. First we voted on H.R. 5759. This is the bill exactly as it appears. We always have copies of the bill that we vote on that are out here in the Speaker's Lobby so you can grab them as you come in here and see what we are voting on. But what this did not reflect was the exceptions, the provisions that were added last night that had to be added by hand here on the floor so that as I tried to talk to my colleagues here on the floor and pointed out that our Republican leadership had added an exception, they didn't know that, and I had to show them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I felt it was important to explain why a bill that I was listed as a cosponsor on ended up with my voting "no" on it, because it was a good bill. My friend, TED YOHO, is a good man. He is a very dear friend. I think the world of him, and he had a good bill here. The purpose is, it says, "to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief."

It was basically to make clear that the President had no authority to do what he did when he started granting amnesty-type work permits to 5 million people who were unauthorized aliens, as the law calls them. My friend Congressman YOHO's bill was entitled the Executive Amnesty Prevention Act of 2014. The title was changed by leadership, and it became the Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration

Act, and the exception that was added—and I won't read the whole thing—in part the exception says that basically this law that was passed by the House this evening shall apply except for humanitarian purposes where the aliens are at imminent risk of serious bodily harm or death.

Now, I don't personally think that exception applies right now, but this administration has been using similar exceptions like that to grant amnesty in the way of asylum and refugee status to people that should not have gotten it, but they are already claiming this exception. So it is kind of like what happened at the end of July when our leadership, we had some great principles all Republicans agreed on regarding dealing with the border issue, the immigration issues, all of us agreed on the principles, but nobody got to see the bill until late Tuesday. I finished reading it about 2 a.m. and then got up at 5 a.m. and reread it, and it was a disaster. It was a de facto amnesty bill. So we only had 1 day basically to get the word out that this is a bad bill because we voted on Thursday, and by Thursday, people had awakened, realized it was a de facto amnesty bill, we got it fixed, so very late Friday night around 10 p.m. or so, we passed a good border bill.

I know that is news to the President because nobody let him know. He didn't know the House had actually acted. But on this one, by adding that exception, I know the President issued a veto threat, but he probably didn't know about the exception being added either, because if you saw the official printout of the bill, it didn't include that exception. But if the Senate came through and passed this same bill with that exception, the President could actually claim that this exception on here legalizes what he had done illegally as an executive amnesty provision to give these work permits. So the bill that I was willing to cosponsor completely changed in the addition of that exception. It wasn't just the title that changed.

On the National Defense Authorization Act, BUCK MCKEON worked very hard on that bill. The people on Armed Services worked very hard. I was very proud of them. They got things in that bill that we have been fighting for. For example, Fort Hood was not workplace violence. That was an act of war against our military members. The law should have reflected it, and the President should have reflected it. But, instead, those military members, those patriots of ours, had been mistreated. They have not been given the Purple Heart they deserved. They have not been given the benefits they deserved, and that needed to be fixed. That fix got in this NDAA, and I am very grateful to BUCK MCKEON for getting that in there.

Another problem, we have had this administration going after chaplains

for saying things like “in Jesus’ name.” They pray in Jesus’ name because as a Christian, Jesus said, if you pray in My name, then it will be answered—but not always “yes.” So chaplains were told it doesn’t matter what your religious beliefs are, you can’t pray in Jesus’ name, and we have got to get rid of all the crosses. The place I reported to every morning for 4 years at Fort Benning had a chapel across the street. Under the orders I had seen, apparently they would have to remove their crosses.

□ 1700

Well, the provision in the NDAA extended religious freedom to our chaplains. It should have been a no-brainer, shouldn’t have been required to have been said, but in this administration, it did.

Also, something that many of us have had problems with was the Authorization for Use of Military Force going back to September 2001, after the 9/11 attacks. It gave the President way too much power.

Some thought it was the NDAA that gave too much power, but actually, it was the AUMF. We amended that. The Gohmert amendment help amend that, but I feel a lot better under this NDAA because the AUMF is finally not continued anymore, so that was a good thing.

The problem is the NDAA—this massive National Defense Authorization Act that is a big, important bill—got to the Rules Committee last night. We didn’t have a chance to read it. I am anal enough, I actually try to read these important bills, and I didn’t have time to read this bill.

What happened to our 72-hour promise? Well, actually, it was a 3-day promise, and that has been whittled down since then, but we didn’t have the 3 days that were originally promised by Republicans.

I knew the bill increased TRICARE costs. I wasn’t happy about that. I voted no against a process that takes something as important as our national defense and said, “Here you go, here is the whole thing, trust us. Vote for it.” We didn’t have a chance to review it.

Were there any powers in this thing given additionally to the NSA? Is there any more power to spy on Americans under this bill? I don’t know. I couldn’t vote for a bill that was launched on us last night that is this important, and I deeply regret it with the good things that were in here.

There were numerous good things, well thought out, but you can’t push a bill this important on us, especially when we know there are problems, we just don’t get a chance to find them. Can’t vote yes—I couldn’t in good conscience vote yes.

One additional irony, Mr. Speaker, I had run for Republican Study Com-

mittee chair, and I knew if I were elected chair of the Republican Study Committee, I would still vote as representative of my district in Texas, but I also knew if I were representing a majority of the feelings of the Republican Study Committee, I should not and would not be in a position to speak out as boldly against a majority of the people in my organization.

Maybe it is fortunate I am not the RSC chair, so I am here to complain about the abuses when they happen by our own leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF DWAYNE ALONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and I always appreciate that opportunity to come here and voice some of the things that are expressions often of the voices of my district and also the voices of Iowans, the voices of the American people.

I happen to live in a place that is the best place in the world to live and raise a family. The anchor of the values that are there and the culture in the neighborhood are reflected in the people.

I rise today, and I come to the floor to express my sadness at the passing of a very, very good friend and a great man, Dwayne Alons. Dwayne Alons passed away Saturday night after a short but brutal illness with cancer.

His life meant so much to so many of us. He lived in Sioux County. Sioux County is that place where I would think, if I would go to sleep and wake up in the park in Sioux County, I would think I might have died and gone to heaven.

It has got the best balance of faith and churches and economics and education and families and culture and work ethic and neighborliness. It has got the best balance of anyplace I know, and Dwayne Alons contributed so much to that.

In almost all of my years that I was in the State legislature, I served in the senate while he served in the house of representatives. When I needed a partner on a cause over in the house, it was Representative Dwayne Alons that I called upon, and it was he that came over to talk to me when I needed some help on my side or if he needed help on the senate side where I served. We stood in the same philosophical and ideological square year after year after year.

The 6-year endeavor that I had embarked upon in 1996 and early 1997 to establish English as the official lan-

guage of the State of Iowa, that effort came up short in the first general assembly. That was 1997 and 1998; then, in 1999 and 2000, that effort came up short again.

In the next general assembly, I talked to Dwayne Alons, and he agreed that he would be the individual carrying the bill in the house of representatives, and there, in that general assembly, after 6 years of trying, we were able to pass English as the official language over from the senate to the house, and there, Representative Dwayne Alons floor-managed the bill, and we were able to put that bill on then-Governor Tom Vilsack, a Democrat’s desk, where he signed the bill that established English as the official language of the State of Iowa. That was a crowning achievement of much of the work that we had done together.

We also opposed the Iowa State Supreme Court’s decision called *Varnum v. Brien*, when the supreme court, magically, unanimously decided that, somehow, in the ratification of our State constitution and their equivalent of the 14th Amendment of the Equal Protection Clause that they had magically written in there, that marriage didn’t necessarily have to be between a man and a woman.

We were able to pass legislation earlier in 1998 that established that a marriage in Iowa would be between one male and one female. Representative Alons definitely supported that. When the judges unanimously decided that they could rewrite Iowa law without a legitimate legal and logical constitutional basis, it was Dwayne Alons that stepped up to defend marriage between a man and a woman.

He did so without apology. He did so without reservation. He did so because he always acted on his convictions. He carried deep convictions.

He had a style not at all similar to mine, Mr. Speaker, a quiet, understated, respectful style, a strong, faithful man who was also a prayer warrior. Whenever there was a Bible study group, you could look around and Dwayne Alons and his wife, Clarice, would be there.

I would like to just chronicle some of the milestones along in his life that he represented the Fourth and then I think, later on, the Fifth District in the State of Iowa.

He also joined the Air Force and became a fighter pilot, an F-16 pilot, and rose to the rank of brigadier general in the Iowa Air National Guard, the 185th—the beloved 185th. He raised a pilot, his son Kevin.

That example that was before his four children was one that they acted on. He had such an influence on their lives, on the lives of their four children and their 14 grandchildren—a quiet, respectful, staid, resolute voice that lived by example. When he spoke, you knew you wanted to hear what Dwayne Alons had to say.

He was stricken by cancer in September and taken just right after Thanksgiving, but his wife, Clarice, they had 47-plus years and the four children that they raised and the 14 grandchildren, and their daughters-in-law and sons-in-law and a host of family and friends remember Dwayne, remember him as I did, grateful to God that we had him as a gift to us and had an opportunity to get to know him, an opportunity to call him a friend, to work with him, to pray with him.

On his last days, I had the privilege to stop and see him in the hospital where I think we all knew that he was in his last days, and I was able to go to his bedside and hold his hand and offer a deep prayer with and for him, and the strength that he had left after I said, "Amen," he said, "Now I am going to say a short prayer of my own," which I could hear—I could barely hear—but in that, there was a message to me, "Don't let up, don't give up, keep up the fight, keep up the fight," as Dwayne did for his whole lifetime in a quiet and a polite and a respectful way, but as a leader.

He led by example, he led by conviction, he led with the moral authority of a man who knew who he was, a man who understood his faith, a man who understood the Constitution and the rule of law, the structure of government and his role in society as a father, as a grandfather, as a husband, as a friend, as a State representative, as a brigadier general in the Air Guard, and as a father of another officer in the Guard.

As I think about Dwayne Alons and think about having to say goodbye to such a good friend, I look at the back of the announcement here for the funeral, and it couldn't be more fitting. It is something that, of course, I think the language has been embedded into the hearts and the minds of the American people, and it is the poem "High Flight."

As an F-16 pilot, as a general, he always saw the clear blue skies, and "High Flight" says this:

Oh, I have slipped the surly bonds of Earth
And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings;
Sunward I've climbed, and joined the tumbling mirth
Of Sun-split clouds—and done a hundred things
You have not dreamed of—wheeled and soared and swung
High in the sunlit silence. Hov'ring there,
I've chased the shouting wind along, and flung
My eager craft through footless halls of air
Up, up the long, delirious burning blue
I've topped the wind-swept heights with easy grace
Where never lark, or even eagle flew—
And, while with silent, lifting mind I've trod,
The high untrespassed sanctity of space,
Put out my hand, and touched the face of God.

That was the life of Dwayne Alons, my pheasant-hunting friend, my legis-

lating friend, my Bible-studying friend, my air warrior friend, and my prayer warrior friend, General Representative Dwayne Alons, may he rest in peace, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate your attention to his life and the opportunity to place some of these memories into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here. His last ask of me and his last prayer, which was not for him but for me, tells you something about the sacrifice and the will of the man that we have lost as a servant to our country, but his inspiration lives beyond, keep it up, don't let up—understood the Constitution.

Here we sit today, Mr. Speaker, with a President who lectured on the Constitution for 10 years as an adjunct professor at the University of Chicago and many times lectured about the separation of powers.

Article I is the legislative body of the government, this Congress, comprised of a House and a Senate. Article II is the executive branch, the President and the people that he gets to command. Article III are the courts.

The separation of powers that was defined by our Founding Fathers, this was not three equal or coequal branches of government—not designed to be, Mr. Speaker; instead, the legislative branch was designed to be a pre-eminent branch of this government, article I, the branch closest to the people, most responsive to the people, and most accountable to the people.

Of the legislative branch, of the article I, the two bodies of the Senate and the House, it is the House of Representatives that is established to be the quick reaction force. Up for election every 2 years, so that if the people are dissatisfied with their Representatives in the United States Congress and the policies that we bring forth, then the people have an opportunity to change out those seats in this House of Representatives, all 435 of them, within each 2 years, we are all up for election or reelection.

If the people decided they wanted to throw out all 435 of us, they had their chance just about a month ago today, and if they decide 2 years from now, short a month, that they want to throw out everybody in the House of Representatives, that is what they do. Our Founding Fathers wanted that restraint on this House.

They wanted this House to have the most control. They wanted the House of Representatives to be where most ideas originated—not all of them, most of them. They wanted us to be the place where we fought out these ideas, and the genius of it is this: each of us represents 750,000 or so people here; each of us in the House of Representatives represents about that many people.

Out there in America, 316 or so million Americans, all of the good ideas that this government needs to consider

are out there in the hearts and minds of our people.

□ 1715

And our job in this constitutional Republic is, go home, listen to the people whom you have the honor and the privilege to represent, listen to them, exchange ideas with them because we are not charged to be devoid of ideas and simply carrying their ideas here. We are charged in this Republic with having a responsibility to get informed, be informed, stay informed, do this full time, so that we are giving all of our heads, all of our hearts and all that we can to this job that we have.

We owe our constituents our best effort and our best judgment, and that includes go home and listen to them. Gather the best ideas that can come out of our districts. Bring them here. Each one of these seats in this place should have within it, within the mind and within the records and within the staff of each one of us and our staff, we should have the best ideas that come from our district. They should be incorporated with the best ideas that we can generate.

We should bring those ideas into this idea marketplace and test them; and while we are doing that, we are evaluating the best ideas that come from the other 434 Members of Congress that come here with the best ideas that they can gather. And throughout that all, with that competition of ideas, the competition of debate, the regular order that we ought to structure here and keep, to the extent that it is possible, then those ideas get written into bills and those bills need to go before subcommittees for hearings, and then they need to go before the subcommittee and the full committee for markup so that the people in the committee that presumably have the most expertise on the topic have an opportunity to perfect that legislation.

Then out of committee it needs to come to the floor where the Rules Committee should be allowing the maximum amount of input from the Members. There is not one single Member of this House of Representatives that has the market cornered on all the good ideas; and there is not one single Member here that represents enough more people within their district that they ought to have more leverage than anybody else.

There has to be a leadership structure, that is true, but that doesn't mean that there is only one or two or three places where the ideas can be approved. It needs to be the best ideas that can come from the people of the United States of America.

That is the structure in our constitutional Republic, and we should have the closest thing to regular order that we can maintain. If it means we work longer, if it means we work harder, we should do that. And we should send our

best ideas over across the rotunda to the Senate. There in the Senate, they can generate some ideas, too, and bring those ideas from the States. But they are only up for election once every 6 years, which means, Mr. Speaker, that they have a little bit different attitude about what they can vote for, what they are willing to support, and where the leverage might be over there.

But in the end, this is about bringing the best ideas that exist in America, process them through this competition of ideas in this great debate forum that we have, and let those best ideas emerge to the top.

Mr. Speaker, sitting here in this place, we have a President that thinks that he does all of that. We have a President who thinks that, even though he lectured on the Constitution and the separation of powers and understands that all legislative power and authority exists in the Congress, not in the President of the United States. It exists in the Congress of the United States.

When you look at our Founding Fathers, they had a habit of putting things down in priority order. One of those examples that I would place into the RECORD here, Mr. Speaker, is in the Declaration of Independence. That is not an independent document from the Constitution. The Declaration is the promise; the Constitution is the fulfillment of the promise that is in the Declaration: life, liberty, pursuit of happiness, in that order. They didn't say, pursuit of happiness, liberty, then life. They didn't say, liberty, pursuit of happiness, then life. It is life, liberty, pursuit of happiness. That is because they are prioritized rights.

Life is the paramount right. It takes precedence over any other right. The second that was established in the Declaration was liberty, God-given liberty. Our Founding Fathers are the ones that articulated that, put it on the parchment, and pledged their lives, their fortune, and their sacred honor to that cause.

Pursuit of happiness, by the way, is not just envisioned by our Founding Fathers to be what I think some people think it is, like this endless tailgate party in this pursuit of happiness. Pursuit of happiness is the development of the whole human being. Some pronounce the Greek term for that is "eudemonia." That means the development of the whole human being—physically, mentally, spiritually, intellectually, knowledge-based, all of those things put together—as someone who, enjoying the rights of life and liberty, is contributing back to that society and civilization and to the government of, by, and for the people. That is what pursuit of happiness is.

But it still is trumped by liberty, and liberty is trumped by life. No one in the exercise of their liberty can take someone else's life, and no one in the

exercise of their pursuit of happiness can take away someone else's liberty or life. That is the order; that is the priority.

So, with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that our Founding Fathers envisioned—and they wrote it in the Constitution, to put it bluntly—article I. They didn't start out with article II or article III. If they declared article I to be the executive branch of government, one might be able to read into this that the President has a little more power than he does. They wanted to make sure the people had the power.

So they wrote in article I, the very first sentence, article I, section 1:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

That is an irrefutable first truth in the Constitution of the United States. That is what Barack Obama taught at the University of Chicago. That is the foundation of article I.

The President of the United States, he is the embodiment at the top of the executive branch of government. And it says in the beginning of article II:

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and, together with the vice president, chosen for that same term, be elected, as follows.

It doesn't actually say that the President, in the first sentence, has this massive power. In fact, nowhere in article II does it say that the President has this massive power to legislate because it is exclusively reserved for the Congress of the United States in the very first sentence, article I, section 1.

So this little lecture that I have provided here, Mr. Speaker—and I know you know all of this to be fact—it is pretty similar to the lectures I imagine the President delivered at the University of Chicago, and it reflects the expressions that he has made of his constitutional understanding at least 22 times into the public record when he said: I don't have the authority to grant amnesty.

Now, I am summarizing this, of course. He wouldn't use that word himself.

He said he didn't have the authority on March 28, 2011, at the high school here in Washington, D.C. He said: I know you want me to pass the DREAM Act and establish it, but you are studying. You are smart students. You are studying the Constitution. You know that I don't have the authority to do that. The Congress writes the laws. The legislature writes the laws. I am head of the executive branch as President. My job is to enforce the laws, and the judicial branch of government's job is to interpret the laws.

That is a pretty concise description of what this Constitution does, that statement, and at least 21 other state-

ments by the President of the United States, in his declaration—his declaration—that he didn't have the authority to legislate.

Then, lo and behold, the President of the United States had a change of heart. He stopped saying he didn't have the authority for several months, didn't seem so curious because he was floating trial balloons about advancing an executive amnesty. Those trial balloons floated out June, July, August, September, October. He announced at some point—or leaked it out—that he wouldn't commit his executive amnesty until after the election for fear there would be consequences for such a thing, and so he held back.

Then a couple of weeks ago, on a Thursday night, he gave an address at 8 on a Thursday night to a national audience that more or less laid out his executive amnesty, which as many times has been characterized as "unconstitutional."

The President then decided he could write immigration law and he could waive the application of the law and the enforcement of the law for vast classes and groups of people that he defined in his executive edict. That number of people may be 5 million. We know historically whenever there has been an amnesty, there has been a massive amount of fraud and a significant amount of underestimation of the real numbers, whether it is 5 million or it is a multiplier of 5 million. I don't think anybody thinks it is going to end up being less than 5 million people.

Now we have a bunch of people that came into America that many of whom committed the crime of illegal border crossing. There are some who overstayed their visas, and they are not technically criminals. They have committed a serious misdemeanor overstaying their visa. In both cases, the law removes them from the United States. That is what the law is.

But the President has decided that he can create these classes of people, exempt them from the law, reward them with a permission slip to stay in the United States and a work permit. Some of it is going to turn into green cards.

So this has been a massive effort to usurp the authority of the United States Congress to pass laws. And for the President to give his oath of office and take that oath of office to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help him God—he is obligated to take care that the laws are faithfully executed. Instead, he has taken the Constitution—figuratively speaking—separated out article I of the Constitution, torn it out, and said: I do the law, too. Folded it, put it in his shirt pocket, and walked away from the podium in the East Room that night.

Now here we are. We are a Nation thrown into a constitutional crisis, a

Nation that was struggling to restore the respect for the rule of law as far back as Ronald Reagan's 1986 Amnesty Act. I remember what that was like. I remember what I thought. I am not Monday morning quarterbacking that. I believe Ronald Reagan would stand the principle and veto the '86 Amnesty Act, because anything less meant that there was an implicit promise that there would be another amnesty, another amnesty, and another amnesty; and when you reward lawbreakers, you get more lawbreakers.

I have been working since '86 to restore the respect for the rule of law, and I have watched it be eroded since, one might say by each succeeding President, Mr. Speaker, but no one has eroded the respect for the rule of law from the White House nearly to the extent as this President.

So as I see what is happening in America, I have been wanting to, working here in this Congress, to restore the pillars of American exceptionalism, those pillars, many of which you find in the Bill of Rights, the first ten Amendments to the Constitution, but just in the first one: freedom of speech, religion, press, the right to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances. The Second Amendment's right to keep and bear arms. It goes on and on.

The Bill of Rights is replete of pillars of American exceptionalism, any one of which, if you pulled it out, this giant shining city on a hill that is built upon those beautiful marble pillars of American exceptionalism, that are drilled down to bedrock, that seek this country and its greatness and the greatness of people that are here, you pull any one of them out, we don't become the great country that we are today.

But the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, the rule of law, the essential pillar of American exceptionalism, that idea that no man—meaning also in this world, no woman either—is above the law. We get equal protection under the law, and we are all treated equally before the law. That rule of law is an essential pillar of American exceptionalism without which we could not have become this great Nation, neither can we sustain ourselves as a great Nation.

But I am watching as it is torn asunder by a willful act of an individual that knows better. We know he knows better because he lectured for 10 years better. And he gave us 22 speeches across the country that told us that he knew better, and then flipped and did this to throw this America into a constitutional crisis.

Then what are our alternatives here in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate? We have a majority in the Republicans coming into the United States Senate. It will soon be nine freshman Republicans that will arrive on the floor of the

United States Senate to take their oath of office in January of 2015, not that long from now.

□ 1730

Here in the House, we are going to end up with 247 Republicans, which is a pretty good-sized majority here in the House of Representatives—the largest majority we have had since sometime back in the Roaring Twenties. That is 15 new Republicans seated in the House of Representatives.

Some say: Well, why don't we just wait and we'll pick up better ground to fight on. We can fight better maybe in January. So let's do a continuing resolution. Maybe we'll just kick the whole omnibus can all the way down the road until September 30.

But we surely can't do this. We surely can't let the President shut the government down. So we'll say there won't be a government shutdown, which is a promise that we're not going to defund the President's lawless act.

Now, if we announce that we are not willing to use the tools that are here in this Constitution in my jacket pocket, carefully given to the House of Representatives especially, but also the Senate, that gives the power of the purse to the Congress, in the Federalist Papers it is very clear that our Founding Fathers intended for this Congress to have the power of the purse because with the power of the purse comes the authority to control everything the executive branch does, if we so choose.

We can write language that is limiting language. We can write language that says: Here's all the money you want, Mr. President. You've already soared through \$17 trillion in national debt—and now, \$18 trillion in national debt. We'll scoop you up a few hundred more billion dollars. In fact, we'll scoop you trillions of dollars over there. And you can spend whatever it is that we have agreed in the discussions with Senator REID and the President of the United States. We are going to provide for money because we don't want to fight. We don't want to fight.

Yes, we do. We have an obligation. And we have to. Money can be compromised if money is not a principle. The Constitution of the United States cannot be compromised; it is a principle. And we take an oath to uphold the Constitution here, 435 of us standing in this same place next January, again. It doesn't mean you get this caveat that says I don't like the politics of defending the Constitution. It doesn't mean that this is too painful for me so I am not going to do it. It doesn't even mean I disagree with the policy so I am not going to defend the Constitution.

What it means is you take an oath to uphold the Constitution, come what may, without regard to political consequences, without regard to policy implications, with complete regard to the

oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. That is our oath. And if the President doesn't keep his, we are ever more obligated to keep ours. That is what we must do. And the most reasonable tool that we have is the tool that defunds the President's lawless executive edicts.

That is what must be done, and it must be done on appropriation bills that are must-pass, that the President wants, which means now, given an understanding that they continued to issue permits throughout the government shutdown 14 months ago. That is under USCIS. They functioned during a government shutdown, issuing DACA permits—the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals—and they continued to exercise these nonprosecutorial discretion Morton memos. They were doing those things, Mr. Speaker, during a government shutdown. So they declared it, apparently, to be an essential service, or they went off on the loop of it being fee-based.

We can write language into the next appropriation bill—and it should be a very short CR that gets us into next year—and that language must shut off the funding to the President's lawless act that he committed and knew what he was doing.

We need to do it now. It is a matter of principle. When you are called upon to keep your oath of office, you don't get to decide that there is going to be another time, a better time. If we vote to fund the President's lawlessness, Mr. Speaker, we don't get our virtue back in January, February, and March of next year. We must uphold the Constitution now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY of California) for today on account of a family illness.

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for December 2, 3, and today on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family medical issues.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 229. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 390 0 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans

Affairs Medical Center"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 2523. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue, NW., in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 2759. An act to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 2921. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 43. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the "Richard K. Salick Post Office".

H.R. 669. An act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

H.R. 1391. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the "London Fallen Veterans Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3085. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3375. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

H.R. 3682. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1961 Premier Drive in Mankato, Minnesota, as the "Lyle C. Pearson Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 3957. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 4189. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4443. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building".

H.R. 4919. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4924. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of certain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 5069. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5106. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the "Philmore Graham Post Office Building".

H.R. 5681. An act to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2040. An Act to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 8, 2014, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8143. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification of troop reduction pursuant to 10 U.S.C. Section 993; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8144. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Pearsall, Texas) [MB Docket No.: 13-23] [RM-11690] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8145. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory

Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Aging Management of Loss of Coating or Lining Integrity for Internal Coatings/Linings on In-Scope Piping, Piping Components, Heat Exchangers, and Tanks [NRC-2014-0004] received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8146. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 14-14, informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Agreement with the Ministry of Defence of the Kingdom of Norway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8147. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-064, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8148. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-109, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8149. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-102, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8150. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-107, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8151. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-122, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8152. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-112, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8153. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's semi-annual report on the activities of the Inspector General for April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8154. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the FY 2014 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8155. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Marine Mammals; Subsidence Taking of Northern Fur Seals; St. George Island, Alaska [Docket No.: 130404331-4881-02] (RIN: 0648-BD12) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8156. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs,

NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 21 [Docket No.: 140214139-4799-02] (RIN: 0648-BD91) received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8157. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD480) received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8158. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD544) received November 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8159. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Extension of the 2014 Gulf of Mexico Recreational Red Grouper Season [Docket No.: 100217095-2081-04] (RIN: 0648-XD479) received November 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8160. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin Distinct Population Segments of Yelloweye Rockfish, Canary Rockfish, and Bocaccio [Docket No.: 130404330-4883-02] (RIN: 0648-BC76) received November 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8161. A letter from the Deputy Director — ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Requirements for the Medicare Incentive Reward Program and Provider Enrollment [CMS-6045-F] (RIN: 0938-AP01) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

8162. A letter from the Deputy Director — ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicaid Program; Disproportionate Share Hospital Payments — Uninsured Definition [CMS-2315-F] (RIN: 0938-AQ37) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 5791. A bill to increase transparency and provide for judicial review of administrative fines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 5792. A bill to establish a special rule for determining normal retirement age for certain existing defined benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Ms. JENKINS):

H.R. 5793. A bill to ensure the integrity of any software, firmware, or product developed for or purchased by the United States Government that uses a third party or open source component, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5794. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 5795. A bill to seek the establishment of and contributions to an International Fund for Israeli-Palestinian Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5796. A bill to give States the option of addressing emissions of greenhouse gases from existing stationary sources by pricing emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5797. A bill to make a supplemental appropriation for the Public Health Emergency Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5798. A bill to provide for a one-year extension of the extended period of protections for members of uniformed services relating to mortgages, mortgage foreclosure, and eviction under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 5799. A bill to establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review of Federal agencies and programs and to recommend the elimination or realignment of duplicative, wasteful, or outdated functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Appropriations, for a period to be subse-

quently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AMASH, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 5800. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from mandating the deployment of vulnerabilities in data security technologies; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5801. A bill to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 5802. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to permit multiemployer plans in critical status to modify plan rules relating to withdrawal liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. McKEON:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3979; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H. Res. 771. A resolution recognizing the 100-year anniversary of Big Brothers Big Sisters Southeastern Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 5791.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5792.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5793.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 5794.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and post roads"

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 5798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 5799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which states "The Congress shall have Power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 5800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 5801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. "To make all Law which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the Foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this

Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 5802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution (relating to Congress' power to regulate commerce . . . among the several states . . .). The United States Congress initially enacted ERISA under the Commerce Clause in order to stabilize employee pension plans that employees carry with them across state lines. This bill modifies ERISA and is thus a regulation of commerce—specifically pension plans—among more than one state.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1074: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1213: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 1339: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 1365: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1775: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 1878: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 1975: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2016: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2164: Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 2211: Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 2424: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 2851: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 2856: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 3465: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 3543: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3672: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 3723: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 3750: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 4351: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 4510: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 4551: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 4574: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 4703: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4793: Ms. MOORE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4840: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4879: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 4920: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 4930: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 4960: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 4978: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 5059: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 5263: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5267: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 5320: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 5324: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5364: Ms. ESTY, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5373: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 5382: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 5478: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5504: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 5505: Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 5589: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 5611: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 5747: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 5752: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 5764: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5768: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 5782: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.J. Res. 125: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H. Res. 190: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. SERRANO.

H. Res. 448: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. YODER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H. Res. 456: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 668: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 705: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Res. 755: Mr. REED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO LECIL NOLAN—RECIPIENT OF THE 29TH ANNUAL PALMER VETERANS APPRECIATION AWARD

HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor Sergeant Lecil Nolan, USA (Ret.), who was recently awarded the 29th Palmer Veterans Appreciation Award, an honor presented annually on Veterans Day by the City of Palmer, Tennessee.

Following his graduation from Grundy County High School in 1969, Lecil enlisted in the United States Army as an infantryman with the 101st Airborne Division and was deployed to Vietnam from January to December of 1971.

After returning home, Sgt. Nolan went to work for the United States Postal Service, where he spent the next 29 years and 10 months serving his local community.

Sgt. Nolan's outstanding service is reflected in the numerous commendations and military decorations he has received, including: the Combat Infantryman Badge, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal with two Bronze Service Stars, Republic of Vietnam Service Medal, Air Medal with Numeral 1, Bronze Star, Marksman (Rifle), and 1st Class Gunner (MGM-60).

Mr. Speaker, this recognition is certainly well-deserved and is a testament to our community's appreciation for Sgt. Nolan's service in the United States Army.

I, along with the grateful citizens of Tennessee's Fourth District, extend a heartfelt thanks to Sgt. Lecil Nolan, as well as to all of our veterans, for their sacrifices made and service rendered to our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHIEF MIKE
WHALEN

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Police Chief Mike Whalen upon his retirement after ten years of dedicated service to the town of Dennis, Massachusetts.

Chief Whalen began his distinguished career as a patrolman in Farmington, Connecticut. Over the next thirty years, he tirelessly worked his way up the ranks of the greater Hartford police department, rising from patrolman to Chief of Police in the Connecticut State Capitol. In 2004, the Cape Cod community was particularly fortunate when Chief Whalen came to Dennis. During his ten years

with the Dennis Police Department, Chief Whalen has been a remarkable leader and has built on his strong reputation for modernizing local police work. Every community that Chief Whalen has touched has benefited as a result of his work, and his guidance and leadership will surely be missed in the town of Dennis.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I commend Chief Mike Whalen. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing him a long and happy retirement and in thanking him for his service.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE
OF MARISOL CORRALES

HON. GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Marisol Corrales served as my District Representative for California's 35th Congressional District, which includes the communities of Bloomington, Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Ontario, Rialto in San Bernardino County, and the city of Pomona in Los Angeles County.

Ms. Marisol Corrales represented my office at 14 senior centers throughout my district. She presented birthday greetings, brought resources and helped seniors with any federal related issues on my behalf. She also assisted with and worked on special projects that met the needs of our district.

Ms. Marisol Corrales contributed greatly to the constituent services objective of my office and assisted constituents facing issues with federal agencies, such as the Department of Veteran Affairs, Internal Revenue Services, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, amongst other federal agencies; her work as a liaison between our office, other state agencies, and our constituents validated her commitment to public service.

Ms. Marisol Corrales managed my iConstituent account; she wrote constituent correspondence and responded to constituent inquiries, as well as constituents' positions on current issues on a daily basis.

As a result of her work in Congress, Ms. Marisol Corrales has had the unique opportunity of acquiring a deeper understanding of the legislative process, public policy formation while also providing assistance to the constituents in our district.

Ms. Marisol Corrales attended local grade schools, graduated from Eisenhower High School, and went on to earn two Bachelor of Arts degrees in Latin American and Iberian Studies (Emphasis in Politics and Economics) and Spanish Language and Literature from the University of California, Santa Barbara.

As a result of her outstanding service as District Representative for my district office,

Ms. Marisol Corrales is better equipped to provide valuable leadership and contributions to educational institutions; local, regional, state and federal governments; and professional, business, and community endeavors in the State of California and the entire nation.

Let it be known Mr. Speaker, that Ms. Marisol Corrales be commended for her exemplary service on behalf of the Members of Congress of the United States, and extended sincere best wishes for every success in her future endeavors.

IN MEMORY OF WORLD WAR II
VETERAN BILL BASTIAN

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life, achievements, and service of World War II veteran Bill Bastian.

Bill joined the United States Army in 1942, serving during the height of the Second World War as an officer in the 203rd Engineer Combat Battalion. Throughout the course of the war, Bill served as company commander, assistant operations officer, and battalion motor and liaison officer.

He was among the brave soldiers who landed on Omaha Beach on D-Day, June 6, 1944.

After the invasion, Bill served as communication liaison officer. He risked his life to ensure that communications remained intact throughout the American advance in France.

He was redeployed to Belgium just before Christmas of 1944, where he faced the brunt of the German offensive in the Battle of the Bulge. During the invasion of Germany, Bill helped construct the bridge over the Fulda River between Frankfurt and Kassel.

As instrumental as this project was, Bill Bastian's contribution to protecting our country's ideals was far greater. He was a proven leader, who valued the resourcefulness of the Americans he commanded. Bill noted that most of the recruits did not even know how to drive a car when they joined the service, but by the end of the conflict, they could operate large machinery, build roads, and repair equipment.

Bill once remarked: "Americans are people that can look at a job, figure out how to get it done, and then get the job done." This is the same manner in which he led his life after the Army.

Bill was more than a soldier; he was a loving husband to his wife of 63 years, Melba. After her passing, Bill devoted his time to leading tours of the Normandy beachhead and the French cemeteries where many of his former comrades are buried. In recent years, Bill's moving radio commentaries have kept the stories of his generation's sacrifice alive.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

This brave veteran's service and devotion to the United States and to liberty lives on in the freedom enjoyed by all Americans. It is my privilege to rise in honor of the life and service of Bill Bastian.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF RICHARD KRUGMAN

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the contributions of one of Colorado's most respected citizens, Dr. Richard D. Krugman. On the occasion of his retirement, it is fitting that we look back at his successful career. His leadership in the medical community is demonstrated in part by the many roles he fills, including Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs for the University of Colorado Denver and Dean of the Colorado School of Medicine. He began his tenure as Dean in 1992, making him the longest-serving dean of any medical school in the country. In that role, he has made a significant impact on not only the Colorado School of Medicine but also the greater Colorado community. He merits both our recognition and gratitude for his steadfast efforts in creating a highly prestigious medical school that benefits the health of Colorado in so many ways.

After graduating from Princeton University, Dr. Krugman earned his medical degree at New York University School of Medicine. He came to Colorado to do his internship and residency in pediatrics at the University of Colorado Denver School Of Medicine. As a board-certified pediatrician, Dr. Krugman joined the University of Colorado faculty in 1973. He has authored over 100 original papers, chapters, editorials and four books, and recently stepped down after 15 years as Editor-in-Chief of Child Abuse and Neglect: The International Journal. He has done incredible work raising awareness and tackling the problem of child abuse. He further assists the community by serving on the Boards of Trustees of Denver Health, Princeton University, the Hasbro Children's Foundation and the Kempe Children's Foundation. Dr. Krugman also served our country as a major in the U.S. Army Reserve.

In addition to his service as dean and vice chancellor, Dr. Krugman left his mark on the University of Colorado in his many other roles. He was the Director of Admissions and Co-Director of the Child Health Associate Program. He served as the Director of the University's Area Health Education Center program, and Vice Chairman for Clinical Affairs in the Department of Pediatrics. He is also president of University Physicians, Inc., the School of Medicine faculty practice plan.

Of Dr. Krugman's many accomplishments at the University of Colorado, one the most notable is the role he played in the construction of the new Anschutz Medical Campus. His unwavering determination to move the medical school from an old campus to a beautiful state of the art facility has dramatically benefitted the School of Medicine. U.S. News & World

Report consistently rates the school among their top five primary care provider rankings.

Please join me in commending Dr. Richard Krugman for more than 40 years of extraordinary service. His talents and perseverance are an example and inspiration for us all and helps to build a better future for everyone living in Colorado.

RECOGNIZING INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observance of National IBD Awareness Week, December 1–7, 2014, which bring attention to over 1.4 million Americans affected by Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis, collectively known as inflammatory bowel disease, or IBD. These disorders impact the gastrointestinal tract, the area of the body where digestion takes place. They cause inflammation of the intestine, which leads to ongoing symptoms and complications.

Although anyone can get IBD, it is most commonly diagnosed in adolescents and young adults between 15 and 25 years old. There is currently no known cause or cure for IBD, and individuals with IBD may suffer from various symptoms from mild to severe abdominal pain, diarrhea, fever, and intestinal bleeding. The impacts are devastating to both patients and their families.

While we still do not have all the answers, there is hope. An increasing number of genes have been identified—over 100 today—that may cause an increase in the risk of developing IBD, confirming that IBD has a strong genetic component. With these discoveries and new technological advances, researchers are working furiously to find cures.

Despite this, the unpredictable nature of these painful and debilitating digestive diseases creates a significant burden on the community and economy. Every year, there is more than \$1.26 billion in direct and indirect costs to the US healthcare system due to hospitalizations as a result of IBD complications.

As the co-chair of the Crohn's and Colitis Caucus, a bi-partisan group of Congressional Members dedicated to educating the public and other Members on IBD, I urge my fellow Caucus members and colleagues to join me in recognizing IBD Awareness week and the millions of Americans suffering from this disease. I would also like to take this time to honor my colleague and fellow co-chair, JIM MORAN, for his leadership over the years in improving access to treatments for IBD for this vulnerable population. He has been an incredible partner in this fight to prevent and cure IBD. He will be missed in this Chamber as he moves on to the next chapter in his life.

With the support of the Crohn's and Colitis Foundation of America, I encourage all Americans to join in the fight to cure, raise awareness, and increase research on this debilitating disease. Together, with the help of researchers, educators, medical professionals,

patients, and families, we can find a cure and end this devastating disease for millions of people around the world.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF ZAFAR INAM

HON. GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Zafar Inam served as my District Representative for California's 35th Congressional District, which includes the communities of Bloomington, Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Ontario, Rialto in San Bernardino County, and the City of Pomona in Los Angeles County.

Mr. Zafar Inam contributed greatly to the public policy goals of my office and served as the principal staff member to constituent groups advocating for a better quality of life, housing issues, intelligence issues, working conditions, education, and immigrants' rights.

Mr. Zafar Inam acted as the District Representative within my Congressional District office. His responsibilities included answering casework correspondence, meeting with constituents, verbal communications with constituents, forming effective relationships with local leaders and serving as a liaison with federal, state, and local agencies.

As a result of Zafar Inam's work in Congress, Zafar has had the unique opportunity of acquiring a deeper understanding of the legislative process, public policy formation in the nation's capital, while also providing assistance to my Congressional Office, other members in Congress, legislative committees, and their constituencies.

A native of Southern California, Zafar attended Upland High School, graduated from Chaffey College, and went on to earn a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering from California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Continuing his pursuit of higher education, Zafar earned his Master's degree in Civil Engineering and Management from California State University, Fullerton, and his impressive resume includes being the local President of Scientists and Engineers of America, organization promoting science and math policy; also designing and building roadways and bridges as an Engineer for the State of California.

As a result of his outstanding service as District Representative for my congressional office, Zafar Inam is better equipped to provide valuable leadership and contributions to educational institutions; local, regional, state and federal governments; and professional, business, and community endeavors in the State of California and the entire nation.

Let it be known Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Zafar Inam, District Representative, be commended for his exemplary service on behalf of the Members of Congress of the United States, and extended sincere best wishes for every success in his future endeavors.

BRIDGING THE AFFORDABILITY
GAP IN ACA**HON. DAVID P. ROE**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, since the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, more and more Tennesseans, and more and more Americans, are expressing concern about the affordability of health care. Even though more people have insurance, they are struggling with growing deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses.

To put a finer point on it, the Kaiser Family Foundation reports that one in three Americans are having difficulty paying their medical bills, while the National Foundation for Credit Counseling reports 64 percent don't have \$1,000 to cover an emergency expense. According to Kaiser, deductibles have increased 50 percent since 2009.

During October, I was made aware of one innovative approach to bridge the affordability gap when I toured Holston Medical Group, one of the largest, multi-specialty physician practices in the southeastern United States and located in my district. Holston is partnering with a company called CarePayment to try to help ensure their patients can afford care recommended by their doctor.

Through its partnership with CarePayment, Holston patients can spread medical payments over 25 months or more at zero percent APR, without impact to their credit score. Everyone is eligible, regardless of income or employment status. This program helps patients afford their bills, and it also helps hospitals reduce their bad debt. For example, Holston has reduced its bad debt by 85 percent. That's significant, particularly when you consider that hospitals are seeing more and more of their bad debt coming from patients who have insurance.

This program removes financial concerns so patients can focus on their recovery. I was told one story about Betty, a constituent from Bristol, Tennessee, who injured her shoulder and needed physical therapy, but couldn't afford treatment. She enrolled in Holston's CarePayment program, finished therapy and pays just \$25 a month. She says she couldn't have had the treatment if Holston didn't offer the financing plan.

As a physician, I know what can happen when patients delay care. And delaying treatment is more likely when they don't have the money to pay.

The partnership between CarePayment and Holston is increasingly necessary as costs continue to be shifted. With uncertainty about the long-term feasibility of the ACA, partnerships like these may be helpful in ensuring patients can continue to receive the care they need.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 5739, THE NO
SOCIAL SECURITY FOR NAZIS ACT**HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 04, 2014

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this week, I voted in support of H.R. 5739, the No Social Security for Nazis Act, of which I am proud original co sponsor.

For decades now individuals who have been identified as Nazi war criminals have accessed their Social Security benefits, by means of a loophole in the Social Security Act. This loophole allowed those who were denaturalized, or those who voluntarily renounced their United States' citizenship, and left the country to avoid formal deportation proceedings, to continue receiving Social Security benefits.

H.R. 5739 will close the loophole by amending the law to stop Social Security benefit payments to those denaturalized due to participation in Nazi persecutions or those who voluntarily renounced their citizenship as part of a settlement with the Attorney General related to their participation in Nazi persecution.

Our country and the world will never forget the atrocities committed by the Nazi regime against millions of Jews and other targeted groups during World War II, nor should the perpetrators of these atrocities be allowed to continue to collect Social Security benefits due to a loophole in the law.

My district in Brooklyn, New York, which is the Ninth Congressional District of New York, is home to one of the largest orthodox Jewish populations in the country as well as being home to the second largest Jewish population in the nation overall. I know that my constituents would feel reassured to know that this loophole has been closed.

So, on behalf of my Jewish constituents and of all Americans, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who joined me in supporting H.R. 5739, the No Social Security for Nazis Act.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE
OF DANIEL SANCHEZ**HON. GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Daniel Sanchez served as my Communications Director for California's 35th Congressional District, which includes the communities of Bloomington, Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Ontario, Rialto in San Bernardino County, and the city of Pomona in Los Angeles County.

Mr. Daniel Sanchez contributed greatly to the communications and public policy goals of my office and served as a legislative staff member to specifically serve constituent groups advocating for a better quality of life, housing issues, intelligence issues, working conditions, education, and immigrants' rights.

Mr. Daniel Sanchez managed the office's online presence as Chief Web Master and Social Media Coordinator, helping share the Con-

gresswoman's work to constituents on Facebook, Twitter, Google+, YouTube, Instagram and Vine.

As a result of his work in Congress, Mr. Daniel Sanchez has had the unique opportunity of acquiring a deeper understanding of the legislative process, public policy formation in the nation's capital, while also providing assistance to other members in Congress, legislative committees, and their constituencies.

A native of Rialto, California, Mr. Daniel Sanchez attended local grade schools, graduated from Wilmer Amina Carter High School, and went on to earn a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from the University of California, Riverside.

As a result of his outstanding service as Communications Director for my congressional office, Mr. Daniel Sanchez is better equipped to provide valuable leadership and contributions to educational institutions; local, regional, state and federal governments; and professional, business, and community endeavors in the State of California and the entire nation.

Let it be known Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Daniel Sanchez be commended for his exemplary service on behalf of the Members of Congress of the United States, and extended sincere best wishes for every success in his future endeavors.

VICKI WAGNER**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Vicki Wagner for receiving the 2014 City of Golden Mayor's Award of Excellence.

The City of Golden honors Vicki for her achievements over four decades of ongoing and enthusiastic volunteerism. Vicki came to Golden in 1968 and soon began volunteering in the City. First in her children's schools, then on the newly-created Citizens Action Committee in the 1980's, the Golden Urban Renewal Authority, and the Farmer's Market since it opened in 2002. She currently serves on the Golden Visitors Center Board of Trustees and the Golden Good Government League. Vicki is primarily responsible for the beautiful landscaping at the Visitors Center and exemplifies the spirit that makes Golden great.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Vicki Wagner for this well-deserved recognition by the City of Golden.

RECOGNIZING MR. PETER H.
STEPHAICH FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS
TO OUR NATION'S WATER
TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Peter H. Stephaich on the occasion of his receipt of the River Bell Award for

his contributions to our nation's water transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Stephaich has devoted his talents to serving the maritime industry for over 30 years. During this time, he has held a number of important roles that make him a trusted figure, and someone who the industry looks to as a leader on transportation issues. He currently serves as Chairman and CEO of Blue Danube Incorporated and Campbell Transportation, which together employ hundreds of people, and operate over 500 vessels and four shipyards across the inland waterway system. In addition, he has served in a number of notable positions that have made him a steward of the industry. From his chairmanship of the National Waterways Foundation and the Board of American Waterways Operators, to his position as Commissioner and Vice Chairman of the Port of Pittsburgh Commission, Peter Stephaich is renowned across the nation as a stalwart advocate for America's water transportation professionals. Furthermore he has extended this advocacy to Capitol Hill, where he has been a notable voice for legislation to update and modernize our infrastructure. His testimony before the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee was an important part of the process that led to the passage of The Water Resources Reform & Development Act of 2014 (WRRDA), and his input is thoroughly valued among the halls of Congress.

Transportation of goods and services across America's waterways has never been more crucial to the economic wellbeing of our nation than it is today. Leaders like Peter Stephaich help expand this important industry, and in doing so help speed the flow of materials and commodities that are the fuel our nation needs to grow and prosper. His receipt of the River Bell Award is certainly well deserved, and I invite my colleagues to join me in offering congratulations for his many years of service as a transportation leader.

**SUPPORT ROBUST FUNDING FOR
ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE RESEARCH**

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as co-chair of the Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease to help raise awareness about the impact of Alzheimer's and the importance of increasing federal resources to assist individuals, families and caregivers.

In the United States, Alzheimer's has reached epidemic proportions. Today, the disease—a degenerative condition for which there is no cure or any effective treatment—is the 6th leading cause of death in our country, with a 68 percent increase in deaths caused by Alzheimer's within the last 10 years. Over 5.2 million Americans currently have this form of dementia and the number of family members and caregivers affected reaches more than 15 million. In my home state of New Jersey, an estimated 170,000 Garden State residents suffer from Alzheimer's, and 443,000 caregivers provided unpaid care. As our elder-

ly population grows, the number of Americans affected by this disease is expected to triple by 2050.

The economic consequences of Alzheimer's are immense, and resources and assistance must be allocated appropriately to change the trajectory of the disease. Alzheimer's currently costs Americans \$150 billion annually in Medicare and Medicaid programs alone. By 2050, care of Alzheimer's patients could reach \$850 billion in Medicare and Medicaid costs. Including out of pocket and other expenses, the number totals one trillion.

Sharing the impact of the disease are the 15 million family members and others who act as caregivers and provide an estimated 17 billion hours of unpaid care—often relinquishing their jobs and other obligations to do so. These caregivers also endure significantly high rates of physical and emotional stress while attending to their loved ones. While their sacrifices are born of love and remain personally priceless, the economic costs of unpaid care are estimated to exceed \$200 billion annually.

Research and preventative services are important tools that not only raise the quality of life for patients and families but serve as an investment that will reduce future costs. Accordingly, I worked with former Congressman, now Senator, ED MARKEY (D-MA)—then Co-Chair of the Task Force—in 2010 to write the House-version of the National Alzheimer's Project Act (NAPA) which became Public Law 111-375. Our legislation established the ambitious goal of preventing and successfully treating Alzheimer's disease by 2025 in the United States, and required an annual National Plan to achieve this goal.

It is vital that we commit ourselves fully to this objective and time is of the essence.

We must make a robust investment in research at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Institutes on Aging (NIA). The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, HHS & Education recently approved their FY 2015 bill, which calls for an additional \$100 million in funding at the NIA. This funding will go a long way toward meeting the goals laid out in NAPA.

But we can do better—not only with funding but with better information and planning.

On that note, the Subcommittee also included language directing NIH to submit a professional judgment budget for Alzheimer's disease research. As a cosponsor of the Alzheimer's Accountability Act (H.R. 4351), I firmly believe that unfiltered information specifying the resources necessary to meet the goals and objectives laid out in the National Plan would provide Congress with a valuable tool for setting research and service priorities.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday Rep. MAXINE WATERS—the current Co-chair of the Task Force—and I sent a letter to the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House Appropriations Committee requesting that they include the Senate Subcommittee's funding level and the language requiring a professional judgment budget in the coming spending package.

I urge my colleagues to accept this request and work with the Task Force to continue to boost funding for Alzheimer's research and services in the coming years.

**HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE
OF WENDY J. MEDINA**

HON. GLORIA NEGRETE MCLEOD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Wendy J. Medina served as my Senior District Representative for California's 35th Congressional District, which includes the communities of Bloomington, Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Ontario, Rialto in San Bernardino County, and the city of Pomona in Los Angeles County.

With over fourteen years' experience working in California state and federal politics, Mrs. Wendy J. Medina consistently demonstrated a strong work ethic and a deep commitment to the community.

Mrs. Wendy J. Medina worked tirelessly to coordinate well-attended district events that met the needs of our district; her work as a liaison between our office, other state agencies, and our constituents validated her commitment to public service.

As a result of her outstanding service as a Senior District Representative for my congressional office, Mrs. Wendy J. Medina is better prepared to provide valuable leadership and contributions to educational institutions; local, regional, state and federal governments; and professional, business, and community endeavors in the State of California and the entire nation.

Mrs. Wendy J. Medina attended local grade schools and graduated from Ontario High School. Mrs. Wendy J. Medina and her husband, Javier Garcia, are the proud parents of four wonderful children; Alexia, Diego, Natalia and Kayla.

Let it be known Mr. Speaker, that Mrs. Wendy J. Medina be commended for her exemplary service on behalf of the Members of Congress of the United States, and extended sincere best wishes for every success in her future endeavors.

**TRIBUTE TO FARGO MAYOR
DENNIS WALAKER**

HON. KEVIN CRAMER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the good people of Fargo, North Dakota have broken hearts today. Their mayor, Dennis Walaker, died suddenly this week, sending a wave of emotion across my entire state.

Mayor Walaker epitomized what it means to be the people's servant, not because he was perfect—he certainly was not—but because he was as common as an uncommon politician can be.

Denny earned the top job in the city by virtue of his service as a city employee famous for fighting floods. The legend was solidified as he defied the feds and the odds by applying his uncommon common sense to the 2009 record flood fight, keeping his city safe and his people in their homes.

While Denny's famous flood fights put him on a big stage, it was the character of the man that was really under the spotlight more than his competence as a civil engineer.

Denny was always where he needed to be. He wore a suit and tie when he had to, but was more comfortable wearing, well, more comfortable clothes. It's hard to describe without cliché, but Denny was loved because he was one of the people he represented, whoever they were.

He was one of "them."

He was always available and accountable, and expected the same of other public officials at every level. Denny's communication style was more blunt than eloquent, but always memorable and effective. While he didn't shy away from criticizing legislators at the state and federal levels—in fact he seemed to relish it—he wasn't offensive. Perhaps because he expected the same clarity from us as he provided to us.

He was a good example to all of us. Not every politician could or even should match his personality or style; we should strive to match his character.

I pray for Denny's family and our city as we mourn, but am confident the memories we carry will keep him close to us for a very long time.

IN HONOR OF STEVE PRICE

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of myself and my dear friend and colleague Representative LOIS CAPPS to honor the career of a remarkable public servant whose work and character should serve as a model for us all. Mr. Steve Price is retiring from CalTrans after nearly 35 years in various engineering positions. In that time Steve carved out a reputation for integrity and unfailing honesty. If it could be done, Steve would make it happen. If an idea was impractical, Steve let you know. Simply put, Steve made government—at least the portion that he controlled—work for the people of California.

We had the great pleasure to getting to know Steve in his capacity as the maintenance supervisor for CalTrans District 5, which encompasses both of our congressional districts. California's Highway 1 connects our districts from Moro Bay and Hearst Castle in the south up through Carmel and Monterey in the north. Along the way the road passes through Big Sur and offers one of the most spectacular views of land and sea anywhere in the world. But as Steve likes to remind us all, that land has been falling into the sea for eons and the highway's construction 80 years ago did nothing to slow that. So every time a slide, wildfire, or washed out bridge closes the highway, we find ourselves sitting at the table with Steve and the local community working out solutions to keep the coast highway open. And it has been in those community settings that Steve's particular brand of diplomacy made its greatest impact. Where some work to sooth community anxieties with gentle words and reas-

suring platitudes, Steve offers unvarnished honesty. Steve's presence in the room always helped bring the conversation back to the practical.

But above all, Steve was a tremendously skilled and innovative engineer. He has been a strong advocate for worker safety and sought out opportunities to include maintenance staff in the project design process. Steve has received a Tranny Award in 1995 for leading the Caltrans effort on the Hearst Scenic Conservation purchase; acted as the Interim State Traffic engineer; participated in Transportation Research Board study on Design of In-Vehicle Driving Behavior and Crash Risk Study; received the Karl Moskowitz award for Outstanding Engineering in Transportation in 2014; and served as the State Pavement Engineer in 2014, just to name a few accomplishments. He has also applied his engineering skills to aid in Haiti's recovery from the devastating 2010 earthquake.

Mr. Speaker, we know we speak for the whole House in offering this body's gratitude for a job well done. Steve's leadership will be missed by us, his colleagues, and numerous communities up and down the Central Coast. We wish Steve and his family every success in retirement and can rest assured that his voice will continue to be heard.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF MARY J. ARMSTRONG

HON. GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, Mary J. Armstrong served as my District Representative for California's 35th Congressional District, which includes the communities of Bloomington, Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Ontario, Rialto in San Bernardino County, and the city of Pomona in Los Angeles County.

Mary J. Armstrong capacity of responsibilities included preparing and presenting certificates of recognition, assisting with the planning of community events and attending committee hearings and meetings.

Mary J. Armstrong managed and researched constituents' casework, not limited to staffing me at various events and meetings as needed and represented me on occasion, worked as a liaison with federal agencies and addressed a variety of issues and concerns of the constituents of the 35th Congressional District.

Having served the State of California for eleven years, Mary J. Armstrong began her legislative career in 2003, with Assembly Member Mervyn M. Dymally, representing the 52nd Assembly District and transitioned to the 32nd Senatorial District, and two years with the 35th Congressional District with me.

Mary and her husband, Jesse Armstrong, are the proud parents of four Children, Stephanie, Calvin, Anthony and Angela, and grandparents of six grandchildren and one great grand child.

Mary J. Armstrong is dependable, adaptable and a resourceful team player, she possesses the persistence and personality to excel in

competitive markets and dynamic fast-paced environments and she rendered outstanding service to me in providing quality service to the people of the 32nd Senatorial District and the 35th Congressional District and throughout the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, I fully extend all due recognition to Mary J. Armstrong for her many exceptional achievements and personal loyalty for exemplifying the character and proficiency that mark the best of California's legislative staff.

THE STATUS OF THE TERRITORIES OF JUDEA AND SAMARIA ACCORDING TO INTERNATIONAL LAW

HON. STEVE STOCKMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to convey to the House important information regarding the legality of the presence of the State of Israel in Judea and Samaria under international law. Due to the unique and sui generis historic and legal circumstances of Israel's presence in Judea and Samaria, this presence cannot be considered to be an occupation. Moreover, provisions of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention, regarding transfer of populations, cannot be considered applicable, and were never intended to apply to the type of settlement activity carried out by Israel in Judea and Samaria. According to international law, Israelis have the lawful right to settle in Judea and Samaria, and consequently, the establishment of settlements cannot in and of itself be considered to be illegal. The following is an excerpt from the 2012 Levy Commission Report on the Legal Status of Building in Judea and Samaria that deals with international law. The full report can be viewed in its entirety at <http://regavim.org.il/en/levy-report-translated-into-english/>.

THE STATUS OF THE TERRITORIES OF JUDEA AND SAMARIA ACCORDING TO INTERNATIONAL LAW

3. In light of the different approaches in regard to the status of the State of Israel and its activities in Judea and Samaria, any examination of the issue of land and settlement thereon requires, first and foremost, clarification of the issue of the status of the territory according to international law.

Some take the view that the answer to the issue of settlements is a simple one inasmuch as it is prohibited according to international law. That is the view of Peace Now (see the letter from Hagit Ofra from 2 April 2010); B'tselem (see the letter from its Executive Director Jessica Montell from 29 March 2012, and its pamphlet Land Grab: Israel's Settlement Policy in the West Bank, published May 2002); Yesh Din and the Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI) (see the letter from Attorney Tamar Feldman from 19 April 2012); and Adalah (see the letter from attorney Fatma Alaju from 12 June 2012).

The approach taken by these organizations is a reflection of the position taken by the Palestinian leadership and some in the international community, who view Israel's status as that of a "military occupier," and the settlement endeavor as an entirely illegal

phenomenon. This approach denies any Israeli or Jewish right to these territories. To sum up, they claim that the territories of Judea and Samaria are "occupied territory" as defined by international law in that they were captured from the Kingdom of Jordan in 1967. Consequently, according to this approach, the provisions of international law regarding the matter of occupation apply to Israel as a military occupier, i.e. Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land. The Hague, 18 October 1907, which govern the relationship between the occupier, the occupied territory, and the Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Geneva, 12 August (1949).

According to the Hague Regulations, the occupying power, while concerning himself with the occupier's security needs, is required to care for the needs of the civilian population until the occupation is terminated. According to these regulations, it is forbidden in principle to seize personal property, although the occupying power has the right to enjoy all the advantages derivable from the use of the property of the occupied state, and public property that is not privately owned without changing its fixed nature. Moreover, according to this approach, Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention prohibits the transfer of parts of the occupying power's own civilian population into the territory it occupies. Accordingly, in their view, the establishment of settlements carried out by Israel is in violation of this article, even without addressing the type or status of the land upon which they are built.

In this context, we were presented with an approach by some of the abovementioned organizations, whereby they do not accept the premise that the lands that do not constitute personal property are state lands. It was claimed that in the absence of orderly registration of most of the land in Judea and Samaria, and precise registration of the rights of the local inhabitants, it is reasonable to assume that the local population is entitled to benefit from land that is neither defined nor registered as privately owned land. From this it follows that the use of land for the purpose of the establishment of Israeli settlements impinges on the rights of the local population, which is a protected population according to the Convention, and Israel, as an occupying power, is obliged to safeguard these rights and not deny them by exploiting the land for the benefit of its own population.

4. If this legal approach were correct, we would, in accordance with our Terms of reference, be required to terminate the work of this Committee, since in such circumstances, we could not recommend regularizing the status of the settlements. On the contrary, we would be required to recommend that the proper authorities remove them.

However, we were also presented with another legal position, *inter alia* by the Regavim movement (Attorneys Bezalel Smotritz and Amit Fisher) and by the Benjamin Regional Council (the expert legal opinion of Attorneys Daniel Reisner and Harel Amon). They are of the view that Israel is not an "Occupying Power" as determined by international law *inter alia* because the territories of Judea and Samaria were never a legitimate part of any Arab state, including the kingdom of Jordan. Consequently, those conventions dealing with the administration of occupied territory and an occupied population are not applicable to Israel's presence in Judea and Samaria.

According to this approach, even if the Geneva Convention applied, Article 49 was never intended to apply to the circumstances of Israel's settlements. Article 49 was drafted by the Allies after World War II to prevent the forcible transfer of an occupied population, as was carried out by Nazi Germany, which forcibly transferred people from Germany to Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia with the aim of changing the demographic and cultural makeup of the population. These circumstances do not exist in the case of Israel's settlement. Other than the fundamental commitment that applies universally by virtue of international humanitarian norms to respect individual personal property rights and uphold the law that applied in the territory prior to the IDF entering it, there is no fundamental restriction to Israel's right to utilize the land and allow its citizens to settle there, as long as the property rights of the local inhabitants are not harmed and as long as no decision to the contrary is made by the government of Israel in the context of regional peace negotiations.

5. Is Israel's status that of a "military occupier" with all that this implies in accordance with international law? In our view, the answer to this question is no.

After having considered all the approaches placed before us, the most reasonable interpretation of those provisions of international law appears to be that the accepted term "occupier" with its attending obligations, is intended to apply to brief periods of the occupation of the territory of a sovereign state pending termination of the conflict between the parties and the return of the territory or any other agreed upon arrangement. However, Israel's presence in Judea and Samaria is fundamentally different: Its control of the territory spans decades and no one can foresee when or if it will end; the territory was captured from a state (the kingdom of Jordan), whose sovereignty over the territory had never been legally and definitively affirmed, and has since renounced its claim of sovereignty; the State of Israel has a claim to sovereign right over the territory.

As for Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, many have offered interpretations, and the predominant view appears to be that that article was indeed intended to address the harsh reality dictated by certain countries during World War II when portions of their populations were forcibly deported and transferred into the territories they seized, a process that was accompanied by a substantial worsening of the status of the occupied population (see HCJ 785/87 Affo et al. v. Commander of IDF Forces in the West Bank et al. IsrSC 42(2) 1; and the article by Alan Baker: "The Settlements Issue: Distorting the Geneva Conventions and Oslo Accords, from January 2011).

This interpretation is supported by several sources: The authoritative interpretation of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the body entrusted with the implementation of the Fourth Geneva Convention, in which the purpose of Article 49 is stated as follows:

"It is intended to prevent a practice adopted during the Second World War by certain Powers, which transferred portions of their own population to occupied territory for political and racial reasons or in order, as they claimed, to colonize those territories. Such transfers worsened the economic situation of the native population and endangered their separate existence as a race."

Legal scholars Prof. Eugene Rostow, Dean of Yale Law School in the U.S., and Prof. Ju-

lius Stone have acknowledged that Article 49 was intended to prevent the inhumane atrocities carried out by the Nazis, e.g. the massive transfer of people into conquered territory for the purpose of extermination, slave labor or colonization.

"The Convention prohibits many of the inhumane practices of the Nazis and the Soviet Union during and before the Second World War—the mass transfer of people into and out of occupied territories for purposes of extermination, slave labor or colonization, for example. . . . The Jewish settlers in the West Bank are most emphatically volunteers. They have not been "deported" or "transferred" to the area by the Government of Israel, and their movement involves none of the atrocious purposes or harmful effects on the existing population it is the goal of the Geneva Convention to prevent." (Rostow)

"Irony would . . . be pushed to the absurdity of claiming that Article 49(6) designed to prevent repetition of Nazi-type genocidal policies of rendering Nazi metropolitan territories *judenrein*, has now come to mean that . . . the West Bank . . . must be made *judenrein* and must be so maintained, if necessary by the use of force by the government of Israel against its own inhabitants. Common sense as well as correct historical and functional context excludes so tyrannical a reading of Article 49(6)." (Julius Stone)

6. We are not convinced that an analogy may be drawn between this legal provision and those who sought to settle in Judea and Samaria, who were neither forcibly "deported" nor "transferred," but who rather chose to live there based on their ideology of settling the Land of Israel.

We have not lost sight of the views of those who believe that the Fourth Geneva Convention should be interpreted so as also to prohibit the occupying state from encouraging or supporting the transfer of parts of its population to the occupied territory, even if it did not initiate it. However, even if this interpretation is correct, we would not alter our conclusions that Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention does not apply to Jewish settlement in Judea and Samaria in view of the status of the territory according to international law. On this matter, we offer a brief historical review.

7. On 2 November 1917–17 Heshvan 5678, Lord James Balfour, the British Foreign Secretary, published a declaration saying that:

"His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

In this declaration, Britain acknowledged the rights of the Jewish people in the Land of Israel and expressed its willingness to promote a process that would ultimately lead to the establishment of a national home for it in this part of the world. This declaration reappeared in a different form, in the resolution of the Peace Conference in San Remo, Italy, which laid the foundations for the British Mandate over the Land of Israel and recognized the historical bond between the Jewish people and Palestine (see the preamble):

"The principal Allied powers have also agreed that the Mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration

originally made on November 2nd, 1917, by the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the said powers, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country. [. . .] Recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country.

It should be noted here that the mandatory instrument (like the Balfour Declaration) noted only that "the civil and religious rights" of the inhabitants of Palestine should be protected, and no mention was made of the realization of the national rights of the Arab nation. As for the practical implementation of this declaration, Article 2 of the Mandatory Instrument states:

"The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion."

And Article 6 of the Palestine Mandate states:

"The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes."

In August 1922 the League of Nations approved the mandate given to Britain, thereby recognizing, as a norm enshrined in international law, the right of the Jewish people to determine its home in the Land of Israel, its historic homeland, and establish its state therein.

To complete the picture, we would add that upon the establishment of the United Nations in 1945, Article 80 of its Charter determined the principle of recognition of the continued validity of existing rights of states and nations acquired pursuant to various mandates, including of course the right of the Jews to settle in the Land of Israel, as specified in the abovementioned documents:

Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements [. . .] nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties" (Article 80, Paragraph 1, UN Charter).

8. In November 1947, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the recommendations of the committee it had established regarding the partition of the Land of Israel west of the Jordan into two states. However, this plan was never carried out and accordingly did not secure a foothold in international law after the Arab states rejected it and launched a war to prevent both its implementation and the establishment of a Jewish state. The results of that war determined the political reality that followed: The Jewish state was established within the

territory that was acquired in the war. On the other hand, the Arab state was not formed, and Egypt and Jordan controlled the territories they captured (Gaza, Judea and Samaria). Later, the Arab countries, which refused to accept the outcome of the war, insisted that the Armistice Agreement include a declaration that under no circumstances should the armistice demarcation lines be regarded as a political or territorial border. Despite this, in April 1950, Jordan annexed the territories of Judea and Samaria, unlike Egypt, which did not demand sovereignty over the Gaza Strip. However, Jordan's annexation did not attain legal standing and was opposed even by the majority of Arab countries, until in 1988, Jordan declared that it no longer considered itself as having any status over that area (on this matter see Supreme Court President Landau's remarks in HCJ 61/80 Haetzni v. State of Israel, IsrSC 34(3) 595, 597; HCJ 69/81 Bassil Abu Aita et al. v. The Regional Commander of Judea and Samaria et al., IsrSC 37(2) 197, 227).

This restored the legal status of the territory to its original status, i.e. territory designated to serve as the national home of the Jewish people, which retained its "right of possession" during the period of the Jordanian control, but was absent from the area for a number of years due to the war that was forced on it, but has since returned.

9. Alongside its international commitment to administer the territory and care for the rights of the local population and public order, Israel has had every right to claim sovereignty over these territories, as maintained by all Israeli governments. Despite this, they opted not to annex the territory, but rather to adopt a pragmatic approach in order to enable peace negotiations with the representatives of the Palestinian people and the Arab states. Thus, Israel has never viewed itself as an occupying power in the classic sense of the term, and subsequently, has never taken upon itself to apply the Fourth Geneva Convention to the territories of Judea, Samaria and Gaza. At this point, it should be noted that the government of Israel did indeed ratify the Convention in 1951, although it was never made part of Israeli law by way of Knesset legislation (on this matter, see CrimaA 131/67 Kamiar v. State of Israel, 22(2) IsrSC 85, 97; HCJ 393/82 Jam'iat Iscan Al-Ma'aloun v. Commander of the IDF Forces in the Area of Judea and Samaria, IsrSC 37(4) 785).

Israel voluntarily chose to uphold the humanitarian provisions of the Convention (HCJ 337/71, Christian Society for the Holy Places v. Minister of Defense, IsrSC 26(1) 574; HCJ 256/72, Electricity Company for Jerusalem District v. Minister of Defense et al., IsrSC 27(1) 124; HCJ 698/80 Kawasme et al. v. The Minister of Defense et al., IsrSC 35(1) 617; HCJ 1661/05 Hof Aza. Regional Council et al. v. Knesset of Israel et al., IsrSC 59(2) 481).

As a result, Israel pursued a policy that allowed Israelis to voluntarily establish their residence in the territory in accordance with the rules determined by the Israeli government and under the supervision of the Israeli legal system, subject to the fact that their continued presence would be subject to the outcome of the diplomatic negotiations.

In view of the above, we have no doubt that from the perspective of international law, the establishment of Jewish settlements in Judea and Samaria is not illegal.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANU
NATARAJAN

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Anu Natarajan, an exemplary public servant from my district.

Anu began her career almost 20 years ago as a member of the City of Fremont's planning staff. She was appointed to the Fremont Planning Commission, with which she served for two years before her appointment to the City Council at the end of 2004.

During her time as an elected official, she helped guide the development of Fremont as it transformed itself into an extension of Silicon Valley and oversaw dramatic growth in the high technology and manufacturing sectors of Fremont's economy.

Just as importantly, throughout her tenure she has advocated for a community-based planning process to create well-designed, sustainable, and livable communities to further economic growth.

Anu also has served important roles for a variety of community and economic development organizations, including the MidPen Housing Corporation and the American Leadership Forum. As a board member of StopWaste.org, she helped establish our country's first countywide ban on single use plastic bags. She also has served for more than a decade as a Commissioner of the Housing Authority of Alameda County.

Anu's passion for community building has left an indelible mark on the City of Fremont and her tireless public service sets an example for us all.

Anu's tenure on the Fremont City Council ended this month, but she will not soon be forgotten. I want to offer her my thanks for her years of public service and to congratulate her on a job well done.

H.R. 5759, THE "PREVENTING EXECUTIVE OVERREACH ON IMMIGRATION ACT," AND H.R. 3979, THE "NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015"

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

H.R. 5759, THE PREVENTING EXECUTIVE OVERREACH ON IMMIGRATION ACT

Today I voted against H.R. 5759, the "Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act." This year, House Republicans have stonewalled on immigration reform and refused to work with Democrats. Instead of allowing a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that passed the Senate nearly a year and a half ago, the House voted on a resolution that is as unproductive as it is insulting to those harmed by our broken immigration system. Today's actions are another example of

the loudest voices on Capitol Hill turning their backs on our businesses, our faith leaders, law enforcement, and hard-working immigrant families.

The President's bold action is the right path forward, bringing millions out of the shadows, strengthening families, and growing our economy. The executive order is no substitute for comprehensive immigration reform, but, until then, this is a critical step in the right direction.

The President's action is not without precedent. Over the years, there have been dozens of executive actions taken on immigration matters, including from five Republican presidents. We cannot afford to lose billions in economic growth, totaling \$1 trillion over the next 20 years, that economists estimate the federal budget will lose as a result of our failed immigration policies.

We must build on the President's action—and the advocacy that inspired it—to enact comprehensive immigration reform. There is no other solution.

H.R. 3979, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
OF 2015

Today I voted against H.R. 3979, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2015. This is a critical time for the U.S. military, yet at the exact moment Congress should be having an in-depth debate over these difficult issues, we will be voting on a bill that's nearly 2,000 pages long and asked to take it or leave it, without amendment.

Support for this bill sidesteps critical issues. Those include dealing with a far-reaching interpretation of the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) currently used to justify U.S. air strikes in Syria; the recent doubling of U.S. troops in Iraq and their role; and, the recent authorization of an expanded role for U.S. troops in Afghanistan next year, instead of ending that war this year, as planned.

This Defense Authorization would also extend for a period of nearly two years the President's authority to train and equip highly vetted Syrian opposition fighters focused on combating ISIS and Syria's dictator, Bashar al-Assad. While not an authorization for U.S. boots on the ground in Syria, it does commit us to a long-term engagement in Syria. Congress should have taken this opportunity to debate the implications. But we did not.

There are some bright spots in this bill that I worked very hard to secure and am pleased to see them included. One is a critical two-year extension and expansion of the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) program. Without action in the NDAA, the U.S. would have left our Afghan allies in the lurch, without any path to safety in the U.S., as promised to them in exchange for their service to protect our men and women in uniform.

Also included is an amendment I offered to the NDAA in March that will require the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office to issue a report, on a regular basis, that forecasts the long-term estimated cost of the United States' nuclear weapons arsenal. The initial report that my amendment codified found that the Pentagon underestimated projected costs by \$150 billion. The United States is scheduled to spend at least one-half to two-thirds of a trillion dollars over the next 10 years on our nuclear forces and related programs. This spending, adjusting for inflation, is higher than

at the height of the Cold War. Transparency and nonpartisan oversight strengthens our democracy and promotes greater efficiency and effectiveness in government, especially in monitoring government spending.

It is unfortunate that this Defense Authorization is another missed opportunity to have the debate the American public deserves, and to set our military on a sustainable path.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF RUFINO BAUTISTA, JR.

HON. GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rufino Bautista, Jr. served as a Senior Field Representative in California's 35th Congressional District, which includes the communities of Bloomington, Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Ontario, Rialto in San Bernardino County, and the city of Pomona in Los Angeles County.

Mr. Rufino Bautista, Jr. provided constituent services to the people of the 35th Congressional District during my tenure in both the California State Legislature and now as Member of Congress.

As a senior member of my staff, having served for 10 years in the district, Mr. Rufino Bautista, Jr. helped establish the internship program in my office, and mentored many high school and college interns as well as new staff members who were eager to learn about policy and government and serve the constituents of the 35th district.

Mr. Rufino Bautista, Jr. was active in promoting increased community participation in the electoral process by helping to register nearly 20,000 new voters in the 35th Congressional District and its surrounding communities.

A native of Rowland Heights, California, Mr. Rufino Bautista, Jr. attended Bishop Amat High School and went on to earn a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Having served previously as an aide to the Los Angeles City Council, Mr. Rufino Bautista, Jr. has served the people of California at the local, state, and federal levels of government and moves forward with a wealth of experience in government service and community organizing.

Let it be known Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Rufino Bautista, Jr. be commended for his exemplary service on behalf of the Members of Congress of the United States, and extended sincere best wishes for every success in his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 1, 2014, I was unavoidably detained due to business in my district. Had I been present

on the House floor, I would have voted "aye" on roll call No. 532, H.R. 5629, the Strengthening Domestic Nuclear Security Act of 2014. I would have voted "aye" on roll call No. 533, H.R. 3438, the National Laboratories Mean National Security Act.

IN RECOGNITION OF SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCILMAN STEVE COHN

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Sacramento City Councilman Steve Cohn as he retires after twenty years of serving the community of Sacramento. As Councilman Cohn's family, friends, and colleagues gather to celebrate his career and his outstanding accomplishments, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring him, as he has contributed so much to the Sacramento region.

Councilman Cohn earned a bachelor's degree at Yale University, spent time as a Fulbright Scholar in France and graduated magna cum laude from the University of San Diego's law school. Professionally, Councilman Cohn was a leading lawyer at the California Energy Commission and the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

In 1994, Councilman was elected to the Sacramento City Council. Councilman Cohn's many accomplishments for the Sacramento region include expanding the regional transit and intercity rail service from Sacramento to the San Francisco Bay Area and beyond. He led efforts to modernize Sacramento's historic Downtown train station and has been committed to ensuring the Sacramento region has a strong public transportation system. Councilman Cohn's efforts on the City Council also improved public safety, ensured economic growth, and increased the region's level of flood protection. I have enjoyed working closely with Councilman Cohn, as he has been a true partner on a number of critical issues. Every park in his district has been renovated and families enjoy the annual Pops in the Park summer concert series that Councilman Cohn founded. Recognizing his accomplishments and leadership, Councilman Cohn has received numerous civic awards for his outstanding leadership.

As part of his regional responsibilities, Councilman Cohn has served as Chair of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Vice Chair of the Sacramento Metro Air Quality Management District and the San Joaquin (Rail Corridor) Joint Powers Authority (JPA), and Co-Chair of the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Policy Steering Committee. He has also served on the Boards of Sacramento Regional Transit, Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, Sacramento Library Authority, City Council Law & Legislation Committee, Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District and Sacramento Regional Human Rights/Fair Housing Commission.

Mr. Speaker, as Councilman Cohn's wife Catherine, family, friends, and colleagues gather to recognize him for his many years of

public service, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking and recognizing him for his many years of exemplary service.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE OF
BRET KNAPP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like take a brief moment to recognize the life, service and dedication of Mr. Bret Knapp. After a life of public service in our national laboratories, Bret passed away a few weeks ago at the too-early age of 56. This exceptional man spent 33 years working within our nuclear weapons laboratories, and leaves a lasting legacy of exceptional leadership, technical depth and—most notably—open, honest and straightforward communication.

An engineer by training, Bret thrived at the two “physics” labs often dominated by physicists and scientists. During 26 years at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), Bret led programs in all manner of defense and nuclear technologies and contributed to efforts that dealt with all phases of nuclear weapons research, development, sustainment, certification, and dismantlement. Bret’s broad experience and technical horsepower enabled him to dig into the details of any program and his direct and straightforward manner was always seeking solutions.

Bret received multiple awards for excellence from the National Nuclear Security Administration during the course of his career, and in 2006 was asked to move to LLNL’s sister laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), to help lead its nuclear weapons program. In November 2013, Bret was selected to serve as the Acting Director of Lawrence Livermore. Under his leadership, both LANL and LLNL carried out their critical but often-unheralded nuclear security missions for the nation.

My condolences, and that of the nation, go to his family as well as his professional family at the national labs. Bret will be missed, but his contributions to our country will endure.

RECOGNIZING ST. PAUL UNITED
METHODIST CHURCH

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize St. Paul United Methodist Church in my home state of Texas. After enriching the Dallas community for more than a century, St. Paul United Methodist Church has been recognized as a Texas Historic Landmark. The historical recognition of this church and its congregation in the Dallas community is an honor long overdue.

As a proud public servant of the thirtieth Congressional District of Texas, I am proud to see this tribute bestowed upon St. Paul United

Methodist Church. With a rich history deeply rooted in education, dating back to the early periods of the Emancipation Proclamation, St. Paul served as one of only a few schools open to African American children during this turbulent time.

For well over a century, St. Paul United Methodist Church has been a pillar in the faith community of Dallas, answering the call to serve District 30 constituents through fellowship, ministry, and safe haven. I am honored to represent St. Paul and its congregation in the U.S. House of Representatives. I deeply value this historic landmark, and I congratulate St. Paul United Methodist Church on this outstanding honor.

In honor of its numerous years of service, ministry, and leadership, I encourage my fellow colleagues and state legislatures to recognize the value in the deeply enriching culture of historic landmarks such as St. Paul United Methodist Church. Through their tireless efforts to serve their surrounding communities, they will provide enrichment for years to come.

HONORING RON BADGER

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Hoosier state, many small towns and cities take pride in their locally owned businesses. These small shops often have storied pasts and are unique for their high quality services and homey appeal. It is businesses like these that are the backbone of Indiana’s economy.

One such business is Badger’s Shoe Repair located on East Main Street in New Albany, Indiana. Currently owned and operated by Ron Badger, Badger’s Shoe Repair has been providing high quality shoe and leather service repair since its opening by Ron’s father, Morgan Badger, in 1940. There is much history in this store, finding its start during a time of shoe rationing in World War II. Many small shoe repair stores have come and gone since that time yet Badger’s has remained a staple of the community.

For nearly 75 years, customers from all around the region have come to Badger’s for not only its fine craftsmanship but also for the outstanding customer service. Each customer receives the highest quality of care and service while Ron also offers that unique Hoosier hospitality.

Ron Badger took over the family business in 1974 when his father retired after 34 years. At the age of 35, Ron gave up his career in clerical work to become his own boss and take over his father’s store. Ron has stayed true to the old ways of shoe repair, using the same techniques and equipment that his father did. This high-quality work and personal attention to detail has attracted some elite clientele, including boots used at the world-famous Churchill Downs.

Unfortunately, Badger’s Shoe Repair will be closing on December 31st of this year for the last time. After many years of hard work, Ron Badger has announced his retirement. I would

like to take this opportunity to thank and acknowledge Ron for his unique contribution to the Hoosier community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Ron Badger on all his wonderful accomplishments. His family owned store’s success serves as a shining example for many small business owners throughout Indiana and the rest of the country. I know that his family and community are proud that he kept Badger’s Shoe Repair open and successful for so many years. His hard work and Hoosier charm will surely be missed in the New Albany community.

MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently a very special event took place in my District in East Tennessee.

For three days in September, Medal of Honor recipients were honored at the Medal of Honor Convention in Knoxville.

The Medal of Honor is the highest award that can be given to military personnel. Recipients must meet a very high standard of “conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his or her life above and beyond the call of duty.”

There are less than 100 living recipients of this award—an elite club of brave soldiers unmatched anywhere. The word hero is used way too frequently these days, but this was a gathering to honor true American heroes.

A few months ago, I attended a reception at the East Tennessee Historical Society and planned to attend some of the events over the Medal of Honor Convention weekend. Unfortunately, my son Zane ended up in the hospital for 5 days, and I spent most of the weekend at the hospital or helping to care for my 18-month-old grandson.

It was a great honor for this convention to be hosted in East Tennessee. My state has a deep history of military service and is very patriotic.

Tennessee is known as the “Volunteer State” because of the high number of volunteer soldiers during the War of 1812 and the Mexican-American War.

It is also home to Alvin York, who is thought to be one of the most famous Medal of Honor recipients.

Medal of Honor recipient Gen. George Gillespie of Kingston, Tennessee, actually redesignated the Army medal, and many of our Nation’s first Medal of Honor recipients are buried in Tennessee.

Joe Thompson and convention co-chair Chris Coyne worked for three years to bring this event to Knoxville. It could not have happened without their dedication, creativity and patriotism.

Dozens of Medal of Honor recipients were honored during the convention, including Supreme Court Justice Samuel Anthony Alito, Jr. and retired Col. Jack Jacobs, now an NBC News military analyst, who declared Knoxville “to be the most beautiful place in the country.”

Mr. Speaker, this convention was a great honor for East Tennessee and a testament to

the patriotism and spirit of my District. I call this convention's success to the attention of my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, and I hope everyone takes a moment to honor these soldiers whose sacrifice for our freedom can never be repaid.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009 the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,994,739,178,153.43. We've added \$7,367,862,129,240.35 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.3 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

FORECLOSURE PROTECTION FOR
MILITARY SERVICEMEMBERS
LEGISLATION

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, as our economy continues to recover, some military servicemembers, particularly those leaving active duty, are facing financial challenges, such as find new employment, among other things. Additionally, a slow recovering real-estate market in some areas of the country can make it difficult for military members to sell their homes or purchase new ones upon receiving new orders.

That's why I'm introducing legislation today, with the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DENNY HECK, to provide a one year extension of foreclosure protection for military servicemembers leaving active duty. In 2012, Congress extended the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act protection against foreclosure for military personnel from three months to a year post-military service to help give servicemembers time to get on their feet financially and avoid the stress of potentially losing their home. These financial challenges still exist for many service members, particularly those re-acclimating to civilian life after serving abroad.

Extending this one-year protection from foreclosure time frame for an additional one-year will provide uniform treatment for servicemembers for an additional year and avoid confusion among servicemembers that could result if the time frame reverts to three months.

Our nation's military personnel are the best in the world, willingly putting their lives on the lines to protect our freedoms every day. The least we can do for them is ensure they have a home when they leave active duty service.

The gentleman from Washington, Mr. HECK, and I are pleased to be introducing this bill

today. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF PEARL
HARBOR, DECEMBER 7TH, 1941

HON. KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I sat in my office this past week, thinking, writing, and reflecting.

Trying to put together the words to honor those who gave the ultimate sacrifice 73 years ago is no easy task.

And no matter how many years pass, no words better describe that pivotal day than President Roosevelt's descriptor of "a date which will live in infamy".

And within an hour of those words, Congress launched the greatest generation into war against Imperial Japan.

While the names and faces of that day sink below the surface of our memory, photographs of that era packed away collecting dust, of those who rallied in support of our efforts, patriots, heroes, each and every one . . . The sacrifices of the greatest generation, standing boldly together against the great evils threatening us—will never die.

Let us proclaim once again, that whoever wishes us ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, and oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty and the people of this great nation.

Thank-you and God Bless You.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 17; Tuesday, November 18; Wednesday, November 19; and Thursday, November 20, 2014, I was out on medical leave recovering from surgery and unable to be present for recorded votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yes" on roll call vote No. 520 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5162), "no" on roll call vote No. 521 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 756), "no" on roll call vote No. 522 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 756), "no" on roll call vote No. 523 (on agreeing to the Stewart amendment to H.R. 1422), "yes" on roll call vote No. 524 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 1422 with instructions), "no" on roll call vote No. 525 (on passage of H.R. 1422), "yes" on roll call vote No. 526 (on agreeing to the Kennedy amendment to H.R. 4012), "yes" on roll call vote No. 527 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 4012 with instructions), "no" on roll call vote No. 528 (on passage of H.R. 4012), "yes" on roll call vote No. 529 (on agreeing to the Waxman amendment to H.R. 4795), "yes" on roll call vote No. 530 (on the motion to recommit H.R.

4795 with instructions), and "no" on roll call vote No. 531 (on passage of H.R. 4795).

LAKELAND WORLD WAR II
MEMORIAL DEDICATION

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my colleagues' attention to a very special dedication ceremony taking place in my home town of Lakeland, Florida.

The World War II Memorial Plaza at Veterans Park will be dedicated this Sunday, on the anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attacks on December 7, 1941. It is fitting that the first portion of the memorial to be placed will honor the casualties of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, December 7, 1941, is still a day that lives in infamy. The War in the Pacific was a hard-fought, slow, and deadly campaign that tested the very resolve of the American military. And yet, through the valor and heroism of our service men and women, we were victorious.

My own father served in the Navy in the Pacific theater, and the stories he told me growing up made me appreciate not only his patriotism and courage, but that of his brothers in arms. I am thankful that these brave heroes will be honored in Lakeland this weekend for their courage and sacrifice during one of the most important military campaigns in our nation's history, and with that, I yield back.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on November 17, 2014, on Roll Call #520 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 5162—To amend the Act entitled "An Act to allow a certain parcel of land in Rockingham County, Virginia, to be used for a child care center" to remove the use restriction, and for other purposes, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On November 18, 2014, on Roll Call #521 on Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 756, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1422) EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4012) Secret Science Reform Act; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4795) Promoting New Manufacturing Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On November 18, 2014, on Roll Call #522 on H. Res. 756, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1422) EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4012) Secret Science Reform Act; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4795) Promoting New Manufacturing

Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On November 18, 2014, on Roll Call #523 on Agreeing to the Stewart of Utah Amendment to H.R. 1422, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On November 18, 2014, on Roll Call #524 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 1422, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On November 18, 2014, on Roll Call #525 on passage of H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On November 19, 2014, on Roll Call #526 on Agreeing to the Kennedy Amendment to H.R. 4012, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On November 19, 2014, on Roll Call #527 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4012, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On November 19, 2014, on Roll Call #528 on passage of H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present I would have voted NAY.

On November 20, 2014, on Roll Call #529 on Agreeing to the Waxman Amendment to H.R. 4795, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On November 20, 2014, on Roll Call #530 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4795, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On November 20, 2014, on Roll Call #531 on passage of H.R. 4795, the Promoting New Manufacturing Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

HONORING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF JHONNY PINEDA

HON. GLORIA NEGRETE McLEOD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jhonny Pineda served as my Legislative Assistant for California's 35th Congressional District, which includes the communities of Bloomington, Chino, Fontana, Montclair, Ontario, Rialto in San Bernardino County, and the city of Pomona in Los Angeles County.

Mr. Jhonny Pineda contributed greatly to the public policy goals of my office and served as a legislative staff member to specifically serve constituent groups advocating for a better quality of life, assisting with housing issues, veteran issues, working conditions, education, and immigrants' rights.

Mr. Jhonny Pineda contributed to organizing numerous community events in my district of office such as grant workshops, community re-

source fairs, small business export forums, veteran town hall meetings, STEM education school programs, and healthcare hearings.

As a result of his work in Congress, Mr. Jhonny Pineda has had the unique opportunity of acquiring a deeper understanding of the legislative process, public policy formation in the nation's capital, while also providing assistance to the Hispanic CAUCUS and Diversity Task Force sub-committee.

A native of Huntington Park, California, Mr. Jhonny Pineda attended local grade schools, graduated from Bell High School, and went on to earn a Bachelor of Arts degree in Public Administrations from California State University, San Bernardino and Masters in Business Management from University of Redlands.

As a result of his outstanding service as Legislative Assistant for my congressional office, Mr. Jhonny Pineda is better equipped to provide valuable leadership and contributions to local, regional, state and federal governments; and professional, business, and community endeavors in the State of California and the entire nation.

Let it be known Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Jhonny Pineda be commended for his exemplary service on behalf of the Members of Congress of the United States, and extended sincere best wishes for every success in his future endeavors.

HONORING WAYNE H. WOOD

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Wayne H. Wood, a longtime constituent and friend of mine, and a lifelong friend to the farmers of Michigan. Mr. Wood is retiring after fourteen years as president of the Michigan Farm Bureau.

For most of his adult life, Mr. Wood has been dedicated to the well-being and advancement of the farmers that help put food on the tables of all Americans. Having served as president of the Michigan Farm Bureau since 2000, he also represented that same organization as its vice president the twelve years before that. He was first elected to the board of directors in 1984 as a Director-at-Large. But his roots run even deeper than that, as he was the president of the Sanilac County Farm Bureau for five years before he moved up to the state organization.

As a director representing the Midwest Region on the American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors, he has extended his influence beyond the borders of Michigan. His region includes a dozen states: Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin.

Mr. Wood has held a number of important positions of leadership related to the farming industry. He serves on and formerly chaired the Michigan Agriculture Preservation Fund Board, a nine-member board, appointed by the governor, which oversees the state Purchase of Development Rights program and

grant funding. He also spent four years presiding over the Michigan Farmland and Community Alliance, an MFB affiliate organization dedicated to farmland preservation.

In 2003, Mr. Wood became the sole agricultural representative on two high-profile councils. First, Gov. Jennifer Granholm appointed Mr. Wood to her Michigan Land Use Leadership Council, which was charged with studying urban sprawl and making recommendations to the governor on how to minimize the impact of current land use trends on the state's environment and economy. Second, the director of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality appointed him to a newly formed Environmental Advisory Council. The Council is responsible for advising the department on major issues that may affect DEQ programs, policies and operations.

In 2004, the general manager of the Michigan State Fair appointed Mr. Wood to co-chair a commission charged with studying and making recommendations regarding changes and improvements to the annual state fair. In 2005, Governor Granholm appointed him to a newly formed Michigan Food Policy Council, which is charged with making recommendations on ways to increase economic development opportunities in Michigan's food sector while improving agricultural production, community well-being and public health across the state.

Nationally, Mr. Wood was appointed by former Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz to the Rural Environmental Conservation Program Advisory Board.

I know that Wayne Wood's heart will never be far from dairy farming, as he will continue to run his own family farm with his wife, Diane, his son, Mark, his brother Randy, and his nephew, Greg.

On behalf of the people of Michigan's 10th District, and the farmers of Michigan and the Midwest, I congratulate Mr. Wayne H. Wood on his retirement and thank him for his tireless service.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SACRAMENTO JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE, ISAO FUJIMOTO, TOM OKUBO AND THE LATE MITSUYE ENDO

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of The Sacramento Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), Isao Fujimoto, Tom Okubo and the late Mitsuye Endo. As Sacramento JACL and community leaders gather to celebrate their organization and these three outstanding individuals, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring them for their great contributions to the Sacramento region and beyond.

Isao Fujimoto was born in 1922 and his family farmed strawberries in Santa Clara County. During World War II he spent time at the internment camps at Heart Mountain and Tule Lake. After the war he received degrees from University of California at Berkeley, Stanford University, and Cornell University. Prior to

joining the faculty at the University of California at Davis, he served in the United States Army as a correspondent in Korea and taught chemistry and English at San Jose High School. At UC Davis, Professor Fujimoto created many of the Asian American programs on campus and helped found the Students of Asian American Studies Program. Professor Fujimoto is active in the community and is very involved with the Central Valley Partnership. Professor Fujimoto is married to Christine Fry and they have two children.

Tom Okubo, born in 1925 in Stockton and attended Sacramento High School before being sent to the Tule Lake Relocation Camp at the age of 17. During World War II, Mr. Okubo was drafted into the United States Army and later served in the Korean War. Returning from war, he went back to school, met his wife Sue and they were married in 1948. He worked for the State of California for 37 years and started Sacramento Custom Tours when he retired in 1988. He and Sue have two children, two grandchildren, and a great grandson. Mr. Okubo is a true community leader and remains active in JACL, VFW and other community organizations.

Mitsuye Endo was born in Sacramento in 1920. In 1942 President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. At this time, Ms. Endo was working as a keypunch operator at the Department of Employment. She was dismissed from the State of California along with over 300 other Japanese-American employees as a result of EO 9066. Along with 100 others, she appealed this decision. Ms. Endo and her family were sent to the War Relocation Authority, then to Tule Lake and later to Topaz, Utah. Ms. Endo rightfully felt her confinement was unconstitutional and had the courage to stand up and declare it. She began fighting to get her civil liberties back by filing a petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus. The petition was denied, but Ms. Endo did not stop pursuing her case and her unalienable rights. Eventually her case made it to the Supreme Court. Ms. Endo's case would go down in history as *Ex Parte Endo*, and the Supreme Court eventually ruled in her favor. After Ms. Endo was released from the relocation camps, she married Kenneth Tsutsumi and they raised three children. In 2006, Ms. Endo passed away at the age of 85. In July 2014, Ms. Endo received a Presidential Medal of Freedom for her brave efforts as a loyal American in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, as the members of the Sacramento Japanese American Citizens League gather to honor Isao Fujimoto, Tom Okubo and the late Mitsuye Endo, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing them for their exemplary accomplishments and dedication to our nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CYBER SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Cyber Supply Chain Management

and Transparency Act of 2014, which is designed to address part of the matrix of ongoing vulnerabilities in our nation's government and cyber-infrastructure. This elegant approach emulates proven industry supply chain methods to stimulate the greatest cyber security impact with the least cost or disruption.

Mr. Speaker, with around ninety percent of a modern software application made up of open source components, the problem of deployed software containing open source components with known vulnerabilities is one of great concern.

One report showed seventy-one percent of all software applications built today contain an open source component with at least one known, critical vulnerability—and some in the government contain hundreds. Exploits against vulnerable applications bypass firewalls in place. Worse, in most cases, exploiting them is as easy as pointing and clicking on a free, downloadable attack tool that does all the work for even unskilled adversaries.

Mr. Speaker, the nation's economy needs open source software development and applications built with it. We could not survive in our modern economy without it.

It is precisely because of the importance of open source components to modern software development, that we need to insure integrity in the open source supply chain, so vulnerabilities are not populated throughout the hundreds of thousands of software applications that use open source components.

If a building contained a similar critical flaw, it could collapse, or if a car contained a known defective part, it could be lead to fatalities and need to be recalled.

Given both widely known and less public (but quite damaging) open source supply chain attacks that have been in the news over the last year, it is essential that the U.S. government begin to protect its cyber infrastructure, the data, and safety of its citizens from defective open source code containing known vulnerabilities.

Here is a short list of some of the recent cyber attacks based on open source vulnerabilities:

In July of 2013, vulnerable open source Struts 2 components allowed most major U.S. banks to be breached.

In addition to the highly publicized Heartbleed, 30 additional vulnerabilities in OpenSSL have been reported in 2014 alone. Several of these flawed components found their way into even critical infrastructure industrial controls (e.g. SIEMENS).

The "ShellShock"/"BashBug" attacks against bash leveraged mistakes in "bash" not noticed for over two decades, but is now affecting applications and embedded devices—some incapable of being updated.

In December 2013, 6,916 different organizations downloaded a version of *httpclient* with a broken *ssl* validation (CVE-2012-5783)—66,824 times, more than one year after the NIST NVD alert.

Bouncy Castle is an open source cryptography library used for applications requiring encryption. In 2013, 4,000 organizations downloaded a version of Bouncy Castle with a CVSS level 10 vulnerability 20,000 times—despite a fix being available for the last seven years.

Over the last year, the most often downloaded open source components with severity 10 (CVSS) NIST security defects, were downloaded by an average of 28 thousand organizations worldwide including all of the top ten Federal service providers (integrators). This means, these 28,000 downloaded components by the top ten U.S. government software contractors are now in software being run by the Federal government (and this does not even include commercial software also leveraging known vulnerable third party and open source components). Some of these defective components are as old as 7 years, but they are still being leveraged.

The CVE's in question are: CVE-2007-4575, CVE-2007-6721, CVE-2008-5518, CVE-2010-2272, CVE-2010-2276, CVE-2012-0391, CVE-2012-0392, CVE-2012-0838, CVE-2012-2379, CVE-2013-1777, CVE-2013-1965, CVE-2013-1966, CVE-2013-2115, CVE-2013-2134, CVE-2013-2135, CVE-2013-2251, CVE-2013-4316 and CVE-2014-1202.

Even one of the first founders of the open source movement was quoted in *Wired Magazine*, in an article titled, "The Internet is Broken," under a section subtitled "The Lie of Many Eyes" putting some historic and practical perspective on the assertion that "many eyes" of open source component construction prevents vulnerabilities being introduced:

"For Robert Graham, the CEO of consultancy Errata Security, Shellshock gives lie to a major tenet of open-source software: that open-source code permits 'many eyes' to view and then fix bugs more quickly than proprietary software, where the code is kept out of view from most of the world. It's an idea known as Linus's Law. 'If many eyes had been looking at bash over the past 25 years, these bugs would've been found a long time ago,' Graham wrote on his blog last week.

Linus Torvalds—the guy that Linus's Law is named after and the guy who created the Linux operating system—says that the idea still stands. But the fallacy is the idea that all open-source projects have many eyes. "[There's a lot of code that doesn't actually get very many eyes at all," he says. "And a lot of open-source projects don't actually have all that many developers involved, even when they are fairly core."

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Cyber Chain Integrity Act of 2014 is to help defend the U.S. government cyber infrastructure, and for DHS to carry out its mandate. On a going-forward basis we need all contractors of software, firmware or products to the U.S. Government to:

1) provide the procuring agency with a bill of materials of all third party and open source components used—along with their version numbers;

2) demonstrate that those component versions have no known vulnerabilities (NIST CVEs) for which less vulnerable alternatives are available and where exceptions are required, a written justification must be provided and risk accepted by the agency granting the exception;

3) provide secure update mechanisms affording a prompt and agile response when new vulnerabilities are discovered in those products; and,

4) supply said fixes and remediation updates within a reasonable specified time frame.

Put plainly: Tell us the ingredients, they can't be known to be bad, and they need to be updateable (as they may prove to be vulnerable in the future).

Further, the bill calls for each U.S. government agency to create an internal process for reducing exposure in existing infrastructure and to support operational security in DHS, to:

1) assess and inventory all third party and open source components (with version numbers) in any critical software, firmware or products now in use;

2) develop a risk based plan to remediate known vulnerabilities in third party and open source components now in use;

3) identify un-patchable products to provide compensating controls or migration to patchable replacements;

4) maintain and report lists of components and versions in use for inclusion in a centralized DHS inventory for the purposes of operational risk assessment and incident response:

a) Tactical Uses: Such a resource can more immediately answer "Am I affected?" and "Where is remediation required?"

b) Strategic Uses: A central inventory would also support actionable metrics about projects & suppliers with regards to project & supplier integrity, defect rates, Mean Time To Remediate (MTTR), etc. to support future acquisition and supply chain choices.

Mr. Speaker, physical building codes require a certain quality of steel be used for support beams, and dictate other requirements to ensure substandard building materials are not used in new construction. Similarly, cars must be recalled if they have defective parts (e.g. airbags). Restaurants must pass health code standards, and have specific hygiene and produce requirements so they do not make their customers sick.

This bill requires suppliers to provide a confidential bill of materials (to the procuring agency) of open source components used in their products—just like an ingredients list on the food we buy at the grocery store (not the secret recipes).

This bill does not ask for the source code or how the open source components work together, merely that the bill of materials be supplied to the agency procuring the products, and just like we demand of our cars, that these open source components contain no known defects or vulnerabilities to hackers.

The bill also takes into account future discoveries of open source components with vulnerabilities, like the infamous "Heartbleed" vulnerability, and mandates that software applications be patchable, that is, these vulnerable components can be replaced with non-vulnerable components.

Just like when you find out your car's brake lines need to be replaced, when an open source components are found to have a vulnerability or defect, it needs to be replaced. This bill will allow those patches to be applied. Unfortunately, the Heartbleed vulnerability revealed that many uses were not patchable in embedded devices (e.g.).

Mr. Speaker, the scale of the number of open source components being downloaded and used in software applications has grown at an exponential rate. This year, it is expected that open source components will be downloaded more than 21 billion times, for

use in software applications. Half a dozen years ago, roughly one billion were downloaded. The scope of the issue of open source component supply chain integrity is becoming more important as open source component use in software development explodes.

Here is a quick summary of what the Cyber Supply Chain Management and Transparency Act of 2014 does:

Ingredients: Anything sold to the federal government must provide a Bill of Materials of 3rd Party and Open Source Components (along with their versions) to the procuring agency.

Hygiene & Avoidable Risk: Software cannot use vulnerable components for which a less vulnerable component is available (without a written and compelling justification accepted by procuring agency).

Remediation: Software must be patchable/updateable—as new vulnerabilities will inevitably be revealed.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the committees of jurisdiction and leadership to move forward on this proposal.

RECOGNIZING MEYER COMMUNICATIONS

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Meyer Communications for broadcasting The Mormon Tabernacle Choir to the Ozarks area for over 50 years.

My dear friend Ken Meyer and his late wife Jane started Meyer Communications. Since its founding, Meyer Communications has been an outstanding neighbor in the Ozarks.

Jane passed away in 2001 but her generous spirit lives on today in the philanthropic endeavors of Ken and the Meyer Communications family.

For almost 86 years, the Mormon Tabernacle Choir has been dedicated to transcending cultural and generational boundaries through music. The Mormon Tabernacle Choir has been a much-loved phenomenon of broadcasting with the longest continuous broadcast on the air. Meyer Communications continues to present the Choir each week to be enjoyed by all in the Ozarks.

As we celebrate this special time of year with our family and friends, I want to say thank you to Jane and Ken Meyer for bringing the gift of music to the Ozarks.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE POPULATION COUNCIL

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Population Council (Council), an extraordinary organization that has continued to conduct thor-

ough and critical research on health and development issues throughout the world. Their work is thoughtful, empowering, and has helped governments, organizations, and community groups in over 50 countries to formulate policy, identify best practices, and allocate resources. Thanks to the work of the Population Council, millions of youth, families, and communities are benefitting from evidence-based interventions and programs, including education initiatives, family planning, financial literacy, and HIV/AIDS transmission prevention.

Founded in 1952 by John D. Rockefeller III, the Population Council was originally created to better understand population concerns. Throughout the 1950's and 1960's, the Council prioritized issues related to family planning, contraception and maternal healthcare initiatives both in the United States and abroad. In the following decades, the Council continued its vital health research, and published groundbreaking discoveries that have since saved countless lives and become accepted doctrine in the medical field. One example of the Council's pioneering work was the discovery in 1977 that smoking cigarettes while using oral contraceptives increased women's risk of heart attack, stroke, and death. Notably, since the Council first began researching and developing reversible contraception, over 120 million women worldwide have used a Council-developed contraceptive.

In the 1980's, the Council began what has now become decades of research on the biology, treatment, support, education, and prevention of HIV/AIDS. In 1996, the Council launched "Horizons", a research program on HIV/AIDS interventions funded by the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. This crucial initiative identified best practices associated with preventing and mitigating HIV and AIDS in developing countries. The Council has been instrumental developing home-based, self-testing oral HIV kits, integrating HIV and reproductive services at health clinics, and increasing male circumcision as a means to decrease the rate of female-to-male HIV infection. These practices, treatments, and outreach initiatives have been recognized by governing entities as the key to ending HIV/AIDS.

In recent years, the Council has invested substantial energy, time, and resources to understand the conditions faced by over 500 million adolescent girls in the developing world. Using evidence-based research, the Council has worked to develop and evaluate strategies to help young women lead more healthy and productive lives. Through its thoughtful and extensive research, the Council has demonstrated that when girls are given mentoring, life skills, social support, financial literacy, and education opportunities, their lives improve.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Population Council for their innovative and revolutionary work in improving the health and well-being of children, families, communities and countries worldwide. The Council's work has irrevocably altered healthcare and education systems for the better.

WILLIAM "BILL" FUJIOKA

H.R. 3572, H.R. 5769, H.R. 5771

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with Representatives XAVIER BECERRA, JULIA BROWNLEY, TONY CÁRDENAS, JANICE HAHN, ALAN LOWENTHAL, GRACE NAPOLITANO, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, LINDA SÁNCHEZ, ADAM SCHIFF, BRAD SHERMAN, and HENRY WAXMAN to recognize a dedicated leader and public servant, William "Bill" Fujioka, on his retirement as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the County of Los Angeles. His retirement marks the end of a remarkable four decades in public service for the Los Angeles city and county governments.

Bill Fujioka is a third-generation Japanese-American born to parents William and Linda Fujioka and raised in Boyle Heights and Montebello, California. His grandfather, Fred Jiro Fujioka, first arrived in Kansas City from Japan in the early 1900s and became a successful businessman and esteemed member of his community in California. Tragically, during World War II, the family was sent to an internment camp and all their possessions were confiscated during one of the darkest moments of U.S. history. Decades later, Bill has honored the Fujioka name as a faithful public servant for local government. He began his career as a janitor at UC Santa Cruz, and steadily rose to high-level positions within the city and county offices, including the city of Los Angeles' coveted seat as the City Administrative Officer. Seven years ago, he became the CEO of the County of Los Angeles with unanimous praise from the County Board Supervisors and many public officials. He broke barriers as the first person of color in this prestigious position, managing the largest county in the nation with over 100,000 employees and a budget of approximately \$27 billion. As CEO, he diligently oversaw the delivery of programs and services to the county's more than 10 million residents, including public safety and municipal services as well as programs for health, recreation, culture, and the arts.

Although he initially agreed to serve five years as CEO, Bill's dedication to the community compelled him to stay and help guide the county through the Great Recession. The county benefited immensely from his decision; during the Great Recession, no county employee was laid off or furloughed and many critical services were maintained and provided. His ability to stabilize the county during the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression is truly an extraordinary accomplishment.

Bill's success in managing the County of Los Angeles and his exceptional career as a public servant is a true inspiration for all of us. We thank him for his service, his leadership in the community, and for being a role model for so many.

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

H.R. 3572—To revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in North Carolina, as amended: On December 2, 2014, a conflict kept me from voting on H.R. 3572 under suspension of the rules. This bill revises the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in North Carolina. If I had been present, I would have voted for this legislation.

H.R. 5769—Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014: Today I voted for H.R. 5769, in part as a tribute our retiring colleague HOWARD COBLE. While the legislation contained many good provisions, it also had some disturbing ones. Key among them were those could make it harder for the U.S. to deliver food aid in a more timely, cost effective and impactful way. Any provision that could lead to increased tonnage requirements for our food aid merits significant scrutiny because added delay directly threatens lives already at risk. The House, federal agencies, and NGO stakeholders were, unfortunately, given no such opportunity for oversight before the final bill was brought to the floor. Should this bill be enacted in its present form, I look forward to working with Secretary Fox to ensure this provision is implemented fairly.

H.R. 5771—Tax Increase Prevention Act: During the debate on the House floor over H.R. 5771, the Tax Increase Prevention Act, it was clear I was torn. The reason I ultimately voted against this legislation is because it should have been the first order of business taken up by Congress, and not the last. This tax extenders package represents another failure to treat people right and fairly, and one more missed opportunity for reform. In addition, H.R. 5771 continues the harmful trend of adding the deficit while ignoring the low hanging fruit, where consensus is within reach and provisions are ripe for reform.

H.R. 5683 "ENSURING ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ACT"

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5683, the "Ensuring Access to Justice for Claims Against the United States Act."

I support the bill because it amends 28 U.S.C. § 1500 to remove the prohibition depriving the United States Court of Federal Claims of jurisdiction over any civil action against the United States pending in, or on appeal from, the U.S. Court of Federal Claims (CFC) in cases in which the plaintiff also has pending in another federal court a civil action

that includes a claim against the United States arising from the same set of operative facts.

Under current law, the Court of Federal Claims is prohibited from exercising jurisdiction over any claim in which the plaintiff has pending in any other federal court a lawsuit against the United States arising out of the same incident even if the lawsuit in the CFC seeks different relief.

When combined with other jurisdictional limits on the Court of Federal Claims and the court's statute of limitations, this prohibition forces plaintiffs to pick and choose among potentially meritorious claims against the United States and leads to plaintiffs being denied relief for unlawful government actions.

As Justice Sotomayor has observed, this jurisdictional bar imposes an unfair burden on plaintiffs by forcing them to "choose either to forgo relief in the district court or to file first in the district court and risk the expiration of the statute of limitations on their claims in the CFC."

The Administrative Conference of the United States has identified several examples of potentially meritorious claims against the United States that have been adversely affected by the jurisdictional prohibition contained in Section 1500:

1. A federal employee who sued the government in district court under both the Equal Pay Act and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Her Equal Pay Act claim was transferred to the CFC and was dismissed under Section 1500;

2. Property owners who sued in the CFC, claiming the government had taken their property without just compensation. Their claim was dismissed because they had previously sued in district court on a tort theory;

3. A local government that was sued by the United States in district court over taxation of certain federal office buildings filed a counterclaim against the United States for the taxes it believed it was owed. The counterclaims were transferred to the CFC and dismissed under Section 1500; and

4. An Indian tribe that sued in the CFC for breach of trust. Its claims were dismissed because it sued on similar claims in district court on the same day.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before remedies the deficiency in Section 1500 by striking the jurisdictional bar and replacing it with a presumptive stay provision.

Under the presumptive stay provision, a plaintiff could file and maintain actions arising out of a single incident in both the CFC and the district court at the same time, but the action that was filed second would be stayed until the first action is no longer pending.

The stay could be lifted by the agreement of the parties or upon a finding by a judge that the stay is not in the interest of justice.

This presumptive stay provision provides judges with flexibility to manage potentially duplicative litigation against the United States in a manner that is consistent with modern judicial practice.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5683, the Ensuring Access to Justice for Claims Against the United States Act, eliminates wasteful obstacles to justice and inefficient use of scarce judicial resources while at the same time protecting plaintiffs' ability to seek complete relief when

actions of the federal government violate their legal rights.

I support this legislation and urge all members to join me in voting for H.R. 5683.

RECOGNIZING THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 2014

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Jew-

ish Community Center of Stamford, Connecticut, for being named the 2014 S.T.R.I.V.E. (Sports Teach Respect Initiative Values and Excellence) Organization of the Year. The S.T.R.I.V.E. award is provided by the National Council of Youth Sports to organizations that implement youth sport practices that promote health and safety.

Since opening its doors in 1916, the Stamford JCC has been a valuable community resource, particularly well-known for its continuum of safe, supportive, and inclusive health and fitness programs for children and youth of all abilities, backgrounds, and financial circumstances. This year, more than 1,500 kids, ages three to sixteen, have taken part in

“kids-first” recreational activities, created to promote important attributes including teamwork, community engagement, sportsmanship, self-esteem and self-discipline.

I commend the Stamford JCC for this wonderful achievement, and for their work in helping promote healthy and safe recreational activities for children in Stamford.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, December 8, 2014

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

December 8, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRADLEY BYRNE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

THANKING THE PEOPLE OF AMERICAN SAMOA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank our fellow Americans and the people of American Samoa for the opportunity they gave me to serve them.

Having grown up in the small village of Vailoatai in American Samoa and having graduated from Kahuku High School in Hawaii, I never expected that the people of American Samoa would choose me to serve them in the U.S. House of Representatives from the time they first elected me in 1988 until 2014.

I pay special tribute to them and to the late Paramount Chief A.U. Fuimaono, who served as American Samoa's first elected representative to Washington, D.C. Paramount Chief Fuimaono gave me the opportunity to serve as his chief of staff from 1973 to 1975, and I am grateful for all he taught me.

From 1975 to 1981, it was my honor to serve with the late Congressman Philip Burton, who was chairman of the

House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs. During my service as his chief counsel, he instructed me with drafting legislation providing for the first elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor of American Samoa and for American Samoa to be represented by a Delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives. I will always be grateful and thankful for the opportunity that I had to participate in such a historic undertaking for and on behalf of the people of American Samoa.

After my service with Chairman Burton, the late Senate President, Paramount Chief Letuli Tololo encouraged me to come home and ai le pefu ma savali le ma'ama'a, which means, come back home to "eat the dust and walk on the rocks" so that I could feel the people's pains and sufferings and so that I might be able to serve them with more meaningful purpose.

I followed his advice, and as I look back over my life of service, had I not returned to American Samoa to live among our people, it would have been impossible for the people of American Samoa to have entrusted me to serve them for nearly four decades at home and abroad.

As I now leave this great institution, Mr. Speaker, I once more express my love for the people of American Samoa and to all my fellow Americans. I also want to express my love to my dear wife, Antonina Hinanui, who is from Tahiti, and our children for standing beside me throughout my years of service.

I express my love for my late father, Eni Fa'aua'a, Sr., and my dear mother, Taulaitufanuameaataamali'i. I also want to thank my siblings for their unwavering support.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I publicly want to thank my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, in the House and the U.S. Senate. We have worked together in close cooperation for many years, and I will always be grateful for their steadfast friendship, as well as their constant support for the initiatives I put forward on behalf of the people of American Samoa.

I especially want to thank our fellow Democratic leader NANCY PELOSI. My service with the late Congressman Phillip Burton, who was like a father to me, led to my friendship with Congresswoman PELOSI. Congresswoman PELOSI and I have been family since our Burton days, and I am grateful that she has been a part of my life for all these years.

I am also proud that Congresswoman PELOSI became the first woman in U.S.

history to serve as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. Congresswoman PELOSI will always hold a special place in my heart.

I thank my friends from around the world, including diplomats and world leaders from Vietnam, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Malaysia, Cambodia, Laos, Taiwan, both North and South Korea, China, India, Hong Kong, and elsewhere, for their friendship and support.

I also want to thank my staff in Washington, D.C., and in American Samoa for their loyalty and dedication to me, to our Nation, and to the people of American Samoa.

Above all, I thank my Heavenly Father for his guidance and protection.

I go forward, Mr. Speaker, knowing that the best is yet to come and hoping that I will be remembered for trying my best. For the times I fell short, I ask for forgiveness.

To each of my colleagues and to you, Mr. Speaker, I extend my kindest and highest regards. May God be with you always. Fa'afetai ma ia Soifua, meaning, in the Samoan language, thank you, and may peace be with you always.

CRISES IN VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, stability in the Western Hemisphere is in jeopardy due to the political and economic pressures occurring in Venezuela. Misguided financial decisions, attacks on entrepreneurship, and socialist policies have led the economy in Venezuela to a free fall.

With oil prices continuing to decrease, Venezuela is suffering from large budget shortfalls due to its large dependency on oil sales. To try to make up for the deficiency, the Venezuelans have a foreign debt of over \$100 billion and have had to cut its oil shipments to some Caribbean and Central American nations.

This paradigm shift can lead to an opening for the U.S. to get more involved in the region and deter the large democratic setbacks that we have experienced in recent years.

Venezuela's economic crisis is combined with its political problems and, Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge this body to stand in solidarity with the freedom-seeking people of Venezuela. Nicolas Maduro's intransigent, brutal regime continues to desperately and violently

silence dissonant voices who believe in freedom, in democracy, and in respect for human rights.

Just last week, democracy advocate Maria Corina Machado was summoned to a kangaroo court in Caracas. This courageous woman was, until recently, a member of the Venezuelan National Assembly until she was illegally removed from her seat in Congress by the Venezuelan thugs. Why was she removed from that seat? Because she spoke up for the people of Venezuela.

Before she was removed unjustly from her legislative seat, she was physically assaulted on the floor of the National Assembly. Yes, on the floor of the Venezuelan Congress, she was beaten up.

Maria Corina, despite being banned from leaving her country, continues to use the power of her voice to spread awareness about the violence and the corrupt nature of Nicolas Maduro's brutal regime.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, her case is not an isolated incident. Earlier this year, savage repression met the thousands of students who peacefully demonstrated, seeking a better Venezuela. Maduro, in desperation, used his National Guard and paramilitary forces to savagely quash the protest. During that time, innocent people were injured, arrested, and even killed, unarmed demonstrators killed by Nicolas Maduro. Seventy-two of those students remain in prison today, as well as two mayors who are in prison and opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez, another brave voice for freedom like Maria Corina.

Here is Leopoldo Lopez. He remains in solitary confinement in Ramo Verde military prison under the poorest of conditions and without regular access to visitors and all denying his due process. His wife, children, family, and friends are not allowed to freely visit him, Mr. Speaker.

His case caused international outcry from Amnesty International, stating that the charges against him are politically motivated and an assault on dissent in Venezuela.

More recently, the United Nations working group on arbitrary detentions, along with that body's top human rights officials, demanded the release of Leopoldo Lopez as well as the release of all of those who have been detained for exercising their legitimate right to express themselves freely.

In response, the Venezuelan regime stated that the U.N. body's decision was nonbinding on them, and so these innocent civilians remain in prison.

The Venezuelan people have been met with intimidation, with violence, with imprisonment for simply calling for respect for human rights and democratic freedoms in their own country.

So the United States must stand with them in their struggle for freedom. That is why this body passed H.R. 4587, the Venezuelan Human Rights and De-

mocracy Protection Act, in May, a bill that I authored. The bill targets Venezuelan officials by denying them visas to enter the United States, blocks their property, freezes their assets, and prohibits financial transactions of these thugs responsible for committing human rights abuses against the people of Venezuela.

I call on the Senate to pass the Venezuela sanctions legislation immediately to send a signal that these abusive tactics by the Maduro regime will have consequences.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Venezuela are sending us a distress signal, and the United States must stand ready to act for the cause of freedom, democracy of our own hemisphere. Democracy leaders like Leopoldo Lopez and Maria Corina Machado are counting on us.

HONORING HARRIET TUBMAN'S LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation's great history, the life of Harriet Ross Tubman is certainly a life worth recognition by this Congress and this country.

Harriet Tubman, born Araminta Ross in 1822, dedicated her life to the emancipation movement as a leader of the Underground Railroad that provided enslaved African Americans a pathway to freedom in the North. She served for the Union Army during the Civil War and as a caregiver for the elderly by establishing the Tubman Home for the Aged in Auburn, New York, where she lived out her life.

She suffered from traumatic brain injury throughout her life after she was hit as a teenager with a heavy weight by a slave overseer who was trying to subdue another enslaved person. She was an advocate for women's rights and worked to get women the vote. After settling in Auburn, she dedicated much of her life and effort to the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church there.

In 2008, the National Park Service completed a special resource study to determine the most appropriate way to recognize the life of Harriet Tubman. The Park Service eventually came to the conclusion that a park should include two geographically separate units. One would be a tightly clustered set of buildings in Auburn, New York, and the other would include large sections of landscape that are evocative of Tubman's life both as a slave and as a conductor of the Underground Railroad on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

The Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act, which I introduced, aims to further commemorate the life of Harriet Tubman by establishing the Harriet Tubman National Historical

Park in Auburn and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Dorchester County, Maryland.

Harriet Tubman Historical Park is located in Auburn, New York, and the part of that that includes historical structures like the Tubman home, the Tubman Home for the Aged, the AME Zion Church that she went to, and the Fort Hill Cemetery where she is buried.

Mr. Speaker, last week this House passed legislation as part of the armed services authorization bill to establish a park in Tubman's honor. This week I hope the Senate will also pass this legislation and send it to President Obama for his signature.

It is completely appropriate that this provision should be included, for, though not as well known as her activity on the Underground Railroad, Harriet Tubman was one of our first African American women military veterans. She volunteered her time and efforts, traveling to the South to help the Union war effort by helping fugitives and serving as a nurse to Union soldiers in Port Royal, South Carolina.

□ 1215

Eventually she was leading bands of scouts through the land around Port Royal, where her ability to travel unseen and fool her adversaries made her an ideal spy. Her group, working under the orders of the Secretary of War, made maps and collected important intelligence that aided the Union capture of Jacksonville, Florida.

Subsequently, Tubman became the first woman to lead an armed assault during the Civil War. When Union Colonel James Montgomery and his troops attacked plantations along the Combahee River, Tubman went with them and guided three steamboats around confederate mines in the waters leading to the shore. More than 750 enslaved African Americans were rescued in the Combahee River raid and, according to the newspapers at the time, most of those newly liberated men went on to join the Union Army, largely due to Tubman's recruiting efforts.

Mr. Speaker, Harriet Tubman lived for freedom and worked hard to extend freedom to hundreds of others. In doing so, she earned the Nation's respect and honor. A century after her death, I am proud to have worked so hard to establish a fitting memorial to her.

I truly believe that Harriet Tubman's example of inner strength, persistence, her love of freedom, and her dedication to the Nation based on the principles of freedom makes her as relevant today as she was in her own time.

Mr. Speaker, our time is filled with too much cynicism and people feeling powerless to do much to better our society. We should look to the example of

Harriet Tubman, a true American patriot. She was someone for whom liberty and freedom were not just concepts but were principles worth working for and fighting for.

According to Tubman's authorized biographer, Sarah Bradford, when Tubman had escaped from slavery in the Northern States, she said, "I looked at my hands to see if I was the same person. There was such a glory over everything. The Sun came up like gold through the trees and over the fields, and I felt like I was in Heaven."

We, Mr. Speaker, should look to Harriet Tubman, an enslaved African American woman of slight physical stature and suffering from head trauma, and realize that the glory and heaven that is American freedom is there for us all if we are willing to work for it and to fight for it and to believe in it, as Harriet Tubman did.

SOUTHERN PRESTIGE INTERNATIONAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in October, I had the privilege of visiting Southern Prestige International to view firsthand the company's creative and innovative manufacturing solutions.

Based in Statesville, North Carolina, Jim Wilson, one of the most creative and remarkable people I have ever met, started the company in March 1979 as Southern Prestige Industries. In 2013, this family-owned business joined with partners Jeff Eidson and Joey Chambers to form a new company, Southern Prestige International, and focus on future opportunities.

Currently, Southern Prestige International has two operating companies, ProEdge Precision and Specialty Perf. ProEdge Precision is an advanced manufacturer of precision machine components for the aerospace, defense, medical, energy, and commercial industries. Specialty Perf is a soft-goods perforator, producing specialty products for signage, advertising media, and food packaging, as well as one-way vision, energy diffusion/control, and medical products.

Although its business has taken on different forms over the years, today Southern Prestige International is a place where experience and confidence have prevailed to forge an advanced manufacturing business that understands the needs of its customers.

During my visit, I had the opportunity to meet with employees as well as local leaders in workforce development before touring the company's two manufacturing operations. ProEdge Precision currently employs about 35 people, and during the visit, Mr. Chambers told me he could see the company doubling its workforce in the next few

years to keep up with increasing demand. However, he also said one of the company's greatest challenges is finding the qualified workforce it needs to be a competitive manufacturer in today's marketplace.

It is my hope that Southern Prestige International will have an easier time finding these employees with implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, which aims to close the skills gap by modernizing and reforming our country's workforce development system. By streamlining the jumble of paperwork and red tape that has been prevalent in Federal workforce education programs, this law will provide direct access to education and skills development for in-demand jobs.

During the tour, I saw firsthand the cutting-edge equipment and methods used by Southern Prestige International and how they take advantage of industry innovations and develop proprietary advances of their own to give customers a competitive edge.

It is clear we need to stop Washington from telling employers every little jot and tittle of what to do and turn the American workforce loose to be productive and innovative, as it has been in the past.

The underlying philosophy of Southern Prestige International is that of customer service and high-quality products. It is clear that there is more wisdom in Iredell County than in Washington, D.C.

A PIECE OF HOME THIS CHRISTMAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States has our military all over the world, and we have for a good number of years. In fact, the United States has been at war for a long, long time.

This year, as we approach Christmas, families across America will gather around to enjoy homemade apple pie and turkey and each other's company, but our men and women in uniform, those volunteers, are still all over the world, protecting and representing the United States. These are America's best. It is the best we have in our country.

In 2005, I had the opportunity to go over to Iraq and see our military during the Christmas season. But before I left, I decided I would ask local schoolchildren and their teachers to help make some homemade Christmas cards and holiday cards to give to our troops when I arrived in Iraq.

So that year, after I landed, I took about 5,000 handmade Christmas cards—made primarily by schoolchildren—to our servicemen and -women in Iraq and also in Kosovo. Since that time, children in southeast Texas have been making handmade

Christmas cards and holiday cards for our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq and other parts of the world every year, and these cards are either taken overseas by me or they are shipped.

This year, the community in southeast Texas and the schools rallied, and the result is quite outstanding. I am proud to say that this holiday season we will be sending 96,000 handmade Christmas cards and holiday cards to our troops in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other parts of the world, primarily made by schoolkids in southeast Texas. Remember, Mr. Speaker, these are handmade cards. These are not store-bought cards.

These cards were received from various Texas residents. Just to name a few: Kingwood High School, Sterling Middle School, Timberwood Middle School, Goose Creek Memorial High School, Alamo Elementary, Horace Mann Junior High, the Hi Neighbor Club in Kingwood, Houston Methodist Hospital, Baytown Chamber of Commerce, the Baytown school district, the Baytown Housing Authority, Victory Hospital, and Boy Scout and Girl Scout clubs in southeast Texas.

Mr. Speaker, 80,000 of these came from the city of Baytown alone. So a big "thank you" to Rikki Wheeler, the executive vice president of the Baytown Chamber of Commerce, as well as to the Baytown schools, hospitals, and organizations for their remarkable contribution and organizing and managing the collection of these cards.

The patriotic spirit of those folks in southeast Texas to me is quite heartwarming, and the outpouring of support from Texans, primarily schoolchildren, is quite exceptional.

I want to thank all of those who have taken the time to bring joy to our troops in lands that are far, far away, those troops who will be separated from their families this Christmas. It is because of the schools, the teachers, and the schoolchildren that this is all made possible every year.

This is a way that people in southeast Texas show appreciation to our troops who are separated from their families this time of the year. Remembering to thank them and send them special greetings is very important.

Many of these schoolchildren have family members overseas who are serving in the military, and this small gesture brings comfort and cheer to all of those involved. A piece of home will mean so much to those who are representing us overseas, and it is possible only because the community volunteers to do this each year.

The simple act of making a handmade card shows the connection between our warriors and our schoolchildren who are thinking about them this time of year. So this Christmas, as Americans celebrate, we remember to say a prayer for those who safeguard America's freedoms.

We thank our volunteers in uniform, and we thank our volunteers who made this season quite special for our military by making these cards.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I will also include for the RECORD a list of other groups who have made holiday cards for our troops.

Advanced Aromatics/GCM High/Chevron Phillips
Aramark/Stuart Career Ctr.-Culinary Arts Awards & Engraving/St. Joseph's/Byt Draft'g/Staff'g
Bayer/Clark Elementary
Baytown GMC/Bowie Elem.
Baytown Sun/GCCISD Public Relations
Beacon FCU/Ashbel Smith Elem.
CenterPoint/Gentry Jr.
Chevron Phillips/Crockett Elem.
CRCU/Lamar Elem.
Community Toyota/Highlands Jr.
Crespo & Jirrels/Peter Hyland (ALP)
ExxonMobil/RE Lee High
ExxonMobil/Walker Elem.
ExxonMobil/Travis Elem.
ExxonMobil/San Jacinto Elem.
ExxonMobil/Baytown Jr.
ExxonMobil/Cedar Bayou Jr.
Highlands C of C/Hopper Primary
Highlands Rotary/Highlands Elementary
Houston Methodist San Jac Hosp/RS Sterling High
Kiwanis Club/Alamo Elem.
LCY/Harlem Elem.
Legacy/Point Alternative
Rotary/DeZavala Elem.
Shine Dental/Impact Early College High School
SNC-GDS/Horace Mann Jr.
Solvay/Carver Elem.
Texas First/SF Austin Elem.
GCCISD Special Olympics
Stuart Career Ctr.
Woodforest/Banuelos Elem.
BCA 2nd Grade Class

AMERICA'S SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask for a moment that my colleagues imagine a situation. Imagine a few years down the road that a Republican President announces he has instructed the Justice Department to no longer enforce the Clean Air Act, that he has told the Justice Department to no longer prosecute violations of the Clean Air Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rise up with frustration and indignation. They would say the President has failed to faithfully execute the laws passed by Congress, as he has been constitutionally required to do, and they would be right to do so.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is happening in our country today. President Obama has chosen unilaterally not to enforce our Nation's longstanding immigration laws. He has made this decision without any consultation with Congress and entirely on his own.

Think for a moment about the precedent this action sets: that a President

can alter longstanding law simply through an executive memo and his words, a President can simply say that he is not going to enforce the law. That would be frightening to all Americans, regardless of political belief.

Let's be clear what this action is not. It is not prosecutorial discretion.

No one doubts that the President has prosecutorial discretion. But this goes far beyond that power and enters into new territory that, frankly, has never before been touched.

I believe this issue was settled long ago, before our country was even founded. You see, in the 17th century in Britain, during this big fight between the King of England and Parliament, the King said that he had prerogative powers, the ability to override Parliament. And there were battles. There were wars in Britain about how this was going to be settled. And the Parliament determined, in consultation with the courts, that the King couldn't, on his own, do that, that he couldn't just simply say, I am going to dispense with the laws or suspend their operations for a period of time.

Our Founding Fathers knew this history well, and when they put together the Constitution of our country, in article II, they had that in their minds when they gave to the President the obligation—not the option—to faithfully execute the laws, all the laws of the United States, regardless of whether the President agrees with those laws or not.

I would say that this type of executive action is clearly not what the Founders had in mind when they drafted our Constitution. The main overriding goal of our forefathers was to prevent the executive from becoming too powerful, and they went to great efforts to ensure a strong system of checks and balances.

President Obama's executive action runs in the face of how our government was designed to operate. Let's also remember that earlier this year, President Obama said his policies—all of them—would be on the ballot in the mid-term elections. And the American people went to the polls and soundly rejected the President's policies. They made clear they were not supportive of more unilateral executive action. They wanted us to work together.

□ 1230

As a Congress, we warned the President not to go forward with this executive action.

Mr. Speaker, we need a solution to our Nation's immigration problem, but by using executive action, the President has made finding common ground far more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this House should rise above the actions of the President, and early next year, we should send the President real border security legislation, much like the bor-

der security legislation we passed in this House this past summer, yet the Senate wouldn't even take up.

This House should pass legislation to update and fix the worker visa program. This House should pass legislation to put in place E-Verify for all employers. This House should pass legislation to tighten internal security. Then, and only then, when we go through all of those pieces of legislation, should we even begin to discuss what we are going to do about the millions of people who are in this country illegally.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the more the President acts outside the bounds of his powers, the harder it becomes to actually achieve a solution. It leads me to wonder: Does President Obama actually want a long-term, lasting solution to immigration? His actions imply otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to rethink his approach to the immigration debate. I urge him to abandon this ill-conceived executive action and, instead, to come to the table and work with the Republicans and Democrats in the Congress and both Houses to find together the commonsense solutions that we need to find for these problems.

We are capable of doing that. That is how our Founders intended our government to operate, and anything other than that is a disservice to the American people.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 8, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 8, 2014 at 10:37 a.m.:

That the Senate passed H.R. 2366
That the Senate passed H.R. 4812
That the Senate passed H.R. 5108
That the Senate passed H.R. 5462
That the Senate passed H.R. 5739
That the Senate passed H. Con. Res. 120
That the Senate passed H.J. Res. 105
That the Senate passed S. 1447
That the Senate passed S. 1683
That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 45

Appointments:
Katherine Tobin of Virginia, United States-China Economic Security Review Commission.

Tom Girardi of California, Library of Congress Trust Fund Board.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Lieutenant Commander Robert Burns, Chaplain, United States Navy Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, Plantation, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we praise You for You have blessed this land with a diverse multitude gathered from every nation, tribe, people, and language. You have bound us together with noble ideals of liberty, justice, equality, and yet we struggle to be one people, a unified Nation.

We pray for all the Members of this House, asking You to bless them with wisdom and discernment to lead our people to reconciliation, to rebuild our Nation's confidence in justice, to restore our sense of equality. Free them from the divisive distractions of any lesser ideals that they may more powerfully serve the people as a House in one accord, making every effort to keep the unity of the people through the bond of peace.

Bless also our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines deployed overseas as they continue to bring peace to this troubled world. We pray in Your Holy Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

IMMIGRATION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, President Obama significantly overstepped the bounds of his constitutionally granted executive authority when he took steps to grant amnesty to millions of immigrants who are in the United States illegally.

Prior to his unilateral actions, the President himself acknowledged repeatedly that this is not how our democracy functions, and the way to reform this Nation's broken immigration system is legislatively. As they say in North Carolina, the President has "gone to meddling." It is absolutely critical that we go on record against his unparalleled power grab, and Congress must do everything it can to stop his destructive actions.

As the granddaughter of Italian immigrants, I am thankful America has always opened her arms to people looking to build a better way for themselves and their families legally. However, breaking the law to enter the United States should not be rewarded. It is wrong to short-circuit the American immigration process in this manner when there are so many individuals who have waited years for the opportunity to come to this country the right way, the legal way.

RECOGNIZING FIU VP OF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS STEVE SAULS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the career of Steve Sauls, who is retiring this month from Florida International University.

As vice president of government relations for Miami's public research university—and my alma mater—Steve has always aimed for a more beautiful day in south Florida.

Early in his career as a House staffer, Steve helped craft the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, opening the doors of opportunity to thousands of Cubans fleeing the oppression of Fidel Castro.

After moving to Miami, Steve was instrumental in creating the International Hurricane Research Center following Hurricane Andrew, helping advance research to make south Florida and the Nation more resilient to hurricanes.

Congratulations, Steve, on a fulfilling career and a well-deserved retirement, and please do enjoy your own fair share of beautiful days in south Florida.

RECOGNIZING PUEBLO EAST BOYS FOOTBALL TEAM

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Pueblo East High School football team and their coach, David Ramirez, who claimed their first Class 3A football title.

The Eagles and their opponents, the Rifle Bears, who had an impressive 12-win season, both showed great sportsmanship and determination in the final game, resulting in a 30-14 victory for the Eagles.

All year long Coach Ramirez and his staff instilled confidence in the Eagle team to work hard but most importantly believe in themselves and their quest for a championship. With grit and a long tradition of Eagle pride, a stellar season was realized in the culmination of a State football title. The city of Pueblo is extremely proud of this team. Each coach, player, and the staff of this Eagle football team will stand tall among the great athletic champions in Pueblo sports history.

Mr. Speaker, with Coach Ramirez's leadership and the team's hard work, Pueblo East captured their first football championship in school history while establishing a legacy of dedication and commitment to the game. There is no doubt that future Eagle teams will be inspired to do the same. We are very proud of them.

CORRECTION TO ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3979, PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979, pursuant to House Resolution 770, the Clerk be instructed to make the correction I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 3050 of the House amendment, strike "2013" and insert "2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 770, I call up the bill (H.R. 5781) to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 770, the amendment printed in part C of House Report 113-646 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5781

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF

Sec. 101. Definitions.

Sec. 102. Emergency projects.

Sec. 103. Temporary operational flexibility for first few storms of the water year.

Sec. 104. Progress report.

Sec. 105. Status of surface storage studies.

TITLE II—PROTECTION OF THIRD-PARTY WATER RIGHTS

Sec. 201. Offset for State Water Project.

Sec. 202. Area of origin protections.

Sec. 203. No redirected adverse impacts.

Sec. 204. Allocations for Sacramento Valley Contractors.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Effect on existing obligations.

Sec. 302. Termination of authorities.

TITLE I—CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT.**—The term “Central Valley Project” has the meaning given the term in section 3403 of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (106 Stat. 4707).

(2) **DELTA.**—The term “Delta” means the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and the Suisun Marsh, as defined in sections 12220 and 29101 of the California Public Resources Code.

(3) **NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE LONG-TERM SURVIVAL.**—The term “negative impact on the long-term survival” means to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a listed species in the wild by reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of that species.

(4) **SALMONID BIOLOGICAL OPINION.**—The term “salmonid biological opinion” means the biological opinion issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service on June 4, 2009.

(5) **SECRETARIES.**—The term “Secretaries” means—

(A) the Secretary of Commerce; and

(B) the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) **SMELT BIOLOGICAL OPINION.**—The term “smelt biological opinion” means the biological opinion on the Long-Term Operational Criteria and Plan for coordination of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on December 15, 2008.

(7) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of California.

(8) **STATE WATER PROJECT.**—The term “State Water Project” means the water project described by California Water Code section 11550 et seq. and operated by the California Department of Water Resources.

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY PROJECTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the priority of individuals or entities, including those with Sacramento River Settlement Contracts, that have priority to the diversion and use of water over water rights held by the United States for operations of the Central Valley Project and over rights held by the State for

operations of the State Water Project and the United States obligation to make a substitute supply of water available to the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors, the Secretaries shall direct the operations of the Central Valley Project and allow the State Water Project to provide the maximum quantity of water supplies possible to Central Valley Project agricultural, municipal and industrial, and refuge service and repayment contractors, and State Water Project contractors, by approving, consistent with applicable laws (including regulations)—

(1) any project or operations to provide additional water supplies if there is any possible way whatsoever that the Secretaries can do so unless the project or operations constitute a highly inefficient way of providing additional water supplies; and

(2) any projects or operations as quickly as possible based on available information to address the emergency conditions.

(b) **MANDATE.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the applicable Secretary shall—

(1) authorize and implement actions to ensure that the Delta Cross Channel Gates remain open to the maximum extent practicable using findings from the United States Geological Survey on diurnal behavior of juvenile salmonids, timed to maximize the peak flood tide period and provide water supply and water quality benefits, consistent with operational criteria and monitoring set forth in the California State Water Resources Control Board’s Order Approving a Temporary Urgency Change in License and Permit Terms in Response to Drought Conditions, effective January 31, 2014, or a successor order;

(2)(A) implement turbidity control strategies that allow for increased water deliveries for the Central Valley Project and State Water Project while avoiding a negative impact on the long-term survival delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) due to entrainment at Central Valley Project and State Water Project pumping plants;

(B) operating within the ranges provided for in the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion to minimize water supply reductions for the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project, manage reverse flow in Old and Middle Rivers at –5,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) unless current scientific data indicate a less negative Old and Middle River flow is necessary to avoid a negative impact on the long-term survival of the listed species; and

(C) show in writing that any determination to manage OMR reverse flow at rates less negative than –5000 cubic feet per second is necessary to avoid a significant negative impact on the long-term survival of the Delta smelt, including an explanation of the data examined and the connection between those data and the choice made prior to reducing pumping to a rate less negative than –5000 cfs;

(3) adopt a 1:1 inflow to export ratio for the increment of increased flow of the San Joaquin River, as measured as a 3-day running average at Vernalis during the period from April 1 through May 31, resulting from voluntary sale, transfers, or exchanges of water from agencies with rights to divert water from the San Joaquin River or its tributaries on the condition that a proposed sale, transfer, or exchange under this paragraph may only proceed if the Secretary of the Interior determines that the environmental effects of the proposed sale, transfer, or exchange are consistent with effects permissible under applicable law (including regulations), and provided that Delta conditions are suitable to

allow movement of the acquired, transferred, or exchanged water through the Delta consistent with the Central Valley Project’s and the State Water Project’s permitted water rights;

(4) issue all necessary permit decisions under the authority of the Secretaries within 30 days of receiving a completed application by the State to place and use temporary barriers or operable gates in Delta channels to improve water quantity and quality for Central Valley Project and State Water Project contractors and other water users, which barriers or gates should provide benefits for species protection and in-Delta water user water quality and shall be designed such that formal consultations under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) would not be necessary;

(5)(A) complete all requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) necessary to make final permit decisions on water transfer requests associated with voluntarily fallowing nonpermanent crops in the State, within 30 days of receiving such a request; and

(B) allow any water transfer request associated with fallowing to maximize the quantity of water supplies available for non-habitat uses as long as the fallowing and associated water transfer are in compliance with applicable Federal laws (including regulations);

(6) allow any North of Delta agricultural water service contractor with unused Central Valley Project water to take delivery of such unused water through April 15, of the contract year immediately following the contract year in which such water was allocated, if—

(A) the contractor requests the extension; and

(B) the requesting contractor certifies that, without the extension, the contractor would have insufficient supplies to adequately meet water delivery obligations;

(7) to the maximum extent possible based on the availability and quality of groundwater and without causing land subsidence—

(A) meet the Level 2 and Level 4 water supply needs of units of the National Wildlife Refuge System in the Central Valley of California, the Gray Lodge, Los Banos, Volta, North Grasslands, and Mendota State wildlife management areas, and the Grasslands Resources Conservation District in the Central Valley of California through the improvement or installation of wells to use groundwater resources and the purchase of water from willing sellers; and

(B) make a quantity of Central Valley Project water obtained from the measures implemented under subparagraph (A) available to Central Valley Project water service contractors; and

(8) implement instream and offsite projects in the Delta and upstream in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin basins, in coordination with the California Department of Water Resources and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, that offset the effects on species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) due to actions taken under this Act.

(c) **OTHER AGENCIES.**—To the extent that a Federal agency other than agencies headed by the Secretaries has a role in approving projects described in subsections (a) and (b), the provisions of this section shall apply to those Federal agencies.

(d) **ACCELERATED PROJECT DECISION AND ELEVATION.**—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the State, the heads of Federal agencies shall use the expedited procedures under this subsection to make final decisions relating to a Federal project or operation to provide additional water supplies or address emergency drought conditions pursuant to subsections (a) and (b).

(2) REQUEST FOR RESOLUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the State, the head of an agency referred to in subsection (a), or the head of another Federal agency responsible for carrying out a review of a project, as applicable, the Secretary of the Interior shall convene a final project decision meeting with the heads of all relevant Federal agencies to decide whether to approve a project to provide emergency water supplies.

(B) MEETING.—The Secretary of the Interior shall convene a meeting requested under subparagraph (A) not later than 7 days after receiving the meeting request.

(3) NOTIFICATION.—Upon receipt of a request for a meeting under this subsection, the Secretary of the Interior shall notify the heads of all relevant Federal agencies of the request, including the project to be reviewed and the date for the meeting.

(4) DECISION.—Not later than 10 days after the date on which a meeting is requested under paragraph (2), the head of the relevant Federal agency shall issue a final decision on the project in writing.

(5) MEETING CONVENED BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Interior may convene a final project decision meeting under this subsection at any time, at the discretion of the Secretary, regardless of whether a meeting is requested under paragraph (2).

SEC. 103. TEMPORARY OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY FOR FIRST FEW STORMS OF THE WATER YEAR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with avoiding a negative impact on the long-term survival in the short-term upon listed fish species beyond the range of those authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and other environmental protections under subsection (d), the Secretaries shall authorize the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project, combined, to operate at levels that result in negative Old and Middle River flows at -7500 cubic feet per second (based on United States Geological Survey gauges on Old and Middle Rivers) daily average for 28 cumulative days after October 1, as described in subsection (b).

(b) DAYS OF TEMPORARY OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY.—The temporary operational flexibility described in subsection (a) shall be authorized on days that the California Department of Water Resources determines the daily average river flow of the Sacramento River is at, or above, 17,000 cubic feet per second as measured at the Sacramento River at Freeport gauge maintained by the United States Geological Survey.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH ESA AUTHORIZATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretaries may continue to impose any requirements under the smelt and salmonid biological opinions during any period of temporary operational flexibility as they determine are reasonably necessary to avoid additional negative impacts on the long-term survival of a listed fish species beyond the range of those authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(d) OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS.—

(1) The Secretaries' actions under this section shall be consistent with applicable regulatory requirements under state law, including State Water Resources Control Board De-

cision 1641, as it may be implemented in any given year.

(2) During the first flush of sediment out of the Delta in each water year, and provided that such determination is based upon objective evidence, OMR flow may be managed at rates less negative than -5000 cubic feet per second for a minimum duration to avoid movement of adult Delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) to areas in the southern Delta that would be likely to increase entrainment at Central Valley Project and State Water Project pumping plants.

(3) This section shall not affect the application of the salmonid biological opinion from April 1 to May 31, unless the Secretary of Commerce finds that some or all of such applicable requirements may be adjusted during this time period to provide emergency water supply relief without resulting in additional adverse effects beyond those authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. In addition to any other actions to benefit water supply, the Secretary and the Secretary of Commerce shall consider allowing through-Delta water transfers to occur during this period.

(4) During operations under this section, the Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with the Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, shall undertake a monitoring program and other data gathering to ensure incidental take levels are not exceeded, and to identify potential negative impacts and actions, if any, necessary to mitigate impacts of the temporary operational flexibility to species listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(e) TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS TO TARGET PERIOD.—If, before temporary operational flexibility has been implemented on 28 cumulative days, the Secretaries operate the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project combined at levels that result in Old and Middle River flows less negative than -7500 cubic feet per second during days of temporary operational flexibility as defined in subsection (b), the duration of such operation shall not be counted toward the 28 cumulative days specified in subsection (a).

(f) EMERGENCY CONSULTATION; EFFECT ON RUNNING AVERAGES.—

(1) If necessary to implement the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall use the emergency consultation procedures under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and its implementing regulation at section 402.05, title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, to temporarily adjust the operating criteria under the biological opinions, solely for the 28 cumulative days of temporary operational flexibility—

(A) no more than necessary to achieve the purposes of this section consistent with the environmental protections in subsections (c) and (d); and

(B) including, as appropriate, adjustments to ensure that the actual flow rates during the periods of temporary operational flexibility do not count toward the 5-day and 14-day running averages of tidally filtered daily Old and Middle River flow requirements under the biological opinions.

(2) At the conclusion of the 28 cumulative days of temporary operational flexibility, the Secretary of the Interior shall not reinstate consultation on these adjusted operations, and no mitigation shall be required, if the effects on listed fish species of these operations under this section remain within the range of those authorized under the Endangered Species Act. If the Secretary of the Interior reinstitutes consultation, no mitigation measures shall be required.

(g) LEVEL OF DETAIL REQUIRED FOR ANALYSIS.—In articulating the determinations required under this section, the Secretaries shall fully satisfy the requirements herein but shall not be expected to provide a greater level of supporting detail for the analysis than feasible to provide within the short time frame permitted for timely decision-making in response to changing conditions in the Delta.

SEC. 104. PROGRESS REPORT.

Ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretaries shall provide a progress report describing the implementation of sections 101, 102, and 103 to the Committee on Natural Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate.

SEC. 105. STATUS OF SURFACE STORAGE STUDIES.

One year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide a progress report on the status of feasibility studies undertaken pursuant to section 103(d)(1) to the Committee on Natural Resources in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate. The report shall include timelines for study completion, draft environmental impact statements, final environmental impact statements, and Records of Decision.

TITLE II—PROTECTION OF THIRD-PARTY WATER RIGHTS

SEC. 201. OFFSET FOR STATE WATER PROJECT.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION IMPACTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall confer with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in connection with the implementation of this Act on potential impacts to any consistency determination for operations of the State Water Project issued pursuant to California Fish and Game Code section 2080.1.

(b) ADDITIONAL YIELD.—If, as a result of the application of this Act, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife—

(1) revokes the consistency determinations pursuant to California Fish and Game Code section 2080.1 that are applicable to the State Water Project;

(2) amends or issues one or more new consistency determinations pursuant to California Fish and Game Code section 2080.1 in a manner that directly or indirectly results in reduced water supply to the State Water Project as compared with the water supply available under the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion; or

(3) requires take authorization under section 2081 for operation of the State Water Project in a manner that directly or indirectly results in reduced water supply to the State Water Project as compared with the water supply available under the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion,

ment's action, Central Valley Project yield is greater than it would have been absent the Department's actions, then that additional yield shall be made available to the State Water Project for delivery to State Water Project contractors to offset losses resulting from the Department's action.

(c) NOTIFICATION RELATED TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall immediately notify the Director of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in writing if the Secretary of the Interior determines that implementation of the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion consistent with this Act reduces environmental protections for any species covered by the opinions.

SEC. 202. AREA OF ORIGIN PROTECTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior is directed, in the operation of the Central Valley Project, to adhere to California's water rights laws governing water rights priorities and to honor water rights senior to those held by the United States for operation of the Central Valley Project, regardless of the source of priority, including any appropriative water rights initiated prior to December 19, 1914, as well as water rights and other priorities perfected or to be perfected pursuant to California Water Code Part 2 of Division 2, Article 1.7 (commencing with section 1215 of chapter 1 of part 2 of division 2, sections 10505, 10505.5, 11128, 11460, 11461, 11462, and 11463, and sections 12200 to 12220, inclusive).

(b) **DIVERSIONS.**—Any action undertaken by the Secretaries pursuant to both this Act and section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531, et seq.) that requires that diversions from the Sacramento River or the San Joaquin River watersheds upstream of the Delta be bypassed shall not be undertaken in a manner that alters the water rights priorities established by California law.

(c) **ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.**—Nothing in this title alters the existing authorities provided to and obligations placed upon the Federal Government under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531, et seq.), as amended.

(d) **CONTRACTS.**—With respect to individuals and entities with water rights on the Sacramento River, the mandates of this section may be met, in whole or in part, through a contract with the Secretary executed pursuant to section 14 of Public Law 76-260, 53 Stat. 1187 (43 U.S.C. 389) that is in conformance with the Sacramento River Settlement Contracts renewed by the Secretary in 2005.

SEC. 203. NO REDIRECTED ADVERSE IMPACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that, except as otherwise provided for in a water service or repayment contract, actions taken in compliance with legal obligations imposed pursuant to or as a result of this Act, including such actions under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and other applicable Federal and State laws, shall not directly or indirectly—

(1) result in the involuntary reduction of water supply or fiscal impacts to individuals or districts who receive water from either the State Water Project or the United States under water rights settlement contracts, exchange contracts, water service contracts, repayment contracts, or water supply contracts; or

(2) cause redirected adverse water supply or fiscal impacts to those within the Sacramento River watershed, the San Joaquin River watershed or the State Water Project service area.

(b) **COSTS.**—To the extent that costs are incurred solely pursuant to or as a result of this Act and would not otherwise have been incurred by any entity or public or local agency or subdivision of the State of California, such costs shall not be borne by any such entity, agency, or subdivision of the State of California, unless such costs are incurred on a voluntary basis.

(c) **RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS NOT MODIFIED OR AMENDED.**—Nothing in this Act shall modify or amend the rights and obligations of the parties to any existing—

(1) water service, repayment, settlement, purchase, or exchange contract with the United States, including the obligation to

satisfy exchange contracts and settlement contracts prior to the allocation of any other Central Valley Project water; or

(2) State Water Project water supply or settlement contract with the State.

SEC. 204. ALLOCATIONS FOR SACRAMENTO VALLEY CONTRACTORS.

(a) **ALLOCATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior is directed, in the operation of the Central Valley Project, to allocate water provided for irrigation purposes to existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed in compliance with the following:

(A) Not less than 100 percent of their contract quantities in a "Wet" year.

(B) Not less than 100 percent of their contract quantities in an "Above Normal" year.

(C) Not less than 100 percent of their contract quantities in a "Below Normal" year that is preceded by an "Above Normal" or a "Wet" year.

(D) Not less than 50 percent of their contract quantities in a "Dry" year that is preceded by a "Below Normal," an "Above Normal," or a "Wet" year.

(E) In all other years not identified herein, the allocation percentage for existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed shall not be less than twice the allocation percentage to south-of-Delta Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors, up to 100 percent; provided, that nothing herein shall preclude an allocation to existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed that is greater than twice the allocation percentage to South-of-Delta Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary's actions under paragraph (a) shall be subject to—

(A) the priority of individuals or entities with Sacramento River water rights, including those with Sacramento River Settlement Contracts, that have priority to the diversion and use of Sacramento River water over water rights held by the United States for operations of the Central Valley Project;

(B) the United States obligation to make a substitute supply of water available to the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors; and

(C) the Secretary's obligation to make water available to managed wetlands pursuant to section 3406(d) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (Public Law 102-575).

(b) **PROTECTION OF MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL SUPPLIES.**—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be deemed to—

(1) modify any provision of a water service contract that addresses municipal and industrial water shortage policies of the Secretary;

(2) affect or limit the authority of the Secretary to adopt or modify municipal and industrial water shortage policies;

(3) affect or limit the authority of the Secretary to implement municipal and industrial water shortage policies; or

(4) affect allocations to Central Valley Project municipal and industrial contractors pursuant to such policies

Neither subsection (a) nor the Secretary's implementation of subsection (a) shall constrain, govern or affect, directly or indirectly, the operations of the Central Valley Project's American River Division or any deliveries from that Division, its units or its facilities.

(c) **NO EFFECT ON ALLOCATIONS.**—This section shall not—

(1) affect the allocation of water to Friant Division contractors; or

(2) result in the involuntary reduction in contract water allocations to individuals or entities with contracts to receive water from the Friant Division.

(d) **PROGRAM FOR WATER RESCHEDULING.**—The Secretary of the Interior shall develop and implement a program, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, to provide for the opportunity for existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed to reschedule water, provided for under their Central Valley Project water service contracts, from one year to the next.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term "existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors within the Sacramento River Watershed" means water service contractors within the Shasta, Trinity, and Sacramento River Divisions of the Central Valley Project, that have a water service contract in effect, on the date of the enactment of this section, that provides water for irrigation.

(2) The year type terms used in subsection (a) have the meaning given those year types in the Sacramento Valley Water Year Type (40-30-30) Index.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. EFFECT ON EXISTING OBLIGATIONS.**

Nothing in this Act preempts or modifies any existing obligation of the United States under Federal reclamation law to operate the Central Valley Project in conformity with State law, including established water rights priorities.

SEC. 302. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITIES.

This Act shall expire on September 30, 2016, or the date on which the Governor of the State suspends the state of drought emergency declaration, whichever is later.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5781.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, as introduced by our colleague from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Today the House meets once again to provide a solution to the ongoing water crisis in California. The House has been on record twice to provide solutions, and here we are, and we must act again. Although this bill is different

from the two prior attempts and reflects significant bipartisan progress towards enacting a solution, we must provide relief, even if it is short-term relief before this Congress adjourns. It is unacceptable for us to give up when Californians are starving and their communities are literally drying up.

Like California, my central Washington district is heavily dependent on irrigated water to support our local economy and our agriculture industry. I understand the importance of having a stable, reliable water source, and I also understand the economic devastation that is caused when the water supply is shut off, particularly when the shutoff is avoidable.

California is in an emergency situation. For years San Joaquin Valley farmers have been fighting against Federal regulations and environmental lawsuits that have diverted water supplies in order to help a 3-inch fish. In 2009 there was a deliberate diversion of over 300 billion—Mr. Speaker, that is billion with a B—gallons of water away from farmers.

Mr. Speaker, let me equate that: 300 billion gallons of water is nearly 1 million acre-feet of water. What is an acre-foot? An acre-foot of water—for 1 year, that is 12 inches of water for a year that was diverted from these farmers.

As a result, thousands of farmworkers lost their jobs, unemployment reached 40 percent in some communities, and thousands of acres of fertile farmland dried up. The same thing is happening today.

As chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, I have traveled to Fresno, California, twice and have seen the effects of natural and man-made drought firsthand. We have held multiple hearings and heard the pleas of communities that simply want the water turned back on and their livelihoods restored.

We have seen farmers who normally help feed the Nation being sent to wait in line at food banks and, in some cases, Mr. Speaker, being served carrots imported from China.

I want to stress that this crisis does not just impact California, but it has a rippling effect across the entire Nation.

California's San Joaquin Valley is the salad bowl for the world and provides a significant share of fruits and vegetables for our country.

Food grows where water flows. When there is no water, our food supply suffers, resulting in higher food prices across the country, higher unemployment, and increased reliance on foreign food sources.

Unlike the last time this body acted on this issue, the Senate did pass its version of the bill in June of this year. I commend Senator FEINSTEIN for her efforts to pass that short-term bill. However, since the bills were so different in their scope, those interested in productive conversations to bridge

differences have negotiated in good faith over the last 6 months.

We got very close to a resolution but more time was necessary on agreeing to a long-term bill. In the interim, the measure before us today reflects much of what the Senate passed earlier this year and agreed to in our negotiations to bring some short-term water supply relief to many of those communities in need.

This bill simply allows us to capture some water from storms in this and the next water year and improves data quality when it comes to the existing biological opinions on smelt and salmon. It also protects those communities in the north that are in relatively abundant water areas.

The entire bill, Mr. Speaker, sunsets in September of 2016 to allow more time to negotiate a longer-term solution that not only could help California but other States in the West as well.

This bill is not perfect, but it is a short-term bridge based on productive negotiations between those who want sensible solutions to the California water crisis. This bill, while very limited in scope, helps protect the jobs and economic livelihoods of farm families and workers and communities that are in dire need of water.

The people of the San Joaquin Valley cannot wait any longer for Congress to act. As the title of this bill suggests, it is truly an emergency for many, and time is running out. Those communities facing massive unemployment deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues in the last two Congresses for working together to get us this solution. This is the latest iteration of that, and I want to commend them.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman VALADAO's bill, H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, is a northern California drought relief bill; it isn't a California drought relief act.

It was introduced last week without hearings, without markups, without consultation with the House Democrats, and without any consultation or input from local water agencies, State agencies, cities, and/or tribes.

This bill is being rushed to the floor without the input of critical California leaders throughout the State. It focuses primarily on providing more Bay-Delta water to Central Valley farmers at the expense of other users. This bill would require mandatory increases in pumping to Central Valley agriculture, which could force water managers throughout the State to cut water deliveries to southern California, to other urban water users, and, of course, to fisheries, which is a mainstay of many of the tribes in California.

□ 1415

This could also lead to less fresh water in the delta and higher levels of salt and contamination in the water being pumped down to southern California.

The White House states the President will veto this bill because "it fails to equitably address critical elements of California's complex water challenges," and "the bill appears to include a number of potentially conflicting mandates which can cause confusion and undermine environmental laws, making it ripe for future litigation."

Senator BOXER says she opposes the bill because "it could reignite the water wars by overriding critical State and Federal protections of all of California."

Mr. Speaker, I have some of the statements of opposition. One of them is The Sacramento Bee who has come out opposing the bill because "any legislation affecting California water policy deserves a full hearing with input from the varied interests in northern California, the Central Valley, and the south."

Mr. Speaker, we must work in a bipartisan manner to address this drought crisis for the whole State and certainly not in secret and behind closed doors.

I have introduced H.R. 5363, the Water in the 21st Century Act, and Representative HUFFMAN has introduced H.R. 4239, which would provide drought relief to all of California with its water conservation programs, its water recycling projects, its groundwater improvement operations and storm water capture solutions, including desalination and title XVI.

House Democratic proposals have been excluded from this bill, H.R. 5781. There have been past attempts in past Congresses to pass certainly some proposals our legislation has proposed today, and it has failed.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD statements of opposition to this bill from the White House, from Senator BOXER, The Sacramento Bee, American Rivers, the League of Conservation Voters, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, the Nature Conservancy, the Pacific Fishery Management Council, the Golden Gate Salmon Association, the Golden Gate Fishermen's Association, and the California Environmental Water Caucus, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, I urge us not to pass this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, December 5, 2014.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5781—THE CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 2014

(Rep. Valadao, R-CA, and 6 cosponsors)

The Administration opposes H.R. 5781 because it fails to equitably address critical

elements of California's complex water challenges. The Administration appreciates the efforts by the bill authors to address concerns raised by the Administration regarding H.R. 3964, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act. However, because H.R. 5781 makes operational determinations regarding the use of limited water resources during the ongoing drought, and contains many new provisions that could lead to unintended consequences or further litigation, the Administration cannot support the bill in its current form.

The Administration takes seriously the ongoing drought that has affected communities, producers and water users across much of the country, including the especially hard hit State of California. Since the President's visit to Fresno, California earlier this year the Administration has undertaken a number of steps to help those most affected by drought. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has directed millions of dollars in food, conservation and emergency water assistance to tens of thousands of residents in areas hardest hit by drought. The Bureau of Reclamation has provided cost-share assistance for nine water reclamation and reuse projects in the State as well as millions of dollars in grants to build long-term resiliency to drought.

Moreover, the President has directed Federal agencies to work with state and local officials in real-time to maximize limited water supplies, prioritize public health and safety, meet state water quality requirements, and ensure a balanced approach to providing for the water needs of people, agriculture, businesses, power, imperiled species and the environment. Among other things, these efforts took form in a 2014 Drought Operations Plan, prepared in close coordination with the State, and the Administration is already taking steps to prepare a new drought plan for 2015 based on lessons learned and the best available science during the current year.

H.R. 5781 was introduced on December 2 and is being considered in the few remaining days of this session without a hearing or opportunity for the public to review and provide comment. In particular, the bill appears to include a number of potentially conflicting mandates which can create confusion and undermine environmental laws, making it ripe for future litigation. Given the complexity of California water issues, policy determinations over the use of scarce water resources should be developed in an open and transparent manner, with an ability for the public, affected stakeholders, and Federal, state and local officials to review and provide comment and feedback. The Administration stands ready to work with Congress in this regard.

For these reasons, if the President were presented with H.R. 5781, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

SENATOR BARBARA BOXER, D-CALIFORNIA
H.R. 5781

"I have carefully studied the Republican water bill and I am dismayed that this measure could reignite the water wars by overriding critical state and federal protections for California. The GOP's proposal would dictate specific pumping levels—regardless of the opinions of scientists—which could jeopardize our state's salmon fishing industry.

"We have communities across the state that are hurting from this drought, so we need a balanced approach that doesn't pit one stakeholder against another, and meets the needs of all of California's water users."

[From The Sacramento Bee]

EMERGENCY DROUGHT BILL DESERVES TO DIE
(By the Editorial Board)

House Republicans intend to jam through a California drought-relief bill early next week that would suspend some state water rights and environmental law to maximize water diversions from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

This is no way to address an issue as important to California as water. It is doomed to fail in the Senate and deserves to die. California's congressional delegation should be working on a compromise that involves all interested parties, not ramming through a bill during the final days of the lame-duck session.

Late Friday, the Obama administration came out in opposition to the bill, saying in a statement that "it fails to equitably address critical elements of California's complex water challenges" and "the bill appears to include a number of potentially conflicting mandates which can create confusion and undermine environmental laws, making it ripe for future litigation."

Central Valley Republicans have proposed the bill, HR 5781, and plan to bring it to a vote as early as Monday without going through committee hearings. The new bill deserves a full public hearing so that we know its full implications for California.

The House Rules Committee won't allow amendments to this problematic bill, which is unfortunate. The 26-page bill is replete with technical language, directed at environmental laws and regulations governing California water policy.

Rep. Jared Huffman, D-San Rafael, told the Rules Committee that the bill, like a previous version, would micromanage the state's water system without input from federal, state or local water officials. He warned that it would violate state environmental laws, misstates federal water contract law, and would have negative implications for fisheries and Indian water rights.

Rep. David Valadao, R-Hanford, who introduced the California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, claimed the bill has bipartisan support and approval of California's Sens. Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer.

Boxer, however, made clear she opposes the bill, saying in an emailed statement to The Bee: "The problem here is that Republicans insisted on a secretive process, and only bad things can happen when your process is secretive . . . and now they are trying jam through legislation that will only reignite California's water wars."

On Friday, Feinstein said in an email to The Bee, "There are some provisions in HR 5781 I support and there are some provisions I don't support, so we'll have to wait and see what action the House takes."

Feinstein dropped talks with House Republicans in November and said she would reopen negotiations in January. That is a reasonable approach. Any legislation affecting California water policy deserves a full hearing with input from the varied interest in Northern California, the Central Valley and the south.

The bill is backed by House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-Bakersfield, Rep. Tom McClintock, R-Elk Grove; Rep. Doug LaMalfa, R-Richvale, and others who would export water to Central Valley and Southern California at the expense of the environment and other water users.

The drought is hurting farmers and cities; it is challenging for all of us. However, a near-unanimous California Legislature approved placing a \$7.5 billion water bond

measure before voters, showing that changes in state water policy can be achieved through consensus.

But trying to remedy the problem for some Californians while excluding others from the discussion will, like Boxer said, reignite water wars.

AUDUBON CALIFORNIA, AMERICAN RIVERS, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, CALIFORNIA WATERFOWL ASSOCIATION, CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, CLEAN WATER ACTION, CONSERVATIVES FOR RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP, EARTHJUSTICE, ENDANGERED SPECIES COALITION, EPIC-ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION INFORMATION CENTER ENVIRONMENT AMERICA, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, GREENPEACE, INSTITUTE FOR FISHERIES RESOURCES, KLAMATH FOREST ALLIANCE, LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE ASSOCIATION, NORTHCOAST ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER, PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION OF FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS, SIERRA CLUB, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY, UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS,

December 5, 2014.

PLEASE OPPOSE H.R. 5781

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write to urge you to oppose H.R. 5781, (Valadao, R-CA), a bill that would dramatically weaken protections for salmon, migratory birds, and other fish and wildlife in California's Bay-Delta estuary, and the thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that depend on the health of these species.

This legislation would roll back environmental protections for salmon, migratory birds, endangered fish and wildlife, and other native species in California's Bay-Delta watershed, in order to significantly increase water exports out of the largest estuary on the West Coast. The bill would revise and override protections required under the Endangered Species Act and substitute political judgment for existing scientific determinations. It would undermine protections for migratory birds, expediting water transfers that could harm wildlife habitat and undermining water supply for the state and federal wildlife refuges. This complex legislation could greatly interfere with state water rights and cripple the ability of state and federal agencies to manage limited water resources for all beneficial uses, yet it has never been subject to a single committee hearing or input from the State, hunting organizations, sport and commercial fishermen, tribes, and conservation groups.

California's ongoing drought—not federal environmental laws protecting salmon and other fish and wildlife—is the reason for low water supplies across the state. H.R. 5781 attempts to scapegoat environmental protections for the lack of rain and snow, and it threatens thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that depend on healthy salmon runs from the Bay-Delta. The closure of the salmon fishery in 2008 and 2009 resulted in thousands of lost jobs in these states. The livelihoods of commercial and recreational salmon fishermen, Delta farmers, fishing guides, tackle shops, and communities across California and along the West Coast depend on the environmental protections that H.R. 5781 would eliminate.

California has already lost more than 90 percent of its existing wetlands and in the

current drought conditions, migratory birds are crowding onto the small remaining habitat areas, suffering from decreased food and increased risk of disease. H.R. 5781 would further exacerbate the extremely difficult conditions facing migratory birds in California by threatening the minimal water supply and degrading conditions on federal and state wildlife refuges, and impacting the important private lands that these birds rely upon as they migrate up and down the Pacific Flyway.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to oppose H.R. 5781 and any other last-minute attempts to undercut the existing balance of rights among the users of the California Bay-Delta watershed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), the author of the previous bill that I had mentioned in my opening remarks.

Mr. VALADAO. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of my legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since taking office, ensuring the Central Valley has reliable access to clean, high-quality water has been my number one priority. My constituents are suffering through a drought, and they have suffered more these last few years because of the laws that are in place today.

We have got regulations that require that we basically send water that should be going to communities, to homes, and to farms that create jobs and grow food, and that water is being diverted out to the ocean all in the name of a fish.

We have got so many different people living in this valley, from farm workers, to farmers, and to business owners, all different types of folks that represent this, and this has affected every single one of them. It has affected everybody down to their just regular daily lives.

When you think about how simple it is for someone to just turn on the faucet, be able to take water, put it in a cup, and put it in their coffeepot in the morning, that is what we are talking about today.

We have had wells go dry. We have got communities in my district today that are literally watching and in the process of looking to drill four, five, sometimes six wells, just to get enough water into the household. It is something that is very frustrating.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is a very, very simple patch. It is a short-term bill. As the chairman mentioned, the bill expires at the end of September next year, or when the Governor decides the drought declaration is over.

The bill is simple, and it is very specific that it does keep in place all protections of the Endangered Species Act, the biological opinions and others that have been put in place to protect the environment, but this does give a

little more flexibility to those agencies to allow some pumping to help these poor communities.

We have got people in food lines today. We have got people who are trying to feed their families and trying to earn an honest day's wage, and this is actually hurting those people, the people that my friends across the aisle always claim to want to help the most.

This is a simple, very small piece of legislation, the majority of which was introduced by a Democrat in the Senate, with just a few provisions that were changed. This isn't a surprise legislation that we passed out of the House, a lot more complicated, a lot more comprehensive. It covers the issue, and it creates a long-term solution. Again, this is a short-term solution that helps provide some security.

The bill helps all Californians, especially those south of the delta, including those in southern California, because there is about 20 million Californians that rely on water from northern California. Across the board, this is a piece of legislation that helps all people in California be successful, feed their families, and take care of their daily life. It is something that I feel is very reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, we work across the aisle as much as we can. We have worked on this issue for 6 months now, but it is a complicated issue, and we have a lot of outside interests that want to see this prevented, but it is all, again, over a few bad laws that need to be changed.

All we are asking today is for a short-term fix, give us enough time to give these people a little bit of breathing room, a little bit of fresh water for their houses, and something that could really, truly make a difference in their lives, and they are trying to stop it. It truly is sad. We are here at the last possible minute.

The most important aspect to this bill and the reason why it is so important that we pass it today is, if we don't get something done this week, we have to wait for the next Congress. The next Congress starts in January. From there, we have got to wait a few more weeks before a bill gets introduced, passed, and goes through the process again, and we start all over.

In that time, we will miss out on all the rain that could possibly—we are in a drought, but we did have some rain last week. We could have some more rain in the next 2 weeks, maybe a month, and that is an opportunity that we will be wasting if we don't take care of this legislation today and get this passed.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from northern California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

May I add that I am very thankful for his many years of service to this House and to the Nation, especially the State of California on water issues.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we find ourselves in a situation where a group of people in the Central Valley—a small number of farmers in the Central Valley—have decided that if they can't have it their way, they are just going to roll over the process.

Now, we are confronted with a piece of legislation that was, in fact, much of it was withdrawn by the Senator from California because it became apparent to all of the interests in the State that there were no public hearings, there was no public participation, and it was a very narrow group of people sitting in the back room in the Capitol of the United States drafting legislation, where essentially everybody except the people in that room take a hit. The people in the room get a benefit.

How do they get the benefit? Because they extract more water than you can currently extract and still keep the State whole. They extract more water from a vibrant, commercial fishing industry. That is why the Senators in Oregon and the Pacific Fisheries Association are against this legislation.

This is a fishing industry that is worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and they are at risk if you operate under this legislation because this legislation overrides what the State agencies, what the Governor, what the Federal agencies, and what the Secretary of the Interior did this last time.

Mr. Speaker, when we got two surprise storms in March of this year, we went back to the drawing table, and we figured out how we could get more water out of this system to help these farmers in the Central Valley. That was a good faith effort. That was done within the law.

Now, what they want to do is eviscerate that law, take away those safeguards, and say, "We are going to take additional water out this system." When they take that additional water out of the system, they take that additional water out of the water quality of hundreds of thousands of people who drink the water from the delta and rely on a fresh water supply.

We are quite aware of what happens in these dry years, and if you keep turning the pumps on, those people are going to start sucking—those water districts are going to start taking saltwater out of the delta. They take it at the expense of the delta farmers who pump water in the delta. That water will become saltier and saltier, and they will not be able to plant their crops. They have limited time to plant their crops, as it is, under these droughts.

Everybody in this State is paying a price for this drought, but now, in the eleventh hour of this Congress, this group of farmers, these very powerful,

small people—these very powerful, small people—have decided they are going to do it this way. We have seen this before.

We have worked year after year to get agreement, and when they can't get their way, they go off to a private meeting, they draft legislation, and that collapses all those talks, and then we start over again. This is about the third or fourth time we have been here because it is their way or the highway, and they absolutely expect that they can take water.

These are people who have a contract right. They have a contract right that is variable because they have the lowest water rights in the State, and so what they are trying to do is to say they get to get in line in front of everybody else in the State in exercising their water rights.

The fact of the matter is we understand exactly what this is going to do. That is why The Sacramento Bee, the Central Valley newspaper, the Fresno Central Valley newspaper said that this bill deserves to die. This bill deserves to die.

Mr. Speaker, I want to praise Senator BOXER for alerting the Members—they talked about working across the aisle. They worked across the aisle, but not with members of the House delegation who represent this impacted area who stand to lose these jobs and who stand to lose millions of dollars of economic activity.

I am not suggesting things are right for the people in the Central Valley or right for people in the State. Our whole State is suffering from a drought, but now, this is an eleventh hour attempt to say that we don't like the way you are coming together to do this, and we are going to take ours first.

This is contrary to what the State legislature did on a bipartisan basis and with the participation of legislatures from the Central Valley, from Southern California, from the Imperial Valley, and from north California.

This is contrary to what the State and Federal agencies did to try and work out and to get additional water, as we did in March. This is contrary. This is contrary to what the State legislature said about these being coequal values.

You have to protect the northern delta region, the origins of this water, and you have to try to have sustainable water deliveries to southern California. The legislature, again, on a bipartisan basis agreed to that.

Then, on the bond issue, overwhelmingly, State legislatures voted to put a bond on to try to deal with the drought, a rather remarkable issue, with the support of the Governor. Legislatures from southern California, from the Central Valley, and from north California voted to put it on the ballot.

The public across the State—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents

from every region of the State—voted overwhelmingly to support the bond issue, and now, in the eleventh hour, this small group of people think that they can come and turn those expressions of State legislative intent, of State law, of Federal law, and of State environmental quality laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we cannot let this happen. The suggestion is that, somehow, there is free water floating around out in that system and somebody is denying it. All of the water in this current system, especially in this drought, is for purposes to try to maintain a great Pacific coast salmon run that is tens and tens and tens—hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity from the mouth of San Francisco Bay almost to Santa Barbara and from the mouth of San Francisco Bay almost to the Washington-Oregon border.

This impacts across State lines and the economy that that generates, the economy that that generates in the hospitality industry and the tourism industry, and the economy that generates in the delta. Yes, there have been cutbacks. There have been cutbacks. We have all had cutbacks, all of us; but now, you just don't get to go take your neighbor's water. You don't get to go do that.

We will try and try again, and with these storms, I assume there is going to be a renewal of the effort that was successful. It was successful for the Central Valley, it was successful for the biological opinions, and it was successful for the delta farmer; yet we moved a little additional water that we hadn't anticipated.

Now, with these storms, hopefully, we will be able to do the same things, but to write into the law that all of that water must always be moved as long as this law is in place is absolutely contrary to the interests of the rest of the State of California, whether they are in northern California or whether they are in the Central Valley or whether they are in southern California.

That is how we try to move this policy forward. It is a much better policy today than it has been in the past, but we have got to have this open hearing. We have got to discuss this among all of the members of the California delegation, among all of those who represent the taxpayers of this Nation.

The idea that you can just go into a room in the eleventh hour because you know the session is ending, and you are going to say, "we have greater merit than anybody else, we are going to change this law," that is not the democratic process.

That is not the proper representation of the people we represent in the State

of California, and it is absolutely contrary to what the State government has done and accomplished, what they have done and accomplished together with the Federal agencies, to try and make this work recognizing the incredible hardship that every region in our State is under.

The State is investing billions of dollars, and the private sector is investing billions of dollars to try to make us water efficient, to try to capture more water and anticipate the building of dams.

All of these things are being done, but the idea that you can just come in and say: Well, you know what, we are tired with the process, we are impatient, even though we just voted for the bond issue, we are going to take our water now, and you do the best you can.

□ 1430

They are saying: You do the best you can. You do the best you can if that is your drinking water in towns across Alameda County. You do the best you can if that is the water you farm with. You just do the best you can. If it is too salty and raises health concerns and you can't grow your crops, that is tough because we are coming in line first. We are going to step in front of everyone else.

What you are going to ignite here with the passage of this bill, you are going to take us all back in time. As Senator BOXER pointed out, this reignites the California water wars, something that we tried to move away from, and we have made progress. I appreciate that those who are impatient and who think that they are given a greater right than in fact they are to water, that they believe now that they can just take it from their neighbor—just take it from their neighbor—that is an unacceptable process.

That is why Senator FEINSTEIN withdrew from these negotiations, said she would come back next year and go through regular order and have the hearings that the people of California are entitled to so they know what is going on. And those of us who represent very disparate parts of the State will be able to participate and have hearings and understand how California together cannot only solve the current problem in terms of impacts, but also prepare the State for what most people tell us will be a series of droughts by changing the manner in which we manage water.

Everybody has to put into that pot, but this is somebody just reaching into the pot and saying: I am taking mine first and you all do whatever you want because we have changed the laws of the State, we have changed the laws of this Nation, we have overwritten the biological opinions from the courts, and we have overwritten the basic environmental laws of the State and the

Nation. So we are going to get ours first, and then you do the best you can after that.

Those ramifications ripple across billions of dollars in our economy, just as this drought has rippled across billions of dollars in our economy because of the hardships in agriculture and the shortening of seasons in fishing.

I urge my colleagues not to support this legislation and demand that we have an open process and that we do not cave in to the same group of people who have been trying to do this for 50 years.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, California's regulatory drought was causing enormous economic damage and human hardship long before the historic natural drought that has now stricken the State. And through all of those years, the House has passed legislation repeatedly to address it.

Finally, after years of inaction, the Senate produced a modest measure to provide very limited flexibility for water managers to deal with it. This bill largely reflects those provisions. It is a temporary, stopgap measure that suspends no environmental laws and no regulations. It simply tasks Federal water managers to conserve our water for beneficial human use to the maximum extent possible once all State and Federal environmental and water rights laws have been fulfilled. Let me repeat: the bill explicitly requires all environmental laws and regulations to be adhered to. All the House added to the Senate bill are provisions to strengthen water rights for areas of origin by adding Federal protection over these rights.

During the worst drought in California's history, we continue to release billions of gallons of water from our dams just to adjust river temperatures for the fish. Sadly, this bill doesn't even affect this wasteful practice. But during the next year and a half, it does give limited flexibility to water managers within these laws. That is important because we are getting some rainfall this season, and once all of the environmental laws have been fulfilled, we desperately need to store what surplus remains for what could be another very dry year.

To take that surplus above and beyond what is needed to meet all of our environmental mandates and dump it into the Pacific Ocean, as my colleagues on the left suggest we should do, is nothing short of lunacy. The fact that this very modest bill has evoked such apoplexy from the left is a measure of just how extreme and out of touch they have become. I wish this bill did much more, but it is a start.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the opportunity to speak on H.R. 5781, the California Emergency Drought Relief Act.

Mr. Speaker, we have been here before, and we will be here again until Congress acts to provide authority for increased operational flexibility for California's water projects. The American Geophysical Union released a report last week that indicates, according to some of the measures they are taking, that the 2012-2014 drought affecting California is the worst in 1,200 years. The 2014 drought is responsible for part of the greatest absolute reduction to water availability to agriculture that we have ever seen. But we can operate the projects differently for different outcomes.

The water modeling experts in the area I represent have indicated to me that without additional authority to move water, unless California receives 150 percent of its normal average rainfall this year, which is unlikely, the water allocation on both the east side and the west side of the San Joaquin Valley will be zero. Last year it was zero, and next year it will be zero.

But urban users in the bay area and southern California, they will get water. The fish, they will get water. But the folks on the east and west side of the San Joaquin Valley will get a zero water allocation unless we exceed 150 percent of normal. I would like the House to think about that. We are talking about 2 years without surface water that forms the basis of the economy of the region. The results are an immediate impact to farmworkers and their families, to farmers, and to the farm communities. This isn't some esoteric discussion about precedent; this is about people's lives and their livelihoods that are at stake.

Economists at UC Davis estimated that in 2013 the California economy lost \$2.2 billion in economic output as a result of this drought. For my friends whose primary concern is environmental protection, the loss of surface water supplies for the valley means that farmers are forced to turn to groundwater, and they are overdrafting that groundwater in substantial manner.

This is a crisis. The situation this year has been devastating, and if we do nothing, next year it will become catastrophic.

H.R. 5781 is not perfect nor is it a bill that will solve all of California's problems. We need to fix a broken water system. However, it is a bill that provides, for 18 months, the flexibility for the movement of water which is now not being moved. And it does so responsibly by preserving the Secretary's discretion to reduce pumping to prevent additional harm to endangered species.

It will only take advantage when we have storms. It does not change the biological opinions, and it does nothing to move water rights in front of someone else, as the previous speaker said. It has a sunset on it.

There will be debate about others ways to assist in drought recovery, but this is the measure we have before us now.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It will help the San Joaquin Valley. It will help all of California to get by during the devastating effects this drought is having. It is not a panacea. And yes, we need to work together, but as far as igniting water wars, gee, I don't think they have ever subsided. There are still historic differences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The fault lines on water in California everybody on this floor knows. They are deep and they are historic and they have existed for decades. It is because we have this broken water system. We have a water system designed for 20 million people. We now have 38 million people.

To provide water for the people, for the environment, and to maintain agriculture, of which we are the largest agricultural State, we need to work. We need to work together.

There were some comments about the secret meetings. Gee, if this has been a secret as we have been working together for 8 months now, it is one of the worst-kept secrets in Washington this year, I think. The fact is this provides us a modicum of relief. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, but we need to do much more.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his service to this House and this country. You will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank those who have worked so diligently on this bill, like Congressman DAVID VALADAO. He understands the need. And we are not here today because we haven't thought that we might have this problem. I have stood in this well before with Congressman DEVIN NUNES, looking ahead, trying to be prepared so we can have water throughout California, looking prepared that government, creating a drought when we still have rain and snowpack.

Do you realize 4 years ago we had 170 percent of snowpack, but only 80 percent of the water was allocated to come down through the valley? The

valley not just feeds California, not just feeds the Nation, but feeds the world.

When the valley does not get water, the price of food goes up to all. But you know what is even more important? Those that go out of work. I have watched many elected officials come to this well and talk about unemployment. They say unemployment is below 6 percent. Let me tell you what unemployment is throughout the valley today. There are some cities that have more than 30 percent unemployment. The number one factor—water. So what does the world look like today even though not just this Congress but the Congress before it moved legislation to deal with this issue. We are now at a 1,200-year drought. That is much longer than the entire life of this Nation.

So if we are at this time, why do we bring this bill before us? I think we should have honesty in this bill. This is not the bill I would write. This is not the bill I would bring forward. This is a bipartisan bill where people on both sides of the aisle sat down. We said we need a temporary bill that lives within these means.

So do we change endangered species? No, we do not. What does this bill do? It says, in the rainy season when the flood waters are high, can we not move water down through the valley. That is what this bill does. It also has a safeguard that, if the fish are harmed, to stop.

Does this bill go on forever? No. It goes the length of September or to the length of what the Governor has declared within the drought.

Now, I know government cannot make it rain, but government can stop the government policies that pick fish over people. Government can prepare ahead of time that, if we are going to have a rainy season coming, we allow the water to have the best use of where it goes, that it protects the fish while at the time allocates water to the valley so everyone wins in the process. That is why it was bipartisan. That is why we sat together. That is why it is temporary. That is why this bill is brought before us today.

I would like to thank everybody on both sides of the aisle that worked for it. But what is unfortunate, some people will say things it is not. The most important thing we should do in this House is make sure fairness is provided. I think the greatest fairness that should be provided is being prepared for when water comes. But what is even more important is looking at the faces of the 30 percent unemployed, looking at the faces throughout that valley and saying it does not have to be that way. Government can make a difference if both sides would work together as we did to craft this bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Now, why would an Oregonian insert himself into the perpetual water wars in California? Well, first off, this bill has had no hearings. As you can see from the debate here on the floor, there is extraordinary disagreement over the potential impacts of this legislation. That is not just critical to Californians, it is critical to Oregonians.

I have a letter here from the Pacific Fishery Management Council. They believe that this could have a hugely detrimental impact on some audit species which compose about 80 percent of the California fishery and about 50 percent of the fishery in Oregon.

We went through this before about a decade ago where there were inadequate outflows. There were problems with the forge fish, the smelt, and the returning salmon, and we had a season that was closed for 2 years. It put many, many Oregonians out of work. There was impact beyond commercial fisheries and coastal communities on recreational fisheries. It cost us hundreds of millions of dollars. We got a couple of hundred million dollars in Federal relief.

□ 1445

The experts, the Pacific Fishery Management Council and their lawyers who have read this bill, believe it does change the management of the water in ways that are detrimental and would void the biological opinion and would probably put us back into another couple of “no fishing” years a few years down the road given the cycle of salmon, particularly, section 103(d)(2) and section 103(c).

I have heard here on the floor, despite the fact no hearing has been held—the bill just bubbled up very recently—that on one side they are saying, “No, don’t worry, it will not have a detrimental environmental impact, and, if it does, well, we will stop doing it.”

But I just looked at that section of the bill and it doesn’t quite say that definitively. In fact, it changes the standards, and then it says, “If additional negative impacts might happen, then the Secretary could suspend some of the provisions of this bill.” Not exactly certainty, and we need some certainty here for our fisheries.

We have been hurting for years. Last year, we had a good year, thankfully. We are still dealing with buybacks because of reducing the size of the fleets

from past problems. Fishermen are burdened with the buyback year in, year out. I just got the terms of that adjusted in the NDAA. They had a payday loan from the Federal Government. Now we got them a reasonable loan from the Federal Government. The government didn’t even pay for their buyback. Heck, in the Northeast, they paid for a couple of buybacks. No, we had to pay for our own with a payday loan. Now we are going to jeopardize the fleet 1, 2, or 3 years out because we won’t have the returns with the endangered species.

So this is a bad idea to do in the waning days of a Congress, to bring forward a bill which is controversial, over which there is disagreement on the actual language in the provisions of the bill, and which my experts, the Pacific Fishery Management Council, say would be detrimental and would cause those problems.

PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL,
Portland, OR, December 6, 2014.

Hon. JARED HUFFMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HUFFMAN: Thank you for your letter of November 17 and follow-up on December 3 requesting Pacific Fishery Management Council (Pacific Council) comment on legislation related to operation of the State Water Project and Central Valley Project in California (HR 5781) and its potential impacts to fisheries. Although the timing of the bill did not allow for full Council deliberation, we present the following concerns, which are consistent with previous comments the Council has made on similar legislation. Absent changes in the legislation to address these concerns, the Pacific Council does not support HR 5781 moving forward.

HR 5781 would override Endangered Species Act protections for salmon, steelhead, and other species in the Bay-Delta in order to allow increased pumping from the Delta in excess of scientifically justified levels. These measures also protect salmon stocks not currently listed under the ESA, which are a primary source of healthy sport and commercial fisheries from Central California to Northern Oregon. The bill introduces a new standard for implementing the Endangered Species Act concerning Central Valley salmon and Delta smelt, a keystone species in the Bay-Delta ecosystem. (See Sec 101(3), and 102(b)(2)(a).) It is unclear how severe the negative effects of this new standard might be, but it would certainly impact current water management policy that protects ESA listed salmon stocks from further decline and helps prevent currently healthy stocks from becoming listed under the ESA.

The bill contains several provisions that override the salmon and Delta smelt biological opinions (for example Section 103(d)(2), Section 103(c), and others). Section 103 could result in dramatically higher pumping than is authorized under the biological opinions, and would cause significant harm to migrating salmon and steelhead and other native species. The 1:1 inflow to export ratio for the San Joaquin at Vernalis overrides the ‘reasonable and prudent alternatives’ to standard operations that were set out in the 2009 Central Valley biological opinion in order to protect Sacramento River winter-run Chinook and other salmonid species. Further degradation of salmon habitat is contrary to

the provisions of the Magnuson Stevens Act (Sec. 305(b)(1)(D)) and something the Pacific Council strongly opposes.

Section 103(f)(2) provides exemptions for mitigation of negative effects on listed fish species, which alleviates the project from compensating fisheries for negative effects of its operations; it is unclear if there is an exemption for mitigation of negative effect on non-listed salmon stocks. Exempting mitigation responsibility for harm to salmon populations provides the exact opposite incentive to the kind of salmon protection and enhancement advocated by the Council, and essentially amounts to redistributing the value of salmon fisheries to agricultural or municipal interests, as well as increasing the risk to ESA listed fish stocks threatened with extinction. Additionally, the Pacific Council is concerned about whether Central Valley projects are achieving their current mitigation responsibility, and providing these exemptions could preclude seeking remedy. If this bill moves forward, it should provide direct mitigation for the proposed actions and risks to which it would subject fish populations and fishing communities, not avoiding this appropriate responsibility.

In 2008 and 2009, \$158 million in Congressional aid was provided to deal with the disaster of the closure of ocean salmon fisheries off California and Oregon south of Cape Falcon due to a collapse of the Sacramento River salmon stocks. These fisheries are an important source of jobs for coastal communities, which cannot be replaced simply through disaster relief. Without adjustments to this bill, we fear such a disaster could be repeated in the reasonably near future.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this legislation; please don't hesitate to contact me or Ms. Jennifer Gilden of the Pacific Council office if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

D.O. MCISAAC, PH.D.,
Executive Director.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), author of the original, long-term bill that passed in the last Congress.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, listening to the rhetoric that is coming from the other side, I am reminded of the old saying about the Soviet Union: if you tell a lie long enough, eventually people will believe you.

There is hardly anything coming from the other side of the aisle that is even remotely close to the truth. I don't have enough time to go through it all, but let me just hit the high points.

Number one, let's start with the facts on the table. Most of the population in California lives in the Greater San Francisco Bay Area or Los Angeles, which mostly Democrats represent, and which is the home of the 1 percent in California. The poor people that they continue to make more poor are my constituents because they have taken their water and dumped our water out into the ocean.

Let's take the example of San Francisco in the Greater Bay Area. They get their water not only from the delta, but also the United States Con-

gress passed legislation in the early part of last century that allows water to be piped over from Yosemite National Park directly over to the Bay Area.

This is our water. This water should be going to the San Joaquin Valley. They have given up none of that. You have a Member who has been here for 40-some years who made the claim that some people are reaching in and taking their water. Well, no, it is the opposite. Once again, if you tell a lie long enough, I guess you think eventually people will agree with you or believe you.

This is about San Francisco and Los Angeles getting all of their water, never giving up one drop, and they have taken the water from our communities. As the majority leader said, we have communities that continue to suffer 20, 30, or 40 percent unemployment while the 1 percent on the coast say nothing, do nothing. They complain about it. They give big subsidies to their salmon fishery buddies and the environmental community. We have other people on the other side of the aisle who made their whole careers making millions of dollars off of lawsuits, bringing lawsuits against the farms, that remain undisclosed in the dark today.

So, Mr. Speaker, we need to get the truth out on the table here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. NUNES. So what we are doing here now is, we have been working diligently with Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BOXER, but you have one of the Senators decide that she didn't want to come up with a solution. We got the bill from being permanent down to just an 18-month temporary bill. We have floodwaters today that are not being pumped that historically were pumped. We have communities that are completely out of water, 100 percent out of water, yet the 1 percent, they don't care.

I have heard a lot about the 1 percent around this place. The rhetoric from the other side, that rhetoric represents the 1 percent. We represent the people that are unemployed because of their 1 percent policies.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can get back to the truth. If we can get this bill passed, it gives the Senate an opportunity to amend the bill, send it back in the waning days of this Congress. If they cannot, then we have to start back in January with new legislation.

But, in the meantime, people are out of work, cities are out of water, towns are out of water, rural homes are out of water, schools are out of water, churches are out of water, because the folks on the other side of the aisle

spent 40 years taking water away and keeping it for themselves.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the impassioned speech, but it is not our water. It is California water.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the ranking member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

This is always a difficult issue. It is a California issue, and I want to point out that the California delegation is not evenly split on this. It is unevenly split. The reason is the gentleman just talked about what he called "facts." His points of what he was making are not true.

As the ranking member indicated, the chair, she indicated that this is public water, public water that is transported in the State by publicly financed canals, both by the Federal Government and by the State government. This is water that is supposed to balance for all California. It is all publicly owned and distributed, mostly to the private sector in the San Joaquin Valley.

Now, we have a drought. Everybody knows it. It is a disaster. The President declared it that. What we ought to be doing in Congress is paying for that disaster, like we pay for every other disaster. This bill doesn't do it. I was a coauthor of the original bill, but I am not cosponsoring this one, and I am not supporting this one because what this does is not deal with the problem of getting money to California to build the infrastructure that we need for off-stream storage and things like that.

What it does is disrupt a balanced system that has flexibility. We have been through the worst drought, and there have been flexible releases given this year. We solved it administratively. But to put it in law I think is very harmful. It is going to cause more lawsuits, more dissension, and we are back to, as Senator BOXER indicated, square one and not being able to find resolution.

Now, you argue that, well, we are the leading ag State. I am the leading ag county: \$4.8 billion worth of agriculture. We don't get a drop of this water. We find our own water in our own county. Frankly, we are reducing the amount of use in agriculture tremendously by drip irrigation and other forms of agricultural use.

So I think that the danger here is in the last minute of this Congress we are taking a bill that is extremely controversial and trying to pass it in the last minutes when we really need to resolve this thing so it is a balance for all of California, not just a few.

I think this is very harmful for our State, and I hope that those who are not from California will oppose the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HASTINGS, and a special thanks to my friend and colleague Mr. VALADAO for introducing this legislation.

Why is somebody from Illinois standing on the floor of the House to talk about a bill that affects California? Well, this chart says it all: California crops, 99 percent of the almonds, 99 percent of the figs. Go down this chart and you can see how it impacts every single family that I represent in central Illinois. 800,000 people in my congressional district go buy these products in our stores. The cost of not doing something to affect this historic drought is costing them and their families more to eat these products, healthy products, that come from the Central Valley of California.

When you have over 800,000 acre-feet of water being released, fresh water being released into the ocean, that is enough water for 800,000 families to use for a year. We are simply asking for flexibility that has a direct impact on every single family in this country. It has an impact on my families that I represent, and that is why I am so proud to stand here and support this legislation.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time that is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Some of our colleagues from other States may be experiencing a sense of *deja vu* right now. Yes, this is the second time this year that the House has voted on a California water bill that would harm northern California fisheries, tribes, and communities; that would undermine State law; that would deprive water managers of the flexibility they need; and it would micro-manage the complex water system of California.

To make sure we are all dealing with the same facts, I want to remind my colleagues that the State and Federal water export pumps in the delta right now are operating at more than 5,000 cubic feet per second.

The only reason they are not pumping even faster is not to protect fish and wildlife, not because of the Endangered Species Act, none of the other bogeymen that we hear as a justification for this bill. No, the reason those pumps are not going even faster is be-

cause of standards set by the State of California to protect water quality from municipal and industrial and agricultural and other uses in the system.

So the only way that this bill could deliver more water today—well, there is no way it could deliver more water today—and the only way it could deliver more water in other times of the year is by taking it away from other water users and other beneficial uses in our State.

With that inconvenient fact out of the way, let's talk about the process that brought us here today. H.R. 5781 has never been reviewed by the authorizing committee, let alone marked up in open session. Nor have we received the input of State or Federal agencies that have the responsibility over clean water and fisheries management. Nor have we received the input of affected local water agencies, of commercial and recreational fishing interests, of tribes—including ones that I represent—or other communities that will surely be impacted negatively if this were to become law.

The proponents of this bill say that it is the result of bipartisan collaboration. Really? Those of us who represent northern California's fishing industries, tribes, farmers, and communities have been systematically kept out of the room and even kept out of the conversation.

Last month, we learned that members of our State's Republican delegation refused to even brief Senator BARBARA BOXER if northern California Democrats like me were even in the room.

This is no way to negotiate something this important. It is a terrible precedent for other States as well, and that is why I am glad that Senator BOXER has been so clear in stating her opposition to it, that it would ignite water wars in California, not solve problems, and I am glad that over the weekend we received a veto recommendation from the Obama administration.

Now, on Saturday, the Pacific Fishery Management Council sent me a letter about the bill. I asked them how they felt it would affect western fisheries in this country. Here is what they said:

H.R. 5781 would override Endangered Species Act protections for salmon, steelhead, and other species in the Bay Delta in order to allow increased pumping from the delta in excess of scientifically justified levels.

In 2008 and 2009, \$158 million in congressional aid was provided to deal with the disaster of the closure of ocean salmon fisheries off California and Oregon south of Cape Falcon due to a collapse of the Sacramento River salmon stocks. These fisheries are an important source of jobs for coastal communities, which cannot be replaced simply through disaster relief. Without adjustments to this bill, we fear such a disaster could be repeated in the reasonably near future.

Mr. Speaker, I will include this letter in the RECORD at this time.

PACIFIC FISHERY
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL,
Portland, OR, December 6, 2014.

Hon. JARED HUFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HUFFMAN: Thank you for your letter of November 17 and follow-up on December 3 requesting Pacific Fishery Management Council (Pacific Council) comment on legislation related to operation of the State Water Project and Central Valley Project in California (HR 5781) and its potential impacts to fisheries. Although the timing of the bill did not allow for full Council deliberation, we present the following concerns, which are consistent with previous comments the Council has made on similar legislation. Absent changes in the legislation to address these concerns, the Pacific Council does not support HR 5781 moving forward.

HR 5781 would override Endangered Species Act protections for salmon, steelhead, and other species in the Bay-Delta in order to allow increased pumping from the Delta in excess of scientifically justified levels. These measures also protect salmon stocks not currently listed under the ESA, which are a primary source of healthy sport and commercial fisheries from Central California to Northern Oregon. The bill introduces a new standard for implementing the Endangered Species Act concerning Central Valley salmon and Delta smelt, a keystone species in the Bay-Delta ecosystem. (See Sec 101(3), and 102(b)(2)(a).) It is unclear how severe the negative effects of this new standard might be, but it would certainly impact current water management policy that protects ESA listed salmon stocks from further decline and helps prevent currently healthy stocks from becoming listed under the ESA.

The bill contains several provisions that override the salmon and Delta smelt biological opinions (for example Section 103(d)(2), Section 103(c), and others). Section 103 could result in dramatically higher pumping than is authorized under the biological opinions, and would cause significant harm to migrating salmon and steelhead and other native species. The 1:1 inflow to export ratio for the San Joaquin at Vernalis overrides the 'reasonable and prudent alternatives' to standard operations that were set out in the 2009 Central Valley biological opinion in order to protect Sacramento River winter-run Chinook and other salmonid species. Further degradation of salmon habitat is contrary to the provisions of the Magnuson Stevens Act (Sec. 305(b)(1)(D)) and something the Pacific Council strongly opposes.

Section 103(f)(2) provides exemptions for mitigation of negative effects on listed fish species, which alleviates the project from compensating fisheries for negative effects of its operations; it is unclear if there is an exemption for mitigation of negative effect on non-listed salmon stocks. Exempting mitigation responsibility for harm to salmon populations provides the exact opposite incentive to the kind of salmon protection and enhancement advocated by the Council, and essentially amounts to redistributing the value of salmon fisheries to agricultural or municipal interests, as well as increasing the risk to ESA listed fish stocks threatened with extinction. Additionally, the Pacific Council is concerned about whether Central Valley projects are achieving their current mitigation responsibility, and providing these exemptions could preclude seeking remedy. If this bill moves forward, it should provide direct mitigation for the proposed actions and risks to which it would subject

fish populations and fishing communities, not avoiding this appropriate responsibility.

In 2008 and 2009 \$158 million in Congressional aid was provided to deal with the disaster of the closure of ocean salmon fisheries off California and Oregon south of Cape Falcon due to a collapse of the Sacramento River salmon stocks. These fisheries are an important source of jobs for coastal communities, which cannot be replaced simply through disaster relief. Without adjustments to this bill, we fear such a disaster could be repeated in the reasonably near future.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this legislation; please don't hesitate to contact me or Ms. Jennifer Gilden of the Pacific Council office if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

D.O. MCISAAC, Ph.D.,
Executive Director.

Mr. HUFFMAN. In addition, California's recreational and commercial fishing interests sent a letter on Friday with their concerns that this legislation would "harm, potentially disastrously, the communities, families, and thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that depend on the health of the Bay Delta and its salmon runs."

Mr. Speaker, I will include their letter in the RECORD at this time as well.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 5781

DECEMBER 5, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write to urge you to oppose H.R. 5781 (Valadao, R-CA), a bill that would dramatically weaken protections for salmon and other fish and wildlife in California's Bay-Delta estuary and its tributaries. This legislation would harm, potentially disastrously, the communities, families and thousands of fishing jobs in California and Oregon that depend on the health of the Bay-Delta and its salmon runs.

H.R. 5781 would undermine existing legal protections for salmon, endangered species, and other species in the Bay-Delta ecosystem, in order to pump more water out of the most important salmon producing system south of the Columbia River. For example, the bill would rewrite and override protections required under the Endangered Species Act and replace the best available science with political micro-management. Those ESA protections also benefit fall run Chinook salmon, the backbone of the salmon fishery. This legislation would also undermine existing federal law, which establishes fish and wildlife protection and salmon restoration as a co-equal goal of the Central Valley Project. It would attempt to redirect water dedicated by law to restoring fisheries and ecosystem health. By requiring a massive new groundwater development project, this legislation has the potential to divert tens of millions of dollars away from ecosystem restoration, including salmon restoration projects. Such groundwater development would likely also reduce surface waters needed by salmon.

This damaging legislation has never been subject to a single committee hearing or input from the State, hunting organizations, sport and commercial fishermen, tribes, and conservation groups. Frankly put, this last-minute legislation is a cynical water grab. It doesn't address the cause of the drought, nor does it offer solutions. Instead, it is simply an effort to legislate the destruction of the environment and the salmon industry.

The very real water shortages experienced in parts of California this year are a result of

three dry years, not environmental protections. Real solutions to the impacts of the drought include agricultural and urban water use efficiency, water recycling and other tools that can meet our needs and that don't sacrifice our environment and fisheries. This legislation addresses none of those solutions.

This legislation could not come at a more damaging time. 2015 represents the first year that drought affected salmon year classes will return as spawning adults. We anticipate a significant, perhaps dramatic, reduction in returning salmon during 2015-2017. The coming three years will be a critical time for the salmon industry. This is not a theoretical concern. In 2008-2009, three years after record diversions from the Bay-Delta, low salmon populations led to the complete closure of the salmon fishery. This legislation could help lead to a repeat of that disastrous closure. The standards protecting salmon today are too low already. Further rollbacks could have a devastating impact on salmon runs that have already been harmed by drought.

Our salmon industry is valued at \$1.4 billion in economic activity annually. The industry employs tens of thousands of people from Santa Barbara to northern Oregon, including in California's Central Valley. This industry consists of commercial fishermen, recreational fishermen, fish processors, marinas, coastal communities, equipment manufacturers, tackle shops, the hotel and food industry, tribes, and the salmon fishing industry at large. All of these economic sectors and individuals could be harmed by damaging federal legislation. We all respectfully request your leadership to protect our future.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to oppose H.R. 5781 and any other last-minute attempts to undercut the existing balance of rights and protections among the users of the California Bay-Delta watershed. California's drought requires real solutions, not a return to the imbalanced policies of the 1940s and 1950s.

Thank you for your consideration.

JOHN MCMANUS,
Golden Gate Salmon Association.

ZEKE GRADER,
Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations.

DICK POOL,
Water4Fish.

ROGER THOMAS,
Golden Gate Fishermen's Association.

MARK GORELNUCK,
Coastside Fishing Club.

LARRY COLLINS,
San Francisco Crab Boat Association.

□ 1500

Mr. HUFFMAN. At the Rules Committee debate, I raised a series of important technical questions about flaws in this bill. Unfortunately, the House majority has decided that it cannot be amended through an open rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HUFFMAN. If we did have the benefit of a hearing or even just an op-

portunity to amend through an open rule, we may be able to address some of these, but so far, nobody has answered some of these key technical questions.

First, does the bill allow the State water board, basically, to do its job if we head into a fourth year of a critical drought, doing things like issuing curtailment orders and possibly rationing orders? These are tough calls that our State's water referee has to make. This bill does not appear to allow them the flexibility to do that.

Does the bill, which directs the Federal Government to "provide the maximum quantity of water supplies possible" next year, allow the Federal Government to do other things necessary to operate the system, like filling reservoirs, holding water for public health purposes, or—when it might be needed—even for other water contractors?

Does the bill put additional pressure on the Trinity River, which I represent, and the tribes that have depended on it for their traditions and their subsistence on healthy salmon populations for millennia?

There are many other questions that are unanswered about this bill. It is not ready for prime time, it is not good policy, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for working with me in this committee on this important topic.

Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer in northern California, and when I hear talk of the water wars being reignited, it has been a one-sided war, with the amount of farmers and people that work in the Valley. They haven't had the bullets to be in a water war because we have been losing for a long time.

Hundreds of thousands of acre-feet that have been diverted already in the past adds up to millions over the years for other uses, besides what has been going in the North Valley, South Valley, and Central Valley.

I heard this comment a while ago. Powerful, small people were how legislators looked at us in the valley—powerful, small people. Do these folks standing in the unemployment line look powerful to you? Do the farmers who have been fighting against this for years and years look powerful when we keep losing these battles one after another? To build more storage, we would have water for everybody in California.

This measure here today would help everybody in California that is part of State water projects or the Central Valley Project. Twenty million people in California would see additional benefit by taking—and here's the concept here, folks—excess water during high flows that now would be just flowing out to the Pacific.

We are not taking water during the middle of the season any more than what would already be in the established regime. This is the excess water you would see during flood periods or the high flows that do happen when we have rainfall and water thundering down the Sacramento River, the Feather River, and San Joaquin River during those high flows. We are taking that excess water and reprogramming it, so it can benefit more people. It doesn't take anything from the fish regime or any of that type of concern.

We hear the stuff coming from the other side of the aisle that has continued, whether it has been for 40 years or just recently, to distort what we are trying to do here to make more water for California, which is in its third year of a huge drought—as Mr. MCCARTHY said, what looks like a 1,200-year record for droughts—and about stopping this temporary measure that would help to cause a little bit of excess water be retained to help the people like this to have jobs.

We hear we need jobs in California. We are talking about immigration bills. Let's help people have jobs to live the dream. What about the people that are already here? What about the people standing in that line that have conditions that look like this, with the crops in our State being left fallow, these trees and these vines being stumped or completely pushed out because we can't have a vision, all because we have the typical rhetoric, which I have been listening to as a farmer when I was outside of this place and now today on this floor—and probably many more times—that says we can't build any storage because of this?

It is a new regime which respects the already-established protocols. This doesn't take away the power from the State water board or the other boards in place. If you would actually read the bill, you would see in it those provisions are kept in place by the Governor and by the water boards. All the entities that have authority over it can step in and say, "We think this is going to affect the fish, the water regime, or any of the others."

I urge that we support this measure today, and I ask that we listen to what is in the bill and not listen to the rhetoric and the lies.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water and Power, and I read this information in the newspaper. Nobody ever contacted me. I had no idea the formulation of this particular bill was going on.

When we talk about unemployment, it is nice to trot out pictures and show what the effect is, but I see nothing in this bill that is going to help the farm workers themselves, nothing that is going to provide more wet water, cre-

ate water, whether it is through recycling, desalination, or conservation—all the things that southern California has been doing.

Let's not forget that 80 percent of the water used is for agriculture and 20 percent is for industrial, commercial, and residential; so there is a little bit of a disparity there, my friends.

I really am looking at how we move towards working on a bipartisan basis. We don't want to argue. We want to make resolutions by working together, and that is not happening. Maybe it is something that I have said—I am not sure, Mr. Speaker—but I am more than willing to sit down between now and next year when we have this bill come to the light of the day, if it is reintroduced, and we can have an honest discussion about the effects it has.

Also, when we talk about California's 35 million residents, only 12 million reside in L.A. County, part of the county that I represent. That is not including San Bernardino, Riverside, or San Diego, so we talk about the boaters in southern California getting the shaft for not getting the water and paying more for that water.

When we are looking at water distribution, I suggest that we sit and actually work openly and transparently. We oppose this secretly written Central Valley-focused legislation. We hope that we are going to continue the dialogue because, yes, California, is a donor State. We need to be able to continue providing that for the rest of the Nation, so that we can have a better economy and a growth in our agricultural area.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5781, the so-called California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, which should be called the CVP California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just make a couple of points here before I yield back my time. This has been a very interesting debate. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, I attended two hearings in Fresno, California, particularly on this issue, and saw firsthand the impact of what the natural drought and the manmade drought has done to the San Joaquin Valley.

My friends on the other side of the aisle stated a number of newspapers that editorialized against this. Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a Fresno Bee editorial of December 6 saying that the Valadao bill, which is H.R. 5781, should be passed.

[From The Fresno Bee, Dec. 6, 2014]

FACTS SUPPORT PASSAGE OF DROUGHT RELIEF LEGISLATION

One of the oldest rules in politics is, when the facts are on your side, you cite the facts; when the facts aren't on your side, you pound the table.

Over the last few days, opponents of The California Emergency Drought Relief Act, which was introduced in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, have been yelling about water grabs, protesting the timing of the bill's introduction and doing all they can to divert attention from the facts—both pertaining to this legislation and to the cruel realities of our state's prolonged drought.

So, let's start with the facts.

This drought is the worst that California has experienced in at least 1,200 years. So says a study published by the American Geophysical Union and cited by a Washington Post blog Thursday. Not only have we received little rain, but the lack of precipitation has been intensified by record-breaking high temperatures. Moreover, the fertile agricultural fields of the San Joaquin Valley are suffering through an "exceptional drought," the most severe classification.

Yes, it has rained lately in California. Thank goodness it has. But much more rain is needed to restore our aquifers, fill our reservoirs reverse the economic hardship inflicted on our state and, in particular, the Valley, by the drought.

The bill (H.R. 5781) introduced by Rep. David Valadao, R-Hanford and supported by GOP leadership provides the flexibility and resources to give farmers in the Valley and elsewhere a fighting chance to grow their crops and put people back to work in 2015. In a nutshell, the bill would allow the Bureau of Reclamation the freedom to hold more winter rain and snow and then distribute it to areas in need. Not only would this flexibility help farmers and rural communities, but it would benefit the environment as well.

This legislation is the product of months of talks and negotiations earlier this year involving Republican and Democrats in both the House and the U.S. Senate and is the result of thoughtful compromise. The bill doesn't amend the Endangered Species Act or existing biological opinions. It leaves decision-making about habitat, protected species and water quality to federal environmental agencies. But it would reduce the flow of water through the Sacramento-Joaquin River Delta to the Pacific Ocean and pump more water to the south—as long as that pumping doesn't harm protected fish such as delta smelt, salmon and steelhead.

Moreover, these changes would be temporary, as they would end in September of 2016 or upon the governor ending California's drought declaration.

Opponents are trying to paint this bill as detrimental to the environment and the result of secret negotiations. Again, let's examine the facts. In a phone interview with The Editorial Board on Friday, Rep. Jim Costa, D-Fresno, pointed out that this proposal is similar to Sen. Dianne Feinstein's bill that was passed under unanimous consent by the Senate in February.

Passage of Feinstein's Emergency Drought Relief Act then set the stage for negotiations—and compromise—with Valadao, who earlier had received partisan House approval of a bill that was extreme and over the top. Early on, Northern California Democrats, many of which are supported by environmentalists, were involved in the negotiations. But they drew firm lines in the sand and quit the talk.

Valadao's bill is reasonable and much needed. It deserves the support of Sen. Feinstein and Sen. Barbara Boxer and the California delegation in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Let me address another issue.

We heard a number of times from the speakers on the other side of the aisle that there has been no hearing on this bill; it came out of the blue, blah, blah, blah. We heard that over and over. Maybe it is because when my friends on the other side of the aisle were in the majority, they didn't follow regular order, so let me say this as slowly or plainly as I can.

In the last Congress, Congressman NUNES introduced a long-term bill that we had a number of hearings on in the National Resources Committee. We marked up the bill in the Resources Committee, and we had it on the floor, where there were amendments that were offered to that bill; and, finally, in the last Congress, it passed with bipartisan support.

That was in the last Congress, Mr. NUNES' bill. In this Congress, Mr. VALADAO took that bill, dusted it off, and made two minor changes. We brought it to the floor, and once again, it passed with bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty good example of what regular order is, and all we said, by the way, is, "Okay. This is our position. This is the House's position. If the Senate has a different position, pass a bill." There was nothing complex about that, and to the credit of Senator FEINSTEIN, primarily, there was a bill that passed with unanimous consent.

I might add, however, Mr. Speaker, that there were no hearings held on the Senate bill in the Senate. There were no hearings held on the Senate bill; however, because of the drought in California, many Western senators—primarily, Republican Western senators—when asked, presumably by Senator FEINSTEIN, if this bill could go by unanimous consent, they said, "Yes, but there are some conditions that we ought to look at before it finally becomes law." Their principal concern was in the area of the Endangered Species Act.

Now, in the 20 years that I have been here, I have been a vocal critic of how the Endangered Species Act has been implemented, and I hope that we have made some movement in that with the passage of three bills that we did later on.

My point is this, Mr. Speaker: the Senate then passed their bill. The normal process under regular order is when the House has a position and the Senate has a position, then you get together to negotiate the differences.

Now, there are a lot of differences between those two bills, and for the last 6 months, there has been a good faith effort to try to negotiate the difference.

A week ago, Senator FEINSTEIN said: We just can't get it done at this point; and, at that point, my colleagues here in the House—Mr. VALADAO, principally, but the other colleagues that spoke—said: I think what we ought to do is to put into bill form what we had principally agreed to in this conference—although it wasn't a formal conference, it was an informal conference—and put it in bill form.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say what we have before us is legislation that has been largely agreed to in this informal conference that has been going on for some time with the California water issue.

This isn't something that came out of the dark. As a matter of fact, in the 4 years that my colleagues controlled this House, there was no California water legislation whatsoever. So to come up here and talk and say there are other things and they should be involved, of course, they should be involved. They were involved with the Senate action on the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this is good legislation. It represents a broad consensus that could be done in the informal conference, so I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation. Hopefully, the Senate can take it up before we adjourn. If we don't, the consequences are that we are going to have to start all over again in the next Congress.

There has been so much work that has been done in the informal conference that to let that go and not have some positive action on it, I think, would be wrong for us to do.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 5781, yet another California water-grab bill. If enacted, H.R. 5781 would dictate specific actions for water management agencies' experts to take while undermining state water rights and state environmental laws. These directives would eliminate flexibility in the system by making it more difficult for state and federal agencies to make real-time, science-based decisions to address the drought.

In addition to my colleagues speaking out against the bill today, the Administration issued a Statement of Administration Policy on the bill which states:

H.R. 5781 makes operational determinations regarding the use of limited water resources during the ongoing drought, and contains many new provisions that could lead to unintended consequences or further litigation, the Administration cannot support the bill in its current form.

Further, the Administration highlighted its ongoing work to address the drought:

The United States Department of Agriculture has directed millions of dollars in food, conservation, and emergency water assistance to tens of thousands of residents in areas hardest hit by drought. The Bureau of Reclamation has provided cost-share assistance for nine water reclamation and reuse

projects in the State as well as millions of dollars in grants to build long-term resiliency to drought. . . . The President has directed Federal agencies to work with state and local officials in real-time to maximize limited water supplies, prioritize public health and safety, meet state water quality requirements, and ensure a balanced approach to providing for the water needs of people, agriculture, businesses, power, imperiled species and the environment.

Instead of legislating how the current dwindling supply of water should be moved within the state, we should follow the Administration's lead and fund conservation, recycling, and storage projects to create new water.

Additionally, over 30 environmental, natural resource, and fishing groups sent letters of opposition to H.R. 5781 to Congress. Fishing industry groups oppose the bill because:

The bill would undermine existing legal protections for salmon, endangered species, and other species in the Bay-Delta ecosystem, in order to pump more water out of the most important salmon producing system south of the Columbia River. For example, the bill would rewrite and override protections required under the Endangered Species Act and replace the best available science with political micro-management."

Authors of H.R. 5781 believe it will boost the economy in part of California, but in this haphazard attempt at amelioration, they risk eliminating jobs in the \$1.4 billion salmon industry by, jobs in the Delta tourism industry, and jobs in Northern California agriculture.

Natural resource and bird organizations oppose the bill because of the devastating impact it could have on migratory birds and other fish and wildlife in the Bay-Delta estuary. According to these groups:

California has already lost more than 90 percent of its existing wetlands and in the current drought conditions, migratory birds are crowding onto the small remaining habitat areas, suffering from decreased food and increased risk of disease.

With at least a billion birds migrating along the Pacific Flyway each year, we cannot afford to eliminate even more habitat. We must ensure water supplies are properly balanced for all needs and mandating exports to water users south of the Delta will not achieve this balance.

In addition to being deeply flawed, this bill is being rammed through at the last minute. Introduced just last week, this bill is circumventing all regular order and will be voted on despite having no hearings and no mark-ups. As the Sacramento Bee states, "The new bill deserves a full public hearing so that we know its full implications for California."

As I have stated before, this drought is caused by nature—something so painfully obvious, it can be seen from space. Circumventing science and legislating how to operate a water system is irresponsible and we must find ways to add to our water supply instead of taking water from one group and giving to another for political gain. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5781, a bill that was written in secret, would destroy jobs, ignores established science, and does nothing to address the drought.

Unfortunately, I am unable to participate in this debate today due to the House Majority's

last minute scheduling. Not only were we not given time for Congressional hearings or public input on this legislation, we were not even given enough time to plan to be here to debate the bill after it was rushed to the floor. I was home working in district when this debate was scheduled and by the time I received notice of the floor debate, no flights were available other than the one I was originally on.

Ten months ago this House considered and passed a similarly horrible bill. Neither bill will solve the drought because neither bill can make it rain.

Instead of spending the last ten months working across the aisle with all stakeholders at the table to come up with legislation that actually addresses the statewide drought, the Majority has negotiated this bill in secret with only a select group of farming interests in the Central Valley.

Everyone in California is affected by the ongoing statewide drought and Congress should not be picking winners and losers. Unfortunately, this bill does just that.

H.R. 5781 is nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to use the drought as an excuse to steal water from the Bay Delta—and to do so with zero regard for the folks who depend on that water for their livelihoods.

The Delta supports thousands of jobs in farming, fishing and tourism, and has an economic output of more than \$4 billion a year.

Millions also rely on the Delta for drinking water. When clean water is pumped south, the level of salt water in the Delta increases. Folks can't drink seawater.

The entire state of California is in a drought. It's not due to a lack of pumping. It's due to a lack of snow and rain.

If the Majority was interested in actually addressing the drought, there are things we could do to help. Congress can invest in more water conservation, more water recycling, and more water storage.

With investments like these, we can collect millions of gallons of new water, help farmers better plan, and create good jobs.

This bill does none of that. Our people deserve better than this politically driven bill. They deserve solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 5781.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 770, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5781 is postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the

vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

□ 1515

SGT. AMANDA N. PINSON POST OFFICE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5385) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5385

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SGT. AMANDA N. PINSON POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5385, sponsored by Representative ANN WAGNER of Missouri, to designate the Post Office located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office.

Army Sergeant Amanda Pinson died on March 16, 2006, while serving during Operation Iraqi Freedom. She, along with a fellow soldier, were killed when a mortar round detonated. She was only 21 years old.

Sergeant Pinson enlisted in the Army after graduating from high school and was known as a model soldier, a "breath of fresh air," and wanted to attend college after the military to become a CIA or FBI agent.

Mr. Speaker, this courageous young woman served her country with honor

and gave her life in defense of our country. It is my honor and privilege to stand before this body and pay tribute to Sergeant Pinson's memory and sacrifice. I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5385.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I support this, and I can't add to the excellent words of my colleague from North Carolina.

It is an amazing thing when we are naming post offices to hear about the brave lives—in this case of a very young woman with a bright future who gave her life for her country. So I am delighted to join in Representative WAGNER's legislation to make this name permanent so that we can all remember and revere the memory of this brave soldier.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for his support.

I yield as much time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend and colleague from North Carolina for yielding me this time, and the gentleman from Vermont also for his tremendous support and commitment to honoring our fallen heroes.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of a great American hero. On March 16, 2006, Missouri's Second District lost a brave young woman when United States Army Sergeant Amanda N. Pinson was killed in a mortar attack while serving during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the life of this young patriot.

Army Sergeant Amanda Pinson was a signals intelligence analyst assigned to the 101st Military Intelligence Detachment of the 101st Airborne Division based in Fort Campbell, Kentucky.

On a personal note, I have to say that the Screaming Eagles are very personal to me, as my oldest son is presently serving as an Army officer in the 101st.

Amanda is survived by her mother, Chris; her father, Tony; and her younger brother, Bryan.

Growing up in Lemay, Missouri, Amanda enlisted in the Army after graduating from Hancock Place High School, where she won several scholarships and was on the basketball and the softball teams.

Amanda was always concerned about helping others. In high school, she started her own group called HELP, the Hancock Environmental Leadership Program. She enlisted all of her friends to join, and Amanda and the HELP group planted trees at local parks and volunteered with local seniors.

The group also planted and maintained flowers at the entrance of Jefferson Barracks Park. The park where she used to plant flowers is adjoined to Jefferson Barracks National Cemetery, where Amanda is laid to rest.

Amanda also had the respect and admiration of her fellow soldiers. She was described, indeed, as a model soldier and “a breath of fresh air” by Lieutenant Colonel Lucinda Lane, who spoke at her service.

Upon her death, Sergeant Pinson was awarded a Bronze Star, a Good Conduct Medal, a Global War on Terrorism Medal, and a Purple Heart.

Her impact on the people privileged to know her during her life is evidenced by the many memorials honoring Amanda. In 2006, the U.S. Army honored Amanda by dedicating the building where she worked in Tikrit, Iraq, naming it “Pinson Hall.” A pink willow tree was planted in her honor at her alma mater, Hancock High School, in 2006. And now, the Amanda N. Pinson Post Office will join these memorials as a testament to the bravery, valor, and kindness of this American hero who gave the ultimate sacrifice for her country.

It is my honor to sponsor H.R. 5385, a bill that names the Affton branch, Grasso Plaza post office after such a courageous young woman, immortalizing a hero who gave up her life in service to the Nation she loved. May it bring comfort to her family and friends and give witness to Sergeant Pinson's bravery and her sacrifice.

To quote the phrase that adorns so many of the tributes and memorials to Amanda: “If love could have saved you, you would have lived forever.”

So today, on behalf of a grateful nation, I say: “Thank you, Amanda, and you are, indeed, loved.”

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for her words, and I would say that it represents her heart. Whether it is here in Washington, D.C., or anywhere else, she is always looking to really recognize those who serve their country.

Certainly, in this honor today, I would urge all our Members to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5385.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. ZACHARY M. FISHER POST OFFICE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 5794) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the “Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5794

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SGT. ZACHARY M. FISHER POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the “Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5794, introduced by Representative ANN WAGNER of Missouri, to designate the post office located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office.

Army Sergeant Zachary Fisher, a native of Ballwin, Missouri, was killed on July 14, 2010, at Forward Operating Base Lagman in Afghanistan. He died of wounds sustained when insurgents attacked his vehicle and detonated an improvised explosive device. Sergeant Fisher was only 24 years old.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Fisher was a brave young man. He decided to join the Army Reserve, and then courageously volunteered to become a member of the Active Duty military. Sergeant Fisher chose to put himself in harm's way in order to protect the freedoms that we, as Americans, enjoy every day. We owe him a great debt of gratitude for making the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf.

I ask my colleagues to honor and memorialize Zachary M. Fisher's service by supporting H.R. 5794.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, it is a combination of humility and pride when we hear about the lives of these brave young Americans. That is the second wonderful person from Missouri, but all of us, in our States, have people that have served America this way.

What strikes me here is Sergeant Fisher went from Iraq to Afghanistan—he didn't have to do that, but he had a need to serve—and the inspiring story about his selfless commitment to serving this country when he had behind a loving family and a wife, and he sacrificed all.

If he were here and were asked the question, “Was it worth it?” you know he would say it was because he loved his family, he loved his country, and he was willing and did give his life for his country.

So as a person here standing on the floor, as an American hearing about the bravery of this young man, I want to thank Representative WAGNER for bringing this to the collective attention of the House of Representatives, and we fully support this legislation. It is a small honor for a large sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding the time and the gentleman from Vermont for his always kind and compassionate words about our fallen heroes and these great opportunities that we have to represent them and give living testament to their bravery and their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a great American hero, Sergeant Zachary M. Fisher, of my hometown of Ballwin, Missouri.

On July 14, 2010, Missouri's Second District lost a brave young man when United States Army Sergeant Zach Fisher was killed by an IED while serving during Operation Enduring Freedom.

Sergeant Fisher was assigned to the 27th Engineer Battalion of the 20th Engineer Brigade based out of Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He was, indeed, 24 years old when he died at Forward Operating Base Lagman in Afghanistan.

Zach was, again, from my hometown of Ballwin, Missouri, and he graduated in 2004 from Marquette High School, where his history teacher remembered him as a patriotic student with an interest in how the United States developed as a country.

Zach met his beautiful and loving wife, Jessica, just before his earlier deployment in Iraq. At the time of his death, they had been married for just 2 years.

Zach is survived by his parents, Sue and Jim Jacobs and Bob and Alicia Fisher; three brothers, Andrew, Clayton, and Alexander; and two sisters, Emily and Zoe.

Zach initially enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserves, and when he told his parents that he wanted to report for Active Duty, they asked him to give two good reasons why he would choose to put himself in harm's way for the service of his country. His reply said a lot about the character of the man, Zach Fisher. First, he wanted to join the Army because he wanted the discipline it would provide, and, more importantly, he wanted to be a part of something bigger than himself.

Although the United States of America can never fully repay the priceless debt we owe to Sergeant Fisher, we can do our part to ensure that his memory lives on. Therefore, it is my honor to sponsor H.R. 5794, a bill that names the Chesterfield main post office after such a courageous young man, immortalizing a hero who gave up his life in service to the Nation that he loved.

All of Zachary's friends would say that Zach was their best friend. He was a dedicated warrior whose commitment to family, friends, and country will be long remembered.

I am proud that this legislation will serve as a testament to the dedication and sacrifice of Sergeant Zachary Fisher, standing as a physical reminder of the bravery of one American from Missouri's Second Congressional District who chose to serve a cause greater than oneself.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5794, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5794.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

FATHER RICHARD MARQUESS-BARRY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4030) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the "Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4030

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FATHER RICHARD MARQUESS-BARRY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4030, introduced by FREDERICA WILSON of Florida, to designate the post office located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building.

The Reverend Canon Richard Livingston Marquess-Barry has led a remarkable life—one of courage, service, and strong faith.

Father Marquess-Barry has been an ordained priest in the Episcopal church for 39 years. He currently serves as the pastor of the Historic Saint Agnes Episcopal Church in Miami, Florida. In this capacity, Father Marquess-Barry has contributed to bettering the lives of those in his congregation and community, and he has earned a well-respected reputation for bridging the divide between people of different races and religions and of uplifting the downtrodden and underprivileged. The projects and ministries of his church are numerous—among them, spearheading an affordable housing project for low- and moderate-income families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the dedication and selflessness that Father Marquess-Barry has shown throughout his life, and I urge the support for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I fully support this legislation.

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida, Representative WILSON, and I thank her for sponsoring this legislation.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman WELCH for yielding me time as well as Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for their support in bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4030, a bill to designate the post office

at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami Gardens, Florida, as the Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building.

The Reverend Canon Richard Livingston Marquess-Barry was born on November 14, 1940, in Miami, Florida, to Bahamian immigrants. Raised by his grandparents, Reverend Barry attended the Miami-Dade County Public Schools system while working as a garbage collector every morning before school and as a dishwasher after school.

Reverend Barry earned his Bachelor of Arts at St. Augustine College in Raleigh, North Carolina, in 1962. That same year, he married Virla Rolle, his college sweetheart. The couple has been married for 52 years and has one daughter and two grandsons.

Reverend Barry's lifelong devotion to the church began in 1965 when he became the only person of color enrolled at the Virginia Theological Seminary. Three years later, he earned a master's in divinity, and in 1989, he was the youngest person to earn a doctor of divinity degree in the 200-year history of the Virginia Theological Seminary. He has been a visiting fellow at the University of Munich in Germany as well as at Oxford University in England.

In 1977, Reverend Barry took a pay cut in order to lead the Saint Agnes Episcopal Church, the largest and oldest Episcopal congregation for people of color in south Florida. Not only did he transform Saint Agnes and leave it with an endowment upon his retirement, he also worked tirelessly to improve the Overtown community where Saint Agnes is located.

As a young priest, Reverend Barry served his community religiously and also dedicated himself to furthering civil rights despite numerous assassination attempts. He led the effort to integrate the St. Lucie County public school system. He also pressured the city of Fort Pierce and St. Lucie County to adopt fair hiring and promotion practices within the police and fire departments and within all other government agencies. He has also been a champion of improving housing options for underprivileged people in our community.

Among his many awards, Reverend Barry is currently the holder of two keys to Miami-Dade County and of one key to the city of Miami for his many years of devotion and advocacy to the south Florida community. He has been recognized for his work by Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, the NAACP, the Florida State Senate, and President Obama.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Reverend Barry for his decades of service to our community, and I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill to designate the Miami post office the Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 4030, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4030.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SCOTT J. WILLIAMS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5562) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Ocean Avenue in Lompoc, California, as the "Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5562

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SCOTT J. WILLIAMS MEMORIAL POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Ocean Avenue in Lompoc, California, shall be known and designated as the "Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5562, which is sponsored by Representative LOIS CAPPs of California, to designate the post office located at 801 West Ocean Avenue, in Lompoc, California, as the Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building.

Senior Officer Specialist Scott J. Williams was killed in the line of duty on April 3 of 1997. While performing routine supervision duties at the U.S. penitentiary in Lompoc, California, an inmate senselessly and brutally attacked Officer Williams, tragically taking his life. Officer Williams was a marine veteran, a former Marine of the Year, who served in Operation Desert Storm. He is survived by his wife and two daughters.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 5562 and ensure that this fallen hero is never forgotten.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am in full support of this postal naming.

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California, Representative CAPPs, the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague from Vermont for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5562, which would designate the United States Postal Service facility in Lompoc, California, as the Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building.

This is an important bill not only for the community of Lompoc, which resides in my congressional district on the central coast of California, but for the memory of a public servant we lost way too soon. Naming the Lompoc post office in honor of Scott J. Williams is a very fitting tribute.

Scott was a veteran, a civil servant, and a beloved family man who dedicated his life to public service. As a youth, he attended Lompoc High School and Allan Hancock College, both in the 24th Congressional District of California.

His tradition of service began in the Persian Gulf war, with distinction and valor, rising to the rank of corporal in the United States Marine Corps. During his military career, Scott was widely respected by his colleagues and was credited with saving many lives during combat. In fact, his outstanding work as a decorated veteran has been recognized through multiple awards, including being honored as Marine of the Year in 1989. Upon returning home to Lompoc, Scott continued his services to our Nation and began a career in law enforcement as a correctional officer. After 4 years of service at the United States Bureau of Prisons, Scott was tragically killed in the line of duty in 1997.

We are still saddened by the loss of this local hero and this family man. He is sincerely missed by the people of Los Alamos, California, and by the entire Lompoc, California, community.

After years of selfless service to our Nation and to the local community, the naming of the Lompoc Post Office after Officer Scott Williams is a fitting tribute. This recognition would com-

plement the memorial park and the State highway in his name, and it would continue to honor a man whose selfless career was dedicated to keeping our Nation, as well as his own community, safe.

Scott is survived by his wife, Kristy, and their two daughters, Kaitlin and Kallee. This bill also honors them because they have sacrificed as well, and they have shown great perseverance in the face of terrible tragedy.

I thank you for the privilege of speaking on the family's behalf. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to author this bill and to see it here on the floor today. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5562.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD POST OFFICE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5687) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, as the "Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5687

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, shall be known and designated as the "Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5687, introduced by Representative JANICE HAHN of California, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office.

Juanita Millender-McDonald represented California's 37th District in the House of Representatives for over a decade, serving from 1996 until her untimely death. During her time in Congress, she was known for her commitment to protecting international human rights, and she worked to aid victims of genocide and human trafficking. Representative Millender-McDonald was also the first African American woman to chair the House Administration Committee. Sadly, she passed away on April 22, 2007, at age 68, due to colon cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in memorializing Juanita Millender-McDonald's public service by supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation.

At this time, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California, Representative HAHN, the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today about a friend and predecessor who served some of the same communities that I now represent.

Today, we are voting on a piece of legislation that will recognize the life and legacy of the late Congresswoman, Juanita Millender-McDonald, by designating the United States Postal Service facility located at 101 East Market Street, in Long Beach, as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office.

Many of my colleagues in the House had the opportunity to serve alongside Congresswoman Millender-McDonald. They remember her forceful personality and her unyielding advocacy on behalf of her constituents. However, Juanita, who left us so suddenly and too early, was a remarkable woman who broke barriers and who had many impressive achievements even before entering Congress.

□ 1545

By age 26, Juanita Millender-McDonald was a mother of five. She was already in her forties when, after raising her children, Valerie, Angela, Sherryll, Michael, and R. Keith, she went back to school and earned both her bachelor's and master's degrees with the support of her loving husband, James.

She became a teacher in the Los Angeles Unified School District and later

became the manuscript editor for Images, a textbook aimed at promoting the self-esteem of young women, and the director of gender equality programs for the school district.

She broke down barriers for women and minorities and made history by becoming the first African American woman elected to the Carson City Council and, in 2007, became the first African American woman to chair a congressional committee, the Committee on House Administration.

While serving for more than a decade in the House of Representatives, she also served on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Small Business Committee, the committees on which I now currently serve, and she was an active member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

From her days in the California Assembly to serving here in the House, Juanita Millender-McDonald dedicated her career to advocating for the Los Angeles public school system, job training, women's equality, women's health, and combating the drug epidemic that was tearing apart her community. Her advocacy on behalf of the victims of genocide and human trafficking serves as a lasting testament to her dedication to creating a better world.

Congresswoman Millender-McDonald worked tirelessly for her constituents, taking only a week of leave before she succumbed to cancer.

By designating a United States Postal Service facility in my district as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office, we honor an exemplary woman with an incredible public service record.

It is my hope that honoring her now will allow her life and accomplishments to inspire further residents, not only of Long Beach but Americans across the land.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today about a friend and predecessor who served some of the same communities that I now represent.

Today we are voting on a piece of legislation that will recognize the life and legacy of the late Congresswoman Juanita Millender-McDonald, by designating the United States Postal Service facility located at 101 E. Market Street in Long Beach, as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office.

Many of my colleagues in the House had the opportunity to serve alongside Congresswoman Millender-McDonald and remember her forceful personality and her unyielding advocacy on behalf of her constituents.

However, Juanita, who left us so suddenly and too early, was a remarkable woman who broke barriers and had many impressive achievements even before entering Congress.

By age 26, Juanita Millender-McDonald was a mother of five. She was already in her forties, when, after raising her children, she went back to school and subsequently earned bachelor's and master's degrees and did additional studies towards a PhD.

She became a teacher in L.A. USD and later the manuscript editor for Images, a textbook aimed at promoting the self-esteem of young women, and the director of gender equity programs for the school district.

She broke down barriers for women and minorities and made history by becoming the first African-American woman elected to the Carson City Council, and in 2007 became the first African-American woman to chair a Congressional Committee—the House Administration Committee.

While serving for more than a decade in the House of Representatives, she also served on the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee and the Small Business Committee—the committees on which I now serve—and was an active member of the Congressional Black Caucus.

From her days in the California Assembly to serving here in the House, Juanita Millender-McDonald dedicated her career to advocating for the Los Angeles public school system, job training, women's equality and women's health, and combating the drug epidemic that was tearing apart her community. Her advocacy on behalf of the victims of genocide and human trafficking serves as a lasting testament to her dedication to creating a better world.

Congresswoman Millender-McDonald worked tirelessly for her constituents, taking only a week of leave before she succumbed to cancer.

By designating a United States Postal Service facility in my district as the Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office, we honor an exemplary woman with an incredible public service record.

I know her family, including her husband James McDonald, Jr.; children, Valerie, Angela, Sherryll, Michael and R. Keith; and grandchildren, Ayanna, Myles, Ramia, Blair and Diamond, are so proud of her great legacy.

It is my hope that honoring her now will allow her life and accomplishments to inspire further residents not only of Long Beach but Americans across the land.

Mr. MEADOWS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), my good friend who is the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of legislation naming this facility after Ms. Juanita Millender-McDonald, a wonderful lady. She served this institution well up until her final moments. Most of us were not aware of the terminal illness she had. She served with grace, dignity, and honor, and our respect. She will be missed.

Mr. WELCH. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS)

that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5687.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. JESS BROWN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 579) to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 579

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 579.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 579 designates the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

Mr. Brown was a civil rights lawyer who worked against racial discrimination and was credited in the 1950s with filing the first civil rights lawsuit in the State of Mississippi.

A native of Oklahoma, Mr. Brown attended Illinois State University, Indiana University, and the Texas Southern University Law School. In the 1960s, he was one of only four African American lawyers in the State of Mississippi and one of three who took civil rights cases.

In 1962, he worked on behalf of James Meredith, whose successful lawsuit allowed him to be the first African American student to enroll at Ole Miss. Later, Mr. Brown worked to fight against discrimination in transportation and other public accommodations.

Given his dedication to the law and his work in civil rights, it is appropriate to name this courthouse after him.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by yielding such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of this bill, H.R. 579, a bill to designate the United States courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Jess Brown was born on September 12, 1912, in Coffeyville, Kansas. His parents, Ernestine and Joe Brown, were jazz musicians and performed in and managed a local theater.

R. Jess Brown received a bachelor's of science in industrial arts from Illinois State Normal University and a master's of science in industrial education from Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana.

After teaching at Alcorn State University, R. Jess Brown moved to Jackson, Mississippi, where he taught industrial arts at Lanier High School, the only Black high school in the city at the time. While teaching at Lanier, R. Jess Brown became an intervening plaintiff in a lawsuit that sought equal pay for Black teachers in Jackson.

After teaching in Jackson, Jess attended Texas Southern University law school. Jess left the law school before receiving his juris doctorate but was able to return to Mississippi and pass the Mississippi Bar in 1953.

Beginning his career in Vicksburg, Mississippi, R. Jess Brown confined his practice to cases involving divorces, deeds, land titles, and other practices that did not agitate White members of the bar. However, after the Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka ruling in 1954, Jess felt compelled to defend the civil rights of African Americans.

In the fall of 1955, the conditions and hardships endured by Black lawyers in the courts led Mr. Brown and seven other Black attorneys to establish the Magnolia Bar Association.

Mr. Speaker, R. Jess Brown is credited with filing the first civil suit on behalf of African Americans in the State of Mississippi. That lawsuit, on behalf of a Jefferson County minister, challenged laws that prevented Blacks from voting.

Mr. Speaker, Jess Brown has an extensive record as a civil rights lawyer.

His list of clients included Clyde Kennard, who was charged with and convicted of a fictitious crime while attempting to desegregate the University of Southern Mississippi; James H. Meredith, whose litigation ultimately led to the integration of the University of Mississippi; Dr. Gilbert Mason, who led the effort to end racial segregation on the beaches of Biloxi, Mississippi; and civil rights icons Medgar Wiley Evers and Dr. Aaron Henry.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brown was admitted to practice law before all Mississippi court systems, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court, and the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Brown also served on the executive board of the National Bar Association for approximately 15 years.

On December 3, 1989, R. Jess Brown died of cancer in Jackson, Mississippi, at the age of 77.

Mr. Speaker, R. Jess Brown is well deserving of this honor, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 579.

Mr. PETRI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I too rise in support of H.R. 579, to designate the United States courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

R. Jess Brown was a towering figure in the history of the civil rights movement in the South and especially in the State of Mississippi. He was a native son of Kansas, born in Coffeyville, Kansas, and raised in Muskogee, Oklahoma. He attended law school at Texas Southern University and practiced law in Mississippi, starting in 1953 and continuing throughout the latter civil rights era.

As associate counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Mr. Brown filed the first civil rights suit in Mississippi in the 1950s. The suit, filed in Jefferson Davis County, sought the enforcement of the right of Black citizens to become registered voters.

In 1961, Brown represented James Meredith in his suit to be allowed to enter the University of Mississippi. His victory in this case opened the doors of that university to all of Mississippi's citizens. While working with the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Brown played a major role in fighting discrimination in the areas of transportation and other public accommodations.

During his lifetime, he received numerous awards and honors, including the NAACP's Lawyer of the Year Award; the National Bar Association

C. Francis Stradford Award, which is the Bar Association's highest award; and the Mississippi Teachers Association's award for extraordinary service to education in Mississippi.

R. Jess Brown will be remembered as more than a brilliant attorney and civil rights leader; he will also be remembered as a great American. As such, it is fitting that the United States courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, be designated the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

I support this legislation and urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 579.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 579.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4926) to designate the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway" and the "James L. Oberstar National Scenic Byway" in the State of Minnesota, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4926

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The segment of Interstate Route 35 between milepost 133 at Forest Lake, Minnesota, and milepost 259 at Duluth, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the segment of Interstate Route 35 referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill before us, H.R. 4926.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4926. This bill designates the segment of Interstate Route 35 between mile post 133 at Forest Lake, Minnesota, and mile post 259 at Duluth, Minnesota, as the James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway.

This is a small but well-deserved and fitting tribute to a former colleague, a leader for many years, first on the staff of the Transportation Committee in the House of Representatives, where he was an aide, and then later succeeded his predecessor in the House of Representatives, the Honorable John Blatnik, who represented the Iron Range for many years, and I think who also has a bridge and some other important locations named after him, and then of course who served on the Transportation Committee as an active member, chairman of many of its subcommittees and, ultimately, chairman of the full committee for many, many years.

I got to know Jim Oberstar personally, and we were competitors on a lot of issues, but we were also very much friends. He was a person with strong family values and a great sense of obligation to the working people of the Iron Range in northern Minnesota.

His father had worked on the mines, one of many who came over from what is now Yugoslavia to work in northern Minnesota, creating enormous wealth for our country, helping to build the steel industry, and arm our Nation and also build the railroads, materials and all the rest, and who shared in that, but only modestly, compared with many, many others.

He was a very interesting man with many, many sterling qualities, a natural linguist. I have been at meetings with Jim Oberstar where the French Ambassador would say, "Now, where did you learn French? You must have lived in France." "It was at the University of Minnesota," that is where he learned French.

He also became a very good speaker of the dialect that people speak down in Haiti. He knew three or four other languages. He had a natural facility for languages.

Jim also had a great interest in transportation policy and in history, and I think, as someone said at his memorial service, he felt everyone that he talked with shared the great love he had for all the details and history and facts of different situations, but he was wrong, but if you were interested, it was fascinating to spend time with Jim Oberstar.

He loved the outdoors. He fought to make sure that the lakes and rivers of northern Minnesota and the Boundary

Waters and so on were, to the extent possible, properly managed for the environment, but also available for the working people of that area for their recreation and all the rest, rather than just a few.

He was an example for many of us who served in this House of dedication and putting country and his citizens before self, and he liked to have fun. I had many opportunities to share his love for the outdoors on bicycle trips and other occasions. He was kind enough to come to my district on a number of occasions to help encourage support for different facilities in our area.

He was always a real gentleman, so far as I was concerned in dealing with him, and an example of people who serve in this House from varying backgrounds who have definite and strong feelings, but also who try to make sure that, at the end of the day, they work with people with whom they disagree in order to accomplish something good for our country, and so Jim is sorely missed.

This is a small but fitting memorial for him, and I am sure that he and his wife, Jean, appreciate the fact that the Congress is taking this action today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Wisconsin for his kind words on behalf of not just the Oberstar family, but all the citizens of Minnesota—very kind, very appropriate, and greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield, to begin with, to the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative COLLIN PETERSON, a senior member of the Minnesota congressional delegation and our distinguished colleague.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and also want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his kind words on behalf of the family and the people of the State.

Jim Oberstar passed away this year, as we all know, and we lost a great advocate for transportation and infrastructure. He and I served together for many years in this Congress, and we worked closely together as representatives of rural districts in Minnesota. One thing that I really admired about Congressman Oberstar, he wasn't afraid to take tough positions and do what he thought was right.

As chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, he supported an increase in the gas tax, so that we could ensure long-term sustainable funding for our Nation's transportation needs. That is one thing he and I both agreed on, and I know he met strong resistance for expressing those views.

Beyond his work on the committee, Congressman Oberstar was passionate

about his district and the people he represented. He was a tireless advocate, and he made sure that the Eighth District had a voice through his leadership and in the caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the legacy of Jim Oberstar will live on in Minnesota and across the country for decades to come, and I know that he would be proud to have this highway and national scenic byway in Minnesota named in his memory, and as has been indicated, we will all miss his tremendous expertise and advocacy for transportation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of stories we could tell about the Jim Oberstar, and I think it is probably not fully appropriate to do that at this time but just to say that he was a self-made person, he had great intellectual abilities, and he used them well on behalf of his constituents, his State, and our country.

He had an ability, I think, to work very well with people with whom he would disagree on some issues. He was a man of faith and believed that, at the end of the day, we are all sinners, we couldn't expect perfection. There is going to be a certain disagreement there, but, at the other hand, there are some redeeming qualities in us human beings too, and let's look for those and work with others.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank my colleagues for bringing this legislation forward. I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding, and I thank my good friend, Mr. PETRI, whom I deeply regret seeing leave the Congress, as well, because he has contributed so very much to this Congress, particularly in the field of which we speak today.

Of very few Members can it be said that they grew up in the Congress. One could almost say that about Jim Oberstar who came here as a legislative assistant to the Public Works Committee, then ultimately became its chief of staff, and then decided that he could do the whole thing and become a Member of Congress from the Eighth District of Minnesota.

By the time Jim came to the Congress, he had such an early start that he already knew probably all anyone would expect any Member to know. This early start led to what can only be called breathtaking knowledge and, ultimately, achievements in the transportation and infrastructure field.

He became not only my mentor but, literally, the personal mentor of every

Member on each side of the aisle and, ultimately, a mentor to any Member of Congress who wanted to know anything about the Nation's transportation and infrastructure.

At the bottom, Mr. Speaker, transportation and infrastructure is a very technical and specialized field. It takes hard work and brilliance to become a master of the roads, bridges, infrastructure, and bike and running trails of this country, let alone the complexities of intermodalism. It was a marvel to see Jim go at intermodalism. I had the opportunity to see him offer visionary leadership on intermodalism here with Union Station in Washington, D.C., and around the country.

Mr. Speaker, Jim came to subcommittee hearings almost all the time and participated in these hearings with the same depth as the chair of the subcommittee. He never let his encyclopedic knowledge wither.

Mr. Speaker, I have been on the committee ever since I came to Congress in 1991. I can say without any compunction that, if you were around Jim, no matter where you sat in the committee room, you could not avoid his kindness, his warmth, and his depth. Sometimes Jim may have told you more than you wanted to know about transportation and infrastructure, but at the end of the day, you were glad that you listened because you heard him speak, sometimes playfully, in French—he always understood you had better keep using what you once had—but always offering the benefits of his knowledge, and using his great intellectual and personal gifts to bring us all in to the field he had mastered. No wonder Minnesota elected him to serve so long that he became the longest serving Member from the State.

As we struggle still for a highway bill, I hope we will not forget this great Member who began as an ironworker, worked himself through college as an ironworker, organized unions, and never forgot the roots from which he came, and yet came to this Congress and made himself a friend of anyone who would listen.

I am pleased to be associated with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring former Congressman James Louis "Jim" Oberstar, my friend and mentor, and mentor to thousands. Jim represented the 8th district of Minnesota for 18 terms, from 1975 until 2011, but his breathtaking knowledge and achievements on transportation and infrastructure made him the nation's mentor on these issues.

Born in Chisholm, Minnesota in 1934, Jim was the son of an iron miner and shirt factory worker. He learned at an early age the power of organizing workers to fight for fair wages and safe workplaces, and never forgot his roots in the working class and in the organizations they asked to represent them at the bargaining table. Jim worked in the Minnesota

mines to fund his college education, graduating from the College at St. Thomas in St. Paul with degrees in French and political science.

In 1963, Jim started his career on the Capitol Hill. He worked as legislative assistant and chief of staff for former Congressman John Blatnik, who represented Minnesota's 8th district at the time. He also served as chief of staff of the House Committee on Transportation and Public Works for many years. In 1974, Jim was elected to the House, where he was fully prepared to use his already well-developed knowledge of transportation and infrastructure as a member on the House Committee on Transportation and Public Works.

Jim contributed to the work of building and rebuilding the nation's transportation systems—its road and bridge networks, and, as a cyclist himself, its bike and running trails. Jim's encyclopedic knowledge of the field led him to master the complexities associated with intermodalism, the transportation wave of the future. His work, for example, to make the District of Columbia's Union Station truly intermodal, still in progress, will always be emblematic of his visionary leadership.

From the moment I joined the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, in 1991, I learned from Jim Oberstar and felt his warmth, kindness and depth. Jim not only led us, he nurtured us. Whether smiling as he playfully spoke French or offering the benefits of his commonsense knowledge, Jim's intellectual and personal gifts left us admiring him as a person and in awe of his knowledge and understanding of the field as a professional. Jim's outstanding work in the Congress led the people of Minnesota to make him the longest serving House member from their state, and Jim served the nation with special distinction at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in honoring Jim Oberstar for his many accomplishments for the 8th district of Minnesota and for his devotion to our nation's transportation and infrastructure.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is truly a great honor for me to present to the House this bill to name the stretch of Interstate Highway I-35 from Forest Lake, Minnesota, to Duluth, Minnesota, on behalf of the late former chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, James Oberstar.

I do so in the spirit of bipartisanship that Jim epitomized on behalf of the entire Minnesota delegation, all of whom have sponsored this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I will never forget the moment in January 2013 when Jim entered this Chamber for the first time as a former Member of the Congress. He walked quietly through the side door here, and one by one, his colleagues here in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans alike, noticed him and began to spontaneously applaud Jim Oberstar in welcoming him back to the Congress.

I, quite frankly, have never seen anything quite like it, and this gesture of appreciation for the way Jim Oberstar

brought us together through his bipartisan leadership and example was one of the more heartwarming and important experiences that I have seen take place here in this Chamber.

□ 1615

Jim was an idea guy. As TOM mentioned, it didn't matter to him if an idea came from a Republican or a Democrat. The only thing that mattered to him was whether or not it was a good idea. If you had an idea, Jim wanted to hear it, and he was ready to work with you to make it happen if he thought it was a good idea.

And that was particularly true with respect to the building and rebuilding and expanding our interstate highway system that he had worked on, as it was pointed out here, as a staff member to that committee earlier in his life for the sole purpose of connecting every corner of this great Nation together from border to border and from sea to sea.

Through recessions, through budget deficits, through gas shortages and challenges of every kind, Jim Oberstar never wavered in his support for the interstate highway system because he understood how vital it is to our ability to create good jobs, to literally drive our economy forward and create the atmosphere for successful business and job creation.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to honor Jim Oberstar by naming the stretch of I-35 that serves as the gateway to the district he so ably represented for 36 years and designate it as the James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4926 and to honor the life of a truly remarkable man that we lost this year, Jim Oberstar. This legislation would designate the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway" and the "James L. Oberstar National Scenic Byway" in the State of Minnesota, but more importantly, it would honor the legacy of one of our most beloved former colleagues.

Jim grew up appreciating the value of hard work and he innately understood the importance of cultivating strong relationships and tirelessly fighting for what was right.

He left the House of Representatives and the nation quite frankly, in a better place than when he found it. He was the consummate public servant and has an incredible lasting legacy.

In the 18 terms he served in Congress, he had a remarkable impact on the transportation industry in America and upon all of his colleagues. He was uniquely aware of the value of jobs, the economy, and the interconnectedness of goods and people throughout the country.

In a profession not always known for brevity of remarks, his speeches, as we can all attest,

were amongst the most lengthy. However, when delivering remarks, he spoke passionately and with great intellect, never failing to effectively convey his point to a wide variety of audiences.

More importantly, he understood the value of bipartisanship in Washington and never let politics get in the way of good policy.

While we mourn the loss of our dear friend, we celebrate his life and service to this nation. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 4926, to designate a segment of Interstate Route 35 in the State of Minnesota as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway." This legislation would designate the segment of Interstate Route 35 between milepost 133 at Forest Lake, Minnesota, and milepost 259 at Duluth, Minnesota, as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway."

Renaming these highways is a good way to memorialize Congressman Oberstar's contributions to Minnesota and our country. Born to an underground miner from Chisholm, Minnesota, Jim Oberstar served as a representative for the state of Minnesota for 36 years, totaling 18 terms from 1975 to 2011. He is the longest-serving congressman in Minnesota history.

During his over thirty years of service to our state, Jim always put Minnesotans first. He was a public servant above all else. He had a gifted mind and an uncanny memory that helped him master a number of languages, including Haitian Creole. Jim's passion for helping people get from one place to another safely was contagious and his vision for Minnesota's future lives on as the projects he fought for as chairman of the Transportation Committee remain in Minnesota today.

After the Interstate 35 Bridge collapsed in Minnesota, Jim authored legislation which authorized \$255 million without delay to begin the recovery and rebuilding process. His effective leadership was essential in that time of crisis. In addition to helping rebuild the I-35 Bridge, Jim was responsible for the Gitchi-Gami trail along Lake Superior's North Shore, the lakewalk in Duluth, and the 120-mile long Paul Bunyan bike trail.

Jim Oberstar embodied the Minnesotan values of public service, selflessness and compassion. His spirit, ideas and energy are deeply missed. For these reasons, I support this legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, Jim Oberstar was a true gentleman of the House who ably represented Minnesota's 8th District for 36 years. He was a fixture of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Jim started as staff in the 1960s, became a Member in the 1970s, then served as Chairman of the Committee from 2007 to 2011. I was blessed to work, and sometimes ride, alongside Jim for many years. Given his many years of work to improve transportation in Minnesota and across the country, it is fitting that a portion of Interstate Highway 35 be renamed in his honor.

As a tireless advocate on transportation issues, Jim earned well-deserved admiration in many circles, including in my home state of Oregon. He accompanied me on tours to ad-

vocate for increased infrastructure investment. Jim truly understood the importance of investment as a way to create American jobs, improve safety, and build roads, bridges and transit systems to accommodate a 21st Century economy. His passion and leadership are evident in projects across the country.

Jim was also an avid cyclist, and I am grateful I had the opportunity to show him my state in 2007 during the Cycle Oregon event. He was one tough athlete, easily outpacing cyclists half his age. Jim was a champion of the road in more ways than one.

Like many people in Washington, DC, Minnesota and beyond, I feel fortunate to consider Jim not only a colleague, but a friend and a mentor. I only wish he had lived long enough to share all of his knowledge with the rest of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4926, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate a segment of Interstate Route 35 in the State of Minnesota as the 'James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH F. WEIS JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5146) to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5146

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill before us, H.R. 5146.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5146 designates the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse.

Joseph F. Weis, Jr., served as a Federal judge on the United States Court of Appeals on the Third Circuit from 1973 until assuming senior status in 1988, and he served in that capacity until his death earlier this year in 2014. Prior to his appointment to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Judge Weis was appointed to the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. Prior to his appointment to the Federal bench, he served as a judge on the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County and was in the private practice of law.

Judge Weis also served as a captain in the United States Army during the Second World War and is interred in Arlington National Cemetery. Given Judge Weis' service and dedication to the law, it is fitting to name this courthouse after him.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his support of the legislation during consideration in the committee. I also want to thank every member of the Pennsylvania delegation who cosponsored this bill with me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5146, legislation which would officially designate the Federal courthouse in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, my home district, as the Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse.

This would be fitting recognition for an individual who served his country so well, first as a soldier and then as an outstanding jurist. Throughout his 91 years of life, Joseph F. Weis, Jr., served our country with humility, integrity, and an unfailing sense of duty. As a young man, he enlisted in the Army shortly after Pearl Harbor. Reflecting on that decision later in life, he said plainly: "It was the thing to do. The country was at war, and I felt I should be out there doing my share."

He was awarded the Bronze Star for Valor and a Purple Heart with oakleaf cluster after sustaining multiple injuries over the course of his service.

Upon returning back home, Joe Weis pursued a legal career, joining his father's practice after graduating from

the University of Pittsburgh Law School in 1950. After becoming a respected trial lawyer, he was elected to the Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas in 1968 as the first choice on both the Democratic and Republican ballots. As a judge, he quickly developed a reputation for patience and hard work. He always strove to improve our judicial system, advocating for innovative courthouse technologies and enforcement of judicial ethics.

Two years later, Judge Weis was appointed to the Federal bench, and in 1973 he was appointed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, one step below the Supreme Court. He served on that court for 40 years, retiring just last year when he was 90 years old. He was recognized for his outstanding service on the bench with the Devitt Award, the highest honor given to Federal judges.

Amidst this remarkable list of accomplishments, he was known perhaps most of all for the strength of his character. "He is, if anything, an overly modest and unassuming individual," said the University of Pittsburgh chancellor at his Devitt Award ceremony.

Joe Weis was equally beloved by his colleagues and his law clerks, who to this day still call themselves the "Weis guys."

The life of Joseph F. Weis, Jr., is a model that all public servants should aspire to emulate. Naming this Federal courthouse in his honor is a fitting way to recognize his long, faithful, and extremely capable service to our country, to inspire trust in the Federal justice system which he served for so long and with great integrity, and to provide future generations with an outstanding example of a great public servant. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to name the Federal courthouse in Pittsburgh in his honor.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and thank Congressman DOYLE for that fitting tribute to Judge Weis. Because of Judge Weis' dedicated service to the legal community and his exemplary time as a jurist in Pittsburgh, it is fitting to name the courthouse in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 5146.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I urge all of my colleagues to support the legislation before us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5146.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT OF 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2901) to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to implement, leverage, and monitor and evaluate programs to provide first-time or improved access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to the world's poorest on an equitable and sustainable basis, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2901

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 4. Purpose.

Sec. 5. Improving coordination and oversight of safe water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities.

Sec. 6. Increasing sustainability of safe water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities.

Sec. 7. United States complimentary strategies to increase sustainable, affordable, and equitable access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene.

Sec. 8. Transparency and monitoring and evaluation.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533)—

(A) makes access to affordable, equitable, and sustainable clean water, sanitation, and hygiene for developing countries a specific policy objective of United States foreign assistance programs;

(B) requires the United States Government to—

(i) develop a strategy to elevate and further the United States foreign policy and foreign assistance objective to provide affordable and equitable access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene in developing countries; and

(ii) improve the effectiveness and targeting of United States assistance programs undertaken in support of that strategy;

(C) codifies Target 10 of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals; and

(D) seeks to reduce by half between 1990 (the baseline year) and 2015—

(i) the proportion of people who are unable to reach or afford safe drinking water; and

(ii) the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation.

(2) For maximum effectiveness of assistance, safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene must be coordinated with and reflected in programs and strategies for food security, global health, environment, education, gender equality, and conflict prevention and mitigation.

(3) On February 2, 2012, the United States national intelligence community released a National Intelligence Estimate on Global Water Security, which found that—

(A) over the next decade, countries of strategic importance to the United States will experience water shortages, poor water quality, or floods, that will risk instability or state failure and increase regional tensions;

(B) water problems may pose a risk to global food markets and economic growth, and may harm the economic performance of important trading partners;

(C) water stresses compound existing problems, such as poverty, social tension, and ill-health and without good management of water food supplies will be reduced and water borne diseases will increase; and

(D) pressure will arise for a more engaged United States to make water a global priority and to support major development projects.

(4) On August 1, 2008, Congress passed House Concurrent Resolution 318, which—

(A) supports the goals and ideals of the International Year of Sanitation; and

(B) recognizes the importance of sanitation on public health, poverty reduction, economic and social development, and the environment.

(5) According to the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, commissioned by the United Nations, more than one-fifth of the world's population relies on freshwater sources that are either polluted or excessively withdrawn. Healthy ecosystems provide multiple water-related services, such as flood control and water purification, upon which human security, health and well-being depend. Therefore, measures aiming to maintain or restore those services ensure the long-term sustainability of strategies to secure safe and reliable access to water and sanitation.

(6) While progress is being made on safe water and sanitation efforts—

(A) more than 783,000,000 people throughout the world lack access to safe drinking water; and

(B) approximately 35 percent of the total global population does not have access to basic sanitation services.

(7) A lack of access to clean water and adequate sanitation has disproportionate, and too often deadly impacts on children:

(A) Water and sanitation-related disease, despite being preventable, remains one of the most significant child health problems worldwide. Diarrhea is the most serious of these diseases, alone killing over 3,000 children each day, and is the second biggest cause of death in children in the post neonatal period, aged one month to 5 years. Ninety percent of all people that die from diarrheal disease are children under the age of 5. Eighty-eight percent of diarrheal disease is attributed to unsafe drinking water, inadequate sanitation and poor hygiene.

(B) Even when bouts of diarrhea don't kill, these episodes can physically and mentally

stunt children, affecting them for the rest of their lives.

(C) Having adequate and appropriate water supply and sanitation facilities in schools is a major factor influencing whether children, and especially adolescent girls, attend school.

(D) Adequate sanitation facilities and practices contributes to reducing malnutrition in children, improves the quality of life and dignity of girls and women, protects the environment, and generates economic benefits for communities and nations.

(8) The health and environmental consequences of unsafe drinking water and poor sanitation are significant, accounting for nearly 10 percent of the global burden of disease, and as further indicated by the following:

(A) At any given time, half of the hospital beds in developing countries are occupied by patients suffering from diseases associated with lack of access to safe drinking water, inadequate sanitation, and poor hygiene.

(B) More than 3,575,000 people die each year from water-related disease.

(C) Chronic or acute diarrhea can lead to cognitive delays, with severe repercussions for economic development.

(D) Lack of adequate sanitation contaminates rivers worldwide, as one of the most significant sources of water pollution. Every day, 2,000,000 tons of untreated sewage and industrial and agricultural waste are discharged into the world's freshwaters.

(9) Clean water and sanitation are among the most powerful drivers for human development. They extend opportunity, enhance dignity, and help create a virtuous cycle of improving health and rising wealth.

(10) Diseases linked to unsafe water and poor sanitation, as well as the time and energy women often devote to collecting water, significantly reduce economic productivity in less developed countries and promote lifecycles of disadvantage.

(11) Expanding access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene, while protecting the natural infrastructures that store, deliver, and purify water for nature and people, are essential steps in reducing the global burden of disease, advancing sustainable economic and social development, protecting basic human rights, preventing violence against girls and women, and mitigating sources of conflict associated with water scarcity, mass migration, and water related disasters, both within and between countries.

(12) Nearly 1,000,000,000 people across the globe still suffer from chronic hunger. Water scarcity and poor water management reduce agricultural productivity and add pressures on valuable fisheries, posing a major threat to food security and local livelihoods, and limits the ability of the world to provide the resources necessary for the doubling of food production that will be required to meet the demands of a projected population of 9,000,000,000 people by 2050.

(13) 2.8 billion people in more than 48 countries are expected to face severe and chronic water shortages by 2025, with major impacts on energy and food security, development, livelihoods, human health, and natural infrastructure.

(14) Agriculture consumes 70 percent of all freshwater withdrawn globally. Global increases in the efficiency and productivity of both irrigated and rain-fed agriculture will be needed to meet future food production requirements.

(15) Approximately half the world's population lives in cities, often in slums characterized by unsafe water, poor sanitation,

lack of basic services, overcrowding, inferior construction and insecure tenure.

(16) According to the United Nations, women make up 70 percent of the world's poor. Yet, the time they spend collecting water prevents them from undertaking other activities, such as generating income or attending school.

(17) A lack of access to safe water and improved sanitation close to home and at school can impact girls' educational attainment and retention, limiting their ability to break the cycle of poverty. Research has found increases in girls' school enrollment when clean water points were installed closer to home, and increases in girls' school attendance when separate latrines for boys and girls were provided on site. Meeting Target 10 of the Millennium Development Goals for water and sanitation would provide an estimated 272,000,000 additional school days per year.

(18) A lack of water points close to home or safe, private latrines can put women and girls in isolated situations, making them more vulnerable to sexual and physical violence. Violence against women and girls has consequences ranging from psychosocial trauma to heightened risk of HIV/AIDS.

(19) Faith communities and nonprofit development and conservation organizations across the United States contribute significantly to the improvement of water, sanitation, and hygiene in developing countries. By applying their expertise, providing services, building the capacity of local organizations, establishing long-term partnerships with local communities, empowering marginalized groups, supporting sustainable water management and serving as a voice for the poor, faith-based and nonprofit organizations complement and leverage assistance provided by the United States Government.

(20) United States businesses have developed key technologies, donated goods and services, partnered with private and public sector entities, and invested their capital to improve water and sanitation and freshwater sources in many developing countries. Corporate actors have also partnered with other stakeholders to implement sustainable water management and water use efficiency within their plants and throughout their supply chain.

(21) Implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 must be significantly strengthened if the purposes of section 135 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2152h; relating to assistance to provide safe water and sanitation), as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, are to be met.

(22) The monitoring and evaluation of the performance of United States foreign assistance programs and their contribution to policy, strategies, projects, program goals, and priorities undertaken by the Federal Government is essential to improving aid effectiveness.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In May 2013, the United States Agency for International Development released a Water and Development Strategy, whose goal is “to save lives and advance development through improvements in water supply, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) programs, and through sound management and use of water for food security.”

(2) The Water and Development Strategy states that it supports the efforts of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of

2005 “by advancing many activities consistent with the goals of the Act.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the initial United States Agency for International Development’s Water and Development Strategy, released in May 2013—

(A) is a significant accomplishment and improves the Agency’s capacity to provide sustainable and effective water, sanitation, and hygiene assistance;

(B) is supportive of and should continue to reinforce the United States foreign policy and development objectives for clean water, sanitation, and hygiene;

(C) should be refined and expanded by the United States Agency for International Development as often as necessary to ensure best practices are used and the purposes of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533) and this Act are met, should target the world’s poorest and those suffering from the lowest levels of access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene, and should be updated by the Agency not later than every 5 years, to more fully meet the requirements and spirit of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and section 135 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2152h), as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005; and

(D) is not, on its own, the holistic United States water strategy required by the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, but instead addresses components of a comprehensive strategy for how the United States plans to support the United States foreign policy and development objectives and measure its success towards the objectives required by the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and this Act, and must be complemented by the development of a whole-of-government United States Government global water strategy aimed at creating an enabling environment through diplomatic channels for the Agency’s water, sanitation, and hygiene programming that will better allow the Agency to succeed in its mission; and

(2) the Secretary of State, acting through the Special Advisor for Water Resources (established by 136(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961), as added by section 5(a)(2)(C) of this Act, and in collaboration and consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, should develop a Global Water Resources Strategy relating to United States foreign policy objectives for water, pursuant to section 6(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, as added by section 7 of this Act, that—

(A) articulates a vision for the role played by the Department of State, including in its power as a convener, in addressing the foreign policy and national security issues identified in the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and this Act, the 2012 National Intelligence Estimate on Global Water Security, and other relevant whole-of-government assessments, strategies, and approaches;

(B) is an ambitious United States foreign policy framework that advances the objectives of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and this Act to provide sustainable access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to poor and marginalized people through improved United States diplomatic efforts to build political will and coordination across the Federal Government to better enable United

States Government agencies and partners to meet their international development objectives;

(C) is complementary to, supportive of, and does not inhibit, the Water and Development Strategy, and establishes clear roles and responsibilities insofar as possible among Federal agencies and departments responsible for jointly carrying out the strategy, as required by section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, as added by section 7 of this Act.

SEC. 4. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act and the amendments made by this Act is to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533) by—

(1) improving coordination and oversight of international water, sanitation, hygiene, and sustainable water management programs within and between United States Government agencies;

(2) increasing the sustainability of United States Government-supported water, sanitation, and hygiene programs, including in terms of affordability, accountability, and financial, operational, institutional, and environmental sustainability;

(3) enhancing water, sanitation, and hygiene expertise within the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of State, which shall include a whole of agency approach to establish a learning agenda aimed at increasing the quality, effectiveness, and sustainability of the United States Government-supported water, sanitation, and hygiene programs; and

(4) ensuring water, sanitation, and hygiene programs and strategies are reflected in and supported by other development initiatives such as food security, global health, environment, education, gender quality, and conflict prevention and mitigation within and between countries, with the goal of meeting the needs of the poorest and most marginalized people.

SEC. 5. IMPROVING COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT OF SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 135, as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2536; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as section 136; and

(2) in section 136, as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “AND SANITATION” and inserting “, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “and sanitation” and inserting “, sanitation, and hygiene”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(e) GLOBAL WATER COORDINATOR.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) shall designate a senior advisor to coordinate and oversee the Agency’s programs in developing countries that seek to provide affordable and equitable access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, who shall be known as the ‘Global Water Coordinator’, who shall administer and oversee an office to be known as the Office of Water, Sanitation, and Development, and who shall report directly to the Administrator and the Assistant Administrator overseeing water programs.

“(2) DUTIES.—The Global Water Coordinator shall—

“(A) oversee implementation of this section, the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013;

“(B) oversee the buildup of capacity and expertise within USAID to implement this section, the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, including—

“(i) by appointing USAID mission water advisors in each high priority country, who—

“(I) shall have or be given the opportunity to fully develop their technical skills and competencies necessary to provide appropriate guidance to technical and program staff to ensure the Water and Development Strategy can be successfully implemented; and

“(II) shall ensure water, sanitation, and hygiene objectives and indicators are reflected throughout program planning and budgeting documents;

“(ii) work with USAID regional bureaus, who shall be the primary liaisons between the Global Water Coordinator and mission water advisors, to ensure water, sanitation, and hygiene projects are reflected in country-specific multiyear strategies, multiyear sector strategies, and project designs in each high priority country; and

“(iii) ensure that water, sanitation, hygiene and water management issues are incorporated into all relevant Agency training programs at the office, regional, and mission levels;

“(C) lead the implementation of the Water and Development Strategy and oversee the review and development no later than every 5 years of an updated Water and Development Strategy such that it more clearly meets the requirements of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and this Act;

“(D) assist and monitor the development of country-specific and, where appropriate, regional water strategies, whether independent, or as part of broader USAID country-specific or regional strategies, in coordination with relevant USAID mission directors, other appropriate personnel, and pursuant to the interagency consultation and coordination process as required by section 5(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, ensuring such strategies reflect best practices as they relate to increasing access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene activities, and sustainable water management;

“(E) ensure sustainable and equitable access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene are reflected in strategies and broader USAID policies or strategies, including policies or strategies relating to food security, global health, environment, education, gender equality, and conflict prevention and mitigation;

“(F) develop appropriate benchmarks, measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans for water, sanitation, and hygiene programs in accordance with and as required by sections 6 and 7 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note);

“(G) ensure programming for sustainable water management, and equitable access to clean water, sanitation, and hygiene are reflected across USAID programming in a

manner consistent with the long-term sustainability of service outcomes and freshwater sources; and

“(H) foster the development, dissemination, and increased and consistent use of low-cost and sustainable technologies, public and private partnerships, credit guarantees and other financing arrangements that leverage non-Federal funds for impact on equitable access to affordable water, sanitation, and hygiene services that will provide long-term benefits to the world’s poorest communities.

“(3) STAFF.—The Administrator shall ensure that a sufficient number of employees with appropriate experience or expertise are reassigned or detailed from within USAID to assist the Global Water Coordinator in carrying out the duties of paragraph (2).

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘high priority country’ means a low-income or lower-middle income country designated pursuant to section 6(b)(2)(C) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) and enumerated in the strategy required by such Act, the first iteration of which was released by USAID in May 2013; and

“(B) the term ‘Water and Development Strategy’ means the strategy released by USAID in May 2013 and its revisions, required to be developed as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, but no less than 5 years after such date of enactment and every 5 years thereafter under section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note).

“(f) SPECIAL ADVISOR FOR WATER RESOURCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall designate a senior advisor to develop, coordinate, and oversee United States foreign policy relating to freshwater resources and policies complementary to, and in support of, the United States Agency for International Development’s Water and Development Strategy, who shall be known as the ‘Special Advisor for Water Resources’, and who shall report directly to the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary overseeing water programs.

“(2) DUTIES.—The Special Advisor for Water Resources shall—

“(A) oversee and coordinate the development and implementation of approaches to increasing political will and government support in partner countries in accordance with United States foreign policy on drinking water, sanitation, hygiene, water resource management, and transboundary water, including—

“(i) working with partner countries and other stakeholders to develop, sustain, and leverage political and financial commitments that would improve access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene, and sustainable water management over the long term;

“(ii) assisting and encouraging other countries and international organizations to plan and manage water resources in an efficient, transparent, equitable, inclusive, and environmentally sustainable manner, taking into account the interdependence among water, food, energy, and sustainable development;

“(iii) fostering regional and cross-border cooperation for integrated management, use and protection of internationally shared rivers, lakes, and aquifer systems;

“(iv) preventing and mitigating intra- and trans-boundary conflict over water re-

sources, including through efforts to strengthen international water law and institutions as tools for facilitating cooperation;

“(v) working with partner countries, international organizations, and other stakeholders to manage water resources in ways that reduce risk and impact from potential water-related shocks such as, but not limited to, droughts or floods, including for improved global food security; and

“(vi) fostering increased agricultural and urban productivity of water resources;

“(B) promote and be the representative for United States policy relating to global freshwater issues in key diplomatic and scientific forums; and

“(C) lead the development and implementation of the Global Water Resources Strategy required by section 6(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) and oversee the review of and update to not later than every 5 years the Global Water Resources Strategy to reflect pressing global challenges and changes.

“(3) STAFF.—The Secretary of State shall ensure that a sufficient number of employees of the Department of State with appropriate experience or expertise are reassigned or detailed from within the Department of State to assist the Special Advisor for Water Resources in carrying out the duties of paragraph (2).

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘Water and Development Strategy’ means the strategy released by USAID in May 2013 and its revisions, required to be developed as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, but no less than 5 years after such date of enactment and every 5 years thereafter under section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note); and

“(B) the term ‘Global Water Resources Strategy’ means the strategy required under section 6(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note).”

(b) INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Secretary of State shall develop and implement a process to ensure regular consultation and coordination between the Global Water Coordinator and the Special Advisor for Water Resources so that their efforts are complimentary and in support of the implementation, and subsequent revision not later than every 5 years, of the Global Water Resources Strategy and the Water and Development Strategy.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The process required under paragraph (1) should include jointly convened meetings with any Federal department or agency administering United States water, sanitation, and hygiene programs to evaluate progress in carrying out the strategies described in paragraph (1), or the revision to any such strategy, as required by section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “Global Water Coordinator” means the Global Water Coordinator designated under section 136(e) of the Foreign

Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section;

(B) the term “Global Water Resources Strategy” means the strategy required under section 6(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act;

(C) the term “Special Advisor for Water Resources” means the Special Advisor for Water Resources designated under section 136(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section; and

(D) the term “Water and Development Strategy” means the strategy released by USAID in May 2013 and its revisions, required to be developed as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, but no less than 5 years after such date of enactment and every 5 years thereafter under section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act.

SEC. 6. INCREASING SUSTAINABILITY OF SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) PRINCIPLES.—In order to ensure that water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities of the United States Agency for International Development carried out under the authorities of section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by section 5 of this Act, and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by this Act, achieve maximum impact and continue to deliver lasting benefits after completion, such projects and activities shall be carried out in accordance with, and monitored and evaluated against the following principles:

(1) Projects and activities should be targeted to the poorest and most vulnerable countries and communities, including women and girls, displaced persons and refugees, and other marginalized populations.

(2) Projects and activities should be designed in consultation with a broad range of local and national stakeholders, including communities directly affected by a lack of access to clean water, sanitation or hygiene, nongovernmental organizations, cooperatives, foundations, universities, private sector entities, and women-focused organizations.

(3) Projects and activities to provide services for the poor should be designed wherever possible to be financially or commercially viable over the long term, focusing on local ownership and sustainability, and undertaken in conjunction with relevant public institutions or private enterprise so long as they can provide access to water, sanitation, and hygiene in such a way that strengthens social equity of access and keeps these services affordable to all, especially the poorest of the poor.

(4) Governments of countries in which projects and activities are carried out should identify revenue streams sufficient to cover the costs of maintaining public equipment and services with respect to such projects and activities over the long term.

(5) Projects and activities should provide for a functioning management and maintenance system comprising tools, supply chains, transport, equipment, training and individuals or institutions with clear responsibilities for achieving sustainability.

(6) With respect to projects and activities that are managed by communities or institutions, effective external support should be

provided to such communities or institutions.

(7) Projects should be designed to provide access to water, sanitation, and hygiene, and sustainable water management through joint programs and other coordinated mechanisms and policies, in order to ensure the long-term sustainability of the results achieved, to mitigate any negative environmental impacts, and to ensure the resilience of natural and man-made infrastructure to floods, droughts, and other water-related disasters.

(8) Access to water and sanitation should be expanded in an equitable manner and on the basis of need, without regard to race, gender, religion, or ethnic origin.

(b) **LOCAL OWNERSHIP.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall establish guidelines and procedures to ensure that—

(1) a broad range of local and national stakeholders is consulted in the development of any country-specific water strategy;

(2) any water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities authorized under each such strategy are designed to address the specific needs of women and girls; and

(3) local civil society organizations, including nonprofit organizations as well as businesses, are full participants in the selection and design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities.

(c) **LOCAL PROCUREMENT.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—In providing assistance under the authorities of section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by section 5 of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to award contracts and other acquisition instruments on a noncompetitive basis to local entities in high priority countries to carry out safe water, sanitation, and hygiene projects and activities in such countries.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—A contract or other instrument described in paragraph (1) may not have a value that exceeds \$5,000,000.

(3) **SUPERSEDES OTHER LAWS.**—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development may exercise the authority of paragraph (1) notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(4) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

(A) the term “high priority country” means a low-income or lower-middle income country designated pursuant to section 6(b)(2)(C) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act; and

(B) the term “local entity” means an individual, corporation, or other entity that—

(i) is organized under the laws of the high priority country;

(ii) has its principal place of business or operations in such country; and

(iii) is owned or controlled by citizens of such country.

(5) **FUNDING.**—Funds made available to carry out the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) for any fiscal year are authorized to be made available to carry out this subsection.

(d) **RETENTION OF INTEREST.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY.**—In providing assistance under the authorities of section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by section 5 of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is au-

thorized to enter into agreements with indigenous local private or public groups, associations, or other entities in high priority countries to provide for the retention by such group, association, or other entity, without deposit in the Treasury of the United States and without further appropriation by law, of interest earned on such assistance so provided.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—An agreement described in paragraph (1) may not have a value that exceeds \$5,000,000.

(3) **USE OF INTEREST.**—Any interest earned on the advance of funds under an agreement authorized under paragraph (1) may be used only for the purposes for which the agreement is made.

(4) **AUDITS.**—The Administrator shall, on a regular and recurring basis, audit interest earned on advance funds under an agreement authorized under paragraph (1) to ensure that the requirements of paragraph (3) are met.

(5) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “high priority country” means a low-income or lower-middle income country designated pursuant to section 6(b)(2)(C) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as amended by section 7 of this Act.

SEC. 7. UNITED STATES COMPLIMENTARY STRATEGIES TO INCREASE SUSTAINABLE, AFFORDABLE, AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE.

Section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6. UNITED STATES COMPLIMENTARY STRATEGIES TO INCREASE SUSTAINABLE, AFFORDABLE, AND EQUITABLE ACCESS TO SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE.

“(a) GLOBAL WATER RESOURCES STRATEGY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, and every 5 years thereafter, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, shall develop a strategy to further the United States foreign policy objective to provide affordable and equitable access to safe water and sanitation in developing countries, as described in section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and by the Agency’s Water and Development Strategy required under subsection (b).

“(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) articulate the United States foreign policy framework that will drive the implementation of the United States foreign policy objectives on increasing access to equitable, clean drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene for the world’s poorest, water resource management, transboundary water and prevention of conflict over water resources; and

“(B) address ways in which United States foreign policy efforts will promote global water security by building political will and partnerships, and support for national level planning processes, in conjunction with the United States Agency for International Development and other Federal agencies, and leveraging expertise, knowledge, technology and resources that will increase the likelihood that the world’s poor receive or continue to have the water they need, when and where they need it, in a sustainable, equitable and conflict-free manner.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall be developed in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies, international organizations, international financial institutions, recipient governments, United States and international nongovernmental organizations, indigenous civil society, and other appropriate entities, and shall be complimentary to, or ultimately joined with, the Agency’s Water and Development Strategy required under subsection (b) and subsequent revisions thereto.

“(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Under Secretary of State who has responsibility to oversee water programs and the Special Advisor for Water Resources, shall implement the strategy required under paragraph (1). The strategy may also be implemented in part by other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate.

“(5) CONSISTENT WITH SAFE WATER AND SANITATION POLICY.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall be consistent with the policy stated in section 3 of this Act.

“(6) CONTENT.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, and timetables to achieve the objective described in paragraph (1);

“(B) an assessment of the level of funding and other assistance for United States water and sanitation programs needed each by the United States Department of State year to achieve the goals, benchmarks, and timetables described in subparagraph (A);

“(C) methods to coordinate and integrate United States water, water resources and sanitation assistance carried out by the Department of State with water, sanitation, hygiene and water resource development programs carried out by the United States Agency for International Development and other Federal agencies to achieve the objective described in paragraph (1);

“(D) methods to better coordinate United States water and sanitation assistance programs with programs of other donor countries and entities to achieve the objective described in paragraph (1); and

“(E) an assessment of the commitment of governments of countries that receive assistance under section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to policies or policy reforms that support affordable and equitable access by the people of such countries to safe water and sanitation.

“(b) WATER AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, but no less than 5 years after such date of enactment and every 5 years thereafter, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, acting through the Global Water Coordinator and in consultation with the Special Advisor for Water Resources, shall develop a strategy, to be known as the ‘Water and Development Strategy’, to further, through the United States Agency for International Development, the United States foreign assistance objective to provide affordable, equitable, and sustainable access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene in developing countries, as described in section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Such strategy shall be complimentary to the United States foreign policy objectives of the safe water and sanitation strategy required under subsection (a) and shall be transmitted to

the appropriate congressional committees and made publicly available on the Internet.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall provide an ambitious vision for leadership of the international development objectives of this Act and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013 and meet the following requirements:

“(A) CONSISTENCY WITH SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE POLICY.—The strategy shall be consistent with the policy stated in section 3 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note).

“(B) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—The strategy shall identify low-income and lower-middle income countries with a severe lack of access to affordable, equitable, and sustainable safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene, by assessing—

“(i) the government or nongovernmental organizational capacity or commitment to manage and implement affordable, equitable, and sustainable solutions, in accordance with section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013;

“(ii) opportunities to leverage existing indigenous public sector, local, donor or private sector investments in the water, sanitation and water resource management sector;

“(iii) the number of people and percent of the population without access to an improved source of safe drinking water in or close to home, disaggregated by rural, peri-urban, or urban geographic location;

“(iv) the number of people and percent of the population without access to an improved source of sanitation in or close to home, disaggregated by rural, peri-urban, or urban geographic location;

“(v) the mortality rate and number of deaths of children under 5 years old due to diarrhea;

“(vi) the mortality rate and number of deaths of children under 5 years old due to pneumonia;

“(vii) the number and proportion of children under 5 years old who are under-nourished;

“(viii) the average time burden of water collection in rural areas;

“(ix) the coexistence in a single geographic area of two or more diseases categorized as a neglected tropical disease spread in whole or in part due to lack of access to safe drinking water, sanitation or hygiene, as defined by the Agency; and

“(x) the degree to which water, sanitation, and hygiene programs are identified as a priority by a beneficiary government, region, or community, as identified in national plans and strategies and the country-specific multiyear strategies as developed by the Agency mission in consultation with the national government and civil society.

“(C) DESIGNATING HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—The strategy shall select 10 to 20 of the eligible countries identified through the assessment required by subparagraph (B) and identify such countries as ‘high priority countries’.

“(D) REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—Each country selected as a high priority country shall be the focus of the Agency’s water, sanitation, and hygiene programming, and the strategy shall develop comprehensive and holistic individual country plans for each high priority country so as to meet the objectives of paragraph (1). Such plans shall include—

“(i) a results framework, in accordance with the sustainability principles identified

in section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, and monitoring and evaluation principles identified in section 7 of this Act, which shall include indicators composed of those criteria used in paragraph (2) to identify high priority countries, that shall be used to measure the long-term impacts and sustainability of programs, including the ongoing commitment of host-country institutions, or lack thereof, and increased access to water, sanitation, and hygiene projects, programs and services provided directly or leveraged by the United States Government; and

“(ii) a clearly described process by which the strategy shall be aligned, coordinated, and leveraged with United States development strategies, policies, and international development initiatives that operate within the high priority country, to include coordination with and reflected in the high priority country’s comprehensive strategy for United States Government-supported development assistance.

“(E) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—For each high priority country, the Agency’s mission director for such country shall—

“(i) designate sustainably increasing access to safe drinking water and sanitation as a strategic objective, reflected in country-specific strategies that incorporate sustainable water management goals and targets in accordance with this Act; and

“(ii) ensure, where complimentary, that the benefits of safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene are reflected in other development initiatives.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO INITIAL STRATEGY.—The Agency’s Water and Development Strategy, issued in May 2013, shall be deemed to be the initial strategy required under paragraph (1) and shall be updated in a timely manner as required by paragraph (1).

“(4) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of transmission of the initial strategy required under paragraph (1), the Global Water Coordinator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an implementation plan detailing how the United States Agency for International Development will institutionalize the strategy, including—

“(A) the budget resources needed to achieve the goals, benchmarks, and time-tables described in this subsection, and an assessment of what will likely be achieved at current funding levels; and

“(B) the number, types, and levels of specialists and generalists currently employed, and projected to be needed, in each functional and geographic area, including support, management, and administrative functions, to carry out the strategy.

“(5) COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In developing the strategy required under paragraph (1), and the implementation plan required under paragraph (4), the Global Water Coordinator shall—

“(i) consult with relevant Executive agencies;

“(ii) consult with the Special Advisor for Water Resources;

“(iii) consult with the Interagency Consultation and Coordination process as required by section 5(b) of the Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013; and

“(iv) consult with representatives of civil society and multi-lateral organizations with demonstrated experience in addressing the lack of access to affordable, equitable and sustainable safe drinking water, sanitation and hygiene in developing countries.

“(B) PUBLIC COMMENT.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(D), the Global Water Coordinator shall allow public comments to be submitted for consideration through a mechanism of the Global Water Coordinator’s choosing, except that such comment period shall last not less than 45 days.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) GLOBAL WATER COORDINATOR.—The term ‘Global Water Coordinator’ means the Global Water Coordinator designated under section 136(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

“(2) SPECIAL ADVISOR FOR WATER RESOURCES.—The term ‘Special Advisor for Water Resources’ means the Special Advisor for Water Resources designated under section 136(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.”.

SEC. 8. TRANSPARENCY AND MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

Section 7 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 7. TRANSPARENCY AND MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

“(a) TRANSPARENCY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall, as part of the Agency’s Internet Web site, establish and maintain a Web page to make publicly available comprehensive, timely, comparable, and accessible information on United States water, sanitation, and hygiene foreign assistance programs. The head of each Federal department or agency that administers such programs shall on a quarterly basis publish and update on the Web page such information with respect to programs of the department or agency.

“(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To ensure transparency, accountability, and effectiveness of United States water, sanitation, and hygiene foreign assistance programs, the information required by paragraph (1) shall include—

“(i) the strategy required by section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–121; 119 Stat. 2533; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note);

“(ii) a list of countries that meet the criteria outlined in section 6(b)(2)(B) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005;

“(iii) an identification of each country designated as a high priority country under section 6(b)(2)(C) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, including a fully articulated rationale of why each country received the designation;

“(iv) for each fiscal year, information on the amount of funds expended in each country or program to carry out this Act and the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005, disaggregated by purpose of assistance, including information on capital investments, and the source of such funds by account; and

“(v) evaluations of water, sanitation, and hygiene programs.

“(B) POSTING REQUIREMENTS.—Such information shall be published on the Web page not later than 30 days after the date of issuance of the information and shall be continuously updated.

“(C) REPORT IN LIEU OF INCLUSION.—If the head of a Federal department or agency described in paragraph (1) makes a determination that the inclusion of a required item of

information on the Web page would jeopardize the health or security of an implementing partner or program beneficiary or would be detrimental to the national interests of the United States, such item of information may be submitted to Congress in a written report in lieu of including it on the Web page, along with the reasons for not including it on the Web page.

“(3) DATABASE.—The Web page shall also contain a link to a searchable database available to the public containing such information relating to the current fiscal year and, as available, for each prior fiscal year dating to and including fiscal year 2006.

“(4) FORM.—Such information shall be published on the Web page in unclassified form. Any information determined to be classified information may be submitted to Congress in classified form and an unclassified summary of such information shall be published on the Web page.

“(b) MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—With regard to water, sanitation, and hygiene programming, the Global Water Coordinator shall ensure that the Agency monitors and evaluates projects and activities carried out under such programs, including carrying out assessments of impact where appropriate, and ensuring results of evaluations are used to inform the design of such projects and activities. Such monitoring and evaluations shall—

“(A) be carried out in accordance with, and measured against the principles described in section 6(b) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 and, where appropriate, the goals established section 6(b)(2)(D) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005; and

“(B) conduct longer term monitoring and evaluation of its water activities in order to assess sustainability beyond the typical Agency program cycle and to enable reasonable support to issues that arise post implementation.

“(2) MANDATORY SET-ASIDE FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—Each water, sanitation, and hygiene project shall be planned and budgeted to include funding for both short- and long-term monitoring and evaluation so that the United States Government and other stakeholders can ascertain the long-term return on investment of United States assistance funds and to enable learning about the sustainability of assistance programs and projects that shall inform future projects and programs.

“(3) WHEN TO CONDUCT EVALUATIONS.—The evaluation of water, sanitation, and hygiene projects should include measurable goals and performance metrics, to be tracked against an established baseline at the outset. Such evaluations should occur immediately following the completion of a project, and no fewer than half of all water, sanitation, and hygiene projects shall be reevaluated 5 years after the completion of the project, all in accordance with the requirements and metrics enumerated in paragraph (1).

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) MONITORING.—The term ‘monitoring’ means, with respect to a United States water, sanitation, or hygiene foreign assistance program, a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

“(B) EVALUATION.—The term ‘evaluation’ means, with respect to a United States

water, sanitation, or hygiene foreign assistance program, the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of the program and projects under the program as a basis for judgments, to improve effectiveness, and to inform decisions about current and future programming, including an explanation of the reasons for or causes of the observed results.”.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) water and sanitation are critically important resources that impact many other aspects of human life; and

(2) the United States should be a global leader in helping provide sustainable access to clean water and sanitation for the world's most vulnerable populations.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF ASSISTANCE TO PROVIDE SAFE WATER AND SANITATION TO INCLUDE HYGIENE.

Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 135 (22 U.S.C. 2152h), as added by section 5(a) of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note), as section 136; and

(2) in section 136, as redesignated—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “AND SANITATION” and inserting “, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “and sanitation” and inserting “, sanitation, and hygiene”.

SEC. 4. IMPROVING COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT OF SAFE WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT.—

“(1) USAID GLOBAL WATER COORDINATOR.—

“(A) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this paragraph as ‘USAID’) or the Administrator's designee, who shall be a current USAID employee serving in a career or non-career position in the Senior Executive Service or at the level of a Deputy Assistant Administrator or higher, shall serve concurrently as the USAID Global Water Coordinator (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Coordinator’).

“(B) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—The Coordinator shall—

“(i) provide direction and guidance to, coordinate, and oversee the projects and programs of USAID authorized under this section;

“(ii) lead the implementation and revision, not less frequently than once every 5 years, of USAID's portion of the Global Water Strategy required under subsection (j);

“(iii) seek—

“(I) to expand the capacity of USAID, subject to the availability of appropriations, including through the designation of a lead subject matter expert selected from among

USAID staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h);

“(II) to implement such programs and activities;

“(III) to take advantage of economies of scale; and

“(IV) to conduct more efficient and effective projects and programs;

“(iv) coordinate with the Department of State and USAID staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h) to ensure that USAID activities and projects, USAID program planning and budgeting documents, and USAID country development strategies reflect and seek to implement—

“(I) the safe water, sanitation, and hygiene objectives established in the strategy required under subsection (j), including objectives relating to the management of water resources; and

“(II) international best practices relating to—

“(aa) increasing access to safe water and sanitation;

“(bb) conducting hygiene-related activities; and

“(cc) ensuring appropriate management of water resources; and

“(v) develop appropriate benchmarks, measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans for USAID projects and programs authorized under this section.

“(2) DEPARTMENT OF STATE SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR WATER RESOURCES.—

“(A) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of State or the Secretary's designee, who shall be a current employee of the Department of State serving in a career or non-career position in the Senior Executive Service or at the level of a Deputy Assistant Secretary or higher, shall serve concurrently as the Department of State Special Advisor for Water Resources (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘Special Advisor’).

“(B) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—The Special Advisor shall—

“(i) provide direction and guidance to, coordinate, and oversee the projects and programs of the Department of State authorized under this section;

“(ii) lead the implementation and revision, not less than every 5 years, of the Department of State's portion of the Global Water Strategy required under subsection (j);

“(iii) prioritize and coordinate the Department of State's international engagement on the allocation, distribution, and access to global fresh water resources and policies related to such matters;

“(iv) coordinate with United States Agency for International Development and Department of State staff in each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h) to ensure that United States diplomatic efforts related to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including efforts related to management of water resources and watersheds and the resolution of intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources, are consistent with United States national interests; and

“(v) represent the views of the United States Government on the allocation, distribution, and access to global fresh water resources and policies related to such matters in key international fora, including key diplomatic, development-related, and scientific organizations.

“(3) ADDITIONAL NATURE OF DUTIES AND RESTRICTION ON ADDITIONAL OR SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION.—The responsibilities and specific duties of the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (or the Administrator's designee)

and the Secretary of State (or the Secretary's designee) under paragraph (2) or (3), respectively, shall be in addition to any other responsibilities or specific duties assigned to such individuals. Such individuals shall receive no additional or supplemental compensation as a result of carrying out such responsibilities and specific duties under such paragraphs."

SEC. 5. PROMOTING THE MAXIMUM IMPACT AND LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF USAID SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE-RELATED PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS.

Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) **PRIORITIES AND CRITERIA FOR MAXIMUM IMPACT AND LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY.**—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall ensure that the Agency for International Development's projects and programs authorized under this section are designed to achieve maximum impact and long-term sustainability by—

"(1) prioritizing countries on the basis of the following clearly defined criteria and indicators, to the extent sufficient empirical data are available—

"(A) the proportion of the population using an unimproved drinking water source;

"(B) the total population using an unimproved drinking water source;

"(C) the proportion of the population without piped water access;

"(D) the proportion of the population using shared or other unimproved sanitation facilities;

"(E) the total population using shared or other unimproved sanitation facilities;

"(F) the proportion of the population practicing open defecation;

"(G) the total number of children younger than 5 years of age who died from diarrheal disease;

"(H) the proportion of all deaths of children younger than 5 years of age resulting from diarrheal disease;

"(I) the national government's capacity, capability, and commitment to work with the United States to improve access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including—

"(i) the government's capacity and commitment to developing the indigenous capacity to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors; and

"(ii) the degree to which such government—

"(I) identifies such efforts as a priority; and

"(II) allocates resources to such efforts;

"(J) the availability of opportunities to leverage existing public, private, or other donor investments in the water, sanitation, and hygiene sectors, including investments in the management of water resources; and

"(K) the likelihood of making significant improvements on a per capita basis on the health and educational opportunities available to women as a result of increased access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including access to appropriate facilities at primary and secondary educational institutions seeking to ensure that communities benefitting from such projects and activities develop the indigenous capacity to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors;

"(2) prioritizing and measuring, including through rigorous monitoring and evaluating mechanisms, the extent to which such project or program—

"(A) furthers significant improvements in—

"(i) the criteria set forth in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1);

"(ii) the health and educational opportunities available to women as a result of increased access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene, including access to appropriate facilities at primary and secondary educational institutions; and

"(iii) the indigenous capacity of the host nation or community to provide safe water and sanitation without the assistance of outside donors;

"(B) is designed, as part of the provision of safe water and sanitation to the local community—

"(i) to be financially independent over the long term, focusing on local ownership and sustainability;

"(ii) to be undertaken in conjunction with relevant public institutions or private enterprises;

"(iii) to identify and empower local individuals or institutions to be responsible for the effective management and maintenance of such project or program; and

"(iv) to provide safe water or expertise or capacity building to those identified parties or institutions for the purposes of developing a plan and clear responsibilities for the effective management and maintenance of such project or program;

"(C) leverages existing public, private, or other donor investments in the water, sanitation, and hygiene sectors, including investments in the management of water resources;

"(D) avoids duplication of efforts with other United States Government agencies or departments or those of other nations or nongovernmental organizations;

"(E) coordinates such efforts with the efforts of other United States Government agencies or departments or those of other nations or nongovernmental organizations directed at assisting refugees and other displaced individuals; and

"(F) involves consultation with appropriate stakeholders, including communities directly affected by the lack of access to clean water, sanitation or hygiene, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations; and

"(3) seeking to further the strategy required under subsection (j) after 2018.

"(g) **USE OF CURRENT AND IMPROVED EMPIRICAL DATA COLLECTION AND REVIEW OF NEW STANDARDIZED INDICATORS.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development is authorized to use current and improved empirical data collection—

"(A) to meet the health-based prioritization criteria established pursuant to subsection (f)(1); and

"(B) to review new standardized indicators in evaluating progress towards meeting such criteria.

"(2) **CONSULTATION AND NOTICE.**—The Administrator shall—

"(A) regularly consult with the appropriate congressional committees; and

"(B) notify such committees not later than 30 days before using current or improved empirical data collection for the review of any new standardized indicators under paragraph (1) for the purposes of carrying out this section.

"(h) **DESIGNATION OF HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.**—

"(1) **INITIAL DESIGNATION.**—Not later than October 1, 2015, the President shall—

"(A) designate, on the basis of the criteria set forth in subsection (f)(1) not fewer than

10 countries as high priority countries to be the primary recipients of United States Government assistance authorized under this section during fiscal year 2016; and

"(B) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such designations.

"(2) **ANNUAL DESIGNATIONS.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President shall annually make new designations pursuant to the criteria set forth in paragraph (1).

"(B) **DESIGNATIONS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2018.**—Beginning with fiscal year 2019, designations under paragraph (1) shall be made—

"(i) based upon the criteria set forth in subsection (f)(1); and

"(ii) in furtherance of the strategy required under subsection (j).

"(i) **TARGETING OF PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS TO AREAS OF GREATEST NEED.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 15 days before the obligation of any funds for water, sanitation, or hygiene projects or programs pursuant to this section in countries that are not ranked in the top 50 countries based upon the WASH Needs Index, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of the planned obligation of such funds.

"(2) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this subsection and in subsection (j), the term 'WASH Needs Index' means the needs index for water, sanitation, or hygiene projects or programs authorized under this section that has been developed using the criteria and indicators described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of subsection (f)(1)."

SEC. 6. UNITED STATES STRATEGY TO INCREASE APPROPRIATE LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY AND ACCESS TO SAFE WATER, SANITATION, AND HYGIENE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 136 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as redesignated and amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j) **GLOBAL WATER STRATEGY.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than October 1, 2017, October 1, 2022, and October 1, 2027, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, shall submit a single government-wide Global Water Strategy to the appropriate congressional committees that provides a detailed description of how the United States intends—

"(A) to increase access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene in high priority countries designated pursuant to subsection (h), including a summary of the WASH Needs Index and the specific weighting of empirical data and other definitions used to develop and rank countries on the WASH Needs Index;

"(B) to improve the management of water resources and watersheds in such countries; and

"(C) to work to prevent and resolve, to the greatest degree possible, both intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources in such countries.

"(2) **AGENCY-SPECIFIC PLANS.**—The Global Water Strategy shall include an agency-specific plan—

"(A) from the United States Agency for International Development that describes specifically how the Agency for International Development will—

"(i) carry out the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Global Water Coordinator under subsection (e)(1);

“(ii) ensure that the Agency for International Development’s projects and programs authorized under this section are designed to achieve maximum impact and long-term sustainability, including by implementing the requirements described in subsection (f); and

“(iii) increase access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene in high priority countries designated pursuant to subsection (h);

“(B) from the Department of State that describes specifically how the Department of State will—

“(i) carry out the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Special Coordinator for Water Resources under subsection (e)(2); and

“(ii) ensure that the Department’s activities authorized under this section are designed—

“(I) to improve management of water resources and watersheds in countries designated pursuant to subsection (h); and

“(II) to prevent and resolve, to the greatest degree possible, both intra- and trans-boundary conflicts over water resources in such countries; and

“(C) from other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, that describes the contributions of the departments and agencies to implementing the Global Water Strategy.

“(3) INDIVIDUALIZED PLANS FOR HIGH PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—For each high priority country designated pursuant to subsection (h), the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall—

“(A) develop a costed, evidence-based, and results-oriented plan that—

“(i) seeks to achieve the purposes of this section; and

“(ii) meets the requirements under subsection (f); and

“(B) include such plan in an appendix to the Global Water Strategy required under paragraph (1).

“(4) FIRST TIME ACCESS REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Global Water Strategy shall specifically describe the target percentage of funding for each fiscal year covered by such strategy to be directed toward projects aimed at providing first-time access to safe water and sanitation.

“(5) PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—The Global Water Strategy shall include specific and measurable goals, benchmarks, performance metrics, timetables, and monitoring and evaluation plans required to be developed by the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B)(v).

“(6) CONSULTATION AND BEST PRACTICES.—The Global Water Strategy shall—

“(A) be developed in consultation with the heads of other appropriate Federal departments and agencies; and

“(B) incorporate best practices from the international development community.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

“(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(C) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

“(D) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(2) the term ‘long-term sustainability’ refers to the ability of a service delivery system, community, partner, or beneficiary to maintain, over time, any water, sanitation, or hygiene project that receives funding pur-

suant to the amendments made by the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2014.”.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF STATE AGENCY-SPECIFIC PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit an agency-specific plan to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 136(k) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as added by subsection (a)) that meets the requirements of section 136(j)(2)(B) of such Act, as added by subsection (a).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6 of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-121; 22 U.S.C. 2152h note) is repealed.

Mr. POE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. POE for their hard work on H.R. 2901, the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and was pleased to work closely with the bill’s sponsors and Chairman ROYCE to bring the bill through our Foreign Affairs Committee and onto the floor today.

This legislation enjoys broad support from a coalition of nearly 80 civil society groups that are dedicated to developing access to clean water around the world, and it has more than 100 bipartisan cosponsors in the House.

Congress has long been committed to making the United States a global leader in improving access to water, sanitation, and hygiene. America and its international partners have provided clean water to millions of the world’s poorest people. This investment has saved countless lives, but there is much more work to be done.

More than 750 million people still lack access to clean water. Twenty percent of the global population remains dependent on water that is either polluted or drastically overdrawn. Two and a half billion do not have proper sanitation facilities. Nearly 1 in every 5 deaths among children under age 5 are caused by water-related diseases, and 3.4 million people die from inadequate water, sanitation, and hygiene every year. These problems are not merely social injustices but pose a significant obstacle to security and economic prosperity across wide regions of the world.

This bill will make our existing water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) programs more effective by establishing priorities and focusing on areas with the greatest need and the most potential. It will enhance oversight and coordination by requiring the designation of a Global Water Coordinator at USAID and a Global Water Advisor at the Department of State, and it will update strategic planning by calling for an improved Global Water Strategy. These changes will enhance the investments we are already making through USAID and the Department of State.

Through these steps, H.R. 2901 will help ensure that our water development programs continue to save lives and improve health for

millions of people in need around the world. I encourage my colleagues to support this important bill and hope the other body will give this legislation the expedited consideration it deserves.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD J. SEITZ COMMUNITY-BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1434) to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1434

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIEUTENANT GENERAL RICHARD J. SEITZ COMMUNITY-BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz served as the cadet commander of a unit of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps at Leavenworth High School in Leavenworth, Kansas, where he earned the American Legion Cup as an outstanding cadet;

(2) while attending Kansas State University, Lieutenant General Seitz accepted a commission as a second lieutenant in the Army and was called into active duty in 1940;

(3) Lieutenant General Seitz volunteered to be one of the first paratroopers in the United States;

(4) at age 25, Lieutenant General Seitz as a major, was given command of the 2nd Battalion of the 517th Parachute Infantry Regimental Combat Team, becoming the youngest battalion commander in the Army;

(5) along with the 7th Armored Division, the battalion commanded by Lieutenant General Seitz formed what became known as Task Force Seitz at the Battle of the Bulge with the mission to plug the gaps on the north slope of the Bulge when the Germans attempted to break out;

(6) the service of Lieutenant General Seitz earned him the Silver Star, 2 Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, and many other acknowledgments during his 37-year career in the Army;

(7) after victory in Europe, Lieutenant General Seitz remained in the Army, commanding the 2nd Airborne Battle Group, 503rd Infantry Regiment, and the 82nd Airborne Division;

(8) on retiring in 1978, Lieutenant General Seitz settled in Junction City, Kansas, near Ft. Riley, where he would greet deploying and returning units from Iraq and Afghanistan at all times of the day;

(9) Lieutenant General Seitz remained active in the wider community, working with the Coronado Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America, the Fort Riley National Bank, Rotary International, and the Association of the United States Army and serving on the board of the Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum;

(10) Lieutenant General Seitz had a passion for mentoring young officers and non-commissioned officers at Fort Riley, never ceasing to be a soldier, according to his son, Richard M. Seitz;

(11) Lieutenant General Seitz was named an Outstanding Citizen of Kansas;

(12) in 2012 an elementary school at Fort Riley was named in honor of Lieutenant General Seitz, which is meaningful because he believed the fate of the United States relied on young children and the teachers who inspire them;

(13) during visits to the elementary school, Lieutenant General Seitz would talk with the students about what it meant to be a "proud and great American" and his message was always to "respect the teachers and be a learner";

(14) the family and friends of Lieutenant General Seitz have described him as a gentleman, compassionate, respected, full of integrity, gracious, giving, and a remarkable individual; and

(15) Lieutenant General Seitz lived each day to its fullest and his commitment to his fellow man serves as an inspiration to all the people of the United States.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the "Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic".

(c) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic referred to in subsection (b) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate bill, S. 1434.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 1434 which would name the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

Following completion of the Army ROTC program at Kansas State University, Lieutenant General Seitz served with distinction in World War II. Lieutenant General Seitz participated in the invasion of Italy and the Battle of the Bulge as one of the youngest battalion commanders of the war at the age of 25. After the victory in Europe, Lieutenant General Seitz remained in

the Army commanding at many levels, culminating with command of the 82nd Airborne Division.

During his service, Lieutenant General Seitz earned the Silver Star, two Bronze Stars, the Purple Heart, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit and the French Croix de Guerre and Legion of Honor.

After Lieutenant General Seitz retired, he settled in Junction City and served the Fort Riley community. He would greet deploying and returning units from Iraq and Afghanistan at all times of the day, and he mentored young officers and noncommissioned officers stationed there.

Beyond this service, he also volunteered his time with the Boy Scouts of America, Rotary International, and the Association of the United States Army.

In recognition of Lieutenant General Seitz's service to both his country and his community, naming the Junction City CBOC after him is a fitting and appropriate honor. It is my pleasure to support S. 1434, and I am grateful for the leadership and support of Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, Senator MORAN, and the entire Kansas delegation. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 1434.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1434, which designates the Junction City, Kansas, Community-Based Outpatient Clinic in Junction City as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

General Seitz served in the Army for 37 years. Among the medals and commendations he was awarded are the Silver Star, two Bronze Stars, and the Purple Heart. After he retired, he was awarded the Creighton Abrams Medal. In September 2011, he was given France's highest distinction, the Legion of Honor.

In World War II, joined by a company of 7th Armored Division tanks, General Seitz was in command of a battalion of paratroopers who won two decisive attacks during the Battle of the Bulge. Seitz was only 28 years old at the time. He continued to serve in command roles after World War II, earning his first general's star in 1963, his second star in 1967, and finished his distinguished career in 1978 as a three-star general.

□ 1630

Following his retirement, General Seitz stayed dedicated to those who served. He remained passionate for mentoring commissioned and non-commissioned officers, and frequently visited Fort Riley to greet deploying and returning units bound for the Middle East.

As a native of Leavenworth, Kansas, General Seitz returned to Kansas in 1978 and settled in Junction City.

Joining his name to the community-based outpatient clinic in Junction City, Kansas, would be a fitting way to honor General Seitz in his commitment to duty and valor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support S. 1434, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and, once again, I encourage all Members to support S. 1434.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1434.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORPORAL MICHAEL J. CRESCENZ ACT OF 2013

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 229) to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 229

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. CORPORAL MICHAEL J. CRESCENZ DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the medical center referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 229.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 229, which would name the VA Medical Center located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

Corporal Crescenz was the only Philadelphia native to earn the Medal of Honor during the Vietnam war. His posthumous award of the Medal of Honor resulted from an act of heroism in the Republic of Vietnam on November 20, 1968.

Reading from Corporal Crescenz's Medal of Honor citation:

In the morning, his unit engaged a large, well-entrenched force of the North Vietnamese Army whose initial burst of fire pinned down the lead squad and killed the two point men, halting the advance of Company A.

Immediately, Corporal Crescenz left the relative safety of his own position, seized a nearby machinegun and, with complete disregard for his own safety, charged 100 meters up a slope toward the enemy's bunkers, which he effectively silenced, killing two occupants in each.

Undaunted by the withering machinegun fire around him, Corporal Crescenz courageously moved forward toward a third bunker, which he also succeeded in silencing, killing two more of the enemy and momentarily clearing the route of advance for his comrades.

As a direct result of his heroic actions, his company was able to maneuver freely with minimal danger and complete its mission, defeating the enemy.

Corporal Crescenz's bravery and extraordinary heroism at the cost of his life are in the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.

Naming the Philadelphia VA Medical Center after this American hero is a tribute to his legacy and to all residents who served with our Nation during the Vietnam war.

It is my pleasure to support S. 229, and I am grateful for the leadership and support of Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, Senator TOOMEY, and the entire Pennsylvania delegation.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this hero by supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

We have come to this floor on any number of occasions honoring people, but I think this may be the noblest moment that I have risen on the floor, because, in this instance, it is not to name a stamp after Wilt Chamberlain

from Philadelphia or the train station after Congressman Gray, but this is to acknowledge a young man who graduated from high school in 1966 and, within a year or so, joined, enlisted, and went off to war on behalf of his country in a faraway place.

He finished at Cardinal Dougherty High School. He played varsity baseball there. He played basketball in a summer league at Simons Recreation Center. He grew up in West Oak Lane in my district, on the 7400 block of Thouron Avenue.

But the Corporal Crescenz whom we honor today is someone who, even though he was only in country for just a mere few months, when this attack took place, he grabbed a machinegun and he went towards the fire. It has been recounted when President Nixon awarded him the Medal of Honor, he took out one machinegun nest, he took out another, he then took out a third. Then when a camouflaged artillery post opened up, he charged at it, and that is when he took this mortal round.

But this is a young man who really, I think, represents everything that is important about American ideals because he lived a life of service on behalf of his country. He took it on himself to face challenge in a faraway place. He honors us even in his death, which was a long, long time ago, by giving us the honor to be able to rise and to acknowledge his courage.

Our city lost a lot of people in the Vietnam war. This is the only soldier to earn the Medal of Honor.

I want to thank Councilman David Oh, who is a member of the Republican Party on our city council—it is hard to be a Republican and get elected in Philadelphia—but who helped to raise this issue locally.

I want to thank all of the Pennsylvania Members. We introduced a bill, H.R. 454. Every single Member of the Pennsylvania delegation supported this.

I have visited the Philadelphia VA. I have talked to veterans there who are getting care, all of whom are proud to have served our country. I think that they will be proud that the name of the medical center will be named after this young corporal who didn't make it in the headlines but, today, he is at the very forefront of the work of the United States Congress as we honor his service and we honor his family by this naming bill.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have no further speakers at this time.

The veterans of Philadelphia have for some time been trying to gain recognition for their brother in arms, and I thank the Pennsylvania delegation for their work in bringing this bill to the floor.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 229, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, PAT MEEHAN, my friend.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I also thank my colleague from Philadelphia, the distinguished gentleman, who has been a strong supporter of this important bill. I rise in strong support of S. 229, which is the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Act of 2013.

As has been identified, the legislation would rename the Woodland Avenue Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Philadelphia after Corporal Crescenz. As has been identified, he is Philadelphia's only Medal of Honor recipient from the Vietnam era from Cardinal Dougherty High School, which had contributed more young men who gave their lives in the service of their country during the Vietnam war than any high school in the Nation, so this is quite a distinction.

I visited, as have my colleagues, numerous times the veterans medical center, making sure that it ensures the veterans receive the care they deserve.

But I think one of the things that is important about this kind of a recognition is not only that it has been earned with valor, but the veterans who walk in and out of there each day, many of them Vietnam veterans themselves, want to hear the story about Corporal Crescenz. His name will be enshrined, people will know about it, and his heroism will live and continue to live.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. I missed the opportunity, and I should acknowledge the strong contribution of Congressman BOB BRADY in this effort, along with yourself and Congressman FITZPATRICK. I neglected in my early remarks to do so, so if I could lay that on the RECORD. This would not have happened without Congressman BRADY's support.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I also want to express my appreciation. I think it is one of the endearing factors. While we from time to time may have strong disagreements about issues, we actually have had many more that we have been able to work together on. This is one that I am proud to support.

I will conclude by saying that this was undoubtedly an act in which he not only acted selflessly for himself, but he saved his fellow warfighters from harm.

I would like to commend those who have worked tirelessly on renaming this facility, and I hope that my colleagues will support this measure.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Pennsylvania, MICHAEL FITZPATRICK, my friend, to speak on this issue.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I also am very pleased to join with my colleagues in both the House and the Senate in advancing legislation which will, we hope, appear on the President's desk to honor the service and sacrifice, the very significant sacrifice, of Corporal Michael Crescenz, whom, as we have heard many times here today, was Philadelphia's sole Medal of Honor winner during the Vietnam war.

I want to also thank my friend, Mr. FATTAH, for his work in getting the bill to the floor here today.

Corporal Crescenz received a Medal of Honor for his actions on November 20, 1968, in Vietnam's Hiep Duc Valley. His citation states—and I know the citation was already quoted here today, but I think it bears repeating, at least in part—that Corporal Crescenz gave his life when he “left the relative safety of his own position, seized a nearby machinegun and, with complete disregard for his safety, charged 100 meters up a slope toward the enemy's bunkers, which he effectively silenced. As a direct result of his heroic actions, his company was able to maneuver freely with minimal danger and to complete its mission, defeating the enemy.”

By moving to rename the Philadelphia Veterans Affairs Medical Center the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, we immortalize the legacy of Corporal Crescenz and remember his sacrifice in the defense of our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia region has a long and proud tradition of selfless sacrifice to our Nation dating back to the Revolution. Generations of military members have called our area home, and they continue to serve today. We must continue to recognize those who sacrifice and those who gave their lives at the altar of freedom.

Corporal Crescenz continues to have many friends, led by Joe Griffies and his friends at the Welcome Home Veterans radio program, who have never forgotten Michael Crescenz and have fought tirelessly as well for this legislation.

Mr. FATTAH's Corporal Michael J. Crescenz's Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center legislation reminds us all that the contributions of our Nation's veterans should never be forgotten.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I will close by saying I can't think of anything more appropriate than naming this VA medical center after this Medal of Honor winner. I am a Vietnam-era veteran, lost a lot of friends in the war in Vietnam. It is difficult for me to even talk about it. I can't think of anything

more appropriate than naming this great medical center after this hero from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support S. 229.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Corporal Michael J. Crescenz Act of 2013, to rename the Philadelphia VA Medical Center in honor of Medal of Honor recipient and Philadelphia native Corporal Michael Crescenz.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that we are able to bring this long overdue honor to a great Philadelphian and a worthy American hero. I have been working to accomplish this renaming since I first drafted legislation in 2012, and I am thankful that my colleagues Congressman FATTAH and Senator TOOMEY, as well as the rest of the Pennsylvania delegation, have joined me in this important endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, Corporal Michael J. Crescenz is the only Philadelphia-born recipient of the Medal of Honor, our nation's highest military honor, from the Vietnam War. Born on January 14, 1949 to Mary Ann and Charles Crescenz, Michael grew up in the West Oak Lane neighborhood of Philadelphia and went on to graduate from Cardinal Dougherty High School Class of 1966. He enlisted in the US Army in September 1968, the same month that his older brother Charles was discharged from active duty.

According to his Medal of Honor citation, 19-year old Cpl. Crescenz's platoon came under attack on November 20, 1968, in Vietnam's Hiep Duc Valley. Rather than remain in the relative safety of his position, Cpl. Crescenz seized a nearby machine gun, charged toward the enemy's position, and silenced two bunkers. He then courageously advanced toward a third bunker, which he also silenced, clearing a route for his comrades. Shortly thereafter, gunfire emerged from a fourth, unseen bunker, and in order to protect his fellow soldiers, Cpl. Crescenz advanced on the position, firing with his machine gun. He was mortally wounded when he was just 5 meters away from the camouflaged bunker. His selfless actions allowed his company to maneuver freely to complete its mission, ultimately defeating the enemy.

President Nixon posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor to Cpl. Crescenz in April, 1970 for his gallantry and intrepidity in action. Now, 46 years after his heroic stand, we again humbly recognize the sacrifice of Cpl. Crescenz, along with the sacrifice of all those who paid the ultimate price in Vietnam and in all wars in defense of our nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 229.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1645

LANE A. EVANS VA COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2921) to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the “Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2921

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LANE A. EVANS VA COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the “Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the community based outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2921.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2921, which would name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic at 310 Home Boulevard, Galesburg, Illinois, as the Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic.

We are here today to honor the life and service of the late Congressman Lane Evans by naming the new VA community-based outpatient clinic in Illinois after him. Congressman Evans represented Illinois' 17th District for more than 20 years, was a champion of veterans' issues throughout his time in Congress, and served as the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for a decade.

Congressman Evans passed away this year, at the age of 63, following a long battle with Parkinson's disease. One way to honor Congressman Evans is to recognize his legacy of service to veterans in the community. It is in that

thought that we believe naming this facility after him is a fitting tribute.

It is my pleasure to support S. 2921, and I am grateful for the leadership and support of Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, Senator DURBIN, and the entire Illinois delegation. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this great public servant by supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of bipartisan legislation that I introduced last month to name the Galesburg VA community-based outpatient clinic in honor of former Congressman Lane Evans, who passed away just last month. Lane served the 17th Congressional District of Illinois, the district I now have the honor and privilege of representing. He served it with honor, humility, and hard work for more than two decades.

A Marine Corps veteran himself, Lane was a steadfast champion for our men and women in uniform. A veteran of the Vietnam war era, he served on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee from his arrival in Washington to his position as the committee's ranking member, a post he held for more than 10 years.

Lane Evans' record on behalf of veterans earned him the praise and respect from veterans service organizations and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of former Congressman Lane Evans by designating the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic located in Galesburg, Illinois, as the Lane A. Evans Community Based Outpatient Clinic.

I first got to know Lane when I was a young newspaper reporter covering our region. Lane was always warm, accessible, and friendly to me. I interviewed him many times about a number of different topics.

While he was young, with his trademark boyish haircut, his quiet courage and drive made him seem much older than his age. Through my interactions with him over the years and with those who worked with him and those who he touched through his service, I learned a lot about the man and what he stood for.

A proud native of Rock Island, the son of a firefighter and a nurse, and an Alleman High School and Augustana College graduate, Lane truly represented everything that is right about public service. He will be sorely missed by all those he touched, and the legacy of service that he provided will never be forgotten.

The dedication of a veterans' facility in the heart of the district he represented is a fitting tribute and ac-

knowledgment of his career-long fight to ensure that all veterans get the care and the benefits that they have earned and deserve.

I would like to thank the entire Illinois delegation and the many Members who served with Lane for supporting this effort. In particular, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD of the Veterans' Affairs Committee here in the House and their counterparts in the Senate, Chairman SANDERS and Ranking Member BURR, for bringing this forward. I would also like to thank Senators KIRK and DURBIN from Illinois for shepherding this bill through the Senate.

By renaming this VA clinic, we can ensure that Lane Evans' strong legacy of service to our men and women in uniform lives on in a facility that serves them today. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this bipartisan legislation in honor of the memory of Lane Evans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, my good friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Dr. ROE, for yielding and also for helping bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 2921, which would designate the VA community-based outpatient clinic in Galesburg, Illinois, as the Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic.

As a cosponsor of the House version of the bill, I appreciate the work that both the House and Senate VA Committees have done and the leadership of both Chambers to bring this bill to the floor. I especially want to thank Senator DURBIN for authorizing this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for 24 years, Lane Evans served with distinction as the Representative of Illinois' 17th Congressional District. We mourn his tragic passing last month at the age of 63. Even as he suffered from Parkinson's disease, Mr. Speaker, Lane Evans heroically and tenaciously fought for veterans in the years leading up to his retirement in 2007.

When Congressman Evans retired, the Vietnam Veterans of America said:

Lane's compassion for his fellow veterans and his commitment to do right by them has come right from the heart.

As ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee during my tenure as chairman of the committee, I saw firsthand how he turned his knowledge, compassion, and expertise—his heart—into effective advocacy and how he worked to make a tangible difference in the lives of veterans and their families around the country.

Mr. Speaker, during our tenure as chair and ranking member, we were

able to craft and shepherd into law numerous bills that expanded care and service for our Nation's veterans, including expansion of the GI Bill and assistance to homeless veterans.

Lane's commitment to ensuring that men and women who wore the uniform had timely access to world class medical treatment that they have earned was, in a word, extraordinary.

Of particular interest to Lane, a Vietnam veteran himself, was health care for veterans exposed to agent orange during their service in Vietnam. Throughout the 1980s, it was an honor to work side by side with Lane and others, like Congressman Tom Daschle, in an effort to convince a highly reluctant Department of Veterans Affairs and Pentagon that agent orange severely injured many who served in Vietnam.

In 1991, Lane introduced the Veterans' Compensation Amendments of 1991, which became part of the Agent Orange Act, to provide presumptive service-connected disability assistance to veterans with diseases linked to agent orange; thus the gentleman from Illinois helped ensure that veterans received the care and the compensation they deserved, while not being saddled with the onerous burden of proof for injuries due to exposure to a herbicide that was laced with dioxin.

It is, therefore, highly fitting to name a community-based outpatient clinic after a remarkable lawmaker who fought hard for veterans, health care, and compensation during his time in Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me and all the leadership here on the floor in supporting S. 2921 to honor the legacy of Congressman Evans as a remarkable veterans' advocate.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 2921 in honoring the life of our former friend and colleague, Lane Evans, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support S. 2921.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2921.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN TOM LATHAM ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, we are here today under a Special Order because at this time of year—at the end of a session—we have Members that are retiring, Members that deserve recognition, and Members that other Members of the House would like to talk about for a few minutes.

Today, we have one of the best that, unfortunately, is retiring at the end of this year. He is a gentleman that I have known since I came to Congress and have become good friends with. We have had many entertaining times.

I am sorry to say that the thing that people in Washington are going to miss the most, probably, is a rendition of Roy Orbison duets by Mr. LATHAM and myself. I don't know how, but we certainly had fun with those at various events.

Before I say anything else, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

□ 1700

Mr. LOEBSACK. I thank the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. SIMPSON. I didn't know that you did "Oh, Pretty Woman" and all these other songs. I can't wait, TOM, to see you back in Iowa.

Madam Speaker, it is really an honor for me to be up here tonight to speak for and about TOM LATHAM. When I got elected in 2006, TOM had been here for some time, not a long period of time, but for 12 years. I knew about TOM from what I had read. I didn't know him personally. I was one of those folks who came to Congress with no one expecting me to get here, so I didn't know that many folks in this body certainly before I got elected.

When I got elected, one of the first things I did was try to find out as much as I could about TOM LATHAM and meet with TOM LATHAM and work with him on a number of issues because I knew he had a reputation for working across the aisle. I also knew that he was very good friends at the time with Mr. BOEHNER, who subsequently became Speaker of the House, so I knew it was probably in my interest to get to know TOM LATHAM if I wanted to get things done for Iowa, even though Speaker PELOSI took over when I came.

My job since I have been here, I believe, has been to work with both sides of the aisle, and TOM LATHAM is a model, as far as I am concerned, for doing exactly that.

When I first came, you know, we had a lot of tough issues to deal with here

in the U.S. Congress, and one of the things that happened very early on when I first got elected was the issue of the National Guard came up, and I was on Armed Services. A lot of those Guard folks were being deployed multiple times, and it was very, very difficult for their families.

A number of us recognized that what we needed to do was build facilities, more facilities, upgrade facilities, get rid of those old National Guard armories and replace them with readiness centers that would be there to train and equip our troops in the event that we had to send them overseas on a mission, which we did many, many times, and Iowans proudly have served over the years, over these many years, in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places.

We needed to construct those facilities also for their families, for their spouses, and for their children. So on the Armed Services Committee I did what I could in terms of authorization to make sure that the funds were there, and on the Appropriations Committee, of course, what TOM LATHAM did was make sure that we had the funding to make sure that we built those facilities as well. So we were able to work on that issue together.

Then when the floods, the great flood of 2008 hit across Iowa, but mainly across the eastern half of Iowa—and it would include a lot of TOM LATHAM's district—a lot of it included my district, about half the damage was in my district alone. But I worked with TOM, I worked with STEVE KING, BRUCE BRALEY, and Leonard Boswell. We really did a great job working on a bipartisan basis to make sure that what we needed in Iowa we got. So we worked very hard on that.

Then also on veterans issues. When we heard about the scandal in Phoenix, the first thing I did was I contacted TOM LATHAM and said, "Hey, we need to go to Des Moines together if that is okay with you. I know it is your congressional district—it is not mine—but let's go to Des Moines together and talk to the folks there about the Des Moines facility."

I have been to the VA facility in Iowa City in my district many, many times, but I wanted to go to Des Moines, and I wanted to go with TOM, and I knew that he would work together with me on that to make sure that everything is right, and if it isn't right that we fix it.

So he was very much open to that. He didn't hesitate for a second. That is the kind of person he is. That has been the kind of legislator he is, even at a time—and in this body we have seen a lot of ugliness over the years. It seems as though our politics in America has just gotten uglier by the day sometimes, and even in the middle of all that, when that has happened, TOM LATHAM has stood tall, he has stood proud as an Iowan. He has got a lot of

common sense, like most Iowans do, and he works with the other side because he knows that the job is to get things done. That is what TOM LATHAM does. He has gotten things done.

We are going to miss you, TOM, there is no question about that, and I think you know that probably better than we do. We are going to miss you. I know you have heard that from a lot of folks.

TOM LATHAM, he is a humble Iowa guy, that is what he is. He has been able to get a tremendous amount done for his district, for my alma mater, Iowa State, before he lost that to Congressman KING, and for any other number of folks in his congressional district over the years. I honor you. I honor Kathy. I am looking forward to seeing you later tonight, and thank you for everything, TOM. Farewell and good luck with whatever you end up doing.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his statement. Now I would like to yield to another gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Idaho for yielding to the gentleman from Iowa. There are about four people on the floor right now that do know the difference.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, to give a great message of gratitude and thanks to Congressman TOM LATHAM. I want to tell a little bit of the narrative about how this unfolds from the perspective of Iowa, and that is this: we are all politics all the time. There is no off season for us. You are always on season. When the Iowa caucuses emerge, there is a big focus on Presidential politics.

If you are on the State Central Committee, you are in the middle of that arena. That is where I first met TOM LATHAM and first became aware of his commitment to the political arena and to conservatism. I would want to let the body know, Madam Speaker, that TOM LATHAM didn't come from a place that was a big magnificent megalopolis, unless you would want to describe Alexander, Iowa, with 160-some people, as a big megalopolis. 168 people would be the population of Alexander, Iowa, rooted in now a three-generation seed company, and rooted in the soil. I don't have to explain this to the people from either Idaho or Iowa, but all new wealth comes from the land, and it regenerates itself every year in the form of corn in our neighborhood and soybeans and potatoes in Mr. SIMPSON's neighborhood.

When you see where their origin of wealth comes every year, and you see the families that came across the prairie and turned the sod for the first time and maybe built their house out of it and put their roots down into that soil, and then took the family farm that raised the wealth and boiled that out of there and over from the farm to the town to the city, and you see a family

business with multiple brothers engaged in it, and three generations now, you know that they are tied to the heart of the heartland and the good of what is good about Iowa and America.

That is what TOM LATHAM brought to the political arena from the State Central Committee to a primary and to the United States Congress in 1994, and then catching that wave, that 1994 wave and being elected to the United States Congress 20 years ago.

I take a look at him now, and I think he is no worse for wear. It is the same TOM LATHAM that came here 20 years ago that is going off into retirement today, or shortly here at the end of this Congress, and he hasn't lost his enthusiasm.

Here is what I see—this is a STEVE KING perspective, Madam Speaker—and that is that everybody that comes to this place has their own style and their own way of getting things done.

But the people that have worked with TOM LATHAM for these years know that it isn't always an issue that is run up the flagpole. It doesn't come necessarily with lights and blaring horns, but it gets done. It gets done in a quiet way, it gets done, sometimes with just a slow persuasion. It gets done with building a network of people that want to help and want to get things done.

So when I was elected to come to this Congress in 2003 and inherited a lot of the real estate that had formerly been represented and the constituents that had formerly been represented by TOM LATHAM, I noticed that there were ribbon-cutting ceremonies taking place in my district, and I wasn't necessarily the lead guy when it came to the ribbon-cutting because TOM LATHAM had laid the groundwork for that for years, and they knew it, and they still know it.

The friends and the relationships that were built by doing a good job of representing constituents throughout those years are still there. They still exist. And it has been an easy thing for me to step into that neighborhood because they were well taken care of and well represented.

So, now, after moving from Agriculture over to the Appropriations Committee, I would just remind the body that TOM LATHAM, today, is the only Iowa member on the House Appropriations Committee. He has done a good number of things with projects, not only the transportation projects, but the Iowa National Guard, ag, economic development, small business development, and he is currently chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, and he serves on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug, and also on Homeland Security.

That is an influential footprint in this Congress, and the people that ar-

rive here as freshmen and sophomores recognize that.

But I recognize, also, this man that is rooted in Iowa soil, who is the continuation of the family farm and the family business that relies upon the very foundation of our economy, that all new wealth comes from the land, and that there is a core of family and faith and neighbors and neighborhood that TOM LATHAM has brought to this Congress.

Wherever he ends up in his retirement, we all want to congratulate him and say to TOM LATHAM, "Congratulations, you have earned it. You have picked your time, you have done it your way."

There are only about three ways to leave this Congress: one of them is to get beat, one of them is to die in office, and the other one is to choose your time to retire.

I am glad that you are fit and vigorous and prepared for a fit and vigorous retirement.

But it wouldn't be appropriate, Madam Speaker, for me to conclude my portion of this without saying into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a deep and heartfelt thank you to Kathy Latham. It is from me personally, as well as, for a lot of reasons, across this Hill that with the work that she has done, you got, oftentimes, two for the price of one with TOM and Kathy LATHAM.

She sacrificed a number of times and made my life easier and made things work better for Iowa, for the House of Representatives, and for this country, and I think that the best interests of all of us have always been what made the decisions in the Latham family, which, by the way, now ranks up in about the top three of Iowa political families.

So pay attention, Madam Speaker, to the Latham family going forward. They are not done yet, but they do have a patriarch that is going to ride off into retirement.

Thank you a lot, TOM LATHAM, for serving our country. God bless you.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Let me say, Madam Speaker, that Mr. KING just mentioned the difference between Iowa and Idaho. I will tell you a funny story.

When I was first elected, TOM had been here for 4 years. When I got elected, they used to have a function with a lot of the D.C. reporters and political reporters in town at the Washington Hilton, and they would select a freshman Republican and Democrat from both the House and the Senate to give little speeches, and they were supposed to be kind of funny speeches and stuff.

So I didn't know what to do. They selected me as one of them. So I decided that I was going to explain the difference between Iowa and Idaho because there is a difference. So I went through all the differences in Idaho and Iowa.

Of course I recorded it, and I got home and turned it on to see how I had done. Underneath, and this is on C-SPAN, underneath it said, Congressman MIKE SIMPSON, Republican, Ohio. So we not only get mixed up with Idaho and Iowa also, but also between Ohio and Idaho and Iowa. So that has always made it a little more challenging.

But TOM and I have served together on the Appropriations Committee for, I guess the last 12 years that I have been on it, and he was on it before that. He has been, as was mentioned, the chairman of the Transportation Committee and chairman of the Energy and Water Committee, both committees very important to both Idaho and Iowa and to the country. We have been able to work cooperatively to try to address issues that affect the country and our respective States.

The thing I have always noticed most about TOM, and both speakers have already mentioned it, is the way he works, the way he gets things done. I have always noticed that TOM takes the job that he was elected to do very seriously, but he never takes himself too seriously, which is an important characteristic, I think.

Others have enjoyed working with him on both sides of the aisle. I have certainly enjoyed working with him. And again, we are going to miss him.

At the end of the each session, some people, as STEVE KING mentioned, decide that it is time to retire, and TOM has decided that. Not only are we, in Congress, as friends, going to miss him but, frankly, the country is going to miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho, my good friend. I just want to echo what you were saying, Mr. SIMPSON, that TOM LATHAM actually is a guy who came here, doesn't seek the limelight, but seeks to get things done.

It is tough for me to say this about him because he is my good friend and he is going to rib me about this later. But he really does try to get things done. You don't see him running out to the TV, to the news shows. You don't see him running out holding press conferences. But what you do see is someone who works.

I can tell you that when I first arrived here in Washington, TOM was one of the first people who came up to me and talked to me about—asked if he could help me in any way. He was a farmer from, obviously, the great State of Iowa, and he knew that I was a farmer from the great State of California. We shared what we had in common, and then he asked how he could be helpful.

From day one, TOM has been one of my best friends here, and I don't think there has ever been a day that we have

been in Congress that I haven't spoke to TOM. And then, we always talk over the time that we are not here also.

□ 1715

I have had numerous times when TOM has come out to California to visit my district and to do some good, quality work in meeting with some of my constituents. At the same time, in talking about TOM's work ethic, TOM has had me out to his district in Iowa several times. Typically, you think you are going to do a short, little meeting with some folks, but I can tell you that, when I went out there, TOM actually put me to work. We had to spend a full day working.

I remember, TOM, that you put on a conference for all of your community leaders—your business leaders and your government leaders. You had people from all over the State of Iowa who came there for a full day's session about how your office, its being the last link to the Federal Government, could better serve your constituents.

That is really what this is about, Madam Speaker. TOM worked very hard for his constituents. He didn't try to get press out of it, and he didn't try to make a big deal about it; but you could tell, when I was on the ground there—the several times I was there—that it was about working. It was about working with people, working with his constituents, and about trying to represent them here in Washington the best way that he could. I know the people of Iowa will miss him.

I think you have represented almost the entire State of Iowa at one point or another.

His district has moved around so much over the years.

TOM's family, obviously, great people. His wife, Kathy, deserves a lot of praise for having to deal with him over all of these years that he has been in Washington, traveling back and forth. It takes a special person, and Kathy really is a special, special person to not only deal with TOM but also to put up with having to deal with the tough things that people say. Mr. LATHAM has been through many tough elections, and it takes a very tough person to have to deal with the things that come out in political campaigns, as we are all familiar with.

I know TOM is very proud of his children and grandchildren, and I know that is part of the reason he is leaving us—because he has served his country, and he did the best that he could do for the time that he was here. I think he has a long tradition of serving the people of Iowa—just like his parents, who were community leaders in northern Iowa there, and also his brothers.

I think you had at least one or two brothers who served with distinction in Vietnam, as I remember. I have met all of them, I think, over the years.

Anyway, Madam Speaker, it is kind of a sad day for me to be down here on

the floor of the House but also, I think, a happy day for TOM and his family because he will be able to spend time with his children and grandchildren, which we know, when we are here in Washington, is tough to do.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from California.

The gentleman from California mentioned something that is very important that a lot of people don't realize: it takes a special individual and a special relationship with your spouse, be it husband or wife, to be able to serve in this place. Most people don't realize how many nights you spend away from your family when you are here. I am certain that with most spouses—when I look at mine and when I look at TOM's Kathy—this was not something that they had planned on when they got married. To be able to, I want to say, put up with that and the separation that it causes and the pressure it puts on a family is extremely difficult. Kathy is, truly, a person who is special and has put up with him for 20 years in the House and 39 years of marriage. She has really put up with him for a long time, and we are honored to have spouses like that who support us and keep us going.

The reason I asked for unanimous consent at the first of this Special Order—for people to insert their comments—was that tonight is the White House Christmas reception for Members of Congress, so there are going to be a lot of people getting ready to go down to the White House. Now, one of those individuals who had some responsibilities tonight but who wanted to be here was the Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, who is one of TOM's best friends. They have been together ever since I have come, and, consequently, I have been allowed to associate with him—I don't know why—but we have gotten along and have done some great things.

We are going to miss TOM, but this process goes on. People will get elected—whether it is any of us—who will replace us, and they will step up to the plate and do the job. It is an amazing system that we have been given by our forefathers.

At this point, I yield to my good friend from Iowa, TOM LATHAM.

Mr. LATHAM. First of all, I will say "thank you" to Mr. SIMPSON—a great, great friend—for doing this this evening; to Mr. NUNES, who is still on the floor here; to STEVE KING and DAVE LOEBACK, who were down here. I am not going to sing—we will pass that by—but, again, thank you very, very much for the honor you have bestowed on me and for the kind words here tonight.

Madam Speaker, I will just say the thing I will miss most are my good friends here. That part of it really is hard because it becomes an extended family over time—people whom you

know, whom you work with, whom you trust on a day-to-day basis. I will miss that. Now, there is a lot of other stuff I won't miss here, but I will miss the personal relationships and friendships.

Mr. SIMPSON mentioned the Speaker. I will just tell you that there is no one who could be a better friend and someone I owe so much to. JOHN and Debbie BOEHNER, Kathy and I owe them so much. They are great, great friends. We love them, and we will continue that friendship as we will with all of the colleagues here we have come to know and love.

Anyone who does this job for any period of time understands you are never going to be successful or accomplish anything without the great work of your staff. I have been blessed both in Iowa and here in Washington with tremendous people who have worked so hard for me, who have committed themselves to the people of Iowa—to the service to them and to this country. All of them are very, very special to me. One person, my chief of staff, James Carstensen, who happens to be in the Chamber tonight, has been with me since day one—actually, a year before I got elected, working on the campaign. So 21 years he has had to put up with me.

Thank you very much.

Thanks to all of the members of my staff. It has been a pleasure for me—a great, great honor to have the privilege of serving with them—because we have all done it on a cumulative basis, and we have tried to do the best job possible for the people of Iowa.

I have to say "thank you," obviously, to the Iowans. As Mr. NUNES said, I have represented a lot of the State in having the different districts, starting with the Fifth District, then the Fourth District, and now the Third District—moving from northwest Iowa to northeast Iowa to southwest Iowa. It is the honor of my life to serve the people of Iowa and to have that opportunity to be their Representative in Washington to try to accomplish things for their good and for the good of the country. Again, I just say "thank you."

Everybody who is in Congress knows the sacrifice of your family. My parents, who were such great role models for me, taught me so much. They are gone now. I have got four brothers and their families. I have my son, Justin; Lynnae; Emerson and Jack; my daughter Jennifer; her husband, Brian; and Keaton, Mason, and Carson; and my daughter Jill and her husband, Nick, and their son, Will. I love them, and what they have done to support me over the years is tremendous and will always be appreciated.

Obviously, there is one person. You could never be successful if you didn't have the support of your spouse. Kathy has been just exceptional in putting up with all the back-and-forth—having

two residences and having had to travel here and keep everything going at home while I am away. For the first 19 years we were married, I was on the road with our family business. For the last 20 years, I have been gone, being in Congress. So, obviously, her love and her support has meant everything in the world to me.

Thank you, Dear.

Let me just say, in closing, that it has been an amazing ride for 20 years. For a kid, like Mr. SIMPSON said or Mr. KING said, who grew up in Alexander, Iowa—who grew up on a farm outside of a big town of 168 people—to come to Washington to be able to represent Iowa here is, obviously, a huge, huge honor from that background.

I will honestly say to any Member listening, if you ever get to the point when you walk across the street and don't look up at that dome and get that chill up your spine about something much bigger than you are, you probably should go home. Now, I still get that chill, but I think it is time for me and my family to go a different course.

I am extraordinarily proud to have served here. This is a great, great body. It is something that is an incredible institution. It is truly a slice of America when you come here and you meet the different folks and all you learn about this great country. Having to take into consideration a lot of different views and constituencies from all over the country is an amazing experience. I am very, very proud of that, and I will always feel that my time was well spent here. More so today I am excited about the future because we are going to have an opportunity to spend more time with the family—with Kathy, with the kids and grandchildren. We are going to be able to do some things we have never been able to do before. So I am proud of the past and am excited about the future, and I just thank God that I have had the opportunities I have had to grow up in a State like Iowa and in a community like I grew up in, with parents like I had and brothers and the support of the family.

This is the greatest country in the world. It will always be because of our system of government. As hard as it is to get something done, it is very difficult, but it is the right way to do things, and we need to get back to everyone listening to each other. There is one thing I will say: I never learn a thing when I am talking. You learn things when you are listening to other folks. I think we should all, maybe, step back and listen to each other more, and I think, maybe, we would be better off.

With that, I will just say "thank you" to everyone. It is a great country. God bless America. I am excited about the future.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman.

Again, TOM, we are going to miss you. We have become good friends. Don't become a stranger. You still have another week or two to serve before we sine die, and there are some important votes to cast.

Now that you qualify for Medicare, I wish you and Kathy the best in the next part of this journey of life, and I am sure you will do fantastic. Make sure you get out to Idaho when you get an opportunity, and we will take some famous Idaho potatoes and some famous Iowa corn, and we will put them together with some steak and have a little barbecue.

I thank you for your service to this institution, to the State of Iowa, and to the country. We will miss you.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. LATHAM. I know my colleagues will agree that his retirement is a loss for the House and his constituents.

Ten times beginning in 1994, the people of Iowa had the wisdom to send a good man to Washington.

He brought with him true and much-needed Iowa values, fighting the good fight for individual liberty, fiscal responsibility, and economic opportunity.

His work on the Appropriations Committee for first responders, the Iowa National Guard, agriculture, and education will long outlast him—a legacy of leadership many aspire to, but few truly achieve.

In addition, as the House is well-aware, Mr. LATHAM is my best friend. This, like all his other duties, he has handled with grace and good humor.

On behalf of the House, I thank Mr. LATHAM for his service and wish him and his wife, Kathy, all the best.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and colleague upon his retirement from the U.S. House of Representatives.

I have had the honor and pleasure of serving with Congressman TOM LATHAM on the House Appropriations Committee since 1997. TOM has served on a number of subcommittees, lending his expertise on energy, agriculture and homeland security policy over the years, and most recently serving as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development.

Not only is he an exceedingly capable legislator who has demonstrated, time and again, his commitment to fiscal responsibility, but it is immediately obvious to anyone who meets him that he is 100% committed to his constituents in Iowa.

It is apparent that his Iowa values—hard work, community service, dedication to family—have colored his work here in the U.S. Congress. TOM is a thoughtful, natural born leader whose commitment to our country and his constituents comes through in every meeting, committee hearing and markup he attends. He isn't afraid to put his head down and do the difficult work demanded by this institution.

The two of us have made some great memories throughout his two decades of serv-

ice, and my time in Congress has been greatly enhanced with TOM as a partner and friend. While all of us in the House of Representatives will miss his intellect and friendship, I ask you to join me in wishing TOM, his wife Kathy, their children and grandchildren all the best in his retirement. Thank you, TOM, for your service.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, let me offer my congratulations to those who have served our country in the Congress who now will be retiring and moving on. All of us will get there sometime.

This is a noble job if we make it such, and many people who have served here have done great things for the United States of America. Why? Because they, number one, believe in the principles of the United States, what were set down by our Founding Fathers. Even more than that, what we have had here and what we need more of in America are leaders who care specifically about the American people and what impact they are having on the American people and what impact those policies that they advocate will have on the American people.

□ 1730

All too often, people come to Washington, and pretty soon, what they care about is this or that specific special interest. Or they have a special idea, special interest or special ideas. They have a philosophy. They have a vision that goes beyond what the benefit to the American people is, what they are going to establish because of this philosophical commitment to some ideal.

Well, both of those are enemies of the well-being of the people of the United States. If people who are elected by the population come here and are loyal to special interests that have to make a profit in a specific area, even though it might be detrimental to the American people as a whole, or people come here and they don't care about the American people—they want to see their dream come true, their intellectual and philosophical ideal put into place—well, the American people get left out with that type of leadership.

And what we are doing today, one of the most important issues that we have been facing for almost a decade now, with constant pressure to do something about—what? About immigration policy in the United States. And what we do, what we finally do on this issue will tell us whom we care about and what are our ideals and who we care about more. Do we care about

special interests? Do we care about some ideal notion that is not so tangible? Or do we care about what policy will do specifically to the American people?

For years—and especially on this election year—we have heard repeatedly about the plight of the people who are here in this country illegally, over and over again about how these poor souls, how we need to give them legal status. We need to reach out and do something for them because they are in a bad situation. And, yes, they came here because there was a desperate situation in that land from which they came.

Unfortunately, when you hear people constantly talking about how we are going to help these illegal immigrants who are here in our midst, you don't hear about how what is being recommended to help the illegal immigrants will impact the American people. This is what we should be talking about. This is what needs to be discussed. The people elected by the American people should talk about what is going to happen to the American people if this policy that is being recommended is put into place.

Yes. We would like to help people who have come here illegally, and we would like to help people all over the world. There is no reason not to, if we care about the people who have come here illegally, thumbing their nose at our law, but they are human beings, and we care about them.

By the way, they are also people whom we can identify with because if we were in their spot, we would do the same. We care about them.

But you know what? We have to care more about the American people. We have to care about them if they care about the things that we are doing here. Or maybe they will just write off their government because their government is more concerned about a foreigner who has come here illegally than about the well-being of the American family and the American working people.

We hear this word "comprehensive." Over and over again, we have heard, We have to have comprehensive immigration reform. "Comprehensive immigration reform," what does that mean? Why do we hear that over and over again?

Because they can't use the word "amnesty." And they know that, really, comprehensive immigration reform means one thing and one thing only because there is really not any type of a real argument about making our system better. But to them, when they say "comprehensive immigration reform," they mean changing the status, legalizing the status of those millions of people who are here illegally.

They claim that there are 11 million. That is an old number, and that number has not been updated. And almost

everyone I talk to believes that it is more like 20 million illegals who are here, not 11 million.

So there is not any real problem on our part with the idea of "comprehensive reform," if we were to say, let's make the system more effective. Yes, we need border control, for example, and we need to restructure the visa system because there are a lot of people who are not only coming across the border illegally but who come here and overstay their visas. In fact, the largest number of illegals now—people keep thinking that we are talking about just people from Latin America. No. We have got people coming in from all over the world—many of them on visas, many of them sneaking across the border—who have come here illegally and are currently residing here. That number of people have an impact on the well-being of the American people.

So, yes, let's make the system better. But let's realize that we are not talking about things that we disagree on. It has all been about whether you legalize the status of people who are here illegally.

But let's just note this: We have no apologies to make about the generosity of the American people with our current system of immigration. Yes, it needs to be reformed and made more efficient. But we provide for over a million immigrants to come into our country legally every year.

To put that into perspective, that is more than all of the legal immigration into other countries, into every country of the world, combined. So we permit more legal immigration than every other country of the world combined. But yet over and over again, we are made to feel guilty, that we in some way should feel guilty about our immigration system and about the fact that you have people who are here illegally and we won't legalize their status.

Well, what would legalizing their status do? What would it do? We know what it would do for them. These people who are here illegally, if they have illegal status, they would then be able to perhaps be eligible for government programs, maybe as part of that. Certainly their relatives would be or their children would be.

Right now, even the people who are here illegally are the recipients of government benefits. Of the people who are here receiving—for example, their children have health care, emergency health care. And then, of course, an emergency becomes anything that someone is sick with. And they also, of course, are here, and their children are educated here. And we have government benefits that people have managed, if they end up coming here illegally and have one child—one child then justifies a wide variety of Federal assistance and other welfare assistance programs to these individuals who are basically here illegally.

Well, what does that mean? At a time when we are \$500 billion more in debt every year, we are borrowing money from overseas in order to take care of these people who have come here illegally? That doesn't make any sense at all. And it especially doesn't make any sense when we know that our own government programs, our own government programs today, we are struggling to make ends meet, to make sure these programs stay vital, to make sure that they have money to function and do their jobs efficiently.

The Veterans Administration, we have heard so many problems about how the Veterans Administration had not been doing its job. Well, the money that we spend on people who come here illegally comes right out of the pool of money that should be going to Americans or should at least be going to reduce our debt so that in the future, our American children aren't going to have to pay it off.

Now, we have nothing to be ashamed of in terms of the overall number of people coming here legally. But even now, when the people who are here illegally, their impact is incredibly detrimental, as I just said, in terms of how much money is being spent by the government on services to them rather than services to the American people.

And we also know that illegals, of course, do take jobs. They are working at jobs, most of them. And they are hardworking, good people. But what impact are they having on the jobs that American people want?

They have actually taken jobs that should be—well, let's say Americans wouldn't want to work at that pay level. But the pay level that we are talking about is the pay level that happens when you have tens of millions of illegals in the country willing to work for a pittance. They have come to our country and bent down the wages of America's lower-income people. They have bent them down and taken jobs that should have gone to Americans.

For example, I know that the hotel and restaurant industry is very upset with the idea of not legalizing the status of these people. And let me just note that once you legalize the status of these 20 million illegals that are in our country, well, what will happen, of course, is that they aren't going to work for the pittance wages anymore. And they will start making more wages. And then there will be another wave of illegals that will come in and underbid them. So these particular people will earn more money, but the American people will earn less and less.

And right now, there are many women in the United States who are single mothers, many urban women who have families and live around big hotels, but the hotels hire people who have come here illegally to clean the rooms when there are many thousands of single mothers who would love to

drop their child off at school, clean that room in the middle of the day—which are the hours that they need them at the hotel—and come back by the end of the day to pick up their child. But they are not willing to do it now because those people who work in those hotels, if they are illegals, are paid a pittance. And the American people—no, they won't work for a pittance. And they shouldn't.

And it will be a good thing if it increases the price of a hotel room by \$10 a night in order to make sure that we have American citizens who are paid well and are able to take care of their families. Yes, that is the policy we should have.

We shouldn't have a policy that, instead, brings down the cost of that hotel room by a certain amount, increases the profit of the hotel by a certain amount, and is paid for by the fact that American women no longer can take those jobs because there isn't enough being paid for them to take care of their family.

Now, of course, if you live as many illegals live—three or four families to a home—they might be able to succeed or at least survive. That is not the kind of society we need to build here. That is not what America was all about. And what our policy should be is aimed at people who are American citizens who would like those jobs. And if we don't permit this illegal flood into our country, wages will go up, as compared to if we don't. And, yes, we should be happy that American people are making more money.

Over the last 20 years, we have actually seen the wages of the American people in real terms go down as we have had illegals pouring into our country. Well, whose side are we on? Who do we care for? And that is what this is all about. We are being told that we are heartless because we don't care enough about the people who are illegally in our country to legalize their status when, in fact, we need to make sure that we are not doing anything that will hurt the American people who are struggling right now.

And what will happen if we legalize the status of those people who have come here illegally? What will happen? Let's say there are 20 million here. I know officially it is only 11 million. But every one of those people that we legalize the status for are then going to be eligible for family reunification. There are tens of millions of others who are going to pour in.

It is estimated, from just the legal people coming in after the amnesty, that we are talking about 40 million new people, mainly poor foreigners coming to our country. Does anyone think that it is not going to have a huge impact on the economy of our country, on our economic system, on our neighborhoods, on our schools and the well-being of working people? Does

anyone think that 40 million foreigners—

And that is what is going to happen.

When you hear “comprehensive immigration reform,” think legalizing the status, which will then eventually bring into our country 40 million new foreigners, mainly poor people. Well, that is what this debate is all about.

I would submit that it is not wrong for people, and it is not hateful, it is not being too concerned about money and material things to think in our hearts about our own people before we think about the well-being of foreigners.

What keeps America together? Look, we don't have one race. We don't have one religion. We don't have one ethnic group here. What we have got are people who have come here and are a part of the American family.

□ 1745

We have to care about what happens within the American family because we don't have that sharing of one race or one religion or one ethnic group. What is it going to do if we bring in 40 million foreigners now to those people who are now part of our American family?

Well, someone says that we should expand the American family. Well, yes, we could just say: Hey, anybody in the world who wants to get here, we are going to make them an American and just forget about what that does to the 300 million Americans who are out there depending on their government to watch out for their interests.

What would happen if we have that situation? We will have a very harmful decline in the well-being in their communities, in their jobs, and in the government services that they are able to collect of the American family.

Again, that doesn't mean that illegals who are here are bad people—they aren't—nor are the poor people around the world who will flood into our country—because, if we legalize the status of those who are here, you will see a flood into the country.

Just think about this, just the discussion of what they call this act that was being aimed at legalizing the status of people who were brought here when they were younger, just that discussion of that issue brought 50,000 to 60,000 people swarming in. They sent their children to the border.

Whatever happened to those kids, by the way? What happened to those 60,000 kids who were down on the border? Well, they are all over the United States now. And do you know what? In schools in California, we have children coming in illegally from other countries, and some of them are carrying diseases. This is a horror story.

Who is watching out for our children? We do care about those 60,000 kids that were there and the millions more kids that will come in if we legalize the status of our own illegal immigrants here.

We care about our own kids first, and there is nothing wrong with that. We don't have to apologize about it, and we don't have to apologize also that we have the most generous legal system in the world.

By the way, for those people who always talk about, Well, immigration really helps our country and helps our economy, if you look at the statistics that are being presented, often what you are being told about are the effect of legal immigrants, which is true. They do add, and I personally would like to go on the record in saying that I believe in legal immigration.

I believe that our million people, we can absorb that, 300 million people, we certainly can absorb 1 million more legal immigrants, we should refine our system, so that those legal that are coming in are people that have a means and a skill or an education level, so they will be contributing to the wealth of the country rather than consuming it.

There are a lot of businesses that say they need some specialists. Yes, let's try to structure the legal immigrants in that way so it meets the needs of America, as well as brings in very highly-educated people into our country.

When we bring in people who are not that, when we bring in people who are not producing wealth, but instead are consumers, that means there is less wealth in our society, and that means that especially America's lower-income people are worse off.

Now, when I was a kid, I mowed the lawns in my neighborhood. It was a good thing. You get a work ethic when you are mowing the lawns. I actually painted houses and dug fence posts. I was an ice-cream scooper at Marineland snack bar, and those are the jobs kids did, but today, one of the factors of illegal immigration—and especially if we legalize the status and draw even more illegals in because now, all over the world, they know, Hey, all we have to do is get here, and we can outweigh them—all these entry-level positions, these positions that are actually giving young people a chance to get some work experience, many of these jobs are being taken by people who are here illegally.

They are willing to work at a very low level, and they don't just become entry-level jobs. That is the job they stick with. That means that job is no longer available to an American kid who wants to get some experience in the workplace, a box boy or someone who works at a fast-food restaurant or something like that.

We are actually hurting our young people, we are hurting our poor people, the people at the lowest end of the scale, and of course, we are hurting the people who are dependent on government programs.

Before I go on to that, there are a group of people in our country that

would like to be self-sufficient. They have skills, but they have some sort of physical disability. Those people are struggling to come out and have some self-dignity in earning their own living.

Those people are being replaced by people because, Oh, well, we will just hire this illegal, even if we can hire a disabled person, we can get an able-bodied illegal in here for the same amount, so why have someone who has a physical disability?

The people at the very lowest level—where is unemployment the highest? In our black community and in the Hispanic American community. These are the people who will be the worst hit if we legalize the status of those who are here illegally.

If there are tens of millions more who pour into our country—and as I say, it will be at least 40 million—and then when the word goes out all over the world that we have this surrender of our borders, you can bet there will be even more than that. It will be a massive betrayal of the regular people and lower-income people in the United States, of American citizens—again, the disabled people, lower-income people.

What about those people who have worked all of their lives for government, who made sure that they pay their taxes, knowing that the government is going to have certain things to back them up as they got older or whether there are things that they would need in cases of emergency, or how about the education of their family and things such as that?

No, these programs will have so many tens of millions of more illegals come in because we have legalized the status of those who are already here, those programs now which are suffering, some of them will break down.

So how can, with a straight face, people in this body say they are backing the President's efforts to provide 5 million—this is his first step now—5 million work permits to people who are here illegally?

This is at a time of high unemployment. We are defining who we care for. We have already defined who we are as a Nation on how we have set down a rule of law and whether we try to be fair. We are an imperfect society. We know that. We know we have got some real problems we have to solve and work together on.

We are a multiracial, multiethnic society, but our society as it is will disintegrate if we have tens of millions of illegals pouring into our country. That is just the way it is.

Again, the poorest of the poor will be hurt, and when we give 5 million work permits at a time when we have such high unemployment, when we give 5 million work permits to people who are here illegally, we are actually betraying the American people who are struggling at the lower end of the economic

scale. We are betraying them. It is something we all need to think about.

We need to say to the American people: we are on your side, and we want to do things that are right for you. I have been dismayed by that element of just sort of, not disdain, but a frivolous overlooking of the well-being of the American people when those people are advocating comprehensive immigration reform.

Let us also just note that immigration is something that is on our agenda. We keep hearing about it, but there are special interests at stake here. The reason why it is being pushed is not just this humanitarian special ideal, this humanitarian philosophical thing which I say we have to make sure that those special ideas that they think they become more human, to give our money away to various peoples of the world, that it doesn't hurt Americans, but there are also special interests who are profiting from this.

It is not only a bad idea and a bad ideal that is driving this toward these decisions, but we have special interests that want cheap labor. We have people in the business community that want cheap labor. Now, don't tell me that Americans can no longer work as carpenters or as plumbers or as roofers. The construction industry slowly, but surely, now is evolving into where they are hiring illegals. That is wrong. There are people who can do these jobs, but they will take the lower pay alternative—of course they will.

There are people that claim that they have to hire illegals because they can't hire Americans at that. No. If people were being paid more money, they could hire Americans at those jobs, but we have special interests that want lower pay, and we have special interests on that side of the aisle who want political pawns to come into this country to serve them when election day comes in the future and you have got 40 million new people here over a 20-year period that they will be voting for their political party.

That is just how cynical it is. Low wages and political pawns are being pushed. That is the factor that is pushing this comprehensive program that will be dramatically harmful to the well-being of the American people.

I would hope that we postpone any decision on that until next year when we Republicans can debate this issue, go to the American people, and get their guidance on what policy that they want our country to have when it comes to immigration into our country.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were

taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1447. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of David M. Rubenstein as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4812. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5108. An act to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 4, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2203. To provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Jack Nicklaus, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence, good sportsmanship, and philanthropy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8163. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-78; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0051; Sequence No. 6] received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8164. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation

of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; CFR Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0747; FRL-9919-83-Region 5] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8165. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County's Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Four Industry Categories for Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0475; FRL-9919-66-Region 3] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8166. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia's Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan of the West Virginia Portion of the Martinsburg-Hagerstown, WV-MD Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0690; FRL-9919-65-Region 3] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8167. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; 2014 Iowa State Implementation Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0550; FRL-9919-87-Region 7] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8168. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Availability of Data on Allocations of Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Allowances to Existing Electricity Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9919-91-OAR] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8169. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: 2014 Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems; Final Rule [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0512; FRL-9918-95-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR96) received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8170. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion [EPA-R07-RCRA-2014-0452; FRL-9919-72-Region 7] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8171. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0074; FRL-9919-74-Region 6] received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8172. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Rulemaking to Amend Dates in Federal Implementation Plans Addressing Interstate Transport of Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9919-71-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS40) received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8173. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 13-14, informing the Congress of the Department's intent to sign a Memorandum of Agreement with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Communications and Information Organisation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8174. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to the Taiwan Relations Act, agreements concluded by the American Institute and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in Washington, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3311(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8175. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress for the reporting period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8176. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report to the Congress on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8177. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8178. A letter from the Acting Chief Management Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8179. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to the Congress for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8180. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a separate management report for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8181. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the semiannual report to the Congress on the activities of the Office of In-

spector General for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8182. A letter from the Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's report entitled "Federal Student Loan Repayment Program CY 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4309. A bill to amend the Sikes Act to make certain improvements to the administration of cooperative agreements for land management related to Department of Defense readiness activities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-647 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4489. A bill to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces and World War I, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-648 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a surface danger zone over the Guam National Wildlife Refuge or any portion thereof to support the operation of a live-fire training range complex; with an amendment (Rept. 113-649 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5683. A bill to ensure appropriate judicial review of Federal Government actions by amending the prohibition on the exercise of jurisdiction by the United States Court of Federal Claims of certain claims pending in other courts (Rept. 113-650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4309. The Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

H.R. 4402. The Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

H.R. 4489. The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 5803. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 5804. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing hazardous humanitarian services in West Africa to combat the spread of the 2014 Ebola virus outbreak shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5805. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to expanding access for breakthrough drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 5806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent certain expiring provisions related to charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 5807. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 5808. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to strengthen rules applied in case of competition for diabetic testing strips, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 5809. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 5810. A bill to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H. Res. 772. A resolution directing the House of Representatives to bring a civil action for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge certain policies and actions taken by the executive branch relating to immigration; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H. Res. 773. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that localities should observe Halloween on the last Saturday of October and communicate to the public that trick-or-treating and other public observances of the holiday will take place on that day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 774. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Louis Zamperini and expressing condolences on his passing; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 5803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV; Section 3: the Authority of Congress to make all rules regarding the territories.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 5804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . ."

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 5806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 5808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 5809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 5810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 ("The Congress shall have the power To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States")

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 ("To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes")

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 ("To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof")

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 310: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 366: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1074: Mr. REED.
H.R. 1250: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1339: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 1761: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1816: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1981: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2224: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2955: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2994: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3116: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 3571: Mr. PRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLAY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. NEGRET MCLEOD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MENG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MORAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BASS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4077: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4551: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4740: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 4837: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 4957: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 5033: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5059: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 5178: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 5185: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 5403: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 5505: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 5589: Mr. POLIS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. FATTAH,
H.R. 5644: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 5646: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 5655: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 5656: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 5741: Mr. COOPER and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 5764: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. REED, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HIGGINS,

Ms. MOORE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 5768: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 5778: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5781: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 5783: Ms. FUDGE.

H. Res. 109: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. HIGGINS.

H. Res. 711: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. LEWIS.

H. Res. 757: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

SENATE—Monday, December 8, 2014

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the source of our being, on yesterday, December 7, we remembered how You sustain us even through unexpected tragedies. We recall the deaths, injuries, heroism, doubts, disbelief, and patriotism on that date that will live in infamy.

Lord, continue to guide this land we love on its labyrinthine path to greatness. Protect it from dangers seen and unseen as You unite it for the common good. Use our Senators for Your glory as our Nation seeks to bring deliverance to captives and to let the oppressed go free.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5:30 this afternoon.

At 5:30 p.m., the Senate will proceed to three rollcall votes on the confirmation of Jeffery Baran to be a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Lauren McFerran to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board; and Ellen Williams to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency at the Department of Energy.

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING SENATORS

CARL LEVIN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am very happy to be here today to talk about a couple of my friends—I should say the Senate's friends. I have received a lot of gifts while I have been here. My colleagues, over the years, have given me

things here in the Senate, but one gift stands out really strongly in my mind. On my desk, not far from here, I have this big painting—it is a very famous painting from the National Portrait Gallery of Mark Twain.

Mark Twain, I tell people, was born in Nevada, which is really true. Samuel Clemens wasn't, but Mark Twain was. Orion Clemens was chosen as the Territorial Secretary of Nevada, and he told his younger brother Samuel: Come West and I will find you a job. Samuel had been fighting, which he didn't like, in the Civil War, so he came West to join his brother. But his brother couldn't find him a job, so Samuel Clemens bummed around for quite a while.

Without belaboring the story too long, the fact is, Mark Twain finally went up to Virginia City, which was booming at the time, and he went to the Territorial Enterprise newspaper and got a job as a reporter. This was a stunningly good and important start for his first writing that he had done. That is where he started his fame.

He would have stayed in Nevada longer, but someone challenged him to a duel for some of the things he wrote. So being the smart man he was, he didn't want to duel so he left town, went to California, where he wrote two best-selling books, "The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County" and "Roughing It," which was about his experience in bumming around Nevada until he found a job. These were best sellers. These were great books.

The point of the story, though, is he went to Virginia City as Samuel Clemens and took the name Mark Twain. That is where the name came from.

This means a lot. It is a story I tell many times to people who come to my office. So CARL LEVIN, the wonderful, kind, thoughtful man that he is, said: Can I come and see you? And I said: Sure. He brought to me I guess it is one of the rare double signatures of Samuel Clemens. There may be others, I just have never heard of one. This was done at a club in Hannibal, MO. The club's name was Labinnah—Hannibal spelled backwards—and Mark Twain, in 1902, because of how famous he was, signed Samuel Clemens, Mark Twain, and wrote through the whole—he didn't want anybody else's name there. He wanted just his. So that is the gift he gave me.

That was so fitting. It fits my office perfectly, and it means a lot to me. CARL LEVIN brought with him this handwritten note: "I got this at an auction 10 yrs. ago not knowing why. It

just dawned on me! Best on the New Year, CARL."

That was so nice of him to do that, and it is so hard to explain my appreciation, although I am trying to do that here by outlining what a wonderful human being CARL LEVIN is. What he did for me is an example of who CARL LEVIN is and how he thinks of people. He remembered the story I told him about Mark Twain, and he said, I am sure, to himself: I have this thing I got 10 years ago; I will give it to the Senator, my friend. So he gave me that plaque just because that is who he is.

He has always been attentive to the interests of the people of Michigan and our country. He is the longest serving Senator in the history of the State of Michigan—36 years. His legislative accomplishments are significant. I would say they are unmatched by almost anyone.

CARL LEVIN has stood his ground on controversial issues, and that is an understatement. He has fought to give average Americans a fair shot at what is going on in the world. He has always spoken with a clear voice, speaking for justice, equality, and fairness.

(Mr. MURPHY assumed the Chair.)

The Presiding Officer is a lawyer, I am a lawyer, but I am not sure I would be the best person, if you gave me a document, to look it over and make sure there was everything in that document you wanted in it, but CARL LEVIN is the person you want. I call him my nitpicker. He is so good at making sure everything is right; that every i is dotted, every t is crossed. Bring in CARL LEVIN if you have something and you really need someone to look at it and think it through.

CARL was a prominent lawyer, as was his dad, in Michigan. His dad served as a member of the Michigan Corrections Commission. After graduating from high school, his father worked as an assembly line worker. CARL LEVIN also knew how to work with his hands, but he followed in his father's footsteps by being an extremely hard worker. He attended college at Swarthmore and received a bachelor of arts degree there. Then he attended Harvard Law School and received his juris doctorate from Harvard.

He practiced in the private sector for a while. He began his public career as the first general counsel for the Michigan Civil Rights Commission. He was elected in 1968 to the Detroit City Council, and he served there until 1977. He was elected to the Senate in 1978. CARL has functioned in this body as a levelheaded mediator who is guided by the protection of people in Michigan and our country.

In the past 36 years, CARL has cast over 12,000 votes. Some of those votes were hard, and not always popular, but they were CARL LEVIN votes. He did what he thought was right. When General Motors and Chrysler, in the last few years, faced a potential collapse, he recognized their bankruptcy would devastate the people of Michigan and have a detrimental effect and that is a gross understatement—on this country. He pressed the incoming Obama administration to support the companies with loans. There was a hue and cry from people who opposed that, saying that is the wrong thing to do, Levin is wrong, Obama is wrong. But they were right. Look what it has done to energize, revitalize the State of Michigan, the whole Detroit metropolitan area and our country, with tens of thousands of new jobs as a result of his advocacy. As I said, it wasn't a popular position at the time, but CARL knew what was good for Michigan and good for our country and he has been vindicated a hundred times over.

CARL has been chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations for 10 years. During that period of time, he has done some unusually important things for our country through this committee. Corporate money laundering—1999. He delved into that very deeply.

CARL LEVIN is not a headline hunter. CARL LEVIN is a substantive legislator. He could have held a lot more hearings, but he held them about every 6 months because he wanted his hearings to be CARL LEVIN hearings where, I repeat, every I was dotted, every t was crossed, and they were very powerful hearings.

Gasoline price manipulation, the Enron scandal—he delved into that very deeply.

Misconduct in the United Nations oil-for-food program, tax haven banks and offshore corporate tax evasion—he has talked about that and talked about that. Very notable legislation as a result of the work he has done: Wall Street reform, the Consumer Protection Act, the Credit Card Act, the PATRIOT Act.

CARL LEVIN is a very fine legislator. He fought for Wall Street reform when others were afraid to do so, and he helped restore the broken financial system that held powerful institutions accountable for their actions. CARL's persistence earned him a slot in Time magazine's list of America's 10 best U.S. Senators. They called him the "Bird-Dogger."

Well, that is what he is. Put him on an issue and he will come back with the prey. He is very good. He never stops. He is a sharp-eyed overseer of U.S. defense policy. He has spent his entire career promoting defense policy that protects America's interests at home and abroad while safeguarding the men and women who serve.

CARL is the Chair of the Senate Defense Committee. During the Nation's

most trying of diplomatic times he has done a remarkable job to make sure the military is protected.

Even though he was Chair of this big powerful committee—the Defense Committee—he felt so strongly and he foresaw what a lot of us didn't see. He saw the disaster that would accompany an invasion of Iraq. Accordingly, he talked about how bad it would be and voted against it. CARL LEVIN was right and a lot of us were wrong. I have said before on the Senate floor, of all the votes I have cast during the time I have been in government, the worst was voting for the Iraq war. But I did. CARL LEVIN did not.

But for all of his accomplishments in Congress, his greatest achievements reside in his home. CARL and his wife of over 50 years, Barbara, have three beautiful daughters: Kate, Laura, and Erica. Landra and Barbara are good friends. They are part of a book club. They have had a wonderful relationship over these many years. So as CARL retires from the Senate, I know he is going to cherish the time he is going to spend with his family.

But also CARL and I have had a long, long ongoing conversation. He and his brother SANDER own about 100 acres. They have had it for a long time. CARL LEVIN is not a man of wealth, but he and his brother bought this 100 acres that has nothing on it but trees. He calls it his tree farm. He has shown me pictures of it. I have not seen it lately, but I have had for 15 or 20 years a hat he gave me—a green baseball-type cap—that says "tree farm" on it. I used to tell him I still have that cap. And I still have that cap, CARL.

He will be missed here in Washington. He will be missed in the Senate by all of us. But he will be missed more by his older brother SANDY, who is the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee in the House. They have served together in Congress for 32 years.

I have said this on the floor before, and I will say it again. I will remember CARL LEVIN for a lot of things, but when I was in the House, I came over to visit with him. I was thinking about running for the Senate. I said: CARL, I came to the House with your brother SANDY. He looked up at me and said: SANDY is not only my brother, he is my best friend. That speaks well of the person who CARL LEVIN is.

It has really been a privilege and an honor to serve with CARL. I will miss him so very, very much. I will miss having somebody to take the difficult issues to, to get his view as to what we should do, how we should handle it.

His voice will be missed here in the Senate. I congratulate him on his incomparable career in the Senate, and I wish him the very best.

JAY ROCKEFELLER

Mr. President, it is said that you do not choose your family, and that is

true. We are born into our families. We have no way to determine the family we are born into. Yet as a 27-year-old JAY ROCKEFELLER chose to make the people of West Virginia his family. How did that happen? How did JAY ROCKEFELLER, born in New York to one of the most famous American families, one of the great dynasties in the history of this country, end up in West Virginia?

He was an undergraduate student at Harvard. He decided he did not like some of the things Harvard was doing, and so he left. He dropped out of school and went to Japan. He spent 3 years in Japan. He became an interpreter. He knows the Japanese language extremely well. He loves the Japanese people. He started out at Harvard. As I indicated, after his junior year, he left for Japan. He was there for 3 years. He came home, returned to Harvard, and finished his degree.

JAY ROCKEFELLER, as a 27-year-old, could have done anything, gone anywhere, gotten any education, started any business, or he could have sat around at a home on one of the beaches around the world and just done nothing. But that is not JAY ROCKEFELLER. He wanted to do something. He did not know what he wanted to do. This ROCKEFELLER wanted to do something that was different.

A friend of his published here for many years a magazine called the Washington Monthly, a guy by the name of Pete Peters. He was a man-about-town. Everybody liked him very much, but he was very close to JAY ROCKEFELLER. So JAY talked to him one day trying to find what he should do in life. Here he was, one of the wealthiest men in America. He had a Harvard degree.

"What should I do?"

Pete Peters told him: "What you should do is go someplace and work with poor people."

"Where should I go?"

"Why not West Virginia?"

"West Virginia?"

"West Virginia."

So he joined AmeriCorps. As a VISTA volunteer, he moved to the small mining community of Emmons, WV. That was in 1964. This man of means, this man of stature, this man of notoriety went to this small little town in West Virginia.

It was not easy for JAY ROCKEFELLER to suddenly find himself in a setting he had never imagined. In the first 6 months he was there, he could hardly get anyone to talk to him. He is kind of an intimidating man. His name is ROCKEFELLER. He is 6-foot-7. But eventually his goodness came through. The people of Emmons, WV, started talking to him, and they really liked the man. From 1964 when he moved there, he knew he wanted to identify with poor people, and that is what he has done since 1964.

In 1966 he was elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates assembly.

In 1968 he was chosen to serve as the secretary of state in the State of West Virginia.

He then became the president of West Virginia Wesleyan College and served there for 3 years.

He then was twice elected Governor of the State of West Virginia. He served from 1976 to 1984.

Governor ROCKEFELLER became Senator ROCKEFELLER in 1985. From the time he first stepped onto the Senate floor, he made it clear he was here for one reason: to fight for the people of West Virginia. Senator ROCKEFELLER fought to provide his constituents with health care. He was an architect of CHIP, a children's health program. It is an insurance program. The Children's Health Insurance Program is one of the most important health initiatives in America's history for kids. He fought to protect Medicaid for half a million West Virginians but for millions and millions of Americans.

He has been a senior member of the Committee on Finance, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, and chairman of the Intelligence Committee. What a remarkable career he has had. He fought very hard to protect the American people from President Bush's efforts to privatize Social Security. He has protected retirement disability benefits by doing that for millions and millions of Americans.

His efforts to help West Virginia have not been confined to this building. As the senior Senator from West Virginia, this big man—I repeat, 6-foot-7—with a very, very long reach, has used that reach to bring jobs to his home State as Governor and as Senator. Because of his recruiting, there are thousands and thousands of West Virginians employed at the Toyota factory in Buffalo; Hino Motors in Williamstown; and at the Kureha plant in a town called Belle. Thousands and thousands of jobs. Diamond Electric, Nippon Thermostat, and NGK Spark Plugs are all companies Senator and Governor ROCKEFELLER helped bring to West Virginia.

The people of West Virginia have been blessed to have Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER as a family member for the last 50 years. They have been blessed to have a person of his integrity and tenacity looking out for them in the Senate.

My respect for JAY ROCKEFELLER is unlimited. He has been my colleague for the entire time I have been in the Congress—32 years. Now, as his time in the Senate comes to an end, he will be sorely missed.

I am sure JAY is looking forward to spending more time with Sharon, this wonderful, wonderful woman—and by the way, whose father was a U.S. Senator—and their children John, Valerie, Charles, and Justin, and their six grandchildren.

I so admire this good man. I congratulate him on a very distinguished

career, including five terms in the U.S. Senate, two terms as Governor. I wish him the very best in life.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 5:30 p.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Utah.

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING SENATORS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have only heard two of the comments of the majority leader—one for the distinguished Senator from Michigan and one for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I have to say that both of those Senators deserve a lot of commendation for the service they have given to the Senate. They are both friends of mine.

CARL LEVIN

Senator LEVIN has been a terrific, solid performer for the Democrats in the U.S. Senate, and he is an honest—totally honest—decent, honorable man.

JAY ROCKEFELLER

Senator ROCKEFELLER is on the Finance Committee with me. He is one of the senior people on that committee and certainly one of the people I have enjoyed working with. We worked a number of years ago on the CHIP bill, the SCHIP bill, and he was of inestimable help there. I have to say he has been a wonderful member of the very important Finance Committee.

I will miss both of these brethren and wish them the very, very best in their lives as they go through the remaining years of their lives, and hopefully they and their families will have a wonderful, wonderful time together.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S IMMIGRATION EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as the Appropriations Committees prepare to release the product of their negotiations on a spending bill this afternoon, I rise today to discuss the troubling development that has made their work all the more challenging: President Obama's immigration Executive order. By circumventing Congress, the President has dispensed with the duly-enacted law of the land in a unilateral attempt to alter the legal status of millions of immigrants.

Unfortunately, this issue of Executive overreach is not a new one. Over

the past year, I have come to the Senate floor repeatedly to lay out my objections to President Obama's lawlessness—from the release of Guantanamo detainees to ObamaCare, from his purported recess appointments to Benghazi. Today I come to discuss this latest astonishing instance in the area of immigration.

Immigration is a complex and divisive issue, and Americans hold a wide variety of views on the matter. But one thing that should not be controversial is the President's duty to place fidelity to the Constitution over partisan politics.

The Constitution vests lawmaking authority with Congress, not the President. And the Framers specifically sought to end centuries of abuses by the English monarchs, who claimed the power to dispense with the laws of the land, by requiring the President to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. The Constitution does not suggest or invite the President to enforce the law; it obligates him to do so.

The President and his executive branch, of course, exercise prosecutorial discretion—the discretion to choose not to prosecute certain cases. But that power stems from considerations of fairness and equity in particular cases. Instead of requiring individualized determinations in specific cases, the President's latest Executive order claims the power to sweep up millions of people based on only a few broad, widely shared criteria.

The President is also within his rights not to prosecute when there are not sufficient resources to do so, but the Obama administration has never explained how the Executive order would save money. In fact, the administration's own policy advisers have acknowledged that a work permitting program will be expensive and will take away resources from law enforcement. While no one disagrees that capturing and removing violent criminals should be our highest immigration priority, President Obama has gone much further and made current immigration law essentially a dead letter for millions of illegal immigrants.

President Obama cannot credibly claim that he is attempting to execute immigration law faithfully when ICE agents were forced to release 68,000 potentially deportable aliens last year alone, when the administration took disciplinary action against ICE officers for making lawful arrests, and when the President of the National ICE Council felt compelled to testify before Congress that although “most Americans assume that ICE agents and officers are empowered by the government to enforce the law . . . nothing could be further from the truth.”

Moreover, despite the administration's claim to the contrary, President Obama's action is not comparable to the Executive actions taken by President Reagan or even President George

H.W. Bush. Even the Washington Post's editorial board found that claim by the White House to be "indefensible." Presidents Reagan and Bush simply implemented the enforcement priorities established in laws that Congress actually passed. By contrast President Obama has sought to change the law before Congress has acted, so he cannot rely on Congress's authority to enforce the policy he prefers. Here President Obama has acted directly in the face of congressional opposition, and we should call his Executive order what it is: an attempt to bypass the constitutionally ordained legislative process and rewrite the law unilaterally.

We are all sometimes disappointed and even angry about the outcomes of the legislative process. I have certainly felt that way many times over the course of my 38 years here. But the right response is to redouble our efforts to get it right, not to try to subvert our constitutional system.

The President should heed his own wisdom from as recently as last fall when he said that by broadening immigration enforcement carve-outs "then essentially I would be ignoring the law in a way that I think would be very difficult to defend legally. So that is not an option. . . . What I've said is there is a path to get this done, and that's through Congress."

Even beyond the legal and constitutional problems with the Executive order, the President's approach is also bad policy. His Executive order greatly undercuts the chances for lasting immigration reform because it undermines our confidence that the President will live with any compromises we agree to forge through the legislative process. The Executive order is even bad for those who are currently here illegally—those who are supposed to benefit from it. Instead of temporary half measures, they need the certainty that only legislation can provide.

Last month, in an election in which President Obama insisted that all of his policies were on the ballot, the American people delivered the President a decisive rebuke. Many of us from Congress took the right message from the election—that it is time for us to come together to find areas of agreement and to govern like adults.

Apparently President Obama missed that message. To announce this Executive order after the defeat at the polls displays shocking arrogance. Given how the White House and its allies in the media keep raising the specter of a shutdown or impeachment, it is clear the President is attempting to goad Congress into a fight rather than work with us in the difficult job of actually legislating.

Unlike President Obama, I am committed to making real progress toward implementing lasting immigration reform. I supported the Senate's comprehensive immigration bill last year.

Even though the bill was far from perfect, I voted for it because I believe in working together to get something done on this vitally important issue. As I have long argued, the way to get real immigration reform back on track is not for the President to insist on his "my way or the highway" approach, either by trying to enact his preferred policy unilaterally or even for him to demand an all-or-nothing comprehensive bill. Instead we should consider individual immigration reform measures that can win broad support and help rebuild trust in our country. Only by doing so will we clear a path forward for other more far-reaching reforms.

Take the area of high-skilled immigration. We face a high-skilled worker shortage that has become a national crisis. In April for the second year in a row the Federal Government reached its current H-1B visa quota for workers just 5 days after accepting applications. Employers submitted 172,500 petitions for just 85,000 available visas, so American companies were unable to hire nearly 90,000 high-skilled workers essential to help grow their domestic businesses, develop innovative technologies at home rather than abroad, and compete internationally. Keep in mind most of these folks we have educated in our colleges and universities. They could be of great help to us.

I have been trying to get H-1B expansion through here for a number of months. I think we will get it through honorably. In response to this crisis I worked with my friends Senators KLOBUCHAR, RUBIO, and COONS to introduce the bipartisan immigration innovation or the I-Squared Act. Our bill provides a thoughtful, lasting legislative framework that would increase the number of H-1B visas, based on annual market demand, to attract the highly skilled workers and innovators our economy so desperately needs.

Unilateralism is not the way forward on immigration. If the President is serious about enacting meaningful immigration reform, he can choose to take the first essential step. Even in the current partisan climate there is a widespread consensus and real opportunity for bipartisan, bicameral reform for our outdated visa system for economically essential high-skilled immigrants.

The concrete legislative victory where there is already considerable consensus would help build trust and good will among those who disagree sharply over other areas of immigration policy and would mark a critical first step along the path to broader reform.

For the life of me I cannot understand why the President doesn't accept this hand we are extending to him, knowing that we educate these people, get them their college degrees, their master's degrees, their doctoral degrees, their Ph.D.s, and then we push

them out of the country when they want to stay and help us in the continually evolving and impressive high-tech world. It is mind-boggling to me that we do this.

Canada even advertises in California and in the States south of the Canadian border: Come to Canada. You are welcome here. I commend Canada for having the brains and guts and ability and the political instincts to attract these very highly educated—educated in the United States—people, to help them in their high-tech world, in their engineering world, in their mathematical world, in their science world. Of course we can name a whole host of other areas where they are now helping Canadians when they were educated here, wanted to stay here, wanted to be part of America, and we could not provide a means whereby these people could help us and at the same time an intelligent means that people in our society could accept.

That is not the only action we could take. Naturally we should work together as Democrats and Republicans to do real immigration reform. We have 11 million or more people here who aren't going to go back to their countries. Many of them have never been in their countries, such as the children who were born here and young children who were brought here and never knew anything about their parents' former country. We have to solve these problems, and we don't do it by unilateral actions by a President who basically doesn't seem to give a darn, except for his own unilateral approach to things. That is not what the Presidency should be.

There are three branches of government. They are coequal. The President should enforce laws that are enacted only by Congress. The Supreme Court should interpret laws that are enacted by Congress if there are reasons for doing so. In this case we have a President who basically is ignoring the law, just acting on his own, as though Congress doesn't mean a thing, even though it means everything in these areas.

I counsel the President to change these ways and work with us. I think there will be more people willing to work with him should he do so, and we can solve these problems—we can solve them—not in some stupid, unilateral way that is going to create more problems than it solves but in a way the American people will accept.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING
SENATORS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in the waning days of the 113th Congress it is a bittersweet moment as many of us are saying goodbye—although not on a permanent basis but at least in terms of our official relationships working together as Senators—to so many of our good friends and valued colleagues. Every other December we find ourselves bidding farewell to some of the most admired and respected Members of this Chamber. Today I want to say a few words about three of these esteemed Members, starting with my good friend, the senior Senator from Georgia.

SAXBY CHAMBLISS

SAXBY CHAMBLISS and I arrived in the Senate at the same time following the 2002 elections. At the time, the war on terrorism, as we all know, was barely a year old, and it was by far and away the biggest issue on the minds of Americans across the country and in the Halls of Congress. Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS immediately established himself as one of the Senate's most important leaders on national security issues, which came as no surprise to anyone who watched his career in the House of Representatives. Indeed, in his capacity as chairman of the House Intelligence Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, he oversaw the first official investigation of the 9/11 attacks. It is hard to believe it has now been more than 13 years since that fateful day, but Senator CHAMBLISS has never lost sight of the continuing threat posed by radical Islamic terrorists and he has never stopped working to uphold bipartisan support for strong national security policies. He has been a consistent leader on important pieces of legislation such as the PATRIOT Act and on the detention facilities at Guantanamo Bay. He has also been a leader on the Armed Services Committee on the annual Defense authorization bill which we will be taking up later this week and on controversial but important topics such as the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Most recently on the campaign to destroy the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, Senator CHAMBLISS again has been one of the leading voices helping us find our way to the right strategy and the right policy. In short, name any high-profile national security issue and there is a good chance SAXBY CHAMBLISS has been driving the debate and working to move the United States in the right direction. I know he is also especially proud of his efforts to improve current retirement policies for members of the National Guard and military Reserves.

Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS comes from a State where agriculture is the single largest industry and he spent 6 years as chairman or ranking member of the Senate agriculture committee.

He was one of the first Members of our class in 2002 to serve as a chairman of any standing committee, something we were all a little bit envious of, early on in his first term of office. But he has worked on several tough farm bills during the time he has been in Congress and he has been our go-to Member on all related issues.

In fact, Senator CHAMBLISS understands these issues almost better than anyone on both sides of the aisle, which is another way of saying he understands the challenges facing American farmers better than almost anyone here. That understanding allowed him to play a key role in reforming Federal crop insurance.

Folks down in Georgia have been justly appreciative of Senator CHAMBLISS's work on agriculture policy, and they also appreciate his efforts to accelerate the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project through a Federal-State partnership, which was officially signed back in October. It is an impressive list of accomplishments, and I know I speak for all of our Members on both sides of the aisle and staffers alike, when I say that SAXBY CHAMBLISS will be missed as much for his warmth and friendship as for his policy work.

As a diehard Atlanta Braves and Georgia Bulldogs fan, he is equally at ease discussing baseball, football, quail hunting or national security. He is unfailingly kind, thoughtful, and considerate to everyone with whom he works in this Chamber—whether Senator, staffer or casual visitor.

SAXBY is now preparing for his life's next great chapter, which he will spend with his wife Julianne, to whom he has been married for nearly half a century, their two children, and six grandchildren, which I know bring them a lot of joy.

I wish my good friend all the best in his retirement, and I wish the entire Chambliss family a never-ending supply of health and happiness.

MIKE JOHANNIS

Next, I would like to turn to my colleague from Nebraska, the senior Senator MIKE JOHANNIS. Even if MIKE JOHANNIS had never been a Senator, he would have compiled an extraordinary career of public service. It started with a stint on the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners and continued with 2 years on the Lincoln City Council, followed by 8 years as mayor of Lincoln, NE.

In 1999 MIKE left the mayor's office and moved over to the Nebraska State Capitol, where he served for 6 years as Governor. He said one of his proudest gubernatorial accomplishments was enacting a mental health reform law that helped improve the lives of some of Nebraska's neediest and most vulnerable residents. That to me tells a lot about his character and sense of compassion.

Born and raised as a farm boy, MIKE was named America's 28th Secretary of Agriculture in 2005. Over the next 3 years, he held more than 50 separate forums on the farm bill—more than 50. Not surprisingly, he continued to work on agriculture-related issues when he joined the Senate. Indeed, he has been a true leader, fighting passionately to defend the rights and livelihood of farmers and ranchers everywhere—especially in Nebraska.

These are issues that are vitally important to millions and millions of Americans, including MIKE's constituents, but they are not the kind of issues that help land you prime time appearances on cable news. Luckily for us, MIKE doesn't care about media attention, but what he does care about is doing the right thing for his State and for our country.

He understands something that many of us too quickly forget—that taxes and regulations should be forced to pass a simple cost-benefit test. That is why MIKE worked so hard to block the national energy tax known as cap and trade, and that is why he has consistently demanded that the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal agencies demonstrate how their proposed rules would affect American jobs and American workers.

It is also why he has so aggressively pushed to abolish the IRS 1099 reporting requirement in ObamaCare, which would have placed a costly new burden on America's small-business owners and indirectly on the jobs that they create. MIKE did more than anyone else to help highlight the problems with this requirement and to demand its repeal. Thanks in large part to his efforts, 81 Members of this Chamber voted to abolish it back in 2011.

There is an old cliché in politics that there are two types of politicians—the show horses and workhorses. MIKE has never sought the limelight, and has certainly done more than his fair share of the work. But he has done so in a very quiet and thoughtful manner. He is someone who has kept a low profile while working behind the scenes, building bipartisan consensus and being infallibly polite and gentlemanly in the process.

He is the type of Senator who is universally admired and respected by all of our colleagues. His accomplishments here in the Senate—I have just mentioned a few—have been manifold. Yet I am quite certain his proudest accomplishments are his family—his wife Stephanie, their two children, and five grandchildren. They have been generous enough to share MIKE with us for the past 6 years, and now it is time for MIKE to be with the people he cares about the most. We will miss him a whole lot, but he is moving on to perhaps the most rewarding chapter of his life.

MIKE, thanks for all you have done. Thanks for your service, your guidance, and most of all for your friendship.

TOM COBURN

I will close my remarks today on our retiring colleagues by paying tribute to Dr. TOM COBURN. He is someone we have all come to know and admire over 20 years as a relentless fighter for limited government and conservative values here in the Congress.

TOM can be a very charming guy, but I know he can also be a pain in our side when he is determined to make sure he gets a chance to get a vote on an important matter here in the Senate. I think he is comfortable in both of those roles. In fact, I know he is.

TOM COBURN is a man of strong principle, a man of great integrity, and, perhaps just as importantly, a man of remarkable humility. Our country has benefited greatly from the wisdom and leadership TOM has provided during his service in Congress—first in the House and then in the Senate. I have been in the Senate now for a little more than a decade, and during that time our colleague from Oklahoma has done more than anyone else in this Chamber to eliminate wasteful spending, expose fraud and abuse in the Federal budget, and get our entitlement programs on a sustainable path. TOM would be the first one to say that job has just begun, but he has certainly given it everything he has.

He has educated our Nation on the fiscal threat we live under and what it means for our children and grandchildren, and he has worked tirelessly to correct it.

He has done a remarkable job as the ranking member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, as well as his service on the intelligence and banking committees.

Furthermore, TOM has been an unyielding force for protecting liberty and improving access to affordable health care by proposing positive patient-oriented alternatives, and for these reasons and many more I am grateful for his service.

But perhaps the thing he does not want to be remembered for—but that has made such a profound impression on many of us—is his courage and ability to deal with the fact that he is a three-time cancer survivor. Even last week, I know he was receiving treatment for this most recent flare up, but he will be back here today. He will be doing what he does best, and that is fighting for his principles and perhaps causing more than a little bit of turbulence in the process in this otherwise stayed Chamber.

I know I speak for this entire Chamber when I say it is an honor to serve with a man such as TOM COBURN. I know this to be true because Tom is well respected on both sides of the aisle.

In fact, when Time magazine named TOM one of the 100 most influential people in the world in 2013, a friend of TOM's and former Democratic Senator wrote:

The people of Oklahoma are lucky to have someone like Tom representing them in Washington—someone who speaks his mind, sticks to his principles, and is committed to the people he was elected to serve.

The friend I am referring to who made those remarks is none other than our President, Barack Obama, when he served with TOM in the Senate. When the President said that, he found out that TOM received a number of angry letters from constituents that said he and President Obama looked a little too chummy together, to which TOM replied—and this is classic TOM COBURN: "What better way to influence someone than to love them."

This serves as a testament to his character. You see, TOM has an extraordinary ability not just to win the respect of those who agree with him but the admiration and respect of those who disagree with him as well. That is a rare thing in politics and especially in today's society.

Nevertheless, TOM has spent his career promoting what is good for the country while never wavering from his personal conversations. Along the way he has racked up a lengthy list of accomplishments that protect taxpayers and increase transparency in government.

TOM's résumé proves he has been a leader not only in Congress but in every aspect of his life. For example, I think many of our colleagues don't realize he had a distinguished career in business and medicine before he got here. TOM served as president of the school of business student council while getting his accounting degree at Oklahoma State University. Later he went back to law school—excuse me, that was a Freudian slip he wouldn't be happy with. Later he went back to medical school, where he trained to become a physician and served as president of his class at the University of Oklahoma medical school.

TOM has a lot to be proud of about his service in the House and in the Senate. But, again, like all of us, he is most proud of his family. He has been married to the former Miss Oklahoma for nearly 50 years, and he and Carolyn have three daughters and seven grandchildren. Meanwhile, in his career as a physician, he has delivered more than 4,000 babies, which perhaps explains the vote totals in some of his elections, because I am sure many of them have grown up to vote for him.

The things that I mentioned are only a few of TOM COBURN's long list of notable achievements. Knowing TOM and his work ethic, I have no doubt he will be giving 110 percent right up until the last minute he serves in the 113th Congress on January 3, 2015.

I wish TOM and his family the very best as they enter the next season of life.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING SENATORS

MARK PRYOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in just a few moments one of my best friends in the Senate is going to give his farewell address. Senator MARK PRYOR of Arkansas, a former State legislator, former attorney general, and two-term Senator, was caught in this tidal wave in the last election that caused those of us in the Democratic Party in the former old Confederacy, now known as the South—and of course parts of the South these days don't look anything like the old Confederacy. As a matter of fact, my State of Florida is a good example. It is a compendium of people from all over the United States because folks from all over the country have moved to Florida, and thus it is a microcosm of the country.

Arkansas is a State where the Pryor family has served with great distinction and enormous public service for decades. Although it temporarily comes to an end with Senator PRYOR leaving the Congress in January, that is not the end of his public service. His mom and dad served so ably for years and years in the Governor's mansion, as well as the Senate, serving the people of this country and Arkansas. MARK and his family served our country so ably over the years and that public service will continue.

JAY ROCKEFELLER

I reflect back just a few days ago when Senator ROCKEFELLER gave his farewell speech. He is another extraordinary public servant who has demonstrated selfless public service. He is a Senator who, because of his family heritage, could have done anything he wanted, but he chose—after a life of privilege, growing up as a young man, and after having spent time abroad—to go to one of the poorest States in the Union. He first was a volunteer to the poor and later developed a distinguished record of public service that included secretary of state, Governor, and now a five-term Senator. I will speak later about other colleagues who are leaving.

These are just two examples. Senator ROCKEFELLER and my seatmate Senator PRYOR are extraordinary public servants who when you talked to them

and when you looked in their eyes, if they gave you their word, that was it. You didn't have to worry about it.

Some say it is a throwback to the old days. The old days is a throwback that we ought to go to, when if a Senator gave you his or her word, that was it, when there was civility among Senators, when there was not an avalanche of outside money that came in to try to define you with statements that were not true.

We see what has happened to our politics in America today with exceptional millions of dollars coming into a State, buying up television, to create a statement in 27 seconds often that is not true and that fact checkers say is not true, factcheck.org and Politifact.

Yet when we talk to the TV stations and the broadcast stations and show them the fact checkers, they will still run the TV ads. But rather than talk about the mistakes that were made with the Citizens United Supreme Court case and missing by one vote in this Chamber several years ago—we had 59 votes and we needed 60 to cut off debate so we could get to the DISCLOSE Act, a DISCLOSE Act that did not counter the Supreme Court decision, it just said if you are going to spend all this money, you are going to have to say who it is that is doing the contribution.

Of course, if we had been able to pass that, then all of this money would not be flowing because it is hiding behind this masquerade of the Committee for Good Government or the ABC committee for whatever. So they masquerade behind that veil to spend all of that money in order—for their ultimate purposes.

It caught a number of our people. Just look at what happened in the run-off election this last Saturday. Look at the imbalance of the spending on TV that occurred since the general election and the runoff in the State of Louisiana.

I will speak about Senator LANDRIEU, Senator UDALL, Senator BEGICH, and Senator KAY HAGAN later.

I wanted particularly to talk about Senator ROCKEFELLER, our chairman of the commerce committee, and Senator PRYOR, one of the finest public servants I have ever had a chance to serve with.

“ORION” SPACECRAFT

Mr. NELSON. I want to speak about a very uplifting topic in more ways than one. Friday morning I was at the Cape. We call it the Cape. It is technically known as the Kennedy Space Center. America is going to Mars. The first test flight, the spacecraft *Orion*, put upon another rocket—in this case, a heavy-lift rocket called the Delta IV—twice orbited around the Earth. On that second orbit it was boosted up way beyond low-Earth orbit to 3,600 miles,

and then with a ballistic reentry simulating 80 percent of the forces, the stresses on the spacecraft, the Gs, as well as the heat shield heating up to 4,000 degrees Fahrenheit in a spacecraft totally instrumented to check out the integrity of the spacecraft and the effectiveness of the heat shield as part of it—an ablative heat shield that burns off upon reentry—and it was a fantastic success.

I talked about this last week ahead of time just to give folks an idea of how large this is. The *Apollo* spacecraft was 12 feet in diameter. It looked like a similar kind of shape, a capsule. That was over four decades ago, 12 feet. *Orion* is 16½ feet and totally new technology, a new heat shield and up-to-date instrumentation that will carry four astronauts on our goal of our journey to the planet Mars in the decade of the 2030s.

This is what I wanted to share. Friday night after the launch with the extensive coverage that the news media gave, I was at a totally unrelated charity event for a children's hospital. I had people coming up to me and saying we didn't know that we had a space program. It is simply because they associated the shutdown of the space shuttle with the last flight of 135 flights—they associated that with the shutdown of the space program in the last flight of 2011 of the space shuttle.

They now see what has been happening behind the scenes all along, where indeed we are in a dual track in America's manned space program, the one track going to Mars way beyond low-Earth orbit where we have been for the last 40-some years. This is a low earth orbit that services the International Space Station where 6 humans are right now, about 250 miles above the Earth doing research in the program of going out and exploring the heavens. The second track of the dual track is, in fact, building American rockets, which is being done in a commercially viable way to go to and from the space station as they are right now with cargo, but making those spacecraft safe with the escape systems for humans. That is the dual track. Therefore, as a result, we end up with NASA exploring the heavens again. We are back in the human space business.

The great Senator from the State of Arkansas is here. He does not know I have just spoken about him. It is going to be my privilege to listen to his remarks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I have to begin today by saying one thing, that is, to God be the glory. I will finish with that too. But first let me say a few words.

Since election night I have had many Arkansans come up to me and thank me for my service. I appreciate that. But I need to thank them for allowing me to do this for the last 12 years. It sounds like a cliché, but it is not. Serving in the Senate has been the greatest honor of my life. It truly has been. I have loved it. I have always done it with a cheerful heart. When I go back to my beloved Arkansas, I have to thank the people of Arkansas for allowing me to work for you. But I must confess I will miss waking up every morning and thinking, how can I make a difference for Arkansas and for America today? Those years were momentous in so many ways, for our country and for our world. I had a front-row seat to making history, and I hope I made a little bit of it myself.

On a personal level, those years were filled with family and friends, a remarkable staff, my Senate colleagues, and a whole series of rich, once-in-a-lifetime experiences.

The Lord has given me two wonderful children who are now in college. I know many of you all saw them for the first time when they were in elementary school. I am very proud, and their mother is very proud, of Adams and Porter Pryor. I am very excited about their future.

God has also brought an old sweetheart back into my life, Joi. She and I attended the sixth and seventh grades together. So when I say God has brought joy in my life, I mean it, literally.

Many of you know my parents. Of course, I would be nothing without them. Dave and Barbara Pryor have touched so many lives. They continue to do so.

For the last 8 years, I have lived with my brother David and Judith and Hampton Pryor in Washington, when I am here in Washington. I will always be grateful for their love and hospitality.

Scott and Diane and Devin Pryor in New York have been a great inspiration to me as well.

My staff is simply awesome. I love them all and they are all part of my family too. There are too many to mention, but words such as talent, commitment, public service, effectiveness, all come to mind whenever their names come up. I have said this many times about my staff, and they keep telling me not to say it, but I am going to say it one last time: They do 99 percent of the work and I get 99 percent of the credit. So I want to acknowledge them for a job well done. They should all hold their heads high for the difference they have made. I ask unanimous consent that a list of their names be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lisa Ackerman, Adrianna Alley, Ronnie Anderson, Suzanne Bartolomei, Tim Bass,

Frank Bateman, Jason Bockenstedt, Patrice Bolling, Cathy Bozynski, Zac Bradley, Becca Bradley, Ruth Bradley, Rachel Brown, Sonya Bryant, LaRonda Bryles, Tamara Buchholz, Britton Burnett, Margery Buzbee, Macio Cameron, Lauren Carter, Rachel Colson, Kim Cooper, Paul Cox, Laura Culver, Emily Culver, Olivia Dedner, Shiloh Dillon, Martine Downs, Wes Duncan, Michael Fanguie, William Feland, Greg Feldman, Jeff Fitch, Sherry Flippo, Bradford Foley, Derrick Freeman, Conor Frickel, Bess Ginty, Terri Glaze, Andrew Grobmyer.

Russell Hall, Beth Hallmark, Julie Hamilton, Megan Hargraves, Ruth Hargraves, Jacob Hargraves, Justin Harper, Ehren Hartz, Tonya Hass, Mary Grace Hathaway, Whitney Haynes, Brigit Helgen, Larry Henderson, Lauren Henry-Cowles, Hannah Herdinger, Carrie Hern, Tate Heuer, Gene Higginbotham, Brandon Hirsch, Emily Hoard, Sarah Holland, Greg Holyfield, Vincent Insalaco, Susie James, Mark Johnston, Louis Keller, Hank Kilgore, Caroline Kobek Pezzarossi, Shannon Lane, Stephen Lehrman, Autumn Lewis, Sam Losow, Shannon Lovejoy, Stan Luker, Scott Macconomy, Amanda Manatt-Story, Elizabeth Manney, Randy Massanelli, Eric May, Madra McAdoo, Nathan McCarroll, Lauren McClain.

Marietta McClure, Audrey McFarland, Valerie McNeese, Rodell Mollineau, Melissa Moody, Reed Moody, Brook Mumford, Callie Neel, Eric Nelson, Wayne Palmer, Allison Pearson, Mia Petrini, Brad Phelan, Jim Pitcock, Marisa Pryor, Walter Pryor, Hayne Rainey, Candace Randle, Kris Raper, Robbie Reed, Mary Renick, Erin Ridgeway, Jenny Robertson, Kirk Robertson, Bob Russell, Paul Sanders, Amy Schlesing, Kymara Seals, Kristin Sharp, Ashley Shelton, Ashely Simmons, Jason Smedley, Haley Smoot, Kate Melcher, Lucy Speed, Brandon Spicher, Jeffrey Stein, Arthur Stokenbury, Michelle Strikowsky, Kelvin Stroud, Kelsey Stroud, Richard Swan, Frances Tate, Michael Teague, Jennifer Thompson, Courtney Van Buren, Joan Vehik, Crystal Waitokus, Brad Watt, David West, Preston Weyland, Libby Whitbeck, Deke Whitbeck, Marco White, Amanda White, Quinten Whiteside, Elizabeth Wilson, Andy York, Mary Claire York, Julie Zelnick.

Mr. PRYOR. My colleagues. What can I say about my colleagues that has not been said before? Or maybe I could say, what can I say about my colleagues that they have not said about themselves before?

You know, politics is about people; not just the people out there, but the people in here, the people the people elect. I have served with some greats and some giants. Robert C. Byrd, Ted Kennedy, Daniel Inouye, Ted Stevens are at the top of the list. But the truth is that every single Senator I have served with is a giant.

I have served with about 175 other Senators, so there are too many to single out. But I have made lifelong friendships here. We have done a lot of good things together. This is what I will remember: all the personalities, all the times when we came together to do the right thing, and all the successes we had together.

While in the Senate, I had more than 70 initiatives signed into law. Almost all of those have been bipartisan. I ask unanimous consent to have that list printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Opened a New Opportunity for the Forestry Industry. Allowed domestic forestry products to be recognized by USDA as biobased, leveling the playing field with imports and ensuring such products can be procured by the federal government and sold as a greener alternative to consumers, P.L. 113-179

Funded Critical Agriculture Needs as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. Crafted and passed \$20 billion annual spending measure that allocates funds for agriculture programs, P.L. 113-76

Ensured Veterans Could Collect Retirement Benefits without Gimmicks. Restored the full retirement pay promised to disabled veterans and their survivors, P.L. 113-76

Honored Former Senator Dale Bumpers for his Conservation Efforts. Renamed the White River National Wildlife Refuge to the Senator Dale Bumpers White River National Wildlife Refuge, P.L. 113-76

Ensured Patients Have Access to Life-saving Medical Treatment. Allowed the FDA to access industry-paid user fees that had been blocked by sequestration, P.L. 113-76

Ensured Disabled Veterans are Treated with Dignity During Airport Security. Ensured the dignity of wounded and severely disabled service members and veterans during airport security screenings, P.L. 113-76

Protected Food Safety Inspections from Sequestration. Ensured USDA food inspectors were not furloughed, protecting 500,000 industry jobs at meat, poultry, and egg production facilities, P.L. 113-6

Sought Greater Employment Opportunities for Veterans. Allowed states to accept military training as fulfilling credentials or certifications for special skills required for certain civilian jobs, P.L. 112-239

Protected Consumers from International Scams. Extended the FTC's ability to coordinate investigation efforts with foreign counterparts and obtain monetary consumer redress in cases involving Internet fraud and deception, P.L. 112-203

Expanded the Safety Mission at the National Center for Toxicological Research. Allows the FDA to focus on the health and safety implications of nanomaterials, P.L. 112-144, P.L. 112-55

Kept Fatigued Truck Drivers Off the Road with Electronic Logging Devices. Required truckers to use electronic logging devices to more accurately monitor hours on the job, P.L. 112-141

Prevented Dangerous Drivers from Driving Big Rigs with National Drug Database. Established a national database of drug testing information for commercial drivers to ensure they can't bypass the law, P.L. 112-141

Stepped Up Vehicle Safety Following Numerous Recalls. Updated safety and compliance standards, and increased resources at DOT to conduct additional research and address emerging technologies, P.L. 112-141

Reduced Distracted Driving. Established a grant program for states to enact and enforce laws discouraging distracted driving, P.L. 112-141

Provided Flexibility in Pension Plan Payments. Allows certain companies to invest in growth opportunities instead of setting aside millions to cover certain pension payments, P.L. 112-141

Protected Homeowners from Buying Unnecessary Flood Insurance. Defeated a mandate that would force families and businesses

behind certified levees, dams and other protection to purchase unnecessary flood insurance, P.L. 112-141

Stabilized Arkansas Funding for Rural Schools Program. Authorized USDA to allocate federal dollars for road projects in the state despite a missed deadline, P.L. 112-141

Expanded Possibilities at the U.S. Marshals Museum. Enabled the sale of coins to raise \$5 million to enhance exhibits at the U.S. Marshals Museum, P.L. 112-104

Ensured Military Families Receive Death Benefits. Provided death benefits to a family should a Reservist die at home during training, P.L. 112-81

Facilitated Camp Robinson Land Exchanges to Improve Training and Safety. Twice waived a statute to allow the National Guard to gain land more conducive for training and for an aviation support facility, P.L. 112-81, P.L. 109-13

Enabled First Responders to Help Neighboring States During a Disaster. Secured \$2 million for a program enabling first responders to help their neighbors in times of emergency, P.L. 112-74

Fixed FEMA'S Errors in Disaster Assistance Repayment Process. Used legislative privileges to stop FEMA from recouping disaster aid from an elderly couple who did nothing wrong, and granted FEMA the clear authority to waive debt in cases of FEMA error, P.L. 112-74

Leveraged Funds for Economic Development in the Delta. Increased the Delta Regional Authority's budget by nearly \$2 million, P.L. 112-74

Expanded Environmentally-Friendly Options for Military Construction Projects. Encouraged DoD to recognize all American National Standards Institute approved building ratings and certification systems, P.L. 112-74

Provided Community Access to Health Care. Provided HHS with the authority to issue a waiver and preserve funding for Arkansas Health Education Centers, P.L. 112-74, P.L. 112-10

Promoted Exports Abroad. Required the Commerce Department to develop an outreach plan to strengthen export promotion entities such as the Arkansas World Trade Center, P.L. 112-55

Expanded Science Parks. Enables the government to make loan guarantees and grants to create or expand science parks, P.L. 112-55

Protected Taxpayer Dollars from Prisoner Fraud. Required federal and state prison systems to share information on inmates with the IRS. This step allows the IRS to cross reference tax returns with the list of inmates to determine if a legitimate return is filed, before tax refunds are paid, P.L. 112-41

Expanded Environmentally-Friendly Options for Military Construction Projects. Encouraged DoD to recognize all American National Standards Institute approved building ratings and certification systems, S. Rept. 112-29

Modified Product Safety Law to Reflect Lead Limit Capabilities. Allows flexibility for certain manufacturers and charities in complying with new lead limits, P.L. 112-28

Weeded Out Border Corruption. Required applicants for law enforcement positions within U.S. Customs and Border Protection to receive a polygraph exam before they are hired, P.L. 111-376

Spurred Innovation in Technology through Monetary Prizes. Enables federal agencies to hold competitions with monetary prizes in order to encourage innovation in research and technology, P.L. 111-358

Improved Investments to Advance U.S. Manufacturing. Required the National

Science and Technology Council to identify priorities for R&D programs and address challenges in those programs, P.L. 111-358

Incorporated Entrepreneurship into STEM Activities. Requires lessons in innovation and entrepreneurship be taught as part of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) education activities, P.L. 111-358

Improved Technology Access for Blind and Deaf. Ensures all Americans are able to fully utilize online devices, regardless of disability, P.L. 111-260

Prevented Excessive Financial Regulation of Non-Banks. Ensured banks and financial companies receive a higher threshold of review by the Federal Reserve, but that companies who were not part of the fiscal crisis, like Home Depot, do not have to undergo additional supervision, P.L. 111-203

Empowered Consumers to Make Informed Choices When Selecting Health Plans. Ensured consumers have an easy-to-use Internet tool to select the best plan on the health care exchange, P.L. 111-148

Retired Certain C-130Es. Retired outdated C-130Es and saved taxpayers millions of dollars in maintenance and storage costs, P.L. 111-84

Streamlined DoD Research Requirements. Eliminated a duplicative report to Congress on DoD development programs to allow the Pentagon to spend more time on research and less time on paperwork, P.L. 111-84

Blocked Unreasonable Regulation to End Pocketknife Sales. Prevented Customs and Border Patrol from banning certain pocket knives, bringing relief to consumers and the 20,000 employees that could have been impacted, P.L. 111-83

Preserved President Clinton's Birthplace for Future Generations. Designated the former president's home as a National Historic Site and unit of the National Park System, P.L. 111-11

Helped Parents Protect Children from Inappropriate Content on the Internet. Required the FCC to fulfill its obligation to continuously review and implement blocking technology as it is developed, P.L. 110-452

Fixed Housing Contract Problems for Military Families. Requires DoD to investigate and prevent base housing problems, P.L. 110-417

Fought for Fairness for Military Pilots. Directed the Air Force and Navy to review pilot assignments to non-flying duties, and the effect of these assignments have on these officers' eligibility for flight pay, P.L. 110-417

Ensured Farmers Access to Ammonium Nitrate Fertilizer. Required DHS to ensure that any person who produces or sells ammonium nitrate (AN) registers their facility and maintains records of sales. Buyers are checked against a terrorist screening database, which keeps AN out of the wrong hands without placing an undue burden on farmers, P.L. 110-329

Protected Consumers from Toxic Toys and Other Dangerous Products. Overhauled the Consumer Product Safety Commission and established strong product safety safeguards that cut fatalities in half and dramatically reduced toy-related recalls, P.L. 110-314

Fought for Fairness in the Tax Code for Military Families. Enabled men and women in uniform to collect combat pay and other tax benefits, such as the Child Tax Credit and the Earned Income Tax Credit, P.L. 110-245, P.L. 108-311

Provided Relief to Military Families Affected by Landlord Foreclosures. Allowed the military to move household goods for members of the Armed Forces who are forced to relocate when the housing they are renting goes into foreclosure, P.L. 110-289

Advanced Investment in Cellulosic Biofuel. Required USDA to conduct a nationwide analysis of where the greatest potential for development of cellulosic biofuel exists, P.L. 110-234

Updated Regulations for Private-Public Partnerships Following Disrupted Rice Exports. Improves quality control standards for university and private sector research, P.L. 110-234

Ensured Soldiers Receive Fair Time for Rest and Recuperation. Offered additional leave for troops serving extended tours, P.L. 110-181

Kept the Do Not Call List Free. Permanently kept the Do Not Call program free, simple and effective, P.L. 110-188

Improved Medical Care for Wounded Warriors. Increased personnel and resources available to treat wounded warriors, with an emphasis on training health care workers on identifying and treating PTSD and TBI, P.L. 110-181

Made Swimming Pools Safer for Children. Requires drain covers to meet anti-entrapment safety standards, P.L. 110-140

Improved Fuel Economy Standards. Negotiated an agreement that overcame 30 years of deadlock on fuel economy standards, P.L. 110-140

Maintained Training for First Responders. Secured funding for the Domestic Preparedness Equipment Technical Assistance Program, a nationwide training program for first responders, P.L. 110-53, P.L. 109-295

Tapped an Arkansas Center to Head Rural Transportation Security Research. Designated the Mack-Blackwell Rural Transportation Center at the University of Arkansas as a "National Center of Excellence for Transportation Security," P.L. 110-53

Expanded Online Education Opportunities for Minorities. Established a pilot program for Historically Black Colleges and Universities to develop online courses, P.L. 110-16

Improved Energy Efficiency in Military Housing. Directed DoD to consider products that meet Energy Star specifications in order to reduce the military's energy bill, P.L. 109-364

Cracked Down on Foreign Truck Drivers Entering the U.S. Illegally. Directed DOT and DHS to comply with measures that eliminate fraud in the Commercial Drivers License process and verify citizenship, P.L. 109-347

Put the FEMA Mobile Homes to Good Use. Ensured that mobile homes purchased by FEMA in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina went to serve the public good, P.L. 109-295

Removed Unnecessary Obstacles for a Local Manufacturing Company. Eliminated a 4.5 percent tariff on Crotonaldehyde for Eastman Chemical Corporation, P.L. 109-280

Kept Local Manufacturer Globally Competitive. Eliminated a 4.5% tariff on LCD display panels in order to reduce production costs for Sanyo, P.L. 109-280

Funded the Completion of the Little Rock Central High School Museum and Visitors Center. Secured more than \$5 million to complete the Center, P.L. 109-146, P.L. 109-54

Identified Gasoline Price Gouging. Requires the FTC to determine if and where gasoline price gouging occurs in the supply chain, P.L. 109-108

Prioritized Cleburne County for Water Infrastructure Assistance. Encouraged the Agriculture Secretary to prioritize Cleburne County, Arkansas for Rural Utilities Service water and waste water loans and grants, P.L. 109-97

Improved Medical Care to Soldiers. Increased funding for mobile medical shelter

prototypes, and later urged FEMA to use up to \$10 million to acquire a mobile medical system for evaluation, P.L. 109-90, P.L. 108-287

Prevented Moving Companies from Holding Goods Hostage. Requires movers to release goods if a customer pays the estimate, P.L. 109-59

Promoted the Commercialization of Biodiesel and Hythane. Requires DOE, in conjunction with universities throughout the country, to prepare reports that would evaluate how to best deploy biodiesel and hythane and create an infrastructure to support their potential, P.L. 109-58

Protected Soybean Industry. Directed the USDA to initiate a stronger response to combat Asian Soybean Rust, which resulted in a \$1.2 million for the effort, P.L. 109-13

Established Tracking System for Wounded Service Members. Ensures families receive timely information when loved ones are wounded, P.L. 108-375

Mr. PRYOR. I do not do very many press conferences, as you all know, and I have always been first in line to work with any and all of my colleagues to try to get things done. The Senate is a special place. On a personal level, we talk about the Senate family. It is a family. When people mention the Senate to me, I think of other Senators, of course, and I think of legislation, but usually the first thing that comes to mind is the people who work here: the Parliamentarians, the clerks, the door-men, the Capitol Police. I am appreciative of the other Senators' staffs and the committee staffs, and even to my House colleagues—most of them, anyway. No, even to my House colleagues.

But I have always been mindful of the people who really make this place run: the janitorial staff, the folks in the restaurants, the maintenance guys, the painters, the carpenters, the tech people. The list goes on and on. All of them contribute to make the Senate what it is. We work here together. We go through life and budget cuts and changing political winds together. There is a bond we all feel because we all have been in the Senate together.

Please give me just a few moments of your time to make this next point. As great an institution as the Senate is, the Senate is broken. The American people know it. In fact, this is an area where the American people are way ahead of Washington. The people around our Nation look at Washington and they shake their heads. We sometimes cannot see the forest for the trees because we get bogged down in personalities or perceived wrongs or whatever the case may be.

This is not a Barack Obama problem, this is not a George Bush problem. In fact, all recent Presidents have gone through periods of deep unpopularity. This is an "all of us" problem. The political environment today grinds the trust and confidence out of our system. Let me tell you, that is not good for anybody.

The Republicans have a great opportunity in 2015 and 2016. They convinced

the voters they are the party that can govern. Now it is time for them to turn off the rhetoric and turn on the governing. In the Senate, if the new Republican majority will run the Senate the way they have said it should be run, then this is a very good start. If we can replay the tape over the last 2 years, we will hear Republican Senators time and again clamor for an open amendment process and for regular order. They were caustic when the Democratic majority changed the rules—a change, by the way which I did not support. So let's change the rules back to what they were. Let's govern the way we know we ought to.

Democrats—this is an important message—Democrats should help the Republicans govern. The rules are not the problem around here. We are the problem, all 100 of us. Hyperpartisanship has gotten the best of us. When things get too partisan, good judgment and common sense go out the window. The biggest and most serious problem facing our Nation today is the dysfunction in our political system within Washington. America has incredible potential, but we cannot reach it unless Washington starts to work again for all of us. If we are to continue to be the greatest Nation on Earth, we must work together. That is, after all, the American way. That is our history. This country was created, this country was forged. The great melting pot is just that, a melting pot. *E pluribus unum* actually means something: Out of many, one. We have many differing viewpoints, many philosophies, many backgrounds, many priorities. So we have the pluribus part down pat. That is not the problem. No, the challenge comes with the unum.

From my perspective, I see the ultimate question as a question of loyalty. Who are we loyal to? I just mentioned that we have many different viewpoints, philosophies, and agendas. But if we have different loyalties, then we are a divided nation. That will only lead to bad things. When each of us takes our oath of office, we swear allegiance to the Constitution, not a party, nor a President, nor an interest group. We do not swear allegiance to those who pay for our campaigns or to a certain agenda. We need to hash out our differences in the Senate in committee and on the floor, then hash them out with the House, but at the end of the day, produce legislation. That is the essence of the legislative branch. We also must exert our authority as article I, the first branch of government.

We have checks and balances. We cannot provide the check or the balance if we are not functioning. Making this place function is part of our oath of office. One thing we should all remember: The Senate is bigger than we are. We do not have to look farther than our own desks to see that. Look

inside your desk and you see the names written in the drawer. In my desk I see Senator Gronna, elected in 1911 from North Dakota. Names such as Everett Dirksen and George Mitchell, David Pryor, Joe Lieberman and CARL LEVIN—these men molded history. These are Senators who shaped world events. These Senators were good stewards of what our Founding Fathers created for us. We should be too, each and every one of us.

The Father of our Country had a lot to say about partisanship. In his Farewell Address, he warns us of the “continual mischiefs” and “ill-founded jealousies” caused by parties. We should take heed. It is the greatest mistake of our time to allow these prophesied mischiefs and jealousies to divide us and damage the American political character.

Abraham Lincoln once famously said, “A house divided against itself cannot stand.” That is so true. His voice is echoing down through the halls of history to us. If we are divided, we cannot stand. We will not stand a chance in the future. Let Lincoln's words be a clarion call to all Members of Congress. That includes all Senators.

Look at what is happening to us. The Congress is getting more liberal and more conservative. Look at the wild swings in regulations that have occurred from President Clinton to President Bush to President Obama. No wonder we are seeing a sluggish economic recovery.

Washington is creating uncertainty and instability. The private sector cannot make investments or take risks with confidence. It should be the opposite. The Federal Government should be fostering economic growth. This country needs Washington to function. That starts in this Chamber.

One thing I like to say in meetings is this: “Don't just bring me the problem, bring me the solution.” So I have identified a big problem here this afternoon. It is fair for you to ask about the solution. Regardless of your political philosophy, bipartisanship is the answer. Let's take off the red jersey and take off the blue jersey and let us all put on the red, white, and blue jersey. Our Nation's challenges, large and small, require us to get on the same team; that is team USA.

Remember, I mentioned Abraham Lincoln saying that, “A house divided against itself cannot stand.” Well, he was actually quoting an itinerant Jewish rabbi who said that about 2,000 years ago. Jesus was right then and He is right now. A house divided against itself cannot stand. Good government is good politics. Although there are short-term gains to be had by political division, the long-term consequences are bad for the country. It is time for the giants of the Senate to emerge. Jesus has offered us some advice. Probably the best practical advice of wis-

dom He left us here in the Congress is called the Golden Rule: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. If we applied that around here, about three-quarters of our problems would vanish. Poof.

Is that impossible? Not at all. Most of us claim to have a Judeo-Christian faith, so why not apply what we know to be true? The first step in this process is another one of Jesus's admonitions—forgive one another.

I know each Senator, from time to time, feels betrayed, let down, slighted, or somehow wronged. We need to forgive one another and let the healing begin.

I am not trying to combine religion and politics, but I think most everyone in the world agrees that Jesus is one of the greatest moral teachers of all time. He has a lot to say about how we should treat one another.

There are and there will be 100 Senators. Healing the Senate and getting it to function as it did for two centuries is up to each individual Senator. That means doing the right thing but also persuading others to do the right thing. It is not about us, it is about our country, our children, and our grandchildren. It is about being good stewards.

In closing, let me say I loved my time with you. I will always remember you with fondness and I will always be cheering for you. I expect great things from you because I know you are capable of doing great things. God bless the Senate and the work we do, and God bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. NELSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for not longer than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO MARK PRYOR

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to give a tribute to Senator PRYOR, whose remarks we have just heard.

Through nearly a quarter of a century of dedicated public service, Senator MARK PRYOR has established a strong reputation as the voice of reason.

From an Arkansas legislator and attorney general to a U.S. Senator, Senator PRYOR has always put the people

first. To me, he has been an admired colleague, a great collaborator, and a treasured friend. Working with Senator PRYOR during his service in the Senate, I know that he acquired his voice of reason the old-fashioned way: He is such a good listener.

All of us are pretty good talkers, or we wouldn't be here, but Senator PRYOR has the distinction of being a good listener. Whether debating colleagues on the Senate floor or interacting with his guests on his Pryor-Side Chats back home, he has consistently demonstrated that he is one of those special individuals who can disagree without ever being disagreeable. He always sticks to his principles, yet he respects the principles of those with whom he disagrees. He is well informed but always open to new information.

It has been a particular pleasure to work with Senator PRYOR on the homeland security committee for many years and on the Committee on Appropriations. His work ethic, his attention to detail, his willingness, once again, to listen to alternative views have been great assets in addressing the challenges we face in our country.

He has been a diligent fiscal watchdog for the Nation's taxpayers. To me, Senator PRYOR's approach to public service is best defined by the crucial role he played in ending the government shutdown in the fall of 2013 and as a member of the Gang of 14 in 2005. In each case he worked closely with me and with other Members to end a crisis and to achieve a responsible, common-sense solution. In each case he listened and he led.

As a charter member of our Common Sense Coalition last year, Senator PRYOR stepped forward to restore both government operations and help to restore some modicum of citizen confidence in our Senate, in our government.

These certainly were not the only times that Senator PRYOR's bipartisan approach and concern for the well-being of Americans had been evident. In 2007, after a large number of recalls following injuries and deaths that caused parents throughout America to be concerned about the safety of their children's toys—especially those manufactured overseas—he once again stepped forward to lead. After an extensive investigation in the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, Senator PRYOR worked with those of us on the Republican side on a bill to strengthen the Consumer Product Safety Commission so that we can now better detect and counter threats to our children's health before these threats even reach the store shelves, and eventually homes, schools, and daycare centers.

From restoring trust in government to protecting our children, Senator PRYOR has proven over and over again that bipartisanship works. It is so sig-

nificant that his message to us today is that the dysfunction and hyper-partisanship that have characterized the Senate cannot stand.

That is a wonderful parting message, and it is typical of Senator PRYOR that rather than talking about all of his accomplishments, he instead is beseeching the Senate to work together in the interests of all Americans—whether we are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Greens, or not affiliated with any party at all.

The 2014 election did not produce the result Senator PRYOR had hoped for, but it did reveal another aspect of his extraordinary character. His message to the people of Arkansas and to the new Senator-elect on election night was genuine and it was gracious. To the people of Arkansas, he simply expressed his sincere gratitude for the opportunity to serve. But may these words, spoken that evening to us in the Chamber, which he echoed today, be his legacy. He said that night:

The biggest and most serious problem we are facing in this Nation today is the dysfunction of our political system in Washington. We have incredible potential, but we won't reach it unless Washington starts to work again for all of us.

MARK PRYOR has been an extraordinary individual who always did what he believed was right. He has contributed enormously to our country and served his State well.

I commend him for his service and I thank him for his commitment, his integrity, and, most of us all, for his friendship.

Thank you, MARK.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

MR. DURBIN. Mr. President, the great Cesar Chavez once said: "If you really want to make a friend, go to someone's house and eat with him . . . the people who give you their food give you their heart."

That is true. Sometimes they give you more than that. Sometimes they give you an adventure in eating that you will never forget.

That is what happened to me when, in January, I was invited by MARK PRYOR to be his guest at a legendary Arkansas political event. I am talking about the historic, well-known, annual Gillett, AR, coon supper.

Never heard of the Gillett coon supper in Arkansas? It is to Arkansas what TOM HARKIN's steak fry is to Iowa, only it is nonpartisan, it draws about 1,200, and unfortunately they don't serve steak.

Coon is raccoon served in large buckets. Folks just reach inside and pull out a chunk of coon, as they say in Gillett.

I was there that night with MARK PRYOR. I wanted to make sure I had my best manners as a visiting guest. I was certainly appreciative of the invitation

to a packed room with the Governor and every walking politician in Arkansas. Bill Clinton had been there over and over again in his terms as Governor. He never missed that supper, and we weren't about to miss it that evening.

I watched as they put these bowls of coon and other meats on the table, and I noticed something interesting. All of the visitors like myself had bowls of coon put in front of them. All the folks from Arkansas were eating out of the beef platter. It struck me that perhaps this was a delicacy they were saving just for guests. We asked for advice from MARK PRYOR about the proper selection of the cooked coon, and he said: Get one with a big bone because they have the least amount of meat on them.

So we followed his advice, nibbled at the corners, smiled, and said what a great dinner it was. We looked around and saw that only a handful of the local people from Arkansas were actually eating the delicacy of the evening, including one old fellow whom I went up to afterwards to introduce myself to who was wearing a real coonskin cap. He told me he shot the raccoon and this cap had been in his family for a long time. He passed it on to his daughter first, of course, and then to his grandson.

Mark Twain, another Mark, it turns out, loved roasted raccoon as well, but he always kept an open mind when it came to the issues of the day, including the issue of the afterlife.

Mark Twain once said: "I don't like to commit myself about heaven and hell—you see, I have friends in both places." One reason MARK PRYOR has been such a good Senator is that he has friends on both sides of the aisle. We just heard this warm tribute to MARK PRYOR from my friend SUSAN COLLINS of Maine, and I am sure others will join the chorus on both sides.

MARK PRYOR is a man of deep faith who takes seriously the admonition from the book of the prophet Isaiah: "Come now, let us reason together."

Like KAY HAGAN and MARK UDALL in our caucus, MARK PRYOR has politics and public service in his bloodstream. MARK LUNSFORD PRYOR is the fifth generation of Pryors to serve in politics in his State. The first three generations served as sheriffs.

MARK PRYOR served 4 years in the Arkansas House of Representatives and 4 years as Arkansas attorney general. In 2002, the people of Arkansas elected him to the Senate, the same seat his father David held in the Senate for 18 years. MARK PRYOR placed on his desk the same motto that his father placed on his. It read, simply: "Arkansas Comes First."

But he made his own decisions, and he left a considerable mark in the Senate. Halfway through his freshman term, a new Member himself, MARK

PRYOR was called on to join forces with the lions of the Senate—John Warner, Robert C. Byrd, and Danny Inouye—to forge a compromise over judicial nominations that averted a threat to a bigger confrontation. That compromise, MARK said, was the result of perspiration, not inspiration.

I disagree. It involved the inspiration of a young Senator from Arkansas who realized that public service often meant trying to work together and to reason together and to try to break down in your own individual fashion the dysfunction of Washington.

I worked with MARK on so many things over the years. As a whip I went to him many times, and we talked about difficult votes. I always found him to be honest, straightforward, and highly principled. We didn't always come to the same conclusion on the vote, but I respected him every time because I knew he gave thoughtful consideration to both sides. When it came to his vote, he was going to do what was right in his own heart and especially what was right for Arkansas. I knew that would make the final decision when it came to the vote.

I also want to put in a word of thanks to MARK as a grandfather of two 3-year-olds who are anxiously awaiting for the arrival of Santa Claus in just a few weeks. You see, MARK had the responsibility of reforming the Consumer Product Safety Commission. It was an assignment long overdue. That commission was grinding to a halt. It was not exercising its authority, and it wasn't keeping Americans safe, as it should. MARK stepped up, in a bipartisan fashion. He stepped up, and he ended up strengthening the Consumer Product Safety Commission through his efforts on the Senate commerce committee. That will keep toxic toys and harmful products out of stores.

Many people recognize what MARK PRYOR contributed in that effort. Parents magazine applauded MARK PRYOR as one of the three movers and shakers in Washington in the year 2005 for his work on the Consumer Product Safety Commission—work that continues to this day to keep America safer. Consumer protection has always been a hallmark of MARK's service, dating back to his days in Arkansas as attorney general and certainly as a Senator.

Fewer than 2,000 men and women have ever had the privilege of serving in the Senate. In our entire history, with hundreds of millions of people in our population, fewer than 2,000 have been sworn in to represent their States in the Senate. In MARK PRYOR we have a person who did an extraordinary job as a Senator for Arkansas and for America. He has been a great friend of mine—someone I am going to miss very, very much, but I hope he will keep in touch. We say that somewhat loosely when people leave here, but I mean it, because MARK PRYOR always

brought a smile to my day. I recognize that his work in public service aspired to the highest levels and always will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I came to the floor without any prepared remarks, but I want to say a few words, if I could, about our colleague MARK PRYOR.

I have affectionately called him "Hey, man," because in Arkansas, when you see one of your friends, you don't just say "hi, Tom" or "hi, Mark," you say "hey, man." For the last 12 years, we have been saying a lot of "hey, man's," and hopefully we will do so for a long time to come.

Ten or twelve days ago I was down in Honduras—murder capital of the world—and trying to figure out how to help save a nation that may be a failing nation. They have a lot of gangs down there—gangs involved in extorting money from businesses, a lot of them kidnapping people, trafficking people. Gangs have a bad connotation in Honduras, as they should—here in Washington, DC, and in the Senate, not so much.

Senator COLLINS and Senator DURBIN have talked about some of the "gangs" this Senator from Arkansas has been involved in, which I think most of us would say are doing the Lord's work, doing good work. MARK is a man of deep faith, as we know, and he has been a great role model for the rest of us.

MARK has reminded me before—and maybe some others as well—that in the Old Testament, in Proverbs, we are reminded we should always pray for wisdom—always pray for wisdom. That is something I pray for every night—not just for my colleagues, of course, but certainly for me. All I can say is the good Lord has answered his prayer.

One of the reasons he has ended up as a member of these gangs for good is because he has so much wisdom. He is a good listener. He is just a very, very wise human being.

It has been a joy serving with him. He got here in 2003. He raised his right hand here and took the oath of office in 2003. He came through orientation for new Senators, and I talked to him about it later, and I said: How was orientation, MARK? He said: Well, it lasted about that long. It was over. If you are a Democrat, we are going to put you over here, and if you are a Republican, we will put you over here, and it was just like, have at it. He and I talked about it, and we said: That doesn't make much sense.

As an attorney general and a member of the Attorneys General Association, and myself as a former Governor and a member of the National Governors Association, we had a robust orientation program for new attorneys general and for new Governors. The Presiding Officer is a former Governor of Maine, and

he recalls that well. I think one of the reasons why the Governors are less partisan and more likely to work across the aisle to get things done together—and the same with the attorneys general—is because of that orientation that occurs a couple weeks after the election. We didn't have anything like that in the Senate. So Senator PRYOR, along with former Governor and Senator Voinovich, former Governor Alexander and myself decided to see if we could get some kind of orientation program here for Senators. Now when people show up a couple weeks after getting elected new Senators, they no longer get put over in one corner as Democrats and one corner as Republicans and are told to go at it. They spend some time together—maybe the most concentrated time they will have together during the time they are here—with folks of the other party. Those of us who are Senators and spouses and chaplains and so forth go in and provide information and tell them to learn from our mistakes—those of us who have made plenty of them—and you won't make those same mistakes.

One of the things Senator PRYOR is especially good at doing is trying to connect each new Senator with a mentor—a Democratic Member and a Republican Member—and he was dogged in that. Not that everybody needs a mentor, but we all need friends. We need friends on both sides of the aisle, and you will keep those friendships for a long, long time.

I was a naval officer for 23 years. When I was a 17-year-old graduate from high school, I went off to Ohio State to eventually become a Navy midshipman. I did that for 4 years, 5 years as a naval flight officer in a hot war in Southeast Asia, and 18 in the Cold War until I retired in 1991. I started learning about leadership when I was pretty young—something I learned before I became a midshipman. But among the things I learned about leadership is that a leader should be humble, not haughty. A leader should say do as I do, not do as I say. Leaders should have the heart of a servant, and we should come here with the idea of serving. The Scriptures we read say: He who would be a leader must be a servant to all; he who would be first should be a slave to all.

A leader should have the courage to stay out of step when everybody else is marching to the wrong tune. A leader shouldn't ask what is the easy thing to do, the speedy thing to do; they should ask what is the right thing to do. And a leader, as has already been said, a leader should ask the question asked of a rabbi some 2,000 years ago. A rabbi was asked: What is the most important commandment of all? He mentioned

what one was, and then he said the second one is love our neighbors as ourselves. I think that is the most important one of all. Leaders are like that. Leaders are like that.

I just wish to say that I think my friend, "Hey, man," also known as Senator MARK PRYOR, personifies that kind of leader. God knows we need more of them. He has demonstrated by his own character and behavior what he believes.

I am tempted to say we are going to miss him, but we are still going to see a lot of him. In the Navy, when somebody has done a great job, we say two words: Bravo Zulu—Bravo Zulu. So I say that to my friend.

We also have this admonition. The Navy has the tradition of hailing farewell on a ship or submarine or aircraft carrier, whatever squadron you are on. When people come in, we have an event called a hail and farewell party. When it is over, for those who are leaving, we say: Farewell and a following sea.

So I would say this: Farewell and a following sea, and we will see much more of you in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Senator CARPER for those good remarks, and I think they reflect the quality and the character MARK PRYOR has displayed as a Member of this Senate.

I have been asked: Who are some of your favorite people across the aisle, Democratic people whom you respect and like? MARK PRYOR has always been at the top of that list.

We have both served as attorneys general of our States. We have a number of things to talk about. I have been able to commiserate with him over Arkansas football in recent years. We kind of keep up with those things a lot.

I just would wish to say something that I basically said at the National Prayer Breakfast several years ago. Senator PRYOR and I were cochairmen, and I was able to say, with great confidence, that MARK PRYOR is one of the best people I have ever served with in the Senate. He is a man of faith and integrity, and his ego is under control—not always so around this place, and it makes it run better. He is collegial, willing to work with people across the aisle, work within his own party, and not one who has had difficulty making decisions. He has done what he thought was right year after year here in this great Senate.

We had the opportunity to lead the Senate Prayer Breakfast and then the National Prayer Breakfast twice, and it was a special time. MARK really did a great job and spent a great deal of time meeting with people from all over the world. I think the depth of his faith is quite obvious.

To MARK I wish to say that you are special to me. Your service in the Sen-

ate has been very special. You have always done what you thought was right for your State and done so in a way that is so pleasant and collegial to work with. I know you will have some great adventures ahead. It looks even like the Razorbacks are coming back. They may give Alabama and Auburn a real hard time next year—who knows. Hope springs eternal. They did pretty well at the end of this year, I have to say. A monster may be arising in Arkansas—who knows.

We do have a great Senate, with less than 2,000 people having served in this body. We have people of talent and ability throughout, but there are people over the period of years that touch you as the genuine article, people whom you respect and admire, and, MARK, you are one of those. God bless you and Godspeed.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. PRYOR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I join my colleagues today in all the good words that are being said about my friend Senator PRYOR. I got to know Senator PRYOR best in the commerce committee, where early on he scored a major victory for the children of this country. That was at a time we learned that toys and children's products that contained lead were being brought in from all over the world. We actually had a young child in Minnesota whose mom went out and bought a pair of Reebok tennis shoes, and with the tennis shoes came a little charm. That little child swallowed that charm, and that little child died. He did not die from choking on the charm; he died over a period of days when the lead went into his system. That is just one example. Senator PRYOR was heading up the consumer subcommittee, and we took a major vote to change the standards of lead in children's products, including jewelry and toys, and it was a huge bipartisan vote, a very important bill, what was called one of the most important pieces of consumer legislation in decades. Senator PRYOR got that done.

Later, while he was head of that subcommittee, we had a little girl in Minnesota named Abigail Taylor who died in a swimming pool. All she was doing was playing in a kiddie pool, and she happened to be sitting in the middle of the pool. The pool drain malfunctioned and basically sucked her insides out. She survived for a year. When MARK PRYOR came to Minnesota, he met with

that little girl and her dad. She later died after a surgery to try to save her life.

We worked after that to get the bill passed—named after Howard Baker's grandchild, who had also died in a similar circumstance—to make sure that all these public pool drains—from apartments to YMCAs; you name it—were checked. There has been a decrease in the number of deaths. We do not hear about them on the news like we used to, and that is because of MARK PRYOR's work in the Senate subcommittee.

So I know the Taylor family—that was my proudest moment, standing back in the cloakroom and calling them. They believed after they met MARK PRYOR that it would be easy to pass this bill, that we could get this done. It wasn't quite that easy. It took a few months. We had to end up putting it in the Energy bill to get it done. But being able to call Scott Taylor, who never gave up believing Congress could get something done—that is just one more example of the work Senator PRYOR has done. So I thank him for that.

STOP EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I am also here today to address something entirely different; that is, a bill we would like to get done before the end of the year in the Senate. It is a bill I have with Senator CORNYN, and it is called the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2013. It has 19 bipartisan cosponsors. I note the year is 2013. We have been waiting nearly 2 years to get this done. A version of the bill which is very similar to ours passed the House this summer.

Senator CORNYN and I initially wrote the bill. We worked with all the sex trafficking groups. It is a very important bill, and their No. 1 priority this year is to get it done. I thank Majority Leader REID for his work on this, as well as Senator LEAHY for helping to get the bill to the floor. We have also been working with Senators HEITKAMP and KIRK, and Senator WYDEN has been an incredible partner on these issues. Senator PORTMAN has been supportive. In the House, Congressman PAULSEN called me to sponsor this bill. He took it on and, with the help of Representative CANTOR and Representative MCCARTHY and the Speaker, was able to get that bill passed through the House. So this is one of those instances where people have come together and have been moving a very important bill.

We have support from the National Conference of State Legislatures, and Cindy McCain—the wife of Senator MCCAIN—and I and have done a lot of work on this issue. We spoke to their national conference this year. They

have endorsed this bill. This bill is supported by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the Fraternal Order of Police, Shared Hope International, National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, United Methodist Women, and the list goes on.

It is time to get this done. There is a minor error in the House bill that we need to correct, and that is why we need to pass the Senate bill. We basically made the changes that are in the House bill. We also need to pass it in the Senate because this one includes the national sex trafficking strategy.

We have Senator CORNYN working on his side of the aisle. There appear to be no objections. I will explain in a bit the amendments that passed out of Judiciary 18 to 0. That is his portion that is included in this bill. I was actually having trouble getting the bill through on its own, and so we have joined forces on this bill.

Now it appears we could have some objections on our side, which I hope will get cleared up, because people are disappointed that they cannot get other bills on. I can't help people get these other bills through. I don't have that in my power right now. The 27 million people around the world who are victims of sex trafficking cannot help get that done, nor can all of the kids whom we see in Minnesota who get taken into sex trafficking—13 years old is the average age. They cannot do anything. They cannot be pawns in a game.

It is my hope that we will be able to work this out and get this bill passed in the next day or two because then I have to get it over to the House. So I am under a major time constraint.

This is an important bill which makes clear that girls and boys who are victims of sex trafficking should not be treated as criminals. The statistics, as I said, show that more than 27 million people around the world, whether it is Boko Haram—taking those little girls from their beds in the middle of the night in Nigeria, with their parents having nothing but bicycles to try to track down the people who stole them in the middle of the woods; whether it is a young girl on the oil patch in North Dakota—a major case going on there from the U.S. attorney's office; whether it is a young girl in Minnesota—this is happening in our country today.

Over 80 percent of the victims we have in the United States are from the United States. So while we see this all over the world, we know we have our own problems in our own backyard. In terms of the increase, some of it has come because of the Internet. We love the Internet, but it has also provided ways for people to advertise for sex trafficking in ways that make it more difficult to track down. As I said, the average age of a child who is a victim of sex trafficking is 13 years old—not

old enough to get a driver's license, not even old enough to go to a high school prom. We have seen problems in our own country. Eighty-three percent of sex trafficking victims in America are U.S. citizens.

Despite all those numbers, we are not here just to talk about this bill. The reason I am going to make an enormous push for it this week, to get this done, is because I don't believe young kids—mostly girls—should be pawns in a political game. We are here because of Tamara Vandermoon. She was only 12 years old—in Minnesota—when she was first sold for sex. She wasn't a teenager. She was just mad at her mom and ran away. A pimp found her and made all kinds of promises—promises that sounded pretty good to a scared kid away from home. She was taken advantage of when she was most vulnerable, before she had a chance to grow up and become an adult. That is why we are doing this bill.

This bill is actually based on a model we have in about a dozen States right now, including Minnesota, that basically says to the States: We would like to incentivize you to use this model which is to help the victims of these sex crimes, which is to help them with services, and which is to not prosecute them as criminals because the only way we are really going to be able to go after the johns, the way we are going to be able to go after the people who lead these kinds of rings is if we are willing to give these victims the help they need to turn their lives around but also to get them to testify.

It has worked very well in our State. In Ramsey County alone, we have had several prosecutions, including a 40-year sentence this last year against a guy who was running a major sex trafficking ring. If you don't think this is going on in towns such as St. Paul, MN, then you need to look in your own communities because it is going on.

One of the main goals in the bill is to make sure kids sold for sex are not treated as criminals. According to a report from Polaris, 15 States across the country already have these State safe harbor laws and another 12 States are starting to make progress in the right direction. So we are not starting from scratch. It is not some crazy idea that someone tried in one State and it wasn't working. We know this works. The Cornyn and Klobuchar bill will give incentives to States when they apply for Federal grants, and they are going to be able to apply for Federal grants after they have a safe harbor bill in place.

Our bill would also create a national strategy to combat human trafficking. Our national strategy will encourage cooperation and coordination among all the agencies that work on this problem—Federal, State, tribal, and local. It is a nationwide problem. I can tell you that these pimps and people run-

ning the rings do not care about local boundaries or county boundaries or State boundaries, and we need to be as sophisticated as they are when it comes to tackling this problem.

We also need to be giving sex trafficking victims the right support, such as job training and skills building. The bill allows victims of sex trafficking to participate in the Job Corps program to help them get back on their feet.

I am also pleased to include a provision Senators WHITEHOUSE and SESSIONS have been working on to clarify the authority of the U.S. Marshals Service to assist local law enforcement agencies in locating missing children.

As I said, I have been working closely with Senator CORNYN on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, and this is also a bill with Senator WYDEN which is included in this package.

When you look at this bill, you have to think of the safe harbor provision, the provisions I just mentioned that make it easier for people who are victims of sex trafficking, for kids to be able to participate in job training; then you look at the provision from Senators WHITEHOUSE and SESSIONS regarding the U.S. Marshals; and the last part is the work with Senator CORNYN and Senator WYDEN on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which is included in this bill. It increases the fees and fines of perpetrators and should bring in nearly \$30 million each year to pay for victim services. We know we have a lot of need in the States right now because this is a relatively new problem in terms of being on the increase. So shelters could apply for these grants from this fund. We think this is a very good provision, and I thank Senator WYDEN and Senator CORNYN for working on it.

I would also add that this is a provision that went through on an 18-to-0 vote as an amendment, so we know there was support out of the Judiciary Committee for this part of the bill.

As a former prosecutor, I know how important this victim-centered approach can be. Sex trafficking victims are often afraid to talk to law enforcement. It makes sense. They are not sure they are going to help them. Are they going to give them shelter? Are they going to help them turn their lives around and give them a place to sleep? If they don't have this kind of trust, they go back to the pimp and go back to the guy who was giving them money and giving them a place to sleep and probably giving them drugs. If we focus on identifying those victims even though they may not tell us they are being trafficked, then it will help them to come forward, get help, and also to testify against the trafficker, leading to more convictions.

We need to address the needs of the victim and make sure they have the support they need—housing, education, legal issues—to help break this cycle of

violence and abuse. We have a great new shelter that opened up in St. Paul this year, and I was proud to be there with Cindy McCain and 180 Degrees—that is what it is called—at Brittany's Place in St. Paul. It provides special services for victims of sex trafficking to help them turn their lives around.

We also need to use the tools available to go after such traffickers. If we cannot get them on the sex trafficking charges, we need to look at money laundering charges or enterprise corruption charges or other charges. While they are not directly related to trafficking, they target traffickers nonetheless. That will be important for law enforcement, and it is the reason State prosecutors are now partnering more with Federal prosecutors.

We need to go after trafficking facilitators. These are people who know what is going on, but they are closing their eyes to it or actually letting it happen. There are some incredible businesses that have gotten out front on this issue. For example, Marilyn Carlson Nelson of Radisson Hotels in Minnesota has done training. There are a number of other hotel chains across our country that are working on this issue. Airlines—Delta, American Airlines, and others—have been doing work in this area, and it is actually exciting because we have businesses willing to say: We are on the frontline. We see when something is going on in our hotel or on our plane, and we are willing to train our employees so they know when to report an incident to law enforcement and stop things from happening on the frontline. This is happening right now in our country.

We passed a similar bill in the House, and we all know we have to make some minor corrections on the Senate side. This is the bill that Senator CORNYN and I originally introduced. We have added some good provisions from Senators Whitehouse and Sessions, as well as Senator WYDEN and Senator CORNYN, and that is what this package is. It is the kind of legislation we should pass.

Again, the victims of these sex trafficking crimes are not the ones who can figure out how we negotiate in the Senate. There are States that have not yet done anything. They may open their eyes if they know they may get a grant if they change their laws a bit and find the best practices and what is working across the country. We should be focused on those victims and not what is going on here. I am supportive of a lot of these bills that people on our side of the aisle want out of the Judiciary Committee, but they are not in my control. What is in my control is this bill.

I have garnered Republican support and passed a version of it in the House, and all I am asking from my colleagues is to be able to go forward with this

bill. It would be sad indeed if we were not able to get this bill through because of Democratic objection.

I plan to ask unanimous consent on this bill. If we are not able to work something out, I will keep at it until this session closes. This bill is named the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2013. I think 2 years is enough time. Two years is enough. A young girl's life was ruined at age 18. We can get this bill done.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

PROFILING

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this week I received several requests from international advocate groups to speak out against the injustice that is taking place in other countries with regard to their judicial system. It is not unusual to get a request in the United States to speak out on those matters.

Journalists are in prison solely because they were doing investigative journalism, human rights activists are in prison just because they felt it was necessary to speak out about the injustice in their society, and there are people who have been arrested, harassed or tortured because they disagree with the government and the judicial system of that country is unable to deal with those types of issues.

They understand that one of America's core values is fairness, inclusion, and equal justice under the law; however, recent events have shown that in the United States we are not where we need to be in regard to our judicial system, and we must do more.

Shortly after the tragic death of Trayvon Martin—an unarmed youth killed by an auxiliary police personnel—I convened a group of activists in Baltimore to try and understand what is happening in our community.

I must say that what I observed and learned during that discussion was something that should be very informative to all of us. It was an African-American audience, and they explained to me that if you have a teenaged son in the African-American community, you have to talk to that son about what they need to do in regard to their potential confrontation with police.

It was chilling for me to try to understand the fear that is in our community as to how they have to deal with law enforcement. Law enforcement should be on your side. Yet it sort of ripped me apart to understand how widespread the concern is in minority communities and the widespread number of victims of racial profiling in minority communities. So many families had an example.

There was one young woman who was there, and she told me when she was a young girl she was going to the arena

to see a basketball game with her father. Her father was pulled over for no reason other than the color of his skin. He was pulled aside and unable to proceed to the basketball game. It had a huge impact on this young girl at the time and made her think: Is this America? Are these core values we believe in? Is this equal justice under the law?

One of the victims of racial profiling was a young lawyer who was returning home from a funeral he attended. He was stopped by the Maryland State Police solely because of the color of his skin—no other reason. He decided to do something about it. He brought a legal suit against the Maryland State Police Department—Wilkins v. State of Maryland. As a result of that lawsuit, a consent order was entered into where the Maryland State Police committed to stop racial profiling. There were certain practices that had to be established, certain checks that had to be done, certain data that had to be provided, and I believe it became the model example of what law enforcement needs to do to ensure it is not using racial profiling.

I mentioned that case because Robert Wilkins, the young lawyer who brought that case, has been confirmed by the Senate and now sits on the DC Court of Appeals—one of the confirmations we were able to complete in this term of Congress. He is an excellent member of the Court of Appeals for the District.

We get constant reminders of the problems we have in our criminal justice system; for example, the tragic death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO. I am a strong supporter of the independence of our judicial branch of government and the grand jury system, but I think all of us understand the frustration when there were no criminal indictments brought in the Trayvon Martin case, the Michael Brown case, and in the most recent case with Eric Garner. He was the unarmed individual who was choked to death in New York.

Unfortunately, there are many more examples where the criminal justice system does not appear to work for equal justice for all.

In Oakland, CA, the NAACP reported that out of the 45 officers involved in shootings in the city between 2004 and 2008, 37 of those shot were Black, none were White, one-third of the shootings resulted in fatalities, and although weapons were not found in 40 percent of the cases, no officers were charged. No wonder people are losing confidence that we truly do have a system where all of our citizens are treated equally under the law.

I have to point out that the Department of Justice is investigating the circumstances in the Ferguson and Michael Brown case. We will have to wait and see what happens with the Federal investigation, but the initial suspicions in many of these cases were solely because of the color of a person's skin,

and that is why the individuals were stopped. They were not stopped because they were observed in criminal activities or because they had specific information about a crime that fit the description of the individual who was stopped. That is profiling and profiling is wrong.

Profiling is when the police target an individual, start an investigation, and do something because of race, religion or national origin. That is wrong. It does not work. If you have specific information about a crime, obviously you can use identifiers to deal with the investigation, and that is appropriate. But if you don't have specific information, then it is profiling, and profiling is just plain wrong. It is un-American. It is not what we believe in. It is not in our core values. It is a waste of resources because it doesn't help solve a problem. It turns communities against law enforcement, and we need communities working with law enforcement if we are going to have the most efficient law enforcement. As we have seen too frequently in recent years in the United States, it can be deadly. Profiling must end.

The Attorney General issued some guidance on profiling today. There were some things in there that I found helpful. For the first time the Justice Department guidelines will cover new categories, such as national origin, gender, gender identity, religion, and sexual orientation, while closing certain loopholes and narrowing some exemptions.

The guide mandates new data collection which makes it easier to track profiling complaints. It is all positive. For the first time we have specific guidelines against profiling, but it only applies to the Federal agencies. We need to act because only we can make it apply not just at the Federal level but at the State and local auxiliaries. We can close all loopholes so we do not allow profiling to take place in America, as we should, and we can give a private right of action so we can have enforcement of the laws that we pass. That is what we should do.

I have introduced legislation that does exactly that—The End Racial Profiling Act, S. 1038. I am proud to have as cosponsors Senators REID, DURBIN, BLUMENTHAL, COONS, HARKIN, MENENDEZ, STABENOW, LEVIN, MIKULSKI, WARREN, BOXER, GILLIBRAND, HIRONO, WYDEN, MURPHY, and WHITEHOUSE.

I am proud to say that in the House of Representatives the lead sponsor is JOHN CONYERS, who has been an iconic figure in the fight for civil rights, H.R. 2851. There are 59 cosponsors on the House bill.

The legislation we authored would provide training and mentoring for police departments so they have what they need. It prohibits all forms of profiling. It provides for data collec-

tion. It provides grants to develop best practices. It has broad support, including the support of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, ACLU, NAACP, and the Rights Working Group.

America is a beacon of hope for people all around the world. They embrace our core values because they know what America stands for. It stands for every one of us being treated fairly under our laws. I am proud of our values, and I am proud of what we have been able to accomplish as a nation where we can enjoy religious freedom, where people can speak out however they want to about their government.

Let us take care of business first at home and recognize that we are not where we need to be. Recent events where people have lost their lives show how our system is not working and needs to be corrected. One thing we can do is pass the End Racial Profiling Act. As Senator Kennedy said, civil rights is the great unfinished business of America. We can end profiling by passing legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to work with me so we can end profiling and move one step closer to equal justice under the law for all Americans.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1352

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, as we hurry to finish things late in the year, we are running out of time to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act, referred to as NAHASDA. This legislation was first passed in 1996 to consolidate Indian housing programs at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This block grant replaced 14 different housing programs operating in Indian Country. The law has been previously authorized twice in a bipartisan manner.

The housing needs in Indian Country are staggering. A recent GAO report stated that 5.3 percent of homes on Indian lands lacked complete plumbing. That compares to homes nationwide where less than 1 percent lack plumbing.

Tribal communities also face a serious housing shortage. In some cases, there are up to 20 people living in a single three-bedroom home. That is not by choice, by the way. That is by necessity. These are often extended families with three or four generations under

one roof. This is unacceptable. We must do more to honor the trust responsibility the government has to American Indians.

The best tool we have to address this housing shortage is the Indian Housing Block Grant Program authorized by NAHASDA. Not passing this reauthorization places this program in jeopardy, and we should reauthorize it today.

Last year, during Senator CANTWELL's tenure as chair of the Committee on Indian Affairs, she introduced a reauthorization bill. This bill makes a number of positive changes to the law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 334, S. 1352; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I prepared an amendment which is at the desk. The amendment I would like to offer would strike just one provision of this bill which is the reauthorization of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act from this large reauthorization bill. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, in my view, is unconstitutional. It conditions benefits to certain residents of the State of Hawaii on their ancestry; that is, on what race they belong to, like the U.S. Supreme Court, which invalidated similar laws, making membership of a racial group an explicit qualification for certain benefits. I believe this act violates the constitutional guarantee of equal protection. I, therefore, cannot support the reauthorization without an amendment striking that same language. Accordingly, I respectfully request that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana, modify his request to adopt my amendment which is at the desk and which would strike section 503.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. TESTER. I object to the modification because of this: Setting aside the fact that Senator Inouye was a very good friend of mine, the Native Hawaiian Homelands Act was passed into law some time ago. As Native people, Native Hawaiians have sacrificed their lands similar to Native people here and in Alaska. The Native Hawaiians here have similar needs to those whom I just explained.

The cost of housing in Hawaii is a significant barrier for Native Hawaiians. Reauthorizing the Native Hawaiian provisions will provide stability

and assurances to keep housing programs for Native Hawaiians moving forward. For these reasons, I object to that modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an objection to the modification.

Is there a further objection to the original request?

Mr. LEE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. TESTER. I am disappointed that we cannot pass this legislation. This bill would not only reauthorize Indian housing programs with HUD but would streamline cumbersome environmental requirements and allow for more flexibility to build more modern, sustainable housing. This legislation would also reauthorize housing programs, as I said, for the Native Hawaiians, where the need exists in a big way.

I should also mention that the exact same provision was included in a bill that passed the Republican-controlled House of Representatives last week on a voice vote.

Finally, this legislation will make the HUD-VASH Program available to tribally designated housing authorities through the Indian housing block grant. These funds will be specifically used for housing assistance for homeless, Native veterans, as well as those who are at risk of becoming homeless.

As many of my colleagues know, American Indians serve at higher rates per capita than any other population in the military and continue to be one of the most underserved groups of veterans.

With all these good things in it, I am extremely disappointed that we cannot get this bill across the finish line. Housing Native people should be a priority for Congress as we wrap up this session.

It is frustrating to see a bill get through the House only to have potentially a couple of Senators here hoping to get a better report card from a group such as the Heritage Foundation.

I am sorry we cannot pass the bill today. This is disappointing for any country and the Senate. I am more than willing to talk about germane changes, but the bottom line is this: Many folks here do not understand the trust responsibilities we have to our Native American people. If we are going to start carving folks out such as the Native Hawaiians, we are going to be making two classes of Native American people in this country. I don't think that is fair to them, nor do I think it is fair to this country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

FOIA IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous consent request, but I should explain why.

It is on the Freedom of Information Act, one of our Nation's most important laws. For nearly 50 years, FOIA has given Americans a way to access government information, ensuring their right to know what their government is doing. Today, the Senate is now poised to build on that important legacy with passage of the bipartisan Leahy-Cornyn FOIA Improvement Act.

The FOIA Improvement Act will codify what the President laid out in his historic executive order in 2009. This legislation will require Federal agencies to adopt a "Presumption of Openness", and make it a priority of the people's interest in what their government is doing. Our bill will reduce the overuse of exemptions to withhold information where there is no foreseeable harm. It will make information available for public inspection, and make frequently requested documents available online. It will provide the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS), with additional independence and authority to carry out its work. I believe this legislation reaffirms the fundamental premise of FOIA, that government information belongs to all Americans.

Passage of FOIA will help open the government to more than 300 million Americans whom the government is supposed to serve. The bill is supported by 70 public interest groups that advocate for government transparency. The Sunshine in Government Initiative said the Leahy-Cornyn bill "strengthens government transparency by limiting the ability of agencies to hide decades old documents from the public."

We reported this legislation out of the Judiciary Committee to the full Senate with unanimous support. Ranking Member GRASSLEY said the FOIA Improvement Act "opens wide the curtains and provides more sunlight on the Federal Government." Senator CORNYN has been my partner for many years on government transparency and noted our bipartisan efforts "open up the government and make it more consumer and customer friendly." I thank them both for their work on this legislation.

Today I ask that the Senate pass S. 2520, the bipartisan FOIA Improvement Act of 2014. We often talk about the need for government transparency, and many also note how rare it is that Democrats and Republicans can come together on any legislation. Today, we can accomplish both of those things but time is running out. We drafted this bill in a bipartisan fashion after a long and thoughtful process of consultation. It has broad support from a range of stakeholders.

I urge all Senators to support passage of this legislation today, so it can be taken up by the House, and sent to the President to be signed into law before the end of this Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the

consideration of Calendar No. 605, S. 2520.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2520) to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 2520

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "FOIA Improvement Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO FOIA.

Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "for public inspection and copying" and inserting "for public inspection in an electronic format";

(ii) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

"(D) copies of all records, regardless of form or format—

"(i) that have been released to any person under paragraph (3); and

"(ii)(I) that because of the nature of their subject matter, the agency determines have become or are likely to become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records; or

"(II) that have been requested not less than 3 times; and"; and

(iii) in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (E), by striking "public inspection and copying current" and inserting "public inspection in an electronic format current";

(B) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking clause (viii) and inserting the following:

"(viii)(I) Except as provided in subclause (II), an agency shall not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees) under this subparagraph if the agency has failed to comply with any time limit under paragraph (6).

"(II)(aa) If an agency has determined that unusual circumstances apply (as the term is defined in paragraph (6)(B)) and the agency provided a timely written notice to the requester in accordance with paragraph (6)(B), a failure described in subclause (I) is excused for an additional 10 days. If the agency fails to comply with the extended time limit, the agency may not assess any search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees).

"(bb) If an agency has determined that unusual circumstances apply and more than 50,000 pages are necessary to respond to the request, an agency may charge search fees (or in the case of a requester described under clause (ii)(II) of this subparagraph, duplication fees) if the agency has provided a timely written notice to the requester in accordance with paragraph (6)(B) and the agency has discussed with the requester via written mail, electronic mail, or telephone (or made not less than 3 good-faith attempts to do so) how the requester could effectively limit the scope of the request in accordance with paragraph (6)(B)(ii).

"(cc) If a court has determined that exceptional circumstances exist (as that term is defined in paragraph (6)(C)), a failure described in

subclause (I) shall be excused for the length of time provided by the court order.”;

(C) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “making such request” and all that follows through “determination; and” and inserting the following: “making such request of—”

“(I) such determination and the reasons therefor;

“(II) the right of such person to seek assistance from the FOIA Public Liaison of the agency; and

“(III) in the case of an adverse determination—

“(aa) the right of such person to appeal to the head of the agency, within a period determined by the head of the agency that is not less than 90 days after the date of such adverse determination; and

“(bb) the right of such person to seek dispute resolution services from the FOIA Public Liaison of the agency or the Office of Government Information Services; and”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “the agency.” and inserting “the agency, and notify the requester of the right of the requester to seek dispute resolution services from the Office of Government Information Services.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(8)(A) An agency—

“(i) shall—

“(I) withhold information under this section only if—

“(aa) the agency reasonably foresees that disclosure would harm an interest protected by an exemption described in subsection (b) or other provision of law; or

“(bb) disclosure is prohibited by law; and

“(II)(aa) consider whether partial disclosure of information is possible whenever the agency determines that a full disclosure of a requested record is not possible; and

“(bb) take reasonable steps necessary to segregate and release nonexempt information; and

“(ii) may not—

“(I) withhold information requested under this section merely because the agency can demonstrate, as a technical matter, that the records fall within the scope of an exemption described in subsection (b); or

“(II) withhold information requested under this section merely because disclosure of the information may be embarrassing to the agency or because of speculative or abstract concerns.

“(B) Nothing in this paragraph requires disclosure of information that is otherwise prohibited from disclosure by law, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under subsection (b)(3).”;

(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

“(5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters that would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency, if the requested record or information was created less than 25 years before the date on which the request was made;”;

(3) in subsection (e)

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “and to the Director of the Office of Government Information Services” after “United States”;

(ii) in subparagraph (N), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (O), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(P) the number of times the agency denied a request for records under subsection (c); and

“(Q) the number of records that were made available for public inspection in an electronic format under subsection (a)(2).”;

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) Each agency shall make each such report available for public inspection in an electronic format. In addition, each agency shall make the raw statistical data used in each report available in a timely manner for public inspection in an electronic format, which shall be made available—

“(A) without charge, license, or registration requirement;

“(B) in an aggregated, searchable format; and

“(C) in a format that may be downloaded in bulk.”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “Government Reform and Oversight” and inserting “Oversight and Government Reform”;

(ii) by inserting “Homeland Security and” before “Governmental Affairs”; and

(iii) by striking “April” and inserting “March”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6)(A) The Attorney General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Judiciary of the Senate, and the President a report on or before March 1 of each calendar year, which shall include for the prior calendar year—

“(i) a listing of the number of cases arising under this section;

“(ii) a listing of—

“(I) each subsection, and any exemption, if applicable, involved in each case arising under this section;

“(II) the disposition of each case arising under this section; and

“(III) the cost, fees, and penalties assessed under subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of subsection (a)(4); and

“(iii) a description of the efforts undertaken by the Department of Justice to encourage agency compliance with this section.

“(B) The Attorney General of the United States shall make—

“(i) each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format; and

“(ii) the raw statistical data used in each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format, which shall be made available—

“(I) without charge, license, or registration requirement;

“(II) in an aggregated, searchable format; and

“(III) in a format that may be downloaded in bulk.”;

(4) in subsection (g), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “publicly available upon request” and inserting “available for public inspection in an electronic format”;

(5) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: “The head of the Office shall be the Director of the Office of Government Information Services.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) identify procedures and methods for improving compliance under this section.”;

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) The Office of Government Information Services shall offer mediation services to resolve disputes between persons making requests under this section and administrative agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation and may issue advisory opinions at the discretion of the Office or upon request of any party to a dispute.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4)(A) Not less frequently than annually, the Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall submit to the Committee on

Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the President—

“(i) a report on the findings of the information reviewed and identified under paragraph (2);

“(ii) a summary of the activities of the Office of Government Information Services under paragraph (3), including—

“(I) any advisory opinions issued; and

“(II) the number of times each agency engaged in dispute resolution with the assistance of the Office of Government Information Services or the FOIA Public Liaison; and

“(iii) legislative and regulatory recommendations, if any, to improve the administration of this section.

“(B) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall make each report submitted under subparagraph (A) available for public inspection in an electronic format.

“(C) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall not be required to obtain the prior approval, comment, or review of any officer or agency of the United States, including the Department of Justice, the Archivist of the United States, or the Office of Management and Budget before submitting to Congress, or any committee or subcommittee thereof, any reports, recommendations, testimony, or comments, if such submissions include a statement indicating that the views expressed therein are those of the Director and do not necessarily represent the views of the President.

“(5) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services may directly submit additional information to Congress and the President as the Director determines to be appropriate.

“(6) Not less frequently than annually, the Office of Government Information Services shall conduct a meeting that is open to the public on the review and reports by the Office and shall allow interested persons to appear and present oral or written statements at the meeting.”;

(6) by striking subsections (i), (j), and (k), and inserting the following:

“(i) The Government Accountability Office shall—

“(1) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the FOIA Improvement Act of 2014 and every 2 years thereafter, conduct audits of 3 or more administrative agencies on compliance with and implementation of the requirements of this section and issue reports detailing the results of such audits;

“(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the FOIA Improvement Act of 2014 and every 2 years thereafter, issue a report cataloging the number of exemptions described in paragraphs (3) and (5) of subsection (b) and the use of such exemptions by each agency;

“(3) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the FOIA Improvement Act of 2014, conduct a study on the methods Federal agencies use to reduce the backlog of requests under this section and issue a report on the effectiveness of those methods; and

“(4) submit copies of all reports and audits described in this subsection to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(j)(1) Each agency shall designate a Chief FOIA Officer who shall be a senior official of such agency (at the Assistant Secretary or equivalent level).

“(2) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency shall, subject to the authority of the head of the agency—

“(A) have agency-wide responsibility for efficient and appropriate compliance with this section;

“(B) monitor implementation of this section throughout the agency and keep the head of the

agency, the chief legal officer of the agency, and the Attorney General appropriately informed of the agency's performance in implementing this section;

"(C) recommend to the head of the agency such adjustments to agency practices, policies, personnel, and funding as may be necessary to improve its implementation of this section;

"(D) review and report to the Attorney General, through the head of the agency, at such times and in such formats as the Attorney General may direct, on the agency's performance in implementing this section;

"(E) facilitate public understanding of the purposes of the statutory exemptions of this section by including concise descriptions of the exemptions in both the agency's handbook issued under subsection (g), and the agency's annual report on this section, and by providing an overview, where appropriate, of certain general categories of agency records to which those exemptions apply;

"(F) offer training to agency staff regarding their responsibilities under this section;

"(G) serve as the primary agency liaison with the Office of Government Information Services and the Office of Information Policy; and

"(H) designate 1 or more FOIA Public Liaisons.

"(3) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency shall review, not less frequently than annually, all aspects of the administration of this section by the agency to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section, including—

"(A) agency regulations;

"(B) disclosure of records required under paragraphs (2) and (8) of subsection (a);

"(C) assessment of fees and determination of eligibility for fee waivers;

"(D) the timely processing of requests for information under this section;

"(E) the use of exemptions under subsection (b); and

"(F) dispute resolution services with the assistance of the Office of Government Information Services or the FOIA Public Liaison.

"(k)(1) There is established in the executive branch the Chief FOIA Officers Council (referred to in this subsection as the 'Council').

"(2) The Council shall be comprised of the following members:

"(A) The Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget.

"(B) The Director of the Office of Information Policy at the Department of Justice.

"(C) The Director of the Office of Government Information Services.

"(D) The Chief FOIA Officer of each agency.

"(E) Any other officer or employee of the United States as designated by the Co-Chairs.

"(3) The Director of the Office of Information Policy at the Department of Justice and the Director of the Office of Government Information Services shall be the Co-Chairs of the Council.

"(4) The Administrator of General Services shall provide administrative and other support for the Council.

"(5)(A) The duties of the Council shall include the following:

"(i) Develop recommendations for increasing compliance and efficiency under this section.

"(ii) Disseminate information about agency experiences, ideas, best practices, and innovative approaches related to this section.

"(iii) Identify, develop, and coordinate initiatives to increase transparency and compliance with this section.

"(iv) Promote the development and use of common performance measures for agency compliance with this section.

"(B) In performing the duties described in subparagraph (A), the Council shall consult on a regular basis with members of the public who make requests under this section.

"(6)(A) The Council shall meet regularly and such meetings shall be open to the public unless the Council determines to close the meeting for reasons of national security or to discuss information exempt under subsection (b).

"(B) Not less frequently than annually, the Council shall hold a meeting that shall be open to the public and permit interested persons to appear and present oral and written statements to the Council.

"(C) Not later than 10 business days before a meeting of the Council, notice of such meeting shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(D) Except as provided in subsection (b), the records, reports, transcripts, minutes, appendices, working papers, drafts, studies, agenda, or other documents that were made available to or prepared for or by the Council shall be made publicly available.

"(E) Detailed minutes of each meeting of the Council shall be kept and shall contain a record of the persons present, a complete and accurate description of matters discussed and conclusions reached, and copies of all reports received, issued, or approved by the Council. The minutes shall be redacted as necessary and made publicly available."; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

"(m)(1) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall ensure the operation of a consolidated online request portal that allows a member of the public to submit a request for records under subsection (a) to any agency from a single website. The portal may include any additional tools the Director of the Office of Management and Budget finds will improve the implementation of this section.

"(2) This subsection shall not be construed to alter the power of any other agency to create or maintain an independent online portal for the submission of a request for records under this section. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall establish standards for interoperability between the portal required under paragraph (1) and other request processing software used by agencies subject to this section."

SEC. 3. REVIEW AND ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency (as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States Code) shall review the regulations of such agency and shall issue regulations on procedures for the disclosure of records under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, in accordance with the amendments made by section 2.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations of each agency shall include procedures for engaging in dispute resolution through the FOIA Public Liaison and the Office of Government Information Services.

SEC. 4. PROACTIVE DISCLOSURE THROUGH RECORDS MANAGEMENT.

Section 3102 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) procedures for identifying records of general interest or use to the public that are appropriate for public disclosure, and for posting such records in a publicly accessible electronic format;"

SEC. 5. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act or the amendments made by this Act. The requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the com-

mittee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2520), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see other Senators seeking the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

McFERRAN NOMINATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I speak in support of the nomination of Lauren McFerran to fill an approaching vacancy on the National Labor Relations Board. I was heartened by the recent cloture vote in support of the McFerran nomination and urge my colleagues in just a short while to vote in favor of her confirmation.

Ms. McFerran is well known to most of us as a senior staffer on the HELP Committee, where she has long served as chief labor counsel and more recently as deputy staff director. She has been nominated to fill a vacancy that will result from the departure later this month of a current Board Member, Nancy Schiffer. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank Ms. Schiffer for her dedicated service to the National Labor Relations Board. She has been a highly respected Board Member and I wish her every success in her future endeavors.

I also want to say a word about the previous nominee to the Board, Sharon Block, whose nomination was withdrawn at the insistence of Senate Republicans. Although I have no doubt that Ms. McFerran will serve with fairness and distinction, it is unfortunate that Sharon Block, a dedicated public servant, will not have the opportunity to serve further on the National Labor Relations Board. Ms. Block was an extraordinarily qualified nominee who was widely respected by both Democrats and Republicans alike. Ms. Block's nomination was withdrawn as a result of circumstances wholly beyond her control. But her qualifications and experience are undiminished and untarnished by the circumstances that led to the withdrawal of her nomination.

The National Labor Relations Board is an agency that is absolutely critical to our country, to our economy, and to our middle class. Over 75 years ago, Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act, guaranteeing American workers the right to form and join a

union and to bargain for a better life. That act sets forth a national policy to encourage collective bargaining—to encourage collective bargaining. That is the national policy of this government, and has been since 1935.

Let me read what the act specifically states:

It is declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate the causes of certain substantial obstructions to the free flow of commerce and to mitigate and eliminate these obstructions when they have occurred by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and by protecting the exercise by workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing, for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment or other mutual aid or protection.

That is the policy of the U.S. Government, to encourage collective bargaining, not to destroy it, not to tear it down, not to throw up roadblocks against collective bargaining, but to encourage it. Those who continually attack the National Labor Relations Board, who try to interfere in its procedures, many times are those who want to throw a monkey wrench into collective bargaining. Well, they are going against the policy of the United States.

I am proud to be a citizen of a country that promotes collective bargaining, to allow workers to negotiate for better wages, better conditions, safe working conditions, a country that protects fundamental rights such as the freedom of association.

The act provides these essential protections for union and nonunion workers alike. It gives workers a voice in the workplace, allowing them to join together and speak up for the very essence of middle-class jobs: fair wages, good benefits, safe working conditions. These rights ensure that the people who do the real work in this country have a shot at joining the middle class and receiving a fair share of the benefits when our economy grows.

The NLRB, the National Labor Relations Board, is the guardian of these fundamental rights. Workers themselves cannot enforce the National Labor Relations Act, but they can turn to the Board if they have been denied the basic protections provided under the law. In short, the Board plays a vital role in vindicating workers' rights.

Get this. Understand this. In the past 10 years, the National Labor Relations Board, the NLRB, has secured opportunities for reinstatement of 22,544 employees who were unjustly fired. Over that same past 10 years, the NLRB has recovered more than \$1 billion on behalf of workers whose rights and wages were violated.

The Board also provides relief and remedies to our Nation's employers. A lot of people think the NLRB is just there for the workers. Not so. It is

there to help employers too. For example, employers can turn to the Board for relief if a union commences a wild-cat strike or refuses to bargain in good faith during negotiations. The NLRB has a long history of helping businesses resolve disputes efficiently.

By preventing or resolving labor disputes that could disrupt our economy, the work the Board does is vital to every worker and every business across the Nation. That is why it is so important that we maintain a fully functional five-member NLRB. I am proud of the fact that just over a year ago, we were able to confirm Members to completely fill the first Board in over a decade. Now we need to fill a soon-to-be-open seat so the Board can continue to function effectively. That is what this vote coming up is all about.

It is unfortunate that some of my friends on the other side of the aisle do not believe in the National Labor Relations Act—not all of them, but a very vocal minority, I would say. They do not agree that it should be the policy of the United States to promote collective bargaining and self-organization in order to prevent disruptions in “the free flow of commerce” that can have a detrimental impact on our Nation's economy.

They would like to change the existing law if they could, but they do not have the votes. So, instead, they have attempted to pull every possible lever to slow down the work that goes on at the NLRB. Recently, Republicans in the House of Representatives have held hearing after hearing specifically addressing the NLRB. They passed two bills to amend the NLRA, the National Labor Relations Act, to strip workers of their rights. Republican elected officials have tried to defund the agency, threatening the professional credentials and livelihoods of nonpartisan career employees, and even called on a Republican Board Member to resign in order to incapacitate the agency. You heard me right. Republicans called on a Republican Board Member of the National Labor Relations Board to leave it, and then they would not have enough Members to function.

What most concerns me about this political game-playing is how it affects the everyday lives of workers across America. For workers who are disciplined, penalized, even fired unjustly by employers, it is the NLRB that ensures that workers who are illegally punished, as I mentioned, can get back their jobs and lost wages.

This is exactly why we need to confirm Ms. McFerran today. No one can contest her qualifications. As I said, she currently serves as both chief labor counsel and deputy staff director of the Senate HELP Committee. I am proud to have her as a member of my staff. She has served this committee with excellence and great professionalism, first hired by my predecessor Senator

Kennedy. She stayed on after his passing and my assumption of the chairmanship of the committee.

She has a deep knowledge of labor law. She is an incredibly talented lawyer. She is a person of sterling integrity and strong character. She will be a great asset to the Board. It is my hope that by promptly confirming Ms. McFerran's nomination to fill the upcoming vacancy, we can continue the progress that has been made recently and begin a new era where orderly transitions on the NLRB are the norm, where we do not go month after month, year after year, with vacancies, with a board that cannot function.

Instead of letting every vacancy become a political football, with threats to shutter the Board, and pressure for recess appointments, we should set a new precedent of confirming nominees, Democratic and Republican alike, in a timely manner, allowing the dedicated public servants at the Board to stop worrying about making headlines and instead focus on the important work they do every day.

Again, that important work includes assuring that American workers are able to exercise their right to freedom of association. In the workplace, this freedom means collectively bargaining for better wages, benefits, and working conditions. It is enshrined in the National Labor Relations Act and upheld by the NLRB.

I have no doubt that Ms. McFerran will do an excellent job in this important position. I urge my colleagues to support her confirmation later this afternoon.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The result was announced—yeas 52,
nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 317 Ex.]

NOMINATION OF JEFFERY MARTIN
BARAN TO BE A MEMBER OF
THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF LAUREN
MCGARITY MCFERRAN TO BE A
MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL
LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

NOMINATION OF ELLEN DUDLEY
WILLIAMS TO BE DIRECTOR OF
THE ADVANCED RESEARCH
PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY,
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board; and Ellen Dudley Williams, of Maryland, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Department of Energy.

VOTE ON BARAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Baran nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. VITTER. I yield back and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the yeas and nays are requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

[Rollcall Vote No. 316 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Harkin	Pryor
Begich	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Heller	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Casey	Levin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Markey	Walsh
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hagan	Nelson	

NAYS—40

Alexander	Graham	Murkowski
Ayotte	Grassley	Paul
Barrasso	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Burr	Inhofe	Roberts
Coats	Isakson	Rubio
Cochran	Johanns	Scott
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Corker	Kirk	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—8

Blunt	Cruz	Rockefeller
Chambliss	Landrieu	Toomey
Coburn	McCaskill	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON MCFERRAN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the McFerran nomination.

Who yields time?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Lauren McGarity McFerran, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. HATCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54,
nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Harkin	Nelson
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Walsh
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murray	Wyden

NAYS—40

Alexander	Graham	Murkowski
Ayotte	Grassley	Paul
Barrasso	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hoeven	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johanns	Sessions
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McCain	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	
Flake	Moran	

NOT VOTING—6

Blunt	Coburn	Landrieu
Chambliss	Cruz	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON WILLIAMS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Williams nomination.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Ellen Dudley Williams, of Maryland, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Department of Energy?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only.

The Senator from Florida.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, yesterday at events all around Florida and across the country, America marked the 73rd anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor—a day known not only for its tragedy but also for its role in shaping the destiny of what has come to be

called the “greatest generation.” It is a generation that faced challenges unlike any seen before or since. It saw a decade of widespread prosperity crumble into the deepest depression in American history, and it saw the deepest depression in American history give way to the deadliest war in human history.

The scope of hardship, destruction, and wickedness they faced was exceeded only by the strength and valor with which they responded. Theirs is a generation that truly saved the world. I don’t think any other generation at any time can have that said of them with the same bluntness.

Today that generation passes its stories on to us. They are our parents and grandparents, our ancestors and our heritage. Their stories are emblems of strength that inspire us as we meet our challenges in this new century.

Yesterday we honored the almost 2,500 Americans who were killed on that day of infamy 73 years ago—unsuspecting servicemembers, innocent men and women, but today we have a chance to honor the sacrifices made in response to that attack.

It was on this very day 73 years ago that President Roosevelt famously came before Congress to ask for a declaration of war. He expressed his confidence that the American people would rally to defend their Nation, saying: “The people of the United States have already formed their opinions and well understand the implications to the very life and safety of our Nation.”

He was right. In the days that followed, 5 million Americans dropped everything to volunteer for the Armed Forces. No one asked them to do it; they just did it. Tens of millions more entered the draft or assisted the war effort at home, and the American people became the arsenal of democracy almost overnight.

In the latter years of his life, I had the honor of meeting and working with a man who was at Pearl Harbor. He was in Pearl Harbor that day and fought on foreign battlefields in the years that followed, even losing a limb. I am speaking, of course, of the legendary leader with whom we are all familiar, Senator Daniel Inouye. He was born and raised in Hawaii and was 17 years old on December 7, 1941. When the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, he rushed to the scene to help treat the wounded. He enlisted in the Army the first chance he got and went on to receive the Medal of Honor for his valor.

When the smoke of World War II finally cleared, his legacy of service was just beginning. He would go on to serve Hawaii in both the Senate and the House. By the time of his death, Senator Inouye was the second-longest serving Senator in United States history. I was privileged to count him as my colleague, though for too brief a time.

Like Senator Inouye, I also had the privilege of representing many veterans of World War II, including some who survived the attack on Pearl Harbor. At last count, there are over 140 Pearl Harbor survivors living in Florida, and I wish to tell you the stories of three of those men.

One is SgtMajMC William Braddock of Pensacola. I recently had the privilege of hearing his account of what happened that Sunday morning in Hawaii. Major Braddock had joined the Marine Corps the year prior to the attack. That morning he was in the messhall preparing for duty when he heard the first explosion. He ran outside and was met with pandemonium.

Ships that had been stretched out peacefully in the sun moments before were now engulfed in flames, blanketing the harbor in black smoke. He watched a torpedo drop in the water and seconds later explode into the side of the USS *Oklahoma*. He described the stain of oil on the water and the way flames shot up from it, and the horror of watching sailors trapped in the fire. Amidst the confusion and shouting of orders, he recalled how little he could do to save lives and how helpless he felt.

Following the attack, Major Braddock went on to fight bravely in some of the key battles in World War II. He fought in the Battle of Iwo Jima and remembers vividly the day the iconic flag was raised above the island. He was in the occupational forces in Japan after the devastation of the atomic bombs. But despite all the horrors he witnessed, Major Braddock did not retire from the armed services the first chance he got. On the contrary, he went on to 27 years of distinguished service in the Marine Corps.

I can’t help but be humbled hearing such a story. Major Braddock is a man who fought out of duty and love of his country. He saw himself as a citizen soldier—even recalling the way his experience hunting rabbits in the fields around his house as a boy actually prepared him for Iwo Jima. He is humbled regarding his role. He says he tries not to give too much thought to it when he doesn’t have to.

That same modesty is the hallmark of another story, the story of a Pearl Harbor survivor who lives in Palm Beach County today. His name is Wayne Myrick, and he was a chief machinist’s mate on the USS *Blue* at the time of the attack.

Within seconds of the first explosion, Chief Petty Officer Myrick had rushed to gather ammunition and help operate the guns aboard that destroyer. But as a chief machinist, his attention soon turned to other matters. The captain of the USS *Blue* was eager to get the ship out on open water, but the boilers beneath deck were off line.

Under intense gunfire, Chief Petty Officer Myrick and his crew members

scrambled to get the boilers working and eventually managed to give the ship the maneuvering speed to move out. With his help, the USS *Blue* was one of the first vessels to make it to open water and was able to down five enemy aircraft and at least one submarine.

Chief Petty Officer Myrick recalled how important his oath was to him that day. He and every one of his shipmates took an oath when they enlisted that commanded them to follow their orders and defend their country from all enemies, and he viewed that oath as a solemn and sacred one because it was a reminder that service to one’s country is about more than self. He had a simple but powerful message he wanted me to share today: Be very proud to serve your country.

Finally, I wish to share the story of CDR Hal Sullivan of Jacksonville. Commander Sullivan joined the U.S. Navy when he was 23 years old. He was on the bridge of a destroyer that Sunday morning, tasked with operating the sonar equipment and helping sweep for mines. When the first explosion rocked the harbor, he looked up to see a Japanese plane bank sharply overhead. In fact, it was so close to him, he could see the expression on the face of the pilot. He even recalled wryly that he could have thrown a potato right into the cockpit if he had had one handy.

Before he could process what was happening, gunfire swept over the deck and struck the sailor next to him in the jaw. Commander Sullivan hoisted the man up and helped him to a medic. He spoke of looking up and seeing the USS *Arizona* rolling over with its belly up in flames as flames shot out its side. He saw sailors struggling in the water.

Commander Sullivan insists that his job isn’t worthy of fame and that his contribution that day was simply the execution of duty. But through that humility I can’t help but see a hero—a man as selfless as he is brave, a man who put the lives of others above his own, not just that day but for decades to come. You see, Commander Hal Sullivan went on to serve in both the Atlantic and the Pacific. He didn’t retire from the Navy until almost 30 years after the attack of Pearl Harbor, on the exact same week his son entered West Point.

Even now, at age 96, Hal says he would still be in the Navy if they would let him. I am touched by that because the truth is Hal’s country still needs him, maybe not on the deck of a ship, maybe not risking his life in the middle of the Pacific, but we need him all the same. It is through hearing stories such as his that our generation will find the courage to face its challenges—a courage that is uniquely American.

Pearl Harbor was not just a day of infamy; it was also a day that revealed

the greatness of our ancestors. People such as Major Braddock, Chief Petty Officer Myrick, and Commander Sullivan—it is their blood that flows in the veins of this county that serves as our heritage and reveals our destiny.

I believe it is true, as Shakespeare famously wrote, that some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them. But for the “greatest generation,” it was all three.

Pearl Harbor was the day that greatness was thrust upon them, but it was over the years that followed that their greatness was achieved the only way greatness can be achieved—through blood, toil, tears, and sweat.

And their toil did not stop after the war was won. The world still looked to America—to our industrial power, our political leadership, and our military might—to restore global balance and maintain order while the wounds of mankind healed.

As Pope Pius XII said following the war:

America has a genius for great and unselfish deeds. Into the hands of America God has placed the destiny of an afflicted mankind.

Well, I believe America still has that genius. I believe mankind remains afflicted and that its destiny remains largely in our hands. All around the world, those who yearn for freedom still turn their eyes towards our shores. They wonder if we see their suffering. They wonder if we hear their cries.

I am confident that our own generation will achieve greatness in this century. We will do so by remaining the world's beacon for freedom. That means preserving and extending the promise of the American dream here at home, and it means standing against evil and oppression where it rears its head around the world.

As did the “greatest generation,” our men and women in uniform today fight for a greater cause than themselves. Major Braddock said that if he could tell today's troops one thing, it would be: Don't give up, do what is right and, above all else, be proud of the work you are tasked with carrying out.

I second that sentiment because our children and grandchildren will stand on the shoulders of our generation. They will live in the world we leave behind, the same way we live in the world that was left for us.

So as we marked the 73rd anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, I was grateful for all the tributes that took place throughout Florida over the weekend. It is my prayer that America will take a moment to reflect on the meaning of that day.

Its meaning is not a relic of the past. It doesn't just belong to the “greatest generation.” It belongs to all of us. It was America's solemn call to action—not for a generation but for all time—a powerful reminder of our duty to our

Nation, to each other, to our children, and to an afflicted mankind.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, are we in morning business now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I could not be a stronger supporter of efforts to prevent human trafficking. But we must offer comprehensive solutions that provide meaningful and reliable resources to support these survivors.

Just this Congress, I have led the reauthorization of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act—widely recognized as this country's most important tool in combatting human trafficking. The law reasserted the United States as a global leader in fighting trafficking by strengthening tools available to prosecutors and providing services for victims, including those victims here at home.

The Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act also passed this Congress. That bill expanded the availability of grants to support victims of human trafficking, as well as sexual assault and domestic violence.

And now I am working to enact the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act; S. 2646. This bill authorizes the critical resources needed to provide shelter and services for the 1.6 million youth in this country who are homeless. Many of these young people are, or are at risk of becoming, victims of human trafficking.

It is time we put our money where our mouth is. We must reauthorize these existing programs that work. These children, whether in Vermont, Minnesota, or Texas, need a place to stay and be safe. And I will not leave these priorities behind for political reasons.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MICHAEL B. MCCALL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend of mine and a renowned educator in Kentucky, Dr. Michael B. McCall. Dr. McCall has served as the president of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System, or KCTCS, since 1998, and he recently announced his retirement from that position. It would be difficult to overstate his success at the helm of Kentucky's statewide community and technical college system or

the growth by leaps and bounds that KCTCS has seen under his tenure.

KCTCS was created by the Kentucky Postsecondary Education Improvement Act of 1997, which united all of the Commonwealth's community and technical colleges under one system to serve as a gateway to postsecondary education for all Kentuckians. Dr. McCall was named as the founding president in December 1998. Since then, he has overseen 16 colleges located on more than 70 campuses across the Bluegrass State.

Under Dr. McCall's leadership, KCTCS has become the largest provider of postsecondary education in Kentucky, representing 47.1 percent of all undergraduate college students. KCTCS serves over 92,000 students, and since 1998 the KCTCS Board of Regents has ratified or approved more than 700 programs that result in certificates, diplomas, or associate degrees.

KCTCS is also the State's largest provider of workforce training, serving more than 5,300 businesses and 52,000 employees annually. It is workforce training initiatives such as these that help develop Kentucky's labor force and therefore its economy.

KCTCS has also become Kentucky's largest provider of online learning, offering more than 77 online credentials. Thanks to Dr. McCall's virtual learning initiative known as KCTCS Online, online learners can pursue higher education at any time that is convenient for them.

Other KCTCS accomplishments achieved under Dr. McCall's tenure include the establishment of the North American Racing Academy, which is the first college-affiliated horse racing academy in the United States; the Kentucky Coal Academy; the Kentucky Fire Commission; and the Kentucky Board of Emergency Medical Services. It is clear that Dr. McCall has kept the interests and demands of Kentucky's students and businesses in mind while developing these programs.

Dr. McCall has been an educator and served in community and technical colleges for more than 40 years. Throughout his career, he has been recognized for his leadership and dedication to education. He was the recipient of Phi Theta Kappa's prestigious State Community College Director Award of Distinction.

Dr. McCall also received the National Council for Continuing Education and Training's National Leadership Award in 2005. In the same year the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development honored him with their International Leadership Award. In 2004 Kentucky Monthly Magazine named him the “Kentuckian of the Year.” Dr. McCall also served as board chair of the American Association of Community Colleges, completing his tenure in 2006.

When KCTCS was first established, it set ambitious goals for improving the

level of college attainment for Kentuckians. Thanks to Dr. McCall, KCTCS has met those goals.

Under the leadership of Dr. Michael B. McCall, KCTCS has become a remarkable community and technical college system in the United States, and it will reach even higher in the future. I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. McCall and wishing him well upon his retirement. He has certainly proved to be a great educator and a great friend to the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

USDA PILOT PROJECT FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF UNPROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, for several years I have envisioned a way to give schools affordable and sustainable access to locally grown foods—a system that would benefit schools, children, and farmers alike. To make this a reality, I introduced the Pilot Project for the Procurement of Unprocessed Fruits and Vegetables as an amendment to the 2014 farm bill. I was very encouraged that the final bill included this pilot project and optimistic that my home State of Oregon could help lead the way—as it often does—by hosting one of the eight programs. That is why I am so pleased to say today Oregon was chosen to participate in the pilot project. This is a win for communities and school districts across Oregon who can now offer meals made with the locally grown produce we are famous for, everything from apples to zucchini, blueberries to tomatoes and everything in between.

This is a win for the local farmers who will gain new customers to buy their fruits and vegetables, and this is a win for the school children who will grow up knowing what fresh produce really tastes like.

This innovative and exciting project establishes a competitive pilot program with up to eight demonstration projects, each representing a different region of the country. These demonstration projects will help schools source healthy, local fruits and vegetables for the breakfasts, lunches, or snacks served to students. It is more important today than ever to ensure America's children have fresh, healthy eating options when they are increasingly exposed to unhealthy, processed foods. The partnerships that the pilot projects will surely grow will put money in the pockets of local farmers while also ensuring that our school kids are eating healthily. I look forward to seeing these projects grow and contribute to the healthy lives of our Nation's young men and women.

RURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION EXTENSION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I support efforts to provide permanent enhanced conservation tax incentives for family farmers, ranchers, and forest landowners who make charitable contributions of land for conservation purposes. As a cosponsor of the Rural Heritage Conservation Extension Act, S. 526, I am a strong supporter of these valuable tools for protecting significant natural and historic resources on privately owned lands.

These incentives expired at the end of 2013 and are among the so-called extenders—tax provisions that are routinely extended each time they expire. Making these provisions permanent would benefit wildlife, enhance hunting, fishing and shooting access, and keep working lands functioning and intact.

Specifically, the Rural Heritage Conservation Extension Act would permanently increase the allowable deduction for charitable contributions of property for conservation purposes. The maximum deduction for individuals would increase from 30 percent to 50 percent of adjusted gross income, AGI. Farmers and ranchers would be allowed a maximum deduction of up to 100 percent of AGI. The bill would also allow any unused deduction to be carried forward for up to 15 years to help donors receive the full benefit of their contribution.

When this incentive was in place, it supported donations of conservation easements in my home State of Maine. In 2012, a landowner donated a conservation easement on a 20-acre property in Machiasport, which is home to centuries-old cultural artifacts, including petroglyphs. In addition to being a spiritual site for Maine's Passamaquoddy tribe, this property allows people to explore the State's precolonial history and provides access for local fishermen to utilize valuable clam flats.

Another success story is from 2013 in Harpswell, where a landowner donated a conservation easement on a 44-acre island property in the heart of Casco Bay. The easement provides public access to a scenic peninsula where visitors can picnic, boat, and kayak. Due to this generous donation, Casco Bay is experiencing increased recreational use while also protecting critical habitats for many species of wildlife including shorebirds, herons, and bald eagles.

Continuing the enhanced conservation tax incentives would assist in the conservation of thousands of additional acres and provide a whole host of community benefits—protecting historical features, securing economic opportunities, enhancing recreational access, and preserving valuable wildlife habitat—in 2014 and beyond.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VOICE OF AMERICA'S UKRAINIAN SERVICE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, for 65 years the Voice of America Ukrainian Service has been a vital source of comprehensive and unbiased information for the Ukrainian people.

During the Cold War, VOA's uncensored, truthful reporting of the news was a beacon of freedom for Ukrainians dominated by Soviet rule. Through VOA and broadcasts by other media outlets such as Radio Liberty, information-starved Ukrainians not only learned about life in the United States and the outside world but also about developments within Ukraine itself.

From VOA, Ukrainians discovered government-sponsored human rights violations taking place throughout the Soviet Union. They became aware of the many courageous Ukrainian human rights activists, including members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, who languished in Soviet prisons for daring to call upon the Soviet Government to abide by its Helsinki Final Act commitments. And when disaster struck at Chernobyl, Ukrainians looked to VOA to provide the objective information that the Soviet Government stubbornly refused to share.

Since Ukraine regained its independence in 1991, VOA's Ukrainian Service has been able to reach more Ukrainian citizens than ever before. Its daily news program "Chas-Time" is seen nightly on Ukraine's respected Channel 5, and its reporting is often featured on other major Ukrainian television channels.

VOA's audience has exploded in the year since the Maidan Revolution for Dignity and Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea and aggression in the south-east.

Thanks to its focus on developments in the United States and U.S.-Ukrainian relations, VOA's Ukrainian Service has been instrumental in bringing home to millions of Ukrainians U.S. policy, as well as the perspectives and activities of the Executive Branch, Congress, and NGOs with respect to Ukraine.

Ukraine confronts profound external and internal challenges in its quest for an independent, democratic, European future. As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I commend the ongoing and accelerating role of VOA's Ukrainian service, especially during this historic time.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY NOMINEES

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority, or TVA, is a multibillion-a-year utility—one of the largest in the Nation. It plays a critical role in our economic development efforts in Tennessee by providing

low-cost, reliable power that is essential to attracting, retaining, and growing jobs.

Strong, independent leadership at TVA is a priority for all Tennesseans, and the Senate is scheduled to vote tomorrow morning on two nominees to serve on the TVA board.

TVA board members' sole focus should be ensuring ratepayers throughout the Tennessee Valley have affordable, reliable power, and they must be free to operate the entity without undue influence from outside individuals.

While I respect the two nominees currently being considered, I have grown increasingly concerned by the nomination process and the potential influence—or perception of influence—that an outside investor who has proposed a multibillion-dollar project to TVA has had on this process. I have shared those concerns with the White House and the majority leader through several conversations.

I was particularly disappointed the majority leader announced he was moving forward with votes despite being aware of these issues—making it the first time TVA nominations have been confirmed by a rollcall vote since 1987.

While I still believe the selection of TVA board members and their confirmations deserve a closer look moving forward, today I received copies of letters from Virginia T. Lodge and Ronald A. Walter that address the concerns regarding the potential influence of an outside individual who has business dealings with TVA.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of both letters be printed in the RECORD.

The nominees' forthright letters and their decision to recuse themselves helps ensure that there is no appearance of a lack of impartiality, and I plan to support both of their nominations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 8, 2014.

MR. RALPH E. RODGERS,
*Executive Vice President and General Counsel,
Designated Agency Ethics Official, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tennessee.*

DEAR MR. RODGERS: This supplements my July 30, 2014, letter to you describing steps that I will take to avoid any actual or apparent conflict of interest, consistent with 5 C.F.R. §2635.502, in the event I am confirmed to serve on the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

While I have neither made nor been asked to make any commitments on any projects involving TVA, during the pendency of my nomination I have had contact and discussions with Franklin Haney, with whom I am acquainted, and persons associated with him. I am aware that Mr. Haney has had business dealings with TVA in the past and has made significant business proposals to TVA that may extend into the future. In order to avoid even the appearance of a lack of impar-

tiality, I will not participate personally and substantially in any particular matter in which Mr. Haney or any person on his behalf is a party or represents a party, or in which Mr. Haney, or his family, would have a direct or indirect financial interest.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA T. LODGE.

DECEMBER 8, 2014.

MR. RALPH E. RODGERS,
*Executive Vice President & General Counsel,
Designated Agency Ethics Official, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tennessee.*

DEAR MR. RODGERS: This supplements my July 3, 2014, letter to you describing steps that I will take to avoid any actual or apparent conflict of interest, consistent with 5 C.F.R. §2635.502, in the event I am confirmed to serve on the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

While I have neither made nor been asked to make any commitments on any projects involving TVA, during the pendency of my nomination I have had contact and discussions with Franklin Haney, with whom I am acquainted, and persons associated with him. I have become aware that Mr. Haney has had business dealings with TVA in the past and has made significant business proposals to TVA that may extend into the future. In order to avoid any appearance of a lack of impartiality, I will not participate personally and substantially in any particular matter in which Mr. Haney or any person on his behalf is a party or represents a party, or in which Mr. Haney, or his family, would have a direct or indirect financial interest.

Sincerely,

RONALD A. WALTER.

TRIBUTE TO MAX MAXFIELD

MR. BARRASSO. Mr. President, in his Inaugural Address to the Nation in 2001, President George W. Bush said:

We are bound by ideals that move us beyond our backgrounds, lift us above our interests, and teach us what it means to be citizens. Every child must be taught these principles. Every citizen must uphold them.

In Wyoming, we have a quality leader who has embraced these ideals and is committed to sharing them with future generations. It is a distinct honor to recognize my friend, Secretary of State Max Maxfield, for his lifetime of service as a dedicated public servant. I invite my colleagues to celebrate his contributions as he steps down after sharing over 47 years of experience with the people of Wyoming.

In America, we demand a great deal from our leaders. We expect that they will be wise, altruistic, and that they will carry the hearts of the people with them in all they do. Max has done all of this—and more. He has dedicated his career to helping others and furthering his vision for the success of Wyoming. In doing so, our State has thrived.

Max's career as a public servant is long and distinguished. Max worked for 23 years as the executive director of the YMCA in Casper. He also served as the head of the Wyoming Make-A-Wish Foundation. He then led the Wyoming Recreation Commission and 2 years later the Wyoming Department of

Commerce. In 1998 Max was elected as the State auditor for the two terms and then in 2006 as the Wyoming secretary of state for two additional terms. With his passion for excellence and his pride in Wyoming, Max took great responsibility in his commitment to promoting growth and prosperity for all.

It is sometimes thought that talented leaders must sacrifice their own private pursuits for the good of the cause. Max has successfully demonstrated that it is possible to be a strong leader and still remain true to one's passions. Max and his wife Gayla have been lifelong advocates of giving back. Max has served on the boards of numerous charitable organizations. Among them, he is particularly passionate about helping children and animals. He currently serves as a board member of the Cheyenne Animal Shelter and in the past has worked with the Wyoming Congressional Award Program, Special Olympics, the Wyoming Children's Society, and Laramie County United Way. Max and Gayla have touched the lives of and positively impacted every person they have met.

Max Maxfield has long been a trustee for Wyoming, and his leadership has shaped the direction of our State. Indeed, Max and Gayla's contributions have benefited not only the governance of Wyoming but every community they have visited, every nonprofit organization they have supported, every friend and stranger they have met, and certainly every pet for which they have found a home. I trust that in his retirement Max will continue to remain active in the public sphere. While continuing to support causes that are near and dear to their hearts, Max and Gayla will enjoy quality time with their children, grandchildren, and beloved golden retrievers.

My wife, Bobbi, and I are honored to thank him for his service to the great State of Wyoming. Even more, we are blessed to call him our friend. Please join me in thanking Max Maxfield for his decades of service and wishing him the best as he embarks on the next chapter of his life.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO REBECCA HASLAM

• MR. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a remarkable Vermonter, Rebecca Haslam, who is the recipient of Vermont's 2015 Teacher of the Year Award.

This award is a testament to Rebecca's dedication to her students' academic success and her work to promote the ideals of tolerance and diversity throughout the Burlington School District. Rebecca's leadership in education has helped encourage intellectual and personal growth in so many students.

She has earned the respect of the community through her diligence in the classroom and for her innovative approach to learning.

Ms. Haslam's commitment to her students is unwavering, "They have such a love of learning and they are joyful when they come to school," she explained recently. Rebecca provides a welcoming environment for students to learn, fostering their social, academic, and emotional development.

Ms. Haslam sets high expectations and provides the guidance needed in the classroom to ensure the success of all her students. Rebecca is committed to providing both a rigorous curriculum and a nurturing environment. Her academic expectations inspire students of all backgrounds and learning abilities to thrive.

Over the last few decades, Burlington's schools have welcomed students from all over the world, and for such a small city, the district's classrooms are among the most diverse in the country. Rebecca has drawn from her own childhood experiences in an effort to build bridges of understanding between students, faculty, and community members from different backgrounds. Rebecca serves as the Burlington School District's social studies and equity coach and works with teachers from around the district to incorporate the values of cultural competency in their lesson plans. These professional development sessions have served as valuable tools in capturing the interests of students and preparing them to be engaged citizens who prize equality in our increasingly diverse society.

Rebecca is a role model for all Vermonters. She uses her experiences to forge goals and serve as motivation for her students. The work that Rebecca does to create an atmosphere that is conducive to learning is commendable, and I would like to offer her warm congratulations on her award.●

TRIBUTE TO SIMON "CY" VINCENT AVARA

● Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the Beatles' song "Penny Lane" opens with lyrics about "a barber showing photographs/Of every head he's had the pleasure to know/And all the people that come and go/Stop and say hello." They could have been describing my barber for over 30 years, Simon Vincent Avara, or "Cy," as he was known to everyone. Cy passed away this Saturday at the age of 81. I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a good friend and amazing man.

One might say that Cy Avara was born to be a barber. His parents Vincent and Mary were working class Italian-Americans. His father was a barber but was killed in a car accident when Cy was just 14. That did not deter Cy from following in his father's foot-

steps, however. He found an opportunity apprenticing for another West Baltimore barber and by the time he was just 16, he passed the examination to receive his master license. He was one of the youngest barbers in Maryland. While he was still 16, with just one year of high school under his belt, he opened his own barbershop with used equipment in a former funeral parlor. He charged 60 cents for a man's haircut and 40 cents for children.

A short time later, in 1953, Cy was drafted into the U.S. Army and honorably served our Nation in the Korean War. When he returned to civilian life, he attended cosmetology school—the Baltimore Studio of Hair—to improve his skills when it came to cutting women's hair. As much as he enjoyed cutting and styling hair, however, his greatest satisfaction came from teaching others the same skill and giving people the chance to have a career and support themselves and their families. So Cy opened his own school in 1960, the Avara International Academy of Hair Design and Technology, in his southwest Baltimore neighborhood. That same year—when he was just 26—he also became a member of the Maryland State Board of Barber Examiners. A few years later, he became the youngest person ever elected to be national president of the Barber Examiners. He also served as secretary-treasurer of all union-affiliated barber schools in America and was president and founder of the Maryland Hair Designer's Association. In 1970, Cy opened his second barber school, Avara's Academy Of Hair Design, in Dundalk, MD. The two schools have trained well over 2,000 barber/stylists. In 2011, Cy was inducted into the National Barber Museum and Hall of Fame.

These accolades alone indicate that Cy lived a very successful life. But there was so much more to Cy. As a child, Cy was raised by his parents to appreciate his blessings and to help others who were less fortunate. For instance, his father gave haircuts to people who wanted to make a good impression so they could get a job; his mother provided food to those in need in their neighborhood. Cy never forgot these lessons in generosity. Starting in the mid-1960s, he became involved with St. Vincent's Center for Abused Children. Since then, once every month, he sent his barber students to St. Vincent's Center to cut the children's hair. He has also been a major contributor to the Ed Block Courage Award Foundation, which was started by one of his former barber students, Sam Lamantia, to honor professional football players who have overcome adversity and contributed to the betterment of their community. In the mid-1970s, Cy established a training program at the Maryland Correctional Institution in Hagerstown under the supervision of a master barber which helped students

at the Institution receive credit toward the 1,200 hours required to obtain a license so that once they were released, they would have the opportunity to continue their training and obtain a job in the barber industry. Cy also travelled to Annapolis frequently to lobby on behalf of the integrity of the barber and cosmetology industry.

Cy was such an effective advocate for the industry that some of his children have followed in his footsteps. He saw his profession as a rewarding career opportunity for individuals from all walks of life. The important thing is to like people and to want to work hard. That is a pretty good description of Cy: he worked hard and he liked people, and made us feel welcome in his shop. But it was not hard work to him; it was his passion. He was extraordinarily skilled at his job.

I may have a little bit less hair than I did when I first started going to Cy, but I am going to miss my friend who served his country, community, and family with such devotion. I am going to miss the special banter that may only occur between a barber and his long-time customers. I will take solace in the fact that there are literally thousands of barbers and stylists who were trained at one of Cy's schools and are carrying on the tradition he inherited from his father. On behalf of the entire Senate, I would like to extend my condolences to his wife, Rita T. Avara; his sons, Michael, Thomas, and Lawrence; his daughter, Susan Avara Watson; his sister, Carmelita Silanskas; his eight grandchildren, Lauren, Michele, Rachael, Joshua, Victoria, Jaclyn, Christopher, and Elise; and all the other family and friends of Cy Avara too numerous to mention.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5759. An act to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief.

H.R. 5771. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY) announced that on today, December 8, 2014, he had signed the following enrolled bills, previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 2040. An act to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 43. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 451. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the "Richard K. Salick Post Office".

H.R. 669. An act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

H.R. 1391. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the "London Fallen Veterans Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 3085. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3375. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

H.R. 3682. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1961 Premier Drive in Mankato, Minnesota, as the "Lyle C. Pearson Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 3957. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building".

H.R. 4189. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Hannon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 4443. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building".

H.R. 4919. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4924. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of certain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 5069. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5106. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the "Philmore Graham Post Office Building".

H.R. 5681. An act to provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement

Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

At 3:29 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3979.

The message further announced that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3979) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, with amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 6:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 4812. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5108. An act to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

The bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 5759. An act to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief.

H.R. 5771. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 8, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2040. An act to exchange trust and fee land to resolve land disputes created by the realignment of the Blackfoot River along the boundary of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-8004. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza" ((RIN0579-AC36) (Docket No. APHIS-2006-0074)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8005. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County Oregon; Modification of Container Requirements" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0046; FV14-945-2 FIR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8006. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Process for Establishing Rates Charged for AMS Services" ((RIN0581-AD36) (Docket No. AMS-LPS-13-0050)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8007. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Section 610 Review" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0047) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8008. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Avocados Grown in South Florida and Imported Avocados; Clarification of the Avocado Grade Requirements" (Docket No. AMS-FV-13-0069; FV13-915-3 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8009. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-8010. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the permanent reduction of sizable numbers of members of the Armed Forces at Fort Campbell, Kentucky; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-8011. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs),

Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-8012. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 annual report on the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-8013. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Efficient Utilization of Department of Defense Real Property"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-8014. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense and Global Security), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Proposed Obligations for Cooperative Threat Reduction"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-8015. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" (44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 21, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-8016. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Financial Market Utilities" (RIN7100-AE09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 21, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-8017. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Aging Management of Loss of Coating or Lining Integrity for Internal Coatings/Linings on In-Scope Piping, Piping Components, Heat Exchangers, and Tanks" (NRC-2014-0004) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 2, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8018. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) Test Sale 2014"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-8019. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "American Energy Manufacturing Technical Corrections Act of 2012—Section 8 Best Practices for Advanced Metering"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-8020. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Eligibility for Minimum Essential Coverage Under Pregnancy-Based Medicaid and CHIP Programs" (Notice 2014-71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 3, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-8021. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Qualified Transportation Fringe" (Rev. Rul. 2014-32) received in

the Office of the President of the Senate on December 3, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-8022. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicaid Program; Disproportionate Share Hospital Payments—Uninsured Definition" (RIN0938-AQ37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 3, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-8023. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Requirements for the Medicare Incentive Reward Program and Provider Enrollment" ((RIN0938-AP01) (CMS-6045-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 3, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-8024. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application of One-Per-Year Limit on IRA Rollovers" (Announcement 2014-32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 3, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-8025. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Logistics and Materiel Readiness), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-8026. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the text of an agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8027. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program for 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8028. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2014-0147—2014-0161); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8029. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8030. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-112); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8031. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-064); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8032. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-109); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8033. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-102); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8034. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-107); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8035. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-122); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-8036. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Labeling; Calorie Labeling of Articles of Food in Vending Machines" ((RIN0910-AG56) (Docket No. FDA-2011-F-0171)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-8037. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Labeling; Nutrition Labeling of Standard Menu Items in Restaurants and Similar Food Establishments" ((RIN0910-AG57) (Docket No. FDA-2011-F-0172)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-8038. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Thornyhead Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD626) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8039. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Mexico" (RIN0648-XD610) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8040. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfly Fishery; Notification of Butterfish Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XD603) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8041. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XD584) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8042. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments" (RIN0648-BE59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8043. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Several Groundfish Species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XD624) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8044. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XD588) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8045. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Provide Spectrum for the Operation of Medical Body Area Networks" ((ET Docket No. 08-59) (FCC 14-124)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 21, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8046. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Western Pacific Pelagic Fisheries; U.S. Territorial Catch and Fishing Effort Limits" (RIN0648-BD46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8047. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions" ((ET Docket Nos. 13-26 and 14-14) (FCC 14-157)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 21, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8048. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Several Groundfish Species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Manage-

ment Area" (RIN0648-XD623) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-8049. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8050. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8051. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8052. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administrator's Semiannual Management Report to Congress for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8053. A communication from the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8054. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8055. A communication from the Chief Operating Officer and Acting Executive Director, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8056. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8057. A communication from the Chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a Management Report for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8058. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8059. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transpor-

tation's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8060. A communication from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8061. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8062. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8063. A communication from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Endowment's Annual Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8064. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 Agency Financial Report for the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8065. A communication from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8066. A communication from the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8067. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendment: Boarding of Vessels at CBP Ports" (CBP Dec. 14-11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 20, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8068. A communication from the Acting District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "ANC 1A Did Not Fully Comply with All Legal Requirements"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8069. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8070. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Incorporation by Reference" ((RIN3095-AB78) (Docket No. OFR-2013-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8071. A communication from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8072. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Management, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8073. A communication from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8074. A communication from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8075. A communication from the Administrator, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's annual financial audit and management report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-8076. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary (International Markets and Developments), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-8077. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin Distinct Populations Segments of Yelloweye Rockfish, Canary Rockfish and Bocaccio" (RIN0648-BC76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 21, 2014; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8078. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of the Treasury" (5 CFR Part 3101) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 20, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-8079. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary (Domestic Finance), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 1, 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-8080. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Investment and Innovation, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the re-

port of a rule entitled "Small Business Investment Companies—Investments in Passive Businesses" (RIN3245-AG57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 14, 2014; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-8081. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Adjustments of Status Granted Under Section 13 of the Act of September 11, 1957"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-8082. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to expenditures from the Pershing Hall Revolving Fund for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-363. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to direct the Comptroller General to complete a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the federal reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 395

Whereas, Created more than a hundred years ago, the Federal Reserve is an independent federal agency. As leaders of the central bank of the United States, the Federal Reserve's board of governors have enacted monetary policy that influences our nation's money and credit conditions, supervised and regulated banks and other financial institutions, and provided financial services to the U.S. and foreign governments. Through these powers, and with the help of the federal reserve banks, this agency has considerable influence on the well-being of our nation's economy, the economy of the world, and the day-to-day lives of people everywhere; and

Whereas, American citizens have entrusted the Congress of the United States with overseeing all federal agencies, and Congress must hold the Federal Reserve accountable. However, under the current law, the Comptroller General may audit the Federal Reserve only if written consent has been given, and even then, the purview of audits of the board of governors and federal reserve banks is limited. Under the direction of the Comptroller General, any General Accountability Office audit is prohibited by law from auditing the board or federal reserve banks' transaction history with foreign nations or information related to monetary policy decisions, including discount window operations, open market operations, securities credit, and interest on deposits; and

Whereas, The American public should receive the accountability and transparency they deserve from their government. Providing the Comptroller General the authority and directive to thoroughly audit the Federal Reserve will allow for better oversight and lift the cloak of secrecy off this highly-profitable and influential government institution. Congress must take the actions necessary to fulfill its oversight responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we urge the Congress of the United

States to direct the Comptroller General to complete a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the federal reserve banks; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2946. A bill to provide improved water, sanitation, and hygiene programs for high priority developing countries, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-286).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 2520, a bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act (Rept. No. 113-287).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 429. A bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 1014. A bill to reduce sports-related concussions in youth, and for other purposes.

S. 2022. A bill to establish scientific standards and protocols across forensic disciplines, and for other purposes.

S. 2094. A bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 2482. A bill to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 2484. A bill to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Auckland on November 14, 2009, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 2485. A bill to implement the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as adopted at Lisbon on September 28, 2007.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2777. A bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. SANDERS for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

*Leigh A. Bradley, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2987. A bill to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2988. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish a Federal regulatory budget and to impose cost controls on that budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2989. A bill to promote Federal-State partnerships for developing regional energy strategies and plans to mitigate risks in changing energy systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. Res. 595. A resolution recognizing Nobel Laureates Kailash Satyarthi and Malala Yousafzai for their efforts to end the financial exploitation of children and to ensure the right of all children to an education; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 313

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 641

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 641, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, and other programs, to promote education in palliative care and hospice, and to support the devel-

opment of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 1249

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1249, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 2176

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2176, a bill to revise reporting requirements under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to preserve the privacy of individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2581

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2581, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 2660

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2660, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the special rules for accident and health plans of certain governmental entities, and for other purposes.

S. 2723

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2723, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit.

S. 2964

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2964, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 38

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 38, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Warren Weinstein should be returned home to his family.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 578, a resolution supporting the role of the United States in ensuring children in the world's poorest countries have access

to vaccines and immunization through Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 595—RECOGNIZING NOBEL LAUREATES KAILASH SATYARTHI AND MALALA YOUSAFZAI FOR THEIR EFFORTS TO END THE FINANCIAL EXPLOITATION OF CHILDREN AND TO ENSURE THE RIGHT OF ALL CHILDREN TO AN EDUCATION

Mr. HARKIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 595

Whereas on October 10, 2014, the Norwegian Nobel Committee awarded the 2014 Nobel Peace Prize to Kailash Satyarthi and Malala Yousafzai;

Whereas the International Labour Organization estimates that, worldwide, 168,000,000 children are exploited financially, with 85,000,000 children working in very hazardous environments and deprived of an education;

Whereas the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization estimates that 121,000,000 children are not in school;

Whereas Kailash Satyarthi has personally rescued more than 82,000 children from the worst forms of child labor;

Whereas Malala Yousafzai has promoted education for girls in Pakistan since she was 11 years old and is an advocate for worldwide access to education;

Whereas Kailash Satyarthi has endured threats on his life as a result of such rescue efforts; and

Whereas the Taliban attempted to kill Malala Yousafzai on October 9, 2012, as a result of her efforts to encourage more girls to attend school: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes Nobel Laureates Kailash Satyarthi and Malala Yousafzai as symbols of peace and advocates for ending the financial exploitation of children and for the right of all children to an education;

(2) commends all individuals working around the world to end the scourge of child slavery and to advance education for all children;

(3) recognizes the challenges that remain in ending the financial exploitation of children and providing access to an education for all children;

(4) urges all governments, civil society organizations, businesses, and individuals to unite in the common purpose of protecting children from losing their childhoods as well as their futures; and

(5) recognizes the dedication and commitment to freedom, the rights of children, and the endurance of the human spirit, demonstrated by all individuals who make sacrifices to build a more peaceful world.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3974. Mr. REID (for Mr. MENENDEZ) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2142, to impose targeted sanctions on persons responsible for violations of human rights of antigovernment protesters in Venezuela, to strengthen civil society in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

SA 3975. Mr. REID (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2521, to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security.

SA 3976. Mr. REID (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1281, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3974. Mr. REID (for Mr. MENENDEZ) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2142, to impose targeted sanctions on persons responsible for violations of human rights of antigovernment protesters in Venezuela, to strengthen civil society in Venezuela, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Central Bank of Venezuela and the National Statistical Institute of Venezuela stated that the annual inflation rate in Venezuela in 2013 was 56.30, the highest level of inflation in the Western Hemisphere and the third highest level of inflation in the world behind South Sudan and Syria.

(2) The Central Bank of Venezuela and the Government of Venezuela have imposed a series of currency controls that has exacerbated economic problems and, according to the World Economic Forum, has become the most problematic factor for doing business in Venezuela.

(3) The Central Bank of Venezuela declared that the scarcity index of Venezuela reached 29.4 percent in March 2014, which signifies that fewer than one in 4 basic goods is unavailable at any given time. The Central Bank has not released any information on the scarcity index since that time.

(4) Since 1999, violent crime in Venezuela has risen sharply and the Venezuelan Violence Observatory, an independent nongovernmental organization, found the national per capita murder rate to be 79 per 100,000 people in 2013.

(5) The international nongovernmental organization Human Rights Watch recently stated, "Under the leadership of President Chávez and now President Maduro, the accumulation of power in the executive branch and the erosion of human rights guarantees have enabled the government to intimidate, censor, and prosecute its critics."

(6) The Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013 of the Department of State maintained that in Venezuela "the government did not respect judicial independence or permit judges to act according to the law without fear of retaliation" and "the government used the judiciary to intimidate and selectively prosecute political, union, business, and civil society leaders who were critical of government policies or actions".

(7) The Government of Venezuela has detained foreign journalists and threatened and expelled international media outlets operating in Venezuela, and the international nongovernmental organization Freedom House declared that Venezuela's "media cli-

mate is permeated by intimidation, sometimes including physical attacks, and strong antimedia rhetoric by the government is common".

(8) Since February 4, 2014, the Government of Venezuela has responded to antigovernment protests with violence and killings perpetrated by its public security forces.

(9) In May 2014, Human Rights Watch found that the unlawful use of force perpetrated against antigovernment protesters was "part of a systematic practice by the Venezuelan security forces".

(10) As of September 1, 2014, 41 people had been killed, approximately 3,000 had been arrested unjustly, and more than 150 remained in prison and faced criminal charges as a result of antigovernment demonstrations throughout Venezuela.

(11) Opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez was arrested on February 18, 2014, in relation to the protests and was unjustly charged with criminal incitement, conspiracy, arson, and property damage. Since his arrest, Lopez has been held in solitary confinement and has been denied 58 out of 60 of his proposed witnesses at his ongoing trial.

(12) As of September 1, 2014, not a single member of the public security forces of the Government of Venezuela had been held accountable for acts of violence perpetrated against antigovernment protesters.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ANTIGOVERNMENT PROTESTS IN VENEZUELA AND THE NEED TO PREVENT FURTHER VIOLENCE IN VENEZUELA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States aspires to a mutually beneficial relationship with Venezuela based on respect for human rights and the rule of law and a functional and productive relationship on issues of public security, including counternarcotics and counterterrorism;

(2) the United States supports the people of Venezuela in their efforts to realize their full economic potential and to advance representative democracy, human rights, and the rule of law within their country;

(3) the chronic mismanagement by the Government of Venezuela of its economy has produced conditions of economic hardship and scarcity of basic goods and foodstuffs for the people of Venezuela;

(4) the failure of the Government of Venezuela to guarantee minimal standards of public security for its citizens has led the country to become one of the most violent and corrupt in the world;

(5) the Government of Venezuela continues to take steps to remove checks and balances on the executive, politicize the judiciary, undermine the independence of the legislature through use of executive decree powers, persecute and prosecute its political opponents, curtail freedom of the press, and limit the free expression of its citizens;

(6) Venezuelans, responding to ongoing economic hardship, high levels of crime and violence, and the lack of basic political rights and individual freedoms, have turned out in demonstrations in Caracas and throughout the country to protest the failure of the Government of Venezuela to protect the political and economic well-being of its citizens; and

(7) the repeated use of violence perpetrated by the National Guard and security personnel of Venezuela, as well as persons acting on behalf of the Government of Venezuela, against antigovernment protesters that began on February 4, 2014, is intolerable and the use of unprovoked violence by protesters is also a matter of serious concern.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD VENEZUELA.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the people of Venezuela in their aspiration to live under conditions of peace and representative democracy as defined by the Inter-American Democratic Charter of the Organization of American States;

(2) to work in concert with the other member states within the Organization of American States, as well as the countries of the European Union, to ensure the peaceful resolution of the current situation in Venezuela and the immediate cessation of violence against antigovernment protesters;

(3) to hold accountable government and security officials in Venezuela responsible for or complicit in the use of force in relation to antigovernment protests and similar future acts of violence; and

(4) to continue to support the development of democratic political processes and independent civil society in Venezuela.

SEC. 5. SANCTIONS ON PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR VIOLENCE IN VENEZUELA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person, including any current or former official of the Government of Venezuela or any person acting on behalf of that Government, that the President determines—

(1) has perpetrated, or is responsible for ordering or otherwise directing, significant acts of violence or serious human rights abuses in Venezuela against persons associated with the antigovernment protests in Venezuela that began on February 4, 2014;

(2) has ordered or otherwise directed the arrest or prosecution of a person in Venezuela primarily because of the person's legitimate exercise of freedom of expression or assembly; or

(3) has knowingly materially assisted, sponsored, or provided significant financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the commission of acts described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The requirement to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under paragraph (1)(A) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(4) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States; and

(2) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a notice of and justification for the waiver.

(d) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

(e) TERMINATION.—The requirement to impose sanctions under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2016.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admitted” and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(4) GOOD.—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(5) KNOWINGLY.—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(6) MATERIALLY ASSISTED.—The term “materially assisted” means the provision of assistance that is significant and of a kind directly relevant to acts described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a).

(7) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON BROADCASTING, INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION, AND CIRCUMVENTION TECHNOLOGY DISTRIBUTION IN VENEZUELA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (in this section referred to as the “Board”) shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) a thorough evaluation of the governmental, political, and technological obstacles faced by the people of Venezuela in their efforts to obtain accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and information about domestic and international affairs;

(2) an assessment of current efforts relating to broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela, by the United States Government and otherwise; and

(3) a strategy for expanding such efforts in Venezuela, including recommendations for additional measures to expand upon current efforts.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the current level of Federal funding dedicated to broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela by the Board before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) an assessment of the extent to which the current level and type of news and related programming and content provided by the Voice of America and other sources is addressing the informational needs of the people of Venezuela; and

(3) recommendations for increasing broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela.

SA 3975. Mr. REID (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2521, to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. FISMA REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking subchapters II and III and inserting the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—INFORMATION SECURITY

“§ 3551. Purposes

“The purposes of this subchapter are to—

“(1) provide a comprehensive framework for ensuring the effectiveness of information security controls over information resources that support Federal operations and assets;

“(2) recognize the highly networked nature of the current Federal computing environment and provide effective governmentwide management and oversight of the related information security risks, including coordination of information security efforts throughout the civilian, national security, and law enforcement communities;

“(3) provide for development and maintenance of minimum controls required to protect Federal information and information systems;

“(4) provide a mechanism for improved oversight of Federal agency information security programs, including through automated security tools to continuously diagnose and improve security;

“(5) acknowledge that commercially developed information security products offer advanced, dynamic, robust, and effective information security solutions, reflecting market solutions for the protection of critical infor-

mation infrastructures important to the national defense and economic security of the nation that are designed, built, and operated by the private sector; and

“(6) recognize that the selection of specific technical hardware and software information security solutions should be left to individual agencies from among commercially developed products.

“§ 3552. Definitions

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), the definitions under section 3502 shall apply to this subchapter.

“(b) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subchapter:

“(1) The term ‘binding operational directive’ means a compulsory direction to an agency that—

“(A) is for purposes of safeguarding Federal information and information systems from a known or reasonably suspected information security threat, vulnerability, or risk;

“(B) shall be in accordance with policies, principles, standards, and guidelines issued by the Director; and

“(C) may be revised or repealed by the Director if the direction issued on behalf of the Director is not in accordance with policies and principles developed by the Director.

“(2) The term ‘incident’ means an occurrence that—

“(A) actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of information or an information system; or

“(B) constitutes a violation or imminent threat of violation of law, security policies, security procedures, or acceptable use policies.

“(3) The term ‘information security’ means protecting information and information systems from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction in order to provide—

“(A) integrity, which means guarding against improper information modification or destruction, and includes ensuring information nonrepudiation and authenticity;

“(B) confidentiality, which means preserving authorized restrictions on access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information; and

“(C) availability, which means ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information.

“(4) The term ‘information technology’ has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40.

“(5) The term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

“(6)(A) The term ‘national security system’ means any information system (including any telecommunications system) used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency, or other organization on behalf of an agency—

“(i) the function, operation, or use of which—

“(I) involves intelligence activities;

“(II) involves cryptologic activities related to national security;

“(III) involves command and control of military forces;

“(IV) involves equipment that is an integral part of a weapon or weapons system; or

“(V) subject to subparagraph (B), is critical to the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions; or

“(ii) is protected at all times by procedures established for information that have been

specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order or an Act of Congress to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or foreign policy.

“(B) Subparagraph (A)(i)(V) does not include a system that is to be used for routine administrative and business applications (including payroll, finance, logistics, and personnel management applications).

“(7) The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“§ 3553. Authority and functions of the Director and the Secretary

“(a) DIRECTOR.—The Director shall oversee agency information security policies and practices, including—

“(1) developing and overseeing the implementation of policies, principles, standards, and guidelines on information security, including through ensuring timely agency adoption of and compliance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(2) requiring agencies, consistent with the standards promulgated under such section 11331 and the requirements of this subchapter, to identify and provide information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of—

“(A) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency; or

“(B) information systems used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency;

“(3) ensuring that the Secretary carries out the authorities and functions under subsection (b);

“(4) coordinating the development of standards and guidelines under section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3) with agencies and offices operating or exercising control of national security systems (including the National Security Agency) to assure, to the maximum extent feasible, that such standards and guidelines are complementary with standards and guidelines developed for national security systems;

“(5) overseeing agency compliance with the requirements of this subchapter, including through any authorized action under section 11303 of title 40, to enforce accountability for compliance with such requirements; and

“(6) coordinating information security policies and procedures with related information resources management policies and procedures.

“(b) SECRETARY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall administer the implementation of agency information security policies and practices for information systems, except for national security systems and information systems described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e), including—

“(1) assisting the Director in carrying out the authorities and functions under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), and (6) of subsection (a);

“(2) developing and overseeing the implementation of binding operational directives to agencies to implement the policies, principles, standards, and guidelines developed by the Director under subsection (a)(1) and the requirements of this subchapter, which may be revised or repealed by the Director if the operational directives issued on behalf of the Director are not in accordance with policies, principles, standards, and guidelines developed by the Director, including—

“(A) requirements for reporting security incidents to the Federal information security incident center established under section 3556;

“(B) requirements for the contents of the annual reports required to be submitted under section 3554(c)(1);

“(C) requirements for the mitigation of exigent risks to information systems; and

“(D) other operational requirements as the Director or Secretary, in consultation with the Director, may determine necessary;

“(3) monitoring agency implementation of information security policies and practices;

“(4) convening meetings with senior agency officials to help ensure effective implementation of information security policies and practices;

“(5) coordinating Government-wide efforts on information security policies and practices, including consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603 and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

“(6) providing operational and technical assistance to agencies in implementing policies, principles, standards, and guidelines on information security, including implementation of standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, including by—

“(A) operating the Federal information security incident center established under section 3556;

“(B) upon request by an agency, deploying technology to assist the agency to continuously diagnose and mitigate against cyber threats and vulnerabilities, with or without reimbursement;

“(C) compiling and analyzing data on agency information security; and

“(D) developing and conducting targeted operational evaluations, including threat and vulnerability assessments, on the information systems; and

“(7) other actions as the Director or the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, may determine necessary to carry out this subsection.

“(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall submit to Congress a report on the effectiveness of information security policies and practices during the preceding year, including—

“(1) a summary of the incidents described in the annual reports required to be submitted under section 3554(c)(1), including a summary of the information required under section 3554(c)(1)(A)(iii);

“(2) a description of the threshold for reporting major information security incidents;

“(3) a summary of the results of evaluations required to be performed under section 3555;

“(4) an assessment of agency compliance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40; and

“(5) an assessment of agency compliance with data breach notification policies and procedures issued by the Director.

“(d) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Except for the authorities and functions described in subsection (a)(5) and subsection (c), the authorities and functions of the Director and the Secretary under this section shall not apply to national security systems.

“(e) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SYSTEMS.—(1) The authorities of the Director described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall be delegated to the Secretary of Defense in the case of systems described in paragraph (2)

and to the Director of National Intelligence in the case of systems described in paragraph (3).

“(2) The systems described in this paragraph are systems that are operated by the Department of Defense, a contractor of the Department of Defense, or another entity on behalf of the Department of Defense that processes any information the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of which would have a debilitating impact on the mission of the Department of Defense.

“(3) The systems described in this paragraph are systems that are operated by an element of the intelligence community, a contractor of an element of the intelligence community, or another entity on behalf of an element of the intelligence community that processes any information the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of which would have a debilitating impact on the mission of an element of the intelligence community.

“(f) CONSIDERATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the responsibilities under subsection (b), the Secretary shall consider any applicable standards or guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology and issued by the Secretary of Commerce under section 11331 of title 40.

“(2) DIRECTIVES.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) consult with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology regarding any binding operational directive that implements standards and guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

“(B) ensure that binding operational directives issued under subsection (b)(2) do not conflict with the standards and guidelines issued under section 11331 of title 40.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to direct the Secretary of Commerce in the development and promulgation of standards and guidelines under section 11331 of title 40.

“(g) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—To ensure fiscal and policy consistency, the Secretary shall exercise the authority under this section subject to direction by the President, in coordination with the Director.

“§ 3554. Federal agency responsibilities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency shall—

“(1) be responsible for—

“(A) providing information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of—

“(i) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of the agency; and

“(ii) information systems used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency;

“(B) complying with the requirements of this subchapter and related policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines, including—

“(i) information security standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(ii) operational directives developed by the Secretary under section 3553(b);

“(iii) policies and procedures issued by the Director; and

“(iv) information security standards and guidelines for national security systems issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(C) ensuring that information security management processes are integrated with agency strategic, operational, and budgetary planning processes;

“(2) ensure that senior agency officials provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets under their control, including through—

“(A) assessing the risk and magnitude of the harm that could result from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of such information or information systems;

“(B) determining the levels of information security appropriate to protect such information and information systems in accordance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, for information security classifications and related requirements;

“(C) implementing policies and procedures to cost-effectively reduce risks to an acceptable level; and

“(D) periodically testing and evaluating information security controls and techniques to ensure that they are effectively implemented;

“(3) delegate to the agency Chief Information Officer established under section 3506 (or comparable official in an agency not covered by such section) the authority to ensure compliance with the requirements imposed on the agency under this subchapter, including—

“(A) designating a senior agency information security officer who shall—

“(i) carry out the Chief Information Officer's responsibilities under this section;

“(ii) possess professional qualifications, including training and experience, required to administer the functions described under this section;

“(iii) have information security duties as that official's primary duty; and

“(iv) head an office with the mission and resources to assist in ensuring agency compliance with this section;

“(B) developing and maintaining an agency-wide information security program as required by subsection (b);

“(C) developing and maintaining information security policies, procedures, and control techniques to address all applicable requirements, including those issued under section 3553 of this title and section 11331 of title 40;

“(D) training and overseeing personnel with significant responsibilities for information security with respect to such responsibilities; and

“(E) assisting senior agency officials concerning their responsibilities under paragraph (2);

“(4) ensure that the agency has trained personnel sufficient to assist the agency in complying with the requirements of this subchapter and related policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines;

“(5) ensure that the agency Chief Information Officer, in coordination with other senior agency officials, reports annually to the agency head on the effectiveness of the agency information security program, including progress of remedial actions;

“(6) ensure that senior agency officials, including chief information officers of component agencies or equivalent officials, carry out responsibilities under this subchapter as directed by the official delegated authority under paragraph (3); and

“(7) ensure that all personnel are held accountable for complying with the agency-wide information security program implemented under subsection (b).

“(b) AGENCY PROGRAM.—Each agency shall develop, document, and implement an agency-wide information security program to provide information security for the infor-

mation and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, including those provided or managed by another agency, contractor, or other source, that includes—

“(1) periodic assessments of the risk and magnitude of the harm that could result from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, which may include using automated tools consistent with standards and guidelines promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(2) policies and procedures that—

“(A) are based on the risk assessments required by paragraph (1);

“(B) cost-effectively reduce information security risks to an acceptable level;

“(C) ensure that information security is addressed throughout the life cycle of each agency information system; and

“(D) ensure compliance with—

“(i) the requirements of this subchapter;

“(ii) policies and procedures as may be prescribed by the Director, and information security standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(iii) minimally acceptable system configuration requirements, as determined by the agency; and

“(iv) any other applicable requirements, including standards and guidelines for national security systems issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President;

“(3) subordinate plans for providing adequate information security for networks, facilities, and systems or groups of information systems, as appropriate;

“(4) security awareness training to inform personnel, including contractors and other users of information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, of—

“(A) information security risks associated with their activities; and

“(B) their responsibilities in complying with agency policies and procedures designed to reduce these risks;

“(5) periodic testing and evaluation of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices, to be performed with a frequency depending on risk, but no less than annually, of which such testing—

“(A) shall include testing of management, operational, and technical controls of every information system identified in the inventory required under section 3505(c);

“(B) may include testing relied on in an evaluation under section 3555; and

“(C) shall include using automated tools, consistent with standards and guidelines promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(6) a process for planning, implementing, evaluating, and documenting remedial action to address any deficiencies in the information security policies, procedures, and practices of the agency;

“(7) procedures for detecting, reporting, and responding to security incidents, which—

“(A) shall be consistent with the standards and guidelines described in section 3556(b);

“(B) may include using automated tools; and

“(C) shall include—

“(i) mitigating risks associated with such incidents before substantial damage is done;

“(ii) notifying and consulting with the Federal information security incident center established in section 3556; and

“(iii) notifying and consulting with, as appropriate—

“(I) law enforcement agencies and relevant Offices of Inspector General and Offices of General Counsel;

“(II) an office designated by the President for any incident involving a national security system;

“(III) for a major incident, the committees of Congress described in subsection (c)(1)—

“(aa) not later than 7 days after the date on which there is a reasonable basis to conclude that the major incident has occurred; and

“(bb) after the initial notification under item (aa), within a reasonable period of time after additional information relating to the incident is discovered, including the summary required under subsection (c)(1)(A)(i); and

“(IV) any other agency or office, in accordance with law or as directed by the President; and

“(8) plans and procedures to ensure continuity of operations for information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency.

“(c) AGENCY REPORTING.—

“(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each agency shall submit to the Director, the Secretary, the Committee on Government Reform, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the appropriate authorization and appropriations committees of Congress, and the Comptroller General a report on the adequacy and effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices, including—

“(i) a description of each major information security incident or related sets of incidents, including summaries of—

“(I) the threats and threat actors, vulnerabilities, and impacts relating to the incident;

“(II) the risk assessments conducted under section 3554(a)(2)(A) of the affected information systems before the date on which the incident occurred;

“(III) the status of compliance of the affected information systems with applicable security requirements at the time of the incident; and

“(IV) the detection, response, and remediation actions;

“(ii) the total number of information security incidents, including a description of incidents resulting in significant compromise of information security, system impact levels, types of incident, and locations of affected systems;

“(iii) a description of each major information security incident that involved a breach of personally identifiable information, as defined by the Director, including—

“(I) the number of individuals whose information was affected by the major information security incident; and

“(II) a description of the information that was breached or exposed; and

“(iv) any other information as the Director or the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, may require.

“(B) UNCLASSIFIED REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(ii) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The head of an agency shall ensure that, to the greatest extent practicable, information is included

in the unclassified version of the reports submitted by the agency under subparagraph (A).

“(2) OTHER PLANS AND REPORTS.—Each agency shall address the adequacy and effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices in management plans and reports.

“(d) PERFORMANCE PLAN.—(1) In addition to the requirements of subsection (c), each agency, in consultation with the Director, shall include as part of the performance plan required under section 1115 of title 31 a description of—

“(A) the time periods; and

“(B) the resources, including budget, staffing, and training,

that are necessary to implement the program required under subsection (b).

“(2) The description under paragraph (1) shall be based on the risk assessments required under subsection (b)(1).

“(e) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—Each agency shall provide the public with timely notice and opportunities for comment on proposed information security policies and procedures to the extent that such policies and procedures affect communication with the public.

“§ 3555. Annual independent evaluation

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Each year each agency shall have performed an independent evaluation of the information security program and practices of that agency to determine the effectiveness of such program and practices.

“(2) Each evaluation under this section shall include—

“(A) testing of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices of a representative subset of the agency's information systems;

“(B) an assessment of the effectiveness of the information security policies, procedures, and practices of the agency; and

“(C) separate presentations, as appropriate, regarding information security relating to national security systems.

“(b) INDEPENDENT AUDITOR.—Subject to subsection (c)—

“(1) for each agency with an Inspector General appointed under the Inspector General Act of 1978, the annual evaluation required by this section shall be performed by the Inspector General or by an independent external auditor, as determined by the Inspector General of the agency; and

“(2) for each agency to which paragraph (1) does not apply, the head of the agency shall engage an independent external auditor to perform the evaluation.

“(c) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—For each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system, that portion of the evaluation required by this section directly relating to a national security system shall be performed—

“(1) only by an entity designated by the agency head; and

“(2) in such a manner as to ensure appropriate protection for information associated with any information security vulnerability in such system commensurate with the risk and in accordance with all applicable laws.

“(d) EXISTING EVALUATIONS.—The evaluation required by this section may be based in whole or in part on an audit, evaluation, or report relating to programs or practices of the applicable agency.

“(e) AGENCY REPORTING.—(1) Each year, not later than such date established by the Director, the head of each agency shall submit to the Director the results of the evaluation required under this section.

“(2) To the extent an evaluation required under this section directly relates to a national security system, the evaluation results submitted to the Director shall contain only a summary and assessment of that portion of the evaluation directly relating to a national security system.

“(f) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Agencies and evaluators shall take appropriate steps to ensure the protection of information which, if disclosed, may adversely affect information security. Such protections shall be commensurate with the risk and comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

“(g) OMB REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—(1) The Director shall summarize the results of the evaluations conducted under this section in the report to Congress required under section 3553(c).

“(2) The Director's report to Congress under this subsection shall summarize information regarding information security relating to national security systems in such a manner as to ensure appropriate protection for information associated with any information security vulnerability in such system commensurate with the risk and in accordance with all applicable laws.

“(3) Evaluations and any other descriptions of information systems under the authority and control of the Director of National Intelligence or of National Foreign Intelligence Programs systems under the authority and control of the Secretary of Defense shall be made available to Congress only through the appropriate oversight committees of Congress, in accordance with applicable laws.

“(h) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall periodically evaluate and report to Congress on—

“(1) the adequacy and effectiveness of agency information security policies and practices; and

“(2) implementation of the requirements of this subchapter.

“(i) ASSESSMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Comptroller General may provide technical assistance to an Inspector General or the head of an agency, as applicable, to assist the Inspector General or head of an agency in carrying out the duties under this section, including by testing information security controls and procedures.

“(j) GUIDANCE.—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary, the Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, and other interested parties as appropriate, shall ensure the development of guidance for evaluating the effectiveness of an information security program and practices.

“§ 3556. Federal information security incident center

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure the operation of a central Federal information security incident center to—

“(1) provide timely technical assistance to operators of agency information systems regarding security incidents, including guidance on detecting and handling information security incidents;

“(2) compile and analyze information about incidents that threaten information security;

“(3) inform operators of agency information systems about current and potential information security threats, and vulnerabilities;

“(4) provide, as appropriate, intelligence and other information about cyber threats, vulnerabilities, and incidents to agencies to assist in risk assessments conducted under section 3554(b); and

“(5) consult with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, agencies or offices operating or exercising control of national security systems (including the National Security Agency), and such other agencies or offices in accordance with law and as directed by the President regarding information security incidents and related matters.

“(b) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system shall share information about information security incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities with the Federal information security incident center to the extent consistent with standards and guidelines for national security systems, issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President.

“§ 3557. National security systems

“The head of each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system shall be responsible for ensuring that the agency—

“(1) provides information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of the information contained in such system;

“(2) implements information security policies and practices as required by standards and guidelines for national security systems, issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(3) complies with the requirements of this subchapter.

“§ 3558. Effect on existing law

“Nothing in this subchapter, section 11331 of title 40, or section 20 of the National Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) may be construed as affecting the authority of the President, the Office of Management and Budget or the Director thereof, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or the head of any agency, with respect to the authorized use or disclosure of information, including with regard to the protection of personal privacy under section 552a of title 5, the disclosure of information under section 552 of title 5, the management and disposition of records under chapters 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, the management of information resources under subchapter I of chapter 35 of this title, or the disclosure of information to the Congress or the Comptroller General of the United States.”

(b) MAJOR INCIDENT.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) develop guidance on what constitutes a major incident for purposes of section 3554(b) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) provide to Congress periodic briefings on the status of the developing of the guidance until the date on which the guidance is issued.

(c) CONTINUOUS DIAGNOSTICS.—During the 2 year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, with the assistance of the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall include in each report submitted under section 3553(c) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), an assessment of the adoption by agencies of continuous diagnostics technologies, including through the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation program, and other advanced security tools to provide information security, including challenges to the adoption of such technologies or security tools.

(d) BREACHES.—

(1) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall ensure that data breach notification policies and guidelines are updated periodically and require—

(A) except as provided in paragraph (4), notice by the affected agency to each committee of Congress described in section 3554(c)(1) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, which shall—

(i) be provided expeditiously and not later than 30 days after the date on which the agency discovered the unauthorized acquisition or access; and

(ii) include—

(I) information about the breach, including a summary of any information that the agency knows on the date on which notification is provided about how the breach occurred;

(II) an estimate of the number of individuals affected by the breach, based on information that the agency knows on the date on which notification is provided, including an assessment of the risk of harm to affected individuals;

(III) a description of any circumstances necessitating a delay in providing notice to affected individuals; and

(IV) an estimate of whether and when the agency will provide notice to affected individuals; and

(B) notice by the affected agency to affected individuals, pursuant to data breach notification policies and guidelines, which shall be provided as expeditiously as practicable and without unreasonable delay after the agency discovers the unauthorized acquisition or access.

(2) **NATIONAL SECURITY; LAW ENFORCEMENT; REMEDIATION.**—The Attorney General, the head of an element of the intelligence community (as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), or the Secretary of Homeland Security may delay the notice to affected individuals under paragraph (1)(B) if the notice would disrupt a law enforcement investigation, endanger national security, or hamper security remediation actions.

(3) **REPORTS.**—

(A) **DIRECTOR OF OMB.**—During the first 2 years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, on an annual basis—

(i) assess agency implementation of data breach notification policies and guidelines in aggregate; and

(ii) include the assessment described in clause (i) in the report required under section 3553(c) of title 44, United States Code.

(B) **SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.**—During the first 2 years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall include an assessment of the status of agency implementation of data breach notification policies and guidelines in the requirements under section 3553(b)(2)(B) of title 44, United States Code.

(4) **EXCEPTION.**—Any element of the intelligence community (as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) that is required to provide notice under paragraph (1)(A) shall only provide such notice to appropriate committees of Congress.

(5) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to alter any authority of a Federal agency or department.

(e) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections for chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code is amended by striking the matter relating to subchapters II and III and inserting the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—INFORMATION SECURITY

“3551. Purposes.

“3552. Definitions.

“3553. Authority and functions of the Director and the Secretary.

“3554. Federal agency responsibilities.

“3555. Annual independent evaluation.

“3556. Federal information security incident center.

“3557. National security systems.

“3558. Effect on existing law.”

(2) **CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT.**—Section 8(d)(1) of the Cybersecurity Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7406) is amended by striking “section 3534” and inserting “section 3554”.

(3) **HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.**—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 223 (6 U.S.C. 143)

(i) in the section heading, by inserting “**FEDERAL and**” before “**NON-FEDERAL**”;

(ii) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, in cooperation with the Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection” and inserting “the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H)”;

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) fulfill the responsibilities of the Secretary to protect Federal information systems under subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code.”;

(B) in section 1001(c)(1)(A) (6 U.S.C. 511(c)(1)(A)), by striking “section 3532(3)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(C) in the table of contents in section 1(b), by striking the item relating to section 223 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 223. Enhancement of Federal and non-Federal cybersecurity.”

(4) **NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY ACT.**—Section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “section 3532(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 3532(1)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(2)”;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “section 3532(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”.

(5) **TITLE 10.**—Title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 2222(j)(5), by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(B) in section 2223(c)(3), by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(C) in section 2315, by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”.

(F) **OTHER PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **CIRCULAR A-130.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall amend or revise Office of Management and Budget Circular A-130 to eliminate inefficient or wasteful reporting. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide quarterly briefings to Congress on the status of the amendment or revision required under this paragraph.

(2) **ISPAB.**—Section 21(b) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-4(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “the Institute”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “the Secretary of Commerce,”.

SA 3976. Mr. REID (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1281, to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ INFORMED CONSENT FOR NEWBORN SCREENING RESEARCH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Research on newborn dried blood spots shall be considered research carried out on human subjects meeting the definition of section 46.102(f)(2) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, for purposes of Federally funded research conducted pursuant to the Public Health Service Act until such time as updates to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (the Common Rule) are promulgated pursuant to subsection (c). For purposes of this subsection, sections 46.116(c) and 46.116(d) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall apply only to newborn dried blood spots used for purposes of Federally funded research that were collected not earlier than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promulgate proposed regulations related to the updating of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (the Common Rule), particularly with respect to informed consent. Not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall promulgate final regulations based on such proposed regulations.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 8, 2014, at the time immediately following the first vote of the day, in room S-219 of the Capitol Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Neil Ashdown for the duration of 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Zachary Gross, Katy Crabtree, and Emalee Barto, interns with the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, be granted floor privileges for

the remainder of today's session and that Caitlin Boon, a detailee with the committee, also be granted floor privileges for today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 564, S. 2521.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2521) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Carper-Coburn substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time; and the Senate proceed to vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3975) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2521), as amended, was passed.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 100-702, the appointment of the following individual to the board of the Federal Judicial Center Foundation: Peter Kraus of Texas.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1281.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1281) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Paul amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3976) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify rules relating to newborn screening research and informed consent)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ INFORMED CONSENT FOR NEWBORN SCREENING RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Research on newborn dried blood spots shall be considered research carried out on human subjects meeting the definition of section 46.102(f)(2) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, for purposes of Federally funded research conducted pursuant to the Public Health Service Act until such time as updates to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (the Common Rule) are promulgated pursuant to subsection (c). For purposes of this subsection, sections 46.116(c) and 46.116(d) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall apply only to newborn dried blood spots used for purposes of Federally funded research that were collected not earlier than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promulgate proposed regulations related to the updating of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (the Common Rule), particularly with respect to informed consent. Not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall promulgate final regulations based on such proposed regulations.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1281), as amended, was passed.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Gov-

ernmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of the following measures, which are post office-naming bills, and the Senate proceed to their consideration en bloc: H.R. 4939, H.R. 1707, H.R. 78, H.R. 2112, H.R. 2223, H.R. 2678, H.R. 3534, and H.R. 5030.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed en bloc and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEIL HAVENS POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 4939) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the "Neil Havens Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JAMES R. BURGESS JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 1707) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE THOMAS "MICKEY" LELAND POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 78) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL CLANDESTINE SERVICE OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY NCS OFFICER GREGG DAVID WENZEL MEMORIAL POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 2112) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 787 State Route 17M in Monroe, New York, as the "National Clandestine Service of the Central Intelligence Agency NCS Officer Gregg David Wenzel Memorial Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH L. KINNUNEN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 2223) to designate the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 220 Elm Avenue in Munising, Michigan, as the "Elizabeth L. Kinnunen Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**LARCENIA J. BULLARD POST
OFFICE BUILDING**

The bill (H.R. 2678) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**OFFICER JAMES BONNEAU
MEMORIAL POST OFFICE**

The bill (H.R. 3534) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Michigan Avenue in Jackson, Michigan, as the "Officer James Bonneau Memorial Post Office," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**CORPORAL CHRISTIAN A. GUZMAN
RIVERA POST OFFICE BUILDING**

The bill (H.R. 5030) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**MEASURES READ THE FIRST
TIME—H.R. 5759 AND H.R. 5771**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5759) to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief.

A bill (H.R. 5771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. I now ask for a second reading on both of these measures but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

**VENEZUELA DEFENSE OF HUMAN
RIGHTS AND CIVIL SOCIETY ACT
OF 2014**

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 401, S. 2142.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2142) to impose targeted sanctions on persons responsible for violations of human rights of antigovernment protesters in Venezuela, to strengthen civil society in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments; as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 2142

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Central Bank of Venezuela and the National Statistical Institute of Venezuela have stated that the inflation rate in Venezuela was 56.30 percent in 2013, the highest level of inflation in the Western Hemisphere and the third highest level of inflation in the world behind South Sudan and Syria.

(2) The Central Bank of Venezuela and the Government of Venezuela have imposed a series of currency controls that has exacerbated economic problems and, according to the World Economic Forum, has become the most problematic factor for doing business in Venezuela.

(3) The Central Bank of Venezuela and the National Statistical Institute of Venezuela have declared that the scarcity index of Venezuela reached 28 percent in December 2013, which signifies that one in 4 basic goods is unavailable at any given time.

(4) Since 1999, violent crime in Venezuela has risen sharply and the Venezuelan Violence Observatory, an independent nongovernmental organization, found the national per capita murder rate to be 79 per 100,000 people in 2013.

(5) The international nongovernmental organization Human Rights Watch recently stated, "Under the leadership of President Chávez and now President Maduro, the accumulation of power in the executive branch and the erosion of human rights guarantees have enabled the government to intimidate, censor, and prosecute its critics."

(6) The Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013 of the Department of State maintained that in Venezuela "the government did not respect judicial independence or permit judges to act according to the law without fear of retaliation" and "the govern-

ment used the judiciary to intimidate and selectively prosecute political, union, business, and civil society leaders who were critical of government policies or actions".

(7) The Government of Venezuela has detained foreign journalists and threatened and expelled international media outlets operating in Venezuela, and the international nongovernmental organization Freedom House declared that Venezuela's "media climate is permeated by intimidation, sometimes including physical attacks, and strong antimedia rhetoric by the government is common".

(8) Since February 4, 2014, the Government of Venezuela has responded to antigovernment protests with violence and killings perpetrated by public security forces, and by arresting and unjustly charging opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez with criminal incitement, conspiracy, arson, and intent to damage property.

(9) As of March 13, 2014, 23 people had been killed, more than 100 people had been injured, and dozens had been unjustly detained as a result of antigovernment demonstrations throughout Venezuela.

**SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING
ANTIGOVERNMENT PROTESTS IN
VENEZUELA AND THE NEED TO PRE-
VENT FURTHER VIOLENCE IN VEN-
EZUELA.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States aspires to a mutually beneficial relationship with Venezuela based on respect for human rights and the rule of law and a functional and productive relationship on issues of public security, including counternarcotics and counterterrorism;

(2) the United States supports the people of Venezuela in their efforts to realize their full economic potential and to advance representative democracy, human rights, and the rule of law within their country;

(3) the chronic mismanagement by the Government of Venezuela of its economy has produced conditions of economic hardship and scarcity of basic goods and foodstuffs for the people of Venezuela;

(4) the failure of the Government of Venezuela to guarantee minimal standards of public security for its citizens has led the country to become one of the most violent in the world;

(5) the Government of Venezuela continues to take steps to remove checks and balances on the executive, politicize the judiciary, undermine the independence of the legislature through use of executive decree powers, persecute and prosecute its political opponents, curtail freedom of the press, and limit the free expression of its citizens;

(6) the people of Venezuela, responding to ongoing economic hardship, high levels of crime and violence, and the lack of basic political rights and individual freedoms, have turned out in demonstrations in Caracas and throughout the country to protest the inability of the Government of Venezuela to ensure the political and economic well-being of its citizens; and

(7) the repeated use of violence perpetrated by the National Guard and security personnel of Venezuela, as well as persons acting on behalf of the Government of Venezuela, in relation to the antigovernment protests that began on February 4, 2014, is intolerable and the use of unprovoked violence by protesters is also a matter of serious concern.

**SEC. 4. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD VEN-
EZUELA.**

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the people of Venezuela in their aspiration to live under conditions of

peace and representative democracy as defined by the Inter-American Democratic Charter of the Organization of American States;

(2) to work in concert with the other member states within the Organization of American States, as well as the countries of the European Union, to ensure the peaceful resolution of the current situation in Venezuela and the immediate cessation of violence against antigovernment protestors;

(3) to hold accountable government and security officials in Venezuela responsible for or complicit in the use of force in relation to the antigovernment protests that began on February 4, 2014, and similar future acts of violence; and

(4) to continue to support the development of democratic political processes and independent civil society in Venezuela.

SEC. 5. SANCTIONS ON PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR VIOLENCE IN VENEZUELA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any person, including a current or former official of the Government of Venezuela or a person acting on behalf of that Government, that the President determines—

(1) has perpetrated, or is responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, significant acts of violence or serious human rights abuses in Venezuela against persons associated with the antigovernment protests in Venezuela that began on February 4, 2014;

(2) has directed or ordered the arrest or prosecution of a person primarily because of the person's legitimate exercise of freedom of expression or assembly; or

(3) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided significant financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the commission of acts described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(3) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United

States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a notice of and justification for the waiver.

(d) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admitted” and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) MATERIALLY ASSISTED.—The term “materially assisted” means the provision of assistance that is significant and of a kind directly relevant to acts described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a).

(4) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 6. SUPPORT FOR CIVIL SOCIETY IN VENEZUELA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, directly or through nongovernmental organizations—

(1) defend internationally recognized human rights for the people of Venezuela;

(2) build the organizational and operational capacity of democratic civil society activists and organizations in Venezuela at the national and regional level;

(3) support the efforts of independent media outlets to broadcast, distribute, and share information beyond the limited channels made available by the Government of Venezuela;

(4) strengthen the organizational and operational capacity of democratic civil society in Venezuela;

(5) support the efforts of independent media outlets to broadcast, distribute, and share information beyond the limited means available as of the date of the enactment of this Act;

(6) facilitate open and uncensored access to the Internet for the people of Venezuela;

(7) improve transparency and accountability of institutions that are part of the Government of Venezuela;

(8) provide support to civil society organizations, activists, and peaceful demonstrators in Venezuela that have been targeted for exercising internationally recognized civil

and political rights, as well as journalists targeted for activities related to the work of a free press; and

(9) provide support for democratic [political] organizing and election monitoring in Venezuela.

(b) STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a strategy to carry out the activities described in subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 to carry out subsection (a). Amounts appropriated for the activities set forth in subsection (a) shall be used pursuant to the authorization and requirements contained in this section. Additional amounts may be authorized to be appropriated under provisions of law.

(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to paragraph (1) may not be obligated until 15 days after the date on which the President has provided notice of intent to obligate such funds to—

(i) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(B) WAIVER.—The President may waive the requirement under subparagraph (A) if the President determines that failure to waive that requirement would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare, in which case notification shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than 3 days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON BROADCASTING, INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION, AND CIRCUMVENTION TECHNOLOGY DISTRIBUTION IN VENEZUELA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (in this section referred to as the “Board”) shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) a thorough evaluation of the governmental, political, and technological obstacles faced by the people of Venezuela in their efforts to obtain accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and information about domestic and international affairs;

(2) an assessment of current efforts relating to broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela, by the United States Government and otherwise; and

(3) a strategy for expanding such efforts in Venezuela, including recommendations for additional measures to expand upon current efforts.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the current level of Federal funding dedicated to broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela by the Board before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) an assessment of whether the current level and type of news and related programming and content provided by the Voice of America is sufficiently addressing the informational needs of the people of Venezuela; and

(3) *specific measures for increasing broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela.*

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the Menendez substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3974) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2142), as amended, was passed.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2014

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning, December 9, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 10:30 a.m., as provided for under the previous order; and that the Senate recess from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be two rollcall votes at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow on cloture on the Lodge and Wal-

ter nominations. The confirmation votes will occur at 6 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:45 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, December 9, 2014, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 8, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ELLEN DUDLEY WILLIAMS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2018.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

LAUREN MCGARITY MCFERRAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2019.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING DR. MICHAEL B. MCCALL ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AS PRESIDENT OF THE KENTUCKY COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor, commend, and congratulate Dr. Michael B. McCall, founding president of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS), on the event of his retirement. Dr. McCall has led KCTCS all of the 17 years since its creation in 1997, and during that time has overseen the coordination of Kentucky's community colleges, technical institutes, and the University of Kentucky into an education system that is now the largest provider of postsecondary education in the Commonwealth.

Dr. McCall, a strong advocate for a robust community college system even before coming to Kentucky, was recruited to KCTCS due to his knowledge, experience, and personal drive to see students succeed. As both an educator and an administrator, he has overseen the physical expansion of KCTCS and a dramatic upgrade in the system's academic quality. Dr. McCall oversaw 45 capital projects totaling approximately \$500 million, giving 95 percent of all Kentuckians access to a KCTCS institution within a thirty minute drive. This enhanced presence has helped train the skilled workforce that Kentucky needs in order to compete in the modern economy.

Under Dr. McCall's leadership, enrollment at KCTCS increased by nearly 110 percent, contributing to the education of more than 500,000 Kentuckians. Dr. McCall also established or integrated several specialized programs to provide specialized skills for emergency services and some of Kentucky's signature industries, including emergency medical services, fire and rescue science technology, automotive manufacturing technical training, coal mining, and horseracing. The high-skilled, high-paying jobs in these fields will reinforce the readiness of Kentucky communities to guarantee public safety, grow and develop our local industries, and expand Kentucky's competitive advantage.

Dr. McCall's stewardship of KCTCS has provided the Commonwealth of Kentucky with an academic tradition that will benefit generations to come. I congratulate Dr. McCall on a terrific career improving the lives of my fellow Kentuckians as he enters retirement and wish him all the best for whatever the future may hold.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAVIE GREER ON HER RETIREMENT AS BARREN COUNTY JUDGE-EXECUTIVE

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Judge Davie Greer. After serving 12 years as the Barren County Judge-Executive, Judge Greer will retire at the end of the year. First elected in 2002, Judge Greer was the first woman to serve as the Judge-Executive for Barren County.

Among Judge Greer's many accomplishments in office is the construction of the Barren County Detention Center, the creation of the Barren County Drug Task Force and her work with the Industrial Development Economic Authority of Glasgow-Barren County. Under Judge Greer's leadership, the Barren County Drug Task Force has expanded to cover Edmonson and Allen counties.

Judge Greer has also lead several measures to improve the emergency response resources of Barren County. Likewise, her efforts to enhance and grow the parks and recreation system have improved the quality of life for Barren County's residents.

While Judge Greer may be passing the torch for her elected duties, she vows to remain active in the community. Presently, Judge Greer is the Treasurer of the Salvation Army, a member of the Glasgow Business and Professional Women's Club and a member of the Glasgow-Barren County Chamber of Commerce.

I am grateful for Judge Greer's hard work and dedication to the people of Barren County. I wish her well on her retirement and look forward to continuing to work with her in the community.

IS ACADEMIC FREEDOM THREATENED BY CHINA'S INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES?

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last week, I convened a hearing that was the first in a series probing the question whether China's 'soft power' educational initiatives are undermining academic freedom at U.S. schools and universities. We see it manifested primarily in two ways. The first is in the building of satellite campuses in China for American universities, where Chinese "rules of engagement" are said to hold sway—in other words, places where no criticism of the government, or promotion of democracy and freedom, is al-

lowed. Second, we see it in the myriad outposts of Chinese soft power that have opened on campuses throughout the United States, so-called "Confucius Institutes," whose curricula integrates Chinese Government policy on contentious issues such as Tibet and Taiwan and whose hiring practices explicitly exclude Falun Gong practitioners. It should be noted that we are seeing emerging faculty opposition to these Institutes, as well as to the all-too cozy and lucrative arrangements which American universities have with institutions affiliated with the Chinese government.

This prompts us, however, to ask the question: Is American higher education for sale? And, if so, are U.S. colleges and universities undermining the principle of academic freedom—and, in the process, their credibility—in exchange for China's education dollars?

A number of years ago the author James Mann wrote a book called "The China Fantasy," where he recounts how in the 1990s some American business leaders and government officials put forward the "fantasy" that free trade with China would be the catalyst for political liberalism.

I was in China in the early 1990's. Despite the ongoing jailing and executions of dissidents, American businessmen in China told me that if we just trade more, the dictatorship will soon matriculate into a democracy.

As we all now know now, China has failed to democratize, despite increases in the standard of living of its citizens. Political repression is an all-too-common occurrence. Yet U.S. policy toward China continues to overlook abuses of fundamental human rights for the sake of business opportunities and economic interest.

But what about U.S. universities, who often tout their adherence to higher ideals, and equate their "non-profit" status of a badge of good citizenship which puts them above reproach. Perhaps they too are engaged in their own version of a "China fantasy," willing to accept limitations on the very principles and freedoms that are the foundation of the U.S. system of higher education, justifying quiet compromises they would never entertain at home by telling themselves that they are helping bring about change in China.

As Dr. Perry Link brilliantly argued, these compromises often take the form of self-censorship of what universities and faculty teach, who they invite to speak, what fellows they accept in residence. So long as the dragon is not provoked, they think they will be allowed to continue doing their work, slowly changing China from the inside. But are these American universities changing China, or is China changing these American universities?

What is the reason that New York University, for example, terminated the fellowship of the world class human rights advocate and hero, Chen Guangcheng? NYU is one of those prestigious universities for which China built a campus, a satellite of the university in

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Shanghai. Though the Chinese Government laid out the funds, the transaction involved a moral cost: As certain members of the NYU faculty wrote in a letter to the university's Board of Trustees, the circumstances surrounding the launch of NYU satellite campus in Shanghai and the ending of Chen's residence created a "public perception, accurate or otherwise, that NYU made commitments in order to operate in China."

We have repeatedly invited NYU's President and faculty to testify before this committee, without success. On five separate occasions, we gave NYU 15 dates to appear. As this is the first hearing in a series of hearings we intend to hold on this topic, I hope that they will agree to come at another time, so they can fully state their case.

On a personal note, I spent considerable time with Chen Guangcheng when he first came to the United States, having worked his case since 2004 which included four Congressional hearings exclusively dedicated to his freedom. It is my impression that NYU officials and others sought to isolate him from supporters viewed as too conservative or from those they considered Chinese dissidents. We may never know if NYU experienced what Chen himself termed as "persistent and direct pressure from China" to oust him, or if it was simply an act of prudent self-censorship to keep in Beijing's good graces.

I don't know the answer, but it is my conviction that self-censorship and the chilling effect this has is an even more pernicious threat to fundamental freedoms and the principle of academic freedom. One of our witnesses, the respected academic Dr. Perry Link, has made this case repeatedly over the years, drawing on his own personal experiences, and I thank him for being here today.

We were not there to re-litigate the sad divorce of Chen Guangcheng and NYU. It is only a small, disheartening part of the larger issue: whether American universities will compromise academic freedom to get a piece of the lucrative Chinese education market which is roughly \$27 billion dollars a year.

The hearing I held last week marked the beginning of a long hard look at the costs and benefits of the growing number of Chinese educational partnerships started by U.S. universities and colleges, including exchange programs and satellite campuses in China and Confucius Institutes in the U.S.

While foreign educational partnerships are important endeavors—for students, collaborative research, cultural understanding, and even for the host country—I think we all can agree that U.S. colleges and universities should not be outsourcing academic control, faculty and student oversight, or curriculum to a foreign government. Unfortunately, there is now some evidence emerging that gives rise to the need for this hearing.

The American Association of University Professors, or AAUP, along with its sister organization in Canada, published a report in July, blasting the Confucius Institute model as a partnership "that sacrificed the integrity of the [host] university and its academic staff" by requiring "unacceptable concessions" that allow "the Confucius Institutes to advance a state agenda in the recruitment and control of academic staff, in the choice of curriculum, and in the restriction of debate."

The AAUP concluded by saying that "Confucius Institutes function as an arm of the Chinese state and are allowed to ignore academic freedom" and recommended shutting down U.S. Confucius Institutes unless they could meet certain standards of academic freedom and transparency.

The Confucius Institutes are China's major soft power push, an attempt to increase the number of young people studying (and ideally coming to admire) Chinese culture and language. This is not harmful in itself, for Chinese culture and language—as distinct from its political culture—is, indeed, admirable. But while some U.S. university administrators say the influence of Confucius Institutes is benign, University of Chicago professor Marshal Salhins, has called Confucius Institutes "academic malware" inimical to the U.S. model of academic freedom.

What we should do is welcome U.S.-China educational partnerships that promote cultural understanding and critical language skills and protect academic freedom, that allow the teaching of sensitive topics, and are not subject to any of the same rules that govern Chinese academic institutions—where professors are fired or jailed for exercising the universal right to free speech.

Indeed, there is a U.S. national security interest in having U.S. students learn Chinese, but such language skills should be taught on our terms and without the baggage brought by Confucius Institute ties. And, if those freedoms are violated or compromised, we need to find some recourse, whether through withholding Department of Education funds or State Department exchange program funds from schools that willingly compromise the principles of academic freedom and human rights to gain a small share of the Chinese educational market.

I will be asking for a GAO study to review the agreements of both satellite campuses in China and of Confucius Institutes in the U.S. I would like to know if those agreements are public, whether they compromise academic or other freedoms of faculty, students, and workers and whether Chinese teachers are allowed the freedom to worship as they please and teach about Tiananmen, Tibet, and Taiwan.

I will also ask the GAO to study whether U.S. satellite campuses in China operate differently from Chinese universities and whether there is a two-tier system in place, where Chinese students and faculty have more restrictions placed their activities and research than U.S. students and faculty. I will also ask whether Communist Party committees operate on campus, whether fundamental freedoms are protected for both Chinese and U.S. students and faculty—religious freedom, Internet freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of association, and whether the universities are required to enforce China's draconian population control policies.

These are important questions. We need to look at whether these issues can be handled by the universities, their faculties, and trustees themselves or if there is something the U.S. Congress must do to ensure academic freedom is protected.

U.S. universities and colleges should reflect and protect the highest principles of freedom and transparency. They should be islands of

freedom where foreign students and faculty can enjoy the fundamental freedoms denied them in their own country.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT MERWIN CEO OF MILLS-PENINSULA HEALTH SERVICES ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplished career of a distinguished Californian, Mr. Robert Merwin of San Mateo County, who is retiring at the end of 2014 from his position as Chief Executive Officer of Mills-Peninsula Health Services, a post he has held since January, 1996.

A resident of San Carlos, California, Bob Merwin is a 1971 graduate of the United States International University, and earned his M.B.A. from UCLA in 1973. He began his career in hospital management in 1973 as Assistant Executive Director of the Long Beach Community Hospital. He progressed up the corporate ladder at Long Beach, joined Pacific Presbyterian Medical Center, then came to Mills-Peninsula in 1987 as Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer.

Bob Merwin has served his community as a member of the San Mateo Rotary Club, the American College of Health Care Executives, and as Chair of the West Bay Hospital Conference, and Chair of the Hospital Consortium of San Mateo County.

He is a past director of the American Red Cross Bay Area and a member of the Finance Committee of the Health Plan of San Mateo.

Mills-Peninsula has thrived under Bob Merwin's leadership. He has improved relations between physicians and management, contained costs while increasing productivity and helped develop a strategic plan for the combined hospitals. Under his leadership a new 241 bed acute care facility, Mills-Peninsula Medical Center was constructed. It is a state-of-the-art, \$640 million, 450,000 square foot facility that is a source of pride to our entire community.

Bob Merwin is married to Jean Merwin and he is the father of Michael and Megan. He enjoys golf, tennis and photography.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring Bob Merwin for his stellar career in hospital management and for his extraordinary contributions to our community and our country.

PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE, PASTOR DUONG KIM KHAI

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Pastor Duong Kim Khai, a prisoner held in Vietnam, has nurtured the spiritual lives of his parishioners and helped those of all faiths that have

been victims of injustice in Ben Tre and Dong Thap. He has also served as an advocate for Vietnamese farmers whose land was confiscated by the government. If he is guilty of anything it is of living to serve others and stand up to an oppressive government. I call on the Vietnamese government to release him immediately.

During the 1990s, the Pastor was detained thirteen times, often for organizing prayer sessions. Soon after, he turned his home into a place of worship, as well as a community center where farmers could seek assistance in petitioning authorities. Because he did not have the government's permission to worship, his home was seized by the local government, and he was imprisoned for two years.

On August 16, 2010, he was arrested for supposedly trying to overthrow the Vietnamese government, a convenient charge from a government bent on silencing him. For the next two months, his place of detention and his condition of health were kept secret from his family.

Denied legal representation and with diplomats denied access to his trial, Pastor Duong Kim Khai was sentenced to 2–8 years in prison and 3–5 probation. Unfortunately, his wife, who was never able to visit her husband in prison, has since passed away.

Pastor Duong Kim Khai's trial was a sham and his imprisonment is unacceptable. Freedom to worship is a human right, and the Vietnamese government should immediately release him. Furthermore, I call on the State Department to finally recognize Vietnam as a Country of Particular Concern.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING VICE MAYOR OF THE
RIPON CITY COUNCIL, ELDEN
"RED" NUTT

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the Vice Mayor of the Ripon City Council, Elden "Red" Nutt, who passed away November 21, 2014.

Elden "Red" Nutt was born on May 19, 1937 and raised in Fowler, California. He enlisted in the United States Navy in 1954 and worked as a boiler operator on the USS Hornet (CVA-12).

Red's long history of service to the community of Ripon first started in 1965 when he was hired as a Ripon police officer. Red later became a sergeant in 1972 and was appointed police chief in 1982. He served as chief until retiring in 1991.

Red was appointed to the Ripon planning commission in 2002 and first elected to the city council in 2004, serving stints as vice mayor and mayor. While on the City Council, Red served on various committees and commissions, most notably the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFco) where Red served as Board Chairman.

Notable projects completed during Red's tenure include: Main Street & Stockton Ave. Enhancements, Mistlin Softball Fields, pur-

chase of Ripon's first bus and the start of a fixed route transit service, Stanislaus River Bike Path, Boesch and Lan Parks, City Hall & Police Department expansion, annual fireworks show made possible by community donations, Veterans Museum and memorial wall, and the Police Memorial.

Red's involvement in the community went far beyond his role on the City Council. Red served as the post commander for the American Legion Post 190 in 2004–2005, and again in 2010–2011. Red also served as the president of the Ripon Lions Club, was a two-time past president of the Ripon Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, and auxiliary member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 1051. Red also volunteered his time with the Friends of the Library and the Ripon Historical Society, serving as a docent at the Veterans Museum.

Red and his wife Bonnie have been married for 55 years. They have raised three children, John, Debbie, and Diane. They have six grandchildren and one great grandchild. After retirement, Red enjoyed spending time with his wife traveling the country in their RV and collecting antiques.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the life of Ripon City Council Vice Mayor Elden "Red" Nutt and all of his admirable contributions to the safety and betterment of his community.

HONORING MR. HASTING BULLOCK

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a courageous and remarkable veteran, Mr. Hasting Bullock.

Mr. Hasting Bullock was born on August 8, 1920 in Yazoo City to the late Elnora Young, and the late Thomas Bullock. They later moved to Pickens, Mississippi where he was reared.

Mr. Hasting Bullock later met his wife of 70 years, the late Elmira Howard, and to this union they had 12 children. He joined the U.S. Army in 1942 and served as a 740 Air crafter for 3 years.

He was stationed at New Ginning, and fought in World War II. After departing from the military he began his farming career from 1946–1983. He retired from his farming career and began to work as a local barber. He is now 94 years old and a widower still residing in Pickens, Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Hasting Bullock for his time and dedication to serving our country and others.

HONORING REGINALD N. "REGGIE"
TODD

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reginald N. "Reggie" Todd, who is re-

tiring at the end of this year, after his distinguished and illustrious career spanning more than thirty-eight years representing and advocating for the interests of local governments before the Legislative and Executive Branches of government in Washington, D.C. I wish to extend to Mr. Todd, currently the Chief Legislative Representative for the County of Los Angeles, my appreciation for the decades of dedicated service that he has given to Los Angeles County and the nation.

Mr. Todd has served as the Chief Legislative Representative for the County of Los Angeles for the past sixteen and a half years, leading and coordinating a team of legislative advocates who have been working tirelessly on behalf of the over 10 million people who live in Los Angeles County. My office has worked closely with Mr. Todd and his team on a broad variety of federal issues having an impact on Los Angeles County including appropriations, health care, social services, community development, public safety, transportation and infrastructure, and municipal services. He has advanced the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors' federal legislative agenda with great skill, intelligence, and accomplishment.

Prior to establishing the Los Angeles County Washington Office, Mr. Todd served as Legislative Director of the National Association of Counties (NACo), implementing a broad array of coalition-building around NACo's legislative priorities. Before joining NACo, Mr. Todd served as the Chief Executive Officer of the National Community Development Association, the Legislative Counsel at the National League of Cities, and the Washington Activities Coordinator for the National Association of Regional Councils.

Mr. Todd was born and raised in Baltimore, Maryland. A veteran, he served in the United States Air Force at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, NATO. He received a B.A. in Government and Politics from the University of Maryland-College Park. He has been married to his wife, Saralee S. Todd, for 36 years and has two children, Dr. Elizabeth Todd Breland and Jonathan E. Todd, and a son-in-law, Alex Breland. Mr. Todd also is a very proud, first-time grandfather of Natalie Juanita Breland.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and Los Angeles County, we extend our heartfelt gratitude for Mr. Todd's contributions throughout his remarkable career. With our sincere best wishes, we congratulate him upon his retirement from public service.

HONORING TRAVIS WOOD

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Travis Wood, a devoted husband, loving father and proud New Mexican.

While born a Texan, Travis was raised as a New Mexican. In 1912, Travis was born near the small town of Wellington, Texas; three short years later, his family traveled to New

Mexico, where he would devote a lifetime of service to a community he loved dearly.

Travis was a man of great integrity. He grew up enduring the extremely difficult hand-to-mouth existence as a member of a homestead family. Along with the hard times, however, came many lessons that would serve him throughout his life. At the onset of World War II, Travis enlisted in the United States Navy as a motor machinist first class on the Navy sub-chaser SC 1354, often referred to as the "Splinter Fleet". The Splinter Fleet was detailed to Omaha Beach on D-Day and Travis would later be awarded the bronze star for his courage and valor.

In 1952, following the war, Travis and his wife Clara moved the family to Roy, New Mexico, where Travis accepted a job as a rural letter carrier. Anyone who knew Travis will tell you that his commitment to his country and the State of New Mexico was unwavering. He became an icon in his community as a tireless public figure, serving several terms as Mayor of the Village of Roy, on the Roy School Board, the ENMR Tele-communications Board and the Eastern Plains Council of Governments (COG). In addition, he was an avid member in the Roy Lions Club, the American Legion, the Roy and Springer Masonic Lodges, and a board member of St. Paul's Methodist Church/United Church of Roy.

Travis was always searching for ways to stimulate the economy in his cherished community. For his lasting and effective contributions, his fellow citizens honored his name with the Travis Wood Senior Center. But Travis's most treasured triumph was a private one: building a family. He passionately loved his son Gary Wood, daughter Cheryl Wood Scott, and his grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Gentle, patient, compassionate, loving and selfless—Travis was a helper to many and a friend to all. Travis demonstrates the impact that one individual can have on an entire community and his warmth was felt by all those who knew him. Today, Travis is not with us, but his legacy and lessons will endure in all those he touched. May the memory of Travis live on in our hearts.

**HONORING AIRMAN FIRST CLASS
LAWRENCE DAVID FRIAR**

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a courageous and remarkable veteran, Retired Airman First Class Lawrence David Friar.

Lawrence Friar is a strong believer in the value of family land and property ownership. It is through this belief that prompted him to return to his native home in Lexington, Mississippi in 1972 from Compton, California where he was reared. He was born in Lexington, Mississippi April 20, 1940, but moved out West with his family not long after that.

He returned to his home state to look after his family's land, because so many boundaries and lines were being moved and timber being

cut from his property that he had to come home to watch over things for his other siblings. Born to the late Mack Friar and Lettie Wright Friar, Holmes County, Mississippi natives, there were four boys and six girls. He has been a faithful citizen of the Second Congressional District ever since his return in 1972.

Protecting land is nothing new for Friar for he is a proud American Veteran who protected and served his country in the United States Air Force from 1958 until 1962.

He joined the military immediately after high school in Compton. "When I joined the service, the Vietnamese Conflict has started, and it was still going on when I left the service," he said. Friar had temporary duty in the War Zone, in which they would leave Hawaii and go to the war and work the jets that needed repairing, and then they would return to Hawaii, where he was stationed.

During his tour of duty in the U.S. Air Force, Friar earned and retired with the rank of (E4) Airman First Class.

The Retired Airman First Class Lawrence Friar says "Most importantly, it taught me patience and how to get along with people." he said about his most memorable experience about serving in the U.S. Air Force.

Today, one will find this retired U.S. Air Force veteran home in Lexington, Mississippi as a local leisurely farmer doing some gardening and planting; what people in the south call "truck patches." He hopes to return to California one day to check on some siblings there, but for now he will remain with a watchful eye on his family's land.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Retired Airman First Class Lawrence David Friar for his time and dedication to serving our country and others.

**HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM
SCHEIDE**

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great American citizen and a dear friend. William Scheide, of Princeton, New Jersey, passed away on November 14, 2014, at the age of 100. Bill was a humanitarian, a philanthropist and a supporter of civil rights who, although born into great wealth, was anything but indolent.

Bill was born in Philadelphia on January 6, 1914, the only child of two musicians: John, a pianist, and Harriet, a singer. He developed a love for music early on, and that passion inspired him throughout his hundred years. Bill's family earned their fortune in oil when northwestern Pennsylvania was the center of the oil industry. His grandparents and parents began collecting books, and Bill developed that collection carefully, studiously, and energetically, and built it into one of the greatest collections of rare books and manuscripts in private hands anywhere in the world. Bill attended Princeton University, graduating with the class of 1936, and eventually gave his collection to his university. His collection is huge and

hugely impressive, and includes an early fourteenth century manuscript of the Magna Carta; the first four Bibles printed; an original copy of the Declaration of Independence; the first four folios of Shakespeare; and musical manuscripts of Beethoven, Mozart, Schubert, Wagner, and Bill's beloved Johann Sebastian Bach. Today, the Scheide Library at Princeton continues to be a resource for Princeton students and faculty and for scholars around the world.

In Princeton and throughout the country, Bill Scheide is synonymous with support for the arts—particularly music. He was a renowned pianist, organist, and oboist. After graduating from Princeton, Bill went on to earn a master's degree in music from Columbia and thereafter became one of the world's most renowned Bach scholars. He was the founding director of the Bach Aria Group, which performed and recorded over a period of more than three decades. He eventually returned to Princeton where he held regular concerts in his home, inviting guest musicians or even performing himself.

Bill's impact on Princeton University stretches far beyond his library collection. Over the years, Bill's generosity has allowed hundreds of students to attend the university through the Scheide Scholars Program. His philanthropy also extended beyond the university's gates and into the Princeton community. Through Scheide Concerts, Bill brought to the community classical music performances by some of the world's most sought-after performers. He was an avid supporter of charitable organizations in the area, including Centurion Ministries, which works to free wrongly convicted individuals from prison, and Isles, a community development organization serving our capital city of Trenton. And far beyond central New Jersey, Bill's philanthropy changed the history of our nation. When a young lawyer named Thurgood Marshall asked him to support a case called Brown vs. Board of Education, Bill Scheide provided funding that allowed the NAACP Legal Defense Fund to pursue the case to its stupendous conclusion. He later served on the board of the Legal Defense Fund for nearly four decades. Here in Washington, at the Newseum, exhibits funded by Bill Scheide teach the public about freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. He also served as a trustee of, and generous benefactor to, Westminster Choir College and Princeton Theological Seminary, both of which have buildings bearing his name.

I had the pleasure of spending a great deal of time with Bill over the years. And while Bill will certainly be remembered for his generous charitable endeavors, I believe he will be remembered most by those who knew him for his intellect, his humility, and his generosity of spirit. He was thoughtful about his philanthropy and worked hard at it, and expected nothing in return. His happiness was found in watching the eyes of concertgoers or library visitors light up with joy, or seeing a new young leader emerge from Nassau Hall at Princeton commencement who was only able to attend the university because of the Scheide Scholars Program. He was so humble, in fact, that he asked the university to change the name of the Scheide Music Library

to the Mendel Music Library, to honor another Princeton faculty member and renowned Bach scholar, Arthur Mendel, who he thought deserved the recognition.

Bill is survived by his loving wife, Judy; his daughters, Louise and Barbara; his son, John; three stepchildren; and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Bill Scheide's legacy of generosity and studious philanthropy will not soon be forgotten.

WAYZATA HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS
CROSS COUNTRY

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Wayzata High School Girls Cross-Country team on their recent victories in the state and national championships.

Their 2A Minnesota State Championship, the third in a row for Wayzata, was the result of a strong performance at the state meet in Northfield.

In addition to their third consecutive state championship win, the Wayzata girls' team won the Nike Cross Nationals Meet in Portland, Oregon by beating out teams from New York, Utah, and Indiana.

The Trojans were led by the performance of Anna French who took 3rd place at state and 8th at the national meet.

The Wayzata Girls Cross Country team took on this latest challenge in the midst of difficult practice schedules, academic expectations, and various other commitments. Their success this season is a tribute to their excellent teamwork and tenacity, qualities they will no doubt maintain as they move forward.

I commend Coach Dave Emmans and the entire Trojans team for their passion and hardwork. Cross Country is athletics at its purest and requires mental toughness and physical endurance to excel. By pushing each other every day, Wayzata reached truly exceptional heights this season.

It is my honor to congratulate and represent these hard-working student-athletes and congratulate them on their success.

HONORING CHOPPA STYLES
BARBER SHOP

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable business, Choppa Styles Barber Shop.

Choppa Styles Barber Shop is owned by Ramirez Lee, who was born and raised in Leland, Mississippi. "Choppa Styles" is the name of his shop and is a new age term for the latest in music, fashion, and even hairstyles.

After Lee graduated from barber school, he went to work for other barbershops, but knew that he wanted his own business. He was very particular and wanted to please his customers

while giving them the advantage of his knowledge.

Many people have the mistaken belief that men just walk into a barbershop, sit down and get a haircut. Lee doesn't have that attitude at all.

Lee states that "it's very important for a professional barber to look at the person's facial structure, the type of hair he might have as to whether it is thick or thinning, curly, straight, all those things. A good barber will then style that person's hair to compliment his facial structure."

Lee said that he tries to influence his customers on the necessity of a healthy scalp. Lee also said that he hopes to include hair care products at his shop soon.

Lee doesn't make appointments. All of his customers are walk-ins. He welcomes new customers and invites them to stop by his shop.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Choppa Styles Barber Shop for its dedication to serving and giving back to the community.

HONORING DAVE JONES

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, Dave Jones lived a life of service to freedom, to his faith, and to his family. Dave's wife Sally was a patient of mine, and I've had the opportunity to get to know their family over the past few years.

Dave passed away late last month—a loss not only for his family, but also for fellow members of his church and the people of Cincinnati's East End who he served through his church's outreach program.

Dave served in the military, returned home, raised a family, and ran a successful insurance business.

Dave was a rugged man, but a tender husband, father and grandfather. At their church Dave and Sally taught Sunday School.

Dave and Sally raised five sons and are proud grandparents to three girls and two boys. Today we share their sorrow, but also share the faith that Dave is enjoying his eternal reward.

Dave Jones' legacy will continue through his children and grandchildren who learned firsthand from Dave's daily demonstration of faith through action, dedication to others, and love of family.

It has been a true honor to know Dave and to represent him in Congress. Godspeed.

THE PASSING OF JIMMY RUFFIN

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and music of a great Detroit Motown Records singer and songwriter,

Jimmy Ruffin, who passed away on November 17, 2014, at the age of 78.

His contribution to popular music left a huge mark on the music industry and Rhythm and Blues music.

As the Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have worked on music and copyright issues over the years and have a deep appreciation for the contribution that Mr. Ruffin made for lovers of Rhythm and Blues music across the world.

Mr. Ruffin, born in Collinsville, Mississippi, was the older brother of the late Temptations singer David Ruffin. Both of them sang gospel music in the South and Detroit where their family later moved. They also worked with Barry Gordy and Motown Records, where they became widely known for their style of music.

After serving honorably in the U.S. Army here and overseas he returned to Motown Records to continue his career. Jimmy Ruffin not only wrote but sang many of his musical creations which included his song "What Becomes of the Brokenhearted," which went on to become a Top 10 pop hit.

His reputation grew in this country and around the world. His popularity through the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s continued to grow as he put out songs including "I've Passed This Way Before" and "Gonna Give Her All the Love I've Got." Jimmy and David Ruffin went on to work together on the 1970s album "I Am My Brother's Keeper." In the 1980's he had a major hit, "Hold on to My Love," which the Bee Gees' Robin Gibb produced.

Mr. Ruffin will be missed for his singing and as a musician he produced music that was legendary. We are grateful for the songs and music that Mr. Ruffin provided to the Nation over the years and his songs will live on to be enjoyed by future generations.

I am sad that we have lost a great performer, a consummate artist and one of Motown Records' biggest stars.

Our condolences go out to his family and friends around the world.

HONORING GEORGE REED, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a courageous and remarkable veteran, Mr. George Reed, Jr.

Mr. Reed was born in Enid, Oklahoma in April of 1943. He is the only child of the late Mr. George Reed, Sr., who was a World War II Veteran, and Mrs. Estella Hunt Reed.

Mr. Reed graduated from Gentry High School in 1962. In May of 1963, he did basic training in San Diego, California for the United States Navy.

From 1964–1965, Mr. Reed did two tours in Vietnam on the USS *Oriskany* CVA-34. Then, he transferred to USS *John Archibald Bole* DD 755 and served the next four years on this ship. Two of the places he toured on this ship are Japan and Fort Malaysia.

Mr. Reed served six years, and retired in 1969 as a Machinist Mate E5. He now serves as Post Adjutant at the American Legion Post #205, where they have 30 active members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. George Reed, Jr. for his time and dedication to serving our country.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,993,726,181,400.08. We've added \$7,366,849,132,487.00 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.3 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE
WAYZATA HIGH SCHOOL BOYS
CROSS-COUNTRY TEAM

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Wayzata High School Boys Cross Country team on winning the Minnesota Cross Country 2A Championship Meet, held at St. Olaf College in Northfield.

The Trojans—led by Coach Bill Miles—dominated the field and finished with the lowest score in school history of 47 points. This is the eighth state championship in Coach Miles 40 years of coaching.

Wayzata truly made it a team effort as six different runners made the All-Lake team. The team was led by Connor Olson's championship effort, clocking in at 15 minutes, 17.1 seconds. Jaret Carpenter and Ian Eklin both had top ten finishes as well for the Trojans.

The dedication it takes to become a state championship athlete should be commended. It means skillfully juggling practice, academics, and other commitments to be prepared physically and mentally for each race. Their success this season is a tribute to their effort and focus and they should take pride in their victory.

Cross Country is athletics at its purest. It takes hard work day after day, pushing oneself to the limit in order to achieve your personal best. It takes a strong mental will to reach the point of exhaustion and then push past it. Wayzata's success this year is evidence of this effort.

It is truly an honor to congratulate and represent these hard-working student-athletes. Congratulations Trojans!

HONORING DR. HASKELL S.
BINGHAM

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a courageous and remarkable veteran, Dr. Haskell S. Bingham.

Dr. Bingham was a native son of Vicksburg, Mississippi, born to the late Rev. Judge R. Bingham, Sr. and Mrs. Julia E. Bingham.

Dr. Bingham attended Vicksburg schools, Jackson State College, University of Denver, Peabody College/Vanderbilt University and served in the U.S. Army, and became a Korean War veteran.

Dr. Bingham was a former teacher at Brinkley High School in Jackson, Mississippi. He also retired having served as former Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at Virginia State University, former Assistant to the President at St. Paul's College (Virginia) and former Dean of Admissions and Records at Jackson State University.

Dr. Bingham was greatly respected and loved as the historian/genealogist of the Bingham's of African descent in America. He identified over 2500 relatives in his historical research in South Africa and the United States. He also achieved recognition for his ancestors including the Freedom Fighter Gabriel of Gabriel's Rebellion in Virginia, from the National Parks Service, City of Richmond City Council, and former Governor Kaine of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Haskell S. Bingham for his time and dedication to serving our country.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. JOSEPH
OVICK

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 8, 2014

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Dr. Joseph Owick as he retires from his long-held position as Contra Costa County Superintendent of Schools and to congratulate him on the culmination of a truly outstanding 45-year career in education.

Joseph Owick began his career as a Special Education teacher, working diligently to ensure that each student in his classroom was given every opportunity to succeed. Although classroom teaching has always been his passion, Joe's ability to develop strong coalitions of educators, community members and legislators has led him into a variety of important leadership roles. He served as Assistant Principal, Principal, Director of Special Education, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, and Associate Superintendent for Business. For the past 18 years, Dr. Joseph Owick has been at the helm of Contra Costa County Office of Education working tirelessly to assure that all students receive the very best education. In addition to his administrative work, Dr. Owick has taught in a variety of schools in-

cluding Chapman University's Graduate School of Education and San Jose State University.

Joe has also devoted a great deal of his time to community service. He currently serves on the Board of Directors of the East Bay Leadership Council, Contra Costa County's Children and Families Policy Forum and has served as the President of the Executive Board of the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association. He has also served as Chairman of the Bay Area Leadership Foundation, the Federal Policy and Legislation Committee for the Council of Administrators for Special Education, as vice-chair of the Federal Advocacy for California Education, he is past president of the Association of California School Administrators and a former chair of the Bay Area Region Superintendents Association.

It is easy to see why in 2008 Dr. Joseph Owick was named Citizen of the Year by the East Bay Leadership Foundation. He has also been awarded the Superintendent of the Year Award and the Ferd Kiesel Memorial Award by the Association of California School Administrators and he received the President's Circle Award for Outstanding Service to Education and the Community from Diablo Valley College Foundation. These are only a few of the many commendations that over the years have recognized Dr. Owick's outstanding service to our students, teachers, and our entire community.

But what is most important to know about Joe Owick is that he has always been a "students first" type of educator. He has made it a point to personally visit students and teachers throughout the year, lending freely his support and hands-on experience to ensure that every child has an opportunity to thrive in the classroom. And it is clear from the energy and enthusiasm Joe brings to every facet of his job, that this has been a 45-year love affair with the learning process.

I ask my colleagues to join with me today in commending my friend, Dr. Joseph Owick, on his outstanding career and to thank him on behalf of the thousands of students and teachers who have been the beneficiaries of his work over the years. We join with his family, friends and colleagues in wishing him the very best as he begins his well-earned retirement.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks

section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, December 9, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

DECEMBER 10

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, focusing on the effective enforcement and the future of derivatives regulation.

SR-328A

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine cybersecurity, focusing on enhancing coordination to protect the financial sector.

SD-538

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Colette Dodson Honorable, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

SD-366

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michelle K. Lee, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and Daniel Henry Marti, of Virginia, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on African Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Ebola epidemic, focusing on the keys to success for the international response.

SD-419

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine passenger rail, focusing on investing in our nation's future.

SR-253

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the President's executive action on immigration and the need to pass comprehensive reform.

SD-226

DECEMBER 11

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold a joint oversight hearing to examine the implementation of the President's executive order on Improving Chemical Facility Safety and Security.

SD-406

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider an original resolution entitled, "to authorize the limited use of the United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and the nomination of Antony Blinken, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

SD-419

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Joan Marie Azrack, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Loretta Copeland Biggs, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina, Elizabeth K. Dillon, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, and Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.

SD-226

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, December 9, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 9, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG LAMALFA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

REPRESSIVE CUBAN REGIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, just 90 miles from U.S. shores the most repressive human rights abuses in our hemisphere are being perpetrated by a regime that has shown no respect for human life and that will never change as long as the Castro brothers and their kind remain in power in Cuba.

Every day these brutal thugs continue to repress 11 million Cubans who yearn for freedom and the respect of their basic human rights. But the regime isn't just a threat to the people of Cuba. They also operate within the United States, with sophisticated espionage, tradecraft, and are allies of our worst enemies.

We have but to remember the story of Ana Belen Montes. A senior analyst in our Defense Intelligence Agency, Ana Belen Montes was one of the masterminds of Cuba intelligence in the U.S. She was the top spy for the Castro regime and undermined U.S. foreign policy efforts throughout the world due to her nefarious espionage activities.

She is certainly serving a long sentence in Texas.

But Castro also harbors fugitives from U.S. law, such as Joanne Chesimard. She is a New Jersey cop killer and earned the terrible distinction of being the first woman on the FBI's most wanted list of terrorists.

In 2001, Fidel Castro went to Iran and met with Iranian Supreme Leader Khamenei, and Castro said at that time: Together, Cuba and Iran will bring America to its knees.

These are just a few of the examples of why it is imperative for the Obama administration to get tough with Castro, not only to protect our U.S. national security interests, but also to extend a helpful hand to the pro-democracy leaders on the island who are struggling for freedom.

The Cuban regime continues to repress independent journalists, human rights activists, and commits arbitrary detentions every day, all to thwart any attempt at the exercise of freedom of expression. I will show you just a few of the names and faces of the voices of those opposition leaders in the push for freedom on the island, and each deserves the attention of this body.

Mr. Speaker, this is Berta Soler. Berta Soler is the leader of a movement called Ladies in White, Las Damas de Blanco, a group of women tirelessly advocating for the release of political prisoners in Cuba. These courageous women walk to mass peacefully holding up flowers and are met with brutal attacks by Castro's state security. Berta Soler became the leader of this organization after the death of her predecessor, Laura Pollan.

Laura Pollan started this movement in Cuba. She died under mysterious causes in October 2011. Many people in the island and outside have blamed the Castro regime for the unfortunate and suspicious circumstances of her passing.

We also have many pro-democracy leaders who are still languishing in Cuban jails, and these are some of their faces. This first young man, his name is Angel Yunier Remon. He is also known as El Critico. He is another face of repression on the island. Angel was arrested in March for criticizing the Castro regime's brutal human rights abuses and the oppression of 11 million of his fellow countrymen. To this day, El Critico remains in prison for the mere crime of simply expressing his right to address grievances through rhyme.

Then there is the face of Sonia Garro. Sonia is another member of the Ladies

in White. Sonia and her husband were arrested 2 years ago in a violent raid. Her trial has been suspended four times without an explanation or any reason being given.

Along with Sonia, fighting for the causes of freedom and liberty is this young man, Jorge Luis Garcia Perez, better known as Antunez, who has been in prison in Castro's gulag for nearly 17 years. Antunez and his wife, Yris, have repeatedly been assaulted and beaten by state security forces, and their scars tell a story of resilience and commitment to the cause of freedom on the island. They are free now, but one does not know for how long.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, there is the case of Juan Carlos Gonzalez, another freedom fighter I would like to highlight. He is a lawyer who is blind. He has spent years defending the human rights of the Cuban people.

These are just a few of the faces of the pro-human rights activists in Cuba, Mr. Speaker. I could not possibly cover the face of every single dissident on the island, but these faces are representative of the horrors of the Cuban regime and the horrors that liberty fighters face there every day; and that is why, Mr. Speaker, it is our moral obligation to stand in solidarity with these pro-democracy activists and to be a voice for 11 million people who are being oppressed and silenced in Cuba.

PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, by unanimous consent motion offered by my friend, and the bill's Republican lead, TED POE, the House passed H.R. 2901, our Paul Simon Water for the World Act. It was almost anticlimactic, considering all the ins and outs it has taken for years to be able to hammer out the details necessary to take the next step in reform.

The hard work was all worth it, enhancing our efforts to have the United States embrace its responsibility to help the world deal with our water and sanitation crisis. Make no mistake about it; it is a crisis.

Today 152 million hours will be spent by women and girls to get water—often dirty, polluted water—to meet the basic needs of their families. Almost three-quarter billion people still lack access to this fundamental necessity of life.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

There is an even greater crisis with inadequate sanitation. There are approximately 2.5 billion people who suffer from this lack of what most of us take for granted. It results in horrific disease, stunted growth, and malnutrition. In fact, the children under 5 who are malnourished in India are suffering less from a lack of food and more from the diseases produced by poor sanitation. The children who do survive are left with mental and physical burdens for their entire life.

In a world where there are more cell phones than toilets, this is something that we can do something about. It is seriously out of kilter. The world knows what to do, and we can afford a solution. The enactment of the Water for the World legislation moves us in that direction by focusing the United States' efforts on things that will work, areas of the world most in need, and making sure our solutions are sustainable.

I deeply appreciate the leadership of my friend, colleague, and principle cosponsor of the bill, TED POE, who has been tireless in his efforts; the work of Chairman ROYCE and the Foreign Affairs Committee; our partners in the other body, Senators DICK DURBIN and BOB CORKER; and, of course, dozens of nongovernmental organizations that have been at work around the globe making progress while they have been unrelenting advocates here at home.

I must also acknowledge the tireless efforts of my legislative director, Michael Harold, who has done as much as any human alive to get this across the finish line.

Mr. Speaker, this is an amazing and important accomplishment, but it makes me pause. What else could we do in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation and doing what is right?

Might it be possible to take a small step, show a little courage, and embrace what Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill could do over 30 years ago? President Reagan used his radio address on Thanksgiving 1982 to provide leadership to more than double the gas tax, which he correctly pointed out was really a user fee and which had not increased in 23 years while roads were falling apart.

Well, the current gas tax has not been increased in almost 22 years, and America is falling apart and falling behind. The highway trust fund is going bankrupt. Everyone acknowledges an increase is long overdue. With gasoline prices falling dramatically, seemingly every week, and expected to continue doing so well into the foreseeable future, a nickel a gallon per year is hardly going to be noticed.

But as President Reagan pointed out, people will directly benefit. Today poor road maintenance costs the typical family \$377 per year in damage to their cars, far more than they would pay in a small increase in the gas tax. Mil-

lions of hours and billions of dollars are wasted due to highway congestion.

So let's square our shoulders. Let's show some backbone and vision and take another step forward. Let's raise the user fee we call the gas tax, put hundreds of thousands of people to work all across America at family wage jobs, and renew and rebuild this great country. This would be a nice Christmas present that Americans will enjoy for years to come.

THE NDAA AND MILITARY BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, let me quote from Roger Simon in a recent article, titled, "Down the Opium Rathole." Mr. Simon writes about Afghanistan:

If you spent 13 years pounding money down a rathole with little to show for it, you might wake up one morning and say, "Hey, I'm going to stop pounding money down the rathole." Unfortunately, the United States Government does not think this way.

Mr. Speaker, last week we passed a \$585 billion bill known as the defense bill, with a large percentage of that money going into overseas contingencies: Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria. I question how much damage this bill causes our military Active Duty and our retirees.

Let me quote from Lori Falkner Volkman, a former prosecutor and spokesman for the Keep Your Promise Alliance, an online coalition of military families and organizations. She said: "This is the second Christmas in a row that national leaders have tried to cut military pay benefits. Earned benefits should not even be on the table when entitlement budgets soar and appropriations budgets are billions of dollars over budget."

I did not vote for the NDAA bill. It was 1,648 pages, and we did not have enough time to read and comprehend the contents of the bill. In a recent article in the Jacksonville Daily News regarding my "no" vote on this bill, Mike Hayden, a retired Air Force colonel and present director of governmental relations for the Military Officers Association of America, known as MOAA, said: "An E-5 servicemember would lose more than \$800 in purchasing power annually when the bill takes effect. This is going to cost them a loss of about \$600 a month just in pay."

In the same article, Jim Davis, a retired marine who now lives in Jacksonville and serves as a senior vice commander of the local DAV chapter, said the cuts could adversely affect military families.

Charlie Brown, a quartermaster for the VFW post in Jacksonville, agreed

with Mr. Davis and said the bill doesn't accurately reflect what servicemembers actually deserve.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote James Madison. James Madison wrote: "The power to declare war, including the power to judge the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature."

Mr. Speaker, for too long, we have not had policy debates on the floor of this House, whether it be Iraq, Syria, or Afghanistan. When I look at the waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan, I want to say to the Active Duty in the military and the retirees, I regret so much that the Congress is not debating the issues that we should be debating based on our constitutional duties.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to quote Pat Buchanan. Pat says: "Is it not a symptom of senility to be borrowing from the world so we can defend the world?" I repeat: "Is it not a symptom of senility to be borrowing from the world so we can defend the world?" Mr. Speaker, that is so prophetic. And I thank Pat Buchanan for trying to wake up Congress before it is too late.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have a poster beside me with Uncle Sam. And Uncle Sam says: "I want you to understand that if you can't afford to take care of your veterans, you can't afford to go to war." That, again, is what Pat Buchanan is saying.

Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress in both parties need to understand that we have a constitutional responsibility to not commit our young men and women to fight and die and be wounded unless we debate the policy on the floor of the House.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and please, God, continue to bless America.

EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, equal justice under the law—impartial and uniformly applied—has been, for more than two centuries, the ideological underpinning of American democracy.

But from the very beginning, this noblest aspiration has been intertwined with our struggle with race, a battle that has sometimes come to define our Nation and to divide it in ways that too often cleave us still today.

Mr. Speaker, 150 years since the Emancipation Proclamation and half a century after the Civil Rights Act of 1964 formally ended Jim Crow, our President, his Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the National Security Adviser are all African American.

Blacks are now prominent in every facet of American life. But much of

this has occurred during my lifetime because people marched and sat and voted and demanded greater equality.

Yet despite the progress, equal justice under law is not the reality for too many of our fellow citizens, and injustice continues to limit their lives and their livelihoods in ways that are difficult for many White Americans to comprehend.

Inequality manifests itself at every rung of the criminal justice system, but its most deadly consequences are to be found in the encounters of young men of color with the police.

I have seen the video of Eric Garner in New York and watched the tragedy in Ferguson in the aftermath of the shooting of Michael Brown. The agony of those families and the anger of their communities have rightfully moved the Nation.

Sadly, they are not alone. The deaths of Eric Garner and Michael Brown grabbed national headlines, but decades of strife between police and many poor and minority neighborhoods have resulted in an endemic mistrust of law enforcement there.

One need only consider a phenomenon almost completely foreign to much of America, “the talk.” It is a ritual that plays out in Black and Brown households across our Nation every day as parents teach their young children about the special dangers they face from law enforcement.

As a father, to hear that is heartbreaking. As someone who has long worked with and on behalf of law enforcement and who has deep respect for the bravery and integrity of so many who wear the uniform, it is a call to action.

First, in the months since the Michael Brown shooting, I have pressed for greater deployment of body-worn cameras to police departments across the country, an idea that the President has now endorsed. Cameras are not a panacea, but they are a first step on a path to greater accountability and transparency.

Second, since cameras alone will not bridge the chasm of mistrust between many communities of color and the police there to protect them, we must invest in 21st century police departments.

Effective policing requires mutual respect between the public and the police and a renewed emphasis on community policing strategies. Diversifying police forces so that they are more reflective of the communities they patrol and improving the training of officers to reduce the likelihood of violent confrontations are essential. This cannot be accomplished overnight, however, and generations of injustice have left deep scars.

So the third leg of any law enforcement reform agenda must be enhanced oversight by the Department of Justice, which has a long record of work-

ing with State and local police agencies to modernize and improve practices and behavior.

Justice Department intervention, as in the recent release of a report detailing excessive use of force by Cleveland Police, can be instrumental in overcoming opposition to reform. And I know that Attorney General Holder’s successor will make this a priority.

We ask a lot from our police, who have a difficult and often dangerous job, and we grant them enormous power, including the right to take a life under certain circumstances. It is not only proper that we insist this power is used impartially and as a last resort. It is fundamental to a just society.

In a 1951 speech to the New York Legal Aid Society, the great jurist Learned Hand challenged his audience: “It is the daily, it is the small, it is the cumulative injuries of little people that we are here to protect. If we are able to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice.”

Mr. Speaker, 63 years later, on a street corner in the same city, Eric Garner hauntingly invoked Hand when he pleaded in vain: “Every time you see me, you want to mess with me. I’m tired of it. It stops today. I’m minding my business, officer. I’m minding my business. Please just leave me alone.”

Mr. Speaker, it must stop today.

Mr. Speaker, equal justice under law—impartial and uniformly applied—has been for more than two centuries the ideological underlining of American democracy.

But, from the beginning, this noblest aspiration has been intertwined with our struggle with race—a battle that has sometimes come to define our nation, and to divide it in ways that too often cleave us still today.

One hundred fifty years since the Emancipation Proclamation and half a century after the Civil Rights Act of 1964 formally ended Jim Crow, our President, his Attorney General, Secretary of Homeland Security and National Security Advisor are all African-American.

Blacks are now prominent in every facet of American life. And much of this has occurred during my lifetime, because people marched and sat, and voted and demanded greater equality.

But, despite the progress, equal justice under law is not the reality for too many of our fellow citizens and injustice continues to limit their lives and their livelihoods in ways that are difficult for white Americans to comprehend.

Inequality manifests itself at every rung of the criminal justice system, but its most deadly consequences are to be found in the encounters of young men of color with the police.

I have seen the video of the Eric Garner incident in New York and watched the tragedy in Ferguson in the aftermath of the shooting of Michael Brown. The agony of their families and the anger of their communities have rightfully moved the nation.

Sadly, they are not alone.

The deaths of Eric Garner and Michael Brown grabbed national headlines, but dec-

ades of strife between police and many poor and minority neighborhoods have resulted in an endemic mistrust of law enforcement there.

One need only consider a phenomenon almost completely foreign to much of America—“the talk.”

It is a ritual that plays out in black and brown households across our nation every day—as parents teach their young children about the special dangers they face from law enforcement.

Even the mayor of New York, Bill de Blasio, said last week that he and his wife had to prepare their son—“as families have all over this city for decades—how to take special care in any encounter he has with police officers.”

As a father, to hear that is heartbreaking. As someone who has long worked with and on behalf of law enforcement, and who has deep respect for the bravery and integrity of so many who wear the uniform, it’s a call to action.

First, in the months since the Michael Brown shooting, I have pressed for greater deployment of body-worn cameras to police departments across the country, an idea that the President has now endorsed. Cameras are not a panacea, but they are a first step on a path to greater accountability and transparency.

Second, since cameras alone will not bridge the chasm of mistrust between many communities of color and the police there to protect them; we must invest in 21st Century police departments.

Effective policing requires mutual respect between the public and the police, and a renewed emphasis on community policing strategies. Diversifying police forces so that they are more reflective of the communities they patrol and improving the training of officers to reduce the likelihood of violent confrontations are essential. This cannot be accomplished overnight, however, and generations of injustice have left deep scars.

So the third leg of any law enforcement reform agenda must be enhanced oversight by the Department of Justice, which has a long record of working with state and local police agencies to modernize and improve practices and behavior.

Justice Department intervention, as in the recent release of a report detailing excessive use of force by Cleveland police, can be instrumental in overcoming opposition to reform, and I know that Attorney General Holder’s successor will make this a priority.

We ask a lot from our police who have a difficult and often dangerous job, and we grant them enormous power, including the right to take a life under certain circumstances. It is not only proper that we insist this power is used impartially and as a last resort, it is fundamental to a just society.

In a 1951 speech to the New York Legal Aid Society, the great jurist Learned Hand challenged his audience, “It is the daily; it is the small; it is the cumulative injuries of little people that we are here to protect. . . . If we are able to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice.”

Sixty-three years later, on a street corner in the same city, Eric Garner hauntingly invoked Hand when he pleaded in vain: “Every time you see me, you want to mess with me. I’m

tired of it. It stops today. . . . I'm minding my business, officer. I'm minding my business. Please just leave me alone."

Mr. Speaker, it must stop today.

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House passed legislation to extend a number of individual and business tax provisions that expired on December 31, 2013. This legislation would reinstate the provisions retroactively and extend them through the end of 2014.

As a former small business owner, I recognize the tremendous cost that Federal policy can have on American businesses and believe the temporary extension of many of these tax breaks is necessary. However, I have long been a consistent and vocal supporter of simplifying the Tax Code and decreasing the tax burden of hardworking Americans.

If you listen to the political discussion in our country very long, you will inevitably hear some liberal lawmakers repeat one of their favorite lines: all of our country's budget problems would be solved if only we increased taxes. But our old friend across the pond, Mr. Churchill, once said: "A nation trying to tax itself into prosperity is like a man standing in a bucket trying to lift himself up by the handle." History has shown the truth of this statement: increasing taxes increases government spending and crowds out private sector investment, diminishing our prosperity.

It is ridiculous that Americans labor, on average, 111 days just to make enough to pay the government before starting to keep what they earn for the year.

At 70,000 pages long, the U.S. Tax Code is also far too complicated. It is almost five times wordier than the Bible, minus the grace and mercy. It is so complex and intimidating that the majority of Americans pay good money just to have someone else tell them how much the government is going to take from them.

It is also important that we reduce the number of loopholes in the Tax Code, which is why I have voted for the budget proposals introduced by Chairman RYAN since Republicans regained the majority in the House of Representatives in 2011. These Path to Prosperity budgets provide for comprehensive tax reform, close loopholes, and make our country more economically competitive.

The simple truth is that the United States has the highest corporate tax rates in the developed world. Continuing to make it more expensive to do business in the U.S. than elsewhere in the world will not encourage compa-

nies to operate and keep jobs in this country.

As we move forward with comprehensive tax reform in the 114th Congress, it is vital that we enact policies that strengthen and stabilize our economy as well as give individuals and businesses long-term certainty.

RECOGNIZING MINNIE MINOSO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was a vote by the Major League Baseball committee on who should be inducted into the Hall of Fame from a particular area. One of the players who was up for consideration—and, unfortunately, wasn't chosen—was Minnie Minoso, and it reminded me of the debt I owe Minnie Minoso.

Minnie Minoso was the first African Latin baseball player. And in 1954, in Memphis, Tennessee—a town I was born in and a town in the Southern United States that was especially a part of the Jim Crow era—I went to a baseball game, an exhibition baseball game. And I was on crutches because I had polio. I had a Chicago White Sox cap on and a Chicago White Sox T-shirt.

A player came to give me a baseball from the opposing team, the St. Louis Cardinals. I thanked him. And I went and told my father. And we came down to thank him. And he said: "Don't thank me. Thank that player over there." He was the blackest player on the field, number nine, Minnie Minoso. He didn't feel comfortable in 1955 to give me a baseball. Yet he was the player with the most compassionate heart and humility on the field because that was the segregated South.

Minnie Minoso became my hero, and I followed his career and became friends with him. We exchanged gifts. He came to Memphis, and I went to Chicago.

In 1960 when he came to Memphis, he was staying at the Lorraine Motel—the segregated African American hotel in Memphis—because African Cuban Latin players, African Americans weren't allowed at the Peabody Hotel, where the other players were.

I couldn't believe that my baseball hero, a great all-star, was staying at the Lorraine, which happens to be where Dr. King was murdered. But that is where he had to stay.

I learned about segregation from living in Memphis and from being befriended by Minnie Minoso. The insanity of segregation and the separation of people by race, that period of Jim Crow and previous slavery—which existed in this country for 250 years of slavery and 100-and-some-odd years of Jim Crow—still pervades this country.

There are lingering consequences which must be dealt with. The gen-

tleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) well addressed them. Much must be done in law enforcement and criminal justice but also in education and opportunities for jobs, which people don't have today in the South and many other places, in inner cities.

So as I think about Minnie Minoso, and I think about segregation and the effect that it has had on America—America's original sin was slavery. We haven't overcome it.

Some write about it and get recognition. People read their books. Ta-Nehisi Coates wrote in the Atlantic. Edward Baptist has written a book about the benefits that America got from the slave trade and how many people made money from it shipping cotton, making clothes, insuring the slave trade. It was the great economic benefit of this country and made this country great, all on slavery. Edward Baptist writes it well.

Michelle Alexander writes in "The New Jim Crow" about the incarceration rate of African Americans, that it is wrongfully high. If you are African American, the likelihood that you are going to be arrested and incarcerated is so much greater than a Caucasian for living in the same society and doing the same things.

We must put an end to discrimination in all its forms and fashions. In the criminal justice system, sentencing reform needs to take place. In the criminal justice system, we need to see that law enforcement agencies and prosecutions of law enforcement officers are done transparently and fairly and justly.

We need to be sure that Americans continue to have faith that this is the land of the free and the home of the brave, and that our Nation is one in which people get equal justice, as was planned by our Founding Fathers but was never quite implemented.

VETERANS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss mental health services for veterans.

As you know, physical injuries are not the only ones endured in war. Many soldiers return home with wounds that we cannot see. For some veterans, the psychological trauma endured on the battlefield affects them and their families long after the shots stop firing.

□ 1030

Of the 2 million Americans who served in combat in Iraq or Afghanistan, as many as 300,000 meet criteria for posttraumatic stress disorder. Another 300,000 may have suffered a traumatic brain injury.

Mr. Speaker, for these servicemen and servicewomen, access to quality

mental health care is crucial, so imagine being one of these soldiers who recently returned home with the lasting psychological effects that so commonly result from war.

Now, imagine that in seeking treatment from the VA, you are forced to go 67 days without an appointment. Sixty-seven days is the new average wait time for new mental health patients at the central Alabama VA; and, Mr. Speaker, that number has gotten worse. In May, the wait time for new mental health patients was 57 days.

Mr. Speaker, administrators claim that scheduling and labeling errors have contributed to making the problem appear worse on paper than it actually is, but if after all of this time we haven't figured out how to properly schedule patients at the VA, we have worse problems than I thought. I don't expect it to magically improve overnight, but we shouldn't be moving in the wrong direction.

My primary focus is improving care for veterans in Alabama, and there are ways that we can do it. I am eager to see greater utilization of the Patient-Centered Community Care program, otherwise known as PC3, which connects veteran patients with local doctors or specialists.

It makes no sense to make a veteran wait 2 months for an appointment when we can refer them to an outside provider right away. I believe PC3 is a difference-maker, and I will continue to insist the VA leadership utilize it on the mental health side.

Mr. Speaker, a 2-month wait for mental health patients at the VA is obviously a disservice to our veterans, but it is also a major safety concern for veterans, their families, and the public. It might be uncomfortable to talk about, but the fact is we have a very high suicide rate among veterans.

Twenty-two veterans commit suicide every day. The tendency is even higher for young, male veterans, the very type that are returning home right now from war. The last thing that we should do is make it harder for veterans to get the treatment that they need.

That is why I rise today in support of H.R. 5059, the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention Act. This bipartisan bill aims to, number one, increase access to mental health care for veterans; number two, better meet the demand for mental health professionals; and number three, improve accountability of suicide prevention efforts through the Department of Defense and the VA.

The bill is named for Clay Hunt, a Marine veteran who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, earning the Purple Heart. He was diagnosed with PTSD and actually worked to raise awareness about problems facing people like him returning home from combat.

Like many veterans, Clay ran into roadblocks in his efforts to access care

for his PTSD. I encourage everyone to look up Clay Hunt's full story and read about the difficulty he faced getting needed care from the VA. For some veterans, it might sound all too familiar. On March 31, 2011, at the age of 28, Clay took his own life. Clay's story is sad, it is disheartening, and it is infuriating. But what Clay's story is not? It is not uncommon enough, 22 veterans a day.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go as a Nation in making sure veterans in need of mental health care aren't left behind, but let's start this week by passing the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention Act.

HONORING PALO ALTO COLLEGE IN SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Palo Alto College on the famed south side of San Antonio. Making a high impact through education, Palo Alto College has been meeting the needs of first generation college students in the San Antonio area and in the surrounding communities.

In doing so, Palo Alto College prepares students for a 4-year degree program or to enter the workforce with the skills and the training necessary to strengthen the future of San Antonio, Bexar County, and the 23rd District of Texas.

Palo Alto College was officially chartered by the State of Texas in 1983. Two years later, in 1985, it began offering its first classes, and since then, Palo Alto has quickly grown with the city of San Antonio.

In 1991, because of its deep roots in the Hispanic community and its dedication to helping Hispanic families overcome common barriers to higher education, Palo Alto College was named a Hispanic-Serving Institution by the Federal Government.

Today, Palo Alto College serves over 8,000 students and offers 95 relevant academic programs that move the country forward. Programs include criminal justice and aviation technology, among many others. It also works very closely with employers like Toyota to be sure that its students are receiving cutting-edge training. In ensuring the college can meet the demands of Texas' energy production, it also offers programs in oil and gas technology.

It is ably led by Dr. Mike Flores who, prior to assuming the presidency, had worked his way up through each of the three vice president positions at Palo Alto, and he has served the Palo Alto community for over 19 years.

Where others have provided lip service, Palo Alto College has found success. With a firm understanding of the

promise that our Nation has made to its veterans, Palo Alto College is committed to ensuring higher education remains accessible to veterans and Active Duty servicemen and service-women alike.

Palo Alto College has been listed among the top 20 percent of schools that support veteran education. It has an incredible network of people and resources available to serve veterans. I thank Palo Alto College for the work that they do with our veterans and the Active Duty military. It really is very impressive.

Palo Alto college also plays a fundamental role in the success of many individuals in our community, and its impact will be seen for many generations. Whether it's providing a second chance to nontraditional students through its GED programs or whether it is preparing students for the next level of education, Palo Alto College is there. It is there to meet the needs of the community and to help families achieve prosperity in the American Dream.

I congratulate Palo Alto College on its upcoming birthday—30 years of educational excellence—and I thank them for their continued commitment to ensure education remains accessible. Their mission to provide relevant and needed educational opportunities is admirable.

I look forward to seeing the many successes of those who pass through the doors of Palo Alto College.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MASTER GUNNERY SERGEANT JIMMY MILLS HARGROVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a special and high honor to be in this Chamber of the people's House to honor, to remember, and to pay respectful tribute to a most remarkable American, a true patriot, and one of the finest marines I have ever known, Master Gunnery Sergeant Jimmy Hargrove. He was a dear friend of mine and my family.

Jimmy was enlisted. He was an enlisted marine. This is my father, Ike; he is also an enlisted marine. He is doing great at the age of 91. He is an Iwo Jima veteran. There is something about enlisted marines, when we meet each other, we often ask, "Are you a Parris Island marine?" I was.

If you are a Parris Island marine, you usually give the other alternative, which is this. You say, "Or are you a Hollywood marine?" That is, did you go through boot camp in San Diego?

Well, that question applies to virtually all enlisted marines, but there are some whom that question really doesn't apply to because the answer is neither Parris Island nor San Diego,

but it is a different place they went to boot camp, Montford Point, North Carolina.

From 1942 to 1949, 20,000 young African American men, young Black men from across our country like Jimmy, didn't go to Parris Island or San Diego. He went to Montford Point, and that is where he endured the training that defines, shapes, and molds young men and women now into marines—fully segregated units.

These marines have gone on to fight in our Nation's battles. Jimmy, for example, fought in Korea and then Vietnam. Some have been grievously wounded. Many gave the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation.

It was fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, when in 2012 this body and the Senate unanimously passed legislation which President Obama then signed into law which gave to all Montford Point marines, all surviving Montford Point marines, the Congressional Gold Medal. It was a privilege to be at that ceremony. Jimmy took great pride in this, and he was there as well with his family and his wife, Cheryl.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that we are a better, stronger, and safer America because of our Montford Point marines, and we are a better, safer, and stronger America because of the life of Jimmy Hargrove.

This picture from 2013 at the Marine Corps ball is one of my favorite pictures. It shows the bond between two marines, really one generation to the next. I consider it an honor to pay tribute to him today.

Yesterday, Jimmy was laid to rest in Arlington. It is fitting that he is there in Arlington in eternal rest. What I really remember about Jimmy and think about is—it is not pictured in this picture, but his smile, Jimmy's smile. He was always so optimistic, and though he knew the bitter fruit of segregation, he, himself, was not bitter.

He was fully optimistic about our Nation, and he fought for our Nation even after his retirement. He engaged in shaping public policy and shaping the way our country is headed. I deeply respect him for this. He did not yield to apathy's seductive call, but he chose to continue to fight for his country.

We marines are a proud lot. It is even embedded in our Marines' Hymn. The last verse is:

If the Army and the Navy
Ever look on Heaven's scenes;
They will find the streets are guarded
By United States Marines.

I think of Jimmy as still being on duty and in Heaven as well. He was a man of deep faith, and so I would say to my friend, in respect for his life and his service to our country, "Master Gunnery Hargrove, mission accomplished. Job well done, marine. Semper Fidelis. Semper Fi."

May God grant eternal rest to this fine American, and may God also pro-

vide a special measure of comfort and grace to his wife, Cheryl, and their entire family.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 78. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building".

H.R. 1707. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 2112. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 787 State Route 17M in Monroe, New York, as the "National Clandestine Service of the Central Intelligence Agency NCS Officer Gregg David Wenzel Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 2223. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 Elm Avenue in Munising, Michigan, as the "Elizabeth L. Kinnunen Post Office Building".

H.R. 2678. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building".

H.R. 3534. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Michigan Avenue in Jackson, Michigan, as the "Officer James Bonneau Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4939. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the "Neil Havens Post Office".

H.R. 5030. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1281. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2142. An act to impose targeted sanctions on persons responsible for violations of human rights of antigovernment protesters in Venezuela, to strengthen civil society in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 100-702, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to the board of the Federal Judicial Center Foundation:

Peter Kraus of Texas, vice Richard D. Casey of South Dakota.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Robert Jeffress, First Baptist Church, Dallas, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we come into Your presence recognizing that You are the one true God, the Lord over all creation.

Father, today I want to thank You for the men and women in this House who so selflessly serve You and serve our Nation. I pray that You would bless their work, protect their families, reassure them that they are in this place of leadership because You have promoted them here.

Today, Father, we acknowledge that all of us are here on Earth not to do our will but to accomplish Your will. We affirm the words of the psalmist who said, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

We confess that no individual, no nation can experience Your favor apart from obeying Your commands, following Your principles. Father, I pray You would grant these Representatives the wisdom to lead our Nation and to do just that, so that we may experience Your blessings and not Your judgment.

We pray all of these things in the name of the One who was born in Bethlehem, who died on a cross, and rose again that we might have eternal life, Jesus Christ our Lord. It is in His name that we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING DR. ROBERT JEFFRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, our chaplain today is Dr. Robert Jeffress, senior pastor of the 11,000-member First Baptist Church in Dallas. His opinions are ubiquitous on radio and television, as is his radio program, "Pathway to Victory."

His weekly TV program is on over 1,200 stations and systems worldwide, while he has authored 21 books and is a FOX News contributor.

While some churches flee downtown areas, Dr. Jeffress led his church in a massive revitalization of downtown Dallas. He has a bachelor's from Baylor, master's from Dallas Theological Seminary, doctorates from Southwestern Theological Seminary and Dallas Baptist University.

He and his wife, Amy, have two daughters, Julia and Dorothy, who are here today, and son-in-law, Ryan Sadler.

Dr. Robert Jeffress is principled, brilliant, charitable, and his faith in God leaves no room for fear of man. He and my wife, Kathy, grew up together in church, and he is a dear, treasured friend of mine.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NORTH STATE AVIATION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize North State Aviation, an aircraft maintenance company based in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

In November I had the pleasure of attending the company's fourth anniversary event to celebrate the completion of work on their 300th United Airlines aircraft and 400th aircraft overall.

In just 4 short years, North State Aviation has experienced exponential job growth, going from zero to 365 full-time employees. More than 100 of those employees are military veterans.

However, the economic impact of North State Aviation goes beyond the company itself. While the company's ambitious growth plan has enabled hundreds of workers to find jobs in Winston-Salem, the local community and the region's aviation industry have benefited as well.

As a result of North State's success, Smith Reynolds Airport has been able

to afford the ongoing construction of Runway 4-22, and the airport's master plan includes an additional hangar, in part to give North State more expansion space.

North State Aviation is a company that recognized an opportunity and seized it through hard work and innovation. Its resulting success is well deserved.

SOUTH SUDAN

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern about the ongoing situation in South Sudan. Next Monday we will mark the 1-year anniversary of the outbreak of civil conflict in that young country, which gained its independence in 2011.

Since that conflict began, as many as 2 million people have been displaced, while 1.5 million people are without secure access to food. 50,000 civilians are estimated to have been killed as a result of the fighting between the rival factions.

Alarming, Mr. Speaker, both sides have been stockpiling weapons and are expected to launch fresh attacks once the rainy season ends.

The international community, with strong American leadership, must encourage a peaceful resolution before further bloodshed occurs.

I want to commend the United Nations Mission in South Sudan peacekeepers for their hard work bringing aid to those in need, and I thank Secretary Kerry for his efforts to achieve a political settlement.

I traveled to Juba in 2007. As a matter of fact, the former chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from Florida, was with me. I saw a nation full of promise and hope for the future on the cusp of its independence. That bright future of possibilities for the people of South Sudan ought not to be dimmed by violence, instability, and enmity.

As Americans, we must exert our diplomatic arsenal to bring an end to the fighting and restore that promise of a peaceful and hopeful future for South Sudan.

SANCTIONS IN IRAN

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, recently negotiations with Iran over the country's nuclear program were extended again for another 7 months. This extension, however, carried no additional or strengthened economic sanctions on Iran. Disturbingly, we have now heard that the administration has considered sanctions against Israel, our ally.

A nuclear Iran poses an incredible threat to the Middle East and to the United States. The security of our allies, including Israel, and the stability of the region is at stake. Stronger sanctions are needed regarding Iran—not our ally Israel—to increase pressure, advance negotiations, and achieve a favorable outcome for the U.S. and all of our allies. There is no room for error, and the administration must get a strong agreement in place.

H.R. 850, the Nuclear Iran Prevention Act of 2013, seeks to strengthen and update sanctions on Iran. This passed the House of Representatives. Despite broad bipartisan support, the Senate has done nothing on this bill. The Senate needs to take it up and increase pressure on Iran to reach an agreement. We cannot afford to wait.

FEMA AID FOR WESTERN NEW YORK

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, when a natural disaster strikes, the damage and cleanup costs often far exceed the local government's ability to respond and to rebuild.

Americans take comfort in the knowledge that the Federal Government will aid in the response by providing assistance to mitigate the often massive costs of natural disasters.

The recent record-breaking snowstorm in western New York reminded the Nation that Buffalonians are resilient and generous people. That was on display during the storm and its aftermath with so many instances of neighbors helping neighbors.

The storm also left my community with significant expenses in terms of the emergency response and structures that collapsed under the weight of the snow. That is why I have joined the western New York delegation to urge FEMA to act quickly to certify the disaster and disburse assistance.

Western New Yorkers are the first to volunteer to aid other communities in need. Now we must ensure a helping hand is there for them when they are in need.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House moved forward historic legislation that represents widespread Montana priorities. From protecting some of our State's greatest treasures, as well as access to our public lands, to developing Montana's energy resources and creating better certainty for our farmers and ranchers, this bill reflects

the concerns of Montanans from across our entire State. But just as importantly, it represents the way we do things in Montana and the kind of change we need to see in Washington.

In Montana, we know the importance of rolling up our sleeves and working together to get something done. By coming together, the Montana delegation and Montanans from all corners of our State were able to break gridlock in Washington and bring this most important legislation forward.

I am proud that the House acted last week and passed this bill with strong bipartisan support. I call on the Senate to quickly do the same.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF STEVE SAULS

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend Steve Sauls, Florida International University's vice president for governmental relations, who is retiring after more than 30 years of commitment to the community and the State of Florida.

During his tenure at FIU, Steve helped secure funding for the International Hurricane Center in the wake of Hurricane Andrew, fought to receive authorization for the College of Law at FIU, and played a key role in creating the College of Medicine. Through these efforts and countless others, Steve has helped develop FIU into one of the top public universities in the country. I have been honored to represent FIU in my district and work with Steve to help support this vibrant educational community.

After building a long track record of impressive accomplishments, Steve will be sorely missed. I urge you to join me in recognizing his contributions to south Florida and our country.

HONORING MAJOR KEVIN TANN, UNITED STATES ARMY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Army congressional liaison to the U.S. House of Representatives Major Kevin Tann. Major Tann will be leaving his post at the end of this month but will continue to serve our great Nation working in cyber intelligence at the U.S. Army Cyber Command in Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

Originally a native of North Carolina, Kevin chose to attend college at my alma mater, Florida International University, where he earned a degree in criminal justice and a master of arts in public administration.

Commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Army's Aviation Branch, Kevin participated in multiple combat tours in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. He has earned the Army Aviation and Parachutist Badges, the Bronze Star Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal, and many others.

It is my distinct pleasure to join with Kevin's family, friends, peers, his wife, Joy Tann, and his son, Kevin Joseph Tann, as they honor the many accomplishments of his outstanding career.

THE HOUR OF CODE

(Mr. HONDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the issue of gender imbalance in the computing industry.

Today, women make up over half of the American workforce but only a quarter of the professional computing occupations. We see a similar imbalance in the classrooms. Girls in high school take over half of all the advanced placement exams but only a fifth of computer science exams.

This imbalance deprives the computing industry of a great resource of human capital, and it limits its creativity. To address this imbalance, we need to encourage our female students to pursue computer science as early as possible.

In that spirit, I would like to recognize Computer Science Education Week and the Hour of Code. These programs have reached tens of millions of students worldwide. We need programs like these to ensure that the next generation of computer professionals is diverse so we have all the best talent.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MAJOR D. "JIM" OLMES, JR., OF OIL CITY, PENNSYLVANIA

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the life of Major D. "Jim" Olmes, Jr., of Oil City, Venango County, Pennsylvania. A World War II veteran, a beloved family member, and community leader, Mr. Olmes passed away last week at the age of 93.

Major Olmes was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for valor as a forward air observer during the Battle of Iwo Jima and the Air Medal and also served as an officer in the United States Marine Corps.

Following his service, Olmes attended the University of Pittsburgh, where he earned his law degree before starting his own private practice. He

was also active in the community, serving on the Oil City school board and the former Northwest Pennsylvania Bank and Trust Company board.

Major Olmes was preceded in death by his wife, Virginia Lee Pence, following more than 60 years of marriage together. As reported in the Oil City Derrick, "His greatest joy was his family."

Mr. Speaker, let us remember the special life of Major D. "Jim" Olmes as we pray for his family during this time of mourning.

THE USE OF VIOLENCE IS ABHORRENT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we come to this season of joy, I am always committed to wishing all of my colleagues of this body, this government, and our people a happy holiday.

We are on the brink of the release of a report that talks about issues of torture which America has stood against. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to communicate that any report of past practices which we abhor does not indicate our lack of respect for the men and women of the CIA, nor does it give excuse to any international provocateur or terrorist to do violence to their own people.

This is a deliberative assessment of how we can go forward, how we can continue to protect this Nation, and as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, it is important to protect our Nation. But we should not yield to those who will use this recklessly and violently to do terror around the world.

Let me thank our marines who are on high alert. Let me also bring to the attention of my colleagues that tomorrow is Human Rights Day, and I hope that we will stand on this floor and promote the values of human rights.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I challenge and charge those who would use this in a violent way: you are wrong, you are wrong, and you are wrong.

RECOGNIZING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF NEBRASKA'S LONGEST-SERVING GOVERNOR, DAVE HEINEMAN

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the public service of Dave Heineman, Nebraska's longest-serving Governor. More important than his time in office is what he has accomplished.

He has kept our State prosperous by supporting agriculture, opening new trade opportunities, reforming economic development incentives, and improving education through greater

local control. He has also been an ally of taxpayers by keeping our budget balanced and also advocating for tax reform. Under his watch, Nebraska consistently ranks among the best States to live, work, do business, and raise a family.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful and grateful for Governor Heineman's leadership and service. I join all Nebraskans in wishing him and his wife, Sally Ganem, Godspeed as they embark on the next chapter of their lives.

CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 2014

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I represent a very rural district in northern California which has been greatly impacted by the drought. The town of Redding, for example, has had its water supplies cut to 50 percent this year. Farmers along the Tehama-Colusa Canal received no water at all from the Central Valley Project, leaving thousands of acres of productive farmland fallow.

After the third year of historic drought—the worst drought in 1,200 years, historic in California—it is imperative that we act immediately to prepare for another dry year.

H.R. 5781 by DAVID VALADAO takes immediate action to store more water and start on this remedy. This legislation is just 18 months in duration, giving us time to continue working with the Senate on a longer-term solution.

H.R. 5781 has two simple components: creating flexibility so we can store more water in preparation for the coming year; and preserving the most fundamental water right of all, the idea that those who live where water originates should have access to it.

We also protect northern California to ensure that those who live where our water originates do not have to have their water cut off while other areas of the State receive deliveries. Under this measure, northern California will be guaranteed access to the water that rains on their communities.

Mr. Speaker and Members, we have worked in good faith to negotiate a bipartisan bill to address California's drought. Nothing in this measure is controversial. It leaves the Endangered Species Act intact, it respects water rights, and it helps every region of California. Twenty million Californians will benefit in some fashion or another.

After several years of drought, it is imperative we get on the ball and prepare California for the coming year. We are prepared to continue negotiating, but there is no water to waste, and there is no time to waste. California needs us to act today by passing this measure while we continue to work through the process.

RENEWING OUR GREAT NATION

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, with each new day brings new opportunities for our Congress to work together and solve problems on behalf of the American people.

As the 113th Congress comes to a close, we do so leaving almost 400 bills that have passed the people's House that we sent to the Senate which create jobs, reduce government waste, and support investment in our Nation's future; yet these bills were never even considered or voted upon by the Senate, and they were never heard from again.

As evidenced by the recent elections, the American people reject this blatant partisanship, they reject the dysfunction of the Senate, and they reject the unilateral action by the executive branch to run roughshod over the voice of the people.

As the national debt soared past \$18 trillion last week, we were reminded that it is time to roll up our sleeves and get to work to reduce spending and balance our budgets, to promote energy independence, and to create jobs and grow our economy, to fix our broken immigration system, and to ensure the safety and security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we know there is much work to be done. As we turn to hopeful optimism for the next Congress, let's turn the page together, and let's renew our great Nation.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 9, 2014 at 9:22 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2520.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the

vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CHESAPEAKE BAY ACCOUNT- ABILITY AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1000) to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1000

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) CHESAPEAKE BAY STATE.—The term "Chesapeake Bay State" or "State" means any of—

(A) the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Delaware, and New York;

(B) the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania; and

(C) the District of Columbia.

(3) CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED.—The term "Chesapeake Bay watershed" means all tributaries, backwaters, and side channels, including watersheds, draining into the Chesapeake Bay.

(4) CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.—The term "Chesapeake Executive Council" has the meaning given the term by section 117(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1267(a)).

(5) CHIEF EXECUTIVE.—The term "chief executive" means, in the case of a State or Commonwealth, the Governor of the State or Commonwealth and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(7) FEDERAL RESTORATION ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Federal restoration activity" means a Federal program or project carried out under Federal authority in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act with the express intent to directly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that provide financial and technical assistance to promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(B) CATEGORIZATION.—Federal restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

(i) Physical restoration.

(ii) Planning.

(iii) Feasibility studies.

(iv) Scientific research.

(v) Monitoring.

(vi) Education.

(vii) Infrastructure development.

(8) STATE RESTORATION ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “State restoration activity” means any State program or project carried out under State authority that directly or indirectly protect, conserve, or restore living resources, habitat, water resources, or water quality in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including programs or projects that promote responsible land use, stewardship, and community engagement in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

(B) CATEGORIZATION.—State restoration activities may be categorized as follows:

- (i) Physical restoration.
- (ii) Planning.
- (iii) Feasibility studies.
- (iv) Scientific research.
- (v) Monitoring.
- (vi) Education.
- (vii) Infrastructure development.

SEC. 3. CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSCUT BUDGET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in consultation with the Chesapeake Executive Council, the chief executive of each Chesapeake Bay State, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission, shall submit to Congress a financial report containing—

(1) an interagency crosscut budget that displays, as applicable—

(A) the proposed funding for any Federal restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year, including any planned interagency or intra-agency transfer, for each of the Federal agencies that carry out restoration activities;

(B) to the extent that information is available, the estimated funding for any State restoration activity to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year;

(C) all expenditures for Federal restoration activities from the preceding 2 fiscal years, the current fiscal year, and the succeeding fiscal year;

(D) all expenditures, to the extent that information is available, for State restoration activities during the equivalent time period described in subparagraph (C); and

(E) a section that identifies and evaluates, based on need and appropriateness, specific opportunities to consolidate similar programs and activities within the budget and recommendations to Congress for legislative action to streamline, consolidate, or eliminate similar programs and activities within the budget;

(2) a detailed accounting of all funds received and obligated by each Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years, including the identification of funds that were transferred to a Chesapeake Bay State for restoration activities;

(3) to the extent that information is available, a detailed accounting from each State of all funds received and obligated from a Federal agency for restoration activities during the current and preceding fiscal years; and

(4) a description of each of the proposed Federal and State restoration activities to be carried out in the succeeding fiscal year (corresponding to those activities listed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1)), including—

- (A) the project description;
- (B) the current status of the project;

(C) the Federal or State statutory or regulatory authority, program, or responsible agency;

(D) the authorization level for appropriations;

(E) the project timeline, including benchmarks;

(F) references to project documents;

(G) descriptions of risks and uncertainties of project implementation;

(H) a list of coordinating entities;

(I) a description of the funding history for the project;

(J) cost sharing; and

(K) alignment with the existing Chesapeake Bay Agreement, Chesapeake Executive Council goals and priorities, and Annual Action Plan required by section 205 of Executive Order 13508 (33 U.S.C. 1267 note; relating to Chesapeake Bay protection and restoration).

(b) MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS.—In describing restoration activities in the report required under subsection (a), the Director shall only include—

(1) for the first 3 years that the report is required, descriptions of—

(A) Federal restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$300,000; and

(B) State restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$300,000; and

(2) for every year thereafter, descriptions of—

(A) Federal restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$100,000; and

(B) State restoration activities that have funding amounts greater than or equal to \$100,000.

(c) DEADLINE.—The Director shall submit to Congress the report required by subsection (a) not later than September 30 of each year.

(d) REPORT.—Copies of the report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations, Natural Resources, Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Environment and Public Works, and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an Independent Evaluator for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, who shall review and report on—

(1) restoration activities; and

(2) any related topics that are suggested by the Chesapeake Executive Council.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of submission of nominees by the Chesapeake Executive Council, the Independent Evaluator shall be appointed by the Administrator from among nominees submitted by the Chesapeake Executive Council with the consultation of the scientific community.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—The Chesapeake Executive Council may nominate for consideration as Independent Evaluator a science-based institution of higher education.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall only select as Independent Evaluator a nominee that the Administrator determines demonstrates excellence in marine science, policy evaluation, or other studies relating to complex environmental restoration activities.

(c) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of appointment and once every 2 years thereafter, the Independent Evaluator shall submit to Congress a report describing the findings and recommendations of reviews conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to commend Congressman WITTMAN, the author of the House companion bill, H.R. 739, which has already passed the House earlier in this Congress. I would like to thank him for his work for this government efficiency bill for the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. WITTMAN is a true champion for the Chesapeake Bay, and this bill is another example of his effective leadership for the bay and his Virginia constituents.

Mr. Speaker, there are two parts to this bill, and I will let Mr. WITTMAN explain that, but I would like to comment also that while section 3(d) of the bill does not require that a copy of the financial report be submitted to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, it is our intent that the director should also transmit a copy to that committee.

Finally, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for his assistance in scheduling this bill for floor consideration. I include in the RECORD the exchange of letters on S. 1000 between our two committees.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, December 5, 2014.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning S. 1000, the Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014. S. 1000 contains provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring S. 1000 before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a referral of the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar

legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and would request that you insert our exchange of letters on this matter into the committee report on S. 1000 and the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, December 8, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding S. 1000, the Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014.

I appreciate your willingness to forego a referral of this bill, and agree that by not exercising this authority for S. 1000, your committee is not prejudiced in any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the bill or similar legislation that falls within the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's Rule X jurisdiction.

As the Committee on Natural Resources won't be filing a report on S. 1000, I will instead be pleased to include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Chesapeake Bay is America's largest estuary, and restoration of the estuary will be an incredible conservation challenge. The Federal Government, States, localities, and conservation groups have spent billions of dollars to improve water quality, habitat, fisheries, recreational opportunities, and tributaries since the first Chesapeake Bay agreement was signed back in 1983; yet the water quality has continued to deteriorate.

The efforts have yielded some impressive successes, but by many metrics, the bay is still in poor health. This is due in large part to the fact that since bay cleanup began in earnest in the eighties, the population of the watershed has increased dramatically by more than one-third.

There is more wetland loss, more polluted runoff, and more nutrients in the wastewater and other sources entering the bay. In a sense, the bay is being loved to death by those who live near it.

President Obama's 2009 executive order on Chesapeake Bay protection and restoration has refocused Federal efforts, and that is a good thing; however, taxpayers and bay advocates deserve to know more about how and how much money is being spent.

S. 1000 would require the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a

crosscut budget of Federal agency and State expenditures on bay restoration. This exercise will help identify areas where Bay partners can better coordinate or eliminate redundancy.

Mr. Speaker, this is commonsense legislation that will help improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Chesapeake Bay cleanup efforts. I would certainly congratulate the representative from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) for championing this cause and shepherding his version of this legislation through the House.

I would note that today I did hear on the radio that the Governor-elect of Maryland is proposing to further delay or undo some additional restrictions on the applications of chicken manure and other phosphate nitrogen-rich fertilizers that are contributing to the dramatic deterioration of the bay.

I would say this new Governor is being very shortsighted in terms of the benefits of the bay in total versus the small cost that would be imposed upon farmers to get these needed restrictions in place, and I would hope that he reconsiders and hears a lot about this from his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I support passage of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN). He is the gentleman who sponsored the House version of this legislation.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend and thank Chairman HASTINGS for all of his efforts and his support in bringing this legislation to the floor. We would not be where we are today without his leadership, and it has been a true pleasure and honor to serve with him during his time as chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. Chairman, you have been a tireless champion for preserving our Nation's bountiful natural resources. We thank you so much for the legacy that you have left in leadership, but also for the improvements that you have made in this Nation's natural resources, and I wish you all the best.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1000 is the Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014. I am the author of the House companion legislation, H.R. 739, which has already passed the House earlier this Congress and in previous sessions of Congress.

The Chesapeake Bay is the economic and cultural backbone of our region, and it is one of our Nation's most prized natural resources. Many activities are currently underway to clean up the bay, but without a coordinated effort, it is impossible to ascertain the effectiveness of these programs or to accurately gauge their success.

The restoration effort includes multiple Federal agencies and also in-

cludes six States and the District of Columbia, as well as more than 1,000 localities and multiple nongovernmental operations.

While the drive and determination to restore the bay is shared by all of these entities, the effort can be muddled due to the complexity of various participants. As we have seen, we have taken in some instances steps forward, but in some instances, those steps have not been forthcoming with other efforts. We need to make sure that every effort is indeed making progress on restoring the bay.

□ 1230

At the same time as we look at those efforts, it is difficult to pinpoint exactly where and how much money is being spent across this wide scope of bay restoration activities. To remedy this, we must ensure that Federal, State, and local efforts are not working at cross-purposes and that the restoration effort, as a whole, is coordinated and efficient. Today, when we are in a resource-challenged environment, we must get the most out of the dollars we spend to restore the bay.

This simple legislation would require a crosscut budget to ensure Federal dollars currently spent on bay restoration activities produce results and ensure that we are coordinating how restoration dollars are being spent. That coordination at the local, State, and Federal level is critical to make sure that we demonstrate results and that we continue those efforts that have proven to be successful. It is also critical to make sure that we are not duplicating efforts or unnecessarily spending money in areas that are not producing results.

Second, the bill would require the appointment of an independent evaluator to review restoration activities in the watershed. The Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act is a smart, commonsense piece of legislation that will lead to better spending decisions and better government, which will ensure that more resources are available to help restore the Nation's largest estuary, the Chesapeake Bay.

This has been a truly cooperative effort, and I am very grateful for the leadership of Senator MARK WARNER and Senator TIM KAINE as champions of Chesapeake Bay restoration. I would also like to thank my fellow Virginia Representatives FRANK WOLF, JIM MORAN, BOBBY SCOTT, GERRY CONNOLLY, and SCOTT RIGELL—as well as CHRIS VAN HOLLEN of Maryland—and Congressman RANDY FORBES for their consistent support in getting this bill through the House.

I first introduced this bill in 2008, and it has been a difficult road to get to where we are now, but the Chesapeake Bay, too, has had a difficult road. With the House passage today, Mr. Speaker,

we will be one step closer to the next chapter of the Chesapeake Bay's long history of efforts to restore her to her previous bounty.

Today, we see that the economic foundation of our region remains vested in the Chesapeake Bay, and it continues to be a national treasure. We hope that with today's efforts it will continue to be enjoyed for generations and generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Chesapeake Bay and this commonsense bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this very hard bill that went through arduous examination from all aspects, and I commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) for his work on it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1000.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5699) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5699

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act".

SEC. 2. JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE LAND ACQUISITION.

(a) *ACQUISITION.*—The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation the approximately 44 acres of land, and interests in such land, that are identified on the map entitled "John Muir National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Expansion", numbered 426/127150, and dated November, 2014.

(b) *BOUNDARY.*—Upon the acquisition of the land authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall adjust the boundaries of the John Muir Historic Site in Martinez, California, to include the land identified on the map referred to in subsection (a).

(c) *ADMINISTRATION.*—The land and interests in land acquired under subsection (a) shall be administered as part of the John Muir National Historic Site established by the Act of August 31, 1964 (Public Law 88-547; 78 Stat. 753; 16 U.S.C. 461 note).

(d) *DATE CERTAIN.*—The authority provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply only if the lands identified on the map entitled "John Muir National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Expansion" are held in title by the Muir Heritage Land Trust by May 31, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the John Muir Historic Site was established in 1964 and currently consists of 345 acres in Martinez, California. H.R. 5699 allows the National Park Service to accept the donation of 44 acres of property adjacent to the John Muir National Historic Site. This donation will enhance the recreational value of the existing park by creating new opportunities for visitors. It is a good bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. MILLER on this legislation. H.R. 5699 will authorize the National Park Service to expand the boundary of the John Muir National Historic Site and acquire, by donation, 44 acres of land from the Muir Heritage Land Trust. It will expand the site and help carry on Muir's legacy of conservation and environmental stewardship.

John Muir is an important historic figure to me and to millions of other Americans in terms of his advocacy for the environment. Obviously, we owe him a great debt of gratitude for many, many of the actions of his legacy—Yosemite and Sequoia National Parks, and he also founded the Sierra Club back in the early part of the last century. This bill will contribute to his legacy and help protect and conserve the place where he found solace and inspiration in his later years.

It was interesting to me. I read an article that I would describe as sort of ascribing 21st century political correctness on the part of a few historians—one from UCLA, one from Stanford,

and one person from the Center for Biological Diversity—essentially criticizing and denying the legacy of John Muir and using a 21st century politically correct backwards telescope to look at it. It is just extraordinary to me that there are people like that who exist. Sure, he didn't live up to 21st century political correctness, and he certainly couldn't have predicted the phenomenal growth of the Western United States and the need for amenities that relate to the environment in major urban areas, but what he saved is an extraordinary gift enjoyed by millions of Americans and people from around the entire world every year. I just have to say to those people that they are a bit misguided.

With that, I want to congratulate my friend and colleague Representative GEORGE MILLER on this. Obviously, this is coming at the end of an extraordinary career of service to America and protecting our environment for future generations. I think it is really, really appropriate that Mr. MILLER is moving this bill to help perpetuate the legacy of someone else who, at a much earlier time, also contributed phenomenally to our public resources and assets.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their help in bringing this bill to the floor. It has been subject to negotiations that didn't end until just a couple of weeks ago, and fortunately, we have this time for Congress to consider it. It is a very simple bill that will greatly benefit our national park system by expanding the John Muir National Historic Site in my congressional district in Martinez at no cost to the Federal Government.

The Muir Historic Site is a terrific resource for people living in and visiting the bay area. Thousands and thousands and thousands of people come to the historic site every year. Schoolchildren visit it on a regular basis, and certainly visitors from Scotland come to the site to learn about this rather remarkable native of Scotland who stirred up so much activity in the United States.

As Ranking Member DEFAZIO pointed out, he was absolutely key to the founding and existence of Yosemite National Park and Sequoia National Park. In fact, he left his home site that is part of this park and walked to the Sierras to explore the Sierras and to live in them and to write about them. Some of his most famous books were written on those journeys.

This land, what we know locally as the Plummer Ranch, is contiguous to the John Muir National Historic Site. It was once part of a ranch owned by John Swett. John Swett was a very

close friend of John Muir. There are many historic pictures of them together. John Swett was, in fact, the father of the California public school system. They spent a great deal of time in this area, both farming, farming fruit and grapes and other agricultural products, and were very close friends. So this donation by the Muir Heritage Land Trust to the Federal Government, if we accept it, will bring these two pillars of California's history together, linking the physical connectedness of their ranches. It will connect this area to Mount Wanda, which was named after John Muir's daughter. He used to have orchards at the top and side of Mount Wanda.

So this is really a win-win for the historic community, and it is a win-win for this historic site which is visited by so many people. It is a win for the taxpayers since the money was raised locally to purchase this land from the original owner and to provide it in donation to the National Park Service. With the passage of this bill, that transaction will be completed. It will expand this park. The Nation will have the benefit of this additional historic asset to the site for people to visit and to understand.

Again, I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS for making time for this legislation in his committee's jurisdiction and deliberations, and my good friend PETER DEFAZIO for allowing me to present this on the floor. Thank you so much to both of you.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "aye" on this matter.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation. I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5699, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CHIEF STANDING BEAR NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL FEASIBILITY STUDY

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5086) to amend the National Trails System Act to di-

rect the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5086

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHIEF STANDING BEAR NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL FEASIBILITY STUDY.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"() CHIEF STANDING BEAR NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Standing Bear Trail, extending approximately 550 miles from Niobrara, Nebraska, to Ponca City, Oklahoma, which follows the route taken by Chief Standing Bear and the Ponca people during Federal Indian removal, and approximately 550 miles from Ponca City, Oklahoma, through Omaha, Nebraska, to Niobrara, Nebraska, which follows the return route taken by Chief Standing Bear and the Ponca people, as generally depicted on the map entitled 'Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail Feasibility Study', numbered 903/125,630, and dated November 2014.

"(B) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior.

"(C) COMPONENTS.—The feasibility study conducted pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall include a determination on whether the Chief Standing Bear Trail meets the criteria in subsection (b) of or for designation as a national historic trail."

(b) TIMELINE.—The feasibility study authorized by the amendment in subsection (a) shall be completed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5086, authored by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail.

The proposed trail would extend approximately 550 miles between Nebraska and Oklahoma, following the

route taken by Chief Standing Bear and the Ponca people during the Federal Indian removal. The trail would also commemorate the chief's return to Nebraska and subsequent trial in 1879 when he became the first Native American to be recognized as a person in a Federal court decision. It is a good piece of legislation. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5086 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail in Oklahoma, Nebraska, and Kansas. The trail extends 550 miles following the same route taken by Chief Standing Bear and the Ponca people during Federal Indian removal in 1877 and their subsequent return to Nebraska.

Chief Standing Bear played an important role in American history. He was the first Native American recognized by the United States Government as a person under law, following his arrest and ensuing trial for leaving his reservation in Oklahoma without permission.

Chief Standing Bear was honoring his son's dying wish to be buried in the land of his birth and traveled with his son's remains, along with 20 other members of his tribe, through harsh conditions from Oklahoma back to their ancestral lands in Nebraska.

□ 1245

Unfortunately, at that time, leaving the reservation was a violation of law.

At the very least, 135 years later, it is only right that we look into the feasibility of including this trail as part of the National Historic Trails system, to reflect on a not-so-proud period of American history in our country when Native Americans were treated as second-class citizens and honor the courage of Chief Standing Bear in living up to the promise he had made to his son.

I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for advancing this legislation, and Representative FORTENBERRY for his leadership on this bill.

I support passage, and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), the author of this legislation.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources for his leadership on this issue and for his many, many years of devoted service to this body. We will miss you. All the best in the future. Thank you so much for your service.

Let me also thank the ranking member, Mr. DeFAZIO, for his support on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study for the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail.

Why is this important? Because, as has already been mentioned, Chief Standing Bear holds a special place in Native American, as well as United States history. Establishing a trail in his name would be an outstanding way to recognize his deep contribution to the well-being of our country.

I would like to provide some additional background on this extraordinary individual who, again, prevailed in one of the most important court cases for Native Americans in our country's history.

Chief Standing Bear was a Ponca chief. In the 1800s, the Ponca tribe made its home in the Niobrara River Valley in the area of northeast Nebraska. In 1877, the United States Government pressured the Poncas from their homeland, compelling them to move to Indian territory in Oklahoma.

Not wanting to subject his people to a confrontation with the government, Standing Bear obliged and led them from their homes to their new reservation in Oklahoma. That journey was particularly harsh and the new land was inhospitable. Nearly a third of the tribe died along the way from starvation, malaria, and other illness, including Standing Bear's own daughter, Prairie Flower, and later, his son named Bear Shield.

Standing Bear had promised Bear Shield that he would bury him back home, back home in their native land in the Niobrara River Valley of northeast Nebraska. Embarking on that trip in the winter of 1878, Standing Bear led a group of Poncas. When they reached the Omaha reservation, the United States Army stopped Standing Bear and arrested him for leaving Oklahoma without permission. He was then taken to Fort Omaha and held there to stand trial.

In the meantime, Standing Bear's plight actually attracted national attention; first, in the predecessor to the current Omaha World Herald, the Omaha Daily Herald, which is our local newspaper back home, and through that, the story became well publicized.

At the conclusion of his 2-day trial, Standing Bear himself was allowed to speak. In doing so, he raised his hand, Mr. Speaker, and he had this to say:

That hand is not the color of yours, but if I pierce it, I shall feel pain. If you pierce your hand, you will feel pain. The blood that will flow from mine will be the same color as yours. I am a man. God made us both.

With those profound words, Mr. Speaker, on that late spring day in 1879, I believe that Chief Standing Bear expressed the most profound of American sentiments: the belief in the in-

herent dignity and, therefore, rights of all persons, no matter their ethnicity, no matter their color. To the credit of Judge Elmer Dundy, he ruled then that Native Americans were full persons within the meaning of the law for the first time in that trial.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the story of the great Ponca chief is a story of strength and grace and dignity in the protection of the most basic of human rights. I also believe it is a story that needs to be told again and again, understood, and cherished by all Americans of coming generations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the establishment of the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail would honor both his courage and legacy, the legacy of this brave individual, and his contribution to the civil liberties of our Nation.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the bill and, again, thank the gentlemen for their support as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5086, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1204. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2719. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2521. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security.

WESTERN OREGON INDIAN TRIBAL LANDS ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5701) to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the ben-

efit of federally recognized tribes in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5701

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Western Oregon Indian Tribal Lands Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—RESERVATION OF CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE GRAND RONDE COMMUNITY OF OREGON

Sec. 101. Additional lands for reservation.

TITLE II—OREGON COASTAL LANDS

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Definitions.

Sec. 203. Conveyance.

Sec. 204. Map and legal description.

Sec. 205. Administration.

Sec. 206. Land reclassification.

TITLE III—COW CREEK UMPQUA LAND CONVEYANCE

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Conveyance.

Sec. 304. Map and legal description.

Sec. 305. Administration.

Sec. 306. Land reclassification.

TITLE IV—SILETZ TRIBE INDIAN RESTORATION ACT

Sec. 401. Purpose; clarification.

Sec. 402. Treatment of certain property of the Siletz tribe of the State of Oregon.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT

Sec. 501. Amendments to Coquille Restoration Act.

TITLE I—RESERVATION OF CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE GRAND RONDE COMMUNITY OF OREGON

SEC. 101. ADDITIONAL LANDS FOR RESERVATION.

Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a reservation for the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, and for other purposes," approved September 9, 1988 (Public Law 100-425; 102 Stat. 1594; 102 Stat. 2939; 104 Stat. 207; 106 Stat. 3255; 108 Stat. 708; 108 Stat. 4566; 112 Stat. 1896), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "Subject to valid" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid"; and

(B) by adding after paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (A)) the following:

"(2) ADDITIONAL TRUST ACQUISITIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may accept title to any additional number of acres of real property located within the boundaries of the original 1857 reservation of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon established by Executive order dated June 30, 1857, comprised of land within the political boundaries of Polk and Yamhill Counties, Oregon, if that real property is conveyed or otherwise transferred to the United States by or on behalf of the Tribe.

"(B) TREATMENT OF TRUST LAND.—

"(i) Applications to take land into trust within the boundaries of the original 1857

reservation shall be treated by the Secretary as an on-reservation trust acquisition.

“(ii) Any real property taken into trust under this paragraph shall not be eligible, or used, for any Class II or Class III gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), except for real property within 2 miles of the

gaming facility in existence on the date of enactment of this paragraph that is located on State Highway 18 in the Grand Ronde community of Oregon.

“(C) RESERVATION.—All real property taken into trust within those boundaries at any time after September 9, 1988, shall be part of the reservation of the Tribe.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking “in subsection (a) are approximately 10,311.60” and inserting “in subsection (a)(1) are approximately 11,349.92”; and

(B) in the table—

(i) by striking the following:

“6	7	8	Tax lot 800	5.55”;
----	---	---	-------------	--------

and inserting the following:

“6	7	7, 8, 17, 18	Former tax lot 800, located within the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 7; SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 8; NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 17; and NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 18	5.55”;
----	---	--------------	---	--------

(ii) in the acres column of the last item added by section 2(a)(1) of Public Law 103-445

(108 Stat. 4566), by striking “240” and inserting “241.06”; and

(iii) by striking all text after

“6	7	18	E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	43.42”;
----	---	----	----------------------------------	---------

and inserting the following:

“6	8	1	W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	20.6
6	8	1	N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	19.99
6	8	1	SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	9.99
6	8	1	NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	10.46
6	8	1	NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	12.99
6	7	6	SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	37.39
6	7	5	SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	24.87
6	7	5, 8	SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 5; and NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 8	109.9
6	8	1	NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	31.32
6	8	1	NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	8.89
6	8	1	SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	78.4
6	7	8, 17	SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 8; and NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 17	14.33
6	7	17	NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	6.68
6	8	12	SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	8.19
6	8	1	SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	2.0
6	8	1	SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	5.05
6	8	12	SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$	54.64
6	7	17, 18	SW $\frac{1}{4}$, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 17; and SE $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 18	136.83
6	8	1	SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	20.08
6	7	5	NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	97.38
4	7	31	SE $\frac{1}{4}$	159.60
6	7	17	NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	3.14
6	8	12	NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	1.10
6	7	8	SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	0.92
6	8	12	NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	1.99
6	7	7	NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 7; and	
6	8	12	S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 12	86.48
6	8	12	NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	1.56
6	7	6	W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 6; and	
6	8	1	E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 1	35.82
6	7	5	E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$	19.88
6	8	12	NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$	0.29
6	8	1	SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	2.5
6	7	8	NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	7.16
6	8	1	SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$	5.5
6	8	1	SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$	1.34
			Total	11,349.92”.

TITLE II—OREGON COASTAL LANDS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Oregon Coastal Lands Act”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CONFEDERATED TRIBES.—The term “Confederated Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

(2) OREGON COASTAL LAND.—The term “Oregon Coastal land” means the approximately 14,408 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance” and dated March 27, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 203. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Oregon Coastal land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 204. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Oregon Coastal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 205. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any

right or claim of the Confederated Tribes existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 203.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 203 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) LAWS APPLICABLE TO COMMERCIAL FORESTRY ACTIVITY.—Any commercial forestry activity that is carried out on the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 203 shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

(d) AGREEMENTS.—The Confederated Tribes shall consult with the Secretary and other parties as necessary to develop agreements to provide for access to the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 203 that provide for—

(1) honoring existing reciprocal right-of-way agreements;

(2) administrative access by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(3) management of the Oregon Coastal land that are acquired or developed under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 et seq.), consistent with section 8(f)(3) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(f)(3)).

(e) LAND USE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), once the Oregon Coastal land is taken into trust under section 203, the land shall not be subject to the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

SEC. 206. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes under section 203.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located in the vicinity of the Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(c) MAPS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register one or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

TITLE III—COW CREEK UMPQUA LAND CONVEYANCE

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Cow Creek Umpqua Land Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COUNCIL CREEK LAND.—The term “Council Creek land” means the approximately 17,519 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance” and dated June 27, 2013.

(2) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 303. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Council Creek land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 304. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Council Creek land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 305. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Council Creek land.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 303 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) FOREST MANAGEMENT.—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Council Creek land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

SEC. 306. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under section 303.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—Not later than 18 months after the

date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located in the vicinity of the Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(c) MAPS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register one or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

TITLE IV—SILETZ TRIBE INDIAN RESTORATION ACT

SEC. 401. PURPOSE; CLARIFICATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to facilitate fee-to-trust applications for the Siletz Tribe within the geographic area specified in the amendment made by this title.

(b) CLARIFICATION.—Except as specifically provided otherwise by this title or the amendment made by this title, nothing in this title or the amendment made by this title, shall prioritize for any purpose the claims of any federally recognized Indian tribe over the claims of any other federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 402. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE SILETZ TRIBE OF THE STATE OF OREGON.

Section 7 of the Siletz Tribe Indian Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 711e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) TITLE.—The Secretary may accept title to any additional number of acres of real property located within the boundaries of the original 1855 Siletz Coast Reservation established by Executive order dated November 9, 1855, comprised of land within the political boundaries of Benton, Douglas, Lane, Lincoln, Tillamook, and Yamhill Counties in the State of Oregon, if that real property is conveyed or otherwise transferred to the United States by or on behalf of the tribe.

“(B) TRUST.—Land to which title is accepted by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the tribe.

“(2) TREATMENT AS PART OF RESERVATION.—All real property that is taken into trust under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be considered and evaluated as an on-reservation acquisition under part 151.10 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

“(B) become part of the reservation of the tribe.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON GAMING.—Any real property taken into trust under paragraph (1) shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).”

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT

SEC. 501. AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT.

Section 5(d) of the Coquille Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 715c(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) MANAGEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, shall manage the Coquille Forest in accordance with the laws pertaining to the management of Indian trust land.

“(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(i) UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Unprocessed logs harvested from the Coquille Forest shall be subject to the same Federal statutory restrictions on export to foreign nations that apply to unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land.

“(ii) SALES OF TIMBER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all sales of timber from land subject to this subsection shall be advertised, offered, and awarded according to competitive bidding practices, with sales being awarded to the highest responsible bidder.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (9); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to acknowledge the gentlemen from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. WALDEN, for their hard work on this piece of legislation, which will benefit several Indian tribes in the State of Oregon.

H.R. 5701 is a compilation of several stand-alone bills, most of which have been reported out of the Natural Resources Committee and passed by the full House.

Title I of H.R. 5701 would ease the process for the Grand Ronde Tribe to apply for trust land within the original boundaries of its 1857 reservation, which encompassed 60,000-plus-acre acres in Polk and Yamhill Counties in Oregon.

Further, the bill deems property placed in trust for the tribe after 1988 to be part of the tribe's reservation.

Finally, specific tracts of land totaling 288 acres would be placed in trust for the tribe in its former reservation.

Mr. Speaker, title I is identical to H.R. 841, which previously passed the House.

Title II and title III are similar to provisions found in H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy

Communities Act, which passed the House in September of 2014.

Title IV would make it easier for the Siletz Indian Tribe to apply for trust land within the original boundaries of the 1855 Siletz Coast Reservation, which encompassed a large part of the coast of Oregon. Gaming on this land to be held in trust would be prohibited. This is identical to the Natural Resources Committee-reported version of H.R. 931.

Finally, title V would correct a situation with respect to the management of the Coquille Tribal Forest in Oregon. This forest has been regulated as part of the Northwest Forest Plan, which is inconsistent with the management of other tribally-managed forests in the United States. Under this title, the Coquille Tribe would be able to manage its forest under the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act. This will provide the tribe with the ability to better manage their timber resources.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation, as I mentioned, encompassing three other pieces of legislation that the House and/or the committee has already acted on.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last in the series of bills from the Resources Committee and, perhaps, the last time that I will be on the floor as ranking member and Chairman HASTINGS will be on the floor as chairman.

I just want to thank my colleague from Washington State for all of the work we have done together. We obviously don't always agree on issues, but I think the Resources Committee has reported out more bills and passed more bills in the House than any other committee in this Congress. We have been very active. We are hoping that the Senate will go along with a few that we have pending, and we will get some of those bills enacted into law.

In particular, I want to thank the chairman for his partnership on an issue absolutely critical to the Pacific Northwest, which is the management of the Columbia River system and the Bonneville Power Administration, in the phenomenal gift of that clean and inexpensive power to our region and to the Western U.S. generally.

We have some major issues looming, in particular, the negotiation or renegotiation or termination of the treaty with Canada regarding the Columbia River Treaty. A session that the chairman held in his district in Washington State on a cold day in February was, I think, very critical in helping move that discussion and debate in a productive direction for all the stakeholders and was particularly critical for a position of our region in this negotiation.

I am only hopeful that we will soon get the attention of the State Depart-

ment and whomever else they have seen fit to involve in this process and have a recommendation from the State Department regarding modification or termination of that treaty so we can enter into meaningful negotiations with the Canadians. The gentleman played a particularly key role in that, and I want to thank him for that and, obviously, a lot of other work on forestry and other issues.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Since you opened up commending DOC HASTINGS for his career in the Congress, I want to join you in that. We were both discussing yesterday that we started our careers battling over California water when he came to the Congress and when I came to the Congress, and on the last days of our legislative action we will, once again, be discussing California water. Those are the twists and the turns that this place takes with legislation.

But I want to thank him for his service and leadership of the Resources Committee. He knows how dear those issues are to me in many years of service on that committee. Thank you for your fairness in dealing with a lot of the issues. As Mr. DEFAZIO pointed out, it wasn't about whether we always agreed, but it was about whether or not you could work with one another with some respect and figure out where you could get together on particular issues.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, for too long, Federal policies have unfairly disadvantaged Indian tribes in western Oregon and, obviously, elsewhere around the country. After signing many treaties with the western Oregon tribes, the United States removed them from their original homelands throughout the western part of the State and put them on only two reservations, which were established at the time to house potentially people from more than 60 tribal governments.

Many of the tribes confederated on these reservations far from their ancestral homes. Other tribes refused to leave their ancestral homes and were basically forgotten by the United States, despite its promises that it had made in treaty agreements with them.

Later, in 1954, one of the darkest chapters was when all but one of the Oregon tribes west of the Cascade Mountains lost their Federal recognition in the Western Oregon Termination Act.

□ 1300

The termination era, as scholars call it, was terrible Federal Indian policy. It was so bad that it was only 30 years later that it was formally rebuked by Congress.

Starting in the seventies, Congress began the process of restoring the western Oregon tribes to Federal recognition and of cleaning up the mess that the United States Government made in western Oregon. In fact, I began my congressional career as an original sponsor of the Coquille Restoration Act, legislation to restore one of Oregon's terminated tribes. I partnered with then-Senator Mark Hatfield on that legislation, which was later enacted into law.

While six Oregon tribes are now federally recognized, it remains difficult for these tribes to function as the sovereign nations they are and to govern themselves as effectively as they could.

Shifts in Federal Indian policy have made it time-consuming and expensive for western Oregon tribes—and other tribes around the country—and the Department of the Interior to work together on land-into-trust issues. These policy shifts have also deprived two of the tribes of sufficient land bases, and it has created a legal anomaly with regard to the Coquille Indian Tribe's forest.

H.R. 5701, the Western Oregon Indian Tribal Lands Act, is a long overdue, no-cost, commonsense bill that will go a long way to helping resolve some of the problems the Federal Government and its policy shifts over more than a century have created for the western Oregon tribes.

This legislation clarifies on-reservation land-into-trust procedures for the Grand Ronde and Siletz tribes, so the tribes don't have to face outrageous delays in dealing with the Department of the Interior. The bill also makes good on decades-old promises to restore land bases for the Coos and Cow Creek tribes, and it puts the Coquille Indian Tribe's forest on an equal footing with those of other Indian tribes nationwide.

H.R. 5701 deals only with Oregon issues, Oregon tribes, and Oregon constituents. All of the provisions in this Oregon tribal bill have received some form of consideration by both the House and the Senate. This package also enjoys bipartisan, bicameral support, the rarest of rare things, I would say, in Washington, D.C., these days.

I strongly encourage my colleagues here in the House to join with me in passing this legislation swiftly, so we can get it over to the Senate and hopefully get the Senate to act before the hopefully soon-coming adjournment of the 113th Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I commended two of my colleagues from Oregon for their work on this, Mr. WALDEN and Mr. DEFAZIO. I failed to mention Mr. SCHRADER, who was the author of H.R. 931, which is title IV of this bill. I want to correct that oversight that I made.

I want to thank my two colleagues for their very kind words. This will, I think, be the last time that I have the opportunity to manage a bill on the floor. I will just say that both gentlemen made the observation that while we don't always agree on things, at least we can understand when somebody comes from a particular position, you can deal with that.

I want to take this time then to correct an assertion that my friend from Oregon made when I had my portrait unveiled. I say that because I think most of my colleagues know my position on wilderness areas is probably contrary to what their vision is.

I want to correct the record because Mr. DEFAZIO asserted that my position on wilderness areas was because, as a child, I was lost in the wilderness when we were camping. I thought that was very clever, but it is not the truth, and so while what he said is not on the record, I get the last word here and will say on the record that I was not lost in the wilderness and that is not how I derived my position on wilderness areas.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to yield back if the gentleman from Oregon is prepared to yield back, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You forgot I reserved, Doc, so I do get to respond.

I have to say we were looking for a logical reason for what I would say is your recalcitrance to further create wilderness so that areas may remain undisturbed for future generations. I thought that was potentially a plausible reason.

In fact, it was so plausible that the next day in the gym a Republican Member who was there that didn't know either me or you that well asked if that indeed was a true story. I played him along for just a brief period of time and said, "No." I appreciate that you have corrected the record.

In the NDAA bill, we also did do a wilderness package as it relates to your State and some other wilderness bills that I think were very bipartisan and reasonable. I appreciate the fact you supported that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I will just simply say it has been a pleasure for me to have worked with you in your position as ranking member, and I wish you the best as you move over to be the ranking member of T&I in the next Congress.

This is a good piece of legislation. As the gentleman from Oregon mentioned several times, tribal issues, particularly in Oregon, are somewhat contentious. I am somewhat familiar with that because I do go to the Oregon coast at least every other year.

I congratulate my colleagues from Oregon for this legislation, urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5701, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5781) to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. George Miller of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5781 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE IV—PRESERVING FISHING INDUSTRY JOBS AND THE REGIONAL ECONOMY AND PROTECTING EXISTING WATER RIGHTS PRIORITIES IN WESTERN STATES AND TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY

SEC. 401. PRESERVING FISHING INDUSTRY JOBS AND THE REGIONAL ECONOMY.

Nothing in this Act shall adversely impact the commercial or sport fishing industries of California, Oregon, or Washington or any population of west coast salmon.

SEC. 402. PROTECTING EXISTING WATER RIGHTS PRIORITIES IN WESTERN STATES.

Provisions in this Act changing the relative priority of water rights in California shall not create any legal precedent for any other State.

SEC. 403. PROTECTING TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY.

Nothing in this Act shall undermine Native American tribal sovereignty, or reduce the quantity or quality of the water available to affected Indian tribes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to this bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will proceed immediately to final passage as amended.

There is no question that the underlying bill is controversial, but whenever you stand on the goals of this bill, it is clear that it was not drafted properly. That is no surprise. It was introduced just a week ago and did not go through the normal legislative process. It did not receive a hearing or a markup.

On top of that, the sponsors of the bill failed to consult the interested parties. They didn't consult the fishermen, both commercial and sports fishermen; duck hunters; and others who are deeply impacted by this bill, such as the thousands of farmers who are farming hundreds of thousands of acres and millions of dollars in crops.

They didn't consult the water agencies that are responsible for delivering safe and clean drinking water to the Western States and to many in my district. They didn't consult the tribes whose rights may very well be affected by this legislation. They didn't even consult the Members of Congress from this great delta, the largest delta of the Pacific Ocean. They didn't even consult the Members with direct interest in this legislation.

In fact, it was only when Senator BARBARA BOXER insisted that there be transparency in the process and that we be given copies of the bill that negotiations were called off and Senator FEINSTEIN said that she would take up this bill next year under regular order.

Where does that leave us? With a bill intended to help one region of California at the expense of endangered species that could end up hurting millions of dollars' worth of commercial fishing interests, farmers, tribes, and neighboring States.

My amendment would fix that. First, it clarifies that nothing in this bill would adversely impact the fishing industries in California, Oregon, or Washington. Without this clarification, the bill would result in exporting additional water, which would devastate the salmon population and harm thousands of small businesses and commercial fishermen.

Second, my bill would clarify that this bill would not create a precedent of impacting water rights in other States. This bill is a major rewrite of California's water rights, plain and simple. Most notably, under existing State water rights, the bill's increased pumping for the Central Valley Project would require a reduction in State water project pumping; yet the bill specifically mandates that the water supply for the State water project cannot be reduced, contrary to California law.

This will mean that a small subgroup of water users in California will get a higher priority access to water than they are entitled to under their contracts.

Finally, my amendment clarifies that the bill protects tribal sovereignty and won't reduce the quality

and quantity of water provided to the Indian tribes under the Federal Government's tribal trust obligations.

To give you one example of a tribe that could be harmed by this legislation, the Hoopa Valley Tribe in Humboldt County is dependent on water from the Trinity River. Their economy is dependent upon it, their fisheries are dependent upon it, and the tourism of the tribe is dependent upon the water of this river.

We already saw this year emergency water releases from the Trinity River to prevent mass fish kills. If the water is all pumped out of the dam before then, the problem is there won't be any to help the tribe or to help other parts of the economy lower in the State.

Truly, the House should reject this radical, ill-conceived bill. At a minimum, we should pass my amendment that would ensure that the reckless actions of this bill's sponsors do not result in significant harm to our tribes, fishermen, and neighboring States.

One of the rationales for passing this bill by the supporters of it is that this water just flows to the ocean, that is sort of the way God created the plain; but the fact of the matter is it doesn't just flow to the ocean.

As it goes to the ocean, as it leaves the Sierra mountains and comes down the State, it goes past the cities of Sacramento, Concord, and Pittsburg, where hundreds of thousands of people live and depend upon it for their drinking water supply—clean water.

It goes past the United States Steel mill that uses and needs clean water for steel production. It goes past the DuPont chemical facility that needs clean water for production. It mixes with the saltwater in the Suisun Marsh which allows fish to survive the difference between saltwater and freshwater.

It provides all of those kinds of benefits and jobs for hundreds and thousands of people in the industries that are located in the delta and that are located there because of the delta.

Finally, if there is no water, it does not flow to the ocean. That seems to be some kind of indictment against the river systems of California, that it flows to the ocean. If it doesn't flow to the ocean, then the salmon can't get out into the bay, they can't get out into the ocean, and the incoming salmon can't get up to spawn for the next generation.

What happens when that happens? It means that in Oregon and Washington, it will affect the runs that come up here and provide for commercial fishing; that provide for sport fishing; that provide for recreation; that provide for tourism; that provide revenues to the States in terms of fishing licenses, revenues to all of the States, like California. It provides for the wetlands, for duck hunters, and preserves one of the great byways.

That is not just going to the ocean. That is an incredibly important water system. A small group of farmers here want to take it all for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to say that we kind of alluded to California water in just a prior exchange. Yes, it is complicated, but I want to be very, very specific.

□ 1315

The bill under consideration today is a short-term fix to something that needs a long-term fix. And the gentleman made a number of arguments, but I think the gentleman failed to read the bill because there are two specific sections in there that are contrary to what he is asserting would happen. Those are section 203 and section 301.

Let me try to be as concise as I can on what this legislation does and why it is important to pass it out of this Congress. This legislation, to cut to the chase, simply says that during rainy periods—California is getting rain right now. They will probably get rain for another couple of months, hopefully. During rainy periods, this legislation simply gives Federal agencies and State agencies the flexibility to direct water to where it is needed—nothing more. It is nothing more complicated than that because it doesn't preempt the Endangered Species Act. It doesn't preempt other environmental laws. It simply says that when it rains, and we are in rainy season right now, that we should have the ability to direct that water where it is needed. That is why this legislation has an expiration date in September of 2016, to give time for a more comprehensive solution to this.

So, from my point of view, this motion to recommit is simply a procedural motion to hopefully stop this process of trying to give short-term relief to the drought in California. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to recommit and to vote "yes" on the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 228, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

YEAS—182

Adams	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Hahn	Owens
Bass	Hanabusa	Pallone
Beatty	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Becerra	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Higgins	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Holt	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Honda	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Horsford	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Price (NC)
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Keating	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Kennedy	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kind	T.
Cicilline	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Schakowsky
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Connolly	Levin	Schwartz
Conyers	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lipinski	Scott, David
Crowley	Loeb sack	Serrano
Cuellar	Loftgren	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowe y	Sinema
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Delaney	(NM)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Speier
DelBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Lynch	Takano
Dingell	Maffei	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Carolyn	Thierney
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Ellison	Matsui	Tonko
Engel	McCollum	Tsongas
Enyart	McDermott	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McGovern	Vargas
Esty	McIntyre	Veasey
Farr	McNerney	Vela
Fattah	Meeks	Cummings
Foster	Michaud	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Visclosky
Fudge	Moore	Walz
Gabbard	Moran	Wasserman
Gallo	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Garamendi	Nadler	Waters
Garcia	Napolitano	Welch
Grayson	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Nolan	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Norcross	

NAYS—228

Aderholt	Brat	Clawson (FL)
Amash	Bridenstine	Coble
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Bachmann	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Collins (GA)
Barletta	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Barr	Bucshon	Conaway
Barton	Burgess	Cook
Benishek	Byrne	Costa
Bentivolio	Calvert	Cotton
Bilirakis	Camp	Cramer
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Crawford
Black	Carter	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Cassidy	Culberson
Boustany	Chabot	Daines
Brady (TX)	Chaffetz	Davis, Rodney

Denham	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
DeSantis	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	Kline	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rooney
Duffy	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Roskam
Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Ross
Ellmers	Latham	Rothfus
Farenthold	Latta	Royce
Fincher	LoBiondo	Runyan
Fitzpatrick	Long	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Lucas	Salmon
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Flores	Lummis	Scalise
Forbes	Marino	Schock
Fortenberry	Massie	Schweikert
Fox	Matheson	Scott, Austin
Franks (AZ)	McAllister	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Gardner	McCaul	Shimkus
Garrett	McClintock	Shuster
Gerlach	McHenry	Simpson
Gibbs	McKeon	Smith (MO)
Gibson	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Gingrey (GA)	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	Meadows	Southerland
Gosar	Meehan	Stewart
Gowdy	Messer	Stivers
Granger	Mica	Stockman
Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)	Terry
Griffith (VA)	Mullin	Thompson (PA)
Grimm	Mulvaney	Thornberry
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi
Hanna	Neugebauer	Tipton
Harper	Noem	Turner
Harris	Nugent	Upton
Hartzler	Nunes	Valadao
Hastings (WA)	Nunnelee	Wagner
Heck (NV)	Olson	Walberg
Hensarling	Palazzo	Walden
Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Walorski
Holding	Pearce	Weber (TX)
Hudson	Perry	Webster (FL)
Huelskamp	Peterson	Wenstrup
Huizenga (MI)	Petri	Westmoreland
Hultgren	Pittenger	Whitfield
Hunter	Pitts	Williams
Hurt	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Pompeo	Wittman
Jenkins	Posey	Wolf
Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)	Womack
Johnson, Sam	Reed	Woodall
Jolly	Reichert	Yoder
Jones	Renacci	Yoho
Jordan	Ribble	Young (AK)
Joyce	Rigell	Young (IN)
Kelly (PA)	Roby	
King (IA)	Roe (TN)	

NOT VOTING—24

Barber	Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary
Campbell	Grijalva	Negrete McLeod
Capuano	Hall	Quigley
Cohen	Jeffries	Rice (SC)
Cooper	Labrador	Rogers (MI)
Cummings	Marchant	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	Meng	Waxman

□ 1343

Messrs. BENISHEK, SESSIONS, COFFMAN, GINGREY of Georgia, and BRIDENSTINE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 182, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—230

Aderholt	Gosar	Perry
Amash	Gowdy	Peterson
Amodei	Granger	Petri
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Pitts
Barletta	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Barr	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barrow (GA)	Hanna	Poser
Barton	Harper	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harris	Rahall
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Reed
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Black	Hensarling	Ribble
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Holding	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roby
Brat	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rokita
Buchanan	Issa	Rooney
Bucshon	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Calvert	Jolly	Rothfus
Camp	Jones	Royce
Capito	Jordan	Runyan
Carter	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	Kingston	Schock
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kline	Scott, Austin
Cole	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Lamborn	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lance	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lankford	Shuster
Conaway	Latham	Simpson
Cook	Latta	Smith (MO)
Costa	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Cotton	Long	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Crenshaw	Lummis	Stewart
Culberson	Marino	Stivers
Daines	Massie	Stockman
Davis, Rodney	Matheson	Stutzman
Denham	McAllister	Terry
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	McCaul	Thornberry
DesJarlais	McClintock	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	McHenry	Tipton
Duffy	McIntyre	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McKeon	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Valadao
Ellmers	McMorris	Wagner
Farenthold	McMorris	Walberg
Fincher	Rodgers	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walorski
Fleischmann	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Messer	Webster (FL)
Flores	Mica	Wenstrup
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Fox	Mullin	Williams
Franks (AZ)	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gardner	Neugebauer	Wolf
Garrett	Noem	Womack
Gerlach	Nunes	Woodall
Gibbs	Nunnelee	Yoder
Gibson	Olson	Yoho
Gingrey (GA)	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Goodlatte	Pearce	

NOES—182

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Bass	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Becerra	Bonamici	Bustos
Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)	Butterfield

Capps	Honda	Payne
Cárdenas	Horsford	Pelosi
Carney	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Peters (CA)
Cartwright	Israel	Peters (MI)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Pingree (ME)
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Ciilline	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Clay	Kennedy	Richmond
Cleaver	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kilmer	Ruiz
Connolly	Kind	Ruppersberger
Conyers	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Courtney	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	T.
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Levin	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lewis	Schiff
DeGette	Lipinski	Schneider
Delaney	Loebach	Schrader
DeLauro	Lofgren	Schwartz
DelBene	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lowe	Scott, David
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Doggett	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Doyle	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Edwards	(NM)	Sinema
Ellison	Lynch	Sires
Engel	Maffei	Slaughter
Enyart	Maloney,	Speier
Eshoo	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
Esty	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Farr	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Fattah	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Foster	McDermott	Tierney
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Titus
Fudge	McNerney	Tonko
Gabbard	Meeke	Tsongas
Gallego	Michaud	Van Hollen
Garamendi	Miller, George	Vargas
Garcia	Moore	Veasey
Grayson	Moran	Vela
Green, Al	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Green, Gene	Nadler	Visclosky
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Walz
Hahn	Neal	Wasserman
Hanabusa	Nolan	Schultz
Hastings (FL)	Norcross	Waters
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Welch
Higgins	Owens	Wilson (FL)
Himes	Pallone	Yarmuth
Hinojosa	Pascrell	
Holt	Pastor (AZ)	

NOT VOTING—22

Barber	Grimm	Negrete McLeod
Campbell	Hall	Nugent
Capuano	Jeffries	Rogers (MI)
Cohen	Labrador	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Marchant	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	McCarthy (NY)	Waxman
Graves (MO)	Meng	
Grijalva	Miller, Gary	

□ 1352

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

The bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on December 9, 2014. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: rollcall No. 552—On motion to recommit with instructions—“yea”; rollcall No. 553—On final passage of H.R. 5781—“nay.”

EARLY ACT REAUTHORIZATION OF 2014

Mrs. ELMERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 5185) to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5185

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “EARLY Act Reauthorization of 2014”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE YOUNG WOMEN'S BREAST HEALTH EDUCATION AND AWARENESS REQUIRES LEARNING YOUNG ACT OF 2009.

Section 399NN(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280m(h)) is amended by striking “\$9,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014” and inserting “\$4,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019”.

SEC. 3. GAO REPORT ON HHS ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE BREAST CANCER EDUCATION.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report—

(1) listing and detailing the activities of the Department of Health and Human Services that provide or support breast cancer education described in subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of section 399NN of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280m); and

(2) identifying any such activities that are duplicative with each other or with other Federal breast cancer education efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in strong support of H.R. 5185, the EARLY Act. This very important bipartisan bill would reauthorize education and outreach programs at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention created to highlight the breast cancer risks facing young women.

Breast cancer, as we know, is an issue that hits close to home for many Americans. While most breast cancers are found in women who are over 50 years old or older, about 11 percent of all new cases of breast cancer in the U.S. are found in women 45 and younger. And while diagnosis and treatment

are difficult for women of any age, young survivors often find it even more challenging.

This bill would reauthorize the important programs created in the EARLY Act, first passed to increase an understanding of breast cancer among young women by conducting prevention research and a campaign to raise awareness among the public and medical providers about early cases of breast cancer.

This bill continues to improve the health and quality of life of young breast cancer survivors and young women who are at a higher risk of getting the disease.

I want to particularly thank the two authors of the bill, Representative DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, herself a breast cancer survivor, and Energy and Commerce Committee member RENEE ELLMERS, who is managing the bill this afternoon. I am so proud to support this effort.

The prevention, treatment, and ultimately curing of diseases requires an all-hands-on-deck effort to not only educate but also innovate on new cures and treatments.

Early this year, the Energy and Commerce Committee embarked on the 21st Century Cures initiative with a goal of finding cures and treatments for thousands without one, including this terrible disease.

□ 1400

Sadly, we have all been touched in some manner by cancer or some other disease, whether it is a personal diagnosis or a courageous fight by a loved one. We have been encouraged and humbled by the support that we have seen for this initiative, but also understand that there is a great deal of work ahead. We look forward to meeting that challenge, and this bill helps us.

I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Again, I particularly want to commend the two gentleladies who will be speaking here this afternoon and urge all my colleagues to vote for it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to our colleague from Florida, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, the Democratic sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5185, the reauthorization of the Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act, or the EARLY Act.

The EARLY Act, which I first introduced in 2009 with my good friend and former colleague Sue Myrick of North Carolina, was cosponsored by a humbling 378 Members of the House and became law in 2010.

This law, which has been capably implemented by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, must now

be reauthorized so we can ensure the good work being done by the CDC can continue.

I am very thankful to my good friend, Congresswoman RENEE ELLMERS, for leading the reauthorization effort with me this year. I also deeply appreciate the support and assistance of Chairman FRED UPTON and Ranking Member FRANK PALLONE in helping bring this reauthorization bill to the floor today. It would not have happened without their willingness and their support.

Lastly, but certainly not least, thank you to Senators AMY KLOBUCHAR and DAVID VITTER for sponsoring the Senate version of this important reauthorization bill.

The EARLY Act focuses, Mr. Speaker, on a central tenet, that we must empower young women to understand their bodies and speak up for their health. Too many women and their health practitioners think that breast cancer is not something that happens to younger women, but the hard truth is that more than 26,000 women under age 45 are diagnosed with this deadly disease each year, and too often, their breast cancer is a more aggressive form and is caught later than it should be.

The EARLY Act created a crucial education and outreach campaign administered by the CDC and highlights the breast cancer risks facing young women while empowering them with the tools they need to fight this deadly disease.

It is also designed to help education and sensitize healthcare providers about the specific threats and warning signs of breast cancer in younger women that lead to early detection, diagnosis, and survival.

The EARLY Act also created the Advisory Committee on Breast Cancer in Young Women within the CDC, made up of breast cancer medical professionals and advocates from around the Nation. The advisory committee is hard at work developing evidence-based messages for groups at high risk, from genetic testing to fertility preservation and the basics of insurance coverage.

The CDC is rolling out a number of targeted media outreach strategies to reach specific groups of young women who are more at risk for developing breast cancer.

Understanding these risks is critical, Mr. Speaker, because the statistics are sobering. One in eight women we know will get breast cancer in her lifetime. Breast cancer strikes women from all backgrounds, races, and ethnicities. It strikes the rich and the poor, those with access to quality health care and those with little or no health care.

I was a young woman at high risk, but I didn't know it. Just months after a clean mammogram in late 2007—I know my colleagues here have heard me tell my story—I heard those terrible words, “You have breast cancer.”

Thinking of my children and their future, I underwent seven surgeries, including a double mastectomy, and for as much as I thought I knew as an advocate in the fight against breast cancer throughout my legislative career, there was so much I didn't know.

I did not know that as an Ashkenazi Jew, I was five times more likely to have a genetic mutation that drastically increased the likelihood of getting breast or ovarian cancer. I did not know that I am in fact a carrier of the BRCA gene, which gave me up to an 85 percent lifetime chance of getting breast cancer and up to a 60 percent chance of getting ovarian cancer.

I was fortunate that I had the resources I needed to learn about my risks and got the help I needed, but I didn't find my tumor through luck, Mr. Speaker. I found it through knowledge and awareness, which is what the EARLY Act has been able to give so many young women.

After I was diagnosed with breast cancer and experienced the importance of early detection firsthand, I knew that I had to introduce legislation to help other young women facing this terrible disease.

In the first few years of this law, the CDC has already accomplished incredible work: identifying where the gaps exist in education and awareness among young women and healthcare providers about breast health; supporting young survivors through grants to organizations focused on helping these survivors cope with the many unique challenges that they face as young survivors, including fertility preservation and long-term survivorship challenges; and in implementing a targeted media campaign, including innovative social media efforts to reach women at the highest risk.

The EARLY Act has also supported specific statewide initiatives. In Georgia, the State established a statewide breast cancer genetics services network for referrals of women at high risk and to help collect baseline and post-implementation data.

In 2012, Michigan distributed over 14,000 Michigan Department of Community Health cancer family history guides to assist providers in identifying high-risk patients for referral to genetic specialists.

In addition to the 30 bipartisan cosponsors here in the House, the reauthorization of the EARLY Act has the support of the Susan G. Komen foundation, the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Livestrong Foundation, Young Survival Coalition, Living Beyond Breast Cancer, Cancer Support Community, FORCE, the Black Women's Health Imperative, and the Tigerlily Foundation.

I know these groups have a deep understanding of both the amazing work we have accomplished so far but also the challenges that lie ahead. We must

continue these important efforts and empower more women with the knowledge and tools they need to fight this disease, not just to survive, but to thrive. Together, we can save more of our moms, sisters, grandmothers, daughters, and sister friends.

Please help us keep up the momentum and stand with Congresswoman ELLMERS and myself and countless young women in support of reauthorization of the EARLY Act.

Mr. Speaker, if I might add, on Sunday, I marked a celebration of 7 years as a survivor of breast cancer, so this is particularly poignant and significant, and I am so appreciative of the leadership of the House on both sides of the aisle for giving this bill the full attention that it needs and deserves.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am so proud and honored to have been asked to join with my good friend, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, as an original cosponsor on this very important bipartisan EARLY Act and thrilled to see this reauthorization considered in the House of Representatives.

The EARLY Act has a proven record of success, saving countless lives through both preventive and early detection measures. Unfortunately, like many good friends like my friend from Florida, they were stricken with an awful cancer.

There are still far too many courageous women fighting this disease, including a dear friend of mine back home in Dunn, Fannie Godwin. Fannie was diagnosed with breast cancer at the age of 42, and 4 years later, she continues her courageous fight against this disease.

The EARLY Act will serve to shed light on this disease and give hope to all women like Fannie who are still fighting this awful, awful cancer. This legislation ensures that all women, young and old, have the information and resources necessary to protect themselves and also supports those who are in remission.

This legislation will continue its important work of educating future generations on the risks associated with this disease. I look forward to seeing the EARLY Act pass this House and advance on to the Senate today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5185, the EARLY Act Reauthorization of 2014. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, over 220,000 women and 2,000 men were diagnosed with breast cancer in 2011, making breast cancer the most common cancer among women. Approximately 11 percent of the new breast cancer

cases occur in women under 45 years of age.

Young women who have close relatives diagnosed with breast cancer before age 45, have changes in certain breast cancer genes, were treated with radiation therapy to the breast or the chest as a child or a young adult, or possess certain other risk factors may be at higher risk for getting breast cancer at a young age.

The EARLY Act was first signed into law in 2010 to improve young women's breast health awareness and assist young women diagnosed with breast cancer. The act has supported public health research on breast cancer in young women, communication and education initiatives, and support services to young breast cancer survivors and their families.

Mr. Speaker, today's legislation reauthorizes the EARLY Act at currently appropriated funding levels and requires a study to identify any activities under the act that are duplicative of other Federal breast cancer education efforts.

I want to acknowledge Representatives WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and ELLMERS for their work on this issue and also thank leaders and staff on the Energy and Commerce Committee for helping to bring H.R. 5185 to the floor today.

I urge colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. Breast cancer is an issue that has touched almost every family I know, and this is one way Congress can react to it.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close, and I have no other speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say again thank you to my good friend for allowing me to be a part of this. I know how important it is to her and, again, thousands and thousands like her; and, again, to my friend Fannie Godwin back home, Fannie has touched so many lives. She is a teacher, she is a wife and a mother, and she is involved in her church and her community.

On Christmas Eve, she will be at First Presbyterian Church in Dunn playing the bells in the choir. I always see a smile on Fannie's face, and today, I want to make that smile even bigger.

Again, Mr. Speaker, thank you so much for allowing this to move forward today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5185, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPANE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5705) to modify certain provisions relating to the Propane Education and Research Council.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5705

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Propane Education and Research Enhancement Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE PROPANE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH COUNCIL.

(a) FUNCTIONS OF PROPANE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH COUNCIL.—Section 5(f) of the Propane Education and Research Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 6404(f)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting "to train propane distributors and consumers in strategies to mitigate negative effects of future propane price spikes," after "to enhance consumer and employee safety and training."

(b) MARKET SURVEY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION PRICE ANALYSIS.—Section 9(a) of the Propane Education and Research Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 6408(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "only data provided by the Energy Information Administration" and inserting "the refinery price to end users of consumer grade propane, as published by the Energy Information Administration".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5705, the Propane Education and Research Enhancement Act of 2014, which I introduced along with Congressman WALZ. This important, bipartisan legislation directs the U.S. Department of Commerce to more accurately calculate consumer propane costs. It also enables the propane industry to use its resources to mitigate price spikes.

Last winter in my home State of Ohio, as well as across 26 other States across the country, the lives and liveli-

hoods of many Americans were threatened due to the propane shortages that were being experienced. Access to heat is a requirement for survival and employment, and we want to make sure that Americans do not face the same hardships again this winter or in future winters.

This bill would take the necessary steps to allow the propane industry to adequately address propane supply in pricing issues so consumers are not negatively impacted this coming winter.

□ 1415

In 1996, Congress enacted the Propane Education and Research Act, PERA, authorizing the propane to collect and use its own resources for safety, training, research and development, and education for the benefit of propane consumers and the public. The law also established the Propane Education and Research Council, PERC, to accomplish these goals.

To prevent this program from creating a disproportionate demand for propane, the Department of Commerce is required to annually calculate the price for consumer grade propane and compare it with an index of prices of specified competing fuels. If the price of propane exceeds a certain threshold, PERC is restricted from conducting its educational outreach activities.

In 2009, due to a misinterpretation of the law by the Department of Commerce, the restriction was triggered and all educational outreach by PERC ceased. While the Department of Commerce believes Congress intended PERA to focus only on residential-only propane, the text of the law does not limit it to the residential market.

To correct this discrepancy, the Propane Education and Research Enhancement Act of 2014 would clarify the language in the law to require the Department of Commerce to use the proper data and bring the application of the law back in line with Congress' intent. It would also amend the existing functions of PERC to include training distributors and consumers in strategies to mitigate the negative effects of propane price spikes.

Over the past year, I have been working on this legislation with stakeholders and with Congressman WALZ to help mitigate having another propane shortage. This legislation is an important step in helping to achieve this, and I urge full support by my colleagues for H.R. 5705.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and a special thank you to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

This is a commonsense piece of legislation, but I think it is important to

note, for many of us, and my colleague mentioned, last year when the propane shortage came, folks can prepare—and we understand out in Ohio and Minnesota with our harsh winters that you prepare for these things—but the situation with propane came so quickly and so fast that the imposition that it made in some cases could have become life threatening, where propane tanks were running empty and families were counting on it to heat their homes. We have a lot of agricultural uses in drying our row crops where it is critically important, and I think it is important to note that at that time the gentleman from Ohio stood up and became a national leader on this issue and I think helped not only alleviate at the time but start doing things like this looking to the future.

This is what we should be doing. This is smart, making sure that our markets work correctly and making sure that the intent of Congress is followed and making sure that our consumers are well served. I thank you for that. I think this is exactly what our constituents expect. I know there are a lot of folks in southern Minnesota who have benefited from this.

This is a fairly simple fix. It comes from a misinterpretation. But I think the point that the gentleman has brought up that is critically important, markets are starting to function. We are seeing this, but this is an education piece. I think when we educate the public right on this, and you heard some of the implications of that, by not doing that, when they stopped all education on this, the propane shortage of last winter came quickly. It came fast, and it had immediate repercussions.

I would say once we correct this deficiency, amend it, it will make a difference. It will enable the propane industry to use its resources to mitigate price spikes, and it will more accurately let consumers know what the price of propane is.

So I think this is a fairly simple fix. But nothing is simple in Congress, as we know, and nothing is simple when you are dealing with a complex commodity such as propane. But I do think that as we move into this winter, knocking on wood is one thing, but leadership like the gentleman from Ohio has shown is also helping us.

I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense piece of legislation and move this forward. Again, this is what we are sent here to do, to try to make things a little bit better and make sure our markets function correctly and make sure our constituents are being educated correctly.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5705, the Propane Education and Research Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 5705, the Propane Education and Research Enhancement Act.

Today, tens of millions of Americans rely on propane and heating oil.

Propane and propane accessories are used in everyday life from cooking to commercial agricultural uses are vital to farmers in the Midwest that use propane to dry corn and feed the world.

Heating oil is used throughout the Northeast to heat homes and water during the long New England winter.

Personally, in years past, I've relied on propane when I didn't have access to the vast network of pipelines that supply natural gas.

Unfortunately, like many important commodities, unless you've run out of propane or heating oil, most people probably don't know or understand the vast importance of this product.

In the early 2000s, the Energy and Commerce Committee passed legislation that authorized the Propane Education and Research Council and the National Oilheat Research Alliance.

These two national entities implement consumer education, research and development, and safety and training programs related to the use of propane and heating oil.

While PERC and NORA are federally authorized, these two organizations cost the federal government absolutely nothing.

But they play an important role in the communities they serve.

H.R. 5705 amends the Propane Education and Research Act of 1996, the original legislation, and expands the ability of PERC to educate distributors and consumers in strategies to deal with future propane price spikes.

Last winter, the United States faced a propane emergency.

The industry has stepped up to ensure that we don't face another crisis like that.

But we always need to be prepared and armed with knowledge of how to better deal with any situation.

With preparation legislation like H.R. 5705, we can assist Americans, all over the country, by sharing the best information possible.

I lend my support to H.R. 5705 and I am pleased my colleagues do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, as the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, we had a great shortage last winter that affected small family farms and large farms across the country. We had situations where businesses were being affected and having to shut down. So this is a very important bill that will help folks make sure that hopefully we don't have that situation occur again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 5705.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5705.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE ACT OF 2014

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5764) to authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5764

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE.

Section 118(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

"(7) GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE.—

"(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Agency a Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (referred to in this paragraph as the 'Initiative') to carry out programs and projects for Great Lakes protection and restoration.

"(B) FOCUS AREAS.—The Initiative shall prioritize programs and projects carried out in coordination with non-Federal partners and programs and projects that address priority areas each fiscal year, including—

"(i) the remediation of toxic substances and areas of concern;

"(ii) the prevention and control of invasive species and the impacts of invasive species;

"(iii) the protection and restoration of nearshore health and the prevention and mitigation of nonpoint source pollution;

"(iv) habitat and wildlife protection and restoration, including wetlands restoration and preservation; and

"(v) accountability, monitoring, evaluation, communication, and partnership activities.

"(C) PROJECTS.—Under the Initiative, the Agency shall collaborate with Federal partners, including the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force, to select the best combination of programs and projects for Great Lakes protection and restoration using appropriate principles and criteria, including whether a program or project provides—

"(i) the ability to achieve strategic and measurable environmental outcomes that implement the Great Lakes Action Plan and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement;

"(ii) the feasibility of—

"(I) prompt implementation;

"(II) timely achievement of results; and

"(III) resource leveraging; and

"(iii) the opportunity to improve inter-agency and inter-organizational coordination and collaboration to reduce duplication and streamline efforts.

"(D) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available to carry out the Initiative shall be used to strategically implement—

“(I) Federal projects; and

“(II) projects carried out in coordination with States, Indian tribes, municipalities, institutions of higher education, and other organizations.

“(ii) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—With amounts made available for the Initiative each fiscal year, the Administrator may—

“(I) transfer not more than \$300,000,000 to the head of any Federal department or agency, with the concurrence of the department or agency head, to carry out activities to support the Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement; and

“(II) enter into an interagency agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency to carry out activities described in subclause (I).

“(E) SCOPE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Projects shall be carried out under the Initiative on multiple levels, including—

“(I) Great Lakes-wide; and

“(II) Great Lakes basin-wide.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—No funds made available to carry out the Initiative may be used for any water infrastructure activity (other than a green infrastructure project that improves habitat and other ecosystem functions in the Great Lakes) for which amounts are made available from—

“(I) a State water pollution control revolving fund established under title VI; or

“(II) a State drinking water revolving loan fund established under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12).

“(F) ACTIVITIES BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each relevant Federal department or agency shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(i) maintain the base level of funding for the Great Lakes activities of that department or agency without regard to funding under the Initiative; and

“(ii) identify new activities and projects to support the environmental goals of the Initiative.

“(G) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Initiative \$300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5764.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5764, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2014.

The Great Lakes are an important resource for the United States. More than 30 million people live in the Great Lakes region, and the lakes help support over \$200 billion a year in economic activity.

To help ensure coordination between Federal, State, and private parties in

protecting and restoring the Great Lakes, a Great Lakes Interagency Task Force of Federal agencies was created in 2004. In 2010, the task force released an action plan as part of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative to accelerate efforts to protect and restore the Great Lakes.

In September of this year, the Federal agencies released an updated Action Plan II, which summarized the actions that the Federal agencies planned to implement during fiscal years 2015 through 2019 using Great Lakes funding. The action plan aims to strategically target the biggest threats to the Great Lakes ecosystem and to accelerate progress toward long-term goals.

Congressman JOYCE introduced H.R. 5764 to amend the Great Lakes program provisions under section 118 of the Clean Water Act to formally authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative for 5 years and to carry out projects and activities for Great Lakes protection and restoration.

Under the initiative, the Environmental Protection Agency is to collaborate with other Federal partners, including the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force, to select the best combination of projects and activities for Great Lakes protection and restoration. Specified principles and criteria are to be used in selecting projects and activities, including whether they, one, improve the interagency and inter-organizational coordination and collaboration to reduce duplication and streamline efforts; two, provide the ability to timely achieve strategic and measurable environmental outcomes and leverage resources with other Federal and non-Federal partners.

The bill authorizes the initiative for fiscal year 2015 through 2019. I encourage all Members to support H.R. 5764.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5764, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2014.

Let me start by recognizing the hard work of the bipartisan cosponsors of this legislation, including the retiring dean of the House, Mr. DINGELL, and commend their efforts to move this legislation.

H.R. 5764 would authorize Federal appropriations for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, a program initiated by this administration to coordinate the Federal restoration efforts of the Great Lakes.

For the decades leading up to the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, many Federal agencies were involved in the cleanup and protection of the Great Lakes. However, their efforts were far from coordinated, resulting in inefficient cleanup activities that made little progress in the overall health of the Great Lakes.

In 2010, this administration launched the initiative to accelerate efforts to protect and restore the largest fresh surface water system in the world, the Great Lakes. Under the leadership of the former EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson, this initiative prioritized five focus areas: cleaning up toxics and the Great Lakes areas of concern; combating invasive species; promoting the near-shore health by protecting watersheds from polluted runoff; restoring wetlands and other habitats; and tracking the progress made, as well as educating and working with strategic partners.

As of August 2013, the initiative has funded more than 1,500 projects and programs of the highest priority to meet immediate cleanup and restoration and protection needs. As a result of these efforts, there is tangible proof that the health of the Great Lakes is improving—from the delisting of two additional U.S. Great Lakes Areas of Concern to a list of over 30 success stories recently documented by the Healing Our Waters Coalition. Yet additional progress is needed, and the authorization of appropriations contained in H.R. 5764 is a good step forward to continuing this effort.

However, I would note that most of the successes of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative can all be traced back to one factor that I have highlighted over and over again in this Congress: the critical need for robust Federal funding.

As I noted during floor consideration of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2013, as well as during numerous other authorization and appropriation bills this Congress, to see real progress in the programs we establish, we need also to provide the critical funding to our Federal agencies that implement these programs.

Too often these days we seem driven to cut Federal spending for programs that provide a real benefit to our Nation without an awareness of the consequences of these actions. This Chamber will recognize that there are places where the Federal Government can help and should be making increased investments, such as to repair our crumbling infrastructure or to protect our fragile natural environment. Yet later this week, I fear that we will again be asked to vote on an appropriations package for the Federal Government that woefully underfunds critical investments in our Nation's future, from building the transportation infrastructure that will keep our country competitive into the next century, to investing in the water-related infrastructure that protects communities, families, and businesses, to making targeted improvements to our natural environment to ensure the protection of human, economic, and environmental health for generations to come.

We need to do better. We need to recognize that the expenditure of Federal

money to invest in our Nation is not inherently a bad thing. We need to understand that the Federal Government needs to be an active partner in addressing many of the complex challenges facing our States, our communities, and our everyday lives. And we need to support the missions of those Federal agencies we have charged with ensuring the long-term economic and environmental health of this Nation. These are only some of the ongoing challenges that face this Nation, and we need a Congress that is serious about taking on the hard questions and making the right investments, not only for our own lives and livelihoods, but for those generations of Americans to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the bipartisan sponsors of this legislation for ensuring that the new authorization shows some willingness to provide robust funding for these restoration efforts rather than simply and mindlessly cutting these programs. I urge support of H.R. 5764.

I reserve the balance of my time.

December 8, 2014.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE GREAT LAKES HOUSE DELEGATION: We are writing to convey our support for H.R. 5764, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2014, bipartisan legislation recently introduced by Representatives David Joyce, Louise Slaughter, Sander Levin, and John Dingell. We understand the bill may be considered this week under suspension of the rules and urge you to support it. This is a top regional priority for the Great Lakes states, local communities, tribes, conservation organizations, and business and industry.

This legislation provides formal authorization for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI), an ambitious regional restoration program for the Great Lakes that is cleaning up degraded "toxic hotspots," halting Asian carp and other invasive species, and preventing polluted runoff that closes beaches and causes harmful algal blooms. It provides a solid legislative platform to ensure our region continues to work together successfully to implement a science-based and outcomes-focused plan of action for restoring and protecting the Great Lakes.

The bill directs U.S. EPA to collaborate with the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force and state and local partners to select the best combination of projects to protect and restore the Great Lakes. It focuses on restoration projects that can be implemented quickly, will achieve environmental outcomes outlined in the new Great Lakes Action Plan and Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, and that leverage other funding.

Passing this legislation now will clarify the focus and accountability of our restoration efforts and ensure the program continues to achieve effective results. We recently worked with federal agencies to rewrite the GLRI Action Plan, which lays out our region's restoration goals and objectives, and revises how we measure progress. The new plan addresses the Government Accountability Office's review, which found no major deficiencies in the GLRI program.

Restoring the Great Lakes creates jobs, stimulates economic development, and protects fresh drinking water for 30 million people. The lakes currently generate over 1.5 million jobs and \$60 billion in wages annu-

ally, and provide the foundation for a \$30 billion tourism economy. Clearly, the Great Lakes are an invaluable resource worth restoring and protecting, and this legislation is critical to our collective efforts toward this end. We urge you to support this bill.

Sincerely,

TIM EDER,
Executive Director,
Great Lakes Commission.

TODD AMBS,
Director, Healing Our Waters—Great Lakes Coalition.

WILLIAM TAYLOR,
Chair, U.S. Section,
Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

DAVID A. ULLRICH,
Executive Director,
Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative.

JANE A. TENEYCK,
Executive Director,
Chippewa Ottawa Resource Authority.

KATHRYN A. BUCKNER,
President, Council of Great Lakes Industries.

ED WOLKING, JR.,
Executive Director,
Great Lakes Metro Chambers Coalition.

HEALING OUR WATERS—
GREAT LAKES COALITION,
December 8, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Healing Our Waters—Great Lakes Coalition, we write today to ask you to vote for H.R. 5764, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2014. The legislation is vital in the ongoing effort to restore the Great Lakes, which supplies drinking water to more than 30 million people.

The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act helps achieve our region's restoration goals by formally authorizing the popular Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI). The GLRI is a successful, bipartisan response to protecting and restoring one-fifth of the world's surface fresh water. Our region's recent restoration efforts started when President George W. Bush asked for a restoration blueprint, which the 1,500 stakeholders that were a part of the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration produced in 2005. President Barack Obama continued this effort when he recommended funding in his fiscal year 2010 budget for the implementation of this strategy through Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. The GLRI is an innovative, action-oriented approach targeting the region's biggest environmental problems like invasive species, legacy contaminants, habitat loss, and polluted runoff from farms and cities. It allows the Environmental Protection Agency to enter into interagency agreements with other federal agencies to utilize their existing competitive grant programs allowing the region to quickly and effectively undertake restoration work throughout the Great Lakes basin.

Because of this coordinated effort between federal agencies and non-federal stakeholders, we are seeing tremendous results. Since 2010, three U.S. Areas of Concern (Presque Isle Bay, PA; Deer Lake, MI; White Lake, MI) have been cleaned up and taken off

the list of contaminated sites. Before the GLRI, only one site had been delisted since 1987 (Oswego River, NY). The management actions necessary for delisting the Sheboygan River (WI), Waukegan Harbor (IL), and Ashtabula River (OH) AOCs have also been completed. The GLRI has accelerated the cleanup of regional toxic sites. Between 2010 through 2013, the GLRI removed 42 impairments—from drinking water restrictions to swimming advisories—from 17 contaminated sites. The number of so-called "beneficial use impairments" that have been removed across the region has quadrupled under the GLRI. In fact, more impairments have been removed since the GLRI began in 2010 than in the preceding 22 years.

In addition, from 2004 to 2009, the Great Lakes region was the only area in the country to show a gain in wetland acreage. Now the GLRI is building on that foundation with a goal to restore one million acres in the basin. So far, the Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (among others) restored, protected, or enhanced over 115,000 acres of wetlands and other habitat. More than 1,900 river miles were cleared of over 250 barriers resulting in fish swimming into stretches of river where they had been absent for decades. Based on U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service monitoring, GLRI-sponsored actions are increasing self-sustaining populations of native species important to the Great Lakes, like lake sturgeon—as well as supporting the region's multi-billion dollar outdoor recreation economy. For example, efforts in the Saginaw River watershed have contributed to the now self-sustaining walleye population in Saginaw Bay, MI.

However, there is still much work that needs to be done. Aging sewers, invasive species, and toxic pollutants are just a few of the pervasive threats that impact the region, endangering human and wildlife health, lowering property values, and hurting the region's economy. Without support restoration efforts will slow allowing problems to get worse and more expensive to solve. Ultimately, reducing investment in the Great Lakes won't save money—it will cost the nation more. As the source of drinking water for 30 million people, the nation cannot afford to stop protecting and restoring the Great Lakes.

We hope you will vote for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2014. This bill is important to ensure accountability, transparency, and results. It sets a permanent programmatic stage from which the GLRI can continue to succeed.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to have your staff contact Chad Lord, our coalition's policy director.

Sincerely,

LYNN MCCLURE,
Co-chair.
KRISTY MEYER,
Co-chair.
NICOLE BARKER,
Co-chair.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my full support for H.R. 5764, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act of 2014. The reason is simple, Mr. Speaker: the Great Lakes are a national and economic treasure in the U.S., which contains one-fifth of the world's freshwater supply.

The GLRI is the most important, significant, and productive effort to date to protect these five lakes that provide drinking water and jobs for millions of people. It is crucial that the GLRI be formally authorized at \$300 million for the next 5 years to ensure that the great work already done is not lost.

□ 1430

This does not add any new spending and will continue to make sure necessary resources are available.

GLRI is an action-oriented, results-driven initiative targeting the most significant problems within the basin, including invasive species like Asian carp, toxins and contaminated sediment, nonpoint source pollution, and habitat and wildlife protection and restoration.

The programs are working, and the GLRI will ensure we have healthy Great Lakes, while boosting the economies in this vast region.

The Great Lakes are one of the jewels of the United States. When I talk about the Great Lakes to people who are not from the region, I make sure to point out their benefits are twofold: economic and environmental.

Let me give you a couple of statistics that will illustrate how important it is that we make this critical investment.

Six quadrillion. We are not talking about a little freshwater here. There are six quadrillion gallons of water in the Great Lakes basin. Let's let that number soak in.

\$62 billion. The Great Lakes basin supports a diverse range of industries and small businesses, and that is how much is generated by wages in the industry in the Great Lakes region.

Thirty million. That is the number of people who live within the Great Lakes basin and rely on them for safe drinking water, transportation, and recreation.

\$14 million. That is how much money in GLRI funds that was spent to clean up the Ashtabula River, in the heart of my district. Because these programs are working, I was able to see the Ashtabula River taken off the EPA's designated list of places that are "areas of concern" a couple of months ago. That is a really big deal for northeast Ohio.

1.5 million. That is how many jobs are directly related to the Great Lakes.

3,500. That is how many diverse species of plant and wildlife call the Great Lakes home.

Finally, the last and most telling statistic for you today is the number three. Three is the number of days that residents of Toledo in my home State of Ohio were unable to drink the water in their homes because of the harmful algal blooms in Lake Erie. The water in Lake Erie was literally green. That is unacceptable.

This is a clear reason why we need to pass this bill and authorize GLRI—with bipartisan support—because no Amer-

ican should ever be afraid to drink the tap water in their own home.

Supporting this bill will lock in the programs that work to ensure our Nation's largest bodies of freshwater are protected and will continue to be protected in the future.

Before I close, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, as well as my colleague and dear friend from Ohio, Representative GIBBS, and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their help on this bill. We have spent a lot of time working on this issue, and I am very grateful for their assistance.

I would also like to thank Majority Leader MCCARTHY for scheduling this important bill for floor consideration.

I am very excited the GLRI enjoys so much bipartisan support from Great Lakes Members here in Congress. When we make these investments in our Great Lakes, results are produced for our constituents, the environment, and businesses throughout the vast region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JOYCE. It is critical we formally authorize GLRI so that people who live in Toledo or Mentor or Conneaut in my district don't have to worry about days ahead without fresh drinking water.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who is a cosponsor of the bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member Mr. BISHOP for yielding and thank the chairman Mr. GIBBS, and, obviously, my colleague Mr. JOYCE, who just spoke.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5764.

Since the creation of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, our Nation has made great strides in reviving and protecting our Nation's greatest freshwater treasure, our Great Lakes.

Still, despite progress, this past summer presented a stark reminder of the unfinished challenge, as a toxic algal bloom shut off the fresh drinking water to over half a million people and businesses in Ohio and Michigan for 3 days across Lake Erie's western basin, the largest watershed in the entire Great Lakes.

The public, though shocked, was orderly and beneficent. We didn't have riots or civil disorder.

During that 3-day crisis, astoundingly, we learned communities along the lake were not equipped locally to test the water so vital to their own survival. Two precious days were wasted sending and resending vials and samples 5 hours away to EPA labs, and then back and then back again. This simply is unacceptable. Proper testing equipment on Lake Erie is fundamental, fundamental to a response time commensurate with the challenge that remains before us.

The Lake Erie community needs its own water testing equipment and cer-

tified lab. Already local universities and health departments have been assembling key components of necessary equipment for a certified lab. It is incumbent upon the GLRI to help us find a way to provide the remaining \$147,000—not million—\$147,000 we have to deliver.

To date, the lack of response from our Federal agencies is astounding. Lake Erie's water quality is an emergency due to the toxic algal blooms.

When we see Federal agencies diverting hundreds of millions of dollars abroad to dams in Afghanistan to deliver freshwater, yet somehow our own EPA can't identify funds to protect the American people who live along Lake Erie and Lake Michigan and draw their life source from it, I stand aghast.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman another 1½ minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. When our water crisis occurred, the U.S. EPA didn't even show up or have personnel on the ground. I asked, "Where is Homeland Security funding to help during the crisis and after?" No show. As far as I am concerned, they are asleep at the wheel. Wake up.

As we prepare for a new spring thaw and the increasing rains that will come, feeding the algal blooms, the GLRI presents the hope that I still have that a solution can be found to counter the agency dithering that our region has experienced throughout this harrowing environmental crisis.

Surely, America can do better. I really think the chairman Mr. GIBBS, from the State of Ohio, and my dear colleague Mr. JOYCE, from the State of Ohio, they live at the other end of the lake, but they get the problem. God bless you. And I thank the ranking member, Mr. BISHOP from the east coast, who understands how important freshwater is to sustain life in this country. It shouldn't be this hard.

Thank you so very much for this bill. I rise in strong support.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio, but I would also like to thank a lady and a Member, whom I have begun to call our "lady of our lakes." Ms. KAPTUR, thank you so much for speaking out the way you do about the Great Lakes, and also Mr. JOYCE, a very good colleague and a friend, because we all understand what it is that makes the Great Lakes great. I think that is the whole point of what we are talking about. This is a gift from God.

Now, you have heard Mr. JOYCE talk about some of the statistics. But when you think about it, if you just close your eyes for 1 minute and visualize in

your mind's eye the continental United States, the land mass. The volume of freshwater contained in our Great Lakes would cover that land mass by 9½ to 10 feet. It is an incredible amount of water. But, more importantly, it is an incredible gift from God. We have to protect this area. Why would we not?

The statistics that we talk about are overwhelming. We thank a lot of people for being involved in this. But do you know who I want to thank more than anybody else? The hardworking American taxpayers. By our Constitution, we are granted the authority to tax them, but we are also given the responsibility to spend their money the right way. Why would we have a situation where we can't imagine that we would fund the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative? It just doesn't make sense.

One-fifth of the world's freshwater, not one-fifth of Pennsylvania, not one-fifth of the United States, not one-fifth of North America, but one-fifth of the world's freshwater resides in our Great Lakes. I would suggest to people that talk about energy, you can go a lot longer without oil than you can without drinking water. We have an opportunity to do something that just makes sense to each and every one of us. We can get this done.

If I may, just for a minute, to paraphrase Luke 12:48:

To whom much is given, much is required.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this is not an option, this is a moral obligation on behalf of the people of this great country to look at one of the assets that we have, a gift from God, and make sure that we preserve it for future generations.

I thank both gentlemen from Ohio, the lady from Ohio, and everybody else who was involved in this. I especially want to do a shout-out to a young man who works in the Northeast-Midwest Coalition, a guy by the name of Sam Breene, who lives and breathes the lake's initiatives. I want to thank him for his hard work, and I want to thank everybody involved in getting this taken care of.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), who is a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, my district includes Duluth, Minnesota, the headwaters of the Great Lakes, and, of course, the magnificent North Shore. I encourage you all to come and visit the first chance you get.

I, too, rise in strong support of this important bipartisan Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and I, too, would be remiss if I didn't compliment our chairman, Mr. GIBBS, and our ranking member, Mr. BISHOP, for bringing this

legislation forward, and, of course, our chief sponsor of the legislation, DAVID JOYCE, our good Republican friend. Thank you for your leadership in convincing the Office of the President and our budget operatives around here that in this particular case we need a little bit more than what they wanted or recommended.

I would also remind my colleagues that this is not just about preservation; this is about taking responsibility for some of the neglect out of past. As I can tell you, back in Duluth, there was a time when we had to haul drinking water in for the citizens of Duluth because the water out of Lake Superior wasn't drinkable. I remember a time when the Great Lakes were so polluted they were catching on fire in some places because of neglect. So in many respects we are stepping up and we are assuming responsibility for neglect in the past.

I don't mind telling you how important it has been to us up in the Lake Superior area. We have had over 100 projects funded over the years accomplishing so many things: combating invasive species, mitigating pollution of the past, identifying toxins that represent a threat to the basin and our public health and our public safety, protecting wild rice—I am an old wild rice picker; you can't have enough good native wild rice—and protecting wildlife in general. What a difference these projects have made.

Last, but not least, I would be remiss if I didn't thank our Appropriations Committee members—MARCY KAPTUR and BETTY MCCOLLUM, in particular—for your stepping up in your leadership in this.

But there is still so much more to be done. That is why I stand here today and strongly urge my colleagues to give their full support to this important legislation.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, certainly, protecting and preserving the Great Lakes has always been a principal advocacy of mine through my entire tenure in public office and even before I came into public office. I actually grew up on the Great Lakes. My family was in the marina business. So the lakes were more than just a source of recreation for us. They put food on the table in our family. Like so many from the region, the Great Lakes are a proud part of our identity. We have heard from so many of the various States in the Great Lakes basin today the passion that we all have for these magnificent, magnificent Great Lakes.

As has been said, they generate billions of dollars each and every year through fishing, through the shipping industry, and recreational activities as well. They are 20 percent of the fresh-

water drinking supply on the entire planet, quite frankly.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have not been the best stewards of these magnificent lakes, and we do owe it to future generations to help assure that they are protected and that they are preserved. One great way to do this for the Great Lakes is through this continued funding and support of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative that we are debating here on the floor today.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, I have seen firsthand the impact the GLRI is having on our lakes. From dredging to beach and shoreline restoration to fighting against invasive species, these projects are critical to protecting and restoring the Great Lakes ecosystems.

□ 1445

Actually, in October, I was at a place called Harsens Island in my district where I saw an effort underway to control phragmites, which is sort of an odd name. It is a huge, invasive plant that has been actually choking wetlands throughout the Great Lakes Basin, but funding through this program is eradicating them and letting Mother Nature breathe again.

Along the shoreline of the St. Clair River, GLRI funded the restoration of natural habitats, improved stormwater drainage, and improved water quality, but there is so much more to do. For example, the Clinton River, which flows through a very major metropolitan area in southeast Michigan, is in need of similar restoration projects.

We also need to look at ways that can better detect toxins in our waterways with real-time water quality monitoring systems, some of which we have in my area as it comes through Lake Huron, the St. Clair River, into Lake St. Clair, and down the Detroit River. It is not happening in Lake Erie, and it has to be part of the notification protocol there as well. We also are having some of these green-blue algae blooms in our area.

As was mentioned, these are a gift from God. God gave us these magnificent lakes that have provided us with so much, but we do need to be better stewards of them, and quite frankly, we have a lot of making up to do to Mother Nature.

Mr. Speaker, we can start that certainly today by strongly supporting H.R. 5764, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act. I certainly rise in strong support of this bill from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), and I urge all of my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation. I think it is good, solid bipartisan legislation that is necessary, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize today that we lose some institutional knowledge at the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, specifically the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee. Today is the last hurrah on the floor as we lose our longtime staff director, John Anderson, to the outside world.

John is originally from Charlotte, North Carolina. He joined the Memphis District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in early 1970 as a biologist. Later, he moved on to the Savannah District and finally to the Army Corps of Engineers headquarters here in Washington, D.C.

John joined the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in 1999 on detail from the Corps, and he never left. In 2005, he was promoted to staff director of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

In John's more than 40 years of service to the Nation, he has in some fashion, either at the Corps level or here in Congress, been part of every single WRDA law since 1990. He is widely respected in the world of transportation and infrastructure policy and is a renowned expert in the Nation's water resources policy.

We wish John the best in his departure from Congress. He and his wife, Guimar, are the proud parents of three boys: John Alexander, Patrick, and Richard Anderson. They are also the proud grandparents of three Anderson grandchildren.

It has been a privilege to work with John Anderson in my last 4 years as the chairman of the subcommittee. I wish him well and thank him. Good luck.

I also urge support of the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I, too, want to add a word of both thanks and congratulations to John Anderson for his service in the Congress over a great many years. I came to see firsthand his skill and dedication when we were working so cooperatively together on passing the Water Resources Development Act of 2013. His involvement was essential.

That bill stands as one of the few substantive pieces of bipartisan legislation that this Congress has passed, and we were able to get it in done in part because of John's efforts.

I thank you, and I wish you a well-earned retirement.

Mr. GIBBS. Reclaiming my time, I would also be remiss not to say a few words about my good friend, Mr. BISHOP from Long Island, New York. It has been a privilege having you serve as my ranking member on the sub-

committee for the last 4 years. I wish you well in your endeavors in the future.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for this needed legislation.

In Michigan, we're blessed to be surrounded by the Great Lakes. In so many ways, the Lakes define our state, and our region, as well. For many years, though, we did not treat them as if they were very great. For the better part of a century, the Lakes and their tributaries were polluted to the point that they were dying.

A century of environmental harm cannot be undone overnight, but we've made considerable progress. That's where the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative comes in. Through the GLRI, we are finally addressing longstanding problems, such as toxic hotspots, invasive species like the Asian carp, habitat restoration, and runoff pollution.

The GLRI was created by the Obama Administration and, since 2010, Congress has wisely funded it. Now it is time for Congress to take the next step and formally authorize this vital program. Congress must remain a full partner in the restoration effort in the Great Lakes, and authorizing GLRI is the best way to do that.

I wish to acknowledge the efforts of my colleagues who have worked so hard to support GLRI over the last five years, especially Representative JOYCE, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, and my good friend JOHN DINGELL. I would also like to underscore the longstanding efforts of Senator CARL LEVIN and his staff in the area of Great Lakes restoration.

As we continue to make meaningful progress on restoration of the Great Lakes, this will be a hopeful sign that other difficult environmental redemptions are also achievable. Let us move forward together today by passing the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, as a co-Chair of the House Great Lakes Task Force, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5764, The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act.

This bipartisan legislation authorizes the popular Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. This program is critical to restoring and protecting the Great Lakes, which hold over 20 percent of the world's surface freshwater and are the source of drinking water, jobs, and recreation for millions of Americans.

I have represented districts that span the southern coast of Lake Ontario all the way to the City of Buffalo on Lake Erie and I know first hand the special bond the people of the Great Lakes basin share with these lakes. These magnificent bodies of water are truly unique and we must do all that we can to protect these national treasures for future generations. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5764.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND LIMITATIONS ON THE USE, ENCUMBRANCE, CONVEYANCE, AND CLOSURE OF THE ST. CLAIR REGIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2759) to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND LIMITATIONS ON THE USE, ENCUMBRANCE, CONVEYANCE, AND CLOSURE OF THE ST. CLAIR REGIONAL AIRPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States, acting through the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, shall release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport, as described in the most recent airport layout plan approved by the Federal Aviation Administration, to the extent such restrictions, conditions, and limitations are enforceable by the Administrator.

(b) LIMITATION.—The release under subsection (a) shall not be executed before the City of St. Clair, or its designee, transfers to the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri—

(1) the amounts described in subsection (c), to be used for capital improvements within the meaning of airport development (as defined in section 47102(3) of title 49, United States Code) and consistent with the obligations of the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri under the State block grant program of the Federal Aviation Administration; and

(2) for no consideration, all airport and aviation-related equipment of the St. Clair Regional Airport owned by the City of St. Clair and determined by the Department of Transportation of the State of Missouri to be salvageable for use.

(c) AMOUNTS DESCRIBED.—The amounts described in this subsection are the following:

(1) An amount equal to the fair market value for the highest and best use of the St. Clair Regional Airport property determined in good faith by an independent and qualified real estate appraiser on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) An amount equal to the unamortized portion of any Federal development grants other than land paid to the City of St. Clair for use at the St. Clair Regional Airport, which may be paid with, and shall be an allowable use of, airport revenue notwithstanding section 47107 or 47133 of title 49, United States Code.

(3) An amount equal to the airport revenues remaining in the airport account for

the St. Clair Regional Airport as of the date of the enactment of this Act and otherwise due to or received by the City of St. Clair after such date of enactment pursuant to sections 47107(b) and 47133 of title 49, United States Code.

(d) **REQUIREMENT TO REMOVE RUNWAY LIGHTING SYSTEM.**—The Federal Aviation Administration shall remove the runway end indicator lighting system at St. Clair Regional Airport.

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the applicability of—

(1) the requirements and processes under section 46319 of title 49, United States Code;

(2) the requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(3) the requirements and processes under part 157 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(4) the public notice requirements under section 47107(h)(2) of title 49, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 2759.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2759 releases the city of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport.

The bill will require the city to pay fair market value for the airport property to the Missouri Department of Transportation, repay the unamortized value of Federal grants to the Missouri Department of Transportation, and transfer any remaining revenue to the Missouri Department of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish my Republican colleagues were not rushing to consider this bill without more deliberation. The other body just passed this bill last week. We have had no hearings on the bill, no committee meetings, no markups.

I understand that several general aviation groups have expressed concerns about the bill, and I would have liked the opportunity to hear from them and study their specific reservations.

Each of the Nation's federally-assisted airports is part of a system—a national system—that is greater than the sum of its parts. The Federal Government invests \$3.35 billion a year in airport improvements because each airport in the system not only drives economic growth, but also is a safe harbor for a pilot in distress.

For those reasons, the general rule is that we invest in airports, not close them; nevertheless, I understand that the airport in St. Clair, Missouri, which this bill would allow to close, presents some unique circumstances.

Although the Federal Government has invested almost \$1.1 million in the airport since 1963, the airport has not received a Federal grant since 2006 when it received \$300,000. There are now only about eight aircraft movements at the airport a day. Community leaders believe that there are simply higher and better uses for the airport land.

Based on these extraordinary circumstances, this bill would allow the city of St. Clair to close the airport and would release the city from its obligations as a recipient of Federal airport improvement funds, provided the city transfers remaining grant funds and the market value of the land to the Missouri Department of Transportation.

While I have serious reservations about the precedent that this bill could set, I recognize the unique situation in this particular case. Going forward, I urge my colleagues to think long and hard about what it means for our national system of airports when we start permitting airports to shut down without working through the Federal Aviation Administration's administrative process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2759. This bill, introduced by Senators McCASKILL and BLUNT from Missouri, authorizes the closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport in St. Clair, Missouri, once all obligations to Federal taxpayers have been repaid. St. Clair is a small town of 4,700 in my district, about 50 miles southwest of St. Louis.

The city has operated an airport since the sixties, but in the past decade, a consensus within the community has been reached that the airport should be closed and the land utilized as part of a larger economic development plan for the region. This effort has broad support in the city of St. Clair from the mayor, the city council, the school board, the fire district, and the local chamber of commerce.

The only thing holding up this plan is the continued reluctance of Federal regulators to give the go-ahead. The city approached the Missouri Depart-

ment of Transportation in 2008 and the FAA in 2012, seeking closure of the airport, but the FAA keeps moving the goalposts, giving itself multiple extensions and leaving this small town confused and frustrated, with no end in sight.

As a small business owner myself from a town even smaller than St. Clair, I can tell you that red tape from Federal regulators is one of the biggest obstacles to economic growth in small communities. This legislation provides a simple fix to what has become an unnecessarily complicated issue in this community's attempt to provide growth opportunities in its area.

I should note that there are three other general aviation airports within a 30-mile radius of St. Clair, and the Missouri Department of Transportation has indicated the closure of the airport will not have an adverse effect on aviation in Missouri.

Under the bill, in order for the city to qualify for the release from the FAA, it must transfer amounts previously used for the airport's capital improvements toward the improvement of other general aviation facilities in the area. Under S. 2759, taxpayers will be made whole, and the city will be permitted to move forward with new economic development plans.

S. 2759 is bipartisan and has passed the Senate unanimously. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation so we can take a step forward in cutting through this red tape for the people of St. Clair, Missouri.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2759.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES M. CARTER AND JUDITH N. KEEP UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1378) to designate the United States courthouse located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the "James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1378

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JUDICIAL CENTER DESIGNATION.

The United States Federal Judicial Center located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, shall be known and designated as the "John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center". The Judicial Center includes the Federal property located at 221 West Broadway, 333 West Broadway, 880 Front Street, 325 West F Street, 808 Union Street, and the adjoining plaza.

SEC. 2. COURTHOUSE BUILDING DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, shall be known and designated as the "James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse".

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Federal Judicial Center referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center". Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 2 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1378, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1378 designates the United States Federal Judicial Center located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center. The bill also designates the United States Courthouse in San Diego, California, as the James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse.

John S. Rhoades, Sr., was a United States Federal judge on the United States District Court for the Southern District of California for 22 years. Before Judge Rhoades began practicing law, he served in the United States Navy during World War II. Early in his career, he practiced law for the city of San Diego, California, as a prosecuting attorney and as deputy city attorney.

Judge Rhoades was nominated by President Ronald Reagan in 1985 to serve as a Federal judge on the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, where he served until his death in 2007.

Judith N. Keep was nominated as a judge to the United States District Court for the Southern District of California in 1980 by President Jimmy Carter and served for 24 years. She was the first female Federal judge in her district. She later became its first female chief judge, serving in that capacity from 1991 to 1998. She continued to serve until her death in 2004.

James M. Carter was nominated by President Harry S. Truman as a judge on the United States District Court for the Southern District of California and served for 17 years, including 2 years as chief judge. In 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson nominated Carter to a seat on the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, where he served until his death in 1979.

□ 1500

All three of these judges demonstrated their dedication to the Nation and the law. It is fitting to honor their work by naming the judicial center and courthouse after them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) who is the author of this bill.

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to support my legislation, H.R. 1378, to designate the Federal Courthouse on West Broadway in downtown San Diego as the James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse, and to designate the Federal Judicial Center in San Diego as the John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center.

In San Diego's collaborative spirit, in order to find a name for the new building, the San Diego legal community reached out to find ideas, and through this process some prominent jurists clearly emerged.

These jurists were enthusiastically touted by a bipartisan coalition, including the San Diego County Bar Association, our district's Federal judges, and both Republican and Democratic community leaders across San Diego.

Judge Carter was the moving force behind the creation of the Southern District of California. After its creation, he became the first Chief Judge of the District Court, serving in that position until he was appointed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Judge Keep was instrumental in opening up the San Diego legal field to women. She graduated from the University of San Diego School of Law as its valedictorian and went on to become the first female judge for the District Court of the Southern District of California, and later the District Court's first female Chief Judge.

This bill also honors Judge John Rhoades, who served as a Federal judge

in San Diego for 22 years and was widely respected and beloved throughout the region's legal community.

Judges Carter, Keep, and Rhoades all served the public with distinction and reflected the San Diego legal community's shared values of excellence and integrity. I am proud to honor their legacy with this legislation.

I want to thank two of my colleagues in particular, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, who represented this area before I did and led this effort for the past several years, and Congressman DARRELL ISSA for his support and great amendments to the bill. It is better because of his work.

I am proud to have worked with them both in this Congress to move it forward.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I urge adoption of this bill and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I too urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1378, to designate the new courthouse at 333 West Broadway Street in San Diego as the James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse.

The bipartisan bill before us today has been a long time coming. I'm particularly grateful for SCOTT PETERS's hard work to bring interested parties together and craft a bill that all San Diegans can be proud of.

When we first reached out to the community, San Diego's leaders made it clear that there are no two figures more deserving of this honor than Judges Carter and Keep. The support was overwhelming.

Judges Carter and Keep were truly trailblazers in their field, and worked tirelessly both on and off the bench to better the San Diego community.

Judge Carter was the driving force behind the creation of the Southern California District, allowing the people of San Diego access to the federal court system.

Fittingly, once the Southern California District Court was established, Carter became its first Chief Judge.

Judge Carter also founded the Federal Defenders of San Diego and was instrumental in the creation of the University of San Diego Law School.

He is remembered by those who knew him as a giant of his time, a man whose service was an example for all those who followed in his footsteps.

For her part, Judge Keep was instrumental in opening up the San Diego legal field to women.

She graduated valedictorian at San Diego Law School at a time when only 5% of lawyers were women!

Judge Keep began her career as a public defender, and went on to serve as the Southern California District Court's first female Chief Judge.

Judith worked closely with the San Diego Community Foundation and the Armed Forces

YMCA, and both she and James served as role models and mentors to countless young attorneys and judges in San Diego.

In addition to honoring Judges Carter and Keep, this bill will rename the Federal Judicial Center after the late Judge John Rhoades. Judge Rhoades spent over 20 years as a distinguished U.S. District Judge in San Diego. It is only fitting that the judicial center bear his name.

Judges Carter, Keep, and Rhoades were instrumental in shaping the San Diego legal community into what it is today. I can think of no better tribute to their service than to name this courthouse and judicial center in their honor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1378, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the United States Federal Judicial Center located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the 'John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center' and to designate the United States courthouse located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the 'James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAY HUNT SUICIDE PREVENTION FOR AMERICAN VETERANS ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5059) to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5059

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act" or the "Clay Hunt SAV Act".

SEC. 2. EVALUATIONS OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) EVALUATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once each year, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall provide for the conduct of an evaluation of the mental health care and suicide prevention programs carried out under the laws administered by the Secretary.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each evaluation conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) use metrics that are common among and useful for practitioners in the field of mental health care and suicide prevention;

(B) identify the most effective mental health care and suicide prevention programs conducted by the Secretary, including such programs conducted at a Center of Excellence;

(C) identify the cost-effectiveness of each program identified under subparagraph (B);

(D) measure the satisfaction of patients with respect to the care provided under each such program; and

(E) propose best practices for caring for individuals who suffer from mental health disorders or are at risk of suicide, including such practices conducted or suggested by other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, including the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(3) THIRD PARTY.—Each evaluation conducted under paragraph (1) shall be conducted by an independent third party unaffiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs. Such third party shall submit to the Secretary each such evaluation.

(b) ANNUAL SUBMISSION.—Not later than December 1 of each year, beginning in 2015, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that contains the following:

(1) The most recent evaluations submitted to the Secretary under subsection (a)(3) that the Secretary has not previously submitted to such Committees.

(2) Any recommendations the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF INTERNET WEBSITE TO PROVIDE INFORMATION REGARDING MENTAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Using funds made available to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to publish the Internet websites of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary shall survey the existing Internet websites and information resources of the Department to publish an Internet website that serves as a centralized source to provide veterans with information regarding all of the mental health care services provided by the Secretary.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The Internet website published under subsection (a) shall provide to veterans information regarding all of the mental health care services available in the Veteran Integrated Service Network that the veteran is seeking such services, including, with respect to each medical center, Vet Center (as defined in section 1712A of title 38, United States Code), and community-based outpatient center in the Veterans Integrated Service Network—

(1) the name and contact information of each social work office;

(2) the name and contact information of each mental health clinic;

(3) a list of appropriate staff; and

(4) any other information the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) UPDATED INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the information described in subsection (b) that is published on the

Internet website under subsection (a) is updated not less than once every 90 days.

(d) OUTREACH.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the outreach conducted under section 1720F(i) of title 38, United States Code, includes information regarding the Internet website published under subsection (a).

SEC. 4. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REPAYMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LOANS FOR CERTAIN PSYCHIATRISTS OF VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to repay loans of individuals described in subsection (b) that—

(1) were used by such individuals to finance education relating to psychiatric medicine, including education leading to—

(A) a degree of doctor of medicine; or

(B) a degree of doctor of osteopathy; and

(2) were obtained from any of the following:

(A) A governmental entity.

(B) A private financial institution.

(C) A school.

(D) Any other authorized entity as determined by the Secretary.

(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), an individual eligible for participation in the pilot program is an individual who—

(A) either—

(i) is licensed or eligible for licensure to practice psychiatric medicine in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; or

(ii) is enrolled in the final year of a residency program leading to a specialty qualification in psychiatric medicine that is approved by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education; and

(B) demonstrates a commitment to a long-term career as a psychiatrist in the Veterans Health Administration, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) PROHIBITION ON SIMULTANEOUS ELIGIBILITY.—An individual who is participating in any other program of the Federal Government that repays the educational loans of the individual is not eligible to participate in the pilot program.

(c) SELECTION.—The Secretary shall select not less than 10 individuals described in subsection (b) to participate in the pilot program for each year in which the Secretary carries out the pilot program.

(d) PERIOD OF OBLIGATED SERVICE.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with each individual selected under subsection (c) in which such individual agrees to serve a period of two or more years of obligated service for the Veterans Health Administration in the field of psychiatric medicine, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) LOAN REPAYMENTS.—

(1) AMOUNTS.—Subject to paragraph (2), a loan repayment under this section may consist of payment of the principal, interest, and related expenses of a loan obtained by an individual who is participating in the pilot program for all educational expenses (including tuition, fees, books, and laboratory expenses) of such individual relating to education described in subsection (a)(1).

(2) LIMIT.—For each year of obligated service that an individual who is participating in the pilot program agrees to serve under subsection (d), the Secretary may pay not more than \$30,000 in loan repayment on behalf of such individual.

(f) BREACH.—

(1) LIABILITY.—An individual who participates in the pilot program and fails to satisfy the period of obligated service under

subsection (d) shall be liable to the United States, in lieu of such obligated service, for the amount that has been paid or is payable to or on behalf of the individual under the pilot program, reduced by the proportion that the number of days served for completion of the period of obligated service bears to the total number of days in the period of obligated service of such individual.

(2) **REPAYMENT PERIOD.**—Any amount of damages that the United States is entitled to recover under this subsection shall be paid to the United States not later than one year after the date of the breach of the agreement.

(g) **REPORT.**—

(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than two years after the date on which the pilot program under subsection (a) commences, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The number of individuals who participated in the pilot program, including the number of new hires.

(B) The locations in which such individuals were employed by the Department, including how many such locations were rural or urban locations.

(C) An assessment of the quality of the work performed by such individuals in the course of such employment, including the performance reviews of such individuals.

(D) The number of psychiatrists the Secretary determines is needed by the Department in the future.

(3) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the pilot program terminates under subsection (i), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives an update to the report submitted under paragraph (1) and any recommendations that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section, including standards for qualified loans and authorized payees and other terms and conditions for the making of loan repayments.

(i) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to carry out the pilot program shall expire on the date that is three years after the date on which the Secretary commences the pilot program.

SEC. 5. PILOT PROGRAM ON COMMUNITY OUTREACH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a pilot program to assist veterans transitioning from serving on active duty and to improve the access of veterans to mental health services.

(b) **LOCATIONS.**—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) at not less than five Veterans Integrated Service Networks that have a large population of veterans who—

(1) served in the reserve components of the Armed Forces; or

(2) are transitioning into communities with an established population of veterans after having recently separated from the Armed Forces.

(c) **FUNCTIONS.**—The pilot program at each Veterans Integrated Service Network described in subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) A community oriented veteran peer support network, carried out in partnership

with an appropriate entity with experience in peer support programs, that—

(A) establishes peer support training guidelines;

(B) develops a network of veteran peer support counselors to meet the demands of the communities in the Veterans Integrated Service Network;

(C) conducts training of veteran peer support counselors;

(D) with respect to one medical center selected by the Secretary in each such Veterans Integrated Service Network, has—

(i) a designated peer support specialist who acts as a liaison to the community oriented veteran peer network; and

(ii) a certified mental health professional designated as the community oriented veteran peer network mentor; and

(E) is readily available to veterans, including pursuant to the Veterans Integrated Service Network cooperating and working with State and local governments and appropriate entities.

(2) A community outreach team for each medical center selected by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(D) that—

(A) assists veterans transitioning into communities;

(B) establishes a veteran transition advisory group to facilitate outreach activities;

(C) includes the participation of appropriate community organizations, State and local governments, colleges and universities, chambers of commerce and other local business organizations, and organizations that provide legal aid or advice; and

(D) coordinates with the Veterans Integrated Service Network regarding the Veterans Integrated Service Network carrying out an annual mental health summit to assess the status of veteran mental health care in the community and to develop new or innovative means to provide mental health services to veterans.

(d) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the pilot program under subsection (a) commences, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program. With respect to each Veterans Integrated Service Network described in subsection (b), the report shall include—

(A) a full description of the peer support model implemented under the pilot program, participation data, and data pertaining to past and current mental health related hospitalizations and fatalities;

(B) recommendations on implementing peer support networks throughout the Department;

(C) whether the mental health resources made available under the pilot program for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces is effective; and

(D) a full description of the activities and effectiveness of community outreach coordinating teams under the pilot program, including partnerships that have been established with appropriate entities.

(2) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the pilot program terminates under subsection (e), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives an update to the report submitted under paragraph (1).

(e) **CONSTRUCTION.**—This section may not be construed to authorize the Secretary to hire additional employees of the Department

to carry out the pilot program under subsection (a).

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The authority of the Secretary to carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date on which the pilot program commences.

SEC. 6. COLLABORATION ON SUICIDE PREVENTION EFFORTS BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND NON-PROFIT MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) **COLLABORATION.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may collaborate with non-profit mental health organizations to prevent suicide among veterans as follows:

(1) To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of suicide prevention efforts carried out by the Secretary and non-profit mental health organizations.

(2) To assist non-profit mental health organizations with the suicide prevention efforts of such organizations through the use of the expertise of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(3) To jointly carry out suicide prevention efforts.

(b) **EXCHANGE OF RESOURCES.**—In carrying out any collaboration under subsection (a), the Secretary and any non-profit mental health organization with which the Secretary is collaborating under such subsection shall exchange training sessions and best practices to help with the suicide prevention efforts of the Department and such organization.

(c) **DIRECTOR OF SUICIDE PREVENTION COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall select within the Department a Director of Suicide Prevention Coordination to undertake any collaboration with non-profit mental health organizations under this section or any other provision of law.

SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY FOR HEALTH CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS OF COMBAT SERVICE DURING CERTAIN PERIODS OF HOSTILITIES AND WAR.

Paragraph (3) of section 1710(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(3) In the case of care for a veteran described in paragraph (1)(D), hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care may be provided under or by virtue of subsection (a)(2)(F) only during the following periods:

“(A) Except as provided by subparagraph (B), with respect to a veteran described in paragraph (1)(D) who is discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service after January 27, 2003, the five-year period beginning on the date of such discharge or release.

“(B) With respect to a veteran described in paragraph (1)(D) who is discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service after January 1, 2009, and before January 1, 2011, but did not enroll to receive such hospital care, medical services, or nursing home care pursuant to such paragraph during the five-year period described in subparagraph (A), the one-year period beginning on January 1, 2015.

“(C) With respect to a veteran described in paragraph (1)(D) who is discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service on or before January 27, 2003, and did not enroll in the patient enrollment system under section 1705 of this title on or before such date, the three-year period beginning on January 27, 2008.”.

SEC. 8. PROHIBITION ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act

and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise made available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5059, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in proud support of H.R. 5059, as amended, the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act.

In July, amidst the largest scandal—an accountability scandal—the Department of Veterans Affairs has ever faced, the committee heard testimony from three mothers whose sons had lost their lives to suicide following their service in our military.

One of those mothers was Susan Selke, the mother of Clay Hunt. Clay was a Marine Corps combat veteran who served honorably in both Afghanistan and Iraq, where he was wounded in battle.

Despite suffering from post-traumatic stress upon his separation, Clay devoted himself to humanitarian work and advocated on behalf of his fellow veterans.

Nevertheless, in March of 2011, Clay took his own life at the age of 28. Tragically, Clay was far from alone in his struggle, and his family and friends are far from alone in their heartbreak.

On average, 22 of our Nation's heroes commit suicide each day, in spite of significant increases in VA's mental health and suicide prevention budget, staff, and programs over the last several years.

What is more, for some groups of veterans, including female veterans and veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan, suicide rates are actually getting worse.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to help these veterans. With the passage of H.R. 5059, as amended, which is named in Clay's memory, I think we will. The Clay Hunt SAV Act will help struggling veterans access the supportive services and mental health care they need to, hopefully, save their lives.

To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of VA programs and increase awareness of available services, the bill would require an annual third-party evaluation of VA's mental health care and suicide prevention programs, and

it would require that VA publish an interactive Web site to serve as the central source of information regarding VA mental health services.

To increase VA's capacity to meet the mental health care needs of our veterans, it would establish a pilot program to repay education loans for individuals who have received a degree in psychiatric medicine and who agree to work at VA for at least 2 years.

To create a seamless transition from Active Duty to veteran status and increase community support for those in need, it would establish a pilot program to assist veterans during transition and require VA to collaborate with nonprofit mental health organizations in their communities.

Importantly, the bill would also extend an additional 1 year of eligibility for VA health care services for certain combat veterans who have not yet enrolled and whose 5-year combat eligibility period recently expired.

Congressman WALZ from Minnesota introduced the bill, along with me and Congresswoman DUCKWORTH from Illinois. I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to both of them for their service to our Nation in their uniform and in this Congress.

I am proud to say that this bill has the support of numerous groups of veteran service organizations, including Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Officers Association of America, and the Wounded Warrior Project.

The Clay Hunt SAV Act will not singlehandedly halt the scourge of suicide. The problems the VA health care system faces, and the mental health wounds of war that our veterans face, are far too deep for any single solution to resolve. But it is an important first step, and it is a step that we owe Clay and those like him who returned home from honorable service troubled in mind and in need of help.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5059, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5059, the Clay Hunt SAV Act, which was introduced in July of this year. It has 134 cosponsors, including myself, Chairman MILLER, and the chairman and ranking member of the Health Care Subcommittee. Congressman WALZ is the primary sponsor of this very important piece of legislation.

Over the years, the Veterans Affairs' Committee has taken steps to address the rise of suicide among veterans. In the 110th Congress we enacted the Joshua Omvig Suicide Prevention Act.

Earlier in this Congress we reported H.R. 4971, which included a measure

sponsored by our colleague, Representative SINEMA, that would protect veterans who have worked in classified environments by ensuring that appropriate mental health care treatment options exist for them.

Today, we are acting again, by considering H.R. 5059, the Clay Hunt SAV Act. There are no easy answers or quick fixes to addressing veterans suicide. It will take a concerted effort for all of us in Congress, the White House, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Defense to work together to find real solutions. Veterans support groups, community employers, and families are part of the solution too.

H.R. 5059 takes a number of steps toward that goal. It will improve the safety net for at-risk veterans, while introducing some accountability into the Department of Veterans Affairs mental health care and suicide prevention programs, using a third-party evaluation.

It will provide veterans with a Web site that will serve as a centralized source of information on mental health services.

H.R. 5059 initiates a program to help address some of the glaring mental health personnel shortages at the Department of Veterans Affairs. While the incentives in this bill are limited to the psychiatric field, I would like to see this effort expanded in the future to all mental health professional shortfalls.

H.R. 5059 also takes steps to temporarily expand peer support networks, which we have heard are quite effective. I believe the reports required by this bill will confirm additional resources that should permanently be dedicated to fully utilizing peer support.

H.R. 5059 also provides an additional window of eligibility for combat veterans who may have missed the window of opportunity to sign up for VA health care. This extra time will help to ensure that veterans receive the health care, including mental health care, that they need. I would encourage my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the First District of Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and Mr. WALZ, thank you so much for introducing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support the Clay Hunt SAV Act. I am honored to be an original cosponsor of this important legislation.

As the father of a veteran, and a doctor who worked at the VA hospital in

northern Michigan, I know that the challenges of military life do not end once our servicemembers return from active duty.

The mental wounds of war may be invisible, but no less real to the young men and women suffering from them. Facing high unemployment rates, the stigma of post-traumatic stress disorder, and the loss of military fellowship, returning veterans often face a crisis of confidence at the very moment they should feel nothing but relief and rest.

That is why our bill will help the VA to put the very best mental health professionals to work for our veterans and will create peer support networks to help catch those transitioning servicemembers who might otherwise fall through the cracks.

The time to act to address the epidemic of veterans suicide is now. With this bill, and with continued focus on the health of our veterans, and their mental health as well, we can make a real impact.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and pass the Clay Hunt SAV Act.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ). I want to thank Mr. WALZ for his continued effort to make sure that our veterans are taken care of in this great Nation of ours.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my thanks to Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD. I think an American public which, many times, thinks all politics is bickering and fighting and pettiness needs to see the two examples that these leaders show, consistently putting the needs of our veterans first and foremost, finding areas to improve, and holding people accountable, but this piece of legislation, most importantly, finding solutions to make life better for our veterans. And for that, I am forever grateful to them for the work and for the staff that worked on this.

□ 1515

Ms. DUCKWORTH is not able to be with us today. I said a lot of times that people talk about patriotism and service and heroics. In TAMMY DUCKWORTH's case, you just state her name, and her life is a living testament to that, and she works every day. We are just happy she is with her little one now, but she had a big part in this.

There are very few things that unite this country in the security of our Nation and in the care of our warriors, as I think many of us know, as do the millions who have fought the conflicts and who have fought extremism across the globe—people like Clay Hunt, a young marine, who went and did his duty. He was wounded in Iraq.

That was not enough for Clay, so he went to Afghanistan, where he experienced some of the most horrific condi-

tions you could imagine. That was not enough for Clay. He came home after he did his service in the Marine Corps, and he continued to serve. He went to Haiti, taking his skills that he had learned in the military to help after the hurricane.

Then he came and sat in many of our offices and had many conversations—everything from the GI Bill to the transitioning back of our warriors who are dealing with PTS and making sure that we address their mental health issues.

I know, for many of us, Clay was the epitome of American patriotism, of strength, of everything that is right, and it comes as such a shock. I know it sounds like a cliché, but how could someone so strong and who had done so much be dealing with these demons? We know he was, and we know this Nation didn't do enough. We know he didn't receive the adequate care that he deserved and had earned. To be quite honest with you, it is in our Nation's best interest, both morally and security-wise and everything else, to give them that.

Again, he didn't stop there, and his parents didn't stop there. His parents—his mother and father—are here in this Chamber, as are his friends, to make sure this never happens to another family. Our friends at the veterans service organizations, like the IAVA and Paul Rykoff and his folks and the VFW, have asked us to do better.

The result of this piece of legislation is the folks like Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member MICHAUD, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Mr. BENISHEK, and others who have come down here to speak. Our differences are small compared to our commonalities, and our care for our warriors has to be there. You heard the specifics of this bill, some of the things that it will do.

There is not one of us who is kidding oneself that this is going to be the silver bullet, but it puts it on the forefront. It brings some solutions that came from our warriors, that came from best practices, that came from both sides of the aisle, and brought it forward to find real solutions.

The thing that most encourages me about this is that it is asking us, if things are not working, evaluate them and get rid of them, and bring the things forward that are going to work. Don't get buried in studies for 10 years. We don't have 10 years. We don't have 10 days for people. It is now.

That is, I think, the beauty of this piece of legislation. It starts to move those things forward. It starts to bring the communities back into this. It starts to understand a holistic approach to dealing with the issues of veterans' suicides, because this Nation cannot allow this to happen. We morally cannot. It attacks our soul when we do this. To be very honest, we can't afford to lose people like Clay Hunt.

Clay Hunt is our leader. He is our future leader. He is our business leader. He would at some point have been in this Chamber or wherever he would have chosen to have gone. That was his destiny, and this is happening over 22 times every day.

I encourage my colleagues to support this piece of legislation but, more importantly, to support the spirit that is behind it—bringing us together to get it right: to care for our warriors with the best possible use for our resources and an accountability to those resources to make sure that the outcome is most important.

That outcome is honoring our commitment to the reintegration of these warriors. Once they have done their service to this country, bring them home; make them whole; make sure that they are able to continue to serve this Nation as they wish.

For that, I am grateful. I am especially grateful for the leadership of Clay's family and of his mother, Susan, who absolutely said this can be done; this must be done; and it will be done. Thanks to these two gentlemen's leadership, it will.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Second District of Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), who is a stalwart supporter of veterans in her district and who has a great future ahead in veteran issues.

Mrs. WALORSKI. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, every day, 22 veterans take their own lives. Many of us in this Chamber have experienced this in our own districts. This has been a tragedy in my district as well. Sadly, on March 31, nearly 3 years ago, Clay Hunt was one of those 22 veterans who took his own life at the age of 28.

An Afghanistan and Iraq war veteran and suicide prevention advocate, Clay Hunt epitomized what it meant to have a life of service both in and out of uniform. Today, we honor Clay and his family with H.R. 5059, the Clay Hunt SAV Act. Clay's story was one of bravery and dedication to our country.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps and served on several missions to Iraq and Afghanistan. After his final deployment to Afghanistan, his unit returned in October of 2008, and he was honorably discharged from the Marines.

Here is the key: Clay relied on the VA for medical care and received a 30 percent disability rating from the VA for PTSD. After realizing his PTSD is what prohibited him from keeping a steady job, he appealed the 30 percent rating and encountered a bureaucratic nightmare, including the VA's losing his files.

Clay had to wait months to get in to see a psychiatrist at a VA medical center. When he finally did, he told his mother he would never go back. Two

weeks later, Clay took his own life. Five weeks after his death and 18 months after filing an appeal with the VA for his PTSD rating, Clay's appeal went through. His PTSD rating was 100 percent.

Too little, too late.

Clay's story details the urgency our Nation's heroes deserve in care. If we are going to lower this incredibly alarming rate of suicides, we have to improve the access and effectiveness of mental health care available to our returning heroes, and this step is a step in the right direction. The Clay Hunt SAV Act will increase access to mental health care and improve the quality of care that troops and veterans receive.

Together, we can change this system so no other veteran or spouse or parent will ever have to do what thousands of veterans have endured, including Clay. We owe it today to do what we can do and to continue the fight for our veterans, for what they have endured, and give them nothing but the best.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), the incoming ranking member for the Veterans' Affairs Committee, who has been a strong advocate for our veterans for the number of years she has been on the committee.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Thank you, Ranking Member MICHAUD.

First of all, let me just thank you for your service—your 12 years of service to this Congress—for what you have done for veterans throughout this country and also for working with you on transportation. I want to salute you for all that you have done. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I visited the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, where part of the facility is named the Murtha Cancer Center. Jack Murtha was a friend of mine, and he was the biggest advocate in Congress for men and women who serve in our military. I am especially proud of the visitors' center at the Normandy American Cemetery in France.

I had the opportunity to visit this center not long after it opened in 2007. The visitors' center truly pays tribute to the soldiers who stormed the beaches. It gives visitors a true sense of what the men and their loved ones had gone through on that D-day. I am pleased to have worked with John Murtha, and I am pleased that his memory will live on in the Murtha Cancer Center at Walter Reed.

I rise in support of this legislation, introduced by Mr. WALZ, to help bring attention to the horrible problems that are affecting our Nation's veterans.

I am pleased that my colleague introduced this legislation, which will require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to arrange for an outside evaluation of their mental health care and suicide preven-

tion programs. I am also requiring any servicemember who is discharged for posttraumatic stress disorder or brain injury or military sexual trauma to get treatment. Twenty-two veterans' suicides per day is too many. One suicide is too many.

Again, I want to thank Mr. WALZ for introducing this legislation.

Last night at the White House Christmas ball there were cards available for Members of Congress to sign that would be sent to servicemembers this holiday season. I have placed these cards in the Democratic cloakroom and in the Republican cloakroom, and I am asking for Members who would to sign these cards and send notes to our veterans throughout the world.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. JOLLY), a colleague of mine and a fine member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5059, legislation to improve mental health and suicide prevention services for our Nation's veterans.

Across the country today, there are families grieving, remembering loved ones who, in a moment of tragedy, took their own lives. These families also have in common another memory—the day their loved ones put on the uniform of the Armed Forces for the first time, who raised their right hands and took an oath to defend the Nation, to defend and protect each of us.

In many ways, we as a nation have failed to defend and protect them. We have failed to ensure sufficient access to mental health care and suicide prevention services.

We have remarkable caregivers and mental health counselors in our VA and DOD health systems who are on the front lines of mental health services every day, who do remarkable work; but, administratively, we must do more. We must empower veterans to seek immediate care for mental health and suicide prevention services. We must incentivize mental health professionals to join the VA workforce and deliver health care to our veterans, and we must improve the coordination between the VA and the DOD to deliver these services. This legislation does exactly that, and it is why it deserves our full support.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of national importance, but it is also a matter of personal conviction for many families, including for a mother in my district who, on Memorial Day of this year, at the C.W. Bill Young VA Medical Center at Bay Pines, approached me to share a story about the loss of her son who took his own life while awaiting enrollment in the VA, while awaiting mental health treatment from the VA. His mental health needs

were left untreated, and he took his own life.

There are very few things more important for this body than to give voice to the voiceless. We are doing that today by speaking out about the tragic experiences of those who are no longer with us and by improving a health care system that provides remarkable care every day to our veterans but who need this Congress and this administration to enact much-needed changes. Mr. Speaker, this is critically important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in its passage.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, how many more speakers has the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I have one more speaker before I close.

Mr. MICHAUD. I have one more speaker, and I believe she is on her way.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a gentleman who does not serve on the committee with us but who has a very keen interest in veterans affairs issues.

Mr. ROSKAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate and this discussion today, this is really a bill about real contrasts. The contrast, as the gentleman from Minnesota described a couple of minutes ago, is starting at a very high point, which is a sense of calling, a sense of patriotism, a sense of going forward and meeting a duty and joining the Armed Forces of the United States. That is one end of the spectrum. At the other end of the spectrum was the description that Mrs. WALORSKI had, and that was of Clay Hunt's experience.

From one end of the spectrum to the other.

As I was sitting and listening, Mr. Speaker, I was looking above your head. There is a clock over your head. If you look at these numbers, you have 22 people every day who are going to kill themselves, and we know that. If you think about that and if you look at that clock, you think, in a little bit more than an hour, there is going to be a terrible thing that is going to happen. The good news is that TAMMY DUCKWORTH from Illinois and TIM WALZ from Minnesota and JEFF MILLER from Florida decided to do something about it.

The power of this is when you have that broad of a political spectrum that says we are not going to tolerate this, that we are going to make sure that this issue is not lost in the shuffle, that this is not a statistic, that this is not 22. Rather, these are people who are going to be named; these are people who are going to be discussed; and these are people who are going to be defended.

□ 1530

So I am happy today to join with those who are asking for favorable passage of the Clay Hunt SAV Act.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Providing sufficient and effective mental health care to our veterans is an issue that I believe we must focus on. It is an issue that I hope will bring comprehensive policies in the next Congress. Finding real solutions will require all of us working together and will require sufficient resources and dedication.

I know my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, will be at the forefront of this fight, joined by Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member-elect Ms. BROWN, and all of the Republicans and Democrats on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. But I will not be in the House of Representatives next session to join that fight.

In my years in Congress, I have worked hard toward solutions that provide modern and effective care and benefits for our veterans. I have fought against inadequate budgets and for resources necessary to do the job. I have worked hard to improve the care and benefits of our newest veterans, while never forgetting our veterans from previous conflicts.

I have been encouraged by what we have all been able to accomplish together. But there is more that we have to do, and I know my colleagues will not give up the fight until we have won that battle.

But I do want to thank Chairman MILLER for his leadership, his support, and his friendship over the years. It has been an honor to work with Chairman MILLER, and it has been a pleasure to serve with him as well.

I also want to thank the members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, both past and present. They have been true colleagues, mentors, and friends.

I want to wish the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), our ranking member-elect, the best of luck, and I hope that she will enjoy her time as ranking member as much as I have enjoyed my time as ranking member.

And for the staff, both the majority and minority staff, they are the ones that make Members look good. They work very hard day and night to make sure that the policies that the members of the committee want are put into legislation.

I can say truly that the majority and minority staff in this Congress has worked very well together. They have put aside the partisanship that other committees have not. So I thank them for their hard work and dedication to making sure that we do what we are here to do, and that is to serve our veterans.

There is no more noble calling than serving those who have served this great Nation of ours.

And to my colleagues here in Congress who are veterans and to America's veterans, I will simply say, thank you. Thank you for your service to this great Nation of ours. It is because of you that we are the country that we are today. You never turned your back. You never faltered. And some of you have made the ultimate sacrifice and have given your life for this country. So thank you for your service.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill and move it to the Senate.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would be remiss if I did not say thank you to the gentleman from Maine, MIKE MICHAUD. As the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, we, as a team, along with the members and the staff, have accomplished much this year, but it has all been done in a bipartisan way. We were able to move large pieces of legislation that will impact, in a positive way, veterans for years to come.

We uncovered probably the largest scandal that has ever been uncovered at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and we are now turning that agency in a direction to where it serves the veterans and not itself.

This wouldn't have happened without the steady hand of the gentleman from Maine, MIKE MICHAUD, as the ranking member. Again, he is a fine man. He has been a great Representative, and he is a friend that will be missed. I look forward to going to Maine one day and hunting moose with MIKE, whom I have pestered for 12 years to get a chance to go up and visit. But we will miss him, and we wish him well.

And with that, I want to take a moment to express my condolences and my appreciation to Clay's family, whom I understand are in the Capitol with us today, as well as to all the families of veterans who have lost their lives to suicide. My thoughts and my prayers are with each of them.

Once again, I encourage all the Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to help introduce H.R. 5059, the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act with Chairman JEFF MILLER and Representative TIM WALZ.

This bipartisan bill, named after 28-year-old Marine Veteran Clay Hunt, who tragically took his own life in March 2011, will reduce the barriers that prevent our Veterans from receiving quality mental health care.

It is a heartbreaking reality that twenty-two Veterans take their own lives each day. These are all casualties of war. As a nation, we are failing these brave men and women.

This legislation will task an independent, third party to annually review mental health care and suicide prevention programs and

make recommendations on how to improve care. The bill also requires the VA to create a centralized source of information for all mental health services for Veterans. It will also address the shortage of mental health care professionals in order to ensure access to care as demand increases. Finally, through a pilot program, Veterans will receive reintegration assistance directly from the communities in which they live, fostering a smoother and more inclusive transition to life after the uniform.

Just as these Veterans remained faithful to our country on the battlefield, it is our turn as their Representatives to remain faithful to them. When our service men and women make the brave decision to seek help, we must ensure that they can get the quality assistance and treatment they deserve in a timely manner.

I urge all of the Members to support this legislation so that we can begin to turn the tide against suicide.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as our nation continues to welcome home a new generation of veterans from the battlefield, it is vital that we address the challenges faced by these men and women. The effects of combat are not always left behind for our soldiers, and the transition into civilian life all too often is not an easy one.

Right now, our nation is struggling to combat the impact of PTSD on veterans, and statistics from the VA show that each day 22 American veterans take their own life. This epidemic must be dealt with—the lives of those who protected our freedoms are on the line.

This week, the House passed legislation named after Clay Hunt, a Marine veteran who, after working as an activist drawing attention to the struggles of returning veterans, took his life at the age of just 28.

The Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act will take meaningful steps to ensure veterans like Clay have the resources and treatment they need when they return home. That means increasing access to, boosting accountability for and removing the stigma of potentially-life saving mental health care.

I stand in support of this legislation with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I also stand with veterans' advocacy organizations across America—including the Travis Manion Foundation, based in my district—who work daily to engage and empower veterans and their families throughout their individual journeys.

This week, the Travis Manion Foundation will recognize veteran Jake Wood with the group's annual 'If Not Me, Then Who Award' for his work to support military veterans upon their return home. This is not the first time the Travis Manion Foundation has recognized Jake—back in 2010, the group gave a fellowship to 'Mission Continues' and 'Team Rubicon', organizations Jake was involved with alongside Clay Hunt. Together, Jake and Clay performed over 500 service hours in humanitarian support with other veterans.

It is fitting that we recognize Jake at this time as we honor Clay with the passing of this bill. The time is now for Senate and president must act on the 'Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act'.

Twenty-two lives lost a day are too many. One is too many. Let's work together—Congress, advocacy groups, and veterans—to put an end to the epidemic of veteran suicide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALMON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5059, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN RALPH HALL

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of this 1 hour Special Order for RALPH HALL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker for granting us this Special Order to honor Congressman RALPH HALL of the Fourth Congressional District and for granting me this time today.

Although Congressman HALL has been sidelined by a recent accident, he is blessed to be on the mend, and he hopes to express his thanks in person sometime next year. Hopefully he is watching on C-SPAN television right now from Rockwall, Texas. I cannot tell him how many Members wish him the speediest of recoveries and wish that he was with us now.

RALPH has asked me to put in the RECORD the following statement from himself:

"I want to express my heartfelt appreciation to those in the Fourth Congressional District who gave me their vote of confidence time and again, who gave me the benefit of their wisdom and good ideas, and who inspired me to

do my best to represent their views and their vision in Washington. You will always be dear to my heart."

With that, I yield to the distinguished Congressman from Collin County, Texas, Congressman SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor my fellow Texan and dear friend RALPH HALL.

It has been said, "A hero is someone who has given his or her life to something bigger than oneself." RALPH embodies these very words. He is a man of honor and integrity, a fierce protector of freedom, and a great conservative. He is a shining example of all that is great about America and the great State of Texas.

RALPH and I have known each other a very long time. I won't say how long. We are blessed to represent neighboring districts. There is no greater friend and ally in Congress than RALPH. We have worked together on a number of issues. Recently, I was pleased to help RALPH with a zebra mussel water bill. That is an important law that helped provide clean water to north Texas.

Now, RALPH is known both around the Hill and back at home for his sense of humor. You might say that is why he has never met a stranger. Every person he meets is not just a friend, but a close friend.

On a more serious note, RALPH is also known for his faithful love of his late wife, Mary Ellen. If you ever visit with RALPH, he will tell you she was the person who encouraged him to enter public service, and since then, she was with him every step of the way.

When RALPH had his chairman portrait painted 2 years ago, he made sure Mary Ellen was a part of that portrait. That love and commitment speaks so highly of RALPH's character.

RALPH, as your colleague, I thank you for your service to your constituents, our great State of Texas, and our great Nation.

As your friend, I thank you for your sense of humor; but, more importantly, I thank you for your loyal friendship. D.C. won't be the same without you. God bless you. I salute you, RALPH.

Mr. BARTON. Thank you, Congressman JOHNSON.

Before I yield to Congresswoman GRANGER, I want to say that most of RALPH's Washington, D.C., staff is watching this.

Janet Poppleton, Christopher Roper Schell, Leslie Coppler, Jessica Carter, Mitzyn De La Rosa, and Van Carver: RALPH wanted me to thank you-all for your service to himself and to the people of the Fourth District of Texas.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from the 12th District of Texas, the Honorable KAY GRANGER.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you. It is such an honor to speak about our good friend RALPH HALL.

His background and what he has done is really amazing. He joined the Navy in 1942. He went to war. He came back and got an LLB from Southern Methodist University. He was admitted to the Texas Bar and became a county judge, the president of the State Judges and Commissioners Association. He was elected to the State senate and was president pro tem. Then in 1980, he came to the House of Representatives, where he still serves.

The most important thing in RALPH's life, something that JOE BARTON talked about—he said: "If you are going to talk about how important my life is, you are going to talk about my wife, Mary Ellen," the love of his life. They married in 1944 and were married until she passed in 2008.

But we are really not talking about what RALPH HALL did but who RALPH HALL is. Anyone who met him one time, the first thing you think about is that great smile. He was always smiling. He always had a twinkle in his eye and a joke on his lips. There is no one who tells jokes better than RALPH HALL. He has always got a story, and he has always got a joke.

I had to go to The Dallas Morning News for an endorsement at the editorial board one time, and, unfortunately, RALPH was interviewed right before I was. I walked in and they were still laughing at his jokes. No one could even think of a question for me for a while. But he was just that kind of a person. Never said a mean thing about anyone but told a lot of jokes on a lot of people.

So I wish RALPH were here sitting in this Chamber with us tonight, but because of his accident, he is not. But I know he is watching it.

I will say to RALPH, we miss you, and we wish you the very best. It has been wonderful. We are all better for having known you. Thank you.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, before I introduce Congressman NEUGEBAUER, I have already put one statement in the RECORD that RALPH wanted me to read, but by electronic device, he has sent a second statement.

So this is another direct quote from Congressman HALL:

"Although sidelined by a recent accident, I am blessed to be on the mend and hope to express my thanks in person sometime next year. It has been a great honor and privilege to represent the good people of the Fourth Congressional District for the past 33 years. I thank them for their vote of confidence over the years, for their wisdom and good ideas, and for inspiring me to represent their views and their vision to the best of my ability."

With that, I yield to the Congressman representing Lubbock, Texas, where the Ennis Lions will play a high school football game this Friday night, the Honorable RANDY NEUGEBAUER.

□ 1545

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of my friend and colleague, Congressman RALPH HALL. You look at RALPH's life, and it is a record of service to his country. It began in 1942 as a young lieutenant flying an aircraft off of an aircraft carrier. After the war, RALPH came back to this country and started work in the private sector, creating jobs and expanding the economy in Texas.

Later, RALPH would be the county judge for Rockwall, Texas, and then later would be elected as a Texas State senator. In 1980, he was elected to the United States Congress to represent the Fourth District of Texas, where he has represented that district with distinction.

If you ever traveled in RALPH's district and you stop at the 7-Eleven and you stop to get a little gas and you mentioned RALPH HALL, people's faces light up because I bet everybody in RALPH's district has met RALPH because one of the things that he was very diligent about doing was making sure that the people in his district felt represented.

Since his election, he has worked tirelessly here in Congress on a number of issues, and I had the honor and privilege to serve on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee with RALPH. One of the things I appreciated most about RALPH and I think most of us appreciated is RALPH's sense of humor. Now, that didn't stop him from really asking very direct and grilling questions of witnesses that would come before our committee, and sometimes, it would be a tense moment, but RALPH always had something funny or a story to tell that kind of broke the ice.

You see a number of members of the Texas delegation are here today, particularly the Republican delegation. Every Thursday, we have lunch together and talk about what is good for Texas. The thing that we always looked forward to was we couldn't wait until RALPH got there so RALPH could share a funny story. One of the things that I will miss most about RALPH is those times when he would be on the floor or he would be at lunch sharing those stories.

Now, one of the things about RALPH is that, as he got older, he got wiser. In fact, he got so wise in 2004 that he realized that he needed to be a part of the Republican Party, so he switched from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party, and we were so glad to welcome him to that.

As I said, it has been an honor and a privilege, RALPH, to be part of your team on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and it has been a great honor to be one of your colleagues. More importantly, RALPH, we

want to thank you for your friendship, your kinship, and, most importantly, your service to this great Nation and to the State of Texas.

With that, we say, RALPH, job well done, God bless you, and we look forward to seeing you soon.

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank the gentleman from Lubbock.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the Congressman from the 25th Congressional District of Texas, Mr. ROGER WILLIAMS. Under the newest configuration, he is the only Congressman to ever represent that district, so they must love him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand here today with my Texas colleagues and say a few words about our most treasured friend, mentor, leader, and hero, RALPH HALL. RALPH's lifetime of service to his country and fellow man are full of victories, as we already heard, and highlights too numerous to count.

As a young lieutenant in the U.S. Navy, RALPH served his country and flew planes in World War II. Once the next Congress convenes, we will sorely miss the only two remaining World War II veterans currently in Congress, also including Congressman DINGELL.

RALPH HALL has an appreciation for America that very few of us can understand. He understands sacrifice, he understands service, and he understands putting one's self aside for the greater good.

My friend has always been an accomplished businessman, having successfully served in a number of executive roles in the private sector. He brought his business savvy and military experience to Congress, which undoubtedly contributed to his reputation for being one of the most respected and well-liked Members we have ever had.

His ability to bring humor into every situation was not just to get a laugh; it was his unique way of bringing different viewpoints together to find common ground.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman RALPH HALL has served north Texas well and deserves recognition for his many legislative accomplishments. I am grateful to have served with my friend and a patriot whose leadership, spirit, and statesmanship will always be greatly missed.

I wish him all the best as he continues to serve Texas, America, and his community back home. I will always pray for RALPH and his family.

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank you, Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the Congressman from the First Congressional District, deep east Texas, the soft-spoken Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here honoring RALPH HALL. He has been my Congressman for many years; and, in fact, after being on the bench for about 10 years, I had a feeling

that perhaps I ought to legislate, and I wouldn't do it from the bench. But my Democratic Congressman RALPH HALL, from conversations, he talked like I did—I hope that is not disrespectful to RALPH—but I told him, as long as he is my Congressman, I didn't have any need to run because he would represent me well.

Then we had redistricting in 2003, and it opened up a different district. But I felt that way then, if he had stayed my Congressman, I never had a need to run, so some wish we didn't have redistricting.

As I hear people talk about his age, I think about RALPH saying that when he turned 90, somebody on his staff said: "Congressman HALL, would you rather we didn't mention to people that you are 90?" He said: "No, I am fine with that. I would a lot rather you say he is 90 than, 'Doesn't he look natural?'"

Having been with RALPH yesterday there in Rockwall as he is going through rehab, actually, he doesn't look natural at all, he looks great, and we just look forward to the days when he is fully out of the wheelchair and that rod in his leg is not bothering him as much as it is now. We miss him very much.

He did also provide me a quote that struck him having been chairman of the Science Committee. This is a quote RALPH sent:

We are reminded of the responsibility given to us by the scripture engraved on the hearing room wall of the Science Committee from Proverbs 29:18, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Well, RALPH's eyesight was 20/20. He could see where we have been, and he could see where we were going. It was an honor, a pleasure, and a real privilege to serve with my friend, RALPH HALL.

Mr. BARTON. I thank Congressman GOHMERT.

I now yield to the gentlewoman that represents part of Dallas County in Dallas, Texas, the Honorable EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, who comes from the same hometown as I do: Waco, Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to join you in saying some words about RALPH HALL, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor and privilege to serve with my colleague and friend. We had some laughs just recently when I visited him about our history and working together in elective office.

Our relationship goes back to when I was in the Texas house—and I left the Texas house in the seventies—talking about things that we remembered. I really regret that he is not here today, but he wanted to be, and he planned to be, but he is not going to make it today.

As all of you have had the pleasure of serving with RALPH, we are missing out

on several jokes and stories. Some of them were really funny, and some can't be said in some places, so I won't try to match him in storytelling.

I am going to tell you a little story that happened when RALPH switched parties. I called him and called him and called him and called him, and I couldn't get through, nor did he return my calls until I finally said, "Well, just tell him I still love him, and I don't care what party he is in."

Thirty seconds later, he returned my call, and he said, "I just couldn't take another bawling out from a woman." He said, "I have gotten it from my sister. I got it from my wife."

I said, "But do you know what? Probably nobody understands more than I do because I have been watching your numbers." So it never interfered with our relationship.

When he was chair of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, two of the years that he was chair, I was the ranking member. He never hesitated to reach across the aisle to try to reach consensus. Really, that is the kind of spirit we need now. I will miss him for that. I will miss him because of the history we both shared.

Our districts used to come right next to each other. Now, there are a couple of people that come in between us, but it won't divide our friendship, and I look forward to our continued friendship for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned so much from him. I remember when I first came, he was the person who taught me how to make arrangements to go home every week with the airline that we use and also taught me how to find rooms and shortcuts of how to get where you need to go on this Hill, which is rather complicated when you first get here. He will be greatly missed.

He has meant a lot, and he has done a lot. The space exploration program will be forever grateful to him. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee research and all it stands for will always have RALPH HALL as a part of its history.

I appreciate the opportunity to have had a chance to work with him, to know him and his family, and to wish him well.

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank you, Congressman JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the Congressman from Fort Bend County, Sugar Land, Texas, a Navy pilot himself, as RALPH HALL was in World War II, the Honorable PETE OLSON.

□ 1600

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for that kind introduction.

May 3, 1923, RALPH HALL was born in Fate, Texas. There could not be in the whole world a better name to describe a man's life than being born in Fate, Texas.

Fate touched RALPH in many ways. RALPH is a young man in Rockwall, Texas, pumping gas as a teenager. Guess who drove up and bought gas from my friend RALPH HALL? Bonnie and Clyde, the gangsters.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir, I will yield to my friend.

Mr. BARTON. There is no proof of that. I know the Congressman actually states it as a fact, but I have repeatedly asked him to prove it, and he has absolutely failed. So that is an urban myth of the Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. OLSON. Reclaiming my time, my friend said, when he saw them, he didn't know who they were, but he got a quarter, a maximum amount of money for a tip. He walked in so proud to show his boss what had happened; he had gotten a huge tip. The paper was there right beside the floor. He saw this man and this woman. He pumped gas for those two felons.

Now, when he told his boss who they were, he called the local sheriff. The sheriff said: Thank you so much for calling. I have gotten a call about two stray dogs. Once I catch those dogs, I will go after Bonnie and Clyde.

Fate and RALPH HALL, but fate didn't stop there.

As was mentioned, RALPH was a naval aviator, a pilot in World War II. He did his flight training in Pensacola, Florida. He was there with a marine, a guy named Ted Williams, The Splendid Splinter, batted .403 in 1941.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. OLSON. I yield to my friend for a minute, yes, sir.

Mr. BARTON. Well, while the Bonnie and Clyde story is more fiction than fact—RALPH would have been pumping gas at the ripe old age of 8 or 9 years old for that to be true—the Ted Williams story is fact and is true.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my friend.

The story is RALPH knows Ted is there. He is in the Marines, part of the Navy. RALPH has an idea—baseball game against Army. I will take all their paychecks. I have got Ted Williams. The day of the game comes, knocks on Ted's door, he had some fishing gear: HALL, let's go fishing.

RALPH tried to stop him.

Ted, Ted, I have told my wife Mary Ellen I am coming home with a big paycheck. I bet my whole paycheck on this game. RALPH held the fence up so Ted Williams could go AWOL. Navy lost the game and RALPH had it rough at home with Mary Ellen.

Fate touched RALPH HALL one more time. As the chairman of the NASA committee here in Congress, RALPH HALL is friends with great Americans. This picture shows the greatest, that man right there named Neil Armstrong, the first American to walk on

the Moon. Next to him, Colonel Tom Stafford, another Apollo astronaut; and right by the microphone there, Captain Gene Cernan, the only man to go to the Moon twice, on Apollo 10 and Apollo 17.

Fate touched RALPH HALL's life. Fate touched our lives by giving RALPH HALL to us. He is America's best. He is Texas' best.

RALPH, we love you. God bless you. Bravo Zulu. May you have fair winds and following seas.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Sugar Land. I now yield to Congressman GENE GREEN, who represents the Houston ship channel and the battleship Texas and other such notable Texas landmarks.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure about a noted Texas landmark, but I want to thank you for scheduling a Special Order for our good friend, RALPH HALL.

I rise to pay tribute to a great American who has dedicated his life to protecting and serving our Nation and the great State of Texas, Representative RALPH HALL, a true gentleman.

RALPH began his commitment to service seven decades ago when he joined the United States Navy and served as an aircraft carrier pilot during World War II. Returning to Texas after the war, RALPH began private law practice in Rockwall, Texas, where he served as county judge in the 1950s and represented that area in the Texas State Senate from 1962 to 1972.

That is when I first met RALPH HALL, because in 1972 he ran for Lieutenant Governor in Texas in the Democratic primary. There were a few other folks in that race, so RALPH didn't make it into the runoff. But RALPH was elected to Congress in 1980 as a conservative Democrat, where he served our State honorably on the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Science Committee, where he was chairman from 2011 to 2013.

In 2003, RALPH became a Republican. His votes were always conservative, though. My job in the 1990s as a deputy whip on the Democratic side was to whip Texas Members. So I would go to RALPH, and he was the distinguished gentleman. And that is just not a title; he really was. He would tell me, he said: Well, GENE, what do you want me to do?

I said: Well, RALPH, I want you to vote thisaway.

He said: You know, GENE, I can't really do that.

I said: Well, RALPH, can you vote late?

RALPH was always a conservative, no matter what Republican or Democratic label he had. I had the honor of serving with RALPH in Congress since 1993 and on the Energy and Commerce Committee since 1997, and RALPH has always been, like I said, a true gentleman to me and to all I have ever seen him work with.

I will best remember RALPH as a true hero of Texas who was a committed public servant, either in uniform or elected official, and always stayed true to his beliefs and did everything he could for his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman HALL will be sorely missed by all of us, and I want to thank him for both his hard work and dedication for years, but more importantly for his friendship to a lot of Members—not just Texans, but a lot of Members in Congress. RALPH will be very fondly remembered.

Mr. BARTON. Now I yield to the distinguished Congressman from, I believe, Flower Mound, Texas, in Denton County, the Honorable MICHAEL BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, thank you, chairman, and thank you for calling this hour together.

Of course, the ranks of those who are able to capably deliver a narrative in this House suddenly have gotten a little thinner, but I did have the opportunity to sit down and visit with Mr. HALL just a few days before Thanksgiving, and I know how intense was his desire to be here and be able to talk on the floor today on his own behalf.

RALPH, sadly, that didn't come to pass. I hope you are able to watch today. I hope you are able to hear the accolades of all of your colleagues. We miss you, RALPH. We wish you nothing but the best going forward.

Again, the ranks of the capable narrative deliverer here in the House of Representatives has gotten a little thinner at the end of this term.

Mr. BARTON. I now yield to Mr. BLAKE FARENTHOLD, the Congressman from Corpus Christi, Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you, Chairman BARTON.

It is great to be here to talk a moment or two about my good friend RALPH HALL. When I was first elected to Congress a few years back, RALPH was one of the first people that I met, being a Texan, and I tell you, he has the kindest heart and always has a smile on his face and a good joke ready at hand.

You know, people ask me: What do you see as your career as a Congressman? Who do you look up to? Where do you see your career in Congress going?

I might want to grow up to be RALPH HALL.

Then some of his adversaries said he was getting too old to be in Congress, and RALPH jumped out of a perfectly good airplane. I had to rethink, "I want to grow up to be RALPH HALL," after he jumped out of a perfectly good airplane.

But I tell you, it is a reflection of the courage and dedication that a man like RALPH HALL has. RALPH was committed to serving Texas and the folks that he represented, and he would go to any length, including jumping out of a perfectly good airplane, to continue to serve.

It was an honor and a privilege to have spent 4 years of my life as a colleague of RALPH's, and it has been the greatest 4 years of my life. It is an honor and privilege to have served with him, and he truly will be missed.

I appreciate the opportunity, Chairman BARTON, to be on the floor today to acknowledge my friend and, quite frankly, one of my strongest mentors here in Congress, RALPH HALL.

God bless you, RALPH. We are going to miss you.

Mr. BARTON. I now yield to the gentleman from the 14th District of Illinois, Congressman HULTGREN.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is such a privilege to be able to say a few words for my good friend and my chairman, chairman of the Science Committee when I first was elected to Congress 4 years ago. I had the privilege of serving under Chairman HALL on the Science Committee. A couple memories that I have of so many committees that I went to where the committee would stop because we were laughing so hard with a statement or comment or joke, perfectly timed joke that Chairman HALL would put in, and so I enjoyed that time so much.

My wife and I had an incredible privilege this summer. We have, among ourselves here in Congress, some wonderful people we get to serve with. A few of them truly are heroes, and one of those heroes is RALPH HALL. We had the privilege of going to the 70th anniversary of D-day to recognize those World War II veterans, and RALPH HALL was with us on that trip. We all loved being there, but everybody wanted to be with RALPH HALL—again, a true hero. To be in that place with RALPH HALL was a great, great honor for my wife and me.

My greatest memory since I have been here over the 4 years was with Chairman HALL, and that was in the Science Committee and having the privilege of sitting about 10 feet away from Neil Armstrong and Captain Gene Cernan—the first man to walk on the Moon and the last man to walk on the Moon, people who changed the trajectory of this Nation and this world—and having the opportunity to talk with them and get to know them and to hear their amazing story, but also the humility that they had, that same humility that Chairman HALL has. Just a privilege to serve.

RALPH, we love you. I wish so much that you could be here today to be able to express your own heart for the privilege I know that you felt serving in this incredible place, serving the wonderful constituents you have in Texas. But I want you to know that we love you, we miss you, we are praying for you, and we are excited to see, hopefully soon, a full recovery for you. We are looking forward to having you back here and hearing those great jokes once again.

So, RALPH, I want to let you know that we are pulling for you and excited again for all that you have done and all that you are going to do.

Mr. BARTON. I would now like to yield to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the gentlelady from Houston, Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank him for holding this Special Order for a very dear friend to all of us, RALPH HALL.

I guess my opening remarks would be that, if you took the greater percentage of all of us Members of the House of Representatives, everyone would rise up and say "my good friend RALPH HALL" and really mean it, for he was a good friend and is a good friend to all of us on both sides of the aisle.

When I came to the United States Congress, I went to the Science Committee, and there was RALPH HALL, fighting for the issues that were not only impacting the Nation, but were impacting our great State. No one could doubt that RALPH HALL was a champion for Texas, a champion for the space exploration program.

I used to love getting with him on the floor of the House and strategizing how we could continue to make sure that our human space exploration, our astronauts, and the great research that is done by NASA carries on.

Certainly, as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, he was astutely concerned about the issues of energy, but also health care and many others.

He loved his family, and he forever reminded me of a time when he came to Houston and he had to see his grandson, who is now grown, and I am sure one of RALPH's favorite grandsons, if you will—he loves his family—when he had to get a ride to the hospital where his grandson was, and of course we are so grateful that he recovered. He always tells everyone that I went 30 miles out of my way to take him to that hospital, and I can say to you I did it with joy.

He was always grateful and thankful for friendship and kindness, and he was kind. And I must say that, if he didn't have a career in the United States Congress, he could be a stand-up comic because his timing was everything; his jokes were unique. I don't think they were written anywhere, and of course he was always saying them.

Let me also say, since he has had such a long history, he reminded me of his friendship with the Honorable Barbara Jordan and his friendship with Mickey Leland, two of the predecessors of my particular district.

And then I would offer to say the same remarks that were mentioned just earlier about how excited he was to be in Normandy for the 70th commemoration and have our own special iconic hero, RALPH HALL, who was honored by the French and honored by

many. He was a regular hero and a dynamic hero as we went about the town.

My hat is off to RALPH. I know that he will be well. I know that he knows that we love him. But, more importantly, let me salute him as a great American who has served his Nation with dignity and honor and respect and integrity, and who walks the pathway of a congressional person that respects the dignity and integrity of this House and, as well, the friendship of Democrats and Republicans because he calls everyone an American.

Mr. BARTON. I now yield to RANDY WEBER, the Congressman from the 14th District from Friendswood, Texas.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you may have heard about the revered Halls of Congress, but let me say that there is no more revered HALL of Congress than that of RALPH HALL. Let me tell you why that is.

□ 1615

RALPH HALL was a true Texan and a great American. He is a great example to us all.

As a true Texas gentleman, time and time again, I have seen him demonstrate the art of tact. He once described that art of tact as making someone feel at home when you wish they were.

As a true Texas gentleman, he could do that. As a true Texas gentleman, I saw him time and time again use the art of diplomacy. He explained to me: "RANDY, you know, diplomacy is being able to tell someone to go to Hades and make them happy to be on their way." RALPH had that gift.

Let me tell you, RALPH HALL—and I am going to list some descriptions of him alphabetically. He was American through and through. He was charming. He could turn that charm on. You have heard many of our speakers talk about that. He was committed. He was serious about what he did. Elegant. He was a picture of elegance. You could just see it in the way he moved and the way he worked. Funny. Gosh, he was so funny. The fact is I think he was cut out to be a comedian, but he was probably sewn together wrong. Gosh, he was funny at times. Gracious. A true Texas gentleman. A mentor to us, he could be stern when necessary. Strong. Did I mention Texas through and through? Witty. In short, RALPH was a great example.

Mr. Speaker, I end with this acronym. When I think of RALPH—R-A-L-P-H—I think of R, he was real, he was Republican. I think of A, he was American. I think of L, he was a leader. And then I think of P, RALPH was principled. And then I think of H, and he is a hero.

I will end with this—his last name HALL. H stands for hero, A stands for American, and both the Ls stand for the lasting legacy he is going to leave here in the Halls of Congress. When it

comes to the Halls of Congress, there is none better than RALPH HALL.

RALPH, we love you, we bid you a great American and a great Texan farewell, but only temporarily. Don't be a stranger.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman. I now want to yield to the Honorable DANA ROHRABACHER from California's 48th District in Orange County.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I have served in the House of Representatives now for 26 years, and I have met good people and bad people, and I have met people I agree with and whom I like and people I disagree with and I like. We are reflective of the American people.

People ask me, "What do you think about the United States Congress?" And I always say, "It reflects what the American people are all about."

This is the House of Representatives where we represent all of these parts of our country. Well, RALPH HALL was one of those Representatives who represented the goodness in America and the greatness in America. RALPH HALL was first and foremost, I believe, a patriot who put that above every other one of his considerations.

I was proud to know RALPH. RALPH is still with us, so we shouldn't think of RALPH as being gone from the Earth. For Pete's sake, RALPH is still here, and I hope he is listening right now because we wish him all the best. RALPH HALL is a great American still, but he has left his legacy here behind.

I worked with RALPH on the Science and Space Committee, as they called it, at least they did then—Science, Space, and Technology. RALPH has made enormous contributions to the well-being of our country in two areas in particular.

Number one, he did much to help direct America's space program and keep it a viable effort on the part of the United States to utilize space for the benefit of humankind and, of course, for the purpose of the United States to become a dominant power in the next frontier. His leadership was indispensable to creating the potential that we have today of accomplishing great things in space. And to the things that we have already accomplished, RALPH was right in the middle of it, making sure that job got done.

He also very involved with energy development. I know that there is a little bit of confusion that just because someone is from Texas that they are going to be backing up the oil companies and things such as that. RALPH was a guy who, yeah, he believed in the oil industry, and he was grateful to the oil industry for the good things that it has provided us, the fact that energy and the production of energy is so important to our national well-being. But he was also a man who understood that science was going to develop new methods of energy and was always pushing our committee and the Science Com-

mittee to be on the cutting edge of research and development.

When you get people here running for Congress, they run for Congress because they have strong ideas and ideals, often which don't agree with one another. You can imagine trying to get legislation through committees and on the floor of the House, et cetera, when you have people who are having to interact but have different points of view. Well, tensions at that moment can be a blockage to making things better.

RALPH, if anything else, was the guy who was able to eliminate the tension in the air that was getting in the way of getting something done because he had the best sense of humor of any other Member I have ever, ever come across. RALPH, by doing that, kept this body a productive body, and we weren't at each other's throats.

One last note. My father was a pilot during World War II and he flew in the Pacific. I have a very special place in my heart for RALPH HALL and all those guys because RALPH HALL, too, was a pilot in World War II in the Pacific. He is the godfather to us all.

RALPH, we respect you, we honor you, we love you, we are grateful to you for what you meant to our lives and what you have done to help make our country better off. Thank you. God bless.

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank you, Congressman.

I now want to yield to the gentleman from the Fifth District in Dallas, Texas, the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the Honorable JEB HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to honor my dear friend and this great patriot from Texas, next door to me in Dallas, RALPH HALL. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I feel most inadequate to the task.

There are a number of Members who come to the House floor and some provide humor. Few have provided more humor than RALPH HALL at times when this body critically needs it.

Some Members come to this body and they become well respected. Certainly that is RALPH HALL.

Some are well liked. That is also RALPH HALL.

Some distinguish themselves for their accomplishments. RALPH HALL will take second place to no one on what he has been able to accomplish in his House career.

Then there is a handful, Mr. Speaker, of true American heroes. RALPH HALL served our Nation with courage and distinction in World War II.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that I am not sure I know any Member who combines them all: respectability, likability, humor, effectiveness, and being a true American hero.

We will miss RALPH HALL. We will miss his wit. But, do you know, Mr.

Speaker, even more so I think I will miss his wisdom because there are many times that we have debated various issues either among, perhaps, the Texas delegation or the House as a whole, and occasionally the voices may get a little loud, perhaps the debate gets a little bit confused, and then almost out of nowhere RALPH HALL comes in and imparts his wisdom, and it is like a ray of sunshine piercing the darkness, and I will say, "Yes, that makes sense," and we come together as Members of Congress for the good of America.

I heard the previous speaker speak about it. There is so much we could say about RALPH and his accomplishments. But how ironic in some respects that the oldest Member of the House was so much on the cutting edge of science and technology and has helped this institution lead America into this century. When RALPH HALL has spoken, when he has led, so many have followed.

There are many reasons that it is a privilege to serve in the United States House of Representatives. But one of the great privileges is the people that you meet. There have been none nicer, none wiser, and more accomplished than RALPH HALL.

Mr. Speaker, I will miss, Texas will miss, America will miss RALPH HALL when he leaves this body.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Round Rock, Texas, the distinguished JOHN CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about my friend RALPH HALL. An amazing man. He has done just about anything adventuresome you can think of in your life.

This is the man that tells us that he was a little boy when Bonnie and Clyde went through, and I think he is telling us the truth.

He tells me that he was a fight promoter, and I know he was a fight promoter—I heard it from other people—who turned down a young man from Kentucky named Cassius Clay because he thought he had a glass jaw.

He is a man that served in the wild and wily Texas Legislature and Texas Senate. He once ran for attorney general, and he said he looked in the mirror and thought he saw the attorney general, and it turned out there was another guy that he was seeing in the mirror.

He served in this House both as a Democrat and a Republican and is loved by both parties and respected by both parties.

He had an amazing talent for carrying humor around as a tool of friendship. I just want to share one small thing that livened up a crowd like I have never seen before.

We were at the laying of the keel of the aircraft carrier *George Herbert*

Walker Bush. There were about 50 or so people sitting down in chairs in the hot sun. They put a bottle of water under each chair. I was sitting next to RALPH on the front row. He looked down there underneath his chair and he saw that bottle of water. All these people were sweltering behind us waiting for the thing to start. He reached down, he picked up the bottle of water, he got up, and he turned around to the crowd behind him and he said: "Somebody nice put a bottle of water underneath my chair. Who's got the scotch?" The crowd just started laughing, everybody relaxed, and the ceremony began.

RALPH made friends like nobody else. He is my friend. I think every Member of this House considers him a friend. He is a great American, a great Texan, and I am going to miss him dearly.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

May I inquire how much time I have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of Congressmen come on the House floor and tell anecdotes about RALPH, about how funny he was and how smart he was, and they are all—at least the ones about how smart he was—very true.

We have heard the urban myth about waiting on Bonnie and Clyde, which I do not believe is true. We have heard about Ted Williams and RALPH and Ted playing on the same baseball team in World War II, and that is true. We have heard about the offer to serve as a fight promoter for Cassius Clay, who later became Muhammad Ali, and that is true.

A few more that you may not know:

He was good friends with the Hunt brothers in Dallas and Clint Murchison, who was the original owner of the Dallas Cowboys. At one time, he was asked to be general counsel for what we today call the NFL, which he turned down.

□ 1630

I got to know RALPH when I got elected in 1984. He and I served districts that touch each other. We both live in our districts in Texas, and so we became good buddies because we were always on the first flight to Texas after the last vote at the end of the week and on the last flight before the first vote to Washington at the beginning of the week.

Once we built up enough frequent flyer miles, when there was a complimentary upgrade—we never spent taxpayer dollars to fly in first class—we would fight over who got seat 4F. Because RALPH sweet-talked the special service people at American Airlines, he always won. The only time I have ever gotten seat 4F on American Airlines was when RALPH was not on the plane.

You have heard about the fact that he used to be a Democrat. He was until 2003 or 2004 when he switched parties. One of the first times that I realized how important RALPH HALL was is when the first President Bush won the election to be President of the United States. They called a special meeting over at the Capitol Hill Club on behalf of the National Republican Campaign Committee so that the Republicans in the Congress, who were in the minority, could have a meeting with the incoming President. We thought that was pretty special.

There was a stir in the crowd. We thought it was the President coming in, and it was. The President walked into the room of the Eisenhower Lounge, which the Republicans will know is on the first floor at the Capitol Hill Club.

Before the President began to speak, there was another stir. Through another door that I have never seen used who do you think came into the Capitol Hill Club but RALPH HALL.

Now, what is surprising about that is that at the time, RALPH HALL was a Democrat. RALPH HALL had endorsed George H.W. Bush for President when he was a Democrat, and so he got special recognition at that Capitol Hill meeting.

There have been many great Members from Texas that served in the House since our creation as a State in 1845, Mr. Speaker. Some of the ones that I have enjoyed working with in my tenure are people like Bill Archer of Houston, Jake Pickle, Steve Bartlett, and Sam Hall, but none has been more beloved and none has been more effective than RALPH HALL of Rockwall, Texas.

I have some other things to say, but I see that others are here, so I yield to Mr. WAXMAN, the chairman emeritus and current ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to RALPH HALL, particularly for his earlier years in the House of Representatives when he was a Democrat. He came on the Energy and Commerce Committee early.

We sometimes think about Democrats and Republicans. He became a Republican. He had been a conservative Democrat. Everybody on both sides of the aisle held him in the highest respect because he was a man of integrity and honesty. When he gave you his word, you could count on it.

RALPH and I became friends. I hope that friendship will continue into the future. I want to express to him, his constituents, and his family and friends my admiration for him as a person and my respect for him as a legislator.

I know it is common to say that even though we didn't agree on all things, it didn't make any difference. He always

tried to do what he thought was right. As a result, he earned my respect and that of everyone else.

Mr. BARTON. I yield to Mr. SMITH, the chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), my colleague, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today, we honor the distinguished service of our friend and colleague, RALPH HALL of Texas. If there were a congressional hall of fame, Representative HALL would be a first-ballot inductee. His many years of service were highlighted at the end of 2012 when he became the most senior Member of Congress to ever cast a vote in the House. His career has spanned 34 years.

Since he was 19 years old, he has made his contributions to our country. As a lieutenant in the Navy during World War II, he served as a pilot. Since then, he has never hesitated to accomplish a mission. That mentality has made him a distinguished Member of Congress and a very effective chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Throughout his time in Congress, RALPH HALL has served this institution with style and humor. RALPH always said, "I'd rather be respected at home than liked in Washington." RALPH has actually achieved that rare combination of both. We thank him for his service to Congress, to the great State of Texas, and to our country.

RALPH has asked me to pass along his comment, "I am especially partial to my friends from the Texas delegation who represent their district so well and whose integrity and hard work have benefited not only our State, but also our Nation. I thank you for your friendship and countless acts of Congress."

Mr. BARTON. I now yield to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, time is short this evening, but it is such a privilege to be here to honor RALPH HALL.

Proverbs tell us that our good name is worth more than all the gold and silver on Earth, and that is certainly true of RALPH HALL, someone who I immediately bonded with when I came to Congress in 2001.

RALPH has been a mentor, teacher, and a dear, good friend. I could always—as we all could—count on RALPH to do the right things for the right reasons and be a man of his word. His first priority throughout his time here was to do right by the State of Texas.

As LAMAR said so ably, RALPH always believed it is better to be respected at home and make sure the folks there knew what a good job he was doing for them. It was a real privilege for me to be able to serve with that good man. We will surely miss him.

What a privilege to be here tonight to honor him on this special evening.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. UPTON.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that RALPH HALL is an amazing man. I served with him on the Energy and Commerce Committee a lot of years. I had the luxury of sitting next to him. We have a lot of great stories, that is for sure.

I can remember when he came back to the Science Committee, and we said that we had yet another Texan. He said, "When I'm done, you'll wish that you had another 10 or 12."

Mr. BARTON. RALPH, we love you. We will miss you. You are a great guy. We will see you soon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest gratitude for the privilege to represent the good people of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas for the past 33 years. Other than my faith and my family, this has been the greatest blessing of my life and one for which I will always be grateful.

My service spans 5 Presidents and 7 Speakers of the House, and at the age of 91½, I am the oldest Congressman in the history of the House of Representatives—a record that was set at the slightly younger age of 89½. I have had the privilege of serving alongside some of the most dedicated and influential leaders in America's history—men and women on both sides of the aisle whose integrity and hard work have served our Nation well.

To all of you—former and current Members of the House—I thank you for your leadership and for your friendship. It has been an honor to work with you, and we have had our share of agreements and disagreements on many issues. I respect each of you and the people you represent back home—and I am proud to call so many of you my good friends.

I have been fortunate to serve on two great Committees—the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee—throughout these 33 years, with the exception of a two-year leave of absence from Energy and Commerce.

When I first came to Congress after the 1980 election, future Speaker Jim Wright asked me what committees I would like to serve on. I asked for Energy because Texas is an energy state, and I asked for Science and Space because of the importance of the space program to our Nation and the role of the Johnson Space Center in Houston. I was fortunate to have the opportunity to serve on both of these.

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has helped define the vision and establish the course for our space program, the International Space Station, and scientific research and development. The Energy and Commerce Committee has spurred energy development and innovation, telecommunications breakthroughs, and healthcare reforms, just to name a few. To the members and Chairmen of these Committees, I express my gratitude for your leadership, hard work, and collaboration.

A special thanks goes to Speaker BOEHNER and our Leadership for their confidence in naming me as the Ranking Member of the Science Committee for four years and as Chairman of the Committee in the past Congress, for allowing me to return to Energy and Commerce after the leave of absence, and for granting a waiver to serve on the Science Committee again in this Congress. I also want to express my gratitude to my good friend and Texas colleague LAMAR SMITH, Chairman of the Science Committee, for naming me Chairman Emeritus for the 113th Congress.

I am of course partial to the Texas Delegation—to this great group of men and women who not only represent Texas so well but who also have such a strong commitment to our Nation's prosperity and security. We are like family, and I thank you for your friendship and countless acts of kindness.

As Members of Congress, we could not perform our duties without the aid of dedicated and loyal staff. To my wonderful staff who have guided my office operations and supported me with their hard work, advice, and friendship, I will always be indebted. A special thanks also goes to the talented and dedicated staff of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee who supported me so ably as Ranking Member and as Chairman.

And once again, I want to express my heartfelt appreciation to those in the Fourth Congressional District who gave me their vote of confidence time and again, who gave me the benefit of their wisdom and good ideas, and who inspired me to do my best to represent their views and their vision in Washington. You will always be dear to my heart.

As I bid farewell to this great body, I do so with an abiding faith in this institution and in the commitment of those who work here. We are reminded of the responsibility given to us in a scripture that is engraved on the hearing room wall of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee—Proverbs 29:18, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Throughout my more than 50 years of public service, in the State of Texas and here in Washington, America has faced many challenges, and there are many still facing our Nation today. At 91 years of age, I am looking forward—not back—and I am confident that my colleagues will continue to strive to achieve a vision that is worthy of this great Nation, our people, and our children and grandchildren. May God bless your efforts, and may God continue to bless America.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a dear friend and colleague, the Dean of the Texas Congressional Delegation: Congressman RALPH HALL of the Fourth District of Texas. RALPH has served the Fourth District with unqualified distinction since his first election in 1980. Throughout his service to the Fourth District and the United States Congress, he always focused on his constituents and at the end of the day, what is best for America and her future.

Twenty years ago when I arrived as a young Congressman, RALPH, being a kind and generous man, reached out and helped me. While he may have forgotten, I remember his kindness to this day. Many are asking him to write a book, and I hope he does. Readers would enjoy his great sense of humor and deep understanding of Texas history.

Mr. Speaker, December 7, 2014 marked the forty-third anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor. I want to recognize two departing members who were veterans of World War Two (WW II). First, RALPH HALL joined the United States Navy in December 1942 and served as an aircraft carrier pilot from 1942 to 1945 rising to the rank of Lieutenant (Senior Grade). Secondly, JOHN DINGELL, joined the United States Army in 1944, rose to the rank of Second Lieutenant. And, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that JOHN is the not only the Dean of the Michigan Delegation but also, the Dean of the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, RALPH and JOHN are departing at the end of this session of Congress. With their departures, when the 114th Congress convenes in January 2015 and for the first time since the 113th Congress convened last year, Congress will be without a member of Congress who served in WW II.

Throughout RALPH's congressional career, he would seek compromise and reach across the aisle to ensure legislation was passed in a bi-partisan manner. RALPH represents what is best about Congress when members work together towards a common good and not for a sound bite.

RALPH was a distinguished member of the House Science, Space and Technology Committee. In, 2013, he was named Chairman Emeritus of the committee for his focus on promoting science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) education. Further, RALPH was instrumental in: Ensuring sound science precedes any regulations imposed by the Administration, advancing research and development (R&D) for new technologies to keep America Competitive, expanding production of America's abundant energy resources and seeking alternative sources to reduce costs and increase national security, and maintaining America's preeminence in space.

RALPH will be sorely missed by the Texas Delegation, Members of Congress and their staffs of the United States House of Representatives. RALPH, I wish you fair winds and following seas. Godspeed, my Friend.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one like Texas Congressmen RALPH HALL.

Congressman RALPH HALL is the oldest serving member of Congress, the oldest person to ever serve in the House of Representatives, the oldest person ever elected to a House term and the oldest House member ever to cast a vote. Mr. HALL is also the last remaining Congressman who served our nation during World War II.

And for all of these accomplishments, I would like to thank and congratulate RALPH one more time for his service to the country and his leadership in the Texas Congressional Delegation.

Born in Fate, Texas on May 3, 1923, HALL did not know of his successful future which was ahead of him. At the age of 19, HALL enrolled into the U.S. Navy where he served as a lieutenant and combat aircraft carrier pilot from 1942 to 1945 during World War II.

After serving for three years, HALL then went on to finish college and received his LL.B. from Southern Methodist University in 1951. He was admitted to the Texas Bar, and practiced law in Rockwall. Mr. HALL also participated in the business side of Rockwall

where he took part in serving as President/CEO of Texas Aluminum Corp., General Counsel of Texas Extrusion Co., Chairman of Lakeside News, Inc., and was a founding member of Lakeside National Bank in Rockwall where he currently serves as Chairman of the Board. RALPH had the calling to serve Texas in the political arena in Texas politics, a combat sport. So he began his public service from 1950 to 1962 when he served as County Judge of Rockwall County, Texas.

Mr. HALL also served as President of the State Judges and Commissioners Association in 1958–1959. From 1962 to 1972, Mr. HALL was elected and served as a Texas State Senator where he served as President Pro Tempore in 1968–1969.

Congressman RALPH HALL was first elected to serve the 4th District of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1980 and has been re-elected to each succeeding Congress.

On November 27, 2012, Congressman HALL became the oldest member in the U.S. House of Representatives to ever cast a vote. The following month, on December 25, 2012, he became the oldest-serving Member of the U.S. House of Representatives in recorded history.

Congressman HALL always ensured to serve his people and made sure their voice was heard on different issues throughout Congress. A noteworthy quote Mr. HALL often said was "I'd rather be respected at home than liked in Washington."

RALPH is a hardcore Texan with the unique knowledge of understanding all people from the rich and famous to the infamous and downtrodden. He was a proud conservative democrat and personally knew the likes of LBJ, Speaker Sam Rayburn, Muhammad Ali, baseball great Mickey Mantle, war veteran Audie Murphy, Senator John F. Kennedy, Ted Williams, President Ronald Reagan, Texas Governor John Connally, Texas Governor William "Bill" P. Clements, Jr., Texas Governor Ann Richards, Texas Governor Rick Perry, Curtis Cokes, General Tommy Franks, Lieutenant General Tom Stafford, astronauts Gene Cernan, Buzz Aldrin, Neal Armstrong, U.S. Representative Ray Roberts, U.S. Senator Phil Gramm, famous aviator Claire Chennault, President George H.W. Bush, President George W. Bush, U.S. Senator JOHN CORNYN, U.S. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, U.S. Senator Lloyd Bentsen, T. Boone Pickens, H. Ross Perot, Red Adair, Bo Derek; Chuck Norris, Tom Hanks, and The Ink Spots. He works well with both Republicans and Democrats, but he "got religion," in 2004, and became a Republican. Never forgetting his Democrat roots, he commented, "Being a Democrat was more fun."

RALPH HALL always has a story and a new, but often used joke. He runs 2 miles a day and certainly symbolizes the best of the Greatest Generation. RALPH HALL's service and leadership has shaped him into an important role model that members of the Texas Delegation in Congress, on both sides of the aisle admire. His dedication and love for his public service illustrates how success is attainable when mixed with hard work and determination, along with a love of America and of course, Texas.

And that's just the way it is.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, one word that will always be synonymous with RALPH HALL is 'gentleman.'

I met Congressman HALL when I was first elected to Congress in 1993 and was appointed to the Science, Space and Technology Committee where he served as Chairman at the time when he was a Democrat. As Chairman of the Committee, his bipartisan work there was marked by promotion of science, technology, engineering and math education; advancing American competitiveness through research and development of new technologies; and maintaining our country's preeminence in space.

I've never known Congressman HALL as a person who rests. His work as a policymaker will endure, and he is a natural politician with a knack for coalescing conflicting viewpoints.

Congressman HALL is also one of the kindest Members in Congress. His geniality helps make this institution a better place for the American people. And no matter who you are—astronaut, president, or next door neighbor—Congressman HALL is always one to put a generous hand forward.

I wish Congressman HALL every blessing together with his three sons and five beautiful grandchildren. I'm grateful to know him, to have served with him, and to call him my friend.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the distinguished service of our friend and colleague, RALPH HALL of Texas.

If there were a congressional "Hall of Fame," Representative HALL would be a first ballot inductee. His many years of service were highlighted at the end of 2012 when he became the most senior member of Congress to ever cast a vote in the House of Representatives.

RALPH's career in the House of Representatives and his commitment to his constituents in the 4th District of Texas spans 34 years. But his contributions to our country began before that.

Since he was 19 years old, RALPH has led a life of service. As a lieutenant in the Navy during World War Two, he served as a pilot, and since then has never hesitated to accomplish a mission.

That mentality has made him a distinguished member of Congress, and a very effective Chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Throughout his tenure, RALPH has been a consistent advocate for scientific research and development.

As Science Committee Chairman he worked to ensure that business owners are not burdened by excessive EPA regulations.

RALPH has fostered programs to better understand extreme weather and to ensure that citizens are prepared for natural disasters.

He has worked to advance science education and programs that promote technological breakthroughs to benefit future generations.

And throughout his time in Congress, RALPH HALL has served this institution with style and humor.

RALPH HALL has always said, "I'd rather be respected at home than liked in Washington." RALPH—you actually have achieved that rare combination of both. Thank you for your service to Congress, to the great state of Texas and to our country.

RALPH has asked me to pass along his comment, "I am especially partial to my friends in the Texas Delegation who represent their districts so well and whose integrity and hard work have benefited not only our State but also our Nation. I thank you for your friendship and countless acts of kindness."

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to thank our colleague, and my friend, RALPH HALL for his years of service in the House of Representatives. I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. HALL for many years in the Science Committee, and I have always appreciated the way he has gone about his job. Mr. HALL has always been a public servant in the truest sense of the word. His lifetime of service began with his service in the navy as an aircraft carrier pilot during World War II. We owe a huge debt of gratitude to Mr. HALL and other members of the greatest generation for fighting to preserve the freedoms that we all hold dear. Once he left the armed services, Mr. HALL's service continued in the Texas state legislature before moving on to DC to begin his distinguished service in the House beginning in 1981.

As Science Committee Ranking Member and Chairman, Mr. HALL did a great deal to keep up the proud history we have in this country of support for science and space exploration. During Mr. HALL's tenure, the Committee passed the original America COMPETES Act in 2007 as well as its reauthorization in 2010. These landmark bills helped increase funding for science and education to help the US keep pace in an increasingly competitive world. Though we have not always agreed on every issue, I know that Mr. HALL cares greatly about the US scientific enterprise and the economic benefits it has provided our nation over the years. Those of us that know Mr. HALL know him best for his stories and the personable nature that he did business with. He will most certainly be missed in Congress.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, RALPH HALL has been a fervent and steadfast presence in Congress for almost thirty-five years.

Before coming to Washington, he served as a county judge and as a member of the Texas State Senate.

Before that he flew Hellcat fighters for the Navy during World War II; married the love of his life, Mary Ellen; and tells the story of working at his local pharmacy as a kid and selling a carton of cigarettes and a couple of bottles of Coke to the outlaws Bonnie and Clyde.

Congressman HALL has led an extraordinary and dynamic life, and he readily brought that energy to his work in Congress.

Serving with him on the Science Committee, and especially on the Space Subcommittee, has been a true honor. Congressman HALL has a deep respect for the basic science work done by NASA, especially that done aboard the International Space Station.

He has also been a firm champion of America's space exploration program—and it was in fact he who added the word "Space" back into the name of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology during the 112th Congress. As he has said many times, human space exploration is one of the best methods we have for engaging and inspiring the next generation.

I join my colleagues today in honoring RALPH HALL—who has inspired us all with his dedication to public service and to our nation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is no one like Texas Congressman RALPH HALL.

Congressman RALPH HALL is the oldest serving member of Congress, the oldest person to ever serve in the House of Representatives, the oldest person ever elected to a House term and the oldest House member ever to cast a vote. Mr. HALL is also the last remaining Congressman who served our nation during World War II.

And for all of these accomplishments, I would like to thank and congratulate RALPH one more time for his service to the country and his leadership in the Texas Congressional Delegation.

Born in Fate, Texas on May 3, 1923, HALL did not know of his successful future which was ahead of him. At the age of 19, HALL enrolled into the U.S. Navy where he served as a lieutenant and combat aircraft carrier pilot from 1942 to 1945 during World War II.

After serving for three years, HALL then went on to finish college and received his LL.B. from Southern Methodist University in 1951. He was admitted to the Texas Bar, and practiced law in Rockwall.

Mr. HALL also participated in the business side of Rockwall where he took part in serving as President/CEO of Texas Aluminum Corp., General Counsel of Texas Extrusion Co., Chairman of Lakeside News, Inc., and was a founding member of Lakeside National Bank in Rockwall where he currently serves as Chairman of the Board.

RALPH had the calling to serve Texas in the political arena in Texas politics, a combat sport. So he began his public service from 1950 to 1962 when he served as County Judge of Rockwall County, Texas. Mr. HALL also served as President of the State Judges and Commissioners Association in 1958–1959.

From 1962 to 1972, Mr. HALL was elected and served as a Texas State Senator where he served as President Pro Tempore in 1968–1969.

Congressman RALPH HALL was first elected to serve the 4th District of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1980 and has been re-elected to each succeeding Congress.

On November 27, 2012, Congressman HALL became the oldest member in the U.S. House of Representatives to ever cast a vote. The following month, on December 25, 2012, he became the oldest-serving Member of the U.S. House of Representatives in recorded history.

Congressman HALL always ensured to serve his people and made sure their voice was heard on different issues throughout Congress.

A noteworthy quote Mr. HALL often said was "I'd rather be respected at home than liked in Washington." RALPH is a hardcore Texan with the unique knowledge of understanding all people from the rich and famous to the infamous and downtrodden.

He was a proud conservative democrat and personally knew the likes of LBJ, Speaker Sam Rayburn, Muhammad Ali, baseball great Mickey Mantle, war veteran Audie Murphy, Senator John F. Kennedy, Ted Williams, President Ronald Reagan, Texas Governor

John Connally, Texas Governor William "Bill" P. Clements, Jr., Texas Governor Ann Richards, Texas Governor Rick Perry, Curtis Cokes, General Tommy Franks, Lieutenant General Tom Stafford, astronauts Gene Cernan, Buzz Aldrin, Neal Armstrong, U.S. Representative Ray Roberts, U.S. Senator Phil Gramm, famous aviator Claire Chennault, President George H.W. Bush, President George W. Bush, U.S. Senator JOHN CORNYN, U.S. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, U.S. Senator Lloyd Bentsen, T. Boone Pickens, H. Ross Perot, Red Adair, Bo Derek, Chuck Norris, Ted Williams, Tom Hanks and The Ink Spots.

He works well with both Republicans and Democrats, but he "got religion," in 2004, and became a Republican. Never forgetting his Democrat roots, he commented, "Being a Democrat was more fun."

RALPH HALL always has a story and a new, but often used joke. He runs 2 miles a day and certainly symbolizes the best of the Greatest Generation.

RALPH HALL's service and leadership has shaped him into an important role model that members of the Texas Delegation in Congress, on both sides of the aisle admire. His dedication and love for his public service illustrates how success is attainable when mixed with hard work and determination, along with a love of America and of course, Texas.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN DINGELL ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of our Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, 21 years ago, January of 1993, I was sworn into the 103rd Congress as the 28th Representative of the historic First Congressional District of Illinois.

One of the first Members of Congress to welcome me with the most heartwarming words and smile was none other than my friend from the great State of Michigan, Congressman JOHN DAVID DINGELL, JR.

JOHN DINGELL has trained me, worked with me, and inspired me far more than most other Members of this House. I can't think of any other Member in Congress who has spent the kind of time and energy teaching me the ropes than JOHN DINGELL.

JOHN DINGELL, Mr. Speaker, will go down in U.S. history as being one of the most powerful House committee

chairmen of all times. That is why, Mr. Speaker, around Washington, D.C., throughout the Nation, and throughout this Congress, he was and will continue to be respectfully known as the “lion of the House.”

While some may ascribe that honor to his forceful personality, Mr. Speaker, in my experience with JOHN and watching him operate as chairman, he used a scalpel more than a sledgehammer to score his legislative wins and to gather up and earn the respect of all the Members not only of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, but the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle.

Many will say that the secret to JOHN's success has been his unrivaled mastery of parliamentary procedures and institutional memory. I would agree that he has superb parliamentary knowledge of the parliamentary procedures, and there is a remarkable aspect to his institutional memory.

But what made JOHN DINGELL successful and a genuine American treasure—he was just last week awarded the highest civilian award that this Nation bestows upon an individual, the Presidential Medal of Freedom—is that he knows how to deal with people. He knows how to work with people.

JOHN doesn't go around talking about all his great exploits. I recall a few years back, Mr. Speaker, I was traveling to Michigan to campaign for JOHN. He was in a primary challenge. Little did I know that the man who I was championing had at one time been scorned in his own district because he voted for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I didn't know that about JOHN DINGELL. I didn't know that, but my respect for him mushroomed to the top even more than it had been before because he was a man who when he believed in something has the commitment and courage to stand behind his beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN means what he says, and he says what he means. Nobody can say anything different about JOHN DAVID DINGELL.

JOHN DINGELL, Chairman DINGELL, my friend, I wish you continued health. I wish you continued strength and prosperity as you leave this House of Representatives, this House of the people, and return to your family and friends and constituents in Michigan.

May God bless you and keep you. I will forever hold you dear. I will forever look toward your example in terms of committee work and work on this floor. I want to thank you, JOHN DINGELL, for all that you have contributed to this Nation, to your constituents, to this House, and certainly to the Committee of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Texas, the ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

□ 1645

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. RUSH. I appreciate the fact that you are holding this hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the honor of the work of Mr. JOHN DINGELL who will retire this year as the longest-serving Member, with 59 years as a Michigan Representative. Since 1955, Congressman DINGELL has represented the southeastern Michigan area and served on the Committee on Energy and Commerce and twice as chairman.

When I learned that Mr. DINGELL would retire at the end of this term, I was saddened to know that we would lose such a fine leader and advocate for social democracy; however, we must continue Mr. DINGELL's fight for all Americans.

He is well-known for his battles on behalf of civil rights, clean water, Medicare, and workers' rights. He is also the author of many pieces of legislation that enhance the protection of public health such as the Affordable Care Act.

While he expanded public health and advocated for environmental conservationism, Mr. DINGELL also combated corruption and waste via his chairmanship of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. He exerted strong, unwavering oversight of the executive branch through his committee, and his successes in Congress earned him the 2014 Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Through his career in Congress, he was willing and able to work across the aisle to accomplish tasks that made Americans' lives better. A true advocate for the people, Mr. DINGELL dedicated his life to ensuring that public health safety of the American people was always in the forefront. Whether authoring the Clean Air Act or the Patients' Bill of Rights, Mr. DINGELL was unwavering in his questions to protect Americans.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the accomplishments of Congressman JOHN DINGELL and join me in congratulating him on an outstanding career in public service.

Mr. RUSH. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee, the one who will ascend to the dean of the House, the legendary civil rights icon.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and members of the committee, I rise today to honor a true statesman in every sense of the word, the dean of the House, chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and a champion of the people of Metropolitan Detroit, the Honorable Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

Now, I have had the distinct honor of working with Congressman DINGELL for the last six decades, first as a member

of his congressional staff and then as his colleague in the Michigan delegation. Over these six decades, we have fought together successfully for Medicare, for clean air and water, for workers' rights, and most importantly, for civil rights.

Over these decades, he has succeeded at truly Herculean tasks, including passing the Endangered Species Act, the 1990 Clean Air Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Affordable Care Act, the Patients' Bill of Rights, and the Children's Health Insurance Program, among many others.

Congressman DINGELL is a masterful legislator but, most importantly, a man of conscience. As he passes the torch on to another extraordinary leader, Congresswoman-elect Debbie Dingell, I am so proud to salute his legacy of compassion and service.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank the Congressman from Chicago, the Reverend BOBBY RUSH, for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, we always in Texas refer to the former Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn who served for 48 years as “Man of the House.” In fact, there have been books written about Rayburn with that title, “The Man of the House.” I am a six-generation native Texan, so I certainly would be considered to be somewhat Texas-centric.

In all honesty, I would have to say that the ultimate and true man of the House is the Honorable JOHN DINGELL of Michigan. His father served before him, elected, I believe, while President Roosevelt was President of the United States, and JOHN DINGELL literally grew up in the House of Representatives.

When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, President Roosevelt, I believe, the very next day, December 8, addressed a joint session of Congress in his famous Day of Infamy speech. JOHN DINGELL was on the floor to hear that speech in person, not as a Congressman, but as the son of a Congressman.

He got elected to replace his father when his father passed away in 1955 and, as has been mentioned, has served longer than any other Member of Congress in the history of this Nation. If you count not only his service in Congress, but the time he spent as a child when his father was in Congress, he has literally been in the House for almost a third of its existence as an institution.

I am not sure how many Members he has served with, but it is in the neighborhood of 2,500 Members that he has personally served with.

When I got elected to Congress in 1984, I did not get on the Energy and Commerce Committee in my freshman year, but I did my sophomore year in 1986. JOHN DINGELL was then chairman

and was chairman until the Republicans took the majority in the election in 1994, so I served with Chairman Dingell for my first 10 years in the Congress.

He was a chairman in every sense of the word. The legislation that he helped craft during his chairmanship is some of the most important in the history of this Congress. Certainly, things that he would be most proud of would be the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, some of the health care legislation, and some of the telecommunications legislation.

Those are laws that were passed under his chairmanship and are still the basic law in their field in this country.

When I became chairman in 2003, he was the ranking Democrat on the committee. He helped me, sometimes in public, sometimes behind the scenes. Even when he didn't agree with the legislation that the Republican majority was pushing, he was always thoughtful and giving me tips on procedure and process and sometimes policy.

When we passed a bill to move television from analog to digital, I wanted to put a date certain very quickly. With his counsel, he convinced me that we should draw that out, and he also said: "The final date of the transition shouldn't be until after the Super Bowl; just in case there is a problem, people will get to watch the Super Bowl and won't be cussing you and the Congress for moving from analog to digital." He was absolutely right on that.

With Chairman UPTON's leadership, who is on the floor this evening—several years ago, I went to Chairman UPTON and suggested that we ask the Speaker to name the Energy and Commerce main committee room on the first floor of the Rayburn Building, 2123, the JOHN DINGELL Room. Chairman UPTON thought that was a great idea. He recommended it to the Speaker, and that now is the John Dingell Room.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to say that we are truly losing one of the giants of the Congress when JOHN DINGELL retires at the end of this session.

He is still going to be here. His wife, Debbie, has been elected to succeed him, so hopefully, we will still see him in the Congress, but I really have difficulty imagining a Congress that JOHN DINGELL is not a member of. He will be missed. We honor him, and I consider it a personal privilege that he calls me a friend.

I thank the gentleman from Chicago for yielding me some time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I want to just remind people that we have a growing list of speakers.

Mr. UPTON. Thank you, Mr. RUSH. I will try to be brief.

I do want to put a statement in the RECORD from Mr. CAMP who was here a little while ago and wanted to speak.

I just want to say, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. Chairman is what we still call him. I have known him since 1977 when I came here as a staffer, and I have got to say that he treated me just as well as a staffer, which was great, as he has as a colleague and now, for me, as chairman of the committee.

We are the best of friends. We really are. There have been a lot of different issues that we have worked on, and he took me under his wing a lot of years ago, and we discovered too that, for me, it is better to have DINGELL on our side than to be on a different side, but when he is on the other side, he is certainly a powerful adversary.

Our delegation in Michigan is pretty close. We are involved in so many different issues, jobs and the economy, particularly the auto sector is one of the things where JOHN DINGELL has really led and cared about.

As we know, he is the longest-serving Member of Congress ever in the history of this institution. He is cared about so well.

I can remember bringing over CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS from years past and, as JOE BARTON said, he served with some 2,500 Members here, actually going through the vote Journal on some of the big issues of the day, the Voting Rights Act and others, and actually talking about some of the Members and what they said on that particular day.

He was a fair chairman, always went by the rules, had a command of the issues, a brilliant staff, and their loyalty still exists today. Of course, the light of his life, the lovely Deborah, a great person who we know is going to be taking his place, serving those 700,000 people from southeast Michigan in the next Congress.

If you look back at his life, he has served his country from the first day through today, a World War II vet, something that he has always been so, so proud of, chairman of the most powerful committee here in the House.

In addition to all that, he has been a friend, a father, a husband, and a colleague whose word has always been his bond and who has defined the very utmost of what we would like this place to be. He is a great American.

Thank you, JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman, Mr. RUSH, and I thank Mr. PALLONE for convening this Special Order and all of the members of this committee and Members of this House of Representatives that have come on the floor today with joy.

It is often said, "It is not how long you serve, but how you serve." For JOHN DINGELL, that is not mutually exclusive. He served six decades, and he served it greatly and grandly and with distinction.

I am reminded of a description of him as a 6-foot-3-inch distinguished gentleman, towering over witnesses, but having the biggest of hearts, coming from the best of legacies in his father that served 22 years, reminded of his commitment to the Clean Air Act, safe drinking water, the endangered species.

JOHN has always reminded us new ones, relatively speaking, that his greatest love was to provide affordable health care to every American.

□ 1700

Decades after his father introduced such a bill, he never gave up.

So I stand here today to thank you, JOHN DINGELL, for the Affordable Care Act. They call it many things—"ObamaCare"—but I am getting ready to call it "DingellCare" because you worked without ceasing. Thank you for your service to this Nation, where you stood in the shadows of World War II and stood as an American, willing to serve.

I am grateful for the service that he has given and for his long years of service as the chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Let me conclude by saying that there is much more that all of us can say, but you can see so many Members have come to the floor. On a personal note, there are two items that I want to acknowledge:

Thank you, JOHN DINGELL, for recognizing my voting rights—my opportunity to vote as an African American—and those of the thousands of millions that you helped in 1965. I will never forget your willingness to sacrifice personal political stature to do what is right. I also want to thank you so very much for being the kind of person on the floor of the House who asked about every Member. For every Member who came to your attention, you asked them how they were doing.

I conclude with these remarks, his final words about the Civil Rights Act. He said that he was glad to vote for a bill that solved a problem that was eating at the soul and heart and liver of the country.

Only JOHN DINGELL.

JOHN DINGELL. I salute you as a great and a grand American.

Thank you, Debbie Dingell. I will continue to look forward to your service.

JOHN, we are going to look forward to your service and, of course, to your long life here in this great country and in your great State of Michigan. Again, JOHN, thank you so very much.

Serving nearly six decades in the House of Representatives, JOHN DINGELL has earned the distinction of being both the longest-serving Member of Congress in U.S. history and

one of the most influential legislators of all time.

After serving his country in the Army during World War II, JOHN was first elected to Congress in 1955—representing the people of southeastern Michigan in a seat previously held by his father.

In Washington, JOHN risked his seat to support the Civil Rights Act of 1964, fought to pass Medicare in 1965, and penned legislation like the Clean Air Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act that have kept millions of Americans healthy and preserved our natural beauty for future generations.

But of all JOHN's accomplishments, perhaps the most remarkable has been his tireless fight to guarantee quality, affordable health care for every American.

Decades after his father first introduced a bill for comprehensive health care reform, JOHN continued to introduce health care legislation at the beginning of every session.

And as an original author of the Affordable Care Act, he helped give millions of families the peace of mind of knowing they won't lose everything if they get sick.

One of the proudest moments in my career in the House was watching the distinguished gentleman from Michigan preside over debate on the rule for the Affordable Care Act.

Today, the people of Michigan—and the American people—are better off because of JOHN DINGELL's service to this country.

Ending a career that is among the most singular in congressional history, U.S. Rep. JOHN DINGELL—who helped pass, if not author, many of the most iconic legislative achievements of the last 60 years is, concluding a term of service to metro Detroit, Michigan and the nation unprecedented in its length and remarkable in its scope.

JOHN DINGELL's length of service stretches back to before Alaska and Hawaii were states and his father, John Sr., sat in the seat for 22 years before him.

Last June, he became the longest-serving member of Congress.

JOHN DAVID DINGELL, Jr., was 29 years old when the Detroit native was elected in a 1955 special election to serve out the remainder of his late father's term.

Since then, he has cast tens of thousands of votes and played a role in everything from the Civil Rights Act and Medicare to the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act and, in 2010, the Affordable Care Act.

Known throughout Washington as Big JOHN—at 6-foot-3, he literally towered over many witnesses before his House Energy and Commerce Committee—JOHN DINGELL cut a distinctive figure in the Capitol.

A progressive when it came to workers' rights, he is also a staunch defender of Michigan industries, including its automakers, and at times ran afoul of environmentalists.

He counts as among his most important accomplishments the creation of the Detroit International Wildlife Refuge and the River Raisin Battlefield.

In 1964, he voted for the Civil Rights Act. He called that vote the most important one he ever took—one that "solved a problem that was eating at the soul and heart and liver of this country."

JOHN DINGELL vastly expanded the scope of the House Energy and Commerce Committee's purview during his first stint as chairman—which lasted 1981–95—to the point where it was said it handled four out of every 10 bills in the House.

By example, he had a photo of the Earth from space behind his desk and when anyone asked him to define the committee's jurisdiction, he would point to it.

House Speaker Tip O'Neill used to say "All politics is local", but in JOHN DINGELL's case, all politics has always been personal. It is only when you have a personal relationship with someone that you establish trust, even when you're on opposite sides of an issue.

Through 60 years of public service, JOHN fought for what he believed in, and got things done through relationships and his deep respect for others.

And there was no one he respected more than his constituents. He respected their hopes, their dreams, and their values. He has been relentless in his efforts to secure for them the right to live a decent middle-class life.

He has always been a staunch advocate for health care for every American, and he has been a player on every significant piece of legislation that has helped make America a more just, fair, and free country for over half a century.

It has been a privilege to walk the Halls of Congress with JOHN DINGELL.

I have never known a person who has been a better champion of the American worker, and he deserves a great deal of credit for the resurgence of the iconic American automobile industry.

The House and the American people are losing a great public servant.

But JOHN is gaining a well-deserved retirement, and I wish him many happy years with his family.

JOHN DINGELL has always been more than Mr. Chairman to me.

He has been Dean, the longest serving Member of Congress and one of the most effective in our history.

There has never been a colleague I have admired more.

Happy retirement, JOHN, and thank you for your service.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Illinois, Mr. JOHN SHIMKUS.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are a lot of Members, so I will be quick, but you have to really come down to the floor to recognize a man who has served honorably for so many years—58 years to be exact.

I would like to highlight the fact that, at 18, he joined the United States Army and rose to the rank of second lieutenant and was prepared to be part of the invasion of Japan until the bomb was dropped and the war ended. JOHN won a special election to follow his father, and he has been here ever since. He was the leading congressional supporter of organized labor, of social welfare measures, and of traditional pro-

gressive policies. He was also known as a big hunter and fisher, which we heard many, many times.

I also want to highlight that he was well-known for Dingell-grams, which were missives sent to the administration, regardless of party, that held them to account for public policies and the excesses of the executive branch. He is well-known for that.

I know he will be followed ably by his wife, Debbie, and I look forward to working with her.

May God bless you, JOHN DINGELL, and may God bless the United States of America.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to rise tonight and speak on behalf of my friend and colleague—the Dean of the House of Representatives—JOHN DINGELL. A proud son of Michigan, JOHN DINGELL has dedicated his life to helping those on society's margins and improving quality of life for all Americans. While he is the longest serving member of the House, he is also one of the most accomplished members in its history.

It would be impossible to list all of JOHN DINGELL's accomplishments in the time we're allotted tonight. But make no mistake—JOHN DINGELL has played a role in every major legislative victory over the last sixty years. Throughout his time in Congress, he has been a champion for the American worker, for a clean environment, for health care, for civil rights, for consumers.

When I arrived in the House, I received a seat on the Public Works and Transportation Committee as my freshman assignment. However, I soon realized that my interests and principles were outside the scope of that particular committee. One day, I passed 2123 Rayburn and sat down to watch a hearing of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

For the first time, I saw firsthand our Committee at work. And, for the first time, I saw JOHN DINGELL in action. He filled the whole room. You couldn't miss him. That day changed everything. What I quickly realized was that the Energy and Commerce Committee had the ability to make improvements in the lives of everyday Americans. And JOHN DINGELL was leading the way.

I have had the privilege to learn so much from JOHN ever since I started on the Energy and Commerce Committee. A quarter century later, I am still humbled by the work that we do in 2123—now known fondly, and rightly so, as the JOHN DINGELL Room. And I can only hope to one day live up to the example set by a titan like JOHN DINGELL.

A few weeks ago, our new colleague, Debbie Dingell, said that she could never fill the shoes of JOHN DINGELL—and I feel the same way. When people think of the Energy and Commerce Committee, they cannot help but think of JOHN DINGELL. It is my own hope, that as I step into the committee's leadership I will be able to accomplish a small fraction of what JOHN had achieved. His commitment, charisma and charm were the hallmarks of his leadership when he sat at the committee's helm.

More importantly, he will be remembered for all he accomplished on behalf of the American

people. Though the 114th Congress will be difficult for so many of us, who have served by your side, we are all so thrilled that your wife Debbie will take up the mantle. For those of us who have known her we know that there is no one more able and ready to carry on your legacy—the people of Michigan's 12th will continue to be well served. While you may be retiring, we know that you aren't going away. I know that for so many of us who have called you a mentor and a friend we will still be able to call on your sage advice and wisdom.

Congratulations on your many accomplishments and service in this great body. It has been the honor of a lifetime to serve alongside you.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, JOHN DINGELL is a legend in the Congress and a national treasure.

As the Dean of the House of Representatives, Congressman DINGELL will be retiring at the end of the 113th Congress, and his body of legislative achievements will continue to be experienced by every American for generations to come.

From protecting the environment, to promoting civil and worker rights, Congressman DINGELL's legislative hand shaped it. He famously introduced health care reform legislation in 1955 and in every Congress since then to provide affordable, accessible care for every American. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the 1965 Medicare Act, the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, and the 2011 FDA Food Safety Modernization Act were all championed by Congressman DINGELL.

His meritorious contributions to society span his time serving in Congress and in the U.S. Army, where at the age of 18 he had orders to take part in the first wave of the planned invasion of Japan in 1945. Congressman DINGELL is the longest serving Member of the House, and he is one of two World War II veterans still serving in Congress. President Obama recently awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian award in the United States.

I recall so well the first time I walked into the Energy and Commerce Committee hearing room. It was 1995 and my eyes immediately went to an enormous picture of the Earth hanging on the wall. I asked Chairman DINGELL about the picture and his response has inspired and guided my legislative work because he said the painting represented the jurisdictions of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The Committee has the broadest jurisdictions which reach into the daily lives of millions of Americans. Those jurisdictions include health care, commerce, trade, manufacturing, energy and the environment, technology, communications and consumer protection. It is a reminder for members of the Committee to serve our constituents by fighting for meaningful and lasting opportunity. And it is a reminder that our job at the Committee has the most potential to create lasting impact.

Congressman DINGELL's service and legislation is unmatched in the history of our country and it has been a great honor to serve with him. I wish him and Debbie my full wishes for every blessing.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the incredible service of the Dean of the House of Representatives, JOHN DINGELL.

In his 59 years in the House, JOHN DINGELL has experienced dizzying twists in national politics and turns in world events. And through it all, he succeeded in building a consistent record of achievements true to his core principle of social justice.

If you rely on Medicare—or plan to in your retirement—you can thank JOHN DINGELL. After fighting for its creation, he was the one presiding over the House for its historic passage in 1965.

If you've benefited from the Affordable Care Act, you can thank JOHN DINGELL for his pivotal role in passing this landmark legislation, and for continuing his father's fight to make affordable health care available to all Americans.

If you've benefitted from a safe workplace or fair pay, you can thank JOHN DINGELL for being a champion of the American worker and a tireless advocate for policies to help our businesses create jobs and our middle class get ahead.

And if you simply enjoy outdoor recreation and the ability to breathe clean air and drink clean water, you can thank JOHN DINGELL for his vision. He brought Republicans and Democrats together to pass legislation that protects our environment.

On a personal note, I want to thank JOHN DINGELL for his wisdom and good counsel over the years. His guidance and effort were essential to passing the DISCLOSE Act in the House in 2010. That bill would have required groups spending millions of dollars on political campaign ads to disclose to voters who is bankrolling them. Unfortunately, the bill failed by one vote in a filibuster in the Senate. If JOHN DINGELL had been in the Senate, he would have gotten it passed.

Thank you JOHN DINGELL for all that you've done for our country.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the life and career of the Dean of the House, JOHN DINGELL has been remarkable and historic.

John has been a friend . . . colleague . . . and a true leader in Congress.

During his nearly 60 years serving in the House . . . JOHN has served with passion and integrity. His commitment to public service and deep understanding of this institution has been unmatched.

JOHN has shaped policies that have improved the lives of countless Americans. From backing landmark Civil Rights legislation, to ensuring our environment is protected by authoring the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act and Endangered Species Act.

Most significantly, JOHN has never given up on the fight for affordable, quality health care for all Americans. Early in his career, he helped to pass Medicare, and achieved what he set out to accomplish with passage of the Affordable Care Act in 2010.

There is no question that his work here will have a lasting impact on Congress . . . and this country . . . for generations to come.

It has been an honor to serve with JOHN on the Energy & Commerce Committee . . . where I have had the privilege to work with him on a number of issues, including helping to spur clean energy manufacturing jobs in

this country; and helping American small businesses export their clean energy products and services abroad.

I thank him for his service and his friendship. JOHN, I wish you nothing but the best in your next adventure. You will be truly missed in this body.

I also look forward to working with your wife, Congresswoman Elect Debbie Dingell, in the coming years on important issues facing our country.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the greatest legislators of recent decades, JOHN DINGELL, who will retire at the end of the 113th Congress.

JOHN DINGELL has diligently served the people of Michigan's 12th district and our nation for nearly 60 years.

JOHN is recognized as the Dean of the House and the longest-serving Member of Congress in our nation's history, but it's not his longevity that has made him so special—it's the impact that his legislative accomplishments have had on our society.

Through his service in Congress, he has crafted a legislative legacy that I believe to be unparalleled in its scope and its importance.

JOHN developed his reputation as a legislative giant with years of hard work, persistence, and shrewd coalition-building.

Throughout his tenure, he has been at the forefront of passing groundbreaking, common-sense legislation.

Most notably, JOHN has been a strong, tireless leader in Congress in enacting important civil rights laws.

Not only does this include his work on the Civil Rights Act, but also his work to renew the Voting Rights Act and pass the Employment Nondiscrimination Act.

This type of diligent persistence and strong leadership is something every one of us can learn from going forward.

JOHN served for many years as Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, where he drafted landmark legislation and conducted painstaking oversight of the federal agencies within the Committee's jurisdiction.

This includes championing environmental protection—from the groundbreaking legislation of the 1970s to the revolutionary Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to fighting in recent years against efforts to roll back the progress that we've made.

His passion for the environment and the outdoors is unmatched, and his accomplishments reflect his deep determination to make America a better place.

Impressively, along with the issues I've already mentioned, he has had a tremendous impact on policies as varied as consumer protection and health care.

Few Members of Congress have done as much to improve Americans' lives as JOHN DINGELL, and we can't thank him enough for his service.

JOHN's record of public service will be hard to match.

As a youth, JOHN served as a Congressional page.

After serving our country in the Army in World War II, JOHN served as a county assistant prosecutor before succeeding his father in Congress in 1955.

Since then, he has served 29 remarkably productive terms in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I am proud to call JOHN DINGELL a good friend and respected colleague.

It has been an honor working with him on the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

He has been a great mentor, a gifted leader, a skilled policy-maker, and a dedicated public servant.

I wish JOHN, his wife Debbie, and the entire Dingell family all of the best.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the congressional career of our colleague, the Dean of the House, JOHN DINGELL. As the longest-serving member of Congress ever, it is hard to imagine our nation, this Congress, and the Energy and Commerce Committee without him as he retires at the end of the 113th Congress. I am happy that he is leaving on his own terms and I wish him every happiness as he moves onto the next phase of his life as a congressional spouse.

I am just so honored to be here to celebrate and honor somebody I call a friend—JOHN DINGELL.

Over my time in the House of Representatives, I have noticed that everyone who talks about JOHN DINGELL says my friend, my chairman, my colleague, my mentor, someone I look up to, and someone I respect. I would just like to say that I can't really change those words because they echo my own sentiments.

I was not yet born when JOHN DINGELL was first sworn into the House on December 13, 1955. It was about two and a half years before I entered the world. When he took that courageous vote in support of the Voting Rights Act (VRA) and civil rights, I was six-years-old. I recall at the time living here in the Washington metropolitan area that my father and mother used to bring us to this Capitol almost every Sunday after church. They would bring us and we would run up and down the east front of the Capitol. We would picnic on the west front of the Capitol.

I am thinking today how wonderful it is to know there was someone who was in this chamber who so valued this institution and who, even when I was a six-year old, JOHN DINGELL was working to protect my rights. When I think about that, I think of the need to create a formula for the VRA that the Supreme Court can support that institutes the way that we protect our voting rights in section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Almost none of us, including JOHN LEWIS, would be here had JOHN DINGELL not had the courage to take that vote in 1964.

So, it's such an honor to serve with him and to know that while that may have been the battle in 1964, he remains fully prepared to engage in the battle here in 2014. It is also an honor that we all have the great privilege of being able to serve with JOHN DINGELL.

I believe there is hardly anything that impacts our modern day laws that we can't attribute to the great hard work and public service of JOHN DINGELL. The fact that I got up this morning and turned on a faucet and ran a glass of water and was able to drink it and know that it was clean, was about JOHN DINGELL. That I walked outside today and knew that I could breathe air that was okay—we still have work to do—but to know that that clean

air, and the cleaner we make our air, is attributed to JOHN DINGELL.

I think back to my grandmother who came to live with us at a point when she was aging—and it was actually just prior to the enactment of Medicare—and how different families' lives are now because of the protections that they have for health care as they age and are disabled. Those things are attributable to the great work, the legislative legacy, and the service of JOHN DINGELL.

When I first came into Congress, I won a primary election against an incumbent member. One day JOHN DINGELL pulled me aside in the cloak room and he said, "Come sit down, I want to talk to you, I want to get to know you." And I was, frankly, afraid of him. I knew his history, I had watched him Chair several Energy and Commerce hearings, and I knew that he was a great friend of my predecessor in this chamber.

I sat down and I talked to him, and what I gained from JOHN DINGELL was the kind of honor and dedication that he has, and reverence that he has, for this institution. It is unlike any that we see, and we learn from that. So we talked, and we became friends.

Then a funny thing happened. Barack Obama was elected President of the United States, and his inauguration was about to occur. It is another reminder that JOHN DINGELL's almost 59 years of service—that anniversary will occur this Saturday—are about this amazing legislative work, but it is also about the children, women, men, and families of his district.

The Marching Chiefs of Wyandotte Roosevelt High School in Mr. Dingell's congressional district were invited to play in the 2009 inaugural parade for President Obama. Somehow or another, they booked a hotel in Hershey, Pennsylvania, that was approximately 130 miles and a couple of hours away from Washington, DC. Those students and their chaperones would have had to get up at 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning to get to the inaugural staging area on time. I have the honor of representing a congressional district just outside of Washington, DC, in Maryland. JOHN DINGELL reached out to me and he told me this story, and I said, Well, maybe we can figure out something.

We found a willing partner in Wise Junior High School in Prince George's County, Maryland, where they could stay in the gym. The parent-teacher organization, the staff, and the students welcomed those students from Michigan that they didn't know at all into their high school. They fed them and provided sleeping bags, blankets, and even an ironing board. So, the Marching Chiefs were able to actually get to the inaugural parade much easier and on time.

Those students were so grateful to JOHN DINGELL. What I saw in this great legislator is that the people of his district really did come first and he looked out for them, and they knew that he looked out for them. I thought that that is the kind of Member of Congress that I want to be.

JOHN DINGELL and I have been locked at the hand and the hip ever since. In 2011, I was scheduled to speak at a Washtenaw County, Michigan, Democratic Club dinner. I flew into the Detroit Metropolitan Airport and as I

walked through the terminal, the Wyandotte Roosevelt High School Marching Band started to play. Unbeknownst to me, JOHN DINGELL had coordinated with the school as a surprise thank you.

I think there are so many of us who serve in this institution who really do value the message that JOHN DINGELL has given us about the need to work together and to preserve and protect our democracy by working in a way that gives value and service to all of our communities and to this great nation. So for that, I want to thank JOHN DINGELL for being such an important part of this institution and important part of the way I have learned to become a Member of Congress.

Finally, I want to say a word about JOHN DINGELL's efforts on health care. As many of my colleagues know, JOHN DINGELL, like his father before him, has introduced a universal health care bill at the beginning of each new Congress. Before I came to the Congress, I had an experience of not having had health care and getting very sick, which required a trip to the emergency room. I ended up having a lot of bills that I couldn't pay because I didn't have health insurance. When we began to consider what is today known as the Affordable Care Act (ACA), it was JOHN DINGELL sitting as speaker pro tempore who gavelled in the House with the gavel that he used for the passage of Medicare.

Then during the course of the debate on the ACA, I had the honor of presiding as speaker pro tempore and there was one moment that JOHN DINGELL was speaking on the floor about his father's experience and about his experience working on health care. I will never forget that moment because for me it felt very personal. It felt so wonderful to know that in JOHN DINGELL's service, he has never stopped for a single day of those 59 years to make sure that millions of Americans like me could have health care that was quality, affordable, and accessible. So I thank him very much for his service, and I am so honored to have had the opportunity over these past seven years to serve with him and to learn from him.

JOHN DINGELL's retirement will leave a void in this House that cannot be filled. I wish him, his wife Debbie, his children Chris, Jennifer, John, and Jeanne, and his grandchildren continued success, happiness, and hopefully some well-earned rest. I know they have been of tremendous support to him in his service to this House and our nation. He leaves behind a legacy of service that others can and should aspire to.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues to pay tribute to the distinguished member of the Michigan Delegation: the Honorable JOHN DINGELL, as we mark the end of his long and dedicated service to this body and, more importantly, to the constituents of Michigan's 16th, 15th, and 12th Congressional Districts.

However, Mr. DINGELL's service to this country dates back well before he began his Congressional career in 1955. At the age of 18, he enlisted as an infantryman for the U.S. Army during World War II. He entered the military as a Private and was discharged as a Second Lieutenant while serving in the Panama Canal Zone. For his service defending

our country, he received a medal presented by Oscar winning actor Tom Hanks as part of the "Salute to the Citizen Soldier" in 2004.

After serving in the Army, Mr. DINGELL was elected to fill the seat and the shoes of his father, who passed away while still in office. Together, he and his father have served the citizens of Southeast Michigan for well over 80 years. Blazing his own path, Mr. DINGELL has personally impacted every major piece of legislation for over half a century. Even though we come from different political parties, we can and do agree on many issues that concern the people of Michigan. As Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, or its Ranking Member, he has always pushed for solutions to the problems Americans face. Impressive in both stature and tenacity, Mr. DINGELL has lent his life to public service. It has truly been an honor to serve alongside such an outspoken advocate for not only his constituents, but the state and country as well. And I must add that the dignity and respect he has shown his colleagues—and including this colleague—even as a brand new Member of Congress—is a testament to the respect he has for his fellow Members and this institution.

Mr. Speaker, the good citizens of Michigan's 12th district and colleagues on both sides of the aisle are all better for Mr. DINGELL's long and steady tenure in the House of Representatives. I congratulate him again on his remarkable career and join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the gentleman from Trenton, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today to honor a great legislator, a consummate public servant, and a man whose legacy will leave an indelible mark on this institution and every American he served during his 59 years in the House of Representatives. As the Dean of the House, JOHN DINGELL holds the distinction of being the longest serving member in the history of Congress. However, it's not the length of his tenure that will earn him a place in the history books, but his many accomplishments that have improved the health of our entire nation and its citizens.

JOHN DINGELL presided over this chamber during passage of Medicare in 1965, just one of the laws he shaped over the course of his distinguished career. He helped write the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Air Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act. He has fought diligently to protect Social Security, a program his father helped create, and he was a champion of the Affordable Care Act following years of advocacy on his own part to create an accessible and affordable system of universal health care.

Those of us who have been lucky enough to serve with Representative DINGELL will remember him as a man of unparalleled fortitude and passion, tempered with a sense of respect for his fellow colleagues and the legislative process, who raised the overall tenor of discourse and debate in the House of Representatives. Although we are extremely sad to see his service in this chamber come to an end, his contributions will continue to impact our country for years to come, and the DINGELL name will continue to grace the halls of Congress through his wife, Debbie, who will carry the mantle of public service on behalf of Michigan's 15th District.

Representative DINGELL, on behalf of a grateful country, I thank you for your service to this Congress and to our nation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, others on the floor are recounting Representative JOHN DINGELL, JR.'s historic legislative record, his breath-taking parliamentary skills, and his powerful advocacy. I won't repeat all of that here.

But I would like to say something about my good friend, JOHN DINGELL, JR., and recount an event that shows a great man in the making. On December 8, 1941, soon after President Franklin Delano Roosevelt delivered his speech saying that December 7th is a day that will live in infamy, the House briefly recessed and then reconvened to debate and declare war on Japan.

As I understand it, it was the job of a 15 year-old page, JOHN DINGELL, JR., to go up to the press gallery to tell Fulton Lewis of the Mutual Broadcasting System to turn off the microphones now that the House was going back into session because back then there was no audio recording of Congressional activities.

Instead JOHN told the famous newscaster to leave the microphone on and the tape running. The world now has the recording of that House debate and declaration of war. Here we see JOHN DINGELL, JR. already with a sense of history and an understanding of the importance of Congressional action.

JOHN, who knew that my father was serving in Congress at the same time as his father, befriended me early when I arrived in this Chamber, has shown me the warmest friendship and wisest counsel. For that I am most grateful and full of admiration.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN DINGELL ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Missouri). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. I don't know if he knows, but we are going to be honoring him tomorrow night.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Congressman PALLONE, for recognizing me and for acknowledging the fact that I am the ranking member at the present time, but, of course, you will now take on that job very ably, I am sure, and both of us will follow in the tradition of JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, it is so appropriate that the room where the Energy and Commerce Committee meets is now known as the "JOHN DINGELL Room." JOHN DINGELL has been the leader of that committee and a leader in the Congress longer than anybody else has served in either the Senate or in the House; yet, what I want to say is from my own personal perspective.

I have served on that committee for 40 years, and I have learned more from

JOHN DINGELL than I have from anybody else I have served with as a colleague. There were times when we had disagreements, and we argued them out and then resolved them and compromised on them; but most of the time, he was a stalwart defender of the interests of the working people of this country, a protector of the environment, a person who led the efforts for civil rights, a man who cared about people and understood that government had a very important role to play in people's lives.

From his father, who was active in the New Deal, under President Franklin Roosevelt, who led this Nation to use the government in a positive way—to help people who had nowhere else to turn—JOHN DINGELL carried on that tradition. It is the Liberal-Progressive tradition, and I associate myself with it.

I learned everything I knew as a member of the committee—and I learned everything I knew as a potential chairman and as a short-term chairman—from JOHN DINGELL. He is a Member's Member, and he is going to go down in the history books as one of the outstanding Members of Congress and leaders and chairmen of the oldest committee in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I know we don't have a lot of time, so I just want to say to JOHN DINGELL:

I wish you all the best, and I know you will whisper to Debbie, if she has any questions, the right course to take. Of course, she has been with you long enough that she probably, by this time, will know what to do on her own. God bless you, JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), who himself has been the ranking member of two committees.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinct pleasures in serving for 38 years in this body has been to work with the dean of the House, Mr. JOHN DINGELL. Throughout our almost four decades of serving the people of our respective districts and those of our Nation, my respect and sincere appreciation for this son of Michigan has only grown each and every day.

Few, if any, who have served here in the people's House over the last nearly 60 years would have a different view of the worth and of the value of JOHN DINGELL's contributions to the day-to-day work of this distinguished body. In fact, Representative DINGELL's vast legacy will assuredly be the legions of Members and staff who have learned so many lasting lessons of leadership under JOHN's tutelage. Basic, fundamental, timeless lessons on how to get the people's business done were always at the ready for any Member to partake in and adopt for their own future use. All of us can remember times

when Big John felt it appropriate, timely, and beneficial to just gently impose one of his lessons on Members, even on this body as a whole, if he felt it would move our country forward.

First and foremost, JOHN DINGELL has always valued good, old-fashioned trust. He sees a person's word as his bond—a bond that never shifts even in the strongest political winds. In JOHN's playbook, loyalty, particularly loyalty to principles, is a powerful force that can move the entire country forward. He insists on one other useful attribute for success—time-tested hard work. One must put in the time to do the hard work, the homework, with great attention to the details, ensuring that every T is crossed and that every I is dotted.

These virtues exercised by my friend, whether by his hand's wielding the gavel or in his sizable arm's embracing your future in the back of the House Chamber, he has served our Nation productively. Upon this virtuous foundation, many compromises have been struck to forge stable vehicles to serve the people, their environment, their health, and their livelihoods. A champion of the American worker, of the autoworker, and of our Nation's coal miner, JOHN DINGELL fully appreciates the role that our government can and should play in supporting the breadwinners in every American family.

From the moment JOHN DINGELL came here to the moment he leaves and well beyond, these tenets are the legacy that will always burn brightly in my mind as well as warm my heart. Had I but served a single term with JOHN DINGELL, I would have counted many blessings because of it. Multiplied 29 times, suffice it to say, the entire Nation can itself count many blessings thanks to the good work of our dear friend, JOHN DINGELL, the dean of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the recognition and for leading us in this Special Order that pays tribute to Representative JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to stand on the House floor this afternoon to say thank you to JOHN DINGELL.

Thank you for your service to country. Thank you for your service to the State of Michigan. Thank you for your service to your congressional districts through the years, and, certainly, thank you for your interaction and networking with your colleagues, which has crossed over party lines and has shown, in exemplary fashion, how to get business done in the House. In your tribute this evening, it is important to make mention over and over again of your service to the military by serving us in the Army and by serving us during World War II.

Also, the Great Lakes State, Michigan, has produced a leader of greatness in JOHN DINGELL.

JOHN, it is an honor to say here, during this special tribute, that you were, indeed, everyone's coach. I know the person of humility that you are. You shed that praise when it comes your way, but make no mistake about it that it has been your coaching, your reinforcement, your encouragement to each and every one of us. Certainly, to those of us who entered as freshmen, you were right there to shadow us and to guide us and to remind us that there is a nobleness—with a small "n"—of service through the House that can influence policy and speak to the needs of those most marginalized in our society.

To that end, I want to thank you for identifying so very strongly with struggle. You saw a struggle, and you moved to address it. Whether that be through health care, through human services, through education, and certainly through all sorts of efforts that speak to public safety, our environment, and our energy policy, you saw a struggle, and you met it head-on, and you made certain that the challenges were responded to. You showed us how to work across party lines, and you showed us how to be factual and to see your word as your honor.

With all of that, I salute you, JOHN DINGELL, as being an awesome leader who taught by example how to conduct yourself in this public arena. You are proud of your heritage. We have talked about that many times over. Those roots have fed you so very well and have enabled you to be this person of greatness coming from the Great Lakes State. So thank you so much for your service to country and to all of us here in the Chamber.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am waiting to testify before the Rules Committee right now, but I will submit my statement for the RECORD.

To know him is to love JOHN DINGELL. He taught me that dedication to the legislative process and getting it done comes first.

It is a great privilege to speak about the career and accomplishments of my good friend, JOHN DINGELL.

JOHN has been one of the giants in this body a man with countless friends, but few peers.

His impact on this Institution and this country cannot be overstated.

Over the course of six decades, John has led some of the most important fights in the history of our country—fights for health care, civil rights, social justice, consumer protections, and so much more.

In 1964, he helped push the Civil Rights Bill through Congress.

In 1965, JOHN DINGELL presided over the House as it considered and then passed Medicare.

JOHN wrote the Endangered Species Act.

He wrote the 1990 Clean Air Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and legislation to build North America's first international wildlife refuge.

He authored Affordable Care Act and then fought tirelessly for its passage.

Thanks to JOHN, millions of Americans are getting the benefits today of the Patient's Bill of Rights, the Children's Health Insurance Program, the Mammography Quality Standards Act, the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, and the Prescription Drug User Fee Act.

JOHN DINGELL's towering list of accomplishments are the best representations of what Members of Congress can do when the long-term needs of the people—the country—are elevated beyond the fleeting politics of the moment.

Whenever the history of this country is told—The Civil Rights Act, Medicare, the Affordable Case Act, Environmental Protection, Workers Rights will stand out as the hallmarks of the Democratic Party—our core principles.

They are the legislative actions that delivered on the promise of the American dream—and helped to put it within reach for millions.

These pillars of social justice all bear JOHN DINGELL's name writ large.

JOHN DINGELL is also a strong advocate for women, a long-time champion for the Equal Rights Amendment, and a leader in the fight for Equal Pay for Equal work.

JOHN was here in 1963 when the Equal Pay Act was signed into law.

In the 108th Congress, he and I requested a report from the GAO on the Glass Ceiling.

That report analyzed 18 years of data on over 9,300 Americans and found that women working fulltime were being paid an average of 80 cents for every dollar that men are paid.

He has been fighting to realize the goal of the Equal Pay act for decades and it is a fight that JOHN's wife Debbie is sure to continue in the next Congress.

For more than 80 years, there has been a Mr. DINGELL from Michigan representing Democratic Values and the people of Michigan.

I know I speak for all members of the House when I say that I look forward to working alongside the first Mrs. Dingell from Michigan!

JOHN's impact on Congress and on this country will be felt for generations to come.

His unyielding commitment to do what is right—for his country and his Michigan constituents has been an inspiration to us all.

I fear we may never see his like again in this Congress—but I shall hope that each and every day—every Member of Congress will strive to live up to the example that was once set by the great JOHN DINGELL, Dean of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague and our new ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the great lawmakers of our era, who has dedicated his life to fighting for civil rights, to strengthening our Nation's safety net for the

vulnerable and elderly, and in pushing for workers' rights and protecting American jobs.

I am honored to call this man a mentor and a friend—the dean of the House, Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my full statement be placed in the RECORD.

JOHN's illustrious career speaks for itself: the longest-serving Member in the history of the House of Representatives; the author of dozens of Federal laws, including the Endangered Species Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Affordable Care Act; the chairman or ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee for 28 years; a veteran of the Second World War.

What the history books will never be able to fully share is the respect and kindness JOHN has given to all who have been fortunate enough to work with him.

JOHN has always been generous with his time and with sharing his unparalleled institutional knowledge of the people's House. In 2005, JOHN was a vital voice, and he supported efforts to pass the Energy Policy Act, which became one of the key Federal supports for the current energy renaissance that is providing jobs and lower energy prices for the American people today. Outside of Washington, I was fortunate to spend time with JOHN on hunting trips, where I had the opportunity to get to know him better as a man, as a father, as a husband, and as an avid sportsman.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I would like to personally thank JOHN for his decades of public service in fighting for America's working families. Our Chamber will not be the same without him. God bless JOHN DINGELL and the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the great lawmakers of our era, who has dedicated his life fighting for civil rights, strengthening our nation's safety net for the vulnerable and elderly, and pushing for workers' rights and protecting American jobs.

I am honored to call this man a mentor and a friend, the Dean of the House, Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

JOHN's illustrious career speaks for itself: longest-serving member in the history of the House of Representatives; author of dozens of federal laws, including the Endangered Species Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the Affordable Care Act; Chairman or Ranking Member of the Energy and Commerce Committee for 28 years; a veteran of the Second World War.

What the history books will never be able to fully share is the respect and kindness JOHN gave to all who have been fortunate enough to work with him.

JOHN has always been generous with his time and sharing his unparalleled institutional knowledge of the People's House. In 2003, during the DeLay redistricting fiasco in Texas, which gerrymandered out many longtime House Members, JOHN advised me on what avenues were available to Members to voice disapproval.

In 2005, JOHN was a vital voice and supported efforts to pass the Energy Policy Act, which has become one of the key federal supports for the current energy renaissance that's providing jobs and lower energy prices for the American people today.

Outside of Washington, I have been fortunate to spend time with JOHN on hunting trips, where I had the opportunity of getting to know him better as a man, a father and husband, and as an avid outdoorsman.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I would like to personally thank JOHN for his decades of public service in fighting for America's working families. Our chamber will not be the same without him.

God Bless JOHN DINGELL and the United States of America.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, in 1997, when I was a 39-year-old freshman, JOHN DINGELL took a risk on me. He put me on the Energy and Commerce Committee as a freshman. Since that day, I have learned at his knee every single day. He has become a friend; he has become a mentor—and like so many of us on both sides of the aisle, our experience here in Congress would not be the same without him.

□ 1715

A lot of us know about the long arm of JOHN DINGELL. Over the years, when Chairman DINGELL would put his long arm around your shoulders, and he would say, "Diana, I have a little chore for you," you knew that that little chore was anything but little. It was a part of something much, much bigger. Whether he was just moving a minor amendment to a bill or a large bill itself, and no matter what the issue was, it was always an honor to work together with JOHN DINGELL to get something done for the American people.

As the now-ranking member on JOHN DINGELL's subcommittee, the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, I feel a special responsibility to his legacy. JOHN DINGELL, over the years, held powerful people from all around the country, from every part of industry, accountable to the American public. And today, it is up to all of us, as members of his distinguished committee, to take up the great mantle of that legacy and to make the powerful tell the truth to the American public.

I commit myself today, along with all of us, to carry on his legacy, to do just that, to make this committee a committee that JOHN DINGELL will be proud of.

I am going to miss my dear friend, my wise mentor, and my trusted colleague. All of us will. We all recognize the great contributions he made to this institution and, most importantly, to this country.

Few retirements are as well deserved, with such distinguished service as Mr. DINGELL's. And so I want to say, JOHN, job well done. Godspeed.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If a test of a career is whether you made a difference, Big JOHN's career has been a big success. In so many ways, JOHN was tall in stature physically and in every other way.

There has been much note about his particular accomplishments. I would like to spend just a few minutes today talking not about those accomplishments that are so vivid and so clear, but to talk about JOHN DINGELL and his character.

He remembered his roots, never forgot them. There was always, I think, a sense of the underdog. I think his family came to this country and felt, in a sense, like the underdog, but were thankful that they had an opportunity in this country to rise. And it is so clear that JOHN succeeded.

You might sum it up this way: JOHN DINGELL was a legislator's legislator. He combined courage and civility, dedication and decency, strong views with strong friendships.

I don't remember exactly when it was that, down the hall here, when JOHN was being honored, he decided to talk about this institution and what he had seen happen to it. And it was a very frank talk. And he really bemoaned recent events here, where it was much more difficult to have strong views but to have strong camaraderie, to have strong views but have the ability to compromise on them, to have strong views but find a way to seek and find common ground. That was so convincing, so persuasive for someone who has been in this institution longer than anyone else in the history of this country.

So I think our best salute to JOHN, maybe the best way to remember his contributions—in addition to all of the particular legislation that came to be and meant so much to millions of people in this country—is to try to pick up the mantle that surrounded him all of his career here, to really see if we can seek and find some way in this institution to operate the way JOHN DINGELL saw so much of his career, and why he felt it was such a loss when it dwindled.

So I would like to just join everybody else with some emotion. Our two families have been so close for so many decades. Our two families, the Levins and the Dingells, the Dingells and the Levins, have had their lives so interwoven, so interwoven, coming from somewhat different backgrounds. But those weren't an obstacle. Those were really opportunities.

So I join so many others in saying to JOHN and to Debbie, who has been his partner, more than a job well done—a path that all of us should seek to follow.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

It is such an honor, in paying my tribute, to follow one of Mr. DINGELL's best friends, SANDY LEVIN, his colleague from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with great pride as well as deep humility to honor the longest-serving Member of Congress, the dean of the United States House of Representatives, the Congressman for the 12th District of Michigan and my personal friend, Mr. JOHN DINGELL.

JOHN has served his country with such honor and such distinction, first as a second lieutenant in the United States Army during World War II and, for the past 59 years, right here in Congress over the terms of 11—that is 11—United States Presidents.

But it is not just his longevity that has made JOHN such a force in the United States Congress. Yes, we are losing this man's incredible institutional memory, but hopefully neither he nor we will ever lose our love for this institution.

JOHN DINGELL's hand has helped construct nearly every major advancement in social policy that this country has known over the past six decades, policies that support working families, that strengthen our middle class, and support the United States economy.

Many of us here speak of significant events in United States history, but JOHN DINGELL can speak of these historic events because he was often right there, standing by the President's side. JOHN knows this institution inside and out. And it is that knowledge, coupled with his belief that Congress does have a vital role in making this country better for all of us, that has made him so influential over the years.

But for all he has done for the Nation, JOHN has been and continues to be such a great friend to each of us, no matter which side of the aisle we sit on.

When I first came to Congress, JOHN DINGELL took me under his wing and helped me to earn a seat on the Energy and Commerce Committee, his beloved committee. He told me that we did need nurses at the table, and he always has been a passionate advocate for quality health care. He is such a good friend to my own colleagues in the nursing profession.

The good people of Michigan are losing a great advocate for their State in Congress. This country is losing a passionate and brilliant Representative, and what I am told is the best Twitter feed on the Hill. And I am losing a personal friend on the floor of the House

and a real mentor on the dais at the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

But we won't be sad for long. Next year, we will have another Dingell who will be here as one of us, and that is JOHN's very own lovely wife, Deborah. I look forward to working with Deborah and have no doubt that she will continue the legacy of service that JOHN and his father before him have established.

So with that, I do not say good-bye, dear friend, but I do say best wishes. And know that we are all so full of gratitude and in great debt to you for your service, as you have for so long been of enormous service to each of us.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to our Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for taking this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, when this new House convenes on January 6, it will be the first in 59 years not to include the distinguished dean of this House, Mr. JOHN DINGELL of Michigan.

We will still have a Dingell from Michigan. It will be his wife, Debbie, whom so many of us in this House have come to know and admire. I have worked with Debbie every year that I have been in the Congress. She won the election to succeed JOHN, and surely we will continue to have him in our midst as a congressional spouse. But he will be very, very sorely missed among the Members of this body, all of whom he welcomed to the House over the course of his service as the longest-serving Member in the history of the Congress.

A lot of people like to point to JOHN's tenure in the House and note that when he came to Congress, Americans had Dwight Eisenhower as President, Brooklyn had a champion Dodgers baseball team, and Elvis Presley had his first gold record.

But what I will point out is what Americans did not have. They did not have Medicare. Seniors were unprotected from the rising costs of health care in their golden years until JOHN DINGELL became their champion and introduced legislation that was the precursor to Medicare. And he presided over this House when it passed Medicare in 1965.

Americans did not have the Civil Rights Act or the Voting Rights Act. When JOHN DINGELL took his first oath of office as a Member of this House, millions of African Americans across the South could not vote for Representatives in this House. Just 4 months after taking office, he bravely challenged the Eisenhower administration's leadership on civil rights.

He rose in this Chamber with great audacity to demand that the President protect those who were being denied their most fundamental rights as Americans. It almost cost him his seat. But all of us who know JOHN under-

stand why he was willing to risk everything for a cause that was just.

Americans did not have the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, or the Safe Drinking Water Act, nor did they have the Endangered Species Act or the National Environmental Policy Act. JOHN realized before many of his contemporaries that if Congress did not act to protect our environment, future generations would inherit a Nation spoiled by pollution and neglect, so he became a crusader for conservation.

And the American people did not have SCHIP or the Affordable Care Act—SCHIP being children's health insurance. JOHN DINGELL fought his entire life in public office to make affordable quality health care accessible to all who need it.

In between his work to pass Medicare in 1965 and the enactment of health care reform in 2010, JOHN DINGELL successfully pushed for incremental progress that made the Affordable Care Act possible. And when Leader PELOSI struck the gavel to signify the passage of that law, it was the same gavel that was used by JOHN when he announced the passage of the Medicare Act nearly 50 years before.

□ 1730

I was proud to nominate JOHN for the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our Nation's highest civilian honor, and to be on hand last month as President Obama presented that Medal of Freedom to him at the White House.

Let no one mistake JOHN's legacy as one of simply longevity. Had he served nine terms and not 29, we would surely be here on this floor to praise him as a man of vision, of principle, of courage and achievement, and of a deep love for this country, its people, and for this institution.

I have had the privilege of serving with JOHN in this House for 33 years. Throughout that time, he has been a dear friend from whom I have learned much and with whom I shared many memorable experiences on and off this floor.

JOHN DINGELL, my colleagues, has been and is a man of conviction, he has embodied civility, and he has worked in a bipartisan fashion. His example is one that if we follow, it would benefit the country and the House.

As chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, JOHN was instrumental in supporting a strong auto industry and jobs for America and measures to promote manufacturing here in this country.

Americans remember with gratitude his determined effort as chairman to root out waste, fraud, and abuse across the government and save the taxpayers while improving how the government works.

Seventy-three years ago this week, a young JOHN DINGELL, Jr., then a House page, sat in this Chamber, in which his

father, John, Sr., served, while President Roosevelt delivered his famous speech asking for a declaration of war as a result of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on that Day of Infamy.

Four years later, while serving in the United States Army, Second Lieutenant JOHN DINGELL was preparing to invade Japan when the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki brought the war to an end and quite possibly saving his life. We are all grateful for that, that Providence spared him, so he could come to the people's House and do the people's work for 59 years.

We will miss him dearly. I will miss him. I take comfort in knowing that he will still be here among us as a private citizen, as the husband of the new Member from Michigan's 12th District, and as an elder statesman for our country who I hope will always be ready to share the wisdom of his experience with those who will continue his work in this House.

JOHN DINGELL has been a great American, a citizen who loved his country and served it well. God bless you, JOHN DINGELL, and thank you.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is an understatement to say dean and Chairman JOHN DINGELL is a gentleman of this House and a respected man of the law. He has served our Republic his entire life, beginning as a page for this House at the age of 12, followed by his enlistment in the United States Army and his service during World War II. He is a bona fide representative of the Greatest Generation's dedication and enduring legacy.

He is a Member's Member, always available for counsel and always with an encouraging word. How many of us have benefited from his astute advice? This Chamber says thank you to a man who knows how to negotiate, who knows how to legislate, and knows how to foster great change. He is a master of the art of compromise.

His service has been honorable for over half a century. He has been indefatigable. JOHN has walked forthrightly in the shoes of his beloved father before him, and he served our Nation nobly in this House and the people of Michigan who reelected him 30 times. His service has established a historical record 59 years long of consistent dedication to liberty and to the people of our country.

Historically, he has assumed his place as one of the House's strongest timbers, truly a foundational Member, a master of the rules and decorum that should attend to our privileged service here. He is a champion of the dignity of the House.

Generations to come would be well-advised to emulate his service. He understands and treasures this House, its centrality in steering progress for our democratic Republic.

He is a champion of civil rights, of living wage jobs in America and labor rights here and abroad, of American manufacturing and the auto industry, of energy independence for America, of Medicare and Social Security as his father was before him, of our natural environment and the legal basis for respecting it—our Great Lakes, the fish, fauna, and creatures that form the wild kingdom, the park systems and wildlife refuges, the river and ocean ecosystems that maintain and sustain the stunning beauty and bounty of our land and frankly sustain us. He is the heartbeat of Motown.

I personally will always treasure the moments we spent working on legislation to refinance the U.S. auto industry and our tours of the auto giants' manufacturing platforms, of the times we spent together creating the first international wildlife refuge in our country in the Great Lakes region spanning our shared Michigan-Ohio border with Canada, the clean water and clean air achievements, the tours of the La-Z-Boy company and that firm's stellar involvement in environmental stewardship of our Ohio-Michigan region.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always treasure our encounters, countless as they are, along the Ohio-Michigan border that we shared, the hundreds of plane rides together, often with Deborah along, with dear colleagues like JOHN CONYERS, Billy Ford, as well as our car ride back to Michigan together after 9/11.

We have shared the priceless opportunity to guard liberty and extend her welcoming arms to the people of Poland, our shared ancestral heritage, as Poland cast off the shackles of Communist oppression. Though each of us dreamed of the day when that incredible moment might transpire, its achievement remains one of world history's most glorious moments.

So the patriotic gentleman from Michigan, House seniority rank number one, our dean, you have not only earned your title as "Man of the House," you have inspired millions of people and ably met the call of DANIEL WEBSTER in your time and generation to perform something worthy to be remembered. You have met that test.

My colleague, may God bless you and Deborah and hold you and your loved ones dearly. America thanks you, and so do I, as dean of Ohio's delegation. Godspeed.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his friendship with the distinguished leader of the entire Congress, the dean number one, as Congresswoman KAPTUR said.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be brief and put some of my statement in the

RECORD and hopefully return to the floor in the couple of days ahead to say more about Mr. DINGELL because so many Members are waiting, and I hope more time will be afforded for us to sing the praises of this great man.

Every now and then, you hear the expression "somebody is a living legend." That doesn't even begin to describe JOHN DINGELL. He is a living legend. He has had a hand in nearly every major legislative accomplishment over the past six decades from protecting civil rights and workers' rights—and I am so glad to see JOHN LEWIS here—to ensuring food safety, to enacting essential consumer protections, and to creating jobs in Michigan's Twelfth District and throughout our country.

Among his countless achievements, none holds greater significance than his contribution to the good health of the American people. Each congressional term since 1955, he introduced legislation to secure affordable health care for all Americans.

In 1965, he held the gavel in his hand as Medicare became law of the land, and in 2010, more than half a century later, it was my privilege to hold that same gavel in my hand as we passed the Affordable Care Act, realizing the dream of the Dingell family.

To work alongside JOHN DINGELL is to be inspired by his strength, by the history of our institution, and by the seriousness of his work, not only the length of his service for sure, but the quality of his leadership. He is our distinguished chairman, our distinguished dean, a cherished colleague and friend, a living legend as I said, but that only begins to tell the tale.

His experience, his leadership, his partnership, and his passion will be sorely missed by all of us who had the honor to serve alongside him. We wish him and his beloved wife, our soon-to-be colleague, Debbie, and the entire Dingell family the very best.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in the tributes to a public servant of unmatched leadership and quality.

The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey has followed the many footsteps of Mr. DINGELL on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AMERICA: LAND OF LIBERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN DINGELL ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman and remind my colleagues that we have a lot of speakers,

so if you can limit your remarks, we would appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman, I have learned to be brief, and I will be brief. Coming from Michigan and growing up in a political family and actually succeeding my own uncle, Dale Kildee, in this seat, one would think that Dale is the first Congressman that I really knew, but if you are from Michigan and you were born any time after the middle of the 1950s, JOHN DINGELL is the first Congressman that we knew.

He was a strong voice for our State, and he was really the picture of a Member of Congress for so many years. His longevity is obviously remarkable, but it is what JOHN did and stood for that is most remarkable over his long tenure.

He first was a witness to history in this place when 73 years ago this past Monday, his father was here and he was a page, he sat and watched Franklin Roosevelt give that famous speech on December 7.

He made history in this body. I remember just a few months ago watching on C-SPAN, as I do occasionally, and watching the signing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and watching JOHN DINGELL stand there and receive a pen from President Johnson as that act was signed into law. I sat with him the next day and discussed that time in our history and realized what an amazing privilege I have been given to serve in the same body with JOHN DINGELL.

He is a witness to history, and he made history, but more importantly, for 59 years, JOHN DINGELL was on the right side of history. Look at his record. Look at what he has stood for. He has always been ahead of the rest of the country.

The one thing I do hope is that we can take a lesson from his service and realize that there has been a time in this body when you can be a strong and passionate voice, when you can hold to principle, but still find ways to work across the partisan divide and find compromise and get things done. That is the lesson of his legacy, and it is one that I think we all have an obligation to try to live up to.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard that Representative JOHN DINGELL from Michigan is the longest-serving Member of the House of Representatives in the history of this institution. You have heard that he has been a Member since 1955 and has held a seat in this body since President Eisenhower sat in the White House.

You heard that exactly 1 day and 73 years ago, a young JOHN DINGELL, then

a page in the House, was standing in this very room when President Roosevelt gave his declaration-of-war speech against Japan. He was a page.

Needless to say, it has been a long road of public service for our friend and colleague, JOHN DINGELL. A great defender of civil liberties, JOHN DINGELL stood beside President Johnson as he signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Over his illustrious career, he fought for civil rights, for clean water, for Medicare, for American workers' rights.

On a more personal note, he has always been helpful to me even when I was just a wet-behind-the-ears freshman, and he shared his overflowing reservoir of knowledge and wisdom about the history and customs of this body and the workings of Congress. He will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I will always remember and appreciate his character, his integrity, and his courage in the fight for a better quality of life for the American people.

A poet wrote:

The tree that never had to fight
For sun and sky and air and light,
But stood out in the open plain
And always got its share of rain,
Never became a forest king
But lived and died a scrubby thing.
The man who never had to toil
By hand or mind in life's turmoil,
Who never had to earn his share
Of sun and sky and light and air,
Never became a manly man
But lived and died as he began.
Good timber does not grow in ease:
The stronger winds, the stronger trees;
The further sky, the greater length;
The rougher the storm, the greater strength.
By wind or rain, by sun and snow,
In trees and men good timbers grow.

JOHN DINGELL is good timber. Sir, you will be sorely missed. Thank you for your service.

□ 1745

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to join with many of my colleagues in celebrating JOHN DINGELL and recognizing the many, many things that he has achieved for our country. It is not just that JOHN DINGELL has been the longest serving Member in history; it is what he did in his 30 terms in the House. Many today will honor him for his support of civil rights and voting rights, his lifelong support for working men and women and their unions, for the environment and much, much more. But for me, it is his passionate advocacy for national health care.

I came to Congress with the number one priority of winning affordable, quality, and comprehensive health care for all Americans. I worked to join the Energy and Commerce Committee so that I could learn from JOHN DINGELL, who has been called a legend in the fight for universal coverage. Following

in the footsteps of his father, a key player in the passage of Social Security in 1935 and himself a strong fighter for national health care, Chairman DINGELL introduced the U.S. National Health Insurance Act in his very first term, and he has been fighting to make health care a right ever since.

JOHN DINGELL sat in that chair when we passed Medicare and Medicaid and gaveled it into law. He pushed for the Patients' Bill of Rights. He led the way as we created the Children's Health Insurance Program, and he was a key reason we were able to pass the Affordable Care Act in 2010.

Because of JOHN DINGELL, today more than 120 million Americans have access to health insurance in large part because of his leadership and vision. I am so grateful to have had the privilege of serving with and learning from JOHN DINGELL. I hope that we will follow his strong legacy and continue to make improvements in health care so that we can improve the lives and well-being of all Americans.

Thank you, JOHN DINGELL, for your unparalleled service to this country.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues tonight to honor my friend, my brother, the longest serving Member of Congress, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL.

I had heard of Congressman DINGELL long before I came to the House. I knew he had followed in his father's footsteps on his path to public service, that he was one of the youngest Members of Congress at the time. But most important, I heard that he would stand up, speak out, and fight for the issues of civil rights and social justice.

JOHN DINGELL is one of the most able and respected Members of this body. Yes, he is the dean of the House of Representatives. He had the capacity and the ability to say we have a right to know what is in the food we eat, what is in the air we breathe, and what is in the water that we drink.

He battled on the front lines for Medicare and Medicaid. He is the only Member of Congress still serving today who voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He also helped win passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that JOHN DINGELL is the embodiment of a time when legislators did not hesitate to use the power of the Federal Government to do good for all.

JOHN, my friend, my brother, my colleague, thank you for your service. Thank you for all of the good that you have done to make our country and to make our world a better place.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

As a new insurance commissioner in California in 1991, I had lots of problems with pensions, a lot of problems

with insurance companies going broke. I was summoned to Washington to appear before the Commerce Committee to explain. I had great fear in my mind. The very famous JOHN DINGELL was chairing that committee. But I very quickly realized his goal and mine were the same, that is, to find ways to protect people. A deep friendship then ensued for many years.

My mentor is leaving this session. I will miss him. I know that everybody in this House will miss him in many ways. He is a good man. His heart is as big as this Nation which he has worked so hard for.

JOHN DINGELL, a great, great Member of Congress.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding us extra time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey on behalf of our colleague who set a historical record of serving this Chamber and the people of his district so well for 60 years.

And it is a privilege for me now also, Mr. Speaker, to be in this well to deliver what is my last speech on this floor.

It has been the privilege and the honor of a lifetime for me to serve as a Member of the United States Congress, serving as the first woman ever elected from the State of Minnesota in the capacity of being a Republican. It is an honor, and it is the ride of a lifetime. As I stand here in the well of this House, I am so filled with joy and so much happiness in understanding that the privilege I have is one of being really a link on a chain that has gone on for hundreds of years.

I stand right here on the soil, in the square feet that are the freest square feet in the world because you see, Mr. Speaker, it is here where any voice that holds an election certificate can speak forth the words, words that maybe a President of the United States would vehemently agree with, disagree with, words that maybe colleagues from one's own party and the opposing party may vehemently disagree with, words that in some sense might incite people to anger or to even riot in some cases, but words, nonetheless, that are free—free, free—because a price was paid so that speech could be given. It is an honor. Where else could we find this level of freedom anywhere in the world?

That is why at the very top of this Capitol on the rotunda dome standing a full 20 feet tall is a statute called "Freedom." It is a woman, and her name is Freedom. She stands as the uppermost point in this part of our Nation's Capital. She faces east because she faces toward the sunrise so that every day Freedom's face looks into the morning sun, and, happily, we begin yet one more day of liberty in this country.

You see, I am so proud to be a part of this Nation. I am so proud to be an American citizen because I recognize the costs of my freedom, the price that was paid for it by those who have gone before. I am so thrilled to have this opportunity.

Just behind me, Mr. Speaker, above where you are standing, is our Nation's motto. It says, "In God We Trust." What a fabulous motto. Could any better motto be written for any nation to declare full voiced that it is in God that we as a nation put our trust? What other more trustworthy venue could there be? What other trustworthy vehicle could there be than a holy God?

You see, it is not just today that we mouth these words. These words were mouthed by the Founders of our country, those who decided to leave the comforts of their home to come here to what was essentially an untested, untapped world where there were people, the Native Americans who populated this land, but where a brand-new culture was about to be born, one that would be again the fulcrum to bless the entire world, where people would know that they could come from any portion of the world and find freedom as individuals, but also as a nation.

We have so much to be thankful for, so much to be grateful for. For many people who have never had the privilege of being in this House Chamber before, this is the room where the laws of our Nation are formulated. Our Founders meant that the House of Representatives would be the most powerful form of government. Why? Because it would be these 435 Members that we eventually became would hold the power of the purse. We would hold the Nation's credit card. It would be up to us to decide what we spent money on and what we didn't. We would formulate policy for what is now some 300 million-plus American people.

We are the lawgivers because the people of this country have given us the privilege of the election certificate to make the laws. We must never forget that it is by the consent of the governed that we rule and that we decide our laws.

As I look about this Chamber, we are ringed with the silhouettes of lawgivers throughout history—Hammurabi, various lawgivers throughout all of time, lawgivers for whom veneration is required. And yet only one lawgiver has the distinction of not having a silhouette but having the full face be revealed by the artist. That lawgiver is Moses. Moses is directly above the double doors that lead into the centermost part of this Chamber. In the face of Moses, his eyes look straight upon not only our Nation's motto, "In God We Trust," but Moses' face looks full on into the face of the Speaker of the House.

Daily the Speaker of the House, as he stands up in his authority and in his

podium, recognizes that he, too, is a man under authority, just as Moses was a man under authority. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, Moses is given for the full honor as the greatest lawgiver in this Chamber because he was chosen by the God that we trust to be entrusted with the basis of all law. The basis of all law, as was written by Blackstone, the famous English jurist, was the Ten Commandments that were given by none other than the God we trust on Mount Sinai. We know those laws. Those laws are the fundamental laws of mankind. And here in the United States, the Ten Commandments that God gave to Moses are the very foundation of the law that has given the happiness and the rise of the greatest prosperity that any nation has known before.

Mr. Speaker, it could be no coincidence that this Nation, knowing and enjoying the heights of such great happiness and such great prosperity, could be built upon that foundation of the Ten Commandments and of the law given by the God in whom we trust. What a privilege we have been given. What an unparalleled foundation. We have so much to be grateful for and thankful for.

Before I continue my remarks, I want to also say thank you to people in their individual capacity who have done so much to help me in my service in the House of Representatives. I want to thank, first of all and most importantly, the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Minnesota who thought enough of my campaign to give me the election certificate that I have been privileged to hold for these four terms that I have served in office for 8 years. Had the people of the Sixth Congressional District not elected me to service, I would have never known what a privilege it would be to serve them here in this Chamber. I thank the great people of the Sixth District. It is known as Lake Wobegon country, the greatest people in this country as far as I am concerned—people where all of the men are good looking and the children are above average. It is a State unlike any other, and I am privileged to have served.

I also want to thank the many numerous volunteers who worked on my campaigns to send me here. Without their tireless work stuffing envelopes and serving on the campaigns and making phone calls, it never would have happened.

□ 1800

I was a homemaker at home with our family. I had been a Federal tax litigation attorney. I had had the privilege of starting a charter school. My husband and I started our own company, but I was essentially nobody from nowhere, and because people believed in me, they elected me, and they brought me here. I want to thank again the

people of the Sixth District and the volunteers who sent me here.

I also want to thank the donors who very generously gave their money also so that I could be here. I had very hard-fought campaigns. I was often the top nemesis for the opposite political party in election after election, and millions of dollars were spent to make sure that I would not have the privilege of standing in the well of this House.

I want to thank those who gave me the money to be able to come and who sacrificed so that I could be here. Over the years my races were so expensive that at one point mine was the most expensive race in the country. That was done on an average donation of \$41 per donation. Millions and millions of dollars with an average donation of \$41.

I am so proud of that because real people across the United States saw in me an authentic, credible voice who was here to speak for them. I had people all across the country who said to me, MICHELE, thank you, you speak for me, and I am so thankful that you have fought for me here in Washington.

They knew that I wasn't here to speak for special interests. They knew that I wasn't bought and paid for. They knew that I was speaking for them. I want to say for those that did donate money to my campaigns, I am the same person today as I was when I came here 8 years ago, and I fought for you and for the values that you sent me here to fight for.

I also want to say thank you to the God who saved me. I am so grateful to the Holy God who created us, the Creator God, the God that Jefferson pointed to in the Declaration of Independence. It is because of Him and because He created me in His image and likeness, as He has each one of us, that I even have the possibility of coming here to be able to serve.

I also thank my parents, my father, who has passed away. I thank my mother, Jean LaFave, and my stepfather, Ray LaFave, for their love and their support over the years as well. I am thankful to my brothers, David and Gary and Paul, and my stepbrothers and my stepsisters.

I am thankful to my husband of 36 years, Marcus; to our five wonderful children, Lucas, and his wife, Christine; Harrison, Elisa, Caroline, and Sophia; and also to our wonderful 23 foster children whom we were privileged to raise over the years. As I often joke, yes, I am the old woman in the shoe. I have raised 28 children, and I am so grateful for each one of them.

I am thankful for my very dear friends over the years who prayed for me and stood by me and helped me to get to this position, to my supporters from the great State of Minnesota, and most particularly to the prayer warriors. The very first committee that we formed every time I ran for political office was our prayer committee, and I

thank you to the intercessors who prayed routinely for me. Those prayers I believe were answered.

I also say thank you to the men and women who serve today in our Armed Forces. It was the privilege of a lifetime for me to go and travel across the world to Iraq, to Afghanistan, to Germany, and various places around the world where I was able to meet you in your service, and I thank you for allowing me to meet you there.

I say thank you to our veterans who have gone before. You know how near and dear you are to my heart. I am the daughter of a veteran, stepdaughter of a veteran, sister of a veteran, and I am so grateful because I recognize we would not be here today if it wasn't for our veterans, and I thank you for your service to our country because you answered the call.

I want to also say thank you to my staff:

My longest-serving staff member, Kim Rubin, who came with me on day one and who has served me every single day so superbly as my scheduler. There is no one quite like her, and I have absolutely no idea how I will order my life once I leave here without Kim Rubin.

I say thank you to my chief of staff, Robert Boland, who has stepped in and done a wonderful job with our well-organized machine in our office. He makes it a joy for everyone in our office to serve.

I say thank you to my press communications director, Dan Kotman, who has done such a wonderful job every day challenging me to make sure that I can be as good as I can and to keep me from making the mistakes that I am all too prone to make;

For Mikayla Hall, who keeps me on the current edge in absolutely everything that she does, with a brilliant career in front of her;

For Renee Doyle, my dear longtime friend and legislative director, who has a heart of gold and who has served tirelessly in every form of her capacity;

For Jason Frye, Sergeant Frye, who has served our Nation as a veteran but who now will be a legislative director for my successor, and he will do a wonderful job serving.

For Kevin Wysocki, who has served me so well. I thank him, Mr. Speaker, for the brilliant, high-quality man of integrity that he is;

For Jessica Cahill, who has always been there to serve me in every possible capacity that she was asked to do;

For our intern Julie; for our district director Deb Steiskal, who has been so faithful to me during my time in service; for Barbara Harper, who has been with me through thick and thin through 16 years of activism and political life; for Nicole Severson Pelzer, who serves our veterans; for Karen Miller, who will continue to serve our district.

I am so grateful for the Capitol Police, for all that they have done to secure my safety; for the Sergeant at Arms; for our chaplains; our Bible study leaders; for the Clerk's Office.

I want to give a special shout-out to James, who runs the railroad car in the basement of the Rayburn Building. James has become a wonderful friend, a man of God, and we literally have tears in our eyes when we are saying goodbye to each other in these last days. He has brought joy to my heart, and I thank him as well as I thank Maria, who stands right out here outside the door. She has to fetch me all the time because I am usually the last one in the Chamber, trying to get more business done, and Maria says it is time to go, Congresswoman, and I thank God for Maria and what a darling that she has been.

I am grateful for the committee staff from the Financial Services Committee, on which I have been privileged to serve for 8 years, for the committee staff on the Intel Committee. No one knows how hard they work and what a vital service they play to our Nation.

I am grateful for Bonnie, the elevator lady, who is always so happy.

I am grateful for the two ladies at our lunch counter back in the cloakroom, to Ms. Pat and Ms. Doris. You are such good cooks, you make wonderful sandwiches, and I always knew that if I was short \$2, you would see me through to the next day. So thank you for believing in my creditworthiness.

More than anything, I want to say thank you to the Founders of this Nation, who gave us the most incredible ride by believing in us and in our future, by recognizing that these truths are self-evident, that all men and all women are created equal, that we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among those rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

What that means to me is this: no government gave me rights that only God can give, and no government can take away the rights that only God can give. The only reason that we even have a government and the only reason it was instituted among men is to secure for me and for you the rights that God gave us: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Beyond that, we rule by the consent of the governed.

This is a pretty simple gig to figure out here. There are things that government can't touch. Would that we would learn that. But there are things that we do, and those things that we do should be for the happiness of mankind. You see, it is our job not to think only of ourselves, but to think of the generations that are yet to come.

My favorite Americans are people who didn't know they were Americans. They were the Pilgrims. They came here before our Nation was founded. I

love the story that was written by Governor Bradford. He wrote in his journal, which I have read in the King's English multiple times. The Pilgrims are one of my favorite groups of people.

Governor Bradford wrote that with the sorrow and the sacrifice that the Pilgrims made—you know, the very first year when they came over, fully half of them died in that first starving winter. Governor Bradford wrote that it was worth it all because the Pilgrims saw themselves, in his words, as stepping stones. He said they willingly laid down their lives and sacrificed themselves because they looked into the future, Mr. Speaker, and they saw you, and they saw me, and they saw all of the American generations that would come after them, and they saw what a marvelous land filled with natural resources, the ability to have freedom, a completely new covenant, a completely new promise that we could make with the future and with the God that we trust.

We could have here a brand new, ordered experiment in liberty, and we did. The generations benefited, and our generation has benefited like nothing before. And that is what we too must do.

As I wind down my remarks, I say thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you that I could have that privilege of also being a stepping stone to look to the future so that the next generation would live better than we do today. Thank you for the privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2244, TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 12, 2014, THROUGH JANUARY 3, 2015

Ms. FOXX from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-654) on the resolution (H. Res. 775) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 2244) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from December 12, 2014, through January 3, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN DINGELL ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 30 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges of serving in this body is that occasionally we walk among giants. Most of us 435 Members are ordinary, but among us are a few extraordinary citizens who become Members of Congress and serve this great country.

We are saying good-bye this week to one of those giants. JOHN DINGELL, after serving some 59 years in this Chamber, is leaving us, and leaving us with a legacy of legislation that is truly astonishing: the Endangered Species Act, the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, the Safe Drinking Water Act, legislation to create the first international wildlife refuge in North America, not to mention the Civil Rights Act or the Affordable Care Act or any number of other giant pieces of legislation.

He has often said when asked about the jurisdiction that he was in charge of as chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee that he would point to a map of the Earth when asked about his jurisdiction and would say, "If it moves, it is energy, and if it doesn't, it is commerce." That is the way he would define the jurisdiction under his leadership.

We are thrilled that his wife now continues that extraordinary legacy by joining us as a Member of the next Congress, and I look forward to working with her on so many very important issues.

So to JOHN DINGELL I say, I walked among many here in this Chamber, none as giant as you, and forevermore I will remember your great leadership to this body and to this country.

MEDICAID PRIMARY CARE PAY BUMP AND WOMEN'S HEALTH

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to shift gears, Mr. Speaker, and speak about an issue that, frankly, JOHN DINGELL would be very concerned about as well, and that has to do with Medicaid primary care pay bump.

At the end of this year there will be up to 7 million more women who are eligible for Medicaid through the Medicaid expansion program who will not be able to get health care because they can't find a doctor.

□ 1815

Medicaid pays less than Medicare and private insurance for primary care. That is not surprising. In 2012, the average Medicaid rates were only 59 percent of Medicare rates for primary care services.

Now, you may be scratching your head and saying: Well, why would we somehow cheat the poor out of health care? That is precisely what we are doing. By reducing the amount of money available to physicians who provide care to the poor in this country,

we are basically saying: "Find it if you can."

In my home State of California, the Medi-Cal reimbursement rates are on average only 43 percent of Medicare rates for primary care services. This map shows what the situation is. The very light color are those States which were at 33 to 57 percent, the medium blue is at 59 to 82, and the dark blue is at 85 to 98 percent of Medicare rates. As you see, most States are in that 59 to 82 percent range, but many large States, like California and Florida, are between 33 and 57 percent.

The Affordable Care Act addressed this issue by creating a 2-year Medicaid pay bump for certain primary care services for millions of low-income individuals newly eligible for Medicaid-covered care. Without congressional action by the end of this year, that pay bump expires and, with it, health care for millions of Americans.

I come to the floor today to demand that we extend the Medicaid pay bump past 2014 and protect health care for our low-income constituents.

Additionally, the way the current pay bump is structured disadvantages women, many of whom prefer to see their trusted OB/GYNs to access primary and preventive care services. As we know, primary care and preventive care are crucial to the general health of our citizens, as well as to the reduction of health care costs, but the pay bump doesn't cover these crucial primary care providers.

When I was in the State legislature in California, I, like many of us here, tended to find legislation that related to something that I knew. I realized that I never went to the doctor. The only time I went to the doctor was to visit my OB/GYN once a year.

When primary care providers were being identified, I thought: Why shouldn't OB/GYNs be allowed to be primary care providers as well? So I introduced legislation in California which became law that specified that indeed OB/GYNs could be primary care providers.

What we do know is almost 6 in 10 women report seeing their OB/GYN on a regular basis. It is the one thing that women do at least once a year. One-third of women view their OB/GYN providers as their main source of care, so Federal recognition of the primary care role that OB/GYNs play for women in the ACA's Medicaid pay bump lags behind this general recognition in many other sectors of our health care infrastructure.

Thirty-five States and the District of Columbia classify OB/GYNs as primary care providers for their Medicaid programs. In TRICARE, the Federal health care program for our military servicemembers, OB/GYNs are recognized as primary care case managers.

OB/GYNs are included under the primary care provider definition in community health teams, a grant program

that supports primary care practices and patient-centered medical homes. In the primary care residency program called the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education program, which aims to increase the number of primary care residents and dentists trained in geographically isolated, economically, or medically vulnerable communities, OB/GYNs are included as one of the primary care disciplines.

Let's be clear. Lack of recognition of OB/GYNs as primary care providers under the ACA pay bump puts women who receive their health care from Medicaid at a disadvantage. Twenty-three percent of women Medicaid beneficiaries report a problem finding a new doctor who will accept their insurance, compared to 7 percent of Medicare beneficiaries and 13 percent of women with private insurance, due very simply to the very low payment plans and rates that exist for Medicaid.

I urge my colleagues to extend the Medicaid pay bump past 2014 and expand it to include a protection for women's health by officially including OB/GYNs as primary care providers.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman RICK NOLAN, my very good friend and someone who I admire greatly as well.

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great Member of Congress serving with us today but who is planning to retire, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL. I would like to do so by telling a little story.

Some 40 years ago, I was elected to the Congress of the United States for the first time. Before I had even been sworn in, I faced my first big challenge. The Congressman that I preceded had passed some legislation called the Big Stone Wildlife Management Area. The editor of our biggest newspaper had applauded him for that. I supported it in my campaign. I said: "I'll do everything I can do see that it's fully implemented and fully funded."

Well, I had just been elected, and the President of the United States announced that the project was not going to go forward, it was not going to be implemented, and it was not going to be funded. Here I am, I have just been elected, at least it appears as though I am already doing harm and damage to the district, and I haven't even been sworn in yet.

We came out here for a little orientation session, and I decided I would check with the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee that is responsible for this kind of legislation, to see if he had any advice for me on how I could effectively deal with this.

He said: "Come see me tomorrow." So I went to see him the next day and

he said: "Put out a press release. The project is going to be fully staffed, it's going to be fully funded, it's going to be fully implemented."

I said to him, questioningly: "Gee, Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States of America says it's not going to be fully funded, it's not going to be fully implemented."

He put his arm around me and he said: "Son, let me tell you something. Presidents come and go around this town with quite regularity. Old dogs like me have been here forever, and I'm going to be here forever. The bureaucracy will listen to an old dog like me before they'll listen to some darn fool President of the United States."

Well, needless to say, apprehensively, I put out the press release saying the project was going to be fully funded, fully implemented, and indeed, it was. In the process, I learned an incredibly valuable lesson from Mr. DINGELL, and that is there are many ways to effect public policy beyond the legislative actions—which of course are perhaps most important—that we make here in this Chamber.

By getting a hold of these bureaucracies and talking to them and telling them what you would like to see happen and, when appropriate, being supportive of their mission and their goals, they are inclined to be supportive of you as well.

That little story happened 40 years ago. Well, then I went on a 32-year hiatus. I spent the next 32 years of my life in the private sector, in business, community service, and raising my family. I came back here 40 years later and who is still here proving his point but JOHN DINGELL.

As I said, 11 Presidents have come and gone, but he is still here. I believe he has served longer than any other Member of the Congress in the history of the country; perhaps, most importantly, he is maybe the greatest Member to ever serve in the Congress.

There are so many good things that have happened in this country over the better part of a half a century that we can attribute to the good work of the honorable Representative, the great Representative JOHN DINGELL.

JOHN, we are all so grateful for your incredible service. I am thrilled and honored to be able to be here to join my many other colleagues in saluting you for your great service to the people that you have represented so ably from your own district, but your larger vision as well of what has been so important for the progress of the people here in America.

Thank you for your wisdom. Thank you for sharing that with so many of us who benefited from having sought your wisdom. Thank you for your effectiveness and all the great things you have done for this country. We salute you, Mr. DINGELL.

We love you, and we will miss you, but we will be forever grateful. This

country will always be a better place for you having served in this Chamber.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend a warm goodbye to the Dean of the House, JOHN DINGELL, who I am honored to call my dear friend of over forty years. The people of Michigan's 12th congressional district as well as the people across the nation are truly grateful for the devotion and leadership that he has provided over the last half century in Congress.

JOHN has certainly demonstrated what it means to be a true American patriot and hero. A fellow veteran, he is currently one of two World War II veterans still serving in Congress leaving Texas Republican RALPH HALL as the sole member who served in World War II.

JOHN has made it his life's work to fight to protect the health and well-being of both our people and our planet, and we have all benefited from his hard work and many accomplishments during his tenure. JOHN acted as the driving force behind imperative legislative initiatives like the Clean Water Act of 1972, the Clean Air Act of 1990, and the Endangered Species Act.

Through dedication and an everlasting thirst for public service JOHN has made an indelible impact in this institution. His charismatic candor will be missed. I will always be thankful that JOHN fought alongside me in Congress in times of both good and bad. I know JOHN will remain a voice of reason in our nation.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my respect and appreciation for Congressman JOHN DINGELL and his 59 years of service in the United States House of Representatives. Congressman DINGELL served with honor, dignity, and distinction, fighting each and every day for his home state of Michigan and for our entire country. While Mr. DINGELL is retiring, Debbie Dingell was elected this year to represent Michigan's 12th Congressional District in the next Congress. Like her husband, I know she will make the people of Michigan proud, and I look forward to working with her.

As a veteran of World War II and the longest-serving Member of Congress, Mr. DINGELL understands the meaning of service. He devoted himself to expanding opportunities for all Americans and to helping more families achieve the American Dream. He was a leader in the fight to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and helped create Medicare in 1965. An advocate for public safety, Mr. DINGELL wrote the 1990 Clean Air Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act, protecting the health of Americans and the environment.

Mr. DINGELL's tireless efforts will leave an indelible mark on our country and in Congress. I am thankful for his service and proud to call him a colleague and a friend. While we will miss his leadership, we can follow Mr. DINGELL's example and honor his legacy by putting aside our differences and working together to tackle our nation's challenges.

I wish Mr. DINGELL and his family all the best.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the inspiring career of Congressman JOHN DINGELL, and his retirement from this institution after 59 dedicated years of public service.

Few Americans have had a bigger, more lasting impact on the United States Congress than JOHN DINGELL. After serving his country in the Army during World War II, John was first elected to Congress in 1955, and has played a vital role in almost every significant piece of legislation passed over the last half century. During his time in office, JOHN DINGELL was a statesman who always put good policy above partisanship, and who nearly lost reelection because of his support for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. His impact on landmark legislation that includes Medicare, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and Affordable Care Act will continue to be felt for years to come.

The People's House has suffered a great loss with Congressman DINGELL's retirement and his institutional knowledge will be sorely missed. Mr. DINGELL has been an inspiration, mentor, and friend to those who were lucky enough to know him. It has been an honor to serve alongside him, and I have no doubt that his legacy will endure for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the service of Congressman JOHN DINGELL in the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand with my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to commend the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, JR., Dean of the House of Representatives, on his lifetime of service to the American people.

The people of his district in Michigan believed in him have sent him to Capitol Hill in a record twenty-nine consecutive elections, which is 59 years in this august body.

On issue after issue, Congressman DINGELL was a leader in the effort to secure civil rights for all Americans, to protect the quality of our air and water, to allow children and older Americans to afford health care, to protect the rights of our workers to bargain collectively for fair wages and benefits, to support the auto industry and the Great Lakes and to build the manufacturing sector of our economy. He has impacted virtually every piece of legislation to be signed into law during the last half century, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Affordable Care Act.

A veteran of the Second World War, who was awarded the nation's highest civilian honor—the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Obama in 2014, Congressman DINGELL remained committed to supporting the men and women of our armed forces, both on the field of battle and on their return home to the United States.

History will record his dedication to the belief that every American should have the ability to access comprehensive health care at an affordable cost. Continuing a tradition started by his father, Congressman John D. Dingell, Sr., every session of Congress he introduced a bill to provide for universal health care. With the Affordable Care Act, of which Congressman DINGELL was a proud co-sponsor, he achieved that high purpose to which he dedicated himself.

Congressman DINGELL's contribution to this institution will remain forever an example of public service in the public interest. When we honor him, we honor our shared faith in the promise of the American Dream and our com-

mitment to extend the blessing of freedom to the generations who will follow us.

A PRIVILEGE TO SERVE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I now have the opportunity to offer remarks concerning my six terms of service in the House of Representatives. What a distinct honor and privilege it has been to serve 700,000 fellow citizens from southeastern Pennsylvania in these hallowed halls.

From the moment I stepped foot in this building during freshman orientation back in 2002, I knew I was joining an institution that has been at the epicenter of landmark legislative decisions during the course of our Republic's history, and I knew that I would put up scores of historically important votes on behalf of my constituents.

From sitting in Statuary Hall during our freshman orientation dinner, where the likes of Abraham Lincoln and John Quincy Adams served, to sitting in this Hall during my first State of the Union address, to meeting with the President in the White House or on Air Force One, I have had more than my fair share of "pinch me" moments in this job.

However, the essence of the service that we all provide to our constituents is not the number of special moments interacting with a President or sitting through a historic speech. It is the honor and the privilege to serve every single day and in working to meet the needs, aspirations, and expectations of one's constituents.

We introduce legislation, we vote on bills that come before us, and we undertake day-to-day constituent services that hopefully improve the quality of life of our fellow citizens and move our great Nation forward.

The majority of this work is done outside of the political limelight and is rarely reported on by the media, but the real, important work that all House Members do every day boils down to being the strong and passionate voice for the 700,000 citizens we serve, both in this legislative Hall, as well through the constituent services we provide.

I have had the great fortune of having some bills passed in both the House and Senate and then signed into law. Those experiences were very heartwarming and satisfying, but I also assisted in having constituents get veterans benefits or Social Security checks sent to them or their son or daughter receiving an appointment to one of our fine military academies.

Each and every one of those legislative and constituent experiences has

added to the richness and fulfillment I have received from my experience here, and so I must express my gratitude and my appreciation to the numerous people who have assisted in supporting me along the way.

I have been blessed with wonderful supporters back home who have helped me through some very tough and competitive campaigns. They were always there to lend their energy and commitment, and I especially thank them for the faith they placed in me.

I have had a terrific staff, both in my D.C. and district offices, who have tirelessly worked on behalf of my constituents and supported me in my efforts. I would particularly like to recognize the various chiefs of staffs I had over the years: Linda Pedigo, Guy Ciarrocchi, Bill Tighe, Annie Fultz Dutton, and Lauryn Schothorst. They have been incredibly helpful and responsible for allowing us to accomplish all that we have.

On a more personal note, I would also like to thank my mother for the unbelievable inspiration and example she was for me over the years through her work ethic, her honesty and integrity, and her passion for civic responsibility.

I also want to thank my two sisters, Hedy and Eve, for always supporting me in my decisions to run for public office and in helping me any way they could.

□ 1830

A special thank you to my children—Katie, Jimmy, and Robby—and my stepchildren—Joel, Jay, and Katelyn—for their unwavering support for my public life.

Finally, I want to thank my great partner in life, my wife, Karen, who has unfailingly helped me and supported me in whatever public service decisions I have made.

As we close out the 113th Congress, amid cantankerous partisan relations both here in Congress as well as in our country generally, I would be remiss if I did not call on all of my colleagues here to renew their commitment to work together across ideological and partisan lines to find the best public policy that will move our country forward.

We share a common purpose as Members: to represent and advocate on behalf of our respective districts and reflect the will of the voters who have sent us here.

But the American people want something more. They have a burning hope that Members, regardless of party affiliation, will work through their political differences and find the common ground that is the bedrock of our country. So now, more than ever, public service must be infused with the commitment to achieve and not just to argue.

I wish all of those being sworn into office at the start of the 114th Congress

in a few weeks the best of success as they work towards historic achievements in the next 2 years.

Leaving Congress gives one time to pause and think and ask a simple question: Why did I come here in the first place?

Well, the answer to that question is pretty clear to me and pretty simple: to provide my constituents with a strong and passionate voice in the legislative process, to provide a level of constituent service that is second to none, and to serve with honesty and integrity in all actions.

As I look back, I hope and believe I have accomplished these goals, and I am most appreciative of all the great friends that I have met in my time here. But above all, I thank all of those who voted me into public office over the past six terms for their confidence and for their trust. It has been an incredible honor and a privilege to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills and a Joint Resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 78. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building".

H.R. 1707. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 2112. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 787 State Route 17M in Monroe, New York, as the "National Clandestine Service of the Central Intelligence Agency NCS Officer Gregg David Wenzel Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 2223. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 Elm Avenue in Munising, Michigan, as the "Elizabeth L. Kinnunen Post Office Building".

H.R. 2366. An act to require the Secretary of Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

H.R. 2678. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building".

H.R. 3534. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Michigan Avenue in Jackson, Michigan, as the "Officer James Bonneau Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4939. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the "Neil Havens Post Office".

H.R. 5030. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building".

H.R. 5462. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers.

H.R. 5739. An act to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Gálvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Gálvez.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 229. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenzo Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center."

S. 1434. An act to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

S. 2673. An act to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 2917. An act to expand the program of priority review and encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

S. 2921. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 8, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 43. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 Red River Avenue North in Cold Spring, Minnesota, as the "Officer Tommy Decker Memorial Post Office."

H.R. 451. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 North Brevard Avenue in Cocoa Beach, Florida, as the "Richard K. Salick Post Office."

H.R. 1391. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 South Oak Street in London, Ohio, as the "London Fallen Veterans Memorial Post Office."

H.R. 3085. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building."

H.R. 3375. To designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic."

H.R. 3682. To designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 1961 Premier Drive in Mankato, Minnesota, as the "Lyle C. Pearson Community Based Outpatient Clinic."

H.R. 3957. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 218-

10 Merrick Boulevard in Springfield Gardens, New York, as the "Cynthia Jenkins Post Office Building."

H.R. 4189. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4000 Leap Road in Hilliard, Ohio, as the "Master Sergeant Shawn T. Harmon, Master Sergeant Jeffrey J. Rieck and Veterans Memorial Post Office Building."

H.R. 4443. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Vermilyea Avenue, in New York, New York, as the "Corporal Juan Mariel Alcantara Post Office Building."

H.R. 4919. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 715 Shawan Falls Drive in Dublin, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Wesley G. Davids and Captain Nicholas J. Rozanski Memorial Post Office."

H.R. 5106. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Admiral Callaghan Lane in Vallejo, California, as the "Philmore Graham Post Office Building."

H.R. 669. To improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life.

H.R. 5681. To provide for the approval of the Amendment to the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.

H.R. 4924. To direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into the Big Sandy River-Planet Ranch Water Rights Settlement Agreement and the Hualapai Tribe Bill Williams River Water Rights Settlement Agreement, to provide for the lease of certain land located within Planet Ranch on the Bill Williams River in the State of Arizona to benefit the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and to provide for the settlement of specific water rights claims in the Bill Williams River watershed in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 5069. To amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to find the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, also reported that on December 9, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4812. To amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to establish a process for providing expedited and dignified passenger screening services for veterans traveling to visit war memorials built and dedicated to honor their service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5108. To establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5462. To amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the Wednesday, December 10, 2014, at 10 House adjourned until tomorrow, a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third and fourth quarters of 2014, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JAMES BRANDELL, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 5 AND OCT. 8, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
James Brandell	10/5	10/7	Belgium		918.00						918.00
	10/7	10/8	England		521.00						521.00
	10/4	10/8					1,644.70				1,644.70
Committee total					1,439.00		1,644.70				3,083.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES BRANDELL, Nov. 18, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, REBECCA TALLENT, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 23 AND OCT. 31, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Rebecca Tallent	10/23	10/25	Greece		336.00		13,145.00				13,481.00
	10/25	10/28	Turkey		1,293.00						1,293.00
	10/28	10/31	Italy		1,311.00						1,311.00
Committee total					2,940.00		13,145.00				16,085.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REBECCA TALLENT, Nov. 21, 2014.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2014

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mark Meadows	8/9	8/12	United Kingdom		1,210.49			214.95			1,425.44
	8/12	8/12	Belgium				87.39				87.39
	8/12	8/15	Hungary		744.90			287.17			1,032.07
	8/14	8/14	Croatia				44.91				44.91
Hon. John J. Duncan	8/15	8/16	France		516.00			203.18			719.18
	8/9	8/12	United Kingdom		1,210.49			214.95			1,425.44
	8/12	8/12	Belgium				87.39				87.39
	8/12	8/15	Hungary		744.90			287.17			1,032.07
Hon. Michele Bachmann	8/14	8/14	Croatia				44.91				44.91
	8/15	8/16	France		516.00			203.18			719.18
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
Eric Burgeson	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
Hon. Larry Bucshon	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
Hon. Jeff Denham	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
Janet Erickson	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
Hon. Blake Farenthold	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
Hon. Bob Gibbs	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
Hon. Duncan Hunter	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
Fleming M. Legg	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
Stephen Martinko	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
Hon. Markwayne Mullin	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
Hon. Thomas Rice	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06				734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75				587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70				2,075.94

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2014—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bill Shuster	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06		137.63		734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75		157.77		587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70		375.70		2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06		137.63		734.95
Dennis Wirtz	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75		157.77		587.62
	8/13	8/18	China		1,338.54		361.70		375.70		2,075.94
	8/18	8/19	Hong Kong		451.26		146.06		137.63		734.95
	8/19	8/20	Korea		329.10		100.75		157.77		587.62
Committee total					36,726.28		9,392.25		11,477.10		57,595.63

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, Nov. 18, 2014.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8183. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-78; Item V; Docket No.: 2014-0053; Sequence 4] received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8184. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirements [FAC 2005-78; FAR Case 2012-032; Item IV; Docket No.: 2012-0032, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM65) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8185. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Year Format [FAC 2005-78; FAR Case 2014-006; Item III; Docket: 2011-0023, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM53) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8186. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Streamlining Claims Processing [FAC 2005-78; FAR Case 2014-011; Item II; Docket No.: 2014-0011, Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AM83) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8187. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Incorporating Section K in Contracts [FAC 2005-78; FAR Case 2014-001; Item I; Docket No.: 2014-0001, Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AM78) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8188. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-78; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2014-0052; Sequence No. 6] received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8189. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled "American Energy Manufacturing Technical Corrections Act of 2012 — Section 8 Best Practices for Advanced Metering"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8190. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Commercial Clothes Washers [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-TP-0002] (RIN: 1904-AC93) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8191. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Exemption From Registration for Persons Authorized Under U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission or Agreement State Medical Use Licenses or Permits and Administering the Drug Product DaTscan [Docket No.: DEA-394] (RIN: 1117-AB38) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8192. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Provide Spectrum for the Operation of Medical Body Area Networks [ET Docket No.: 08-59] received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8193. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions; Office of Engineering and Technology Releases and Seeks Comment on Updated OET-69 Software; Office of Engineering and Technology Seeks to Supplement the Incentive Auction Proceeding Record Regarding Potential Interference Between Broadcast Television and Wireless Services [GN Docket No.: 12-268] [ET Docket No.: 13-26] [ET Docket No.: 14-14] received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8194. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2014 Annual Report on the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, pursuant to Section 304 of the International Academic Opportunity Act of 2000 (Title III, P.L. 106-309); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8195. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress and the Corporation for National and Community Service's Response and Report on Final Action for the reporting period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8196. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's response to alleged violations of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8197. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2014 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8198. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8199. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8200. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for Fiscal Year 2014, prepared in accordance with Title II, Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8201. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration, transmitting the personnel report as required by 3 U.S.C. 113 (2014), for personnel employed in the White House Office, the Executive Residence at the White House, the Office of the Vice President, the Office of Policy Development, and the Office of Administration for FY 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8202. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "ANC 1A Did Not Fully Comply with All Legal Requirements"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5086. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for purposes (Rept. 113-651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5699. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4320. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues; with an amendment (Rept. 113-653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 775. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 2244) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and providing for proceedings during the period from December 12, 2014, through January 3, 2015 (Rept. 113-654). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 5811. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a charitable deduction for the service of volunteer firefighters and emergency medical and rescue personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5812. A bill to support innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself and Mr. NUNNELEE):

H.R. 5813. A bill to allow for a contract for operation of Melville Hall at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, after receipt of a gift from the United States Merchant Marine Academy Alumni Association and Foundation, Inc., for renovation of such hall and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H.R. 5814. A bill to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a pe-

riod to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 5815. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for pharmacy benefits manager standards under the Medicare prescription drug program to further transparency of payment methodologies to pharmacies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5816. A bill to extend the authorization for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 5817. A bill to amend section 701 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to clarify the period of eligibility during which certain spouses are entitled to assistance under the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 5818. A bill to relinquish all Federal interests in certain lands in the State of Louisiana to correct errors resulting from possible omission of lands from previous surveys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5819. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to ensure that scientists are being funded at the age when they are most likely to make breakthroughs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5820. A bill to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to allocate additional funding through the Common Fund for research by emerging scientists; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 5821. A bill to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5822. A bill to establish a Hazardous Materials Information Advisory Committee to develop standards for the use of electronic shipping papers for the transportation of hazardous materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 5823. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create incentives for healthcare providers to promote quality healthcare outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 5824. A bill to modify certain provisions of law relating to torture; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period

to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 5811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, "The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 5813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 5814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec 8, clause 3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 5817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 5818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which states "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the

Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.”

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 5821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States).

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 5823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 5824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 11 and 18.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 139: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 140: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1318: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1354: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2376: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2482: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2856: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms.

MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 3424: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3708: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3750: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 4169: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 4240: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 4324: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4351: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4510: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 4772: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4790: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4865: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 4920: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 4930: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4960: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 5059: Mr. FOSTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. REED, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5130: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 5182: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 5267: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5320: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 5407: Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5474: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 5481: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 5484: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5589: Ms. MOORE, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 5655: Mr. REED.

H.R. 5656: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 5686: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 5709: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 5742: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 5747: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 5764: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 5780: Mr. TIBERI and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 5782: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 5783: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5792: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5803: Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. FALCOMA.

H.R. 5806: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 5807: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 190: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. DELAURIO.

H. Res. 688: Mr. BERA of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 762: Mr. FORBES.

SENATE—Tuesday, December 9, 2014

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Rev. Claude Pomerleau, with the congregation of Holy Cross Priests, Portland, OR, and also a Vermonter.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Father whose presence is so immediate and mysterious, whose personal care brings this planet and the entire universe into existence by Your creative Word, may we not lose our capacity for wonder, to listen and care for Your creation. It is wisdom and contemplation that allow us to read the signs of the times. You put these signs in our hearts through music and dance, poetry and prose, arts and sciences. We thank You as day begins, and the energies of Your daughters and sons are focused on the day's business. Inspire these here assembled with the gifts of peace and justice, as Your Word inspires them with courage and compassion for all.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we note you open the Senate every day, but today you had a little extra something in your step and a gleam in your eye because of the guest Chaplain, who is your lovely wife Marcelle's brother, so I am glad you have had the chance to have a small visit with him again.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m. this morning.

At 10:30 a.m., the Senate will proceed to two rollcall votes on the Lodge and Walter nominations. If cloture is invoked on either nomination, a confirmation vote will occur at 6 p.m. this evening.

The Senate will recess from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus luncheons.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 5759 AND H.R. 5771

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The leader is correct.

The clerk will report the bills by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5759) to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief.

A bill (H.R. 5771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiration provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to any further proceedings with respect to both of these bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bills will be placed on the calendar.

AVIATION SECURITY STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the commerce committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1204 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1204) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rockefeller-Tester substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and there be no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3977) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AVIATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 44946. Aviation Security Advisory Committee

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Transportation Security Administration an aviation security advisory committee.

"(b) DUTIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall consult the Advisory Committee, as appropriate, on aviation security matters, including on the development, refinement, and implementation of policies, programs, rule-making, and security directives pertaining to aviation security, while adhering to sensitive security guidelines.

"(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall develop, at the request of the Assistant Secretary, recommendations for improvements to aviation security.

"(B) RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEES.—Recommendations agreed upon by the subcommittees established under this section shall be approved by the Advisory Committee before transmission to the Assistant Secretary.

"(3) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The Advisory Committee shall periodically submit to the Assistant Secretary—

"(A) reports on matters identified by the Assistant Secretary; and

"(B) reports on other matters identified by a majority of the members of the Advisory Committee.

"(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Advisory Committee shall submit to the Assistant Secretary an annual report providing information on the activities, findings, and recommendations of the Advisory Committee, including its subcommittees, for the preceding year. Not later than 6 months after the date that the Secretary receives the annual report, the Secretary shall publish a public version describing the Advisory Committee's activities and such related matters as would be informative to the public consistent with the policy of section 552(b) of title 5.

"(5) FEEDBACK.—Not later than 90 days after receiving recommendations transmitted by the Advisory Committee under paragraph (4), the Assistant Secretary shall respond in writing to the Advisory Committee with feedback on each of the recommendations, an action plan to implement any of the recommendations with which the Assistant Secretary concurs, and a justification for why any of the recommendations have been rejected.

“(6) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after providing written feedback to the Advisory Committee under paragraph (5), the Assistant Secretary shall notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives on such feedback, and provide a briefing upon request.

“(7) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to briefing the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives under paragraph (6), the Assistant Secretary shall submit to such committees a report containing information relating to the recommendations transmitted by the Advisory Committee in accordance with paragraph (4).

“(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) APPOINTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2014, the Assistant Secretary shall appoint the members of the Advisory Committee.

“(B) COMPOSITION.—The membership of the Advisory Committee shall consist of individuals representing not more than 34 member organizations. Each organization shall be represented by 1 individual (or the individual's designee).

“(C) REPRESENTATION.—The membership of the Advisory Committee shall include representatives of air carriers, all-cargo air transportation, indirect air carriers, labor organizations representing air carrier employees, labor organizations representing transportation security officers, aircraft manufacturers, airport operators, airport construction and maintenance contractors, labor organizations representing employees of airport construction and maintenance contractors, general aviation, privacy organizations, the travel industry, airport-based businesses (including minority-owned small businesses), businesses that conduct security screening operations at airports, aeronautical repair stations, passenger advocacy groups, the aviation security technology industry (including screening technology and biometrics), victims of terrorist acts against aviation, and law enforcement and security experts.

“(2) TERM OF OFFICE.—

“(A) TERMS.—The term of each member of the Advisory Committee shall be 2 years. A member of the Advisory Committee may be reappointed.

“(B) REMOVAL.—The Assistant Secretary may review the participation of a member of the Advisory Committee and remove such member for cause at any time.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Committee shall not receive pay, allowances, or benefits from the Government by reason of their service on the Advisory Committee.

“(4) MEETINGS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall require the Advisory Committee to meet at least semiannually and may convene additional meetings as necessary.

“(B) PUBLIC MEETINGS.—At least 1 of the meetings described in subparagraph (A) shall be open to the public.

“(C) ATTENDANCE.—The Advisory Committee shall maintain a record of the persons present at each meeting.

“(5) MEMBER ACCESS TO SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of a member's appointment, the Assistant Secretary shall determine if there is cause for the member to be restricted from

possessing sensitive security information. Without such cause, and upon the member voluntarily signing a non-disclosure agreement, the member may be granted access to sensitive security information that is relevant to the member's advisory duties. The member shall protect the sensitive security information in accordance with part 1520 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(6) CHAIRPERSON.—A stakeholder representative on the Advisory Committee who is elected by the appointed membership of the Advisory Committee shall chair the Advisory Committee.

“(d) SUBCOMMITTEES.—

“(1) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee chairperson, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary, may establish within the Advisory Committee any subcommittee that the Assistant Secretary and Advisory Committee determine to be necessary. The Assistant Secretary and the Advisory Committee shall create subcommittees to address aviation security issues, including the following:

“(A) AIR CARGO SECURITY.—The implementation of the air cargo security programs established by the Transportation Security Administration to screen air cargo on passenger aircraft and all-cargo aircraft in accordance with established cargo screening mandates.

“(B) GENERAL AVIATION.—General aviation facilities, general aviation aircraft, and helicopter operations at general aviation and commercial service airports.

“(C) PERIMETER AND ACCESS CONTROL.—Recommendations on airport perimeter security, exit lane security and technology at commercial service airports, and access control issues.

“(D) SECURITY TECHNOLOGY.—Security technology standards and requirements, including their harmonization internationally, technology to screen passengers, passenger baggage, carry-on baggage, and cargo, and biometric technology.

“(2) RISK-BASED SECURITY.—All subcommittees established by the Advisory Committee chairperson in coordination with the Assistant Secretary shall consider risk-based security approaches in the performance of their functions that weigh the optimum balance of costs and benefits in transportation security, including for passenger screening, baggage screening, air cargo security policies, and general aviation security matters.

“(3) MEETINGS AND REPORTING.—Each subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly and submit to the Advisory Committee for inclusion in the annual report required under subsection (b)(4) information, including recommendations, regarding issues within the subcommittee.

“(4) SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRS.—Each subcommittee shall be co-chaired by a Government official and an industry official.

“(e) SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS.—Each subcommittee under this section shall include subject matter experts with relevant expertise who are appointed by the respective subcommittee chairpersons.

“(f) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee and its subcommittees.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term ‘Advisory Committee’ means the aviation security advisory committee established under subsection (a).

“(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term ‘Assistant Secretary’ means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration).

“(3) PERIMETER SECURITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘perimeter security’ means procedures or systems to monitor, secure, and prevent unauthorized access to an airport, including its airfield and terminal.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘perimeter security’ includes the fence area surrounding an airport, access gates, and access controls.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“44946. Aviation Security Advisory Committee.”

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1204), as amended, was passed.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2719 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2719) to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Ayotte amendment, which is a substitute amendment, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3978) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 2719), as amended, was passed.

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING SENATORS

TIM JOHNSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the words Hemingway said so clearly—“man is not made for defeat”—applied to anyone in the world, they certainly apply to TIM JOHNSON. He is a testament to this sentiment because he never ever acknowledged defeat. He refuses to be defeated.

TIM never lost an election. He served in the House of Representatives from

1987 to 1997—for 10 years. He served in the State legislature. They weren't all easy votes and weren't all easy elections. He won his election in 2002 by 524 votes. Hundreds of thousands of votes were cast, but he won by 524 votes.

Senator TIM JOHNSON refused to succumb to defeat because he knew he was fighting for the people of South Dakota. He fought for South Dakota jobs when he fought to keep Ellsworth Air Force Base open and running. It was based near Rapid City, and he saved it from closing. He worked to this end, saving thousands of jobs, preserving a thriving economy based on that Ellsworth Air Force Base.

During his tenure in the House and Senate he fought for water, which is so important. People from so many other States don't realize how important water is to States such as South Dakota and many Western States. Water is something you always have to keep your eye on. He secured funding for the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Project and the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System. Combined, those two projects provided clean drinking water to some 400,000 people. That is half the population of the State of South Dakota.

Without question though, TIM's biggest fight took place in 2006. I can still remember that so clearly. I got a call from his chief of staff saying: You need to go to the hospital. TIM has been taken by ambulance to George Washington. So I went there because TIM had suffered a very bad bleed on the brain. He was born with this situation—no one knew of course—but it suddenly hit him. Lots of people have this condition, but most people don't have a bleed on their brain, but TIM did. I was there in the hospital with him. Barbara was there, his daughter Kelsey, and his two boys, Brendan and Brooks, came in as soon as they could. One was serving in the military after having seen combat duty as a member of the U.S. Army. The other boy is a lawyer and is now a U.S. attorney in South Dakota.

It was a very difficult time for his family and a difficult time for him especially. He was in surgery on more than one occasion. His life was threatened. Many people don't survive this difficult situation he was hit with. But he is a huge man. I, frankly, never realized how physically big and strong he was until I saw him lying there in the hospital. But TIM met these physical challenges, and they were very difficult. Ten months later he was back working in the Senate. He was here on the floor.

After this incident, his physical body would never be the same, but his mental capacity is better than ever. With the support of his wife Barbara, since 1969, and their three children, whose names I have already mentioned, he made this remarkable recovery. It was all very difficult. He had to learn to

talk again, he had to learn to walk again, and much of his life now is physically different than it was before. He is now, a lot of times, in a wheelchair, but he has never asked for any sympathy. He has pushed forward as he always has his whole life.

Regardless of these changes to his body, his honorable, indomitable spirit is the same. One newspaper recently said, in speaking of TIM's return to the Senate:

Loss of integrity is a greater handicap to any politician and, once lost, cannot be regained with confidence. Johnson's integrity has never been in question.

TIM JOHNSON has his integrity. He has his unbreakable determination to fight for the people of South Dakota and just fight to do the things he needs to do.

TIM is retiring after 18 years in the Senate and 10 years in the House. To say he will be missed by the people of South Dakota is a gross understatement. He worked here with my predecessor, the Democratic leader Tom Daschle, and they got so many good things done for the State of South Dakota. Senator Daschle is missed as TIM will be missed, but their friendship is something I have long admired.

To show the type of person he is, the person he beat by 524 votes came back the next election and endorsed him—a Republican and long-time Member of the House and Senate, Larry Pressler. He endorsed TIM JOHNSON in his reelection. That is the kind of integrity TIM JOHNSON has. People admire him very much.

TIM JOHNSON leaves the Senate as he entered it, undefeated. I will miss him very much. My wife will miss Barbara. They are members of a book club, and I have seen their exchange of emails back and forth as to what books they should read, what they thought of the book, and where they are going to meet. So the Reids will miss the Johnsons. South Dakota will miss the Johnsons. But TIM will still proceed forward and be a great blessing to the State of South Dakota, as he has always been, and to his family.

TOM HARKIN

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln once said:

I want it said of me by those who knew me best, that I always plucked a thistle and planted a flower where I thought a flower would grow.

Today I stand for just a few minutes to honor a man by the name of TOM HARKIN. Throughout his time in the Senate he has planted many flowers—so many we can't count them all. TOM HARKIN's legacy of fighting for all Americans, particularly those who are disadvantaged, will never be forgotten. In fact, no one in the history of this institution has done more for people who have a physical disadvantage, an emotional disadvantage, a mental disadvantage, and disadvantages generally, than TOM HARKIN.

TOM's life wasn't easy. His father was a miner. His mother, a Slovenian immigrant, died when TOM was 10 years old. He and his family pushed forward, living in a house without hot water or a furnace.

Not one to use his difficult upbringing as an excuse, TOM HARKIN pushed himself very hard. He attended Iowa State University. He came there on a Navy ROTC scholarship. Upon graduation, he enlisted in the Navy and became an Active-Duty pilot—a naval pilot.

I have such admiration for naval pilots, for all pilots, really, but thinking of landing on an aircraft carrier out in the middle of the ocean, that postage stamp size you have to try to find and land out there is something Navy pilots do, and TOM HARKIN did this.

In 1974 he was elected to represent Iowa's Fifth Congressional District, a seat he held for 10 years. When he came to the Senate in 1984, TOM, similar to President Lincoln before him, encountered many thistles.

He was especially motivated to help millions of Americans with disabilities, as I have already said. Here is what TOM HARKIN said once:

I heard stories from individuals who had to crawl on their hands and knees to go up a flight of stairs, who couldn't ride a bus because there wasn't a lift or couldn't cross a street in a wheelchair because there were no curb cuts. Millions of Americans were denied access to their own communities and to the American dream.

TOM did a lot to make sure people did have the ability to dream. What did he do? He encountered the injustice faced by millions of disabled Americans and responded by authoring the Americans with Disabilities Act.

People don't realize now what those disabled people had to go through. There was a big dispute here in the Senate and in the House as to whether Members of Congress should vote for this. It created a lot of issues for businesses. A former Member of the House of Representatives, James Bilbray of Nevada, was getting a lot of pressure not to vote for this, but he voted for this, and here is why he voted for it:

Just like TOM HARKIN saw this long before many of us did, James Bilbray had a friend whose daughter was confined to a wheelchair. This man wanted to visit Congressman Bilbray and his family here in Washington, DC. What an ordeal it was. They couldn't find a place with a hotel room. They had trouble getting airline reservations. It was extremely difficult. So Jimmy Bilbray said: That is enough for me. I am voting for this.

This landmark legislation that was pushed and pushed by TOM HARKIN has helped to move areas of employment, public services, transportation, and telecommunications for people with disabilities. TOM HARKIN's work to protect the disadvantaged hasn't been just reactive, it has been preventative.

TOM has lost four siblings to cancer. In response to that heartbreak, what has he done? Senator HARKIN fought to double the funding for groundbreaking medical research at the National Institutes of Health. He had a partner in this for many years, Arlen Specter from Pennsylvania. They worked on that subcommittee, Labor-HHS, and Appropriations. Some will remember that this was an unbelievable thing he did to force us to spend more money on medical research. But in hindsight, what a blessing this was for America and for Members of the Senate who voted for this. It was good for us, and it was good for the country. It was good for our constituents. With the extra money NIH got, they have engaged in a landmark effort to cure cancer, heart disease, and a myriad of other diseases.

We have a long way to go. Funding hasn't been adequate the last 6 years. The only boost we got in NIH funding was in the stimulus, the first few months of the Obama administration where we got additional money. That was done as a result of the work by TOM HARKIN and Arlen Specter, and that money now is not there. We need to do more for the National Institutes of Health.

TOM HARKIN has been tireless. He worked to triple the funding for the Centers for Disease Control. In fact, in ObamaCare he is the one who was responsible for the prevention title in that bill.

He has spent his career coming to the defense of the defenseless. A longtime defender of human rights, TOM has worked to fight child labor, both domestically and abroad. His tireless efforts gave him the U.S. Labor Department's Award for the Elimination of Child Labor.

I have spent much of my Senate life on the Senate floor. I can remember when I would look and see one of his staff come to the floor, and I thought: Oh, no. I knew we were in for some trouble. His name was Richard Bender. I really have such admiration for Senator HARKIN's staff, but it was epitomized when Richard Bender walked in this door because I knew HARKIN was going to do something we had not planned. Sometimes it took a lot longer to get things done because of Bender and HARKIN, but in the end it was always better for our country.

So after a lifetime of service, TOM will finally be able to spend his post-Senate time in another direction, still involved in a form of public service. I have such great admiration for Ruth, whom I know extremely well. I don't know Amy and Jenny, his daughters, but I do know they are going to be able to spend a little more time with their dad and her husband.

On a side note, TOM HARKIN is one of the few Senators who has been to my home in Searchlight. I was there one

day, and I got a call. He said: "Are you going to be home?"

"Yes."

"Do you mind if we drop by?"

"No, I don't mind if you drop by."

So within an hour he was at my home in Searchlight.

So as TOM HARKIN closes a chapter of service to the American people, I salute TOM HARKIN on a job very well done. He has become the longest-serving Democratic Senator in Iowa's history, and he will be greatly missed.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Republican leader is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS BRANDON T. PICKERING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a fallen soldier from Kentucky who was lost in battle. PFC Brandon T. Pickering of Fort Thomas, KY, died on April 10, 2011, in Germany from wounds sustained on April 8 in Wardak Province, Afghanistan, when enemy combatants attacked his unit with small arms fire and a rocket-propelled grenade. He was 21 years old.

For his service in uniform, Private First Class Pickering received several awards, medals, and decorations, including the Bronze Star Medal, the Purple Heart Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the NATO Medal, and the Combat Infantryman Badge.

Says Tammy Moore, Brandon's mother:

To know Brandon was to know love and laughter.

When Brandon was boarding the plane to go back to Afghanistan, he turned and looked at me and I thought, "My God, my son's a man." It was the first time I looked at him and didn't see him as my little boy.

Brandon grew up in Fort Thomas, in northern Kentucky and attended Woodfill Elementary, Highlands Middle School, and Highlands High School. As a kid growing up he loved to fish and played baseball and football. Brandon also practiced tae kwon do as a kid, and he earned his black belt by age 10.

Brandon's high school classmates and teachers remember him as an unassuming student with a big heart, a good sense of humor, and a dedication to helping others.

Says Highlands High School principal Brian Roberts:

As a school, we join the Fort Thomas community and the family in mourning his loss.

Says former high school classmate Stephanie Orleck:

Even on bad days, I was always able to turn to Brandon to bring out a smile on my face.

Brandon also had a mischievous side. His mother recalls:

Brandon loved a good prank. In high school he decided it would be funny to place a mouse trap in another student's locker. When the principal called him, he admitted it right away.

That was the worst trouble Brandon ever gave his parents.

As a teenager, Brandon also enjoyed the freedom that came with his driver's license.

While teaching Brandon how to drive, he told me, "Mom, I know you don't want to hear this, but this is the happiest I've ever been."

I told him, "Brandon, I know you don't want to hear this, but this is the most scared I've ever been!"

After graduating high school in 2008, Brandon attended Cincinnati State.

Tammy recalls:

After two semesters, he told me he was thinking of joining the Army. I asked him to give school another semester and if he still felt the same, I would support his decision. The third semester came and went, and Brandon was firm on his decision.

He enlisted and in September 2009 he left for basic training at Fort Benning, GA. After basic training he was stationed at Fort Polk, LA.

Tammy said:

There was a small town outside of Fort Polk named Pickering; Brandon thought that was neat and so did I.

Brandon was an only child, but when he got to Fort Polk he found brothers.

Assigned to Fort Polk in April of 2010, Brandon was assigned to the 1st Platoon, Company C, 2nd Battalion, 4th Infantry Regiment, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division. He was soon deployed to Afghanistan for Operation Enduring Freedom in October of 2010. Part of a two-man machinegun team, Brandon was 6 months into his first combat tour when he was fatally wounded.

Brandon was flown to Landstuhl Regional Medical Center in Germany before he died. Because of this, his family was able to be with him before he passed away.

Brandon made one final gift by volunteering to be an organ donor. His final sacrifice was an offering of life for four Germans, including a 6-year-old girl.

Tammy said:

Even in his death, Brandon saved the lives of four people.

I often wondered how I could have raised such a wonderful human being and then I think, only by the grace of God.

The Fort Thomas, KY, road where Brandon grew up was fittingly renamed in his honor as a permanent reminder of his life and his deeds. The portion of River Road in Fort Thomas that runs from State Route 8 along the Ohio River to South Fort Thomas Avenue next to the Cincinnati VA Medical Center is now named the Private First

Class Brandon T. Pickering Memorial Highway.

We are thinking of Brandon's family as I recount his story for my Senate colleagues, including his mother Tammy Moore, his father David Pickering, his grandfather Thomas Pickering, and many other beloved family members and friends.

Brandon was laid to rest with full military honors at the Alexandria Cemetery in Alexandria, KY. His tombstone bears the words, "Live a life worthy of my sacrifice."

Tammy had some final thoughts on the words that mark her son's grave.

People should think about that—not just for my son, but for all the sons and daughters, and the ones in the past.

What people have sacrificed to keep this country free—freedom isn't free, and it's not cheap. It comes at a high cost, and we all have a responsibility to each other and to this nation.

I couldn't agree more with Tammy Moore's thoughts, and I want her to know that this Senate certainly does recognize the responsibility we have as a nation to honor and always remember the sacrifices of brave heroes like her son, PFC Brandon T. Pickering. We are in awe of his life of service, and we are humbled by his final sacrifice. From Germany to Afghanistan to Fort Thomas, we can see the lives he touched and the people he left better off for having known him.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, for debate only, until 10:30 a.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am looking at the clock, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be able to continue in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show the introduction of and prayer by our visiting Chaplain today, Father Claude Pomerleau of Portland, OR, a member of the Holy Cross priests. That is as much of a thumbnail as saying any one of us is a U.S. Senator, period. There is a lot more to it.

Claude Pomerleau has been nearly 50 years a priest. I know because he is my brother-in-law, and my wife Marcelle

and I, as well as his wonderful parents, Phil and Cecile Pomerleau, joined him in Rome nearly 50 years ago when he was ordained a priest. My family—my parents, my brothers and sisters, and also our children—has always had such a wonderful relationship with Father Pomerleau. It is great now to see the young grandchildren come in and give him a hug and say: Hi, Uncle Claude.

I also look at his distinguished career. He is not just a brother and brother-in-law, an uncle and friend, he is a man who has taught, speaks many languages, and who has a Ph.D. from the University of Denver. He teaches now at the University of Portland even in semiretirement and also in Santiago, where he is a well-respected visiting professor, and where I am told his Spanish is like that of a native.

He was born in Vermont. His parents are French Canadians, two people who strongly practiced their religion, believed in it, and brought up their children speaking French at home. They instilled in him the values that really make our country great and make a human being even greater.

He has been a mentor. He has been a moral anchor for our family for decades. I think of him being on the altar as a young altar boy at the time Marcelle and I were married 52 years ago, and he has been part of our lives and our marriage ever since. He is the man we turn to when we want guidance. He is a man both of us love greatly. And I would like to say, as the longest serving Member of the Senate, what an honor it was to have him open with the prayer.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for allowing this.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Lodge nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move

to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Virginia Tyler Lodge, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Bernard Sanders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Virginia Tyler Lodge, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 318 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Ayotte	Franken	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Begich	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Hagan	Pryor
Blumenthal	Harkin	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Reid
Boxer	Heitkamp	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coats	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Manchin	Vitter
Corker	Markey	Walsh
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—32

Barrasso	Hatch	Moran
Blunt	Heller	Paul
Boozman	Hoeben	Portman
Burr	Inhofe	Risch
Chambliss	Isakson	Roberts
Coburn	Johanns	Rubio
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Crapo	Kirk	Thune
Enzi	Lee	Toomey
Fischer	McCain	Wicker
Grassley	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—5

Cruz	Rockefeller	Udall (CO)
Landrieu	Schumer	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 32.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF VIRGINIA TYLER LODGE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Virginia Tyler Lodge, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Walter nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ronald Anderson Walter, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Tom Udall, Brian Schatz, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard Blumenthal, Jeff Merkley, Al Franken, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Bernard Sanders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ronald Anderson Walter, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 319 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Franken	Murray
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Nelson
Baldwin	Graham	Pryor
Begich	Hagan	Reed
Bennet	Harkin	Reid
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rockefeller
Booker	Heitkamp	Sanders
Boxer	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Sessions
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coats	Levin	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Markey	Vitter
Corker	McCaskill	Walsh
Cornyn	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Flake	Murphy	

NAYS—31

Barrasso	Heller	Paul
Blunt	Hoeven	Portman
Boozman	Inhofe	Risch
Burr	Isakson	Roberts
Coburn	Johanns	Rubio
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Crapo	Kirk	Thune
Enzi	Lee	Toomey
Fischer	McCain	Wicker
Grassley	McConnell	
Hatch	Moran	

NOT VOTING—4

Chambliss	Landrieu
Cruz	Udall (CO)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 65, the nays are 31.

The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF RONALD ANDERSON WALTER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk reported the nomination of Ronald Anderson Walter, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 6 p.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the matter before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is currently in a period of morning business for debate only.

The majority leader.

CIA OVERSIGHT REPORT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today for the first time the American people are going to learn the full truth about torture that took place under the CIA during the Bush administration. I have served for 22 years with the chairman

of the Intelligence Committee, DIANNE FEINSTEIN. She is dignified. She is very thorough in whatever she does. She is intelligent and she cares a great deal. She has proven herself to be the one of the most thoughtful and hard-working Members of this body. The people of California are, as well they should be, very proud of this good woman.

I am appreciative of the work the Senate Intelligence Committee has done under her direction. We are here today because of her efforts. She has persevered, overcome obstacles that have been significant, to make this study available to the American people.

I am gratified for the work done by Democrats on the Intelligence Committee. We are here today, again I repeat, because of their efforts. We do not often mention, as certainly we should, the work of our staffs. I want to throw a big bouquet to the intelligence staff. They have worked so hard. Under the direction of Senator FEINSTEIN, they have worked for 7 years—7 years—working on this vitally important matter. It is a report that was not easy, but they did it.

Here is what they did: Committee members and staff combed through more than 6 million pages—6 million pages—of documents to formulate the report. The full committee report is 6,700 pages long—7 years, I repeat, in the making.

The unclassified executive summary, which is going to be released today, is more than 500 pages. I want everyone to understand, the Select Committee on Intelligence, along with the House Committee on Intelligence, is the only group of people who provide oversight over our intelligence community. They actually have the ability to investigate what happened. No one else. Not the press, not Senators, nor the public, or outside organizations have the ability to investigate the CIA. But we did it. The implications of this report are profound. Not only is torture wrong, but it does not work. For people today, we hear them coming from different places saying, It was great. It was terrific what we did. It has got us so much.

It has got us nothing, except a bad name. Without this report, the American people would not know what actually took place under the CIA's torture program. This critical report highlights the importance of Senate oversight and the role Congress must play in overseeing the executive branch of government. The only way our country can put this episode in the past is to come to terms with what happened and commit to ensuring it will never happen again. This is how we as Americans make our Nation stronger. When we realize there is a problem, we seek the evidence; we study it; we learn from it. Then we set about to enact change. Americans must learn from our mistakes. We learned about the Pentagon

papers. They were helpful to us as a country. The Iran contra affair. I was here when it went on. It was hard on us, but it was important that we did this. More recently, what happened in that prison in Iraq, Abu-Ghraib.

We have three separate branches of government, the judicial, the executive, and the legislative branches of government. To me, this work done by the Intelligence Committee, of which the Presiding Officer is a member, cries out for our Constitution, three separate, equal branches of government.

We are here today to talk about the work done by the legislative branch of government. We can protect our national security as a country without resorting to methods like torture. They are contrary to the fundamental values of America. So I call upon the administration, the Intelligence Committee, and my colleagues in Congress to join me in that commitment, that what took place, the torture program, is not in keeping with our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the leader for his words and for his support. They are extraordinarily welcome and appreciated.

Today, a 500-page executive summary of the Senate Intelligence Committee's 5½ year review of the CIA's detention and interrogation program, which was conducted between 2002 and 2009, is being released publicly. The executive summary, which is going out today, is backed by a 6,700-page classified and unredacted report with 38,000 footnotes which can be released, if necessary, at a later time.

The report released today examines the CIA's secret overseas detention of at least 119 individuals and the use of coercive interrogation techniques, in some cases amounting to torture.

Over the past couple of weeks, I have gone through a great deal of introspection about whether to delay the release of this report to a later time. This clearly is a period of turmoil and instability in many parts of the world. Unfortunately, that is going to continue for the foreseeable future whether or not this report is released.

There are those who will seize upon the report and say "See what the Americans did," and they will try to use it to justify evil actions or incite more violence. We can't prevent that, but history will judge us by our commitment to a just society governed by law and the willingness to face an ugly truth and say "never again."

There may never be the right time to release this report. The instability we see today will not be resolved in

months or years. But this report is too important to shelve indefinitely.

My determination to release it has also increased due to a campaign of mistaken statements and press articles launched against the report before anyone has had the chance to read it. As a matter of fact, the report is just now, as I speak, being released. This is what it looks like.

Senator CHAMBLISS asked me if we could have the minority report bound with the majority report. For this draft that is not possible. In the filed draft it will be bound together. But this is what the summary of the 6,000 pages looks like.

My words give me no pleasure. I am releasing this report because I know there are thousands of employees at the CIA who do not condone what I will speak about this morning and who work day and night, long hours, within the law, for America's security in what is certainly a difficult world. My colleagues on the Intelligence Committee and I are proud of them, just as everyone in this Chamber is, and we will always support them.

In reviewing the study in the past few days, with the decision looming over the public release, I was struck by a quote found on page 126 of the executive summary. It cites a former CIA inspector general, John Helgerson, who in 2005 wrote the following to the then-Director of the CIA, which clearly states the situation with respect to this report years later as well:

We have found that the Agency over the decades has continued to get itself in messes related to interrogation programs for one overriding reason: we do not document and learn from our experience—each generation of officers is left to improvise anew, with problematic results for our officers as individuals and for our Agency.

I believe that to be true. I agree with Mr. Helgerson. His comments are true today. But this must change.

On March 11, 2009, the committee voted 14 to 1 to begin a review of the CIA's detention and interrogation program. Over the past 5 years a small team of committee investigators pored over the more than 6.3 million pages of CIA records the leader spoke about to complete this report or what we call the study. It shows that the CIA's actions a decade ago are a stain on our values and on our history. The release of this 500-page summary cannot remove that stain, but it can and does say to our people and the world that America is big enough to admit when it is wrong and confident enough to learn from its mistakes. Releasing this report is an important step to restore our values and show the world that we are, in fact, a just and lawful society.

Over the next hour I wish to lay out for Senators and the American public the report's key findings and conclusions. I ask that when I complete this, Senator MCCAIN be recognized. Before I get to the substance of the report, I

wish to make a few comments about why it is so important that we make this study public.

All of us have vivid memories of that Tuesday morning when terrorists struck New York, Washington, DC, and Pennsylvania. Make no mistake—on September 11, 2001, war was declared on the United States. Terrorists struck our financial center, they struck our military center, and they tried to strike our political center and would have had brave and courageous passengers not brought down the plane. We still vividly remember the mix of outrage, deep despair, and sadness as we watched from Washington—smoke rising from the Pentagon, the passenger plane lying in a Pennsylvania field, and the sound of bodies striking canopies at ground level as innocents jumped to the ground below from the World Trade Center. Mass terror that we often see abroad had struck us directly in our front yard, killing 3,000 innocent men, women, and children.

What happened? We came together as a nation with one singular mission: Bring those who committed these acts to justice. But it is at this point where the values of America come into play, where the rule of law and the fundamental principles of right and wrong become important.

In 1990 the Senate ratified the Convention against Torture. The convention makes clear that this ban against torture is absolute. It states:

No exceptional circumstances whatsoever—

Including what I just read—

whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture.

Nonetheless, it was argued that the need for information on possible additional terrorist plots after 9/11 made extraordinary interrogation techniques necessary.

Even if one were to set aside all of the moral arguments, our review was a meticulous and detailed examination of records. It finds that coercive interrogation techniques did not produce the vital, otherwise unavailable intelligence the CIA has claimed.

I will go into further detail on this issue in a moment, but let me make clear that these comments are not a condemnation of the CIA as a whole. The CIA plays an incredibly important part in our Nation's security and has thousands of dedicated and talented employees.

What we have found is that a surprisingly few people were responsible for designing, carrying out, and managing this program. Two contractors developed and led the interrogations. There was little effective oversight. Analysts, on occasion, gave operational orders about interrogations, and CIA management of the program was weak and confused.

Our final report was approved by a bipartisan vote of 9 to 6 in December of 2012 and exposes brutality in stark contrast to our values as a nation.

This effort was focused on the actions of the CIA from late 2001 to January of 2009. The report does include considerable detail on the CIA's interactions with the White House, the Departments of Justice, State, and Defense, and the Senate Intelligence Committee.

The review is based on contemporaneous records and documents during the time the program was in place and active. These documents are important because they aren't based on recollection, they aren't based on revision, and they aren't a rationalization a decade later. It is these documents, referenced repeatedly in thousands of footnotes, that provide the factual basis for the study's conclusions. The committee's majority staff reviewed more than 6.3 million pages of these documents provided by the CIA, as well as records from other departments and agencies. These records include finished intelligence assessments, CIA operational and intelligence cables, memoranda, emails, real-time chat sessions, inspector general reports, testimony before Congress, pictures, and other internal records.

It is true that we didn't conduct our own interviews, and I wish to state why that was the case. In 2009 there was an ongoing review by the Department of Justice Special Prosecutor, John Durham. On August 24, Attorney General Holder expanded that review. This occurred 6 months after our study had begun. Durham's original investigation of the CIA's destruction of interrogation videotapes was broadened to include possible criminal actions of CIA employees in the course of CIA detention and interrogation activities.

At the time, the committee's vice chairman, Kit Bond, withdrew the minority's participation in the study, citing the Attorney General's expanded investigation as the reason.

The Department of Justice refused to coordinate its investigation with the Intelligence Committee's review. As a result, possible interviewees could be subject to additional liability if they were interviewed, and the CIA, citing the Attorney General's investigation, would not instruct its employees to participate in interviews.

Notwithstanding, I am very confident of the factual accuracy and comprehensive nature of this report for three reasons:

No. 1, it is 6.3 million pages of documents reviewed, and they reveal records of actions as those actions took place, not through recollections more than a decade later.

No. 2, the CIA and CIA senior officers have taken the opportunity to explain their views on CIA detention and interrogation operations. They have done

this in on-the-record statements in classified committee hearings, written testimony and answers to questions, and through the formal response to the committee in June 2013 after reading this study.

No. 3, the committee had access to and utilized an extensive set of reports of interviews conducted by the CIA inspector general and the CIA's oral history program.

So while we could not conduct new interviews of individuals, we did utilize transcripts or summaries of interviews of those directly engaged in detention and interrogation operations. These interviews occurred at the time the program was operational and covered the exact topics we would have asked about had we conducted interviews ourselves.

These interview reports and transcripts included but were not limited to the following: George Tenet, Director of the CIA when the Agency took custody and interrogated the majority of detainees; Jose Rodriguez, Director of the CIA's Counterterrorism Center, a key player in the program; CIA General Counsel Scott Mueller; CIA Deputy Director of Operations James Pavitt; CIA Acting General Counsel John Rizzo; CIA Deputy Director John McLaughlin; and a variety of interrogators, lawyers, medical personnel, senior counterterrorism analysts, and managers of the detention and interrogation program.

The best place to start on how we got into this situation—and I am delighted that the previous Chairman Senator ROCKEFELLER is on the floor—is a little more than 8 years ago, on September 6, 2006, when the committee met to be briefed by then-Director Michael Hayden.

At that 2006 meeting the full committee learned for the first time—the first time—of the use of so-called enhanced interrogation techniques or EITs.

It was a short meeting, in part because President Bush was making a public speech later that day disclosing officially for the first time the existence of CIA black sites and announcing the transfer of 14 detainees from CIA custody to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. It was the first time the interrogation program was explained to the full committee, as details had previously been limited to the chairman and vice chairman.

Then, on December 7, 2007, The New York Times reported that CIA personnel in 2005 had destroyed videotapes of the interrogation of two CIA detainees—the CIA's first detainee Abu Zubaydah, as well as Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri. The committee had not been informed of the destruction of the tapes.

Days later, on December 11, 2007, the committee held a hearing on the destruction of the videotapes. Director

Hayden, the primary witness, testified the CIA had concluded the destruction of videotapes was acceptable, in part because Congress had not yet requested to see them. My source is our committee's transcript of the hearing on December 11, 2007. Director Hayden stated that if the committee had asked for the videotapes, they would have been provided. But of course the committee had not known the videotapes existed.

We now know from CIA emails and records that the videotapes were destroyed shortly after CIA attorneys raised concerns that Congress might find out about the tapes.

In any case, at that same December 11 committee hearing, Director Hayden told the committee that CIA cables related to the interrogation sessions depicted in the videotapes were "... a more than adequate representation of the tapes and therefore, if you want them, we will give you access to them." That is a quote from our transcript of the December 11, 2007, hearing.

Senator ROCKEFELLER, then-chairman of the committee, designated two members of the committee staff to review the cables describing the interrogation sessions of Abu Zubaydah and al-Nashiri. Senator Bond, then-vice chairman, similarly directed two of his staffers to review the cables. The designated staff members completed their review and compiled a summary of the content of the CIA cables by early 2009, by which time I had become chairman.

The description in the cables of CIA's interrogations and the treatment of detainees presented a starkly different picture from Director Hayden's testimony before the committee. They described brutal, around-the-clock interrogations, especially of Abu Zubaydah, in which multiple coercive techniques were used in combination and with substantial repetition. It was an ugly, visceral description.

The summary also indicated that Abu Zubaydah and al-Nashiri did not, as a result of the use of these so-called EITs, provide the kind of intelligence that led the CIA to stop terrorist plots or arrest additional suspects. As a result, I think it is fair to say the entire committee was concerned and it approved the scope of an investigation by a vote of 14 to 1, and the work began.

In my March 11, 2014, floor speech about the study, I described how in 2009 the committee came to an agreement with the new CIA Director, Leon Panetta, for access to documents and other records about the CIA's detention and interrogation program. I will not repeat that here. From 2009 to 2012, our staff conducted a massive and unprecedented review of CIA records. Draft sections of the report were produced by late 2011 and shared with the full committee. The final report was completed in December 2012 and approved by the committee by a bipartisan vote of 9 to 6.

After that vote, I sent the full report to the President and asked the administration to provide comments on it before it was released. Six months later, in June of 2013, the CIA responded. I directed then that if the CIA pointed out any error in our report, we would fix it, and we did fix one bullet point that did not impact our findings and conclusions. If the CIA came to a different conclusion than the report did, we would note that in the report and explain our reasons for disagreeing, if we disagreed. You will see some of that documented in the footnotes of that executive summary as well as in the 6,000 pages.

In April 2014, the committee prepared an updated version of the full study and voted 12 to 3 to declassify and release the executive summary, findings and conclusions and minority and additional views.

On August 1, we received a declassified version from the executive branch. It was immediately apparent the redactions to our report prevented a clear and understandable reading of the study and prevented us from substantiating the findings and conclusions, so we obviously objected.

For the past 4 months, the committee and the CIA, the Director of National Intelligence, and the White House have engaged in a lengthy negotiation over the redactions to the report. We have been able to include some more information in the report today without sacrificing sources and methods or our national security.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a letter from the White House, dated yesterday, transmitting the unclassified parts of report, and it also points out that the executive summary is 93 percent complete and that the redactions amount to 7 percent.

Mr. President, this has been a long process. The work began 7 years ago when Senator ROCKEFELLER directed committee staff to review the CIA cables describing the interrogation sessions of Abu Zubaydah and al-Nashiri. It has been very difficult, but I believe documentation and the findings and conclusions will make clear how this program was morally, legally, and administratively misguided and that this Nation should never again engage in these tactics.

Let me now turn to the contents of the study. As I noted, we have 20 findings and conclusions which fall into four general categories: First, the CIA's enhanced interrogation techniques were not an effective way to gather intelligence information; second, the CIA provided extensive amounts of inaccurate information about the operation of the program and its effectiveness to the White House, the Department of Justice, Congress, the CIA inspector general, the media, and the American public; third, the

CIA's management of the program was inadequate and deeply flawed; and fourth, the CIA program was far more brutal than people were led to believe.

Let me describe each category in more detail. The first set of findings and conclusions concern the effectiveness or lack thereof of the CIA interrogation program. The committee found that the CIA's coercive interrogation techniques were not an effective means of acquiring accurate intelligence or gaining detainee cooperation.

The CIA and other defenders of the program have repeatedly claimed the use of so-called interrogation techniques was necessary to get detainees to provide critical information and to bring detainees to a "state of compliance," in which they would cooperate and provide information. The study concludes both claims are inaccurate.

The report is very specific in how it evaluates the CIA's claims on the effectiveness and necessity of its enhanced interrogation techniques. Specifically, we used the CIA's own definition of effectiveness as ratified and approved by the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel. The CIA claimed that the EITs were necessary to obtain "otherwise unavailable" information that could not be obtained from any other source to stop terrorist attacks and save American lives, that is a claim we conclude is inaccurate.

We took 20 examples that the CIA itself claimed to show the success of these interrogations. These include cases of terrorist plots stopped or terrorists captured. The CIA used these examples in presentations to the White House, in testimony to Congress, in submissions to the Department of Justice, and ultimately to the American people.

Some of the claims are well known: the capture of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, the prevention of attacks against the Library Tower in Los Angeles, and the takedown of Osama bin Laden. Other claims were made only in classified settings to the White House, Congress, and Department of Justice.

In each case, the CIA claimed that critical and unique information came from one or more detainees in its custody after they were subjected to the CIA's coercive techniques, and that information led to a specific counterterrorism success. Our staff reviewed every one of the 20 cases and not a single case holds up.

In every single one of these cases, at least one of the following was true: One, the intelligence community had information separate from the use of EITs that led to the terrorist disruption or capture; two, information from a detainee subjected to EITs played no role in the claimed disruption or capture; and three, the purported terrorist plot either did not exist or posed no real threat to Americans or U.S. interests.

Some critics have suggested the study concludes that no intelligence was ever provided from any detainee the CIA held. That is false and the study makes no such claim. What is true is that actionable intelligence that was "otherwise unavailable" was not obtained using these coercive interrogation techniques.

The report also chronicles where the use of interrogation techniques that do not involve physical force were effective. Specifically, the report provides examples where interrogators had sufficient information to confront detainees with facts, know when they were lying and when they applied rapport-building techniques that were developed and honed by the U.S. military, the FBI, and more recently the inter-agency High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group, called the HIG, that these techniques produced good intelligence.

Let me make a couple of additional comments on the claimed effectiveness of CIA interrogations. At no time did the CIA's coercive interrogation techniques lead to the collection of intelligence on an imminent threat that many believe was the justification for the use of these techniques. The committee never found an example of this hypothetical ticking timebomb scenario.

The use of coercive technique methods regularly resulted in fabricated information. Sometimes the CIA actually knew detainees were lying. Other times the CIA acted on false information, diverting resources and leading officers or contractors to falsely believe they were acquiring unique or actionable intelligence and that its interrogations were working when they were not.

Internally, CIA officers often called into question the effectiveness of the CIA's interrogation techniques, noting how the techniques failed to elicit detainee cooperation or produce accurate information.

The report includes numerous examples of CIA officers questioning the agency's claims, but these contradictions were marginalized and not presented externally.

The second set of findings and conclusions is that the CIA provided extensive inaccurate information about the program and its effectiveness to the White House, the Department of Justice, Congress, the CIA inspector general, the media, and the American public.

This conclusion is somewhat personal for me. I remember clearly when Director Hayden briefed the Intelligence Committee for the first time on the so-called EITs at that September 2006 committee meeting. He referred specifically to a "tummy slap," among other techniques, and presented the entire set of techniques as minimally harmful and applied in a highly clinical and professional manner. They were not.

The committee's report demonstrates that these techniques were physically very harmful, and that the constraints that existed on paper in Washington did not match the way techniques were used at CIA sites around the world.

Of particular note was the treatment of Abu Zubaydah over a span of 17 days in August 2002. This involved nonstop interrogation and abuse, 24/7, from August 4 to August 21, and included multiple forms of deprivation and physical assault. The description of this period, first written up by our staff in early 2009 while Senator ROCKEFELLER was chairman, was what prompted this full review.

But the inaccurate and incomplete descriptions go far beyond that. The CIA provided inaccurate memoranda and explanations to the Department of Justice while its Office of Legal Counsel was considering the legality of the coercive techniques.

In those communications to the Department of Justice, the CIA claimed the following: The coercive techniques would not be used with excessive repetition; detainees would always have an opportunity to provide information prior to the use of the techniques; the techniques were to be used in progression, starting with the least aggressive and proceeding only if needed; medical personnel would make sure that interrogations wouldn't cause serious harm, and they could intervene at any time to stop interrogations; interrogators were carefully vetted and highly trained, and each technique was to be used in a specific way without deviation, and only with specific approval for the interrogator and detainee involved.

None of these assurances, which the Department of Justice relied on to form its legal opinions, were consistently or even routinely carried out.

In many cases, important information was withheld from policymakers. For example, foreign intelligence committee chairman Bob Graham asked a number of questions after he was first briefed in September of 2002, but the CIA refused to answer him, effectively stonewalling him until he left the committee at the end of the year.

In another example, the CIA, in coordination with White House officials and staff, initially withheld information of the CIA's interrogation techniques from Secretary of State Colin Powell and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. There are CIA records stating that Colin Powell wasn't told about the program at first because there were concerns that "Powell would blow his stack if he were briefed." Source: Email from John Rizzo dated July 31, 2003.

CIA records clearly indicate, and definitively, that after he was briefed on the CIA's first detainee, Abu Zubaydah, the CIA didn't tell President Bush about the full nature of the EITs until

April 2006. That is what the records indicate.

The CIA similarly withheld information or provided false information to the CIA inspector general during his conduct of a special review by the IG in 2004.

Incomplete and inaccurate information from the CIA was used in documents provided to the Department of Justice and as a basis for President Bush's speech on September 6, 2006, in which he publicly acknowledged the CIA program for the first time.

In all of these cases, other CIA officers acknowledged internally that information the CIA had provided was wrong.

The CIA also misled other CIA and White House officials. When Vice President Cheney's counsel David Addington asked CIA General Counsel Scott Muller in 2003 about the CIA's videotaping the waterboarding of detainees, Muller deliberately told him that videotapes "were not being made," but did not disclose that videotapes of previous waterboarding sessions had been made and still existed. Source: E-mail from Scott Muller dated June 7, 2003.

There are many more examples in the committee's report. All are documented.

The third set of findings and conclusions notes the various ways in which CIA management of the Detention and Interrogation Program—from its inception to its formal termination in January of 2009—was inadequate and deeply flawed.

There is no doubt that the Detention and Interrogation Program was, by any measure, a major CIA undertaking. It raised significant legal and policy issues and involved significant resources and funding. It was not, however, managed as a significant CIA program. Instead, it had limited oversight and lacked formal direction and management.

For example, in the 6 months between being granted detention authority and taking custody of its first detainee, Abu Zubaydah, the CIA had not identified and prepared a suitable detention site. It had not researched effective interrogation techniques or developed a legal basis for the use of interrogation techniques outside of the rapport-building techniques that were official CIA policy until that time.

In fact, there is no indication the CIA reviewed its own history—that is just what Helgerson was saying in 2005—with coercive interrogation tactics. As the executive summary notes, the CIA had engaged in rough interrogations in the past.

In fact, the CIA had previously sent a letter to the Intelligence Committee in 1989—and here is the quote—that "inhumane physical or psychological techniques are counterproductive because they do not produce intelligence and will probably result in false answers."

That was a letter from John Helgerson, CIA Director of Congressional Affairs, dated January 8, 1989.

However, in late 2001 and early 2002, rather than research interrogation practices and coordinate with other parts of the government with extensive expertise in detention and interrogation of terrorist suspects, the CIA engaged two contract psychologists who had never conducted interrogations themselves or ever operated detention facilities.

As the CIA captured or received custody of detainees through 2002, it maintained separate lines of management at headquarters for different detention facilities.

No individual or office was in charge of the Detention and Interrogation Program until January of 2003, by which point more than one-third of CIA detainees identified in our review had been detained and interrogated.

One clear example of flawed CIA management was the poorly managed detention facility referred to in our report by the code name COBALT to hide the actual name of the facility. It began operations in September of 2002. The facility kept few formal records of the detainees housed there, and untrained CIA officers conducted frequent unauthorized and unsupervised interrogations using techniques that were not, and never became, part of the CIA's formal enhanced interrogation program.

The CIA placed a junior officer with no relevant experience in charge of the site. In November 2002, an otherwise healthy detainee—who was being held mostly nude and chained to a concrete floor—died at the facility from what is believed to have been hypothermia.

In interviews conducted in 2003 by the CIA Office of the Inspector General, CIA's leadership acknowledged that they had little or no awareness of operations at this specific CIA detention site, and some CIA senior officials believed, erroneously, that enhanced interrogation techniques were not used there.

The CIA, in its June 2013 response to the committee's report, agreed that there were management failures in the program, but asserted that they were corrected by early 2003. While the study found that management failures improved somewhat, we found they persisted until the end of the program.

Among the numerous management shortcomings identified in the report are the following: The CIA used poorly trained and nonvetted personnel.

Individuals were deployed—in particular, interrogators—without relevant training or experience. Due to the CIA's redactions to the report, there are limits to what I can say in this regard, but it is a clear fact that the CIA deployed officers who had histories of personnel, ethical, and professional problems of a serious nature.

These included histories of violence and abusive treatment of others that should have called into question their employment with the U.S. Government, let alone their suitability to participate in a sensitive CIA covert action program.

The two contractors that CIA allowed to develop, operate, and assess its interrogation operations conducted numerous “inherently governmental functions” that never should have been outsourced to contractors. These contractors, referred to in the report in special pseudonyms, SWIGERT and DUNBAR, developed the list of so-called enhanced interrogation techniques that the CIA employed.

They developed a list of so-called enhanced interrogation techniques that the CIA employed. They personally conducted interrogations of some of the CIA’s most significant detainees, using the techniques including the waterboarding of Abu Zubaydah, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, and al-Nashiri.

The contractors provided the official evaluations of whether detainees’ psychological states allowed for the continued use of the enhanced techniques, even for some detainees they themselves were interrogating or had interrogated. Evaluating the psychological state of the very detainees they were interrogating is a clear conflict of interest and a violation of professional guidelines.

The CIA relied on these two contractors to evaluate the interrogation program they had devised and in which they had obvious financial interests. Again, it is a clear conflict of interest and an avoidance of responsibility by the CIA.

In 2005, the two contractors formed a company specifically for the purpose of expanding their work with the CIA. From 2005 to 2008, the CIA outsourced almost all aspects of its detention and interrogation program to this company as part of a contract valued at more than \$180 million. Ultimately, not all contract options were exercised. However, the CIA has paid these two contractors and their company more than \$80 million.

Of the 119 individuals found to have been detained by the CIA during the life of the program, the committee found that at least 26 were wrongfully held. These are cases where the CIA itself determined that it had not met the standard for detention set out in the 2001 Memorandum of Notification which governed the covert action. Detainees often remained in custody for months after the CIA determined they should have been released. CIA records provide insufficient information to justify the detention of many other detainees.

Due to poor recordkeeping, a full accounting of how many specific detainees were held and how they were spe-

cifically treated while in custody may never be known. Similarly, in specific instances we found that enhanced interrogation techniques were used without authorization in a manner far different and more brutal than had been authorized by the Office of Legal Counsel and conducted by personnel not approved to use them on detainees.

Decisions about how and when to apply interrogation techniques were ad hoc and not proposed, evaluated, and approved in a manner described by the CIA in written descriptions and testimony about the program. Detainees were often subjected to harsh and brutal interrogation and treatment because CIA analysts believed, often in error, that they knew more information than what they had provided.

Sometimes CIA managers and interrogators in the field were uncomfortable with what they were being asked to do and recommended ending the abuse of a detainee. Repeatedly in such cases they were overruled by people at CIA headquarters who thought they knew better, such as by analysts with no line authority. This shows again how a relatively small number of CIA personnel—perhaps 40 to 50—were making decisions on detention and interrogation despite the better judgments of other CIA officers.

The fourth and final set of findings and conclusions concerns how the interrogations of CIA detainees were absolutely brutal, far worse than the CIA represented them to policymakers and others.

Beginning with the first detainee, Abu Zubaydah, and continuing with others, the CIA applied its so-called enhanced interrogation techniques in combination and in near nonstop fashion for days and even weeks at a time on one detainee. In contrast to the CIA representations, the detainees were subjected to the most aggressive techniques immediately—stripped naked, diapered, physically struck, and put in various painful stress positions for long periods of time. They were deprived of sleep for days—in one case up to 180 hours; that is 7½ days, over a week, with no sleep—usually in standing or in stress positions, at times with their hands tied together over their heads, chained to the ceiling.

In the COBALT facility I previously mentioned, interrogators and guards used what they called rough takedowns in which a detainee was grabbed from his cell, clothes cut off, hooded, and dragged up and down a dirt hallway while being slapped and punched.

The CIA led several detainees to believe they would never be allowed to leave CIA custody alive, suggesting to Abu Zubaydah that he would only leave in a coffin-shaped box. That is from a CIA cable on August 12, 2002.

According to another CIA cable, CIA officers also planned to cremate Zubaydah should he not survive his in-

terrogation. Source: CIA cable, July 15, 2002.

After the news and photographs emerged from the U.S. military detention of Iraqis at Abu Ghraib, the Intelligence Committee held a hearing on the matter on May 12, 2004. Without disclosing any details of its own interrogation program, CIA Director John McLaughlin testified that CIA interrogations were nothing like what was depicted at Abu Ghraib, the U.S. prison in Iraq where detainees were abused by American personnel. This, of course, was false.

CIA detainees at one facility, described as a dungeon, were kept in complete darkness, constantly shackled in isolated cells with loud noise or music and only a bucket to use for human waste.

The U.S. Bureau of Prisons personnel went to that location in November 2002 and, according to a contemporaneous internal CIA email, told CIA officers they had never “been in a facility where individuals are so sensory deprived.” Source: CIA email, sender and recipient redacted, December 5, 2002.

Throughout the program, multiple CIA detainees subjected to interrogations exhibited psychological and behavioral issues including hallucinations, paranoia, insomnia, and attempts at self-harm and self-mutilation. Multiple CIA psychologists identified the lack of human contact experienced by the detainees as a cause of psychiatric problems.

The executive summary includes far more detail than I am going to provide here about things that were in these interrogation sessions, and the summary itself includes only a subset of the treatment of the 119 known CIA detainees. There is far more detail—all documented—in the full 6,700-page study. This briefly summarizes the committee’s findings and conclusions.

Before I wrap up, I wish to thank the people who made this undertaking possible. First, I thank Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER. He started this project by directing his staff to review the operational cables that described the first recorded interrogations after we learned that the videotapes of those sessions had been destroyed. That report was what led to this multiyear investigation, and without it we wouldn’t have had any sense of what happened.

I thank other Members of the Senate Intelligence Committee, one of whom is on the floor today, from the great State of New Mexico. Others have been on the floor who voted to conduct this investigation and to approve its result and make the report public.

Most importantly, I want to thank the Intelligence Committee staff who performed this work. They are dedicated and committed public officials who sacrificed a significant portion of their lives to see this report through to its publication. They have worked

days, nights, and weekends for years in some of the most difficult circumstances. It is no secret to anyone that the CIA does not want this report coming out, and I believe the Nation owes them a debt of gratitude. They are Dan Jones, who has led this review since 2007, and more than anyone else, today's report is a result of his effort. Evan Gottesman and Chad Tanner, the two other members of the study staff, each wrote thousands of pages of the full report and have dedicated themselves and much of their lives to this project. Alissa Starzak, who began this review as co-lead, contributed extensively until her departure from the committee in 2011.

Other key contributors to the drafting, editing, and review of the report were Jennifer Barrett, Nick Basciano, Mike Buchwald, Jim Catella, Eric Chapman, John Dickas, Lorenzo Goco, Andrew Grotto, Tressa Guenov, Clete Johnson, Michael Noblet, Michael Pevzner, Tommy Ross, Caroline Tess, and James Wolfe; and finally, David Grannis, who has been a never-faltering staff director throughout this review.

This study is bigger than the actions of the CIA. It is really about American values and morals. It is about the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, our rule of law. These values exist regardless of the circumstances in which we find ourselves. They exist in peacetime and in wartime, and if we cast aside these values when convenient, we have failed to live by the very precepts that make our Nation a great one.

There is a reason why we carry the banner of a great and just nation. So we submit this study on behalf of the committee to the public in the belief that it will stand the test of time, and with it the report will carry the message: "Never again."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 8, 2014.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FEINSTEIN: I write in response to your letters to the President transmitting versions of the executive summary, findings, and conclusions of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's report regarding the Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA) former detention and interrogation program.

The President believes that the Agency's former detention and interrogation program was inconsistent with our values as a Nation. To reflect our values, one of his first acts in office was to sign an Executive Order that brought an end to the program.

Since the Committee first delivered a version of its executive summary, findings, and conclusions of the report (report) in April, the Administration has worked in good faith with the Committee on the declassification effort. On August 1, the Administration provided a version of the report, as well as minority and additional views that

would declassify 85 percent of the text. Since then, at the request of the Committee, the Administration has continually sought to reduce further the redactions in the report in a manner that also protects U.S. national security. We have appreciated the constructive dialogue with the Committee over the last few months, which allowed us to work through more than 400 of the Committee's requests for declassification.

Today, we are delivering to the Committee a version of the Committee report, as well as minority and additional views, that are over 93 percent declassified. The minimal redactions are the result of a considerable effort by the Director of National Intelligence, working with the CIA, Department of Defense, Department of State, and other agencies, to review and declassify hundreds of pages of information related to the historical CIA program.

As we have shared with you in prior letters and conversations, the President supports making public the declassified version of the Committee's important report as he believes that public scrutiny and debate will help to inform the public's understanding of the program and to ensure that such a program will never be repeated. As we have also shared with you, in advance of release of the Committee report, the Administration has planned to take a series of security steps to prepare our personnel and facilities overseas. We have already initiated those security precautions and will continue to implement them consistent with prior conversations about the timing of the Committee's expected release of its report.

The Committee report reflects a significant five year effort, and we commend the Committee and its staff on its completion. The report also reflects extraordinary cooperation by the Executive Branch to ensure access to the information necessary to review the CIA's former program, including more than six million pages of records. We must now, however, begin to look forward to the future. The men and women in the Intelligence Community are fundamental to America's national security. They perform an important service to our country in very trying circumstances. They make extraordinary sacrifices to keep the American people safe, often without any expectation of credit or acknowledgment. As they carry on the nation's critical work, they have the President's support and appreciation, as I know they have yours.

Sincerely,

W. NEIL EGGLESTON,
Counsel to the President.

I very much appreciate your attention, and I yield to Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I wish to begin by expressing my appreciation and admiration to the personnel who serve in our intelligence agencies, including the CIA, who are out there every day defending our Nation.

I have read the executive summary and I also have been briefed on the entirety of this report. I rise in support of the release—the long-delayed release—of the Senate Intelligence Committee's summarized unclassified review of the so-called enhanced interrogation techniques that were employed by the previous administration to extract information from captured terrorists. It is a

thorough and thoughtful study of practices that I believe not only failed their purpose to secure actionable intelligence to prevent further attacks on the United States and our allies, but actually damaged our security interests as well as our reputation as a force for good in the world.

I believe the American people have a right—indeed a responsibility—to know what was done in their name, how these practices did or did not serve our interests, and how they comported with our most important values.

I commend Chairwoman FEINSTEIN and her staff for their diligence in seeking a truthful accounting of policies I hope we will never resort to again. I thank them for persevering against persistent opposition from many members of the intelligence community, from officials in two administrations, and from some of our colleagues.

The truth is sometimes a hard pill to swallow. It sometimes causes us difficulties at home and abroad. It is sometimes used by our enemies in attempts to hurt us. But the American people are entitled to it nonetheless. They must know when the values that define our Nation are intentionally disregarded by our security policies, even those policies that are conducted in secret. They must be able to make informed judgments about whether those policies and the personnel who supported them were justified in compromising our values, whether they served a greater good, or whether, as I believe, they stained our national honor, did much harm, and little practical good.

What were the policies? What was their purpose? Did they achieve it? Did they make us safer, less safe, or did they make no difference? What did they gain us? What did they cost us? What did they gain us? What did they cost us? The American people need the answers to these questions. Yes, some things must be kept from public disclosure to protect clandestine operations, sources, and methods, but not the answers to these questions. By providing them, the committee has empowered the American people to come to their own decisions about whether we should have employed such practices in the past and whether we should consider permitting them in the future.

This report strengthens self-government and ultimately, I believe, American security and stature in the world. I thank the committee for that valuable public service.

I have long believed some of these practices amounted to torture as a reasonable person would define it, especially but not only the practice of waterboarding, which is a mock execution and an exquisite form of torture. Its use was shameful and unnecessary, and, contrary to assertions made by some of its defenders and as the committee's report makes clear, it produced little useful intelligence to help

us track down the perpetrators of 9/11 or prevent new attacks and atrocities.

I know from personal experience that the abuse of prisoners will produce more bad than good intelligence. I know victims of torture will offer intentionally misleading information if they think their captors will believe it. I know they will say whatever they think their torturers want them to say if they believe it will stop their suffering. Most of all, I know the use of torture compromises that which most distinguishes us from our enemies—our belief that all people, even captured enemies, possess basic human rights which are protected by international conventions the United States not only joined but for the most part authored.

I know too that bad things happen in war. I know that in war good people can feel obliged for good reasons to do things they would normally object to and recoil from. I understand the reasons that governed the decision to resort to these interrogation methods, and I know that those who approved them and those who used them were dedicated to securing justice for victims of terrorist attacks and to protecting Americans from further harm. I know their responsibilities were grave and urgent and the strain of their duty was onerous. I respect their dedication, and I appreciate their dilemma. But I dispute wholeheartedly that it was right for them to use these methods which this report makes clear were neither in the best interests of justice, nor our security, nor the ideals we have sacrificed so much blood and treasure to defend.

The knowledge of torture's dubious efficacy and my moral objection to the abuse of prisoners motivated my sponsorship of the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005, which prohibits "cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment" of captured combatants, whether they wear a nation's uniform or not, and which passed the Senate by a vote of 90 to 9.

Subsequently, I successfully offered amendments to the Military Commissions Act of 2006, which, among other things, prevented the attempt to weaken Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions and broadened definitions in the War Crimes Act to make the future use of waterboarding and other "enhanced interrogation techniques" punishable as war crimes.

There was considerable misinformation disseminated then about what was and wasn't achieved using these methods in an effort to discourage support for the legislation. There was a good amount of misinformation used in 2011 to credit the use of these methods with the death of Osama bin Laden. And there is, I fear, misinformation being used today to prevent the release of this report, disputing its findings and warning about the security consequences of their public disclosure.

Will the report's release cause outrage that leads to violence in some

parts of the Muslim world? Yes, I suppose that is possible and perhaps likely. Sadly, violence needs little incentive in some quarters of the world today. But that doesn't mean we will be telling the world something it will be shocked to learn. The entire world already knows we waterboarded prisoners. It knows we subjected prisoners to various other types of degrading treatment. It knows we used black sites, secret prisons. Those practices haven't been a secret for a decade. Terrorists might use the report's reidentification of the practices as an excuse to attack Americans, but they hardly need an excuse for that. That has been their life's calling for a while now.

What might come as a surprise not just to our enemies but to many Americans is how little these practices did aid our efforts to bring 9/11 culprits to justice and to find and prevent terrorist attacks today and tomorrow. That could be a real surprise since it contradicts the many assurances provided by intelligence officials on the record and in private that enhanced interrogation techniques were indispensable in the war against terrorism. And I suspect the objection of those same officials to the release of this report is really focused on that disclosure—torture's ineffectiveness—because we gave up much in the expectation that torture would make us safer—too much.

Obviously, we need intelligence to defeat our enemies, but we need reliable intelligence. Torture produces more misleading information than actionable intelligence. And what the advocates of harsh and cruel interrogation methods have never established is that we couldn't have gathered as good or more reliable intelligence from using humane methods.

The most important lead we got in the search for bin Laden came from using conventional interrogation methods. I think it is an insult to the many intelligence officers who have acquired good intelligence without hurting or degrading prisoners to assert that we can't win these wars without such methods. Yes, we can, and we will.

But in the end torture's failure to serve its intended purpose isn't the main reason to oppose its use. I have often said and I will always maintain that this question isn't about our enemies; it is about us. It is about who we were, who we are, and who we aspire to be. It is about how we represent ourselves to the world.

We have made our way in this often dangerous and cruel world not by just strictly pursuing our geopolitical interests but by exemplifying our political values and influencing other nations to embrace them. When we fight to defend our security, we fight also for an idea—not for a tribe or a twisted interpretation of an ancient religion or for a King but for an idea that all men are endowed by the Creator with in-

alienable rights. How much safer the world would be if all nations believed the same. How much more dangerous it can become when we forget it ourselves, even momentarily.

Our enemies act without conscience. We must not. This executive summary of the committee's report makes clear that acting without conscience isn't necessary. It isn't even helpful in winning this strange and long war we are fighting. We should be grateful to have that truth affirmed.

Now, let us reassert the contrary proposition: that is it essential to our success in this war that we ask those who fight it for us to remember at all times that they are defending a sacred ideal of how nations should be governed and conduct their relations with others—even our enemies.

Those of us who give them this duty are obliged by history, by our Nation's highest ideals and the many terrible sacrifices made to protect them, by our respect for human dignity, to make clear we need not risk our national honor to prevail in this or any war. We need only remember in the worst of times, through the chaos and terror of war, when facing cruelty, suffering, and loss, that we are always Americans and different, stronger, and better than those who would destroy us.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in a seated position.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I come to the floor to wholly support the comments of my colleagues, the Senator from California and the Senator from Arizona, to speak about a matter of great importance to me personally but more importantly to the country.

The Senate Intelligence Committee's entire study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program—I will just call it the program—is the most in-depth, the most substantive oversight initiative the committee has ever taken. I doubt any committee has done more than this. It presents extremely valuable insights into crucial oversight questions and problems that need to be addressed by the CIA.

Moreover, this study exemplifies why this committee was created in the first place following the findings of the Church Committee nearly 40 years ago, and I commend my friend and the committee's leader, the Senator from California, for shepherding this landmark initiative to this point. For years, often behind closed doors, without any recognition, she has been a strong and tireless advocate, and she deserves our thanks and recognition.

It is my hope and expectation that beyond the initial release of the executive summary and findings and conclusions, that the entire 6,800 pages, with

37,500 footnotes, will eventually be made public—and I am sure it will—with the appropriate redactions. Those public findings will be critical to fully learning the necessary lessons from this dark episode in our Nation's history and to ensure that it never happens again. It has been a very long, very hard fight to get to this point. Especially in the early years of the CIA's detention program, it was a struggle for the committee to get the most basic information or any information at all about the program.

The committee's study of the detention and interrogation program is not just the story of the brutal and ill-conceived program itself; this study is also the story of the breakdown in our system of governance that allowed the country to deviate in such a significant and horrific way from our core principles. One of the profound ways that breakdown happened was through the active subversion of meaningful congressional oversight—a theme mirrored in the Bush administration's warrantless wiretapping program during that same period.

I first learned about some aspects of the CIA's detention and interrogation program in 2003 when I became vice chair of the committee. At that point and for years after, the CIA refused to provide me or anybody else with any additional information about the program. They further refused to notify the full committee about the program's existence. My colleagues will remember there was always the Gang of 4, the Gang of 6, or the Gang of 8. They would take the chairman and vice chairman, take them to the White House, give them a flip chart, 45 minutes for the Vice President, and off he would go. Senator ROBERTS and I went down by car and were instructed we couldn't talk to each other on the way back from one of those meetings. It was absurd. They refused to do anything to be of assistance.

The briefings I received provided little or no insight into the CIA's program. Questions or followup requests were rejected, and at times I was not allowed to consult with my counsel. I am not a lawyer. There are legal matters involved here. They said we couldn't talk to any of our staff, legal counsel or not, or other members of the committee who knew nothing about this because they had not been informed at all.

It was clear these briefings were not meant to answer any questions but were intended only to provide cover for the administration and the CIA. It was infuriating to me to realize I was part of a box checking exercise that the administration planned to use, and later did use, so they could disingenuously claim they had—in a phrase I will never be able to forget—“fully briefed Congress.”

In the years that followed I fought and lost many battles to obtain cred-

ible information about the detention and interrogation program. As vice chair I tried to launch, as has been mentioned, a comprehensive investigation into the program, but that effort was blocked.

Later in 2005, when I fought for access to over 100 specific documents cited in the inspector general report, the CIA refused to cooperate.

The first time the full Senate Intelligence Committee was given any information about this detention program was September 2006. This was years after the program's inception and the same day the President informed the Nation.

The following year when I became chairman, the vice chairman, Kit Bond, and I agreed to push for significant additional access to the program. For heaven's sake, at least allow both the Senate Intelligence Committee and the House Intelligence Committee, on a full basis, to be informed about this and also to include our staff's counsel on these matters. We finally actually prevailed and got this access. I think I withheld something from them until they agreed to do that which enabled us to have much-needed hearings on the program, which we proceeded to do.

As chairman, I made sure we scrutinized it from every angle. However, the challenge of getting accurate information from the CIA persisted. It was during this period that the House and Senate considered the 2008 Intelligence Authorization Act and a potential provision that set the Army Field Manual—which is the only way to go—as the standard for the entire American Government, including the CIA. This would have effectively ended the CIA's enhanced interrogation techniques, a term eerily sanitized in bureaucratic jargon for what, in a number of cases, amounted to torture.

As chairman, I knew the inclusion of the Army Field Manual provision would jeopardize the entire bill. I thought it might bring it down. People would think it was too soft or too radical or whatever, but I was committed to seeing the bill signed into law. In the end, it was an easy decision.

I supported including the provision to end the CIA's program because it was the right thing to do. I did it because Congress needed to send a clear signal that it did not stand by the Bush administration's policy.

The House and Senate went on to pass the bill with bipartisan votes. Although the Bush administration vetoed the bill to preserve its ability to continue these practices, it was an important symbolic moment.

In the same period, I also sent two committee staffers, as our chairwoman has indicated, to begin reviewing cables at the CIA regarding the agency's interrogations of Abu Zubaydah and al-Nashiri. I firmly believed we had to review those cables, which are now the

only source of important historical information on this subject, because the CIA destroyed its tapes of some of their interrogation sessions. The CIA destroyed those tapes against the explicit direction from the White House and the Director of National Intelligence.

The investigation that began in 2007 grew under Chairman FEINSTEIN's dedication and tremendous leadership into a full study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program. The more the committee dug, the more the committee found, and the results we uncovered are both shocking and deeply troubling.

First, the detention and interrogation program was conceived by people who were ignorant of the topic and made it up on the fly based on the untested theories of contractors who had never met a terrorist or conducted a real-world interrogation of any kind.

Second, it was executed by personnel with insufficient linguistic and interrogation training and little, if any, real-world experience.

Moreover, the CIA was aware that some of these personnel had a staggering array of personal and professional failings—enumerated by the committee's chairman—including potentially criminal activity, that should have disqualified them immediately not only from being interrogators but from being employed by the CIA or anybody in government.

Nevertheless, it was consistently represented that these interrogators were professionalized and carefully vetted—their term—and that became a part of the hollow legal justification of the entire program.

Third, the program was managed incompetently by senior officials who paid little or no attention to critical details. It was rife with troubling personal and financial conflicts of interest among the small group of the CIA officials and contractors who promoted and defended it. Obviously it was in their interest to do so.

Fourth, as the chairman indicated, the program was physically very severe, far more so than any of us outside the CIA ever knew. Although waterboarding has received the most attention, there were other techniques I personally believe—one in particular—that may have been much worse.

Finally, its results were unclear at best, but it was presented to the White House, the Department of Justice, the Congress, and the media as a silver bullet that was indispensable to saving lives. That was their mantra. In fact, it did not provide the intelligence it was supposed to provide or the CIA argued that it did provide.

To be perfectly clear, these harsh techniques were not approved by anyone ever for the low-bar standard of learning useful information from detainees. These techniques were approved because the Bush officials were

told, and therefore believed, that these coercive interrogations were absolutely necessary to elicit intelligence that was unavailable by any other collection method and would save American lives. That was simply not the case.

For me, personally, the arc of this story comprises more than a decade of my 30 years of work in the Senate and one of the hardest fights—I think the hardest fight—I have ever been through. Many of the worst years were during the Bush administration.

However, I did not fully anticipate how hard these last few years would be in this administration to get this summary declassified and to tell the full story of what happened. Indeed, to my great frustration, even after months of endless negotiations, significant aspects of the story remain obscured by black ink.

I have great admiration for the President, and I am appreciative of the leadership role he has taken to depart from the practices of the Bush administration on these issues. His Executive order formally ended the CIA's detention program practices, and that is a good example. It is a great example.

It was, therefore, with deep disappointment that over the course of a number of private meetings and conversations I came to feel that the White House's strong deference to the CIA throughout this process has at times worked at cross-purposes with the White House's stated interest in transparency and has muddled what should be a clear and unequivocal legacy on this issue.

While aspiring to be the most transparent administration in history, this White House continues to quietly withhold from the committee more than 9,000 documents related to the CIA's programs. I don't know why. They won't say, and they won't produce.

In addition to strongly supporting the CIA's insistence on the unprecedented redaction of fake names in the report, which obscures the public's ability to understand the important connections which are so important for weaving together the tapestry, the administration also pushed for the redaction of information in the committee's study that should not be classified, contradicting the administration's own Executive order on classification.

Let me be clear.

That order clearly states that in no case shall information fail to be declassified in order to conceal violations of law and efficiency or administrative error or prevent embarrassment to a person, organization, or agency.

In some instances, the White House asked not only that information be redacted but that the redaction itself be removed so it would be impossible for the reader to tell that something was already hidden. Strange.

Given this, looking back, I am deeply disappointed, rather than surprised,

that even when the CIA inexplicably conducted an unauthorized search of the committee's computer files and emails at an offsite facility, which was potentially criminal, and even when it became clear that the intent of the search was to suppress the committee's awareness of an internal CIA review that corroborated parts of the intelligence committee's study and contradicted public CIA statements, the White House continued to support the CIA leadership, and that support was unflinching.

Despite these frustrations, I have also seen how hard Chairman FEINSTEIN has fought against great odds, stubborn odds, protective odds, mysterious odds, which are not really clear to me. I have tried to support her thoughtful and determined efforts at every opportunity to make sure as much of the story can be told as possible, and I am deeply proud of the product the committee ended up with.

Now it is time to move forward. For all of the misinformation, incompetence, and brutality of the CIA's program, the committee's study is not and must not be simply a backward-looking condemnation of the past. The study presents a tremendous opportunity to develop forward-looking lessons that must be central to all future activities.

The point has been made—I thoroughly agree—that the vast majority of people who work at the CIA—and there are tens and tens of thousands of them—do very good work and are working very hard and have absolutely nothing to do with any of this. But if this report had not been released, the country would have felt that everybody at the CIA—and the world would have felt it—was involved in this program. It is important to say that that was not the case. It was just 30 or 40 people at the top. Many of the people you see on television blasting this report were intimately involved in carrying it out and setting it up.

The CIA developed the detention program in a time of great fear, anxiety, and unprecedented crisis. It is at these times of crisis when we need sound judgment, excellence, and professionalism from the CIA the most.

When mistakes are made, they call for self-reflection and scrutiny. For that process to begin, we first have to make sure there is an absolutely accurate public record of what happened. We are doing that. The public release of the executive summary and findings and conclusions is a tremendous and consequential step toward that end.

For some, I expect there will be the temptation to reject and cast doubt, to trivialize, to attack or rationalize parts of the study that are disturbing or are embarrassing. Indeed, the CIA program's dramatic divergence from the standards that we hold ourselves to is hard to reconcile. However, we must fight that shortsighted temptation to

wish away the gravity of what this study found.

How we deal with this opportunity to learn and improve will reflect on the maturity of our democracy. As a country, we are strong enough to bear the weight of the mistakes we have made. As an institution, so is the Central Intelligence Agency. We must confront this dark period in our recent history with honesty and critical introspection. We must draw lessons, and we must apply those lessons as we move forward. Although it may be uncomfortable at times, ultimately we will grow stronger, and we will ensure that this never happens again.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I know the time for recess for caucus is approaching and I know there are other Members on the Democratic side who want to speak. It is now time for a Member from the Republican side to speak.

I ask unanimous consent that the recess be delayed for 5 minutes so the distinguished Senator from South Carolina might speak.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you very much. I have been a military lawyer for over 30 years. That has been one of the highlights of my life—to serve in the Air Force. During the debate about these techniques, I was very proud of the fact that every military lawyer came out on the side that the techniques in question were not who we are and what we want to be.

We are one of the leading voices of the Geneva Convention. We have stood by the Geneva Convention since its inception. I am convinced that the techniques in question violate the Geneva Convention. I am also convinced that they were motivated by fear, fear of another attack. Put yourself in the shoes of the people responsible for defending the country right after 9/11. We had been hit. We had been hit hard. Everybody thought something else was coming.

As we rounded these guys up, there was a sense of urgency and a commitment to never let it happen again that generated this program.

Who knew what, when? I do not know. All I can tell you is the people involved believed they were trying to defend the country and what they were doing was necessary. Did they get some good information? Probably so. Has it been a net loser for us as a country? Absolutely so. All I can say is the techniques in question were motivated by fear of another attack, and people at the time thought this was the best way to defend the Nation. I accept that on their part.

But as a nation, I hope we have learned the following: In this ideological struggle, good versus evil, we need to choose good. There is no shortage of people who will cut your head off. The techniques in question are nowhere near what the enemies of this Nation and radical Islam would do to people under their control. There is no comparison.

The comparison is between who we are and what we want to be. In that regard, we made a mistake. No one is going to jail because they should not, because the laws in question—the laws that existed at the time of this program—were, to be generous, vague.

I spent about a year of my life with Senator MCCAIN working with the Bush administration and colleagues on the Democratic side to come up with the Detainee Treatment Act which clearly puts people on notice of what you can and cannot do. Going forward we fixed this problem. How do I know it is a problem? I travel. I go to the Mideast a lot. I go all over the world. It was a problem for us. Whether we like it or not, we are seen as the good guys. I like it.

Sometimes good people make mistakes. We have corrected the problem. We have interrogation techniques now that I think can protect the Nation and are within our values. The one thing I want to stress to my colleagues is that this is a war of an ideological nature. There will be no capital to conquer. We are not going to take Tokyo. We are not going to take Berlin. There is no air force to shoot down; there is no navy to sink. You are fighting a radical extreme ideology that is motivated by hate. In their world, if you do not agree with their religion, you are no longer a human being.

The only way we can possibly defeat this ideology is to offer something better. The good news for us is that we stand for something better. We stand for due process. We stand for humane treatment. We stand for the ability to have a say when you are accused of something. Our enemies stand for none of that. That is their greatest weakness. Our greatest strength is to offer a better way.

When you go to Anbar Province and you go to other places in the Mideast that have experienced life under ISIS—ISIL—and Al Qaeda, the reaction has almost been universal: We do not like this. When America comes over the hill, and they see that flag, they know help is on the way.

To the CIA officers who serve in the shadows, who intermingle with the most notorious in the world, who are always away from home never knowing if you are going back: Thank you. There is a debate about whether this report is accurate line by line. I do not know. Is this the definitive answer to the program's problems? I do not know, but I do know the program hurt our country.

Those days are behind us. The good guys air their dirty laundry. I wished we had waited because the world is in such a volatile shape right now. I do fear this report will be used by our enemies. But I guess there is no good time to do things like this.

So to those who helped prepare the report, I understand where you are coming from. To those on my side who believe that we have gone too far, I understand that too. But this has always been easy for me. I have been too associated with the subject matter for too long. Every time our Nation cuts a corner, and every time we act out of fear and abandon who we are, we always regret it. That has happened forever. This is a step toward righting a wrong. To our enemies: Take no comfort from the fact that we have changed our program. We are committed to your demise. We are committed to your incarceration and killing you on the battlefield, if necessary.

To our friends, because we choose a different path, do not mistake that for weakness. What we are doing today is not a sign of weakness. It is a sign of the ultimate strength—that you can self correct, that you can reevaluate and you can do some soul searching, and you can come out with a better product. The tools available to our intelligence community today over time will yield better results, more reliable results. The example we are setting will, over time, change the world.

To defeat radical Islam you have to show separation. Today is a commitment to show separation. The techniques they employ to impose their will have been used for thousands of years. They are always, over time, rejected. The values we stand for—tolerance, humane treatment of everyone; whether you agree with them or not—have also stood the test of time. Over time, we will win, and they will lose. Today is about making that time period shorter. The sooner America can reattach itself to who she is, the worse off the enemy will be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

ALASKA SAFE FAMILIES AND VILLAGES ACT OF 2014

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 534, S. 1474.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1474) to encourage the State of Alaska to enter into intergovernmental agreements with Indian tribes in the State relating to the enforcement of certain State laws by Indian tribes to improve the quality of life in rural Alaska, to reduce alcohol and drug abuse, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 1474

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Alaska Safe Families and Villages Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) residents of remote Alaska villages suffer disproportionately from crimes and civil disturbances rooted in alcohol abuse, illicit drug use, suicide, and domestic violence;

(2) the alcohol-related suicide rate in remote Alaska villages is 6 times the average in the United States and the alcohol-related mortality rate is 3.5 times that of the general population of the United States;

(3) Alaska Native women suffer the highest rate of forcible sexual assault in the United States and an Alaska Native woman is sexually assaulted every 18 hours;

(4) according to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, one in two Alaska Native women experience physical or sexual violence;

(5) according to the 2006 Initial Report and Recommendations of the Alaska Rural Justice and Law Enforcement Commission, more than 95 percent of all crimes committed in rural Alaska can be attributed to alcohol abuse;

(6) the cost of drug and alcohol abuse in Alaska is estimated at \$525,000,000 per year;

(7) there are more than 200 remote villages in Alaska, which are ancestral homelands to Indian tribes and geographically isolated by rivers, oceans, and mountains making most of those villages accessible only by air;

(8) small size and remoteness, lack of connection to a road system, and extreme weather conditions often prevent or delay travel, including that of law enforcement personnel, into remote villages, resulting in challenging law enforcement conditions and lack of ready access to the State judicial system;

(9) less than 1/2 of remote Alaska villages are served by trained State law enforcement entities and several Indian tribes provide peace officers or tribal police without adequate training or equipment;

(10) the centralized State judicial system relies on general jurisdiction Superior Courts in the regional hub communities, with only a handful of staffed magistrate courts outside of the hub communities;

(11) the lack of effective law enforcement and accessible judicial services in remote Alaska villages contributes significantly to increased crime, alcohol abuse, drug abuse, domestic violence, rates of suicide, poor educational achievement, and lack of economic development;

(12) Indian tribes that operate within remote Alaska villages should be supported in carrying out local culturally relevant solutions to effectively provide law enforcement in villages and access to swift judicial proceedings;

(13) increasing capacities of local law enforcement entities to enforce local tribal laws and to achieve increased tribal involvement in State law enforcement in remote villages will promote a stronger link between the State and village residents, encourage community involvement, and create greater local accountability with respect to violence and substance abuse;

(14) the United States has a trust responsibility to Indian tribes in the State;

(15) the report of the Indian Law and Order Commission to the President and Congress entitled “A Roadmap to Making Native America Safer” and dated November 2013 found that the

crisis in criminal justice in the State is a national problem and urged the Federal Government and the State to strengthen tribal sovereignty and self-governance and for Congress to create a jurisdictional framework to support tribal sovereignty and expand the authority of Indian tribes in the State; and

(16) it is necessary to invoke the plenary authority of Congress over Indian tribes under article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution to improve access to judicial systems in remote Alaska Native villages and provide for the presence of trained local law enforcement.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—
(1) to improve the delivery of justice in Alaska Native villages by—

(A) encouraging the State and Indian tribes to enter into intergovernmental agreements relating to the enforcement and adjudication of State laws relating to drug and alcohol offenses; and

(B) supporting Indian tribes in the State in the enforcement and adjudication of tribal laws relating to child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, and drug and alcohol offenses; and

(2) to enhance coordination and communication among Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The term “Attorney General” means the Attorney General of the United States.

(2) GRANT PROGRAM.—The term “grant program” means the Alaska Safe Families and Villages Self Governance Intergovernmental Grant Program established under section 4.

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a).

(4) PARTICIPATING INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “participating Indian tribe” means an Indian tribe selected by the Attorney General to participate in the grant program or the tribal law program, as applicable.

(5) REMOTE ALASKA VILLAGE.—The term “remote Alaska village” means an Alaska Native Village Statistical Area delineated for the Director of the Census by the officials of the village for the purpose of presenting data for the decennial census conducted under section 141(a) of title 13, United States Code.

(6) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Alaska.

(7) TRIBAL COURT.—The term “tribal court” means any court, council, or a mechanism of any court or council sanctioned by an Indian tribe for the adjudication of disputes, including the violation of tribal laws, ordinances, and regulations.

(8) TRIBAL LAW PROGRAM.—The term “tribal law program” means the Alaska Safe Families and Villages Tribal Law Program established under section 5.

SEC. 4. ALASKA SAFE FAMILIES AND VILLAGES SELF GOVERNANCE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall establish a program in the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice, to be known as the Alaska Safe Families and Villages Self Governance Intergovernmental Grant Program, to make grants to Indian tribes acting on behalf of 1 or more Indian tribes to assist Indian tribes in planning for and carrying out intergovernmental agreements described in subsection (d).

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Indian tribe desiring to participate in the grant program shall submit to the Attorney General an application in accordance with this section.

(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANT PROGRAM.—To be eligible to participate in the grant program, an Indian tribe in the State shall—

(A) request participation by resolution or other official action by the governing body of the Indian tribe;

(B) have for the preceding 3 fiscal years no uncorrected significant and material audit exceptions regarding any Federal contract, compact, or grant;

(C) demonstrate to the Attorney General sufficient governance capacity to conduct the grant program, as evidenced by the history of the Indian tribe in operating government services (including public utilities, children’s courts, law enforcement, social service programs, or other activities);

(D) certify that the Indian tribe has entered into, or can evidence intent to enter into negotiations relating to, an intergovernmental agreement with the State described in subsection (d);

(E) meet such other criteria as the Attorney General may promulgate, after providing public notice and an opportunity to comment; and

(F) submit to the Attorney General of the State a copy of the application.

(c) USE OF AMOUNTS.—Each participating Indian tribe shall use amounts made available under the grant program—

(1) to carry out a planning phase that may include—

(A) internal governmental and organizational planning;

(B) developing written tribal law or ordinances, including tribal laws and ordinances detailing the structure and procedures of the tribal court;

(C) developing enforcement mechanisms; and

(D) negotiating and finalizing any intergovernmental agreements necessary to carry out this section; and

(2) to carry out activities of the Indian tribe in accordance with an applicable intergovernmental agreement with the State.

(d) INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State (including political subdivisions of the State) and Indian tribes in the State are encouraged to enter into intergovernmental agreements relating to the enforcement of certain State laws by the Indian tribe.

(2) CONTENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An intergovernmental agreement described in paragraph (1) may describe the duties of the State and the applicable Indian tribe relating to—

(i) the employment of law enforcement officers, probation, and parole officers;

(ii) the appointment and deputization by the State of tribal law enforcement officers as special officers to aid and assist in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the State;

(iii) the enforcement of punishments imposed by the Indian tribe under tribal law;

(iv) the transfer of enforcement duties for State drug- and alcohol-related misdemeanor offenses to the Indian tribe;

(v) the adjudication by the Indian tribe of State drug- and alcohol-related misdemeanor offenses;

(vi) the transfer of information and evidence between tribal law enforcement entities and the court system of the State;

(vii) the detention of offenders;

(viii) searches and seizures of alcohol and drugs at municipal and State airports; and

(ix) jurisdictional or financial matters.

(B) REMEDIES.—Subject to title II of Public Law 90–284 (25 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”), an intergovernmental agreement described in paragraph (1) may include remedies to be imposed by the applicable Indian tribe relating to the enforcement of State law, including—

(i) restorative justice, including circle sentencing;

(ii) community service;

(iii) fines;

(iv) forfeitures;

(v) commitments for treatment;

(vi) restraining orders;

(vii) emergency detentions; and

(viii) any other remedies agreed to by the State and Indian tribe.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives an annual report that—

(A) describes the grants awarded under the grant program;

(B) assesses the effectiveness of the grant program; and

(C) includes any recommendations of the Attorney General relating to the grant program.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each report shall be prepared in consultation with the government of each participating Indian tribe and the State.

SEC. 5. ALASKA SAFE FAMILIES AND VILLAGES SELF GOVERNANCE TRIBAL LAW PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall establish a project in the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice, to be known as the Alaska Safe Families and Villages Self Governance Tribal Law Project, to make grants to Indian tribes acting on behalf of 1 or more Indian tribes to assist Indian tribes in planning for and carrying out concurrent jurisdiction activities described in subsection (d).

(b) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Indian tribe desiring to participate in the tribal law program shall submit to the Attorney General an application in accordance with this section.

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to participate in the tribal law program, an Indian tribe in the State shall—

(A) request participation by resolution or other official action by the governing body of the Indian tribe;

(B) have for the preceding 3 fiscal years no uncorrected significant and material audit exceptions regarding any Federal contract, compact, or grant;

(C) demonstrate to the Attorney General sufficient governance capacity to conduct the tribal law program, as evidenced by the history of the Indian tribe in operating government services (including public utilities, children’s courts, law enforcement, social service programs, or other activities);

(D) meet such other criteria as the Attorney General may promulgate, after providing for public notice; and

(E) submit to the Attorney General of the State a copy of the application submitted under this section.

(3) ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS.—On completion of the planning phase described in subsection (c), the Indian tribe shall provide to the Attorney General—

(A) the constitution of the Indian tribe or equivalent organic documents showing the structure of the tribal government and the placement and authority of the tribal court within that structure;

(B) written tribal laws or ordinances governing tribal court procedures and the regulation and enforcement of child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, drugs and alcohol, and related matters; and

(C) such other information as the Attorney General may, by public notice, require.

(c) PLANNING PHASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each participating Indian tribe shall complete a planning phase that includes—

(A) internal governmental and organizational planning;

(B) developing written tribal law or ordinances detailing the structure and procedures of the tribal court; and

(C) enforcement mechanisms.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after receiving an application under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall certify the completion of the planning phase under this section.

(B) TIMING.—The Attorney General may make a certification described in subparagraph (A) on the date on which the participating Indian tribe submits an application under subsection (b) if the Indian tribe demonstrates to the Attorney General that the Indian tribe has satisfied the requirements of the planning phase under paragraph (1).

(d) CONCURRENT JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise agreed to by the Indian tribe in an intergovernmental agreement, beginning 30 days after the date on which the certification described in subsection (c)(2) is made, the participating Indian tribe may exercise civil jurisdiction, concurrent with the State, in matters relating to child abuse and neglect, domestic violence, drug-related offenses, and alcohol-related offenses over—

(A) any member of, or person eligible for membership in, the Indian tribe; and

(B) any nonmember of the Indian tribe, if the nonmember resides or is located in the remote Alaska Native village in which the Indian tribe operates.

(2) SANCTIONS.—A participating Indian tribe exercising jurisdiction under paragraph (1) shall impose such civil sanctions as the tribal court has determined to be appropriate, consistent with title II of Public Law 90–284 (25 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”) and tribal law, including—

(A) restorative justice, including community or circle sentencing;

(B) community service;

(C) fines;

(D) forfeitures;

(E) commitments for treatment;

(F) restraining orders;

(G) emergency detentions; and

(H) any other remedies the tribal court determines are appropriate.

(3) INCARCERATION.—A person shall not be incarcerated by a participating Indian tribe exercising jurisdiction under paragraph (1) except pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement described in section 4(d).

(4) EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES.—Nothing in this subsection prevents a participating Indian tribe exercising jurisdiction under paragraph (1) from—

(A) assuming protective custody of a member of the Indian tribe or otherwise taking action to prevent imminent harm to that member or others; and

(B) taking immediate, temporary protective measures to address a situation involving an imminent threat of harm to a member of the Indian tribe by a nonmember.

(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a brief annual report that—

(A) details the activities carried out under the tribal law program; and

(B) includes an assessment and any recommendations of the Attorney General relating to the tribal law program.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each report shall be prepared—

(A) in consultation with the government of each participating Indian tribe; and

(B) after the participating Indian tribe and the State have an opportunity to comment on the report.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) EFFECT OF ACT.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) limits, alters, or diminishes the civil or criminal jurisdiction of the State, any subdivision of the State, or the United States;

(2) limits or diminishes the jurisdiction of any Indian tribe in the State, including inherent and statutory authority of the Indian tribe over alcohol, and drug abuse, child protection, child custody, and domestic violence (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act);

(3) creates a territorial basis for the jurisdiction of any Indian tribe in the State (other than as provided in section 5) or otherwise establishes Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) in any area of the State;

(4) confers any criminal jurisdiction on any Indian tribe in the State unless agreed to in an intergovernmental agreement described in section 4(d);

(5) diminishes the trust responsibility of the United States to Indian tribes in the State;

(6) abridges or diminishes the sovereign immunity of any Indian tribe in the State;

(7) alters the criminal or civil jurisdiction of the Metlakatla Indian Community within the Annette Islands Reserve (as in effect on the date before the date of enactment of this Act); or

(8) limits in any manner the eligibility of the State, any political subdivision of the State, or any Indian tribe in the State, for any other Federal assistance under any other law.

(b) NO LIABILITY FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA.—The State, including any political subdivision of the State, shall not be liable for any act or omission of a participating Indian tribe in carrying out this Act, including any act or omission of a participating Indian tribe undertaken pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement described in section 4(d).

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall promulgate such regulations as the Attorney General determines are necessary to carry out this Act.

(d) ELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Participating Indian tribes shall be eligible for the same tribal court and law enforcement programs and level of funding from the Bureau of Indian Affairs as are available to other Indian tribes.

(2) APPLICABILITY IN THE STATE.—Nothing in this Act limits the application in the State of—

(A) the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–211; 124 Stat. 2261);

(B) the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4; 127 Stat. 54); or

(C) any amendments made by the Acts referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(e) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each of the 50 States shall give full faith and credit to all official acts and decrees of the tribal court of a participating Indian tribe to the same extent and in the same manner as that State accords full faith and credit to the official acts and decrees of other States.

(2) OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this subsection impairs the duty of the State to give full faith and credit under any other law.

SEC. 7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may enter into contracts with Indian tribes in the State to provide—

(1) training and technical assistance on tribal court development to any Indian tribe in the State; and

(2) the training for proper transfer of evidence and information—

(A) between tribal and State law enforcement entities; and

(B) between State and tribal court systems.

(b) COOPERATION.—Indian tribes may cooperate with other entities for the provision of services under the contracts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 8. FUNDING.

The Attorney General shall use amounts made available to the Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs to carry out this Act.

SEC. 9. REPEAL OF SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE OF ALASKA.

Section 910 of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (18 U.S.C. 2265 note; Public Law 113–4) is repealed.

Mr. BEGICH. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn, the Begich substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the title amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported substitute amendment was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 3981) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE OF ALASKA.

Section 910 of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (18 U.S.C. 2265 note; Public Law 113–4) is repealed.

The bill (S. 1474), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed.

The title amendment (No. 3982) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 to repeal a special rule for the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S RETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, while Chairman FEINSTEIN and Chairman ROCKEFELLER are still here on the floor, may I just take a moment to thank them for the work they did on this report. I am very proud of the moral certainty of leadership that both Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Chairman FEINSTEIN showed.

It was, as they know better than I, through many troubles, toils, and snares, that this report was able to be produced. I could not be happier that

we made it public while Senator ROCKEFELLER remains a Member of this body and has the chance to participate in this.

I join Chairman FEINSTEIN in recognizing the exceptional work of the Intelligence Committee staff: David, Dan, Alissa—who is not with us any longer. I thank you for mentioning Andrew Grotto, who was my staff member, who worked on this report. I feel we have done a very good thing here. I appreciate very much in particular Senator MCCAIN coming forward. He brings a unique moral perspective and force to this conversation. He has wielded that moral perspective and force with great courage.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:11 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be equally charged to both sides.

The Senator from Georgia.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I rise today as the vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to respond to the public release of the declassified version of the executive summary and findings and conclusions from the committee's study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program.

This is not a pleasant duty for me. During my 4 years as the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I have enjoyed an excellent relationship with our chairman, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN. We have worked closely to conduct strong bipartisan oversight of the U.S. intelligence community, including the passage and enactment of significant national security legislation. However, this particular study has been one of the very, very few areas where we have never been able to see eye-to-eye.

Putting this report out today is going to have significant consequences. In addition to reopening a number of old wounds both domestically and internationally, it could be used to incite unrest and even attacks against our servicemembers, other personnel overseas, and our international partners. This report could also stoke addi-

tional mistreatment or death for American or other Western captives overseas. It will endanger CIA personnel, sources, and future intelligence operations. This report will damage our relationship with several significant international counterterrorism partners at a time when we can least afford it. Even worse, despite the fact that the administration and many in the majority are aware of these consequences, they have chosen to release the report today.

The United States today is faced with a wide array of security challenges across the globe, including in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, north Africa, Somalia, Ukraine, and the list goes on. Instead of focusing on the problems right in front of us, the majority side of the Intelligence Committee has spent the last 5 years and over \$40 million focused on a program that effectively ended over 8 years ago, while the world around us burns.

In March 2009, when the committee first undertook the study, I was the only member of the Intelligence Committee who voted against moving forward with it. I believed then, as I still do today, that vital committee and intelligence community resources would be squandered over a debate that Congress, the executive branch, and the Supreme Court had already settled. This issue has been investigated or reviewed extensively by the executive branch, including criminal investigations by the Department of Justice, the Senate Armed Services Committee, the International Committee of the Red Cross, as well as other entities.

Congress has passed two separate acts directly related to detention and interrogation issues—specifically, the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 and the Military Commissions Act of 2006. The executive branch terminated the CIA program and directed that future interrogations be conducted in accordance with the U.S. Army Field Manual on Interrogation. Also, the Supreme Court decided *Rasul v. Bush* in 2004, *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld* in 2004, *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld* in 2006, as well as *Boumediene v. Bush* in 2008, all of which established that detainees were entitled to habeas corpus review and identified certain deficiencies in both the Detainee Treatment Act and the Military Commissions Act.

By the time I became the vice chairman, the minority had already withdrawn from active participation in the study as a result of Attorney General Holder's decision to reopen the criminal inquiry related to the interrogation of certain detainees in the CIA's detention program. This unfortunate decision deprived the committee of the ability to interview key witnesses who participated in the CIA program and essentially limited the committee's study to the review of a cold documen-

tary record. Now, how can any credible investigation take place without interviewing witnesses? This is a 6,000-page report, and not one single witness was ever interviewed in this study being done. This is a poor excuse for the type of oversight the Congress should be conducting.

There is no doubt that the CIA's detention and interrogation program—which was hastily executed in the aftermath of the worst terrorist attack in our Nation's history—had flaws. The CIA has admitted as much in its June 27, 2013, response to the study. There is also no doubt that there were instances in which CIA interrogators exceeded their authorities and certain detainees may have suffered as a result. However, the executive summary and findings and conclusions released today contain a disturbing number of factual and analytical errors. These factual and analytical shortfalls ultimately led to an unacceptable number of incorrect claims and invalid conclusions that I cannot endorse.

The study essentially refuses to admit that CIA detainees—especially CIA detainees subjected to enhanced interrogation techniques—provided intelligence information which helped the U.S. Government and its allies to neutralize numerous terrorist threats. On its face, this refusal does not make sense given the vast amount of information gained from these interrogations, the thousands of intelligence reports that were generated as a result of them, the capture of additional terrorists, and the disruption of the plots those captured terrorists were planning.

Instead of acknowledging these realities, the study adopts an analytical approach designed to obscure the value of the intelligence obtained from the program. For example, the study falsely claims that the use of enhanced interrogation techniques played “no role” in the identification of Jose Padilla because Abu Zubaydah, a senior member of Al Qaeda with direct ties to Osama bin Laden, provided the information about Padilla during an interrogation by FBI agents who were “exclusively” using what is called “rapport-building” techniques against him more than 3 months prior to the CIA’s “use of DOJ-approved enhanced interrogation techniques.” What the study ignores, however, is the fact that Abu Zubaydah’s earlier interrogation in April of 2002 actually did involve the use of interrogation techniques that were later included in the list of enhanced interrogation techniques. Specifically, the facts demonstrate that Abu Zubaydah was subjected to “around the clock” interrogation that included more than 4 days of dietary manipulation, nudity, and more than 126 hours—which is about 5 days—of sleep deprivation during a 136-hour period by the time the

FBI finished up the 8.5-hour interrogation shift in which Abu Zubaydah finally yielded the identification of Jose Padilla. So during a 5-day time period, Abu Zubaydah got less than 10 hours of sleep, yet the majority does not acknowledge that this was an enhanced interrogation. In light of these facts, the study's claims that the FBI was exclusively using "rapport-building" techniques is nothing short of being dishonest.

More important, the actionable intelligence gleaned from the enhanced interrogation of Abu Zubaydah that started in April of 2002 served as the foundation for the capture of additional terrorists and the disruption of the plots those captured terrorists were planning. His information was also used to gather additional actionable intelligence from these newly captured terrorists, which in turn led to a series of successful capture operations and plot disruptions. By the study's own count, the numerous interrogations of Abu Zubaydah resulted in 766 sole-source disseminated intelligence reports. That is an awful lot of actionable intelligence collected under the CIA program that this study tries to quietly sweep under the carpet in an effort to support its false headline that the CIA's use of enhanced interrogation techniques was not effective.

The study also overlooks several crucial intelligence successes that prevented terror attacks against the United States and our allies around the world. Al Qaeda-affiliated extremists subjected to the program's enhanced interrogation techniques made admissions that led to the identification of the man responsible for plotting the September 11 attacks, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, or KSM.

The program also helped stop terrorist attacks in the U.S. homeland and against our military forces overseas. Al Qaeda affiliate Abu Zubaydah's statements to interrogators led to the identification of Jose Padilla—an Al Qaeda operative tasked with conducting a terrorist attack inside the United States. The interrogation of KSM and Guleed Hassan Ahmed disrupted Al Qaeda's plotting against Camp Lemonier in Djibouti, a critical base of operations in the war on terror in Africa and at that time home to some 1,600 U.S. military personnel. There is no telling how many lives this program saved in those particular interrogations alone.

Intelligence gathered under the detention and interrogation program also prevented terrorist attacks on our allies in the United Kingdom. Terrorist plots against London's Heathrow Airport and Canary Wharf—a major London financial center—were disrupted because key conspirators were apprehended and questioned on the basis of intelligence gathered using several interrogation techniques, including enhanced interrogation techniques.

Finally, information from detainees held in the program was critical to ascertaining the true significance of Abu Ahmed al-Kuwaiti, the Al Qaeda facilitator who served as Osama bin Laden's personal courier and the man who ultimately lead CIA intelligence analysts and the Navy Seals to bin Laden himself.

For anyone interested in a nice, chronological survey of the significant intelligence gained from the program and how it was used to capture additional terrorists and disrupt terrorist plots, I would invite my colleagues to read two pages of our minority views. Pages 96 and 97 delineate exactly a chronology of significant intelligence that allowed for the takedown of individuals.

It seems as though the study takes every opportunity to unfairly portray the CIA in the worst light possible, presupposing improper motivations and the most detestable behavior at every turn. The very enemies whom the program helped keep at bay for all of those years, as well as adversarial nations, will be able to exploit what is essentially a dangerously insightful and instructive treasure trove of information about our intelligence operations. I am all for pointing out and correcting problems with the intelligence community and I have been very outspoken on some of them, but I prefer our oversight be conducted quietly and in a manner that does not jeopardize the national security of the United States.

Ultimately, our minority views examined eight of the study's most problematic conclusions, many of which attack the CIA's integrity and credibility in developing and implementing the program. These problematic claims and conclusions created the false impression that the CIA was actively misleading policymakers and impeding the counterterrorism efforts of other Federal Government agencies during the program's operation. We found these claims and conclusions were largely not supported by the documentary record and were based upon flawed reasoning.

Specifically, we found that:

No. 1, the CIA's detention and interrogation program was effective and produced valuable and actionable intelligence.

No. 2, most of the CIA's claims of effectiveness with respect to the use of EITs were accurate.

No. 3, the CIA attempted to keep the Congress informed of its activities and did so on a regular basis. As a member of the committee, I can attest to that.

No. 4, the CIA did not impede White House oversight. The White House was very involved in doing oversight of the program.

No. 5, the CIA was not responsible nor did it have control over sharing or dissemination of information to other executive branch agencies or to members of the Principals Committee.

No. 6, many of the study's claims about the CIA providing inaccurate information to the Department of Justice were themselves totally inaccurate.

No. 7, the CIA did not significantly impede oversight by the CIA Office of the Inspector General.

No. 8, the White House determined that the CIA would have the lead on dealing with the media regarding detainees.

These findings are not meant as a defense of the CIA. The CIA is fully capable of defending its own actions, and I know it will do so. Rather, these findings are a critique of certain aspects of this particular study. As a general rule, I want our committee findings, conclusions, and recommendations to be unassailable in every investigation we conduct. Unfortunately, that didn't happen, and I am very concerned about the unintended consequences that will result from the study's erroneous and inflammatory conclusions.

I imagine some members of the media may choose to repeat the study's false headlines contained in the report without checking the underlying facts. By doing so they will only be damaging their own credibility. I invite anyone who reads the study's executive summary and findings and conclusions to pay particular attention to how often the text uses absolutes, such as "played no role," "no connection" or "no indication." Please then read our minority views to find the clear counter examples that disprove most of these absolute claims. I suspect the readers who make this effort will be disappointed, as I was, that this study makes so many inaccurate claims and conclusions.

Our minority views also explain how this study was crippled by numerous procedural irregularities that hampered the committee's ability to conduct a fair and objective review of the CIA's detention and interrogation program. These procedural defects resulted in a premature committee vote in December of 2012 to approve the study before the text was adequately reviewed by the committee membership or subjected to a routine fact check by the intelligence community.

Typically, once a Senate committee report has been approved, staff are only authorized to make technical and conforming changes. The executive summary and findings and conclusions released this week have undergone such extensive and unprecedented revisions since the study was approved back in December of 2012 that the traditional concept of technical and conforming changes has now been rendered meaningless. Amazingly, the majority made significant changes in the substance of the study for months after it was voted on by the committee. In addition, after we submitted our minority views, the majority staff then went back and

made a few changes to specifically correct some of the more blatant errors that we identified in the views and that the CIA identified in their review. While I am pleased our views led to some minor improvements in the study, those untimely changes required us to add text explaining the validity of our initial conclusions and criticisms. Simply put, the documents released today are very different from the documents that were approved almost exactly 2 years ago by the committee at the end of the last Congress on a partisan basis.

Another significant weakness of this study is its disregard of the context under which the CIA's detention and interrogation program was developed. It is critical to remember that the intelligence community was inundated by a surge of terrorist threat reporting after the September 11 attacks. The fear of a follow-on attack was pervasive, and it was genuine. The Nation was traumatized by the horrific murders of nearly 3,000 Americans and at the CIA there was no greater imperative than stopping another attack from happening. This context is entirely absent from the study.

In addition, everyone must remember that the CIA was directed to conduct this program by the President. I have spoken with a number of CIA officers over the years who remember the contentious debates about the program at the time it was being considered, but at the end of the day the Agency did what the President directed them to do under the color of law and based upon opinions issued and updated by the Department of Justice.

Many of my colleagues continue to discuss the brutality of many of the enhanced interrogation techniques. I agree that waterboarding, which only occurred against three detainees, is particularly severe. Many of the other techniques were not. By comparison, KSM, who was one of the detainees who was subjected to waterboarding, personally beheaded Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl, and a number of other U.S. citizens have been tortured and beheaded by Al Qaeda-inspired groups since.

In my opinion, the current threat level posed by ISIL and other Al Qaeda-affiliated terrorist groups may be greater today than what we faced prior to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. They are better funded, better equipped, and have recruited hundreds of terrorists who have American as well as European passports. ISIL terrorists are using social media to encourage new recruits to conduct "lone wolf" attacks in their home countries such as the United States. They are murdering and beheading captured hostages and planning terrorist attacks against U.S. citizens.

In light of these significant threats, the President is still attempting to

make good on a misguided campaign promise to close down Guantanamo Bay. It doesn't seem to matter to him that we are now down to the worst of the worst or that his own review groups have strongly recommended against the release of these remaining terrorists. Instead, he has returned to the pre-9/11 practice of treating terrorists like ordinary criminals. We are reading terrorists their Miranda rights instead of conducting extended intelligence interrogations to develop actionable intelligence that might lead to additional captures or plot disruptions.

I think we would be better off if we were to return to a mindset where we attempt to capture the enemy and use authorized interrogation techniques to obtain the actionable intelligence information needed to neutralize these dangerous terrorist organizations. While there is no doubt there were indeed moments during the CIA detention and interrogation program where interrogators exceeded their authorized limits, such instances were relatively few and far between.

In this, my last week of service on the floor of the U.S. Senate and as the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I wish to thank the men and women of the CIA and the rest of the intelligence community and the members of our Armed Forces who have served us so well since the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Their efforts and their sacrifices have not gone unnoticed. I will be forever grateful for their patriotic service to our beloved country. May God bless them all and may God bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

TRIBUTES TO MIKE JOHANNIS

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I come to the floor to praise the public service of and bid farewell to my friend and valued colleague from Nebraska, Senator MIKE JOHANNIS.

With my remarks, I celebrate not just MIKE's last 6 years in the Senate but also his 30-plus years in public service that will culminate with the end of this term.

At the highest levels of government in both the legislative and executive branches, MIKE's life of public service has been punctuated by great accomplishment. From the Lancaster County Board in Nebraska to the Lincoln City Council, from his service as mayor of Lincoln to his service as the 38th Governor of Nebraska, from his service as the 28th U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and throughout his tenure in the Senate, MIKE has demonstrated a commitment to those with muted voices in our political system, including small business owners, veterans, those impaired by mental illness and most certainly America's farmers and ranchers.

In the Senate, MIKE's leadership and bipartisan efforts to repeal purposeless tax reporting requirements in ObamaCare, his championing new trade agreements, and his contribution to the development and final passage of a new farm bill this year all describe a strong conservative legislator committed to stimulating economic growth through reduced government spending, lower tax rates, and reduced regulatory burdens on American business.

I have appreciated MIKE's partnership on key legislation, including his joining me to cosponsor the bipartisan Congressional Accountability and Line-Item Veto Act of 2009. During the 112th Congress, we were both cosponsors of the Foreign Earnings Reinvestment Act, a bipartisan effort to let corporations reinvest earnings kept overseas by our high corporate tax rates back into the American economy.

I was also proud to join MIKE as an original cosponsor of his bill, the Two-Year Regulatory Freeze Act of 2011, which sought to give the American economy a much needed reprieve to burdensome and confusing Federal regulations that frequently hinder economic growth. MIKE was also an original cosponsor of the Jobs Through Growth Act, and many others.

I am also grateful that he joined in helping replenish the Forest Service's aging air tanker fleet. A decade ago the Forest Service had roughly 40 large air tankers to fight wildfires that burned millions of acres of land across Western States, including Nebraska and Arizona.

Today they own eight large air tankers. Senator JOHANNIS and I saw an opportunity to transfer several excess Department of Defense aircraft to the Forest Service to temporarily address this shortage, and that has happened.

While MIKE and I have had disagreements along the way, I have always respected his knowledge and experience as a farmer, foreign trade expert, and the Nation's former Agriculture Secretary.

I am proud of the areas where we agree: reining in certain farm subsidy programs, advocating for free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, and even working together to kill the proposed USDA catfish office—a little known \$15 million program inside the last farm bill that we both highlighted as wasting taxpayer money and that, from a trade perspective, was negatively impacting our cattlemen and soy farmers.

We also agree on the need to help returning veterans seeking to reenter the workforce as beginning farmers, an effort he championed in our last farm bill. I have long applauded Senator JOHANNIS for calling on Congress to pass laws to stop farm subsidies from going to millionaires while he was a sitting Secretary of Agriculture.

As much as I respect the substance of MIKE's accomplishments in public service, I have valued how he has achieved them with a quiet, purposeful dignity and, indeed, a vibrant sense of humor. He has never been opposed to bipartisan cooperation whenever it is needed to further the interests of his constituents or the greater Nation.

For these reasons, his approach to governance in legislating has earned him the respect of colleagues and constituents across the political continuum. It should also serve as an example to all of us in this body who remain behind.

In an email MIKE wrote to his friends last February announcing his decision not to seek reelection in 2014, MIKE wrote: "With everything in life, there is a time and a season."

Well, to my friend and valued colleague, MIKE JOHANNIS, I bid fair winds and following seas in all that he and his lovely wife Stephanie do, and I thank him for his service and his friendship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I rise and second what my friend and colleague from Arizona said.

It has been a privilege of mine to serve in this body for 12 years—and I will be making some comments about that tomorrow—but during my early years in the Senate the Secretary of Agriculture was Secretary MIKE JOHANNIS.

Being a very active member of the Agriculture Committee and being chairman for 2 years during then-Secretary JOHANNIS's tenure, I had the opportunity to work with MIKE on a day-to-day basis and, boy, what a pleasure it is to work with one of the finest gentlemen and public servants I have ever known. He is smart, and he is political when he needs to be political, but he has as much or more common sense as, again, any public servant I have ever known.

For the past 6 years, he has been my next-door neighbor in the Russell building, so we see a lot of each other coming and going and have the opportunity to visit on a regular basis.

As I leave at the end of this term, one of the real Members of the Senate I am going to miss is MIKE JOHANNIS. I publicly thank him for his service and thank him for his commitment. I wish him and Stephanie the best, but what I really thank him for is the great friendship he and I developed over the years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I join the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Georgia—my senior Senator, Mr. CHAMBLISS—to rise for a minute and talk about MIKE JOHANNIS.

I want to amend that. I don't want to just talk about MIKE JOHANNIS, I want

to talk about him and Stephanie Johannis.

In the South what we have is what we call a two-for. MIKE and Stephanie are a two-for. They are a great pair for America, and they are a great pair for the State of Nebraska.

As a Senator from an agricultural State, I know the value that MIKE brought to the Cabinet of the United States when he was Secretary of Agriculture.

I know from his serving the State of Nebraska when he was Governor what a great job they did. I know the past 6 years, working side-by-side with MIKE JOHANNIS has been a real treat. He is a gentleman, and he is a scholar. He doesn't do anything where he doesn't know what he is doing, and if he is not always right, he is almost always right because he always has Stephanie there to guide him in the right direction.

I pay tribute to a great Senator, and a great personal friend, MIKE JOHANNIS, and his lovely wife Stephanie.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. JOHANNIS. I wish to start by saying I so appreciate the kind words by Senators MCCAIN, CHAMBLISS, and ISAKSON. I see there are others in the Chamber who may weigh in and offer a thought or two. I can't express how much I appreciate it.

I would like to offer a few thoughts—my farewell thoughts—today.

I rise, first, to convey a very deep and sincere appreciation to the people of a really great State, the State of Nebraska. They have entrusted me with the high privilege and the solemn responsibility of representing them in this body.

I am honored to have served as a Senator from Nebraska, and I hope and pray that I have done so in a manner that upholds the high standards that Nebraskans have rightly established for their elected office holders.

If I could turn back the clock 32 years I would do it again—from my first day as the county commissioner, throughout my service as a Lincoln City Council member, as mayor of our capital city, Lincoln, as the Governor of Nebraska, in President Bush's Cabinet, and now as a Senator. No doubt about it, if I could turn back the clock, I would just do it again.

I am so grateful for the trust placed in me and the support of so many people who have made this service possible.

Let me start with the top of the list, and that would be my family. My wife, Stephanie, has been an incredible pillar of support.

One of my best friends refers to her as "spirited." That would be an understatement. She is a true partner. She

has given her whole heart to public service—both her own service as a State senator and as a county commissioner when we first met—and to mine.

I thank my children, Justin and Michaela, who are now grown up. They have their own families. We have five beautiful grandchildren. They have been a source of true joy and pride. They too have cheerfully supported me despite the sometimes long hours and the missed birthdays—I could go on and on. It cut into that dad and grandpa time.

I offer a special word of thanks to the hundreds or thousands of volunteers whom I could never thank individually. They went out there, pounded the yard signs, walked the precincts, worked the phone banks, and they probably wrote checks when the bank account was pretty low. Their belief in me is what has been inspiring in those campaigns.

Another group of people near and dear to my heart are my current and former staff, campaign or government related. We have always called ourselves Team Johannis. It is an extended family and for good reason. Their hard work, their commitment, and their professionalism enabled me to represent and serve our great State and our country.

I have not only been truly blessed by the privilege to serve, but I have been blessed by the privilege of meeting some very extraordinary people.

In my various roles I have been with world leaders, spiritual heads, cultural icons, Presidents, Vice Presidents, Prime Ministers, Queens, and Kings—all memorable experiences to be sure. But I will say they are not the extraordinary people I speak about today. My real inspiration comes from ordinary people whom I have observed and watched do remarkable, extraordinary things.

Each year for the past 6 years, I have had the privilege of selecting a Nebraska family to be honored as "Angels in Adoption." Each year their stories of unconditional love show the limitless capacity of the human heart.

One family, the Welchels of Harrisburg, NE, went from two children to seven. They adopted five children, all with special needs, but their selflessness did not stop there. They created a camp where these very special kids could share life's journeys. How powerful is that?

I have learned that heroes walk among us daily whose courage is revealed in split-second decisions, and in that split second they put the lives of others in front of their own.

Two Nebraskans did exactly that in 2012. A school bus had collided with a semitrailer on a rural road near a community called Blue Hill, NE. These individuals, Ron Meyer and Phil Petr, arrived on this horrific scene. They bravely ran onto that burning bus and

pulled five children to safety. A witness who was there at the scene expressed absolutely no doubt those five children would have perished, as others sadly did, if not for the remarkable courage of Ron and Phil.

I have been so moved beyond words by my conversations with the parents of our fallen men and women in uniform. I would call them to offer them my condolences, and I have found their strength to be so astounding. To a person, they speak with such passion about love of country and pride in their loved one's service, despite sorrow. They honor their children with their patriotism. They honor their children with their fortitude. Their grace through incomprehensible grief inspires immeasurable gratitude. May God bless them and all of the families of the fallen.

Walking the streets of a tornado-ravaged community—and I have done that too many times as Governor and as a Senator—I saw ordinary people doing extraordinary things.

One stands out especially in my mind. I watched in amazement as Kim Neiman, the Pilger, NE, city clerk, attempted to take care of every conceivable need of every single resident following a devastating tornado that literally leveled this Nebraska community.

Her tireless advocacy, her raw determination was focused entirely on the community she loved. She had virtually no regard for her personal loss. You see, her home was destroyed, and her life was turned upside down by this tornado as well. But for Kim, community came first.

These are good people, and there are so many more like them. They inspired me, and they have motivated me to search for solutions to break through partisan rancor that too often dominates this government.

But they also fuel my optimism for the future. You see, I believe that America's strength is in the fabric of which we are woven. The threads of this fabric include both the character of our people and the wisdom reported in our Constitution.

It is a very strong and very durable fabric that withstands the overreach of any one President and the misguided policies of any one administration.

That is why I look back, not with any regret—I would do it all over again—but with gratitude. There were victories won during my time here, and I am pleased to have lead some of those charges. But I have to admit many battles remain.

I would be dishonest if I denied some feelings of frustration about the absence of the will to address issues of paramount importance to our country, but I know that no issue is powerful enough to shred the fabric of this great Nation. Rather, these challenges are overpowered by the ordinary people

who do extraordinary things, by the character of our people, and by the wisdom of our Founders. So I reject the prophecy of hopelessness.

As the challenges we face grow more urgent—and they will—so grows the collective fortitude to address them, and I believe that is about to intensify.

On January 3, I will officially pass the baton to Senator-elect Ben Sasse, and I wish him the best. With the 114th Congress, there will be a new day in this Chamber, a new majority, and a lot of new faces. I hope they embrace the new opportunities to exemplify true statesmanship.

Although confidence in our Nation's ability to solve problems may be shaken, I still believe ordinary people can do extraordinary things—even here in Washington, DC. May God guide those efforts and may God bless this great country, the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

TRIBUTES TO MIKE JOHANNIS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I had an opportunity to address the extraordinary career of the Senator from Nebraska the other day, and he was on the floor, which was welcomed, and his staff was in the gallery. I wanted to say again, in a much shorter version, how much we all appreciate his remarkable contributions to our country, to his State, and to the Senate and wish him well in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate the legacy of my dear friend, my colleague, and my fellow Nebraskan, Senator MIKE JOHANNIS.

Senator JOHANNIS has dedicated more than three decades of his life to serving the people of Nebraska and also this Nation. His career in public service began at the local level, where he was elected to the Lancaster County Board of Commissioners. He later joined the Lincoln City Council, and eventually became mayor of Nebraska's capital city where he served for two terms.

Perhaps the most infamous decision Senator JOHANNIS ever made throughout his career in public service was in his days as mayor of Lincoln. After an early season winter storm dropped more than a foot of heavy wet snow on Lincoln in late October, Mayor JOHANNIS decided to cancel Halloween. He cited power outages and hazardous downed power lines.

As you can imagine, this news was not received well among some of those Lincolniters. To this day, constituents haven't forgotten and they still occasionally remind him of how he deprived an entire city of trick or treats on that fateful October evening. He made up for it, though, when he and his wife

Stephanie treated children who came to trick or treat at the mansion.

Fortunately, this incident didn't deal a death blow to Senator JOHANNIS' political career. He went on to serve as Governor of Nebraska and was re-elected to a second term.

As Governor, he focused on fiscal discipline and the responsible use of limited State tax dollars, principles he upheld here in the Senate as well. At one point, as Governor, he even vetoed an entire 2-year budget proposal because it raised taxes to expand government power.

He also championed ambitious mental health reforms that allowed patients to receive care in the stability and in the security of their own communities where they could be near their loved ones. A decade later, these reforms in Nebraska are still regarded as a major milestone in improving mental health care.

Before he was a Senator or a Governor or a mayor or a city councilman, he worked on his family's dairy farm. That is not easy work. And as MIKE puts it, it is a job that builds character and humility. Growing up on a dairy farm, he would milk cows every day before school, sometimes even taking the tractor halfway to town in the winter months when the roads were so bad that the schoolbus couldn't get out to his farm.

This upbringing gave Senator JOHANNIS a great appreciation and a deep understanding for the needs of our Nation's ag producers, so it was no surprise when President George W. Bush selected him to lead the Department of Agriculture as its Secretary. MIKE dutifully served in this role, overseeing a new reform-oriented farm bill and opening doors to new global markets for our Nation's ag producers.

As Secretary of Agriculture, he saw firsthand the challenges facing hungry nations. It was in this role that he fell in love with the people of Africa, and he has worked here in the Senate to develop food aid programs that not only feed but also empower hungry populations around the world.

Senator JOHANNIS has tirelessly worked for our State and our Nation. He brought to the Senate a unique perspective, having served virtually every level of government. His well-rounded approach to his work here reflects that rare wisdom. Many of us here have had the pleasure of working closely with him because he always makes a point to work with his colleagues regardless of party affiliation, whether it be on complex legislation or that annual Senate secret Santa tradition.

We are all familiar with the confident, peaceful demeanor he brings to the Senate, and his plain-spoken clarity will truly be missed once he leaves Congress. This is who MIKE JOHANNIS is. It is who he has always been: a quiet workhorse with a soft spot for the

world's most disadvantaged, and a burning desire to help wherever he can. Friends back home who have known him since before he began his career in public service will tell you that he is the same man today he was back then—never losing sight of his goal of helping people, never getting a big head, and always putting Nebraska first.

The Senator's wife Stephanie has been by his side throughout every step of this tremendous journey, always supportive and steadfast. Anyone who knows MIKE knows he and Steph are inseparable. I am sure they are both looking forward to having more time to spend with family next year.

MIKE, you are a statesman and a model citizen. I am thankful for all the work you have done for Nebraska and for the entire Nation. You have set such a great example for your fellow Senators, and we all appreciate your dedication over these past 32 years. You have served Nebraska with dignity and integrity. Good luck. I wish you and Stephanie all the best. God bless you both.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, this is a bittersweet time for all of us. As you have heard, as we close the book on one term of Congress and look forward to the next, we are here to say goodbye to one of our esteemed colleagues who is finishing his service in the Senate. It is always tough, but it is especially hard for me with regard to Senator MIKE JOHANNIS—a guy I consider a fine Senator, also a good friend, and sort of the perfect example of the statesman. Through his impressive career as mayor, Governor, Cabinet member, and Senator, as his colleague has just said, he has displayed that.

I first met Senator JOHANNIS when he was Secretary JOHANNIS. He was Secretary of Agriculture in the George W. Bush Cabinet, and that meant we got to spend a lot of time together. I was the U.S. Trade Representative, and I truly believe I have traveled around the world more with MIKE than I have with my family. We went all over, from Asia to Europe to South America and Africa. We fought for farmers and ranchers. Our ideal was that we could expand exports, and we were able to do that and make some progress with his hard work.

We went to far-flung corners of the world, such as Burkina Faso, to deal with cotton issues important to U.S. farmers. We spent countless—and I mean countless—hours on something called the green room negotiating sessions, trying to reach a deal in the Doha round of talks with the World Trade Organization.

I remember one time MIKE and I had the opportunity to brief reporters as we were going across Africa. We were

racing across the Sahara desert to make our way to an airport. Because the airport had no lights, the pilots insisted we get there while there was still light so they could see where they were landing.

He taught me a lot, not just about arcane agricultural issues, such as what is a green box or an amber box subsidy in agriculture—fun issues such as that—but he also taught me a lot about negotiating and about how, as we said earlier, to be a statesman.

We had some tough negotiating sessions, but MIKE was always a proud and relentless representative and champion for the interests of our great country and the interests of the farmers and ranchers he knew so well. He always did his job on the global stage with honor and with dignity. If there has ever been a more forceful advocate for American farmers, whether it was there or here in the Senate, I don't know who it is.

In 2007, he told me he was going to leave the administration and go home to Nebraska, and that he was considering running for the Senate. I never thought I would be able to serve with him, because I didn't know I was going to follow him, but I knew when he told me that, he would be in the Senate and that he would put in the same level of dedication to this body as he had as Secretary of Agriculture, and that has been true.

He is not flashy. His colleague from Nebraska has just called him a workhorse. I hope he takes that as a compliment. I would. He has never sought out the cameras or, for that matter, sought out recognition for his good work. He just does the right thing. A true statesman.

So, MIKE JOHANNIS, we are going to miss you. We are going to miss Stephanie. And we wish you Godspeed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, the first time I met MIKE JOHANNIS was in Hutchison, KS. Hutchison, KS, is where we have the State fair every year. I was somebody then. I was the chairman of the sometimes powerful House Committee on Agriculture, and I had made a pitch to get the Secretary of Agriculture to actually come to the fair, thinking that MIKE JOHANNIS would be a far better speaker than myself and maybe I could avoid some trouble. So I had the Secretary come and I made the promise that every farmer who wanted to ask the Secretary of Agriculture a question would have that opportunity. I hadn't bothered to tell MIKE about it, but when he arrived on the scene, he nodded his head and said: Fine. He had this yellow tablet under his arm, and with ample staff, some who used to work for me, but that is beside the point.

So cutting things short, all the activities in the State fair he attended,

and he dutifully went around to every exhibit, and we finally ended up in the amphitheater and there must have been 150 to 175 farmers all lined up waiting to speak to or to question the Secretary of Agriculture. I thought to myself: Oh, my gosh, what have I done? The Secretary is coming in—I didn't know MIKE that well at that particular time—and what have I gotten him into?

But MIKE didn't seem to be bothered at all. He was absolutely comfortable, unflappable. He had the microphone and he sat down at a table, put down the yellow tablet and said: Yes, sir, and what is your first question and what is your name? The individual would give his name and the question, and MIKE would write down the question. He said: Thank you very much for that. It will receive all of our attention. Next.

He went through the whole 125 or 150 and never answered a question, but he wrote it down. Every farmer who came up later to me said: You know, the Secretary wrote down my question. They were tremendously impressed, as opposed to me. Silly me, I would have tried to answer their questions, and we would have been there 2 or 3 hours, Lord knows how long. So I asked MIKE: How do you get by with that? He said: Well, it saves a lot of time and you never get in trouble by what you don't say, which always sort of stuck with me and what a class act he was.

County commissioner, mayor of Lincoln, Governor, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Senate. I suppose if I floated a balloon for you to be President that you might—no, Stephanie wouldn't buy it and you wouldn't either. But that would be the logical next step, MIKE, and I think we certainly could and probably will do a lot worse. But at any rate, since I brought up Stephanie, Franki and I extend our very best wishes and love.

I do have somewhat of a minor discomfort, it isn't a quarrel—I would never quarrel with Stephanie—but some degree of discomfort.

We have to have meetings around here a lot, and some of us stay for the whole thing. We would always look around for MIKE. He would be around for the fireworks and then he would leave and he would always go home—because he had a home very close on Capitol Hill—to be with Stephanie.

She is absolutely wonderful. She has the best smile ever. You cannot be unhappy or in a bad mood ever when you see Stephanie.

So I would come to work in the Hart Building or here in the Capitol and I would happen to run into Stephanie and she would always come up with that big smile on her face and say: Hi, PAT. How are things going?

What are you going to do? I mean, I am trying to be the curmudgeon of the Senate, but GRASSLEY keeps edging me out. So here I would be in sort of a bad

or a grumpy mood and she would flash that smile, and I would say: Just fine. Then I would be feeling pretty good and I would go into the office. They would say: What is wrong? You have a smile on your face. I would say, "I've been Stephanized." I am truly going to miss that.

I remember the time we were sitting probably right about here in the back. We had just concluded the farm bill for the first time, and then it took us 400 days to get the rest of it. MIKE is an expert on agriculture program policy. Ask anybody else if they would like to talk about agriculture program policy and you would get a high glaze after about 8 seconds—but not MICHAEL. MIKE knows agriculture farm program policy. We call it farm program policy in Nebraska and Kansas, but he knows an awful lot about it.

I asked him: How many people do you think in this body, in this Senate, absolutely understand farm program policy? He retorted: How many people want to understand agriculture program policy? We decided there were about 5 in the Senate and maybe about 10 in the House—which shows you why we have a tough time getting the farm bill done.

I relied on his advice and counsel when I was the ranking member. I am so sorry—I regret—should I have the privilege of becoming chairman of the Senate agriculture committee, I would look forward to a dynamic duo with regard to what we could accomplish. But Senator JOHANNIS is like Shane: Come back, Shane. Come back, MIKE. But Shane rode away, and the Senator is going to ride back to Nebraska. I give him that, and I give him all of the success he can possibly have.

Six years is all this man has served. Some people have been here a lot longer. I have. You can accomplish a lot in 6 years. People say: What can you do in 6 years?

No. 1, you can work on legislation and you can know what you are talking about and you can earn people's respect and you can be smart about it. I don't mean smart smart. I mean just smart, so that what you say and when you say it, people pay attention. That is precisely the kind of person MIKE is. You can have all the integrity in the world and you can do exactly what he says when he talks about the people of Nebraska.

The people of Kansas are very similar to the people of Nebraska. My only complaint with the people of Nebraska is they chose to go play in the Big Ten and are finding it a little more difficult than running the track meets they used to run against Kansas State and KU. But if you want to go to the Big Ten and do that, why that is your business—but we have the same kind of roots.

I have always said there are no self-made men or women in public office. It

is our friends and the people we represent who make us what we are, and Senator JOHANNIS has spoken so eloquently to that.

MICHAEL, I was trying to think of a tag I could label you with that might be noteworthy of everything you stand for. Others will do better than I and others have already said that. I simply come up by saying that you are an uncommon man with a very common touch, and I am going to miss you—and everybody in the conference is going to miss you and I suspect everybody in the Senate is going to miss you for the way you have conducted yourself and the job you have done for Nebraska.

We wish you all the best and we love you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, when Senator MIKE JOHANNIS stated in February of last year that he had decided not to seek a second term in the Senate, he did so in a way that revealed so much about his character. There was no dramatic press conference, there were no weeks of rumors, there were no guessing games. Instead, there was just a simple and brief press release.

Then, the very next day it was back to work for Senator JOHANNIS, traveling throughout the State of Nebraska for a series of townhall meetings with the people he is honored to serve.

Nine months later, in October of 2013, his character again shone through. The Federal Government was shut down due to a massive failure to govern responsibly. It was stifling our economy and causing great harm to the trust the American people deserve to have in their government.

As a key member of our Common Sense Coalition, Senator JOHANNIS worked effectively and quietly to restore government operations and to restore citizen trust in government. Again, no dramatics, no search for the limelight, just solid results, just effective leadership.

Quiet, effective leadership guided by common sense has been the hallmark throughout the Senator's 32 years in public service. From Lancaster County commissioner and mayor of Lincoln to Governor of Nebraska and U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, he has been well informed, thoughtful, and untiring.

The old farm country saying that sowing is easy, reaping is hard perfectly describes his record of accomplishment and his determination to see any task to its completion. Most of all, the Senator from Nebraska always does what he thinks is in the best interests of our country and of the people he so proudly represents.

In an interview shortly before he announced that he would be leaving the Senate, Senator JOHANNIS said he hoped he would be remembered as "a guy who was good to work with."

Working with Senator MIKE JOHANNIS has been more than just good. It has

been an honor and a privilege and I wish him and Stephanie all the best.

Thank you for your service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to also express my appreciation for Senator MIKE JOHANNIS and for his wife Stephanie.

I first met MIKE shortly after I was elected Governor of my State. At that time MIKE was serving as Governor of Nebraska. Right away when I went and visited with MIKE I could tell this was somebody who was not only somebody we could count on but who had the right motivation in public service, had great ideas, and was somebody I could look to as a mentor, and I have ever since.

From his experience at the local level as commissioner, then as mayor, then as Governor, then as Secretary of Agriculture, and then as a Senator, MIKE has been somebody all of us have counted on and somebody whose advice we have sought when we wrestled with tough decisions.

So I just want to add my voice as well to the others who have expressed our appreciation for Senator MIKE JOHANNIS and for Stephanie and to say how much we are going to miss him. We are going to miss him not only on a personal level—because he is a great guy and a great friend and somebody we can count on—but we are going to miss his advice, his counsel, his participation in this process on behalf of the American people.

I think MIKE epitomizes the kind of approach we need to have in this body to get work done—to listen, to think carefully, and to remember always that we work for the American people, and he has a long and distinguished career doing that.

He is somebody who will be truly missed, and I think he is somebody who exemplifies the very best of this body and of public service on behalf of our great Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, our colleagues know the Presiding Officer is a recovering Governor, I am a recovering Governor, MIKE JOHANNIS is a recovering Governor. So we are sort of a support group for one another, men and women who used to be somebody special. I am kidding because I think we still are.

The Senator was talking about MICHAEL, and I had the privilege of knowing him and his wife for a number of years. We were Governors together, and my wife Martha and his wife Stephanie were First Ladies together and define what the standards should be for First Lady or First Man, if you will, if you have a female Governor.

I will never forget when I first met him. I was talking about Stephanie and how we know each other and so forth,

and he told me this great story about—I think they were county commissioners together. It was Lancaster County.

I might be mistaken, I think he used to be in those days maybe a Democrat, and a long time ago I was a young Republican for Barry Goldwater, when I was a 17-year-old Republican freshman student at Ohio State, and later found out Hillary Clinton was a Goldwater “Golden Girl” at the Republican convention in 1964.

In any event, I just want to say one of the reasons he is so thoughtful, and I hope maybe the reason I am fairly thoughtful, is because we have the ability to work across the aisle and to see and appreciate the views of other people.

The story about how he and Stephanie, when they were on county council together, they met, started liking each other, started dating, fell in love and later got married—they even had lunch together every day they were on county council, and every day he was Governor they continued to have lunch together and here, too, for many days. That is a love, the kind you just don’t see. You just don’t see that very much.

I just want to say: You are such an inspiration to the rest of us, you and your wife, the way you cherish each other and hold together and support each other and stand by each other. It is just a real source of inspiration.

There is an old saying: It doesn’t matter who gets credit for something when you get a lot more done. You define that, a guy who doesn’t need headlines, a lot of attention. I hope the rest of us are that way, but you define that for us.

We love working with you. We are going to miss you. We wish you the best and wish you Godspeed. As we say in the Navy, fair winds. God bless you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am here to talk about the Intelligence Committee report, but before the Senator leaves the floor, I just want to tell my colleague from Nebraska how much I appreciate his service. I note for the body that in the effort to build a bipartisan coalition for major tax reform, MIKE JOHANNIS was the Senator whose counsel we all thought we needed, and I thank him. I will have more to say about his career before the end of this week.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA’S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have served on the Senate Intelligence Committee for 14 years and came to the Senate floor in the spring of 2005 to join with Senator ROCKEFELLER in calling for the committee to investigate the CIA’s interrogation activities and

the possible use of torture. In 2009 I joined my Intelligence Committee colleagues in voting to approve Chair FEINSTEIN’s motion to launch an investigation into these activities.

I said at the time, I continue to believe it today, that what this debate over torture requires is an infusion of facts. Americans can hear me and other policymakers argue that the CIA’s so-called enhanced interrogation techniques constituted torture and did not work, and Americans can also hear various former officials argue that these techniques are not torture and that they produced uniquely valuable information. What is important is that today all Americans finally have access to the facts so they can make up their own minds. Personally, I hope this report closes the door on the possibility of our country ever resorting to torture again.

Americans have known since the days of the Salem witch trials that torture is an unreliable means of obtaining truthful information in addition to being morally reprehensible. But following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, a small number of CIA officials chose to follow the advice of private, outside contractors who told them the way to quickly get important information from captured terrorist suspects was by using coercive interrogation techniques that had been developed and used by Communist dictatorships during the Cold War.

I would note that the CIA officials later paid these same contractors to evaluate the effectiveness of their own work.

CIA officials repeatedly represented to the public, to the Congress, to the White House, and to the Justice Department that the techniques were safe, that they were only used against high-level terrorist captives, and that their use provided unique otherwise unavailable intelligence that saved lives. After 5 long years of investigation, our committee found that none of these claims held up. The CIA’s so-called enhanced interrogation techniques included a number of techniques that our country has long considered torture. Furthermore, the CIA’s own interrogation records make it clear that the use of these techniques in the CIA’s secret prisons was far harsher than was described in representations by the CIA.

CIA Director Michael Hayden testified that any deviation from approved procedures were reported and corrected, but CIA interrogation logs described a wide variety of harsh techniques that the Justice Department’s infamous torture memos did not even consider. Practices such as placing detainees in ice water or threatening a detainee with a power drill were often not appropriately recorded or corrected when they happened. Director Hayden also testified that detainees at a minimum have always had a bucket to dis-

pose of their human waste, but in fact CIA detainees were routinely placed in diapers for extended periods of time, and CIA cables show multiple instances in which interrogators withheld waste buckets from detainees.

CIA records indicate that some CIA prisoners may not have been terrorists at all. Some of these individuals were in fact ruthless terrorists with blood already on their hands, but one of the report’s most important findings is that this did not seem to be the case in every instance. In one particularly troubling case, the CIA held an intellectually challenged man prisoner and attempted to use tapes of him crying as leverage against another member of the individual’s family.

At another point the CIA official noted in writing that the CIA was holding a number of detainees about whom we know very little, and the CIA on multiple occasions continued to hold people even after CIA officers concluded there was not information to detain them. The review even found email records that described Director Hayden instructing a CIA officer to underreport the total number of CIA detainees. To this day the CIA’s official response to this report indicates that senior CIA officials are alarmingly uninterested in determining exactly how many detainees the CIA even held.

To be clear, the report doesn’t attempt to determine the motivation behind these misrepresentations. The report doesn’t reach judgments about whether individuals deliberately lied or unknowingly passed along inaccurate information. It simply compares the representations the CIA made to Congress, the Justice Department, the public, and others to the information found in the CIA’s own internal records, and it notes where those comparisons reveal significant contradictions.

One of the biggest sets of contradictions revolve around the repeated claim that the use of these techniques produced unique, otherwise unavailable intelligence that saved lives. CIA officials made this claim to the White House, the Justice Department, the Congress, and the public. The claim was repeated over and over and over again. Over the years CIA officials came up with a number of examples to try to support the claim, such as the names of particular terrorists supposedly captured as a result of coercive interrogations or plots that had been supposedly thwarted based on this unique, otherwise unavailable information.

The committee took the 20 most prominent or frequently cited examples used by the CIA and our investigators spent years going through them. Twenty examples are going to seem like a lot to anybody who reads the report, but the committee members who were working on the report agreed it

was important to be comprehensive and avoid cherry-picking just one or two cases. In every one of these cases the CIA statements about the unique effectiveness of coercive interrogation techniques were contradicted in one way or another by the Agency's own internal records.

I am going to repeat that because I think it is a particularly important finding. In every one of these 20 cases, CIA statements about the unique effectiveness of coercive interrogation was contradicted in one way or another by the Agency's own internal records. We are not talking about minor inconsistencies. We are talking about fundamental contradictions.

For example, in congressional testimony and documents prepared for White House briefings, the CIA claimed that a detainee had identified Khalid Shaikh Mohammed as the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks after he was detained by the CIA and subjected to the CIA's coercive interrogation techniques, but in fact CIA records clearly show that Abu Zubaydah provided this information during noncoercive interrogations by the FBI prior to the beginning of his coercive CIA interrogations and days before he was even moved to the CIA's secret detention site. I personally expected that there would be at least one or two cases where vague or incomplete records might appear to support the Agency's claims, but in fact in every one of these 20 examples they and the arguments for them crumble under close scrutiny.

The report that is being released today includes a number of redactions aimed at protecting our national security. I will say in my view some of these redactions are unnecessary and a few of them even obscure some details that would help Americans understand parts of the report. Overall I am satisfied that the redactions do not make the report unreadable and it would be possible for Americans to read the report to learn not only what happened but how it happened, and learning that is essential to keep it from happening again.

One of the reasons this public release is necessary is that the current CIA leadership has been resistant to acknowledging the full scope of the mistakes and misrepresentations that have surrounded this program. Some of this resistance is made clear in the Agency's official response to the committee's report, and I suspect some of it will be echoed by former officials who were involved in the program.

Finally, I want to wrap up by reminding people about the documents that have come to be known as the Panetta review. When former CIA Director Panetta came to the Agency in 2009, he made it clear from the outset that he wanted to work to put the Agency's history of torture behind it and that he wanted to cooperate with

the Intelligence Committee inquiry. He also sensibly asked CIA personnel to review internal CIA records and get a sense of what this investigation could be expected to find.

The review got off to a solid start. It began to identify some of the same mistakes and misrepresentations that are identified in our committee's report. Unfortunately, it does not appear that this review ever made it to the Director's desk. Instead, publicly available documents made it clear this review was quietly terminated by CIA attorneys who thought it was moving too fast.

Earlier this year the Agency conducted an unprecedented and secret search of Senate files in an effort to find out whether the committee had obtained copies of the Panetta review. After it was found that committee investigators had in fact obtained the Panetta review, the CIA actually attempted to file unsupported criminal allegations against Senate staff members. After the search was publicly revealed by the press, the CIA's own spokesperson acknowledged in USA Today that the search had taken place and it had been done because the CIA was looking to see if our investigators had found a document the CIA didn't want the Congress to have. Incredibly, that same week CIA Director John Brennan told reporter Andrea Mitchell of NBC that the CIA had not spied on Senate files and that "nothing could be further from the truth."

I think this incident and the difference between what was said to Andrea Mitchell and what the Agency's own people said to USA Today reflects once again what I call an alarming culture of misinformation. Instead of acknowledging the serious organizational problems that are laid out in this report, the Agency's leadership seems inclined to try to sweep them under the rug. This means organizational problems aren't going to be fixed unless they are laid out publicly, and there is also a danger that other countries or even future administrations might be tempted to use torture if they don't have all the facts about the CIA's experience. That is why the release today is so important.

In concluding, I thank all of the staff who have put in hours and hours and nights and weekends and time away from their families to get this investigation completed. I praise Chair FEINSTEIN and our former Chair Senator ROCKEFELLER, who together were resolute in pushing for this kind of congressional oversight.

TRIBUTE TO MARK UDALL

Mr. WYDEN. I close with just a word about our friend and colleague Senator MARK UDALL of Colorado. I have had the pleasure of serving with Senator UDALL on the Intelligence Committee

and have admired his commitment to American security and core American values. Many in the Senate would not know this because all of those intelligence meetings are behind closed doors, but MARK UDALL is not a Senator who is afraid to stand alone. He is not afraid to fight for what he believes in. When the fight to declassify this report got bumpy—and let me tell you it did a lot of times. I think some of you heard this weekend we had an eleventh-hour objection to the report getting out. People asked me what I thought, and I said it was not particularly surprising because there were objections practically every hour on the hour for months and months. Yet when the fight to declassify the report got very difficult, some people said: This is going to get buried forever. That is what happens when you try to get accountability and transparency. Senator MARK UDALL made it clear that wasn't going to be allowed to happen on MARK UDALL's watch.

I am going to wrap up by saying to Senator UDALL, I remember when we started this battle together and we got a handful of votes, sometimes like 13 to 2 or whatever. We thought it was going to be a long time before there was reform. We went from those days to eventually getting up to 15 or 20 votes. Colleagues, today, to a great extent because of Senator UDALL, in the last vote for real surveillance reform, we were up to 58 votes—58 votes for real surveillance reform. That, to a great extent, is possible because of the extraordinary service of my good friend Senator MARK UDALL from Colorado. We westerners always make sure we stay in touch, and you know that is going to be the case with this particular friend from the West, a wonderful Senator, Mr. MARK UDALL.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today is a historic day, as Senator WYDEN made clear, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator ROCKEFELLER, and many other Senators to follow.

Before I talk about my involvement in the efforts that were put forth to reach this day, I want to say to Senator WYDEN, my good friend, you honor me with those comments. I want to acknowledge that when you are in a fight, it matters whom you are in the fight with. It has been my privilege and honor to fight on the side of transparency, on the side of protecting the Bill of Rights, and this has been a righteous cause. We are going to continue to work to find the right balance between privacy and security. As Ben

Franklin famously implied, we can have both, but we don't end up with both if we set aside the Bill of Rights and those fundamental principles that are enshrined into the Bill of Rights. It has been my privilege to fight alongside you, and I wish you all the best. Yes, we westerners will stay in touch.

Turning back to the matter at hand, today, almost 6 years after the Senate Intelligence Committee voted to conduct a study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program and nearly 2 years after approving the report, the American people will finally know the truth about a very dark chapter in our Nation's history.

I had two goals at the beginning of this long process, and I still hold those two goals today. First, I have been committed to correcting the public record on the CIA's multiple misrepresentations to the American people, to other agencies, the executive branch, the White House, and to Congress.

Second, my goal has been to ensure that the truth comes out about the terrible acts committed in the name of the American people. Why? Because I want this to be our way of going forward, that neither the CIA nor any future administration repeats the grievous mistakes this important oversight work reveals.

This has been a careful and very deliberative process. We have compiled, drafted, redacted, and now released this report. It has been much harder than it needed to be. Senator WYDEN and many others pointed it out.

It brings no joy to discuss the CIA's brutal and appalling use of torture or the unprecedented actions that some in the intelligence community and the administration have taken in order to cover up the truth. By releasing the Intelligence Committee's landmark report, we affirm that we are a nation that does not hide from its past but learns from it. An honest examination of our shortcomings is not a sign of weakness but of the strength of our great Republic.

We have made significant progress since the CIA first delivered its heavily—underline “heavily”—redacted version of the executive summary to the committee in August. The report we released today cuts through the fog the CIA's redactions created and will give the American people a candid, brutal, and coherent account of the CIA's torture program.

As the chairman said earlier today, even when public tensions were high, our committee continued to work behind the scenes to successfully whittle down 400 instances of unnecessary redactions to just a few. We didn't make all the progress we wanted, and the redaction process was filled with unwarranted and completely unnecessary obstacles, but all told, after reviewing the final version, I believe our landmark report accomplishes the

goals I laid out at the outset and tells the story that needs to be told. It also represents a significant and essential step toward restoring faith in the crucial role of Congress to conduct oversight of the intelligence community. Congressional oversight is important to all of government's activities, but it is especially important to those parts of government that operate in secret, as the Church committee discovered decades ago.

The challenges the Church committee confronted four decades ago persists today—namely, how to ensure that those government actions which are necessarily conducted in secret are nonetheless conducted within the confines of the law.

The release of this executive summary is testament to the power of effective oversight and the determination of Chairman FEINSTEIN and members of the committee to doggedly beat back obstacle after obstacle in order to reveal the truth to the American people. I have much more to say about these obstacles and about the critical importance of reforming an agency that refuses to even acknowledge what it has done. I will deliver those remarks soon. For now, I wish to congratulate the chairman and her staff on this very important achievement.

The document we are finally releasing today is the definitive history of what happened in the CIA's detention and interrogation program. We have always been a forward-looking nation, but to be so, we must be mindful of our own history. That is what this study is all about. That is why I have no doubt that we will emerge from this dark episode with our democracy strengthened and our future made even brighter.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I see the distinguished senior Senator from Texas on the floor seeking recognition. I have been told to come here at 3:30 p.m., but obviously I yield to my friend from Texas and ask unanimous consent that when he completes his remarks I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank my friend from Vermont. All of this got pushed back a little bit with the laudatory speeches for our retiring colleague from Nebraska. We are backed up a little bit, but I won't be long.

I have to say that I came to the floor when the Senators from Oregon and Colorado were talking about Senator FEINSTEIN's decision to release this report. I get it that different people see the same subject matter sometimes through a different lens, but I can't think of any more reckless or irresponsible thing to do to our brave men and women who fight in our military, who have fought our wars for the last 13

years, and the intelligence community that has worked while risking their lives to keep us safe.

We all remember what happened on 9/11/2001, but apparently with time our memories have faded. What we do know for a fact is we would not have avoided another attack on our own soil if it were not for the dedication and the patriotism of men and women in our intelligence community who were operating under color of law. In other words, this isn't just something they decided to cook up; this was something that was vetted at the highest levels of the Justice Department and the Department of Defense.

We had hearing upon hearing on these various enhanced interrogation techniques. There were disagreements, but we do know they were effective in gleaning intelligence that helped keep Americans safer. That is not just me saying that. Ask Leon Panetta, the immediate past Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Secretary of the Department of Defense—a proud Democrat but also a patriot in his own right. Ask John Brennan, President Obama's choice to be the current CIA Director. He said virtually the same thing.

So much of this should have proven to be unnecessary after two separate U.S. attorneys conducted criminal investigations. There was one done earlier and then one done later when Attorney General Eric Holder reopened the investigation. These men and women who risk their lives to do what their government asks them to do to keep us safe were subjected to at least two Justice Department investigations, and obviously no decision to proceed with any kind of criminal charges was decided upon.

I think you have to wonder about the timing of this in a lameduck session where we have basically three items of business to do before we break for the Christmas holidays and a new Congress. It is clear that this report was pushed out in an attempt to make a political statement, but I have to tell you that I think it is a reckless act, and it is a disservice not only to the men and women who risked their lives but also to the American people who should expect more of us.

This was not a bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee report. Once Republicans on the Senate Intelligence Committee figured out what was happening, they simply disassociated themselves from it. This is purely a partisan report. There are absolutely no recommendations made for any reforms in this report. It was simply done to embarrass and to hold up our brave men and women who serve our country and the intelligence community to ridicule, and it is a shame.

TRIBUTE TO RALPH HALL

Mr. CORNYN. I came to the floor to talk about another topic, and that is about my friend and fellow Texan Congressman RALPH HALL, who at the end of this year will be retiring from representing Texas's Fourth District in the House of Representatives for more than three decades. It is hard to speak to the entirety of RALPH's 34 years in Congress in just a few minutes. I will try. I would be remiss if I didn't mention some of his greatest hits, so to speak.

Let me begin with what I admire most about RALPH HALL and why he is so beloved back home in Texas. Why would they return him election after election over these many years?

First, RALPH is someone whom a lot of Texans look up to as a role model. He is a happy warrior. Having proudly served this country and Texas for over 50 years, he is a man of extraordinary character and remarkable integrity.

Thinking about RALPH, the first thing that comes to mind is his service to others, from his military service to being the oldest and among the longest serving Members of Congress. RALPH has lived a life of service to others and leaves behind a considerable legacy—one that will be long remembered and celebrated by people in my State and I believe the people of the United States too.

Those who know RALPH know he is the man who, wherever he goes—whether it is back home or here in Washington—before leaving a room, he will have hugged or shaken the hand of every person in the room, not to mention telling a few bad jokes and leaving everybody laughing in the process. He is a man who truly cares about others, and that is evident by the way he arranged his desk in his Washington office. He said one of his favorite things about his office is the view. Even so, he arranged his desk with his back to the window so others could sit and enjoy the view. This speaks to the kind of man he is, always putting other people first.

As I said, he is also well known for his excellent sense of humor and an occasional bad joke. He is a great storyteller and raconteur. He does have some pretty good stories to tell, though, from selling cigarettes to the famous outlaws Bonnie and Clyde, to putting President Reagan on hold, to his interesting encounters and friendships with Mickey Mantle, Muhammad Ali, Ted Williams, Neil Armstrong, John Glenn, among others. There are his many stories about flying Hellcat fighter aircraft in the U.S. Army during World War II.

RALPH has led a full and exciting life. During his time in Congress, he has not just been the hometown Congressman from Rockwall, TX; he has been the hometown Congressman to everyone he has encountered. It doesn't matter who

you are—RALPH just naturally wants to try to find out how he can be helpful to you, from the person he met on the street, to the colleagues in the Texas delegation, to the President of the United States. That is just the way he is.

Knowing RALPH, he probably has something up his sleeve that he is not telling us about what he is going to do after he leaves Congress next month. In fact, when asked about his plans after leaving Congress, RALPH mentioned he would probably go to work at Walmart because he has to have a job.

RALPH has always got to have something to do. But it goes to show that no matter what he does next, he will not be slowing down anytime soon.

RALPH HALL will be greatly missed in this Congress. I am privileged to call him a colleague and a friend. I would like to wish him Godspeed and all the best as he continues to recover from a recent car accident at home in Rockwall. I look forward to seeing what he accomplishes in the next chapter of his long and storied life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the tremendous statement made by the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, earlier today. She has spoken of this issue on other occasions, and we Americans should listen.

More than a decade ago the Central Intelligence Agency began detaining and torturing human beings in the name of the war on terrorism. Then employees and contractors of the U.S. Government, paid for by our taxpayers' dollars, abused and degraded, dehumanized people. They stripped them of their basic humanity. But more than stripping them of their basic humanity, they stripped America of its standing in the world as the leader of promoting and protecting human rights. Instead of protecting us as Americans, by their actions they hurt all Americans.

President Obama banned torture and cruel treatment when he took office, but only now, because of the courage and conviction of Senator FEINSTEIN and the other members of the Intelligence Committee and their staffs, do we have a full and public accounting of the CIA's actions—an accounting the American people deserve.

The decision to release this historic report, as Senator FEINSTEIN has courageously said, has been difficult, but it was the right and moral thing to do. If something is right and something is moral, no matter how difficult it is, you should do it. Releasing the report

demonstrates that America—the America I love—is different. As Americans, we cannot sweep our mistakes under the rug and pretend they did not happen. We have to acknowledge our mistakes. We have to learn from our mistakes. In this case, we as Americans must and will do everything we can to ensure that our government never tortures again.

Five years ago, in 2009, I called for a commission of inquiry to review the Bush administration's detention and interrogation program and other sweeping claims of executive power by the Bush administration. I believe that in order to restore America's moral leadership, we have to acknowledge what happened in our name because much of the leadership we can show around the world is not based on our wealth or on the power of our military but on our moral leadership. Our Nation needed back then a full accounting of the CIA's treatment of detainees, and we need it today. With this report, at long last we have it.

This is not the first report to record or condemn the detention and interrogation policies and practices that were used during the last administration, but it is the first to fully chronicle the actions of the most secretive of our government agencies, the Central Intelligence Agency. The final report lays bare the dark truth about their program. That truth is far worse and it is far more brutal than most Americans ever imagined.

We have all seen the shocking pictures from Abu Ghraib. We have read the cold, clinical description of "harsh" or "enhanced" techniques written by Department of Justice attorneys to justify such treatment. We know that what was done at Abu Ghraib terribly diminished the image of the United States throughout the world. It did not make us safer by one iota. In fact, many would argue it made us less safe.

The report makes clear one fundamental truth: The CIA tortured people. That is the bottom line. No euphemistic description or legal obfuscation or pettifoggery can hide that fact any longer. The Intelligence Committee report shows that techniques such as waterboarding and sleep deprivation were used in ways far more frequent and cruel and harmful than previously known. It shows that gross mismanagement by those in charge at the CIA and a shocking indifference to human dignity led to horrendous treatment and conditions of confinement that went far beyond even what they had been approving. It turns out that the senior CIA leadership did not even know that "enhanced" techniques were being used at one CIA detention facility. In fact, in one instance, one of their prisoners died as a result, left shackled on a concrete floor in a dungeon room, and likely died of hypothermia.

This is America? This is what we stand for? This is the image we want to give the rest of the world? This American does not think so. This American does not think so. It is not what brought my grandparents and great-grandparents to this country.

These so-called “enhanced” interrogation techniques were not just used on the worst of the worst either. In some instances, the CIA did not even know whom it was holding. CIA records show that at least 26 people detained by the CIA did not meet the CIA’s own standard for detention. Some of these individuals were subjected to—and this is a wonderful slogan—“enhanced” techniques. What an evil slogan. Some detainees were determined not even to be members of Al Qaeda.

Moreover, the CIA relied on contractors—not even CIA personnel but contractors—who had no experience as interrogators to develop this program. They were happy to take American taxpayers’ money. They did not know what they were doing, but they said: Give us the money. Eventually the CIA outsourced all aspects of the program to the company these contractors set up. Did they make a few thousand dollars? No. They made \$80 million. This was a program out of control. It is yet another reason why Congress has to exercise its oversight responsibility.

The report also disproves CIA claims that torture programs were necessary to protect our Nation, and that it thwarted attacks. How many times have we heard it before—that we need this to protect us; we need this to protect us from another 9/11? We had all of the evidence we needed to stop 9/11, but the government had not even bothered to translate some of the material that our intelligence people had already obtained. After the fact, they decided: We should really translate some of that material we have. Then we found it could have been stopped.

This program of torture did not make us safer. As laid out in meticulous detail in the report, the use of these techniques did not generate uniquely valuable intelligence. In fact, the report thoroughly repudiates each of the most commonly cited examples of plots thwarted and terrorists captured. That should not come as a surprise.

The Senate Judiciary Committee held numerous hearings on the Bush administration’s interrogation policies and practices. What we heard time and again from witness after witness is that torture and other cruel treatments do not work. But there are still some who continue to argue, even in the face of overwhelming testimony and actually now hard evidence to the contrary, that the program thwarted attacks and saved lives. They defend the CIA’s action. They argue that the report does not tell the full story. But these are often the same people who participated in the rampant misrepresentations detailed in this report.

The report shows that CIA officials consistently misled virtually everyone outside the Agency about what was actually going on and about the results of the CIA interrogations—very similar to what we heard leading up to the war in Iraq after 9/11. I remember being in those hearings. I remember listening to the then-Vice President. I remember listening to others in those secret hearings and thinking: It does not ring true. I stated to others that I thought some of the things they were telling us did not ring true.

I remember walking early one morning with my wife near our home and two joggers coming up, calling us by name. These were people we had never seen before in the neighborhood.

One of them said, “I hear you have some questions.” He asked whether I had asked to see a particular document.

I said, “I haven’t. I didn’t know there was such a thing.”

He said, “You might find it interesting to read.”

So I did. Then I raised even more questions about what I read there, which totally contradicted what the Vice President and others were saying. I mentioned that to some.

A few days later we are out walking again. Both joggers—my wife remembers this so well—they said, “I see you read the document.”

I said, “I did.”

“But did they tell you about this other document?”

I said, “I didn’t know there was such a document.”

“You may find it interesting.”

And so I then reviewed it. It was obvious from what I read that they were withholding evidence that Saddam Hussein had nothing to do with 9/11, contrary to what the Vice President and others were saying; that there were no weapons of mass destruction; and that in fact, they were actually well penned in by the no-fly zone we had set up. But instead we rushed into war because we sought to avenge 9/11, even though they had nothing to do with 9/11. Now almost \$3 trillion later, look at the mess we are in.

The report released today details how, like the run-up to the war in Iraq, material that was held back from people who should have seen it. This included Members of Congress, White House officials, even Justice Department lawyers who were being asked to review the legality of CIA techniques.

In the coming weeks, as we go into the new Congress, we are going to hear a lot about the need for oversight. I would hope the new leadership would look at the report Senator FEINSTEIN and her committee have come out with, because this is where oversight should be—at the top of the list. So too should the unprecedented spying by the CIA on the congressional staff investigating this program. Just think

about that. They investigated Members of Congress who were asking them about things they had done wrong. Then there is also the troubling pattern of intimidation, which includes the CIA referring its own congressional overseers to the Justice Department for criminal prosecution. My God, we are going back to the Joseph McCarthy days with things like this. This report and those actions show a CIA out of control. It is incumbent upon all of us—Republicans and Democrats alike—in the Congress to hold the Agency accountable.

The Judiciary Committee should take a hard look at the role of the Department of Justice and its legal justifications for this program. Much ink has been spilled criticizing the OLC opinion written during the Bush administration by John Yoo, Jay Bybee, and Stephen Bradbury. The OLC has always had a good reputation, but these opinions sullied the reputation of that office, and they have been rightly repudiated. But the report also demonstrates that even those opinions were the result of key misrepresentations by the CIA about the seniority of the people subjected to these techniques, the implementation of the techniques, and the intelligence resulting from them.

As an institution, if we truly represent 325 million Americans, do we not have a responsibility to examine the systemic failure that allowed this to happen and then to ensure that it does not happen again?

Those who attack the credibility of this report are wrong. This report is not based on conjecture or theory or insinuation. Anyone who reads it can see that this careful, thorough report was meticulously researched and written. It is based on more than 6 million pages of CIA cables, emails, and other documents containing descriptions that CIA employees and contractors themselves recorded.

I believe Senator FEINSTEIN and the other members of the Intelligence Committee who worked on this deserve our respect and our appreciation.

Intelligence Committee staffers, too, have dedicated years of their lives to this report. They have demonstrated courage and dedication in the face of enormous challenges, because they thought first and foremost about the United States of America.

In the past year they were even threatened with criminal prosecution. Why? For doing the job they are supposed to do for the United States of America. But they would not allow themselves to be intimidated. They have served their country well, and they have my deepest appreciation for bringing us this truly historic study.

I thank their families, because they couldn’t tell their families the things they were reading. I imagine the families knew of some of these attacks on

them. Their families too deserve our thanks.

I am disappointed that those same honorable staffers had to spend so many months arguing with this White House about redactions to this report—a White House that is supposed to be dedicated to transparency. This report should have been issued months ago, and it still contains more redactions than it should. I can think of some who will wonder why the redactions are there, but I am gratified that we can finally shed light on this dark chapter.

Among the many lessons we can take from this report is that Americans deserve more government transparency, and that is essential to a strong democracy. Just yesterday the Senate unanimously passed a bipartisan bill, the Leahy-Cornyn FOIA Improvement Act. It significantly improves the Freedom of Information Act. Today's release of this report is another important victory for greater government transparency.

I strongly disagree with those who argue that the reports should not come out and who have tried to pressure and silence Senator FEINSTEIN. Don't place the blame on those who are telling the truth. Place the blame squarely where it belongs: on those who authorized and carried out a systematic program of torture and secret detention, which is in violation of domestic law, and in violation of international law. But more importantly it is in violation of the fundamental principles of morality on which our great Nation was founded.

In trying times, such as those we faced after September 11 and those we face now, we look to our intelligence, military, and law enforcement professionals to keep us safe. We are fortunate to have so many dedicated and talented people serving in the intelligence community, military, and law enforcement. But one lesson for their sake, our sake, and our country's sake, is that we should never become so blinded by fear that we are willing to sacrifice our own principles, laws, and humanity.

We are the greatest, most powerful Nation on Earth. We cannot turn our backs on our laws, our history, and our Constitution because we are afraid. This Senator is not afraid.

No matter what, our enemies are human beings. And no matter how hardened and evil they are, no matter how repulsive their actions—and many are—no matter how horribly they have treated their own victims, we do not torture them—because we don't join them on that dark side of history. We stand on the other side of history as Americans. Generations of men and women have given their lives and many have even endured torture themselves in order to protect this Nation. They did so not to protect our way of life, but to protect our principles, our understanding of right and wrong, of humanity, of evil.

The shameful actions uncovered by this report dishonored those men and women who have fought to protect what is the best of our Nation, as well as the men and women even today who continue to put their lives at risk for this country.

Americans know, throughout this country, that we are better than this. As we heard after Abu Ghraib and we will hear now, we are better than this and we should never let this happen again. Let's show the rest of the world, too.

I have spoken much longer than I normally do, but this is important to me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I also want to address the report that was released this morning by the Chair of the Intelligence Committee. I come at this in a slightly different way than some of my colleagues, because I came to this process late.

I joined the Intelligence Committee in January of 2013. By that time the report had been authorized, had been written, and actually had been finalized. So I came to it as a final product and the decision was whether it should be released.

Before talking about the report, there are two very important points that should be made.

No. 1, one of my problems with this discussion is that everybody talks about the CIA. The CIA did this, the CIA did that. The fact is the CIA as an institution doesn't do anything. People do things.

I have been around the world and met with CIA people in many countries. I have met with them here. They are patriotic, they are dedicated, they are smart, and they are brave. The problem with this situation is their reputation has been sullied by a relatively small group of people early in the prior decade.

So I want to make clear, at least as far as I am concerned, this is not an attempt to discredit or otherwise undermine the CIA or the good people who are there, but to point out that mistakes were made.

No. 2, I think we need to acknowledge that those were extraordinary times, the year or so after September 11. We thought there was going to be another attack. There was a lot of pressure to uncover that information. It is easy, 10 years later, to look back and say: Well, we shouldn't have done this or we shouldn't have done that. I understand that. We have to acknowledge that. However, those circumstances cannot justify a basic violation of who we are as Americans and what our values are.

The process is the report was completed and accepted by the committee on a bipartisan basis. My predecessor,

Olympia Snowe, voted in favor of the acceptance of the report in December of 2012.

It was then sent to the CIA. They responded, a rather full response. It took about 6 months, and then they submitted their response to the committee.

I knew the vote was going to be coming up last spring as to whether to release the report. I went to the secure site in one of our buildings and sat down every night for a week and read this executive summary, every single word—all 500 pages, all of the footnotes—and made my own judgment as one who was in no way invested in this report. Here are the conclusions I reached. I must say, until I sat and read it, I didn't fully comprehend what this issue was, why we needed this large report, why we needed to do this study. After reading it, I was shaken and convinced that the report was important and should be released.

Basically, it has four conclusions. I am not going to go through them in detail, but No. 1 was: We committed torture. I am not going to argue that. I would say, as I said repeatedly, read the report. No person can read the description of what was done in our name and not conclude that it was way outside the values of our country and constituted torture by any definition.

No. 2, it was terribly managed. That is not a very exciting point about management, but nobody was in charge. Contractors were actually designing the program and assessing whether it was successful—the people who had designed it and were implementing it. There was no central place at the CIA that managed it, so that was a problem.

No. 3—and this we are going to talk about for a few minutes—it was not effective. The guts of this report are an analysis of the 20 principal cases the CIA presented as justification for the torture to say that it worked, that it led to intelligence that was reliable and current, and the report goes through in excruciating detail looking at each one of those allegations.

It basically finds that the information was either already available, it was available in our hands, it was available in other ways, and the witnesses had given up the data prior to their being subjected to these extraordinary measures. I am going to talk, as I mentioned, in a couple of minutes about this issue of effectiveness.

I should have said this at the beginning. My poor words can't contribute a great deal to this debate, but the speech Senator JOHN MCCAIN made on this floor this morning should be required viewing for every schoolchild in America, every Member of this body, every Member of this Congress, and every American. He spoke eloquently about the violation of our ideals of this program and the fact that it cannot, will not, and could not work.

The final point we take from the report is this program was continually misrepresented. It was misrepresented to the President, it was misrepresented to the Justice Department, it was misrepresented to the Congress, and it was misrepresented to the Intelligence Committee.

The problem is that continues today. In the past few days we have seen an outburst of statements, speeches, and interviews on television saying it was effective. It wasn't effective, and the report makes that clear.

There is a semantic sleight of hand going on, and I have already seen it in two or three interviews on television where people slide from the report and they say: The program of detention of people whom we captured after September 11 was effective in generating intelligence.

Absolutely true. There is no doubt of that. People were detained, they were interrogated, they gave good intelligence, it taught us what we know about Al Qaeda, and it was very helpful to the country in preventing future plots.

The question for the House, though, is was the torture effective? If you have somebody in custody, they give up good information, and then later you torture them and they don't give you anymore information, the torture didn't create that information or that intelligence. The question is did the extraordinary methods create additional evidence.

People should cock their ears when they hear people say the program created this good intelligence. It did. But the program is not what we are talking about today. We are talking about so-called enhanced interrogation techniques.

I would suggest when people come up with a euphemism such as enhanced interrogation techniques, that should tip us off that something is going on that we should be concerned about.

I wrestled with this decision. It was not easy. There is risk involved. There has been a lot of commentary today. Our people are on alert. Will someone attack us because of this report?

I can't deny that risk. I think it is impossible to say. But we have already learned that these people will attack us for any or no reason. They have been trying to attack us for 10 years. That is their reason for existing.

ISIL has beheaded Americans, not because of this report, but because that is their agenda. Now they may issue a press release or a YouTube video and say we are doing this because of the report, but I would submit they are going to do it anyway.

What they are going to cite—it is not the report, it is what we did that has inflamed opposition around the world, and it has done so for many years already.

Finally, on the question of the risk, when the terrible activities at Abu

Ghraib came to the attention of the Congress, we did a report. The Armed Services Committee did a study and issued a report in grisly detail of what was done, and at that point we had 100,000 troops in Iraq. If ever there was a report that would have inflamed public opinion in a foreign country and generated retribution against us, it was that. We cannot be intimidated by people who tell us that we cannot exercise and be true to our own ideals.

But if there is any risk, why should we do it? Because these actions are so alien to our values, they are so alien to our principles that we simply can't countenance them.

By the way, if this wasn't torture, if this wasn't a problem, why did the CIA destroy the tapes of one of these interrogations? That is what started all of this, when the Senate learned they had destroyed tapes. If they thought this was not torture—which is what they were telling us—then why are they destroying the tapes? That is what began this process.

To me, one of the most telling quotes in the whole report was a back-and-forth between the CIA and I think the White House—but I think it was within the CIA where the statement was made: "Whatever you do, don't let Colin Powell find out about this, he'll blow his stack." Now that tells me they knew they were doing something that wasn't acceptable to our country and to the American people. But the second reason to release this report is the key: so it will never happen again. That is the whole deal here.

The campaign of the last few days of people saying it worked and it wasn't torture and you shouldn't do it because of the risk—that, to me, validates my concern because these people are essentially saying: We would do it again if we had the chance. And the only thing standing between them and doing it again is an Executive order signed by this President in January of 2009, which could be wiped out in the first week of a new Presidency or in the first month of a new Presidency. We cannot have this happen again.

The oratory is that it works. I have a letter, which I will submit for the RECORD, from 20 former terrorist interrogators—Army, Air Force, CIA, FBI—saying these kinds of tactics don't work and, in fact, they produce bad intelligence. There is an article in Politico today by Mark Fallen, who is a 30-year interrogator, saying it doesn't work.

We have to have this discussion and lay that to rest because the people who are saying it works are really saying: And we will do it again if we have to. And that is not who we are as people.

Interestingly, in the CIA's response to the report—all during the early part of this past decade the argument was—and we are hearing it today—it works. We are certain it works. We got valu-

able intelligence. We got Osama bin Laden.

The CIA is not saying that today. When they submitted their response to the committee's report, what they said about effectiveness was that it is unknowable whether it was effective. I believe the migration from the certainty they gave to Members of Congress and the President and the Department of Justice—the migration from "certainty" to "unknowable"—speaks volumes because they couldn't refute the facts that are in this report.

If this idea that this kind of interrogation works becomes conventional wisdom, it will definitely happen again.

I go back in conclusion to JOHN MCCAIN's statement this morning. I can't match his eloquence. It was one of the most powerful messages I have ever heard in this body or anywhere else. He talked about who we are as Americans, and he also talked from personal experience about what torture will do and whether it will produce good information, and I would submit that JOHN MCCAIN knows more about that particular subject than all the rest of us in this body put together.

I got a critical note from a friend in Maine this morning that said "You know, you are naive" and all those kinds of things. I just wrote him back and said, "Don't take it from me; watch what JOHN MCCAIN had to say."

We are exceptional, but we are not exceptional because of natural resources or because we are smarter and better looking than anybody else; we are exceptional because of our values. We are one of the few countries in the world that was founded on explicit values and ideals and principles. And principles aren't something you discard when times get tough. That is when they are important. That is like saying: I am in favor of free press unless somebody says something offensive. These are principles that make us distinct and different.

I believe this debate is about the soul of America. It is about who we want to be as a people. It is a hard debate. It is difficult. It is hard to talk about these things. This was a dark period. But I believe that having this discussion, having this debate, getting this information out—and by the way, all the information is going to be out: the report; the CIA's response was made public today; the minority had their own statement that is quite substantial. So the public is going to be able to look at all this information and make their own decisions. I looked at the information, and the decision I made was that this is important information the people of America are entitled to, they should understand, and we should move forward consistent with our ideals and our principles as a nation and see that something like this never happens again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter I referred to earlier.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 2014.

Hon. ANGUS KING,
U.S. Senate, 359 Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KING: We write to you as current and former professional interrogators, interviewers, and intelligence officials regarding the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's (SSCI) 6000-plus page study of the CIA's post-9/11 rendition, detention, and interrogation program. We understand that the SSCI may soon take up the issue of whether to pursue declassification and public release of the study. In the interest of transparency and furthering an understanding of effective interrogation policy, we urge you to support declassification and release of as much of the study as possible, with only such redactions as are necessary to protect national security.

Since the CIA program was established over a decade ago, there has been substantial public interest in, and discussion of, the fundamental efficacy of the so-called "enhanced interrogation techniques" (EITs). Despite the employment of these methods, critical questions remain unanswered as to whether EITs are an appropriate, lawful, or effective means of consistently eliciting accurate, timely, and comprehensive intelligence from individuals held in custody. Based on our experience, torture and other forms of abusive or coercive techniques are more likely to generate unreliable information and have repeatedly proven to be counterproductive as a means of securing the enduring cooperation of a detained individual. They increase the likelihood of receiving false or misleading information, undermine this nation's ability to work with key international partners, and bolster the recruiting narratives of terrorist groups.

We would like to emphasize that this view is further supported by relevant studies in the behavioral sciences and publicly available evidence, which show that coercive interrogation methods can substantially disrupt a subject's ability to accurately recall and convey information, cause a subject to emotionally and psychologically "shut down," produce the circumstances where resistance is increased, or create incentives for a subject to provide false information to lessen the experience of pain, suffering, or anxiety.

Despite this body of evidence, some former government officials who authorized the CIA's so-called "enhanced interrogation" program after 9/11 claim that it produced a significant and sustained stream of accurate and reliable intelligence that helped disrupt terrorist plots, save American lives, and even locate Osama Bin Laden. While some of the particular claimed successes of the program have been disproven based on publicly available information, the broader claim that the EIT program was necessary to disrupt terrorist plots and save American lives is based on classified information unavailable to the public.

The SSCI study—based on a review of more than 6 million pages of official records—provides an important opportunity to shed light on these important questions. We understand that the SSCI minority and CIA have separate views regarding the meaning and significance of the official documentary record.

Those views are important and should also be made public so that the American people have an opportunity to decide for themselves whether the CIA program was ultimately worth it.

It is beyond time for this critical issue of national importance to be driven by facts—not rhetoric or partisan interest. We therefore urge you to vote in favor of declassifying and releasing the SSCI study on the CIA's post-9/11 interrogation program.

Sincerely,

Tony Camerino, Glenn Carle, James T. Clemente, Jack Cloonan, Gerry Downes, Mark Fallon, Brigadier General David R. Irvine, USA (Ret.), Steven Kleinman, Marcus Lewis, Mike Marks, Robert McFadden, Charles Mink, Joe Navarro, Torin Nelson, Erik Phillips, William Quinn, Buck Revell, Mark Safarik, Haviland Smith, Lieutenant General Harry E. Soyster (Ret.).

Mr. KING. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEVIN be permitted to follow my remarks and speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, torture is wrong, it is un-American, and it doesn't work. Recognizing these important realities, the President signed an Executive order in January of 2009 that limited interrogations by any American personnel to the guidelines that are in the Army Field Manual, and he reinforced U.S. commitment to the Geneva Conventions. This closed the book on the Bush administration's interrogation program. But make no mistake—these weren't enhanced interrogations. This was torture. I would challenge anyone to read this report and not be truly disturbed by some of these techniques.

Releasing the Intelligence Committee's study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program to the American people today will finally provide a thorough accounting of what happened and how it happened. In addition, like my colleague and friend from Maine who spoke before me, I hope this process helps to ensure that it never ever happens again.

This was a grave chapter in our history, and the actions taken under this program cost our Nation global credibility, and—let's be blunt—they put American lives at risk. Some have suggested that releasing this report could put American lives at risk. But let's be clear. It has been the use of torture that has unnecessarily put Americans in harm's way.

There is no question that there will never be a good time to release this study. We all know that for months, terrorists in the extremist group ISIS have been kidnapping and barbarically killing innocent Americans because of what we as a nation stand for. The response to their threats and terrorism should not be for us to change our

American values; it should be to stand firm in our values and work with our allies to root out extremism and terrorism in all its forms.

The release of this study will finally let us face what was done in the name of the American people and allow for future generations to use these findings to learn from the mistakes made by the architects of this program. This is an objective, fact-based study. It is a fair study. And it is the only comprehensive study conducted of this program and the CIA's treatment of its detainees in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. Today marks an enormous, albeit painful, step into our future.

It is important to know that these torture methods were the brainchild of a few CIA officials and their contractors. When I joined the Intelligence Committee two years ago, I began to read the classified report and was surprised to learn this. Frankly, it was not consistent with all of my assumptions. It wasn't what my prejudices told me to expect. But that is exactly why a fact-based study is so important.

Furthermore, it is important to know that at every turn, CIA leadership avoided congressional oversight of these activities and, even worse, misled Congress. That leadership deliberately kept the vast majority of the Senate and House Intelligence Committees in the dark on the interrogation techniques until the day the President revealed the detention and interrogation program to the rest of the world in 2006—4 years after it began.

Even then, misrepresentations to the committee about the effectiveness of this program continued, in large part because the CIA had never performed any comprehensive review of the effectiveness of the interrogation techniques or the actions of its officers. Myths of the effectiveness of torture have been repeated, perpetuating the fable that this was a necessary program that somehow saved lives.

The committee examined the CIA's claims of plots thwarted and detainees captured as a result of intelligence gained through torture. In each and every case, the committee found that the intelligence was already available from other sources or provided by the detainees themselves before they were tortured.

However, we need to stop treating the issue of torture as one worthy of debate over its practical merits. This is about torture being immoral, being un-American. Reducing a human being to a state of despair through systematic subjugation, pain, and humiliation is unquestionably immoral. It should never happen again with the blessing of the Government of the United States of America.

As my colleague who spoke before me—Senator KING of Maine—said so well in an interview this morning,

"This is not America. This is not who we are." I think that sums up how I view the revelations in that report.

The information in the study released today to the public will finally pull back the curtain on the terrible judgment that went into creating and implementing this interrogation program.

The decision to use these techniques and the defense of the program were the work of a relatively small number of people at the CIA. This study is in no way a condemnation of the thousands of patriotic men and women at this great Agency who work tirelessly every day to protect and defend our Nation from very real and imminent threats using lawful measures; using effective measures. In fact, the insistence that so many intelligence successes were the result of enhanced interrogations negates and marginalizes the effective work done by thousands of other CIA officers not involved in these activities.

What this study does is show that multiple levels of government were misled about the effectiveness of these techniques. If secretive government agencies want to operate in a democracy, there must be trust and transparency with those who are tasked with the oversight of those agencies.

As the committee carries out future oversight, we will benefit from the lessons in this study. I hope we never again let the challenges of difficult times be used as an excuse to frustrate and defer oversight the way it was in the early years described in this report.

Although President Obama ended the program by signing that Executive order in 2009, any future President could reverse it. It is worth remembering that years before this detention and interrogation program even began, the CIA had sworn off the harsh interrogations of its past. But in the wake of the terrorist attacks against the United States, it repeated those mistakes by once again engaging in brutal interrogations that undermined our Nation's credibility on the issue of human rights, produced information of dubious value, and wasted millions and millions of taxpayer dollars.

The public interest in this issue too often has centered on the personalities involved and the political battle waged in the release of this study, but those stories are reductive, and I hope they will soon be forgotten. Because the story of what happened in this detention and interrogation program—and how it happened—is too important, and it needs to be fully understood so that future generations will not make the same mistakes that our country made out of fear.

When America engages in these acts, with authorization from the highest levels of government, we invite others to treat our citizens and our soldiers the same way. This study should serve

as a warning to those who would make similar choices in the future or argue about the efficacy of these techniques. Let us learn from the mistakes of the past, and let us never repeat these mistakes again.

Before I close, I wish to say how important it is to acknowledge that the Intelligence Committee's study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program represents many, many years of hard work by Members and staff who faced incredible obstacles in completing their work. The fact that this study is finished is a testament to their dedication, and it is a testament to the dedication and focus of Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Chairman FEINSTEIN in deciding that oversight is our job, regardless of how long it takes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the report released today by the Intelligence Committee is an important addition to the public's knowledge about the CIA's use of torture, euphemistically described by some as "enhanced interrogation techniques" in the period following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

The use of these techniques was a failure, both moral and practical. These tactics violated the values this Nation has long stood for, while adding little benefit to our security. As GEN David Petraeus and others have pointed out, their use has placed U.S. personnel at greater risk of being tortured. They have tarnished America's standing in the world and undermined our moral authority to confront tyrants and torturers. I am glad this report will fully inform a public debate with facts that have remained classified for too long, and I hope it ensures that our Nation never again resorts to such brutal and misguided methods.

The report lays out clearly that, contrary to claims by former CIA and Bush administration officials, these techniques did not produce uniquely valuable intelligence that saved lives. The report examines 20 such specific representations that were used frequently by the CIA to make the case to policymakers for continued use of abusive techniques. In all 20 cases, the CIA's claims about the value of intelligence gathered through torture were inaccurate. At the same time the CIA was making false claims about the effectiveness of these techniques, it was failing to mention that some detainees subjected to these techniques provided false, fabricated information—information that led to time-consuming wild-goose chases.

This is not at all surprising when we consider the origin of these abusive interrogation techniques. In 2008 the Senate Armed Services Committee produced a detailed investigative report into the treatment of detainees in mili-

tary custody. That report traced the path of techniques such as waterboarding, sleep deprivation, and forced nudity from the military's survival, evasion, resistance, and escape training, or SERE training, the path to interrogations of U.S. detainees. SERE training was not designed to train U.S. personnel to torture detainees. Rather, it was designed to prepare U.S. personnel to survive torture at the hands of our enemies. SERE training simulated techniques that were used by the Chinese interrogators during the Korean War—techniques designed to elicit a confession—any confession—whether true or false. Those who tortured U.S. troops were not after valuable actionable intelligence. They were after confessions they could use for propaganda purposes.

Defenders of the CIA's actions have claimed that abusive techniques produced key intelligence on locating bin Laden that couldn't have been acquired through other means. This is false, as the Intelligence Committee's report demonstrates in detail. Not only was the key information leading to bin Laden obtained through other means not involving abusive interrogation techniques by the CIA, but, in fact, the CIA detainee who provided the most significant information about the courier provided the information prior to being subjected to abusive interrogation.

There has been a great deal of conversation, and rightly so, about the need for effective congressional oversight of our intelligence community and the obstacles that exist to that oversight. This report highlights many such obstacles. In one case, this report makes public the likely connection between the Senate's efforts to oversee intelligence and the destruction of CIA tapes documenting abusive interrogation of detainees. In 2005 I sponsored a resolution, with the support of ten colleagues, to establish an independent national commission to examine treatment of detainees since 9/11. According to emails quoted in the report released today, Acting CIA General Counsel John Rizzo wrote on October 31, 2005, that the commission proposal "seems to be gaining some traction," and argued for renewed efforts "to get the right people downtown"—that is, at the White House—"on board with the notion of our destroying the tapes." Does it sound a little bit like Watergate? The videos were destroyed at the direction of Jose Rodriguez, then the head of the CIA's National Clandestine Service, just 1 day after the November 8, 2005, vote on our commission proposal in the Senate. It is just one striking example of the CIA's efforts to evade oversight.

Some have argued against releasing this report, suggesting that it could

spark violence against American interests. Fundamentally, the idea that release of this report undermines our security is a massive exercise in blame shifting. Telling the truth about how we engaged in torture doesn't risk our security. It is the use of torture that undermines our security. Release of this report is hopefully an insurance policy against the danger that a future President, a future intelligence community, and a future Congress might believe that we should compromise our values in pursuit of unreliable information through torture. If a future America believes that what America's CIA did in 2001, 2002, and 2003 was acceptable and useful, we are at risk of repeating the same horrific mistakes. That is a threat to our security.

Torture is never the American way. Concealing the truth is never the American way. Our Nation stands for something better. Our people deserve something better—they deserve an intelligence community that conducts itself according to the law, according to basic human values, and with the safety of our troops always in mind. They deserve better than intelligence tactics that are likely to produce useless lies from people trying to end their torture being used against them, instead of producing valuable intelligence.

I thank Chairman FEINSTEIN for her leadership in completing and releasing this report. I thank Senator ROCKEFELLER for his longstanding effort in this regard. I thank Senator MCCAIN and others for speaking out on the need to ensure that the United States never again repeats these mistakes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN SAVINGS PROMOTION ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am on the floor this afternoon to speak briefly about the American Savings Promotion Act, H.R. 3374.

My understanding is that this bill may soon pass the Senate—it was passed by the House of Representatives in September—and I wish to speak briefly about its value to our country, to its citizens, and to our country's future.

I believe this is a fairly narrow circumstance with broad consequences. I believe if there is a primary responsibility we have in being a citizen of this country, it is to make sure, among other things, that we pass on to future

generations of Americans the opportunity to pursue the American dream—to be able to have an idea to pursue a business plan, to save for your family's and children's education, to save for your own retirement, to prepare yourself for a bright financial future. Unfortunately, many Americans struggle to do that.

Certainly, one of the aspects of that circumstance is there is very little savings that goes on in our country today. People are unable or unwilling, or perhaps undisciplined, in a way that allows them to prepare for their financial security and their financial future. The problem is—and statistics bear this out—people aren't saving. The reality is, according to a recent survey, 44 percent of American households lack the savings to cover basic expenses for 3 months if unemployment or medical emergency or another crisis leads to a loss of stable income. Many Americans have the inability—almost the majority of Americans have the inability to care for themselves and their families if there is an emergency or a problem for more than 3 months. That is something we ought to try to resolve.

I also think there has been over a period of time a disparity of incomes. We want to make certain those at the lowest income levels have an opportunity to increase their income and to increase their financial stability. In fact, the Senator from Oregon, Senator WYDEN, and I created sometime ago the Senate Economic Mobility Caucus, trying to make certain that people have a chance to move up the ladder of economic success and security in our economy and in our country. Senator WYDEN and I came together to bring some of the best minds from conservative to more liberal thought-provoking organizations and policy organizations to visit with Republican and Democratic Senators and their staffs about what ideas are out there that might increase the chances that a person or a family has the chance to improve their financial circumstances.

One of the ideas that arose from that caucus's discussions was this legislation called the American Savings Promotion Act, again, with the realization that people are not saving for their own financial security, that they lack stability in times of emergency and difficult economic challenges to care for themselves, how can we encourage Americans to save more?

One of the ideas that came forth in this regard is the opportunity to link savings to prizes. When I first heard this, I thought it sounded a little bit odd, a little bit like a gimmick. But the reality is with little savings, people still believe—in fact, 20 percent of Americans believe that winning the lottery is a meaningful strategy to build wealth. Americans spend more than \$60 billion every year on lottery tickets and families earning the least

spend the highest percentage of their earnings on lottery tickets despite the long odds of winning.

This legislation is not about a lottery, but about allowing financial institutions the opportunity to provide prizes for those who save, who open a savings account and deposit money into that account. In our country, because of the way financial institutions are regulated, that has been an opportunity in a number of States in credit union financial institutions for a period of time. In fact, the statistics and the facts that arise from that experiment or that experience indicate that savings increases when there is a prize associated with the savings behavior. So it is one of the reasons this makes sense. Prize-linked savings is an innovation, a tool to encourage savings while offering the chance to win a larger prize.

We know these programs work because of the evidence in the States that I mentioned in which credit unions have been offering these prizes associated with savings, and that has occurred in Nebraska and North Carolina and Washington. Since 2009, over 50,000 accountholders have collectively saved more than \$94 million, and it only is available in the credit union setting and not available in a bank setting because of Federal barriers that prevent banks and thrifts from offering these prize-linked savings products.

With the passage of this legislation—again, which is a pretty straightforward, commonsense kind of opportunity—this legislation will update Federal laws to allow States to expand prize-linked savings to other financial institutions beyond credit unions.

Increasing savings is a win-win for individuals. It is certainly valuable to boost the financial institutions' accounts and an improvement to the American economy.

This legislation was introduced by me, with the cosponsorship efforts of Senator SHERROD BROWN, the Senator from Ohio, in an effort to create one more opportunity, one more piece of encouragement for people to save for their own financial well-being, to care for themselves and their families, and to increase the savings rate in this country for the benefit of the entire economy, but most importantly for the benefit of low-income individuals who need a boost of encouragement to save.

I wish to thank my colleagues in the House. As I say, this legislation passed in the House where Congressman KILMER and Congressman COTTON led the effort in the House, and my colleague, the Senator from Ohio, Senator BROWN, for his efforts in supporting this legislation here in the Senate. It is an opportunity for us to do something modest but useful, something based upon common sense, and something that accomplishes a goal we all should have of making certain the American dream is

alive and well, that individuals and families take personal responsibility for themselves and their family members. We all know that increased savings, preparing for any kind of circumstance or emergency that comes our way, is something that ought to be encouraged.

I appreciate that it is likely that later today or tomorrow H.R. 3374 will pass, again, an example of where we have been able to work together and bring new ideas to the cause of making certain that everybody has the opportunity to increase their economic value, to increase the economic worth for their family available for the future, to pay their bills, and to make certain their future is bright, again, in my mind making sure the American dream is more alive and all American families are better off.

Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to address the Senate, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I had a chance briefly earlier, when Chairman DIANNE FEINSTEIN of the Senate Intelligence Committee and her predecessor as Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Commerce Chairman JAY ROCKEFELLER, were on the floor, to express my appreciation to them for the leadership they showed in bringing the Senate Intelligence Committee report through a very long ordeal and finally before the American public today.

I am not going to revisit what the report says. I was on the Intelligence Committee as it was prepared. I was closely involved in its preparation. The points I would like to make here today are, first, to once again thank Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Chairman FEINSTEIN for persisting through this process, particularly Chairman FEINSTEIN, who I think saw very intense resistance both within the Senate and within the CIA to this effort. They, I think, have done something that is in the very best traditions of the Senate.

The second thing I will say is that in my opinion, in America, an open democracy like ours lives and dies by the truth. If we have done something wrong, if we have done something we should not have done, then we should come clean about it. That is what this report does, in excruciating, painstaking detail.

Let me credential the report for a minute. When the CIA was offered a chance to challenge the facts of the report, they had it for 6 months. My understanding is they came up with one factual correction, which was accepted. You hear a lot of blather in the talk show circuit now about how the report is inaccurate. Well, the agency that least wanted to see this report come out and most wanted to hammer at it had 6 months with full access to all of the files and the underlying knowledge of what was done. The best they could come up with was a single correction. So I hope we can get past whether it was correct.

The other thing we should get past is this was a bunch of second-armchair thinking by people who approved the program originally and now, on reflection, want to look good. The Senate was not briefed on this program until the public found out about it. The Senate Intelligence Committee was not briefed on this program until the public found out about it. The only people who were briefed on it were the Chairs, the Chair and the Vice Chair on the House and the Senate side. They were told strictly not to talk to anybody, not to talk to staff, not to consult with lawyers, in some cases not even to talk with each other. So the idea that the Senate is now having some kind of second thoughts about this, having once approved it—part of the findings of the report are that the Senate was misled. Not only was the Senate misled, but it appears the executive branch was misled as well.

The point that I would like to conclude with is that when you have a wrong, a considerable wrong that has taken place—and I think that for an American agency to torture a human being is a very considerable wrong—it tends to affect nearby areas. You cannot contain the wrong. So congressional oversight was compromised in order to protect this program. People simply were not told. When they were told, they were given watered-down, misleading, or outright false versions.

The separation of powers has been compromised by this. A Federal executive agency has actually used its technological skills to hack into the files of a congressional investigative committee. That has to be a first in this country's history. A subject of a congressional investigation was allowed to file a criminal referral with the Department of Justice against members of the investigative committee's staff. That, I believe, is a first in the history of separation-of-powers offenses in this country.

The integrity of reporting not only through congressional oversight, but up into the executive branch, appears to have been compromised to protect this program with information that the government already knew, from legitimate, proper, professional interroga-

tion, being ascribed to the torture program. You can line up the timeline. You can see that the information was disclosed first. You can see where higher-ups in the executive branch were told that that information was due to the torture, which occurred after the information was received. That simply does not meet the test of basic logic.

The final thing is that it compromised the integrity of the way we look at our law. The Department of Justice and the Office of Legal Counsel wrote opinions designed to allow and protect this program that were so bad that they have since been withdrawn by the Department of Justice.

The Presiding Officer is a very able and experienced lawyer. Those of us who have been in the Department of Justice know well that the Office of Legal Counsel stands at the pinnacle of the Department of Justice in terms of legal talent, ability, and acumen. Many of us believe the Department of Justice stands at the pinnacle of the American legal profession. So those are the people who ordinarily are the best of the best. When they write legal opinions so shoddy that they have to be withdrawn, when they overlook and fail to even address the U.S. Circuit Court decisions that describe waterboarding as torture when they are answering the question, is waterboarding torture, that is shoddy legal work.

When I first got a look at this and came to the Senate floor to speak about it, I described it as "fire the associate" quality legal work. That is what we got from the very top of the Department of Justice. It is not because there was a lack of talent there. It is because things were bent and twisted to support this program. So it is very important that the truth just came out.

I am very glad this has happened. It is a sad day in many respects because these are hard truths. These are hard facts to have to face. But we are better off as a country if we face hard truths and hard facts.

I will close by saying this. I have traveled all over that theater looking at the way our Central Intelligence Agency operates and the way our other covert operations operate. I am extremely proud of what our intelligence services do. I am incredibly impressed by the courage and the talent of the young officers who go overseas into often very difficult and dangerous situations and do a brilliant job. In many respects, it is for them that I think this report needs to be out. It needs to be known that this was not the whole department, that there are many officers who had nothing to do with it and would want nothing to do with it and knew better. There were many people who were professionals in interrogation who knew how amateurish this was. It was done by a bunch of contractors, basically.

So I think we should be well aware, as we reflect on this, of their courage and of the sacrifice and of the ability and of the discipline of the young men and women who put themselves in harm's way to make sure that this country has the information and the intelligence it needs to succeed in the world. I am proud of them.

I am also proud of the Intelligence Committee and our staffs who worked so hard to perform this extraordinary service.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that following the vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 1081, Walter, the Senate consider Calendars Nos. 1094 and 1095; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. For the information of all Senators, these two nominations are Peter Michael McKinley to be Ambassador to the Republic of Afghanistan and Richard Rahul Verma to be Ambassador to India.

We expect that the nominations will be considered and confirmed by voice vote.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, a Bloomberg headline Monday noted: "Half of the Senators Who Voted for ObamaCare Will be Gone in 2015." ObamaCare, it seems, has not been kind to the party that jammed it through Congress.

In fact, the third ranking Democrat in the Senate admitted as much 2 weeks ago when he told an audience that Democrats made a mistake after the 2008 election by putting all their focus on passing a health care law. He further said:

Unfortunately, Democrats blew the opportunity the American people gave them. We took their mandate and put all of our focus on the wrong problem—health care reform.

Now, as a result, my colleague from New York said: "The average middle-class person thought, 'the Democrats aren't paying enough attention to me.'"

Well, Democrats weren't paying enough attention to middle-class families. The American people didn't support the health care law, and they made that clear. But Democrats just ignored their objections and forced it through anyway.

They were far from frank about what was in the bill. In fact, ObamaCare architect Jonathan Gruber essentially admitted that Democrats were deliberately deceptive when passing their health reform law. Gruber said:

This bill was written in a tortured way to make sure CBO did not score the mandate as taxes. . . . Lack of transparency is a huge political advantage. And basically, call it the 'stupidity of the American voter' or whatever, but basically that was really, really critical to getting the thing to pass.

That is from Jonathan Gruber, as I said, an architect of ObamaCare.

Well, 4½ years after the law has passed, it is clear Americans were right to be concerned. The law that was supposed to reduce the cost of health care for American families is actually driving up prices.

Each Friday my office puts out a document featuring the ObamaCare headlines of the week. I would like to read a few headlines from the past week that I think give a picture of where we are with this law.

This is from the Associated Press: "Healthcare.gov average premiums going up in 2015." From the Wall Street Journal: "More Cost of Health Care Shifts to Consumers." From Businessweek: "Obamacare's Future: Cancer Patients Paying More for Medication." From Gallup: "Cost Still a Barrier Between Americans and Medical Care." From the Fiscal Times: "High Deductible Plans Have More People Delaying Treatment." From U.S. News & World Report: "Americans Unhappy With Obamacare Shopping Experience." And from The Hill: "Security Flaws Found in Obamacare Fee Calculator."

And I could go on. Those are just headlines from last week. I could read similar headlines from the week before and from the week before that.

Any way you look at it, ObamaCare is a mess. The President promised the law would lower premiums by \$2,500. In fact, the average family health care premium has increased by \$3,064 since the law was passed, and family premiums are still going up.

The President promised Americans could keep the health care plans they had and liked. In reality, ObamaCare has forced millions of Americans off their plans.

The President promised that Americans would be able to keep the doctors they liked. In fact, Americans have lost the doctors they liked and trusted, not to mention access to convenient hospitals and needed medications.

The President promised that shopping for ObamaCare would be like shopping on Amazon or Kayak. The reality is the President's own former Health and Human Services Secretary recently admitted it was more like buying an airline ticket using your fax machine.

We are still just talking about the ways ObamaCare has harmed Americans' health care. But the damage hasn't been confined to health care. ObamaCare is also hurting our already sluggish economy.

Take the ObamaCare tax on life-saving medical devices, such as pacemakers and insulin pumps. This tax has already eliminated thousands of jobs in the medical device industry, and it is on track to eliminate thousands more if it isn't repealed. In fact, this tax is so bad that even Democrats who voted for ObamaCare support repealing the tax.

Then there is the ObamaCare 30-hour workweek rule, which has forced employers to cut workers' hours and wages, and there are the numerous—numerous—ObamaCare rules and regulations that are making it difficult for small businesses to hire and create jobs. It is no wonder that Democrats are rethinking their decisions to support this law.

Americans have made it clear they do not like ObamaCare, and Republicans are listening. One of our top priorities when we take the majority in the Senate in the new Congress will be working to repeal this law and replacing it with real reforms—reforms that will actually cut costs and improve Americans' access to health care.

In the meantime, we will focus on chiseling away at the law's most harmful provisions. We want to repeal the job-killing medical device tax and restore the 40-hour workweek so that employers will no longer be forced to cut workers' hours in order to afford health care costs. Many Democrats as well as Republicans opposed these ObamaCare provisions, so I look forward to bipartisan repeals.

The senior Senator from New York was right when he said Democrats made a mistake when they decided to focus on the President's health care law instead of on jobs and the economy. In poll after poll, Americans have made it clear they want their representatives in Washington focused on creating jobs and on growing the economy, and that is what the new Republican majority in the Senate intends to do.

We will take up legislation to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline and the 42,000-plus jobs it would support. We will take up House-passed bills that have been gathering dust on the Democratic leader's desk.

We will work with the President to expand trade promotion authority to open new markets for American agricultural products and manufactured goods, and we will take up legislation to repeal the President's national energy tax, which could eliminate tens of thousands—hundreds of thousands—of jobs and devastate entire communities.

We also intend to take up big projects that would help put our economy on a path to long-term health, such as legislation to simplify and streamline our costly and inefficient Tax Code.

The election results were pretty decisive. Americans made it very clear they were tired of the Democrats' policies and they wanted a change in Washington, and Republicans are listening. Our priorities in the next Congress will be the American people's priorities. We will focus on creating jobs and growing our economy, and we hope the Democrats will join us. The American people have been waiting long enough.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. CARPER. I object, just for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant bill clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for at least 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAXPAYERS RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I first wish to spend a few minutes talk-

ing about my colleague and chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

The last 2 years have been a real pleasure on my part, and I have grown to have a great friendship with the chairman of the committee. I can truly say in our committee we have done a lot of great work. We have both compromised on a lot of issues to try to move the country forward, and to him I am thankful for that. I don't think either of us have had to break on any principles we have had to be able to do that. I think our committee has been a model in terms of doing bipartisan bills and on bipartisan approval of nominees. For him, I would say I appreciate his leadership this past year. He has the unfortunate attribute of having the same initials I do, so it is somewhat confusing on our committee. But maybe that is why we have been as successful as we have.

I also wish to recognize the hard work of so many of the staff members on both sides, the work they put in, and the cooperative nature under which they have worked.

We have before us a bill we are trying to clear called the Taxpayers Right-to-Know Act, and it is actually a continuation of a bill that Senator CARPER, myself, and several others—including the President—started when we started the transparency act back in 2009. This follows along with the DATA Act which was passed this year.

What this bill does is says the American people ought to know where the money is being spent, and so it says the agencies are going to list the programs they have. It is done in a stepwise fashion so it doesn't put too much pressure on OMB as they try to implement it. I believe at this time we are waiting to make sure we have clearance for this before we ask for a unanimous consent.

I yield my remaining time to the chairman of the committee, Senator CARPER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I would like to say to my colleague, Ted Kennedy said to me when I first got here a number of years ago, talking about compromise and that sort of thing—he always said: I am willing to compromise on policy, not on principle.

I think if we look at what we have accomplished in the last 2 years, that is exactly what we have done. I thank my colleague for being a great leader—not just of his caucus but of our body and for being my friend.

With that, I would say on the legislation that is before us, as he suggested, the Taxpayers Right-to-Know Act does build on previous legislation reported out of our committee. Some of those bills, the DATA Act, the Government Performance and Results Moderniza-

tion Act, and some others have been signed into law with bipartisan support, including by the current President.

The Taxpayers Right-to-Know Act is a good government bill that will provide better and more detailed information to Congress and the American people about Federal spending. Congress has passed several bills in the last few years to improve transparency on government spending and to get this information online. Unfortunately, the information has not always been provided at the level of detail taxpayers and a number of my colleagues and I would prefer.

This bill builds on the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act passed in 2010 and that I coauthored with Senators WARNER and Akaka. That bill required OMB to work with agencies to create a list of all Federal programs that can be accessed on a single Web site.

Unfortunately, there has been no consistency whatsoever across the government in how agencies define the term "program." GAO has agreed that the current program list isn't giving us the kind of transparency we want because agencies took different approaches in defining their programs. The Taxpayers Right-to-Know Act addresses this problem by defining the term "program."

GAO has also noted that the current program inventory does not allow Congress and the GAO to compare similar programs, which is an obstacle to measuring government performance. Additionally, budget and cost information is not available for all programs.

This bill will ensure that agencies provide a full list of their programs along with important information about each program. For grants and other types of direct assistance, it will provide information on how many people a program serves and how many people it takes to run it.

A complete inventory of Federal programs, along with budget and financial information at the program level, will allow Congress to compare similar programs and identify overlap and duplication.

The bill has strong bipartisan support in our committee and was reported out without dissent. Seeing it to final passage would be a good win for this Congress.

I am pleased to yield back to our colleague from Oklahoma for a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 2113

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 531, S. 2113; that

the committee-reported substitute be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Madam President, I don't like this bill. The White House doesn't like the bill. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session to consider the Lodge and Walter nominations.

NOMINATION OF VIRGINIA TYLER LODGE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Lodge nomination.

Mr. REID. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question occurs on the Lodge nomination.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Virginia Tyler Lodge, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 320 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Blumenthal	Cardin
Ayotte	Booker	Carper
Baldwin	Boozman	Casey
Barrasso	Boxer	Coats
Begich	Brown	Cochran
Bennet	Cantwell	Collins

Coons	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Corker	Johnson (WI)	Rockefeller
Cornyn	Kaine	Rubio
Cruz	King	Sanders
Donnelly	Kirk	Schatz
Durbin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Enzi	Leahy	Scott
Feinstein	Lee	Sessions
Fischer	Levin	Shaheen
Flake	Manchin	Shelby
Franken	Markey	Stabenow
Gillibrand	McCain	Tester
Graham	McCaskill	Thune
Grassley	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Hagan	Merkley	Udall (NM)
Hatch	Mikulski	Vitter
Heinrich	Murkowski	Walsh
Heitkamp	Murphy	Warner
Hirono	Murray	Warren
Hoeven	Nelson	Whitehouse
Inhofe	Portman	Wicker
Isakson	Pryor	Wyden
Johanns	Reed	

NAYS—12

Blunt	Crapo	Paul
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	McConnell	Roberts
Coburn	Moran	Toomey

NOT VOTING—2

Harkin	Landrieu
--------	----------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. This vote we are about to have will be the last recorded vote of the day.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

I now ask unanimous consent that following the vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 1095, the Senate consider Calendar Nos. 800 and 801; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes following the first in the series be 10 minutes in length; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. We expect the nominations to be considered by voice vote.

NOMINATION OF RONALD ANDERSON WALTER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Walter nomination.

Mr. REID. I yield back that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Ronald Anderson Walter, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 321 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Portman
Begich	Hatch	Pryor
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Hirono	Rockefeller
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Boxer	Inhofe	Sanders
Brown	Isakson	Schatz
Cantwell	Johanns	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Coats	King	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	Markey	Walsh
Durbin	McCain	Warner
Enzi	McCaskill	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Fischer	Merkley	Wicker
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—12

Blunt	Crapo	Paul
Burr	Heller	Risch
Chambliss	McConnell	Roberts
Coburn	Moran	Toomey

NOT VOTING—2

Harkin	Landrieu
--------	----------

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF PETER MICHAEL MCKINLEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

NOMINATION OF RICHARD RAHUL VERMA TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA

NOMINATION OF TONY HAMMOND TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

NOMINATION OF Nanci E. LANGLEY TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nominations of Peter Michael McKinley, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; Richard Rahul Verma, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of India; Tony Hammond, of Missouri, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission; Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MCKINLEY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Peter Michael McKinley, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON VERMA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard Rahul Verma, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Ex-

traordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of India?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON HAMMOND NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Tony Hammond, of Missouri, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON LANGLEY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Nanci E. Langley, of Hawaii, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LODGE AND WALTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I voted to confirm Virginia Lodge and Ron Walter to be members of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I believe that these nominees are qualified and have demonstrated the characteristics that will enable them to fulfill their duties in supporting the mission of the TVA.

According to the TVA Act, the Board sets the broad strategies and goals of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Given the many changes facing our electricity system, those strategies for TVA—one of the Nation's biggest utilities—are critical. As technology changes the future of energy production and energy use, the administration is busy unleashing costly regulations that risk damaging our economy for little environmental gain.

Navigating these crosscurrents, TVA's Board must strive to keep electricity costs low through prudential and nonideological decisionmaking. They must continue the work of TVA's current management to cut costs without impacting service. Only through demanding decisions based on data and through questioning assumptions will they successfully lead TVA through today's challenges.

Also of importance is TVA's continued maintenance and eventual completion of the Bellefonte nuclear power plant. In the 1970s, TVA made plans to build a large number of nuclear reactors, but it abandoned those plans after completing several plants while others—including two units at Bellefonte—were only partially completed. TVA continues to maintain its assets at Bellefonte, where it has invested \$6 billion. I know that these nominees will examine the cost to complete Bellefonte and the baseload demand forecasts for TVA to best de-

termine when the plant should be completed.

I believe the nominees have demonstrated the ability to serve effectively and I look forward to their service on the Board and to working with them for the betterment of the region in the years to come.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. REID. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 3979.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3979) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act," with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. REID. I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. There is a cloture motion at the desk. I ask that the Chair order it reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979.

Harry Reid, Carl Levin, Brian Schatz, Martin Heinrich, John E. Walsh, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Tom Udall, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Robert Menendez, Tom Harkin, Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Schumer, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3984

Mr. REID. I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to concur in the House amendment to the

Senate amendment to H.R. 3979 with an amendment numbered 3984.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3985 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3984

Mr. REID. I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3985 to amendment No. 3984.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3986

Mr. REID. I have a motion to refer the House message with respect to H.R. 3979 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 3979 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 3986.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3987

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to the instructions which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3987 to the instructions of the motion to refer the House message on H.R. 3979.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3988 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3987

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3988 to amendment No. 3987.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "4" and insert "5".

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING SENATORS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to salute my colleagues who are departing the Senate at the end of this year with the conclusion of the 113th Congress: MARK BEGICH of Alaska, SAXBY CHAMBLISS of Georgia, TOM COBURN of Oklahoma, KAY HAGAN of North Carolina, TOM HARKIN of Iowa, MIKE JOHANNIS of Nebraska, TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota, MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana, CARL LEVIN of Michigan, MARK PRYOR of Arkansas, JAY ROCKEFELLER of West Virginia, MARK UDALL of Colorado, and JOHN WALSH of Montana.

They have all worked hard, ceaselessly giving their energy and considerable time and service to their constituents, to their home States and to our country. I want to thank them for their service and for their kindness to me over many, many years in so many cases. In particular, I want to say a few words about these colleagues.

MARK BEGICH

MARK BEGICH and I worked together to address the challenges facing the fishing industry, which is vital to both of our States. He has continually fought to address the unique challenges facing Alaskans, particularly with respect to access to VA health care. I salute him and wish him the best.

SAXBY CHAMBLISS

I have served with SAXBY CHAMBLISS on the Armed Services Committee and joined him in his efforts to support the National Infantry Museum and Soldier Center. Saxby has been a strong supporter of our men and women in uniform. He has also been a leader on homeland security and intelligence matters. I wish him well.

TOM COBURN

TOM COBURN has always been passionate on the issues he cares about. We have engaged in vigorous debate, demonstrating, I hope, that principled disagreement can lead ultimately to principled progress. My thoughts are with him, particularly as he battles health issues, his cancer. I hope and wish him success and much happiness as he moves forward.

KAY HAGAN

I have served with KAY HAGAN on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee and on the Armed Services Committee. We have worked together on a number of initiatives, including

efforts to keep student loan interest rates low. We traveled together to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan in 2010. She has been a tremendous advocate, especially for our military families and for small businesses.

TOM HARKIN

TOM HARKIN has been a great friend, a longtime advocate for students, for workers, for individuals with disabilities. As Chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, he has worked to end the logjam and pass reauthorizations of our childcare programs and the workforce investment system, and he recently worked with me to pass a bipartisan bill I helped author to ensure consumers have access to the safest, most effective sunscreens available.

He has been a steadfast advocate for increasing our investment in medical research at the NIH. An extraordinary Senator, we have so much to thank him for on behalf of every American. His legacy is going to be so profound. It is hard to pick one. But his efforts, along with Arlen Specter's, to double NIH funding was a landmark in terms of not only successful investment in programs that matter to Americans and the world but bipartisan efforts to lead the country forward.

MIKE JOHANNIS

I have been proud to work with MIKE JOHANNIS, an extraordinary Senator and an extraordinary gentleman, on a number of issues. We were particularly happy—both of us—when the HAVEN Act was incorporated into the pending version of the National Defense Authorization Act. This legislation will allow disabled and low-income veterans the ability to finance improvements to their homes so they are safer and more accessible. We also worked together on healthy housing efforts and to reduce lead hazards. This is consistent with so many things he has done, particularly with respect to veterans. Again, I wish him the best as he goes forward.

TIM JOHNSON

TIM JOHNSON and I served in the House of Representatives together. We came to the Senate together in 1997. As chairman of the banking committee, he has been an extraordinary leader. He has dedicated himself particularly to community banks and to rural housing, which is consistent with the interests of his constituents in South Dakota.

He has worked to build bipartisan compromise on issues like TRIA and FHA reform, among so many other matters. As the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies he has been a tireless advocate for our military personnel. I thank him.

MARY LANDRIEU

MARY LANDRIEU and I also came to the Senate together in 1997. We served

together on the Appropriations Committee, where she has been an extraordinary advocate for Louisiana, particularly after Hurricane Katrina. In fact, her efforts have been so profoundly influential in her home State, she is one that we all look to as a model for what it is to be an advocate for your constituents. She has done it so well.

MARK PRYOR

MARK PRYOR and I have worked together on the Appropriations Committee. We have worked together on a number of initiatives. I want to thank him particularly for his role in trying to help states like Rhode Island be included in the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. I thank MARK for that. I offer him my fondest wishes.

JAY ROCKEFELLER

Today, we are recognizing the work of JAY ROCKEFELLER as chairman of the Intelligence Committee, along with Senator FEINSTEIN. But he has been such a stalwart in so many different areas: as chairman of the commerce committee, someone who has championed the Children's Health Insurance Program, someone who has been in the lead with respect to advocacy for the E-Rate, which helps bring broadband connectivity to all of our libraries and schools, to EPSCoR. I can go on and on for a remarkable career by a remarkable individual, a real gentleman, someone whom I am proud to call a friend and am deeply indebted to his friendship.

MARK UDALL

MARK UDALL and I served together on the Armed Services Committee. I am grateful to have traveled with him also to Afghanistan and Pakistan in 2011. Again, he is committed to our troops, committed to our national security, committed to his home State. He has been an advocate for clean energy, for natural resources, for things that will be a legacy for generations to come in Colorado and throughout the United States.

JOHN WALSH

JOHN WALSH is a friend that I met and served with over the last several years. I want to salute him, not only as a Senator but as a combat veteran. He has had the greatest privilege that I believe any American has—the privilege to lead American soldiers. He did it well. I thank him for that.

CARL LEVIN

But let me say, especially, a few words about my dear, dear friend CARL LEVIN. For 18 years, CARL LEVIN has either been chairman or ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. The U.S. military, the most powerful and professional force in the world, has in countless ways been shaped because CARL LEVIN repeatedly helped form a new common ground to move us forward as a Nation for the benefit of our men and women in uniform and for the benefit of us all.

CARL and I have traveled many times together—Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Israel, Syria, Colombia. We were there to visit with commanders and local leaders, but especially to see our troops and to thank them. In the faces of those troops I saw the trust and respect they felt—some to their own surprise—when they met the chairman—the powerful chairman of the Armed Services Committee. He was there. He had traveled across the globe to listen to them, to work for them, and to thank them.

It was profoundly moving to me to see this—inspiring indeed. As the chairman of one of the other major committees, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, he has pursued the powerful on behalf of the powerless, on behalf of the people. He has not only uncovered abuse, but he has sent a powerful message to an increasingly discouraged America that there is someone who will fight for them, who understands that everyone deserves a fair chance at a better future.

CARL LEVIN has been a friend, a role model. I will miss working with him.

Along with all of my other colleagues who are leaving us at the conclusion of the 113th Congress, let me thank them for their service, their dedication to improving the lives of Americans, and on a very personal level for their friendship. I wish them all well.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Let me conclude on a slightly different topic; that is, to commend Senator ROCKEFELLER again and Senator FEINSTEIN for their extraordinary leadership today in bringing forward to the American public the Intelligence Committee report on the CIA's interrogation program.

But I particularly want to commend and thank Senator MCCAIN. For many years, Senator MCCAIN has spoken out, and many times alone, against the despicable and heinous actions that have been illustrated today. He has led our efforts. No one has led them more vigorously and more intensely and more successfully than JOHN MCCAIN—to prohibit the use of torture and abusive methods by the United States of America, to remind us that our highest ideals require us to do something else—something better—and also to remind us that what is at stake—very much at stake—are the lives and the health of our soldiers.

We cannot expect others to follow the law if we do not. We cannot expect our forces to be treated according to the conventions and laws that govern civilized society if we depart from them. That is a powerful message. It is no surprise coming from someone whose personal experience, whose personal courage lends incredible credibility, incredible support to these efforts.

To these three colleagues, I extend my thanks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TAX EXTENDERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this week it seems that the Senate is finally ready to take up and pass a tax extenders bill. Congress' procrastination on tax extenders has been causing a lot of headaches and indigestion to many of my constituents back home in Iowa.

Small business owners and farmers want to know whether the enhanced expensing rules under section 179 will be extended so that they can invest in new machinery. Retirees want to know whether they can make a charitable donation from their IRA to meet their required minimum distribution. The renewable energy sector wants to know what investments they should make to increase production.

The Senate could have made strides towards answering these questions just this past spring. The Finance Committee acted in a bipartisan fashion to report an extenders package to the floor that would have extended all expiring provisions for 2 years. By all accounts, this package could have been passed by the Senate with broad support on both sides of the aisle.

Unfortunately, movement of this package in the Senate stalled in May due to procedural maneuvering on the Senate floor. That maneuvering was meant to prevent votes on all amendments—even those with broad, bipartisan support. With the Senate failing to take action, the hopes of getting the extenders done in a timely fashion faded last spring.

However, there were high hopes that a bipartisan deal could be worked out with the House that could provide individuals and businesses much-needed tax certainty. Before Thanksgiving, House and Senate negotiators were making real headway towards a bipartisan agreement that would have extended most provisions for 2 years and made several provisions permanent. The President then thwarted negotiations by threatening to veto that package before it was even finalized.

Why the President would threaten to veto a package that, by all accounts, recognized bipartisan priorities as well as priorities of the administration is beyond me. The President's stated complaint is that the deal was geared too heavily toward business. From an administration that has regularly been advocating business-only tax reform, this complaint rings hollow.

However, all of the business provisions that would have been made permanent under the proposed deal have had strong support from both sides of the aisle here in the Senate as well as from the White House. For instance, the President's fiscal package that was

in the 2015 budget calls for both the research and development tax credit and the enhanced expensing rules under Section 179 to be made permanent.

The bipartisan deal would have accomplished this. The proposed deal also included priorities specific to President Obama and many of my Democratic colleagues. For instance, the American opportunity tax credit enacted as part of the President's 2009 stimulus bill would have been made permanent. The President's other named priorities were the enhanced refundable child tax credit and the earned-income tax credit. But it was the President's own actions on immigration—using presidential edict—that made their inclusion a very tough sell. Many on my side of the aisle have long had concerns about fraud and abuse in both of these credits. The President's Executive action only served to enhance these concerns and added fuel to the fire by eroding established policy that prohibits undocumented immigrants from receiving their earned-income credit.

The President may have a phone and a pen. He says he has it, and it seems as if he is always using it. But the last time I checked, Congress is still a co-equal branch of government under the Constitution. When the President acts unilaterally, it should not surprise him when Congress responds.

So it is true that the deal did not include everything the President wanted, but it didn't include everything Republicans wanted either. Nobody ever gets everything they want in bipartisan negotiations. The point of negotiating is to get something the majority of us can support.

By cutting off negotiations, the White House has left us with voting on something that is barely better than nothing for individuals and industries. This includes industries the President claims to be a priority of his, such as the renewable energy sector, which is very much a high priority for me.

Forward policy guidance is critically important to the renewable energy sector. The proposed deal would have provided certainty to wind energy through a multiyear phaseout that would have provided a glidepath to self-sustainability. Other renewable provisions would have been extended for 2 years. Instead, Congress is now faced with settling for a 1-year retroactive extension that fails to provide any meaningful incentive for the further development of renewable energy.

It also fails to provide certainty to other businesses and to individuals as well. These are provisions that will once again expire almost as soon as they go into law. I think we all agree that making tax law 1 year at a time in retroactive fashion is not the way to do business. Yet that is the reality we currently face because of this administration's refusal to compromise.

While I would prefer longer extensions of these provisions, that is not

longer a viable option as we close down this Congress. As a result, I intend to support the House package. My only hope is that in the new Congress we can make strides toward putting some certainty back into the Tax Code.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

WOMEN OWNED SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING

Ms. CANTWELL. I rise today to speak about an important piece of legislation that will be before the Senate shortly that will help women entrepreneurs across the country break through the glass ceiling.

Earlier this year, as chairwoman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I released a report entitled "21st Century Barriers to Women's Entrepreneurship." These barriers, according to our report, show that women entrepreneurs were not getting a fair shot at access to capital, not getting a fair shot at competing for Federal contracts, and needed more programs tailored specifically to their needs and certainly needed more access to capital and at smaller amounts of money.

This chart shows the various things that were relevant from that report: equal access to Federal contracts, access to capital, and relevant business training.

We heard an earful from women entrepreneurs all across America, and it spurred us to take action and make major changes.

That is why we introduced legislation called the Women's Small Business Ownership Act of 2014, and this legislation did three things: It said, let's focus on sole-source contracting authority for women-owned businesses when they are working with the Federal Government, let's improve the counseling to women, and let's make sure women get the access to capital that they deserve.

Additionally, the issue of sole-source contracting was taken up by two of my colleagues, Senator SHAHEEN and Senator GILLIBRAND. I should say that my predecessor on the committee, Senator LANDRIEU, had worked on this issue of access to capital for women for a long time, and we certainly applaud all she did as chairwoman of the Small Business Committee.

The sole-source contracting provision is in the Defense bill we are going to be taking up shortly.

I thank all of my colleagues—as I said, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator LANDRIEU—and also the SBA Administrator, Maria Contreras-Sweet, for their support in getting more federal contracts to women-owned businesses.

There are more than 8 million women-owned businesses in the United States, but they only get a tiny percent—about 4 percent—of Federal contracts. We want to make sure this is

changed. I think we have a second chart that describes this problem.

We have a Federal goal of making sure that small businesses get access to contracts at each Federal agency so that we are doing all we can to grow small businesses in America. If you think about it, many small businesses have the technological expertise to do the work. What they often don't have is the manpower to wade through the lengthy and complicated federal contracting process. So sole-source contracting allows the Federal Government to streamline the procurement process when selecting a company. So we want to make sure this is changed, and the FY 15 NDAA legislation will do just that.

Twenty years ago, Congress established the goal of awarding 5 percent of all Federal contracts to women-owned small businesses, but we did not make sure there was fair representation in the marketplace to achieve this goal. Last year, the Department of Defense accounted for 68 percent of Federal procurement opportunities; yet the Department of Defense only issued 3.6 percent of those contracts to women-owned small businesses. In my State, the State of Washington, women received only 1.67 percent of Federal contracts. We heard from women across America, when they came to testify before the Small Business Committee this summer, exactly how challenging this process is.

I want to point out a last chart, which shows that 28 percent of businesses in the United States are women-owned, and we certainly want to increase that. Part of our challenge economically is to make sure various groups are getting access to adequate capital, getting opportunities to compete for federal contracts, and getting the counseling and training they need, so they can participate in the economy as small business owners. But we can see on this chart that the percentage of federal contracts to women-owned businesses is minuscule. We want to make sure we are doing everything we can to help these women.

Trena Payton, a business owner and veteran from my home state of Washington, is one of these voices fighting for this provision to be made into law. Trena testified at a Small Business Committee hearing on Veterans' Entrepreneurship. In 2003, Trena decided to open her own business. It took her more than a year to land her first contract. She said at the hearing:

As the head of a women-owned small business, I can tell you that access to the federal marketplace is a huge issue.

Today, Trena's company, ABN Technologies, has grown to employ twelve people and last year generated revenues of 8.1 million dollars. On sole-source contracting, Trena said, this change "would help millions of women break through barriers to accessing federal contracts."

I also want to talk about Charlotte Baker, who owns Digital Hands in Tampa, FL. Charlotte's company provides cyber security services and IT business to the government. Her company is developing new, innovative solutions to deter cyber threats. That is a service we need, but she may never win a contract through the regular process.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that is coming over from the House and give women the tools they need to be successful.

I would like to thank the many organizations, small business advocates, and staff who have worked to get the women's sole-source provision enacted into law: Women Impacting Public Policy—especially Ann Sullivan, Barbara Kasoff, John Stanford, and Martin Feeney; the National Women's Business Council; the Women's Business Enterprise National Council; the Women President's Organization; the National Association of Women Business Owners; the National Women Business Owners Corporation; the U.S. Black Chambers; the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; the Association for Enterprise Opportunity; the Business and Professional Women's Foundation; Enterprising Women; the Path Forward Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship; the REDC Center for Women's Enterprise; the Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council; Women in Trucking; the Women's Business Development Council; the Women's Exchange; and the Association of Women's Business Centers. From staff, I'd like to thank Jonathan Hale, Alison Mueller, Nick Sutter, Ami Sanchez, Carl Seip, Jane Campbell, Kevin Wheeler and LeAnn Delaney.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO CARL LEVIN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to offer a few words of tribute to my departing colleague, Senator CARL LEVIN—a model of serious purpose, firm principle, and personal decency, and whose example ought to inspire the service of new and returning Senators. We could not aspire to better service than what he has given our country.

CARL and I have served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee for the better part of three decades. He is my senior in this body by 8 years and has been my chairman for more than 10 years in total. It has been a privilege to serve under his very able, honorable, and fair leadership.

CARL and I sit on opposite sides of the aisle. The difference is quite obvious on any number of issues, but I hope it is also obvious how much I admire and respect my friend from Michigan.

We have had our moments on the committee. Debate there can get a little passionate from time to time, perhaps a little more passionate on my part than CARL's, but that, as all my colleagues would surely attest, is my problem, not CARL's. We are, however, both proud of the committee's tradition of bipartisan cooperation which CARL has worked diligently to preserve and strengthen. We both know how important that tradition is to faithfully discharging our responsibilities to help maintain the defense of this country and do right by the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces. We both feel their example of selfless sacrifice would shame us if we let the committee descend into the partisan posturing that often makes it hard to get important work done in Congress.

When Members disagree in committee—often heatedly—it is because we feel passionately about whatever issue is in dispute. Even then we try to behave civilly and respectfully to each other, and we do not let our disagreements prevent us from completing the committee's business. CARL won't let us. That we have managed to keep that reputation in these contentious times is a tribute to CARL LEVIN. He has kept the committee focused on its duties and not on the next election or the latest rush-to-the-barricades partisan quarrel. He does so in a calm, measured, patient, and thoughtful manner. He seems, in fact, to be calmer and more patient the more heated our disagreements are. As members' emotions and temperatures rise, CARL's unperturbed composure and focus bring our attention back to the business at hand. You could safely say he and I have slightly different leadership styles. I am gentler and less confrontational. But CARL's style seems to work for him. It works well for the committee too, for the armed services, and for the country.

The committee has a heavy workload every year, and CARL manages to keep us all in harness and working together at a good pace and with a constructive, results-oriented approach that is the envy of the dozen or so lesser committees of the Senate. Our principal responsibility is to produce the Defense authorization bill—one of the most important and comprehensive pieces of legislation the Senate considers on an annual basis. The committee has never failed to report the bill, and the Senate has never failed to pass it. That is not an accomplishment that some of the lesser committees I just referred to can claim every year, and no one deserves more of the credit than CARL LEVIN.

When CARL LEVIN first joined the committee, he explained his reason for seeking the assignment this way:

I had never served, and I thought there was a big gap in terms of my background and, frankly, felt it was a way of providing service.

He might never have served in the military, but he has surely served the military well, and he has served the national interests our Armed Forces protect in an exemplary manner that the rest of us would be wise to emulate.

More recently, I have had the honor and privilege of serving alongside CARL on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. His tireless efforts and steadfast dedication to exposing misconduct and abuse by financial institutions and government regulators have set a new standard for thoughtful and thorough congressional investigations.

Whether the topic was the 2008 financial crisis, Swiss banking secrecy, or JPMorgan's "London Whale" debacle, professionals in the industry and the public at large knew they could count on CARL LEVIN to get to the bottom of it with authoritative reports and hearings. CARL's tenacity in uncovering wrongdoing sparked significant changes in the financial sector.

I also commend CARL LEVIN on zealously and effectively pursuing his investigations in a way that has furthered the subcommittee's longstanding tradition of bipartisanship. While CARL LEVIN and I may have had our disagreements, we never let them get in the way of finding common ground where we could.

While CARL's retirement may come as a relief to some of those on Wall Street, his patience, thoughtfulness, and commitment to bipartisanship will be deeply missed on the subcommittee and in the Senate.

Indeed, from CARL LEVIN's long and distinguished service in the Senate, Carl has obtained the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We all listen to him, and we listen closest to him on the occasions when we disagree with him. That, in my view, is a great compliment from one Senator to another. It is a tribute paid to only the most respected Members.

Of course, the greatest compliment one Senator can pay another is to credit him or her as a person who keeps his or her word. That has become too rare in Washington but not so in my experiences with CARL LEVIN. He has never broken his word to me. He has never backed out of a deal, even when doing so would have been personally and politically advantageous. When we are in agreement on an issue, CARL usually argues more effectively than I can, and when we disagree, we usually find a way to settle our dispute without abandoning our responsibilities. CARL LEVIN deserves most of the credit for that too.

One of the great satisfactions in life is to fight for a common cause with someone you haven't always agreed with, someone whose background, views, and personality are different from yours. Yet you discover that despite your differences, you have always been on the same side on the big things.

Thank you, CARL, for the privilege and for your friendship and example. The committee is going to miss you, the Senate is going to miss you, the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces are going to miss you, and I will miss you a lot.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOIA IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with Senator LEAHY of Vermont, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, regarding S. 2520, the FOIA Improvement Act of 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank Senator LEAHY for attempting to address my concerns about this bill. I thank his committee staff for working with my committee staff to insert clarifying report language.

Mr. LEAHY. I would like to acknowledge the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation for highlighting important concerns of the agencies his committee works with closely. This legislation seeks to further the goal of government transparency; but we also understand the need for government agencies to dutifully and carefully fulfill their responsibilities.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. From the beginning, I have recognized that this bill would make important changes to the Freedom of Information Act. My concerns have been rooted in the possible unintended consequences this bill would have on consumer protection. I was concerned this bill would make it harder for our consumer protection agencies to bring enforcement actions against corporate wrongdoers.

Specifically, I am concerned that requiring government law enforcement agencies to show foreseeable harm that is not "speculative or abstract" when invoking FOIA exemptions for attorney-client, work-product, and deliberative process privileges will undermine law enforcement efforts.

Hundreds of years of American legal tradition has generally protected work-

product documents and attorney-client communications from the discovery process in civil litigation. Further, the deliberative process privilege has allowed government agencies' law enforcers to freely exchange ideas and legal strategies as part of their internal decision making process.

I am concerned that the bill could have a "chilling effect" on internal communications and deliberations of agencies' law enforcement personnel who are preparing law enforcement actions against alleged wrongdoers, in order to avoid the prospect of increased litigation.

We do not want to hinder the robust, internal exchange of rigorous ideas and legal strategies within government agencies when they are bringing enforcement actions.

Given this, courts should review agency law enforcement decisions on the new foreseeable harm standard under an "abuse of discretion" standard.

Mr. LEAHY. At Senator ROCKEFELLER's request we have included language in the committee report on the abuse of discretion standard and its application to make clear that it is the intent of Congress that judicial review of agency decisions to withhold information relating to current law enforcement actions under the foreseeable harm standard be subject to an abuse of discretion standard.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Furthermore, if we are going to potentially burden our government agencies with increased costs that will be associated with complying with the bill, then I think Congress should also provide these agencies with sufficient funding to deal with what is sure to be an increased workload.

While I still have concerns about this bill's effect on consumer protection, I think the accommodation made by Senator LEAHY will help. I thank him for inserting clarifying language in the report with regard to this congressional intent on review of information withheld under the foreseeable harm standard.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask consent to engage in a colloquy with Senator LEAHY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, regarding important aspects of S. 2520, the FOIA Improvement Act of 2014.

While I support the ultimate goal of this legislation, which seeks to increase government transparency, as the chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, I am also mindful of the need for government agencies to dutifully and carefully fulfill their oversight responsibilities of our Nation's financial institutions and the health and welfare of our financial systems at large. Financial regulatory agencies are tasked with ensuring the safety and soundness of the financial system,

compliance with Federal consumer financial law, and promoting fair, orderly, and efficient financial markets. A critical component of effective oversight is the ability of a financial regulator to have unfettered access to information from a regulated institution. A financial institution should not have to fear that its regulator will be unable to protect the institution's confidential information from disclosure. Since the passage of the Freedom of Information Act, Congress has recognized the importance of protecting this type of supervisory information as evidenced specifically in 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(8), commonly referred to as Exemption 8, and more generally in other exemptions. It is my understanding that nothing in S. 2520 is intended to limit the scope of the protections under Exemption 8, or other exemptions relevant to financial regulators; nor is the bill intended to require release of confidential information about individuals or information that a financial institution may have, the release of which could compromise the stability of the financial institution or the financial system, or undermine the consumer protection work by the regulators. Given that the release of confidential or sensitive information relating to oversight of regulated entities could cause harm to such entities, individuals, or the financial system, a financial regulatory agency could reasonably foresee that disclosure of such information requested under FOIA may harm an interest protected by Exemption 8. This is precisely why Congress continues to provide these statutory exemptions.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank Senator JOHNSON for his remarks and for his interest and support for this legislation. I agree that it is important to ensure that our financial regulators are able to do the work required to maintain the safety and soundness of our financial institutions. I also agree that the free flow of information between regulators and financial institutions is important to this process. Exemption 8 was intended by Congress, and has been interpreted by the courts, to be very broadly construed to ensure the security of financial institutions and to safeguard the relationship between financial institutions and their supervising agencies. The proposed amendments to the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, are not intended to undermine the broad protection in Exemption 8 or to undermine the integrity of the supervisory examination process. Moreover, much of the information that the government is permitted to withhold under Exemption 8, is also protected under Exemption 4, which exempts from disclosure commercial and financial information that is privileged or confidential. Exemption 4 covers information prohibited from disclosure under the Trade Secrets Act and similar laws, and as such does not provide for discretionary

disclosure under FOIA. As with other exemptions that are based on separate legal restrictions, it is understood that the foreseeable harm standard will not apply to most of the information falling under Exemption 4. I will address these concerns, and I appreciate all the time and attention the Senator from South Dakota has given to this important legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his work on this important matter and for working with me to clarify the scope of this bill. I hope the Senator from Vermont continues to work on these issues with the agencies to ensure that this new standard will not serve to undermine the broad protections currently afforded to confidential supervisory information and in turn undermine the cooperative relationship between regulators and their supervised institutions.

TRIBUTE TO MARK PRYOR

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today we honor the dedicated public service of my dear friend and colleague, Senator MARK PRYOR from Arkansas.

For MARK PRYOR, public service is a calling—one that goes to the roots of who he is. MARK PRYOR is the fifth generation in his family to serve in public office.

Beholden to no party, no special interests, Senator PRYOR's singular objective in Washington has been to make lives better for the people of the State his family calls home. The sign on his desk says "Arkansas comes first." It was his father's campaign slogan a generation ago, and that's the priority that guided MARK PRYOR from the day he arrived in the Senate.

When Senator PRYOR learned that a widow in Greenwood, AR, was being deprived death benefits because her husband died at home, instead of in combat, Senator PRYOR crafted an amendment to change that Pentagon rule, restoring the full death benefit for the widow—and fixing it permanently so it would be available to other surviving spouses.

A deeply patriotic man, with a profound respect for those who serve, Senator PRYOR is the author of the HIRE At Home Act, which encourages companies to consider military experience for servicemembers reentering the workforce.

But he has also fought to bring down the costs of Arkansans' prescriptions and to protect the social safety net. When FEMA demanded back pay for Federal disaster aid it provided to Arkansas, Senator PRYOR made sure the rule got changed.

And I was honored this past year to partner with Senator PRYOR on the Bring Jobs Home Act, to prevent companies from being rewarded for ship-

ping jobs overseas and giving them an incentive to bring those jobs that have left our borders back home again.

Of course, Senator PRYOR served as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies. So as author of the 2014 Farm Bill, I relied on Senator PRYOR as a partner. He introduced the Forest Products Fairness Act, which helps timber farmers in Arkansas and across the Nation qualify for USDA's BioPreferred Program.

During an age of partisan strife, Senator PRYOR has provided sanctuary for those who seek compromise. I share the sentiment he expressed in his farewell address—it is imperative that we come to work not wearing jerseys of red or blue but ones that have red, white and blue.

It saddens me that my dear friend, Senator PRYOR, cannot join us in this enterprise, because he has truly been a voice of civility and reason. But I have no doubt he will find new ways to serve the country and the State that he loves.

I wish him Godspeed in his future efforts.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would like to personally commend Senator FEINSTEIN for releasing this report today. We have all heard the Justice Louis Brandeis quote that "sunlight is the best disinfectant" but occasionally we need a real world reminder. Today, Senator FEINSTEIN and the members and staff of the Intelligence Committee have provided that. The findings of this report are truly remarkable, laying bare that the CIA interrogation program was simultaneously far more brutal and far less effective than previously claimed.

This 600-page report is long overdue and makes clear that the CIA's so-called "enhanced interrogation techniques" failed to produce any otherwise unavailable intelligence that saved lives. At no time were these coercive interrogation techniques effective.

But more critically, this report makes clear to all Americans that what took place was not in keeping with our ideals as a nation. We have no greater duty than to protect the American people and our national security. But the single best way to do that is—and always has been—to do that in a manner consistent with our laws and our traditions. Horrific and torturous practices are explicitly prohibited and are never necessary. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator UDALL and other members of the committee for the months and years they have committed to making this release a reality.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the release of the de-

classified Senate Select Intelligence Committee report on the CIA's past rendition, detention and interrogation practices.

As a longtime member of the committee, I strongly support today's release of the declassified Executive Summary, Findings, Conclusions and Additional and Minority Views of the committee's report. With the release of this report, the American people finally have the information they need to understand the CIA's interrogation practices that spanned 2001 through 2009, when President Obama put an end to the Bush-era program.

The CIA's practices went against our values as Americans and damaged America's global reputation. The committee's report shows not only that torture did not extract the "otherwise unavailable" intelligence that some CIA officials claimed, it did not work as a policy or in practice.

I have consistently opposed the repugnance, legality and efficacy of torture. I supported FBI Director Robert Mueller's directive saying FBI agents may not participate in torture. I have repeatedly and publicly expressed my frustration about being lied to and manipulated by some CIA officials over many years. As I said during the Intelligence Committee's hearing confirming John Brennan as CIA Director, "I'm going to be blunt and this will be no surprise to you, sir—but I've been on this Committee for more than 10 years, and with the exception of Mr. Panetta, I feel I've been jerked around by every CIA Director."

My views against torture have been consistent with those of Senator JOHN MCCAIN, whose stance against torture is particularly compelling given his own experiences as a prisoner of war. I have also supported the use of interrogation techniques as laid out in the Army Field Manual and have decried the use of contractors by the CIA in the torture of detainees.

Some people have raised concerns about the timing of the release of this report and that our enemies could use it as a pretext for violence. Long before the release of this report, however, terrorist groups made their violent intentions towards America clear. They hate America and our freedoms. They use violence for the sake of violence. No public action is without risks, whether by President or Congress, but we also risk who we are as Americans by suppressing the facts in this report.

I would like to reiterate that this report was reviewed and redacted in conjunction with the CIA and White House, and the Director of National Intelligence approved its declassification. It was a difficult process that took over a year, but we finally got to a place where the narrative of the report was adequately preserved while ensuring that CIA personnel and operations were not compromised. The DNI

weighed the risks and ultimately certified the declassification of the report.

To be clear, my support for this report in no way diminishes my respect for the men and women of the CIA, who are faithfully and legally doing their duties. The CIA's intelligence professionals put their lives at risk for our country. They deserve our support and respect.

I would like to thank Select Committee on Intelligence Chairman DIANNE FEINSTEIN for her leadership, as well as my committee colleagues from both sides of the aisle who supported this investigation. Throughout the frustrating and sometimes contentious process of producing this report, we never gave up on pursuing the truth. Thanks also to the committee staff who worked tirelessly on this report at great sacrifice to themselves and their families.

This report sheds light on a complicated episode in America's history, but it is also a testament to the value of never giving up on the search for truth and accountability. I hope that future generations will read it, study it, learn from it and make sure that torture is never again used by the U.S. government.

TRIBUTE TO CLEMENCIA SPIZZIRRI

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take this time to honor an extraordinary Iowa teacher who has had a positive impact on a great many students. Ms. Clemencia Spizzirri was recently announced as the 2015 Iowa Teacher of the Year. This award honors the great work she has done as a foreign language teacher at Merrill Middle School in Des Moines, IA.

Ms. Spizzirri has been teaching Spanish to eager young minds at Merrill Middle School for 5 years. Despite her relatively short time there, her profound impact is evident. The high praise she receives from her students, colleagues, and community members are a testament to the work ethic and passion she displays in her classroom every schoolday.

As an immigrant herself, Ms. Spizzirri embodies the importance of a broad-based education that helps students understand the world beyond their own country. Born in Quito, Ecuador's capital city, Ms. Clemencia was the youngest of seven children. She learned quickly that success was nearly impossible without a quality education. This drove her to become a teacher. She witnessed firsthand the struggles that accompany poverty and knew she could make a difference through teaching. She started her career teaching English in Quito. When the conditions in her country began to worsen, she obtained a visa and moved to the United States. After immigrating to this country, Ms. Spizzirri

received a bachelor's degree in New York. She then moved to Des Moines, IA, where she received her master's degree from Drake University.

Ms. Spizzirri attributes her passion for educating young minds to unfortunate circumstances she has witnessed in her own life. This passion ensures a quality education for all her students and contributes well-rounded citizens to the community. Great teachers are an invaluable resource to all of our communities and Ms. Spizzirri deserves nothing but praise for her tremendous work. I thank Ms. Spizzirri for her service to the people of her community and wish her nothing but the best in her future school years and beyond.

REMEMBERING MARK HESSE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to remember an upstanding Coloradan and accomplished mountaineer who passed away unexpectedly this year while doing what he was so passionate about: climbing. Mark Hesse was a man of exceptional character, exhibited a strong sense of adventure, and was a devoted admirer of nature; all of which are qualities of a true conservationist. He was an inspiration to many of us in the great State of Colorado.

Mark grew up in Colorado Springs, CO, where he became an Eagle Scout. Upon graduating from the University of Colorado at Boulder with a master's degree in special education and teaching, Mark took to traveling abroad in pursuit of climbing peaks around the world. In 1976, he became the first person to climb the completely vertical southeast face of Mount Asgard on Baffin Island. In 1986, he made the first ascent up the northeast buttress of Kangtega in Nepal, a prominent Himalayan peak with a summit of over 20,000 feet. These ascents, among countless others, inspired him to advocate for conservation and accomplish so much for Colorado's environment.

He is survived by Julie Asmuth, his wife of 30 years, his two daughters Hartley and Laurel, his mother Florence, brothers Jon, Paul, Phil, and sisters Anne Ness and Maria Hesse Vasey.

Mark was a loyal and devoted husband and father. He had a warm personality and a great sense of humor. He also had an amazing knack for turning ordinary outings into epic adventures, and thus was well known for adventure stories that seemed almost too absurd to be true. These qualities enabled him to inspire and educate his children and their peers, as well as the friends and colleagues he had through climbing and service projects he was part of. Mark was devoted to taking his family on trips to some of the most remote places possible, including the rainforests in South America and the ocean reefs of South East Asia. He believed in supporting ecotourism and

educating himself and his family about different cultures and natural wonders of the world before they disappeared.

Mark loved the environment, believed in a higher standard for managing public spaces, and was committed to preserving the natural beauty of our great Nation. He received several distinguished awards for his work, such as the American Alpine Club's David Brower Award for Mountain Conservation in 1995, the Bob Marshall Champion of Wilderness Award presented by the U.S. Forest Service in 2005 and 2007, and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management's Making a Difference National Volunteer Award for outstanding service on public lands in 2014. He was the co-founder and executive director of the Santa Fe Mountain Center from 1977 to 1980, the program director of the Southwest Outward Bound School, and co-founder of the Colorado Fourteeners Initiative Program. He worked with the Bureau of Land Management to preserve two popular climbing destinations: Shelf Road and Penitente Canyon. Perhaps most notably, Mark founded the Rocky Mountain Field Institute in 1982, which has engaged more than 16,000 volunteers to contribute 200,000 hours to public land stewardship projects. These efforts amounted to more than \$4 million in on-the-ground restoration efforts.

One of Mark's final projects, and a dream he had been nurturing for many years, was to create a hot-shot trail crew with high-end rock working skills that could build climbing access trails in the steep, rocky, and unstable terrain where climbers travel. At the time of his passing, Mark was collaborating with the Boulder Climbing Community and the Access Fund, two non-profits based in Boulder, to develop the Front Range Climbing Stewards trail crew. The project moved forward, inspired by Mark's lifetime of work, and in 2014 the trail crew performed more than \$120,000 worth of work, in both Eldorado Canyon and the Flatirons, including the spectacular rebuild of the iconic Royal Arch Trail that was destroyed in the flood of 2013.

Colorado lost an irreplaceable individual with the passing of Mark Hesse. I, along with many others, have lost a respected leader, visionary, and friend. Let his life be a reminder of what every American is capable of accomplishing.

I ask that my colleagues join me in remembering Mark Hesse for his passion for the outdoors, his vast wealth of experiences, and his leadership in showing us how to be good stewards of our public lands.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES NIX

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor Charles Nix, who will retire as

the Poinsett County judge after three terms of honorable service to the citizens of Arkansas in this elected position.

As Poinsett County judge, Charles faced and overcame several disasters including the 2011 flood and multiple tornadoes. Charles played a pivotal role in leading the county through the storms, repairing the damages and restoring the livelihood of the citizens.

Beyond his county judge duties, Charles served as a member of the County Judges Association of Arkansas, Crowley's Ridge Development Council Board, Eastern Arkansas Planning and Development Council Board, and Northwest Arkansas Workforce Investment. He also presided as president of the Harrisburg Area Chamber of Commerce and served in the Army National Guard for 6 years.

Charles Nix has displayed honor, perseverance, and an eagerness to serve his community that we can all admire. I am truly grateful for his years of dedicated service and commitment to Poinsett County and the State of Arkansas.●

RECOGNIZING ST. PATRICK SCHOOL

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to applaud St. Patrick School of Chesterton, IN for being recognized as a 2014 National Blue Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education.

Established in 1982, the National Blue Ribbon Schools program has recognized over 7,000 public and nonpublic schools that demonstrate a vision of educational excellence for all students, regardless of their social or economic background. Since its inception, this program has offered the opportunity for schools in every State to gain recognition for educational accomplishments in closing the achievement gaps among student groups.

Recognition as a National Blue Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education is based on a school being measured as either an "Exemplary High Performing School"—where schools are among the State's highest scorers in English and mathematics—or as an "Exemplary Achievement Gap Closing School"—where schools with at least 40 percent of their student body coming from disadvantaged backgrounds have reduced the achievement gap in English and mathematics within the last 5 years. St. Patrick School has made great strides in the area of improved proficiency in both English and mathematics.

As a Four Star School, St. Patrick's takes great care to integrate elements of Catholic faith into its curriculum. Consisting of strong morals, a deeply rooted faith in community, and a strong sense of respectful conduct, the staff at St. Patrick challenges its students to put their faith into action

through community service and social engagement on global issues.

I wish to acknowledge Principal Richard John Rupcich of St. Patrick School, the entire staff, and the student body. It undoubtedly took hard work and dedication to achieve this prestigious award.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate St. Patrick School, and I wish them continued success in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO DONALD LINDBERG

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate who has spent many years leading efforts to build support for biomedical research and improved public health, I would like to pay tribute to a great public servant and trailblazer in medical informatics, Donald A.B. Lindberg, Director of the National Library of Medicine, NLM, the world's largest biomedical library, and a part of the National Institutes of Health. Dr. Lindberg recently announced that he will retire next year after over 30 years of distinguished public service.

Trained as a pathologist, Dr. Lindberg is recognized worldwide as a pioneer in medical information technology, artificial intelligence, computer-aided medical diagnosis and electronic health records. When Dr. Lindberg joined NLM in 1984, the library had no electronic journals, personal computers were few and far between, and only a relatively small number of research institutions had access to the Internet. Today millions of scientists, health professionals, and members of the public use NLM's high-quality electronic information resources billions of times a year.

Dr. Lindberg arrived at NLM with a belief in the potential of advanced computing and telecommunications. He immediately launched the groundbreaking Unified Medical Language System, now broadly used to help computer systems behave as if they understand biomedical meaning. He also greatly expanded NLM's informatics research training programs, increasing the Nation's supply of informatics researchers and health information technology leaders. The library, its grantees, and its former trainees continue to play essential roles in the development of electronic health records, health data standards, and the exchange of health information.

One of the proudest achievements of Dr. Lindberg's tenure was the establishment of the National Center for Biotechnology Information, NCBI, in 1988. It expanded the scope of the NLM and provided a national resource for molecular biology information and essential support for mapping the human genome. Today, NCBI is home to GenBank, dbGaP, PubChem, and

PubMed Central and is an indispensable international repository and software tool developer for genetic sequences and other genomic data, and a pioneer and leader in linking data and published research results to promote new scientific discoveries.

In another unprecedented move, Dr. Lindberg asked NLM to create the Visible Humans, a library of digital images representing the complete anatomy of a man and a woman—giving a unique and detailed look inside the body. People around the world can and do use the images in a variety of ways. They have been used to help students learn anatomy; to develop products like artificial limbs; and to create tools to help surgeons rehearse operations.

As access to the World Wide Web and the Internet spread throughout the country, Dr. Lindberg seized the opportunity to make high quality medical information freely available to the public. In a 1997 press briefing that I sponsored with the late Senator Arlen Specter, R-PA, and then Vice President Al Gore, we announced free Internet access to MEDLINE via PubMed. In 1998, Dr. Lindberg went on to create the consumer-friendly MedlinePlus.gov and a new era of timely and trusted online health information for the general public began. ClinicalTrials.gov, now the world's largest trial registry and a unique source of summary results data for many trials, followed soon after in 2000, providing patients, families and members of the public easy access to information about the location of clinical trials, their design and purpose, and criteria for participation.

In 2003, I again joined the NLM and the National Institute on Aging in launching NIHSeniorHealth.gov, a website that features authoritative, up-to-date information from the NIH, in a format that addresses the cognitive changes that come with aging and allows easy use. In that same year, I partnered with Dr. Lindberg and respected national physician groups to launch the Information Rx project, which supplies prescription pads to health providers to point their patients to trusted health care information from the NIH. At the urging of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Dr. Lindberg has also made high-quality health information available to physicians and their patients via NIH's first consumer magazine, NIH MedlinePlus. This free magazine is now available in Spanish and online around the Nation and worldwide.

Over the past three decades, Dr. Lindberg greatly expanded the scope of the National Network of Libraries of Medicine. Now, NLM and this network of more than 6,000 academic, hospital, and public libraries partner with community-based organizations to bring high-quality information to health professionals and the public—regardless of

location, socioeconomic status or access to computers and telecommunications. NLM has entered into long-standing and successful partnerships with minority-serving institutions, tribal and community-based organizations, and the public health community. NLM's marvelous exhibitions which Dr. Lindberg championed, such as Native Voices: Native Peoples' Concepts of Health and Illness, expand NLM's reach with electronic and traveling versions, bringing important issues and scholarship to persons unable to make it through NLM's Bethesda doors. Moreover, Dr. Lindberg helped set the U.S. standards for the public's use of the Internet. He was the founding Director of the National Coordination Office for High Performance Computing and Communications in the President's Office of Science and Technology Policy and was named by the HHS Secretary to be the U.S. National Coordinator for the G-7 Global Healthcare Applications Project.

It gives me great pleasure pay tribute to Dr. Donald A.B. Lindberg, one of this country's visionaries, for his many contributions in science and technology that have transformed access to biomedical information and clearly had a lasting positive impact on the Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL ROBERT J. McALEER

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to my constituent COL Robert J. McAleer for his exemplary dedication to duty and his service to the U.S. Army and to the United States of America. He has served his last 2 years in the Army as Chief of the Army's Senate Liaison Division, representing the Army on Capitol Hill.

A native of Washington State, Colonel McAleer earned a commission as a distinguished graduate from the U.S. Military Academy in 1988. Colonel McAleer has served in a broad range of challenging operational assignments and an unusually diverse set of Army units: cannon artillery, rocket and missile, air defense, light infantry, cavalry, Ranger, Special Forces, and Stryker.

Colonel McAleer spent more than a decade overseas, including two tours each in Germany and Korea, and two 15-month tours in Iraq. As a lieutenant, he completed critical assignments in austere locations on the Demilitarized Zone in Korea. As a captain and major with the Army Special Operations Command, he participated in the detention of Bosnian war criminals, served as a fire support officer for twenty AC-130 gunship and similar missions in Kosovo, an operation to rescue American hostages in South America, and numerous exercises that served as blueprints for post-9/11 operations. In Iraq, as battalion operations

officer and, later, Squadron Commander, he worked to secure dangerous areas in southwest Baghdad, Abu Ghraib, and then Diyala Province. His units were marked by their discipline, determination, purposeful operations, and focus on the needs of the civilian population. He led efforts in intelligence, governance, essential services, and reconciliation. As a colonel, serving as Chief of Future Operations for Combined Forces Command in Korea, he synchronized the U.S. and South Korean response to North Korea's artillery shelling of Yong Pyong Island, the death of Kim Jong Il, and a North Korean ballistic missile launch. He led major joint and international planning efforts on the Korean Peninsula to prepare military forces and governments for contingencies, especially in the areas of rear area logistics, noncombatant evacuation, and countering and preventing the use of weapons of mass destruction.

With the exception of his current assignment as an Army legislative liaison, Colonel McAleer spent his entire career in combat units, either in command or operations positions. He spent 6 years in command of four units: Bravo Battery 1-39 Field Artillery, Airborne; Bravo Battery 1-321 Field Artillery, Airborne; 2nd Battalion, 8th Field Artillery; and Fires Squadron, 2nd Stryker Cavalry Regiment. A soldier's soldier, focused on his assigned mission and the wellbeing of those under his command, he touched thousands of lives, developing countless leaders and young soldiers in his units.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Colonel McAleer for over 26 years of service to his country. He played a key role in defending our national interests while positively impacting the soldiers and families under his command. He has been an excellent Army liaison to the Senate. We wish Bob, his wife Kate, daughter Catherine, and son Colin all the best as they continue their journey of service.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 229. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenzo Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

S. 1434. An act to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

S. 2921. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boule-

vard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2901. An act to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to implement, leverage, and monitor and evaluate programs to provide first-time or improved access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to the world's poorest on an equitable and sustainable basis, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:46 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 5462. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on the fees charged to passengers of air carriers.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 4:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 579. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

H.R. 4030. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 18640 NW 2nd Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the "Father Richard Marquess-Barry Post Office Building".

H.R. 4926. An act to designate a segment of Interstate Route 35 in the State of Minnesota as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway".

H.R. 5146. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse".

H.R. 5385. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office".

H.R. 5562. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Ocean Avenue in Lompoc, California, as the "Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 5687. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, as the "Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office".

H.R. 5794. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office".

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 4:51 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed

the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 229. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenzo Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

S. 1434. An act to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

S. 2673. An act to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 2917. An act to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

S. 2921. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 2366. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of World War I.

H.R. 5739. An act to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the termination of social security benefits for individuals who participated in Nazi persecution, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 105. Joint Resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Bernardo de Galvez y Madrid, Viscount of Galveston and Count of Galvez.

The enrolled bills and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 6:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 78. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4110 Alameda Road in Houston, Texas, as the "George Thomas 'Mickey' Leland Post Office Building".

H.R. 1707. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 302 East Green Street in Champaign, Illinois, as the "James R. Burgess Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 2112. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 787 State Route 17M in Monroe, New York, as the "National Clandestine Service of the Central Intelligence Agency NCS Officer Gregg David Wenzel Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 2223. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 Elm Avenue in Munising, Michigan, as the "Elizabeth L. Kinnunen Post Office Building".

H.R. 2678. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10360 Southwest 186th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Larcenia J. Bullard Post Office Building".

H.R. 3534. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 West Michigan Avenue in Jackson, Michigan, as the "Officer James Bonneau Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 4939. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2551 Galena Avenue in Simi Valley, California, as the "Neil Havens Post Office".

H.R. 5030. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13500 SW 250 Street in Princeton, Florida, as the "Corporal Christian A. Guzman Rivera Post Office Building".

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 579. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5146. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 5385. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5562. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 801 West Ocean Avenue in Lompoc, California, as the "Federal Correctional Officer Scott J. Williams Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5687. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 East Market Street in Long Beach, California, as the "Juanita Millender-McDonald Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5794. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 5759. An act to establish a rule of construction clarifying the limitations on executive authority to provide certain forms of immigration relief.

H.R. 5771. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2992. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:

Special Report entitled "Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency's Detention and Interrogation Program" (Rept. No. 113-288). Additional and minority views filed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Alissa M. Starzak, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army.

*Robert M. Scher, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*David J. Berteau, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Margaret C. Wilmoth, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. James B. Laster, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. James G. Foggo III, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Derek P. Rydholm, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Larry D. Wyche, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Lawrence F. Thoms, to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Adm. Harry B. Harris, Jr., to be Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Col. Shelley R. Campbell, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Mark C. Nowland, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Michael G. Amundson and ending with Colonel Clifford W. Wilkins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 12, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Colonel Barry K. Taylor)

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Darsie D. Rogers, Jr., to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Frederick S. Rudesheim, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Stephen J. Hager, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Eugene J. LeBoeuf, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. John C. Harris, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Lewis G. Irwin, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. David E. Quantock, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Anthony R. Ierardi, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Vincent R. Stewart, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Andrew E. Busch, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Richard D. Clarke, Jr., to be Major General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. John F. Mulholland, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Aaron T. Walter, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. David W. Ling, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Troy M. Shoemaker, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Scott H. Swift, to be Admiral.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report

favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Taft Owen Aujero and ending with Jeffery Lynn Richard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 15, 2014. (minus 105 nominees beginning with Peter G. Bailey)

Air Force nominations beginning with Peter Brian Abercrombie II and ending with Jason C. Zumwalt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with George W. Clifford III and ending with Young J. Jun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Travis K. Acheson and ending with Paul C. Zurkowski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Jennifer C. Alexander, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Joyce P. Fiedler, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Robert B. O. Allen and ending with Keith M. Vollenweider, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Richard Y. Baird and ending with Jerome L. Vinluan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Richard M. Burgon and ending with Joshua N. Scott, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nomination of Allyson M. Yamaki, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Aaron J. Agirre and ending with Gregory S. Zilinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Erika S. Abraham and ending with Fei Zhang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Rhett B. Casper and ending with Stacey Elizabeth Zaikoski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jose C. Aguirre and ending with Sandy K. Yip, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jason D. Eitutus and ending with Brian K. Wyrick, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Sarahann Beal and ending with Carol C. Walters, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with David P. Abbott and ending with Kevin D.

Underwood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Air Force nominations beginning with Mohammed H. Aljallad and ending with Anita M. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Army nomination of Kimberely Derouenslaven, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Barry C. Busby, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Lamar D. Adams and ending with G001317, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2014. (minus 6 nominees beginning with Steven R. Berger)

Army nominations beginning with Eric C. Anderson and ending with D011466, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2014. (minus 9 nominees beginning with Steven R. Ansley, Jr.)

Army nominations beginning with Randy L. Brandt and ending with Kenneth R. Williams, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Michael D. Acord and ending with D006516, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2014. (minus 8 nominees beginning with Treavor J. Bellandi)

Army nomination of Darrell R. V. Tran, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with George W. Mason III and ending with Alvin D. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with John W. Bozicevic and ending with James E. Scalf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 15, 2014.

Army nomination of Patrick M. McGrath, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Peggy E. D. McGill and ending with Elena M. Scarbrough, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Delroy A. Brown and ending with Richard G. Schmid, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Brian R. Coleman and ending with Robert W. Thompson, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Spencer T. Price)

Army nominations beginning with Vance J. Argo and ending with Gregory W. Teisan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Scott A. Arcand and ending with William D. Weaver, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Dawn M. Flynn and ending with Sandra J. Hetzel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Paul V. Rahm)

Army nominations beginning with Scott B. Byers and ending with Charlene A. Weingarten, which nominations were re-

ceived by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Michele M. Spencer)

Army nominations beginning with Donna K. Ayers and ending with Mary E. Woodard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014. (minus 2 nominees: Lesley A. Watts; Roy Wilms)

Army nominations beginning with Felix J. E. Andujar and ending with Terence R. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Jerry L. Tolbert)

Army nominations beginning with Bryan D. Brown and ending with Nicholas D. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014. (minus 4 nominees: Timothy A. Doherty; William R. Elliott; Lynnell D. Peace; Craig A. Yunker)

Army nominations beginning with Anthony J. Labadia and ending with Joseph F. Tommasino, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Marta E. Acha and ending with Ricord W. Torgerson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Jacob A. Johnson)

Army nominations beginning with Zenaida M. Cofie and ending with Todd L. Stewart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 2014.

Army nomination of Joseph T. Morris, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Richard T. Knowlton, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Robert A. Borchering and ending with Dean L. Whitford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Army nomination of Steven E. Baker, to be Major.

Army nomination of Arun Sharma, to be Major.

Army nomination of James M. Brumit, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Samuel Agostosantiago and ending with John R. Wilt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Edwin B. Bales and ending with Ryan M. Zipf, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Paul P. McBride and ending with Paul E. Reynolds, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Army nomination of John E. Atwood, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Daniel H. Aldana and ending with David R. Navorska, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Army nomination of Eric Graham, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Susan Davis and ending with Matthew G. Stlaurent, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Raymond L. Phua)

Army nominations beginning with Shelley P. Honnold and ending with Neal E. Woollen,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Susan J. Argueta and ending with Jason S. Windsor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Susan R. Cloft)

Army nominations beginning with John R. Bailey and ending with D004653, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014. (minus 2 nominees: Roger S. Giraud; Neil I. Nelson)

Army nominations beginning with Gary L. Gross and ending with Craig D. Shriver, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Melissa R. Beauman and ending with Michael W. Stephens, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 13, 2014.

Army nomination of Richard M. Hester, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jay E. Clasing, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Scott J. Anderson and ending with Stefania V. Wilcox, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Marion A. Alston)

Army nominations beginning with Rachel R. Anthony and ending with D011532, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: Steven A. Brewer)

Army nominations beginning with Nadine M. Alonzo and ending with D012299, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Mark Acopan and ending with Timothy R. Yourk, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014. (minus 1 nominee: James Lawhorn, Jr.)

Army nominations beginning with Katharine M. E. Adams and ending with Hans P. Zeller, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Army nominations beginning with Robert J. Abbott and ending with D011857, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on December 3, 2014.

Marine Corps nomination of Timothy E. Robertson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Christopher E. Hall, to be Major.

Navy nomination of Angela M. Rowell, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Gregory L. Koontz, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Timothy S. Roush, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Kimberly M. Freitas, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Adam B. Yost, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Charles S. Eisenberg, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Jack W.L. Tsao, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of James M. Ross, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Lakeeva B. Gunder-son, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Travis S. Anderson and ending with Julian G. Wilson III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 17, 2014.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Willie E. May, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

*Tho Dinh-Zarr, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2018.

*Mark R. Rosekind, of California, to be Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

*Carlos A. Monje, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2990. A bill to establish a State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 2991. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to promote sustainable conservation and management for the Nation's fisheries and the communities that rely on them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 2992. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes; read the first time.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 209

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 209, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 318

At the request of Mr. JOHANNES, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 318, a bill to rescind funds made available to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency if the Administrator fails to meet certain deadlines.

S. 631

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 631, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1695

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1695, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 1861

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1861, a bill to save taxpayer money and end bailouts of financial institutions by providing for a process to allow financial institutions to go bankrupt.

S. 2206

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2206, a bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information.

S. 2689

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2689, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 2807

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2807, a bill to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2898

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2898, a bill to provide consumer protections for students.

S. 2911

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2911, a bill to establish a task force to review policies and measures to promote, and to develop best practices for, reduction of short-lived climate pollutants, and for other purposes.

S. 2930

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2930, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of an evaluation of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2946

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2946, a bill to provide improved water, sanitation, and hygiene programs for high priority developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2965

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2965, a bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing hazardous humanitarian services in West Africa to combat the spread of the 2014 Ebola virus outbreak shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone.

S. 2971

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 2971, a bill to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 2975

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2975, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 413

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 413, a resolution recognizing 20 years since the genocide in Rwanda, and affirming it is in the national interest of the United States to work in close coordination with international partners to help prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and mass atrocities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3977. Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1204, to amend

title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

SA 3978. Mr. REID (for Ms. AYOTTE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

SA 3979. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3980. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5771, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3981. Mr. BEGICH proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1474, to amend the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 to repeal a special rule for the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

SA 3982. Mr. BEGICH proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1474, *supra*.

SA 3983. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3984. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*.

SA 3985. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3984 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*.

SA 3986. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*.

SA 3987. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3986 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*.

SA 3988. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3987 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*.

SA 3989. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3990. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3991. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3992. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3993. Mr. SCHATZ (for Mr. COONS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 413, recognizing 20 years since the geno-

cide in Rwanda, and affirming it is in the national interest of the United States to work in close coordination with international partners to help prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and mass atrocities.

SA 3994. Mr. SCHATZ (for Mr. COONS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 413, *supra*.

SA 3995. Mr. SCHATZ (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4681, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3977. Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1204, to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AVIATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 44946. Aviation Security Advisory Committee

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Transportation Security Administration an aviation security advisory committee.

"(b) DUTIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall consult the Advisory Committee, as appropriate, on aviation security matters, including on the development, refinement, and implementation of policies, programs, rule-making, and security directives pertaining to aviation security, while adhering to sensitive security guidelines.

"(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall develop, at the request of the Assistant Secretary, recommendations for improvements to aviation security.

"(B) RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEES.—Recommendations agreed upon by the subcommittees established under this section shall be approved by the Advisory Committee before transmission to the Assistant Secretary.

"(3) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The Advisory Committee shall periodically submit to the Assistant Secretary—

"(A) reports on matters identified by the Assistant Secretary; and

"(B) reports on other matters identified by a majority of the members of the Advisory Committee.

"(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Advisory Committee shall submit to the Assistant Secretary an annual report providing information on the activities, findings, and recommendations of the Advisory Committee, including its subcommittees, for the preceding year. Not later than 6 months after

the date that the Secretary receives the annual report, the Secretary shall publish a public version describing the Advisory Committee's activities and such related matters as would be informative to the public consistent with the policy of section 552(b) of title 5.

“(5) **FEEDBACK.**—Not later than 90 days after receiving recommendations transmitted by the Advisory Committee under paragraph (4), the Assistant Secretary shall respond in writing to the Advisory Committee with feedback on each of the recommendations, an action plan to implement any of the recommendations with which the Assistant Secretary concurs, and a justification for why any of the recommendations have been rejected.

“(6) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days after providing written feedback to the Advisory Committee under paragraph (5), the Assistant Secretary shall notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives on such feedback, and provide a briefing upon request.

“(7) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Prior to briefing the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives under paragraph (6), the Assistant Secretary shall submit to such committees a report containing information relating to the recommendations transmitted by the Advisory Committee in accordance with paragraph (4).

“(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

“(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2014, the Assistant Secretary shall appoint the members of the Advisory Committee.

“(B) **COMPOSITION.**—The membership of the Advisory Committee shall consist of individuals representing not more than 34 member organizations. Each organization shall be represented by 1 individual (or the individual's designee).

“(C) **REPRESENTATION.**—The membership of the Advisory Committee shall include representatives of air carriers, all-cargo air transportation, indirect air carriers, labor organizations representing air carrier employees, labor organizations representing transportation security officers, aircraft manufacturers, airport operators, airport construction and maintenance contractors, labor organizations representing employees of airport construction and maintenance contractors, general aviation, privacy organizations, the travel industry, airport-based businesses (including minority-owned small businesses), businesses that conduct security screening operations at airports, aeronautical repair stations, passenger advocacy groups, the aviation security technology industry (including screening technology and biometrics), victims of terrorist acts against aviation, and law enforcement and security experts.

“(2) **TERM OF OFFICE.**—

“(A) **TERMS.**—The term of each member of the Advisory Committee shall be 2 years. A member of the Advisory Committee may be reappointed.

“(B) **REMOVAL.**—The Assistant Secretary may review the participation of a member of the Advisory Committee and remove such member for cause at any time.

“(3) **PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.**—The members of the Advisory Committee shall not receive pay, allowances, or benefits from

the Government by reason of their service on the Advisory Committee.

“(4) **MEETINGS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Secretary shall require the Advisory Committee to meet at least semiannually and may convene additional meetings as necessary.

“(B) **PUBLIC MEETINGS.**—At least 1 of the meetings described in subparagraph (A) shall be open to the public.

“(C) **ATTENDANCE.**—The Advisory Committee shall maintain a record of the persons present at each meeting.

“(5) **MEMBER ACCESS TO SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of a member's appointment, the Assistant Secretary shall determine if there is cause for the member to be restricted from possessing sensitive security information. Without such cause, and upon the member voluntarily signing a non-disclosure agreement, the member may be granted access to sensitive security information that is relevant to the member's advisory duties. The member shall protect the sensitive security information in accordance with part 1520 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(6) **CHAIRPERSON.**—A stakeholder representative on the Advisory Committee who is elected by the appointed membership of the Advisory Committee shall chair the Advisory Committee.

“(d) **SUBCOMMITTEES.**—

“(1) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Advisory Committee chairperson, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary, may establish within the Advisory Committee any subcommittee that the Assistant Secretary and Advisory Committee determine to be necessary. The Assistant Secretary and the Advisory Committee shall create subcommittees to address aviation security issues, including the following:

“(A) **AIR CARGO SECURITY.**—The implementation of the air cargo security programs established by the Transportation Security Administration to screen air cargo on passenger aircraft and all-cargo aircraft in accordance with established cargo screening mandates.

“(B) **GENERAL AVIATION.**—General aviation facilities, general aviation aircraft, and helicopter operations at general aviation and commercial service airports.

“(C) **PERIMETER AND ACCESS CONTROL.**—Recommendations on airport perimeter security, exit lane security and technology at commercial service airports, and access control issues.

“(D) **SECURITY TECHNOLOGY.**—Security technology standards and requirements, including their harmonization internationally, technology to screen passengers, passenger baggage, carry-on baggage, and cargo, and biometric technology.

“(2) **RISK-BASED SECURITY.**—All subcommittees established by the Advisory Committee chairperson in coordination with the Assistant Secretary shall consider risk-based security approaches in the performance of their functions that weigh the optimum balance of costs and benefits in transportation security, including for passenger screening, baggage screening, air cargo security policies, and general aviation security matters.

“(3) **MEETINGS AND REPORTING.**—Each subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly and submit to the Advisory Committee for inclusion in the annual report required under subsection (b)(4) information, including recommendations, regarding issues within the subcommittee.

“(4) **SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRS.**—Each subcommittee shall be co-chaired by a Government official and an industry official.

“(e) **SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS.**—Each subcommittee under this section shall include subject matter experts with relevant expertise who are appointed by the respective subcommittee chairpersons.

“(f) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee and its subcommittees.

“(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The term ‘Advisory Committee’ means the aviation security advisory committee established under subsection (a).

“(2) **ASSISTANT SECRETARY.**—The term ‘Assistant Secretary’ means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration).

“(3) **PERIMETER SECURITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘perimeter security’ means procedures or systems to monitor, secure, and prevent unauthorized access to an airport, including its airfield and terminal.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘perimeter security’ includes the fence area surrounding an airport, access gates, and access controls.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“44946. Aviation Security Advisory Committee.”.

SA 3978. Mr. REID (for Ms. AYOTTE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Transportation Security Administration has not consistently implemented Department of Homeland Security policies and Government best practices for acquisition and procurement.

(2) The Transportation Security Administration has only recently developed a multiyear technology investment plan, and has underutilized innovation opportunities within the private sector, including from small businesses.

(3) The Transportation Security Administration has faced challenges in meeting key performance requirements for several major acquisitions and procurements, resulting in reduced security effectiveness and wasted expenditures.

SEC. 3. TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION ACQUISITION REFORM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2312) is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE XVI—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY “Subtitle A—General Provisions

“SEC. 1601. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The term ‘Administration’ means the Transportation Security Administration.

“(2) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration.

“(3) **PLAN.**—The term ‘Plan’ means the strategic 5-year technology investment plan developed by the Administrator under section 1611.

“(4) **SECURITY-RELATED TECHNOLOGY.**—The term ‘security-related technology’ means any technology that assists the Administration in the prevention of, or defense against, threats to United States transportation systems, including threats to people, property, and information.

“Subtitle B—Transportation Security Administration Acquisition Improvements
“SEC. 1611. 5-YEAR TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT PLAN.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall—

“(1) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, develop and submit to Congress a strategic 5-year technology investment plan, that may include a classified addendum to report sensitive transportation security risks, technology vulnerabilities, or other sensitive security information; and

“(2) to the extent possible, publish the Plan in an unclassified format in the public domain.

“(b) **CONSULTATION.**—The Administrator shall develop the Plan in consultation with—

“(1) the Under Secretary for Management;

“(2) the Under Secretary for Science and Technology;

“(3) the Chief Information Officer; and

“(4) the aviation industry stakeholder advisory committee established by the Administrator.

“(c) **APPROVAL.**—The Administrator may not publish the Plan under subsection (a)(2) until it has been approved by the Secretary.

“(d) **CONTENTS OF PLAN.**—The Plan shall include—

“(1) an analysis of transportation security risks and the associated capability gaps that would be best addressed by security-related technology, including consideration of the most recent quadrennial homeland security review under section 707;

“(2) a set of security-related technology acquisition needs that—

“(A) is prioritized based on risk and associated capability gaps identified under paragraph (1); and

“(B) includes planned technology programs and projects with defined objectives, goals, timelines, and measures;

“(3) an analysis of current and forecast trends in domestic and international passenger travel;

“(4) an identification of currently deployed security-related technologies that are at or near the end of their lifecycles;

“(5) an identification of test, evaluation, modeling, and simulation capabilities, including target methodologies, rationales, and timelines necessary to support the acquisition of the security-related technologies expected to meet the needs under paragraph (2);

“(6) an identification of opportunities for public-private partnerships, small and disadvantaged company participation, intragovernment collaboration, university centers of excellence, and national laboratory technology transfer;

“(7) an identification of the Administration’s acquisition workforce needs for the management of planned security-related technology acquisitions, including consideration of leveraging acquisition expertise of other Federal agencies;

“(8) an identification of the security resources, including information security re-

sources, that will be required to protect security-related technology from physical or cyber theft, diversion, sabotage, or attack;

“(9) an identification of initiatives to streamline the Administration’s acquisition process and provide greater predictability and clarity to small, medium, and large businesses, including the timeline for testing and evaluation;

“(10) an assessment of the impact to commercial aviation passengers;

“(11) a strategy for consulting airport management, air carrier representatives, and Federal security directors whenever an acquisition will lead to the removal of equipment at airports, and how the strategy for consulting with such officials of the relevant airports will address potential negative impacts on commercial passengers or airport operations; and

“(12) in consultation with the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, an identification of security-related technology interface standards, in existence or if implemented, that could promote more interoperable passenger, baggage, and cargo screening systems.

“(e) **LEVERAGING THE PRIVATE SECTOR.**—To the extent possible, and in a manner that is consistent with fair and equitable practices, the Plan shall—

“(1) leverage emerging technology trends and research and development investment trends within the public and private sectors;

“(2) incorporate private sector input, including from the aviation industry stakeholder advisory committee established by the Administrator, through requests for information, industry days, and other innovative means consistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

“(3) in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, identify technologies in existence or in development that, with or without adaptation, are expected to be suitable to meeting mission needs.

“(f) **DISCLOSURE.**—The Administrator shall include with the Plan a list of nongovernment persons that contributed to the writing of the Plan.

“(g) **UPDATE AND REPORT.**—Beginning 2 years after the date the Plan is submitted to Congress under subsection (a), and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress—

“(1) an update of the Plan; and

“(2) a report on the extent to which each security-related technology acquired by the Administration since the last issuance or update of the Plan is consistent with the planned technology programs and projects identified under subsection (d)(2) for that security-related technology.

“SEC. 1612. ACQUISITION JUSTIFICATION AND REPORTS.

“(a) **ACQUISITION JUSTIFICATION.**—Before the Administration implements any security-related technology acquisition, the Administrator, in accordance with the Department’s policies and directives, shall determine whether the acquisition is justified by conducting an analysis that includes—

“(1) an identification of the scenarios and level of risk to transportation security from those scenarios that would be addressed by the security-related technology acquisition;

“(2) an assessment of how the proposed acquisition aligns to the Plan;

“(3) a comparison of the total expected lifecycle cost against the total expected quantitative and qualitative benefits to transportation security;

“(4) an analysis of alternative security solutions, including policy or procedure solu-

tions, to determine if the proposed security-related technology acquisition is the most effective and cost-efficient solution based on cost-benefit considerations;

“(5) an assessment of the potential privacy and civil liberties implications of the proposed acquisition that includes, to the extent practicable, consultation with organizations that advocate for the protection of privacy and civil liberties;

“(6) a determination that the proposed acquisition is consistent with fair information practice principles issued by the Privacy Officer of the Department;

“(7) confirmation that there are no significant risks to human health or safety posed by the proposed acquisition; and

“(8) an estimate of the benefits to commercial aviation passengers.

“(b) REPORTS AND CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than the end of the 30-day period preceding the award by the Administration of a contract for any security-related technology acquisition exceeding \$30,000,000, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives—

“(A) the results of the comprehensive acquisition justification under subsection (a); and

“(B) a certification by the Administrator that the benefits to transportation security justify the contract cost.

“(2) **EXTENSION DUE TO IMMINENT TERRORIST THREAT.**—If there is a known or suspected imminent threat to transportation security, the Administrator—

“(A) may reduce the 30-day period under paragraph (1) to 5 days to rapidly respond to the threat; and

“(B) shall immediately notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives of the known or suspected imminent threat.

“SEC. 1613. ACQUISITION BASELINE ESTABLISHMENT AND REPORTS.

“(a) **BASELINE REQUIREMENTS.—**

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before the Administration implements any security-related technology acquisition, the appropriate acquisition official of the Department shall establish and document a set of formal baseline requirements.

“(2) **CONTENTS.**—The baseline requirements under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) include the estimated costs (including lifecycle costs), schedule, and performance milestones for the planned duration of the acquisition;

“(B) identify the acquisition risks and a plan for mitigating those risks; and

“(C) assess the personnel necessary to manage the acquisition process, manage the ongoing program, and support training and other operations as necessary.

“(3) **FEASIBILITY.**—In establishing the performance milestones under paragraph (2)(A), the appropriate acquisition official of the Department, to the extent possible and in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall ensure that achieving those milestones is technologically feasible.

“(4) **TEST AND EVALUATION PLAN.**—The Administrator, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall develop a test and evaluation plan that describes—

“(A) the activities that are expected to be required to assess acquired technologies

against the performance milestones established under paragraph (2)(A);

“(B) the necessary and cost-effective combination of laboratory testing, field testing, modeling, simulation, and supporting analysis to ensure that such technologies meet the Administration’s mission needs;

“(C) an efficient planning schedule to ensure that test and evaluation activities are completed without undue delay; and

“(D) if commercial aviation passengers are expected to interact with the security-related technology, methods that could be used to measure passenger acceptance of and familiarization with the security-related technology.

“(5) VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION.—The appropriate acquisition official of the Department—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), shall utilize independent reviewers to verify and validate the performance milestones and cost estimates developed under paragraph (2) for a security-related technology that pursuant to section 1611(d)(2) has been identified as a high priority need in the most recent Plan; and

“(B) shall ensure that the use of independent reviewers does not unduly delay the schedule of any acquisition.

“(6) STREAMLINING ACCESS FOR INTERESTED VENDORS.—The Administrator shall establish a streamlined process for an interested vendor of a security-related technology to request and receive appropriate access to the baseline requirements and test and evaluation plans that are necessary for the vendor to participate in the acquisitions process for that technology.

“(b) REVIEW OF BASELINE REQUIREMENTS AND DEVIATION; REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate acquisition official of the Department shall review and assess each implemented acquisition to determine if the acquisition is meeting the baseline requirements established under subsection (a).

“(B) TEST AND EVALUATION ASSESSMENT.—The review shall include an assessment of whether—

“(i) the planned testing and evaluation activities have been completed; and

“(ii) the results of that testing and evaluation demonstrate that the performance milestones are technologically feasible.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after making a finding described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that includes—

“(A) the results of any assessment that finds that—

“(i) the actual or planned costs exceed the baseline costs by more than 10 percent;

“(ii) the actual or planned schedule for delivery has been delayed by more than 180 days; or

“(iii) there is a failure to meet any performance milestone that directly impacts security effectiveness;

“(B) the cause for such excessive costs, delay, or failure; and

“(C) a plan for corrective action.

“SEC. 1614. INVENTORY UTILIZATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Before the procurement of additional quantities of equipment to fulfill a mission need, the Administrator, to the extent practicable, shall utilize any existing units in the Administration’s inventory to meet that need.

“(b) TRACKING OF INVENTORY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish a process for tracking—

“(A) the location of security-related equipment in the inventory under subsection (a);

“(B) the utilization status of security-related technology in the inventory under subsection (a); and

“(C) the quantity of security-related equipment in the inventory under subsection (a).

“(2) INTERNAL CONTROLS.—The Administrator shall implement internal controls to ensure up-to-date accurate data on security-related technology owned, deployed, and in use.

“(c) LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish logistics principles for managing inventory in an effective and efficient manner.

“(2) LIMITATION ON JUST-IN-TIME LOGISTICS.—The Administrator may not use just-in-time logistics if doing so—

“(A) would inhibit necessary planning for large-scale delivery of equipment to airports or other facilities; or

“(B) would unduly diminish surge capacity for response to a terrorist threat.

“SEC. 1615. SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING GOALS.

“Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that includes—

“(1) the Administration’s performance record with respect to meeting its published small-business contracting goals during the preceding fiscal year;

“(2) if the goals described in paragraph (1) were not met or the Administration’s performance was below the published small-business contracting goals of the Department—

“(A) a list of challenges, including deviations from the Administration’s subcontracting plans, and factors that contributed to the level of performance during the preceding fiscal year;

“(B) an action plan, with benchmarks, for addressing each of the challenges identified in subparagraph (A) that—

“(i) is prepared after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the heads of Federal departments and agencies that achieved their published goals for prime contracting with small and minority-owned businesses, including small and disadvantaged businesses, in prior fiscal years; and

“(ii) identifies policies and procedures that could be incorporated by the Administration in furtherance of achieving the Administration’s published goal for such contracting; and

“(3) a status report on the implementation of the action plan that was developed in the preceding fiscal year in accordance with paragraph (2)(B), if such a plan was required.

“SEC. 1616. CONSISTENCY WITH THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION AND DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND DIRECTIVES.

“The Administrator shall execute the responsibilities set forth in this subtitle in a manner consistent with, and not duplicative of, the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Department’s policies and directives.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by striking the items relating to title XVI and inserting the following:

“TITLE XVI—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

“Subtitle A—General Provisions

“Sec. 1601. Definitions.

“Subtitle B—Transportation Security Administration Acquisition Improvements

“Sec. 1611. 5-year technology investment plan.

“Sec. 1612. Acquisition justification and reports.

“Sec. 1613. Acquisition baseline establishment and reports.

“Sec. 1614. Inventory utilization.

“Sec. 1615. Small business contracting goals.

“Sec. 1616. Consistency with the Federal acquisition regulation and departmental policies and directives.”

(c) PRIOR AMENDMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any amendment made by title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 as in effect before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains an assessment of the Transportation Security Administration’s implementation of recommendations regarding the acquisition of security-related technology that were made by the Government Accountability Office before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF SUBTITLE B OF TITLE XVI.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains an evaluation of the Transportation Security Administration’s progress in implementing subtitle B of title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 3, including any efficiencies, cost savings, or delays that have resulted from such implementation.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON FEASIBILITY OF INVENTORY TRACKING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit a report to Congress on the feasibility of tracking security-related technology, including software solutions, of the Administration through automated information and data capture technologies.

SEC. 6. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF TSA’S TEST AND EVALUATION PROCESS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) an evaluation of the Transportation Security Administration’s testing and evaluation activities related to security-related technology;

(2) information on the extent to which—

(A) the execution of such testing and evaluation activities is aligned, temporally and otherwise, with the Administration’s annual budget request, acquisition needs, planned procurements, and acquisitions for technology programs and projects; and

(B) security-related technology that has been tested, evaluated, and certified for use by the Administration but was not procured by the Administration, including the reasons the procurement did not occur; and

(3) recommendations—

(A) to improve the efficiency and efficacy of such testing and evaluation activities; and

(B) to better align such testing and evaluation with the acquisitions process.

SEC. 7. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

SA 3979. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

Subtitle J—Uniform Code of Military Justice Reform

SEC. 596. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014”.

SEC. 597. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE TO PROCEED TO TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL ON CHARGES ON CERTAIN OFFENSES WITH AUTHORIZED MAXIMUM SENTENCE OF CONFINEMENT OF MORE THAN ONE YEAR.

(a) MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in paragraph (2) and not excluded under paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the determination under section 830(b) of such chapter (article 30(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on whether to try such charges by court-martial as provided in paragraph (4).

(B) HOMELAND SECURITY.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in paragraph (2) and not excluded under paragraph (3) against a member of the Coast Guard (when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for the determination under section 830(b) of such chapter (article 30(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on whether to try such charges by court-martial as provided in paragraph (4).

(2) COVERED OFFENSES.—An offense specified in this paragraph is an offense as follows:

(A) An offense under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that is triable by court-martial under that chapter for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for more than one year.

(B) An offense under section 892a of title 10, United States Code (article 92a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 599B of this Act, regardless of the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter for such offense.

(C) An offense under section 907a of title 10, United States Code (article 107a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 599C of this Act, regardless of the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter for such offense.

(D) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (C) as

punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(E) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (C) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(F) An attempt to commit an offense specified in subparagraphs (A) through (E) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(3) EXCLUDED OFFENSES.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to an offense as follows:

(A) An offense under sections 883 through 917 of title 10, United States Code (articles 83 through 117 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under section 933 or 934 of title 10, United States Code (articles 133 and 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(D) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(E) An attempt to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (D) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(4) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—The disposition of charges pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following:

(A) The determination whether to try such charges by court-martial shall be made by a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces designated in accordance with regulations prescribed for purposes of this subsection from among commissioned officers of the Armed Forces in grade O-6 or higher who—

(i) are available for detail as trial counsel under section 827 of title 10, United States Code (article 27 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice);

(ii) have significant experience in trials by general or special court-martial; and

(iii) are outside the chain of command of the member subject to such charges.

(B) Upon a determination under subparagraph (A) to try such charges by court-martial, the officer making that determination shall determine whether to try such charges by a general court-martial convened under section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or a special court-martial convened under section 823 of title 10, United States Code (article 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A determination under subparagraph (A) to try charges by court-martial shall include a determination to try all known offenses, including lesser included offenses.

(D) The determination to try such charges by court-martial under subparagraph (A), and by type of court-martial under subparagraph (B), shall be binding on any applicable convening authority for a trial by court-martial on such charges.

(E) The actions of an officer described in subparagraph (A) in determining under that subparagraph whether or not to try charges by court-martial shall be free of unlawful or unauthorized influence or coercion.

(F) The determination under subparagraph (A) not to proceed to trial of such charges by general or special court-martial shall not op-

erate to terminate or otherwise alter the authority of commanding officers to refer such charges for trial by summary court-martial convened under section 824 of title 10, United States Code (article 24 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or to impose non-judicial punishment in connection with the conduct covered by such charges as authorized by section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(5) CONSTRUCTION WITH CHARGES ON OTHER OFFENSES.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter or affect the disposition of charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense triable by court-martial under that chapter for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for one year or less.

(6) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall revise policies and procedures as necessary to comply with this subsection.

(B) UNIFORMITY.—The General Counsel of the Department of Defense and the General Counsel of the Department of Homeland Security shall jointly review the policies and procedures revised under this paragraph in order to ensure that any lack of uniformity in policies and procedures, as so revised, among the military departments and the Department of Homeland Security does not render unconstitutional any policy or procedure, as so revised.

(7) MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall recommend such changes to the Manual for Courts-Martial as are necessary to ensure compliance with this subsection.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a), and the revisions required by that subsection, shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to charges preferred under section 830 of title 10, United States Code (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), on or after such effective date.

SEC. 598. MODIFICATION OF OFFICERS AUTHORIZED TO CONVENE GENERAL AND SPECIAL COURTS-MARTIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph (8):

“(8) the officers in the offices established pursuant to section 598(c) of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014 or officers in the grade of O-6 or higher who are assigned such responsibility by the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, but only with respect to offenses to which section 597(a)(1) of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014 applies.”.

(b) NO EXERCISE BY OFFICERS IN CHAIN OF COMMAND OF ACCUSED OR VICTIM.—Such section (article) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) An officer specified in subsection (a)(8) may not convene a court-martial under this section if the officer is in the chain of command of the accused or the victim.”.

(c) OFFICES OF CHIEFS OF STAFF ON COURTS-MARTIAL.—

(1) OFFICES REQUIRED.—Each Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces or Commandant specified in paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by subsection (a), shall establish an office to do the following:

(A) To convene general and special courts-martial under sections 822 and 823 of title 10, United States Code (articles 22 and 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), pursuant to paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as so amended, with respect to offenses to which section 592(a)(1) applies.

(B) To detail under section 825 of title 10, United States Code (article 25 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), members of courts-martial convened as described in subparagraph (A).

(2) PERSONNEL.—The personnel of each office established under paragraph (1) shall consist of such members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, or such members of the Coast Guard or civilian personnel of the Department of Homeland Security, as may be detailed or assigned to the office by the Chief of Staff or Commandant concerned. The members and personnel so detailed or assigned, as the case may be, shall be detailed or assigned from personnel billets in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 599. DISCHARGE USING OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall carry out sections 597 and 598 (and the amendments made by section 598) using personnel, funds, and resources otherwise authorized by law.

(b) NO AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL OR RESOURCES.—Sections 597 and 598 (and the amendments made by section 598) shall not be construed as authorizations for personnel, personnel billets, or funds for the discharge of the requirements in such sections.

SEC. 599A. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES ON COURTS-MARTIAL BY INDEPENDENT PANEL ON REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

Section 576(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1762) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraph (J):

“(J) Monitor and assess the implementation and efficacy of sections 597 through 599 of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014, and the amendments made by such sections.”.

SEC. 599B. EXPLICIT CODIFICATION OF RETALIATION FOR REPORTING A CRIME AS AN OFFENSE UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 893 of title 10, United States Code (article 93 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by inserting “, or retaliating against any person subject to his order for reporting a criminal offense,” after “any person subject to his orders”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION (ARTICLE) HEADING.—The heading of such section (article) is amended to read as follows:

“**§ 893. Art. 93. Cruelty and maltreatment; retaliation for reporting a crime.**”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS (ARTICLES).—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter X of chapter 47 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 893 (article 93) and inserting the following new item:

“893. Art. 93. Cruelty and maltreatment; retaliation for reporting a crime.”.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROHIBITION.—Section 1709 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 962; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is repealed.

SEC. 599C. ESTABLISHMENT OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AS A SEPARATE OFFENSE UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) PUNITIVE ARTICLE.—Subchapter X of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by inserting after section 907 (article 107) the following new section (article):

“**§ 907a. Art. 107a. Obstruction of justice**

“Any person subject to this chapter who wrongfully does a certain act with the intent to influence, impede, or otherwise obstruct the due administration of justice shall be punished as a court-martial may direct, except that the maximum punishment authorized for such offense may not exceed dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for not more than five years.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter X of chapter 47 of such title, as amended by section 599B(b)(2) of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 907 (article 107) the following new item:

“907a. Art. 107a. Obstruction of justice.”.

SA 3980. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WICKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5771, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF HEALTH CARE TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 35(b)(1) is amended by striking “January 1, 2014” and inserting “January 1, 2016”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to coverage months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SA 3981. Mr. BEGICH proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1474, to amend the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 to repeal a

special rule for the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF SPECIAL RULE FOR STATE OF ALASKA.

Section 910 of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (18 U.S.C. 2265 note; Public Law 113-4) is repealed.

SA 3982. Mr. BEGICH proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1474, to amend the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 to repeal a special rule for the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 to repeal a special rule for the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.”.

SA 3983. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V, add the following:

Subtitle J—Uniform Code of Military Justice Reform

SEC. 596. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014”.

SEC. 597. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE TO PROCEED TO TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL ON CHARGES ON CERTAIN OFFENSES WITH AUTHORIZED MAXIMUM SENTENCE OF CONFINEMENT OF MORE THAN ONE YEAR.

(a) MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in paragraph (2) and not excluded under paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretaries of the military departments to provide for the determination under section 830(b) of such chapter (article 30(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on whether to try such charges by court-martial as provided in paragraph (4).

(B) HOMELAND SECURITY.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in paragraph (2) and not excluded under paragraph (3) against a member of the Coast Guard (when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for the determination under section 830(b) of such chapter (article 30(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on whether to try such charges by court-martial as provided in paragraph (4).

(2) COVERED OFFENSES.—An offense specified in this paragraph is an offense as follows:

(A) An offense under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that is triable by court-martial under that chapter for which the maximum punishment authorized under that

chapter includes confinement for more than one year.

(B) An offense of retaliation for reporting a crime under section 893 of title 10, United States Code (article 93 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 599B of this Act, regardless of the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter for such offense.

(C) An offense under section 907a of title 10, United States Code (article 107a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 599C of this Act, regardless of the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter for such offense.

(D) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (C) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(E) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (C) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(F) An attempt to commit an offense specified in subparagraphs (A) through (E) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(3) EXCLUDED OFFENSES.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to an offense as follows:

(A) An offense under sections 883 through 917 of title 10, United States Code (articles 83 through 117 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) An offense under section 933 or 934 of title 10, United States Code (articles 133 and 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(D) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) or (B) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(E) An attempt to commit an offense specified in subparagraph (A) through (D) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(4) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—The disposition of charges pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following:

(A) The determination whether to try such charges by court-martial shall be made by a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces designated in accordance with regulations prescribed for purposes of this subsection from among commissioned officers of the Armed Forces in grade O-6 or higher who—

(i) are available for detail as trial counsel under section 827 of title 10, United States Code (article 27 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice);

(ii) have significant experience in trials by general or special court-martial; and

(iii) are outside the chain of command of the member subject to such charges.

(B) Upon a determination under subparagraph (A) to try such charges by court-martial, the officer making that determination shall determine whether to try such charges by a general court-martial convened under section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or a special court-martial convened under section 823 of title 10, United States Code (article 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(C) A determination under subparagraph (A) to try charges by court-martial shall in-

clude a determination to try all known offenses, including lesser included offenses.

(D) The determination to try such charges by court-martial under subparagraph (A), and by type of court-martial under subparagraph (B), shall be binding on any applicable convening authority for a trial by court-martial on such charges.

(E) The actions of an officer described in subparagraph (A) in determining under that subparagraph whether or not to try charges by court-martial shall be free of unlawful or unauthorized influence or coercion.

(F) The determination under subparagraph (A) not to proceed to trial of such charges by general or special court-martial shall not operate to terminate or otherwise alter the authority of commanding officers to refer such charges for trial by summary court-martial convened under section 824 of title 10, United States Code (article 24 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or to impose non-judicial punishment in connection with the conduct covered by such charges as authorized by section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(5) CONSTRUCTION WITH CHARGES ON OTHER OFFENSES.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter or affect the disposition of charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense triable by court-martial under that chapter for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for one year or less.

(6) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall revise policies and procedures as necessary to comply with this subsection.

(B) UNIFORMITY.—The General Counsel of the Department of Defense and the General Counsel of the Department of Homeland Security shall jointly review the policies and procedures revised under this paragraph in order to ensure that any lack of uniformity in policies and procedures, as so revised, among the military departments and the Department of Homeland Security does not render unconstitutional any policy or procedure, as so revised.

(7) MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall recommend such changes to the Manual for Courts-Martial as are necessary to ensure compliance with this subsection.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a), and the revisions required by that subsection, shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to charges preferred under section 830 of title 10, United States Code (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), on or after such effective date.

SEC. 598. MODIFICATION OF OFFICERS AUTHORIZED TO CONVENE GENERAL AND SPECIAL COURTS-MARTIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph (8):

“(8) the officers in the offices established pursuant to section 598(c) of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014 or officers

in the grade of O-6 or higher who are assigned such responsibility by the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or the Commandant of the Coast Guard, but only with respect to offenses to which section 597(a)(1) of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014 applies;”.

(b) NO EXERCISE BY OFFICERS IN CHAIN OF COMMAND OF ACCUSED OR VICTIM.—Such section (article) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) An officer specified in subsection (a)(8) may not convene a court-martial under this section if the officer is in the chain of command of the accused or the victim.”.

(c) OFFICES OF CHIEFS OF STAFF ON COURTS-MARTIAL.—

(1) OFFICES REQUIRED.—Each Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces or Commandant specified in paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by subsection (a), shall establish an office to do the following:

(A) To convene general and special courts-martial under sections 822 and 823 of title 10, United States Code (articles 22 and 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), pursuant to paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as so amended, with respect to offenses to which section 592(a)(1) applies.

(B) To detail under section 825 of title 10, United States Code (article 25 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), members of courts-martial convened as described in subparagraph (A).

(2) PERSONNEL.—The personnel of each office established under paragraph (1) shall consist of such members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, or such members of the Coast Guard or civilian personnel of the Department of Homeland Security, as may be detailed or assigned to the office by the Chief of Staff or Commandant concerned. The members and personnel so detailed or assigned, as the case may be, shall be detailed or assigned from personnel billets in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 599. DISCHARGE USING OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall carry out sections 597 and 598 (and the amendments made by section 598) using personnel, funds, and resources otherwise authorized by law.

(b) NO AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL OR RESOURCES.—Sections 597 and 598 (and the amendments made by section 598) shall not be construed as authorizations for personnel, personnel billets, or funds for the discharge of the requirements in such sections.

SEC. 599A. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES ON COURTS-MARTIAL BY INDEPENDENT PANEL ON REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

Section 576(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1762) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraph (J):

“(J) Monitor and assess the implementation and efficacy of sections 597 through 599 of the Military Justice Improvement Act of 2014, and the amendments made by such sections.”.

SEC. 599B. EXPLICIT CODIFICATION OF RETALIATION FOR REPORTING A CRIME AS AN OFFENSE UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 893 of title 10, United States Code (article 93 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by inserting “, or retaliating against any person subject to his orders for reporting a criminal offense,” after “any person subject to his orders”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION (ARTICLE) HEADING.—The heading of such section (article) is amended to read as follows:

“§ 893. Art. 93. Cruelty and maltreatment; retaliation for reporting a crime”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS (ARTICLES).—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter X of chapter 47 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 893 (article 93) and inserting the following new item:

“893. Art. 93. Cruelty and maltreatment; retaliation for reporting a crime.”.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROHIBITION.—Section 1709 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 962; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is repealed.

SEC. 599C. ESTABLISHMENT OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AS A SEPARATE OFFENSE UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) PUNITIVE ARTICLE.—Subchapter X of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended by inserting after section 907 (article 107) the following new section (article):

“§ 907a. Art. 107a. Obstruction of justice

“Any person subject to this chapter who wrongfully does a certain act with the intent to influence, impede, or otherwise obstruct the due administration of justice shall be punished as a court-martial may direct, except that the maximum punishment authorized for such offense may not exceed dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for not more than five years.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter X of chapter 47 of such title, as amended by section 599B(b)(2) of this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 907 (article 107) the following new item:

“907a. Art. 107a. Obstruction of justice.”.

SA 3984. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

SA 3985. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3984 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 3979,

to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

SA 3986. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 3 days after enactment.

SA 3987. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3986 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

SA 3988. Mr. REID proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3987 proposed by Mr. REID to the amendment SA 3986 proposed by Mr. REID to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

In the amendment, strike “4” and insert “5”.

SA 3989. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1209.

SA 3990. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1080. REPORT ON UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind, of the United States Government to the United Nations and its affiliated agencies and related bodies during the previous fiscal year.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) The total amount of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind, of the United States Government to the United Nations and United Nations affiliated agencies and related bodies.

(2) The approximate percentage of United States Government contributions to each United Nations affiliated agency or body in such fiscal year when compared with all contributions to such agency or body from any source in such fiscal year.

(3) For each such contribution—

(A) the amount of the contribution;

(B) a description of the contribution (including whether assessed or voluntary);

(C) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for the contribution;

(D) the purpose of the contribution; and

(E) the United Nations or United Nations affiliated agency or related body receiving the contribution.

(c) SCOPE OF INITIAL REPORT.—The first report required under subsection (a) shall include the information required under this section for the previous four fiscal years.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 14 days after submitting a report required under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post a public version of the report on a text-based, searchable, and publicly available Internet website.

SA 3991. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 1535, add the following:

(f) LIMITATION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS PENDING CERTIFICATION ON DEFENSE BUDGETS OF NATO EUROPEAN ALLIES.—Funds available for the European Reassurance Initiative, other than funds covered by subsection (b)(1), may not be used for purposes described in subsection (a) unless, not later than 10 days before the commencement of the expenditure of such funds for such purposes, the President certifies to Congress in writing that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies in Europe are—

(1) appropriately prioritizing current defense resources towards deterring aggression by the Russian Federation; and

(2) taking steps—

(A) to reverse declining defense spending, as most recently agreed to in the Wales Summit Declaration issued on September 5, 2014; and

(B) to increase defense spending towards the goal of defense spending in an amount equal to two-percent of gross domestic product (GDP).

SA 3992. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike title XXX.

SA 3993. Mr. SCHATZ (for Mr. COONS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 413, recognizing 20 years since the genocide in Rwanda, and affirming it is in the national interest of the United States to work in close coordination with international partners to help prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and mass atrocities; as follows:

On page 6, beginning on line 14, strike “events; and” and all that follows through “(8) supports” on line 15 and insert the following: “events;

(8) clarifies that nothing in this resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war; and (9) supports

SA 3994. Mr. SCHATZ (for Mr. COONS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 413, recognizing 20 years since the genocide in Rwanda, and affirming it is in the national interest of the United States to work in close coordination with international partners to help prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and mass atrocities; as follows:

Amend the twelfth whereas clause of the preamble to read as follows:

Whereas, in September 2005, the United States joined other members of the United Nations in adopting United Nations General Assembly Resolution 60/1, which affirmed that the international community has a responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity;

SA 3995. Mr. SCHATZ (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4681, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Budgetary effects.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations.

Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.

Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Sec. 303. National intelligence strategy.

Sec. 304. Software licensing.

Sec. 305. Reporting of certain employment activities by former intelligence officers and employees.

Sec. 306. Inclusion of Predominantly Black Institutions in intelligence officer training program.

Sec. 307. Management and oversight of financial intelligence.

Sec. 308. Analysis of private sector policies and procedures for countering insider threats.

Sec. 309. Procedures for the retention of incidentally acquired communications.

Sec. 310. Clarification of limitation of review to retaliatory security clearance or access determinations.

Sec. 311. Feasibility study on consolidating classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples.

Sec. 312. Sense of Congress on cybersecurity threat and cybercrime cooperation with Ukraine.

Sec. 313. Replacement of locally employed staff serving at United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation.

Sec. 314. Inclusion of Sensitive Compartmented Information Facilities in United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation and adjacent countries.

Subtitle B—Reporting

Sec. 321. Report on declassification process.

Sec. 322. Report on intelligence community efficient spending targets.

Sec. 323. Annual report on violations of law or executive order.

Sec. 324. Annual report on intelligence activities of the Department of Homeland Security.

Sec. 325. Report on political prison camps in North Korea.

Sec. 326. Assessment of security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure.

Sec. 327. Enhanced contractor level assessments for the intelligence community.

Sec. 328. Assessment of the efficacy of memoranda of understanding to facilitate intelligence-sharing.

Sec. 329. Report on foreign man-made electromagnetic pulse weapons.

Sec. 330. Report on United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups.

Sec. 331. Feasibility study on retraining veterans in cybersecurity.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The term “congressional intelligence committees” means—

(A) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The Department of Defense.

(4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(5) The National Security Agency.

(6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(7) The Coast Guard.

(8) The Department of State.

(9) The Department of the Treasury.

(10) The Department of Energy.

(11) The Department of Justice.

(12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(14) The National Reconnaissance Office.

(15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

(16) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) **SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101 and, subject to section 103, the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2015, for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. 4681 of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AVAILABILITY.**—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President.

(2) **DISTRIBUTION BY THE PRESIDENT.**—Subject to paragraph (3), the President shall provide for suitable distribution of the classified Schedule of Authorizations, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

(3) **LIMITS ON DISCLOSURE.**—The President shall not publicly disclose the classified

Schedule of Authorizations or any portion of such Schedule except—

(A) as provided in section 601(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 3306(a));

(B) to the extent necessary to implement the budget; or

(C) as otherwise required by law.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR INCREASES.**—The Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2015 by the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed 3 percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such Schedule for such element.

(b) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish guidelines that govern, for each element of the intelligence community, the treatment under the personnel levels authorized under section 102(a), including any exemption from such personnel levels, of employment or assignment in—

(1) a student program, trainee program, or similar program;

(2) a reserve corps or as a reemployed annuitant; or

(3) details, joint duty, or long term, full-time training.

(c) **NOTICE TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify the congressional intelligence committees in writing at least 15 days prior to each exercise of an authority described in subsection (a).

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2015 the sum of \$507,400,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

(b) **AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 794 positions as of September 30, 2015. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) **CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account for fiscal year 2015 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.**—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2015, there are authorized such ad-

ditional personnel for the Community Management Account as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a).

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2015 the sum of \$514,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 303. NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE STRATEGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 108 the following:

“SEC. 108A. NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE STRATEGY.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning in 2017, and once every 4 years thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall develop a comprehensive national intelligence strategy to meet national security objectives for the following 4-year period, or a longer period, if appropriate.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Each national intelligence strategy required by subsection (a) shall—

“(1) delineate a national intelligence strategy consistent with—

“(A) the most recent national security strategy report submitted pursuant to section 108;

“(B) the strategic plans of other relevant departments and agencies of the United States; and

“(C) other relevant national-level plans;

“(2) address matters related to national and military intelligence, including counterintelligence;

“(3) identify the major national security missions that the intelligence community is currently pursuing and will pursue in the future to meet the anticipated security environment;

“(4) describe how the intelligence community will utilize personnel, technology, partnerships, and other capabilities to pursue the major national security missions identified in paragraph (3);

“(5) assess current, emerging, and future threats to the intelligence community, including threats from foreign intelligence and security services and insider threats;

“(6) outline the organizational roles and missions of the elements of the intelligence community as part of an integrated enterprise to meet customer demands for intelligence products, services, and support;

“(7) identify sources of strategic, institutional, programmatic, fiscal, and technological risk; and

“(8) analyze factors that may affect the intelligence community's performance in pur-

suage the major national security missions identified in paragraph (3) during the following 10-year period.

“(c) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on each national intelligence strategy required by subsection (a) not later than 45 days after the date of the completion of such strategy.”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.**—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 108 the following new item:

“Sec. 108A. National intelligence strategy.”.

SEC. 304. SOFTWARE LICENSING.

Section 109 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3044) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “usage; and” and inserting “usage, including—

“(A) increasing the centralization of the management of software licenses;

“(B) increasing the regular tracking and maintaining of comprehensive inventories of software licenses using automated discovery and inventory tools and metrics;

“(C) analyzing software license data to inform investment decisions; and

“(D) providing appropriate personnel with sufficient software licenses management training; and”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “usage.” and inserting “usage, including—

“(A) increasing the centralization of the management of software licenses;

“(B) increasing the regular tracking and maintaining of comprehensive inventories of software licenses using automated discovery and inventory tools and metrics;

“(C) analyzing software license data to inform investment decisions; and

“(D) providing appropriate personnel with sufficient software licenses management training; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) based on the assessment required under paragraph (2), make such recommendations with respect to software procurement and usage to the Director of National Intelligence as the Chief Information Officer considers appropriate.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Director of National Intelligence receives recommendations from the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community in accordance with subsection (b)(3), the Director of National Intelligence shall, to the extent practicable, issue guidelines for the intelligence community on software procurement and usage based on such recommendations.”.

SEC. 305. REPORTING OF CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES BY FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) **RESTRICTION.**—Title III of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3071 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

“SEC. 304. REPORTING OF CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES BY FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of each element of the intelligence community shall issue regulations requiring each employee of

such element occupying a covered position to sign a written agreement requiring the regular reporting of covered employment to the head of such element.

“(b) AGREEMENT ELEMENTS.—The regulations required under subsection (a) shall provide that an agreement contain provisions requiring each employee occupying a covered position to, during the two-year period beginning on the date on which such employee ceases to occupy such covered position—

“(1) report covered employment to the head of the element of the intelligence community that employed such employee in such covered position upon accepting such covered employment; and

“(2) annually (or more frequently if the head of such element considers it appropriate) report covered employment to the head of such element.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED EMPLOYMENT.—The term ‘covered employment’ means direct employment by, representation of, or the provision of advice relating to national security to the government of a foreign country or any person whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in major part, by any government of a foreign country.

“(2) COVERED POSITION.—The term ‘covered position’ means a position within an element of the intelligence community that, based on the level of access of a person occupying such position to information regarding sensitive intelligence sources or methods or other exceptionally sensitive matters, the head of such element determines should be subject to the requirements of this section.

“(3) GOVERNMENT OF A FOREIGN COUNTRY.—The term ‘government of a foreign country’ has the meaning given the term in section 1(e) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(e)).”

(b) REGULATIONS AND CERTIFICATION.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each element of the intelligence community shall issue the regulations required under section 304 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees—

(A) a certification that each head of an element of the intelligence community has prescribed the regulations required under section 304 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section; or

(B) if the Director is unable to submit the certification described under subparagraph (A), an explanation as to why the Director is unable to submit such certification, including a designation of which heads of an element of the intelligence community have prescribed the regulations required under such section 304 and which have not.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended—

(1) by striking the second item relating to section 302 (Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries) and the items relating to sections 304, 305, and 306; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 304. Reporting of certain employment activities by former intelligence officers and employees.”

SEC. 306. INCLUSION OF PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS IN INTELLIGENCE OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 1024 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3224) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “and Predominantly Black Institutions” after “universities”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Predominantly Black Institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 318 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059e).”

SEC. 307. MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall prepare a plan for management of the elements of the intelligence community that carry out financial intelligence activities.

(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall establish a governance framework, procedures for sharing and harmonizing the acquisition and use of financial analytic tools, standards for quality of analytic products, procedures for oversight and evaluation of resource allocations associated with the joint development of information sharing efforts and tools, and an education and training model for elements of the intelligence community that carry out financial intelligence activities.

(c) BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall brief the congressional intelligence committees on the actions the Director proposes to implement the plan required by subsection (a).

SEC. 308. ANALYSIS OF PRIVATE SECTOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR COUNTERING INSIDER THREATS.

(a) ANALYSIS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the National Counterintelligence Executive, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees an analysis of private sector policies and procedures for countering insider threats.

(b) CONTENT.—The analysis required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a review of whether and how the intelligence community could utilize private sector hiring and human resources best practices to screen, vet, and validate the credentials, capabilities, and character of applicants for positions involving trusted access to sensitive information;

(2) an analysis of private sector policies for holding supervisors and subordinates accountable for violations of established security protocols and whether the intelligence community should adopt similar policies for positions of trusted access to sensitive information;

(3) an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of applying mandatory leave policies, similar to those endorsed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Securities and Exchange Commission to identify fraud in the financial services industry, to certain positions within the intelligence community; and

(4) recommendations for how the intelligence community could utilize private sector risk indices, such as credit risk scores, to make determinations about employee access to sensitive information.

SEC. 309. PROCEDURES FOR THE RETENTION OF INCIDENTALLY ACQUIRED COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED COMMUNICATION.—The term “covered communication” means any non-public telephone or electronic communication acquired without the consent of a person who is a party to the communication, including communications in electronic storage.

(2) HEAD OF AN ELEMENT OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term “head of an element of the intelligence community” means, as appropriate—

(A) the head of an element of the intelligence community; or

(B) the head of the department or agency containing such element.

(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(b) PROCEDURES FOR COVERED COMMUNICATIONS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT TO ADOPT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act each head of an element of the intelligence community shall adopt procedures approved by the Attorney General for such element that ensure compliance with the requirements of paragraph (3).

(2) COORDINATION AND APPROVAL.—The procedures required by paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) prepared in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence; and

(B) approved by the Attorney General prior to issuance.

(3) PROCEDURES.—

(A) APPLICATION.—The procedures required by paragraph (1) shall apply to any intelligence collection activity not otherwise authorized by court order (including an order or certification issued by a court established under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803)), subpoena, or similar legal process that is reasonably anticipated to result in the acquisition of a covered communication to or from a United States person and shall permit the acquisition, retention, and dissemination of covered communications subject to the limitation in subparagraph (B).

(B) LIMITATION ON RETENTION.—A covered communication shall not be retained in excess of 5 years, unless—

(i) the communication has been affirmatively determined, in whole or in part, to constitute foreign intelligence or counterintelligence or is necessary to understand or assess foreign intelligence or counterintelligence;

(ii) the communication is reasonably believed to constitute evidence of a crime and is retained by a law enforcement agency;

(iii) the communication is enciphered or reasonably believed to have a secret meaning;

(iv) all parties to the communication are reasonably believed to be non-United States persons;

(v) retention is necessary to protect against an imminent threat to human life, in which case both the nature of the threat and the information to be retained shall be reported to the congressional intelligence committees not later than 30 days after the date such retention is extended under this clause;

(vi) retention is necessary for technical assurance or compliance purposes, including a court order or discovery obligation, in which case access to information retained for technical assurance or compliance purposes shall

be reported to the congressional intelligence committees on an annual basis; or

(vii) retention for a period in excess of 5 years is approved by the head of the element of the intelligence community responsible for such retention, based on a determination that retention is necessary to protect the national security of the United States, in which case the head of such element shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees a written certification describing—

(I) the reasons extended retention is necessary to protect the national security of the United States;

(II) the duration for which the head of the element is authorizing retention;

(III) the particular information to be retained; and

(IV) the measures the element of the intelligence community is taking to protect the privacy interests of United States persons or persons located inside the United States.

SEC. 310. CLARIFICATION OF LIMITATION OF REVIEW TO RETALIATORY SECURITY CLEARANCE OR ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.

Section 3001(b)(7) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(b)(7)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2014—” and inserting “2014, and consistent with subsection (j)—”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “to appeal a determination to suspend or revoke a security clearance or access to classified information” and inserting “alleging reprisal for having made a protected disclosure (provided the individual does not disclose classified information or other information contrary to law) to appeal any action affecting an employee’s access to classified information”;

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking “information,” inserting “information following a protected disclosure.”

SEC. 311. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON CONSOLIDATING CLASSIFIED DATABASES OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND MALWARE SAMPLES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the National Security Agency, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall conduct a feasibility study on consolidating classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples in the intelligence community.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The feasibility study required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An inventory of classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples in the intelligence community.

(2) An assessment of actions that could be carried out to consolidate such databases to achieve the greatest possible information sharing within the intelligence community and cost savings for the Federal Government.

(3) An assessment of any impediments to such consolidation.

(4) An assessment of whether the Intelligence Community Information Technology Enterprise can support such consolidation.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Director of National Intelligence completes the feasibility study required by subsection (a), the Director shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a written report

that summarizes the feasibility study, including the information required under subsection (b).

SEC. 312. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CYBERSECURITY THREAT AND CYBERCRIME COOPERATION WITH UKRAINE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) cooperation between the intelligence and law enforcement agencies of the United States and Ukraine should be increased to improve cybersecurity policies between these two countries;

(2) the United States should pursue improved extradition procedures among the Governments of the United States, Ukraine, and other countries from which cybercriminals target United States citizens and entities;

(3) the President should—

(A) initiate a round of formal United States-Ukraine bilateral talks on cybersecurity threat and cybercrime cooperation, with additional multilateral talks that include other law enforcement partners such as Europol and Interpol; and

(B) work to obtain a commitment from the Government of Ukraine to end cybercrime directed at persons outside Ukraine and to work with the United States and other allies to deter and convict known cybercriminals;

(4) the President should establish a capacity building program with the Government of Ukraine, which could include—

(A) a joint effort to improve cyber capacity building, including intelligence and law enforcement services in Ukraine;

(B) sending United States law enforcement agents to aid law enforcement agencies in Ukraine in investigating cybercrimes; and

(C) agreements to improve communications networks to enhance law enforcement cooperation, such as a hotline directly connecting law enforcement agencies in the United States and Ukraine; and

(5) the President should establish and maintain an intelligence and law enforcement cooperation scorecard with metrics designed to measure the number of instances that intelligence and law enforcement agencies in the United States request assistance from intelligence and law enforcement agencies in Ukraine and the number and type of responses received to such requests.

SEC. 313. REPLACEMENT OF LOCALLY EMPLOYED STAFF SERVING AT UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall ensure that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, every supervisory position at a United States diplomatic facility in the Russian Federation shall be occupied by a citizen of the United States who has passed, and shall be subject to, a thorough background check.

(2) **EXTENSION.**—The Secretary of State may extend the deadline under paragraph (1) for up to one year by providing advance written notification and justification of such extension to the appropriate congressional committees.

(3) **PROGRESS REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on progress made toward meeting the employment requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) **PLAN FOR REDUCED USE OF LOCALLY EMPLOYED STAFF.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with other appropriate government agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congress-

sional committees a plan to further reduce the reliance on locally employed staff in United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation. The plan shall, at a minimum, include cost estimates, timelines, and numbers of employees to be replaced.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to infringe on the power of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls.”

SEC. 314. INCLUSION OF SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION FACILITIES IN UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND ADJACENT COUNTRIES.

(a) **SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION FACILITY REQUIREMENT.**—Each United States diplomatic facility that, after the date of the enactment of this Act, is constructed in, or undergoes a construction upgrade in, the Russian Federation, any country that shares a land border with the Russian Federation, or any country that is a former member of the Soviet Union shall be constructed to include a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility.

(b) **NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.**—The Secretary of State may waive the requirement under subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that such waiver is in the national security interest of the United States and submits a written justification to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 180 days before exercising such waiver.

(c) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Reporting

SEC. 321. REPORT ON DECLASSIFICATION PROGRESS.

Not later than December 31, 2016, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report describing—

(1) proposals to improve the declassification process throughout the intelligence community; and

(2) steps the intelligence community could take, or legislation that may be necessary, to enable the National Declassification Center to better accomplish the missions assigned to the Center by Executive Order No. 13526 (75 Fed. Reg. 707).

SEC. 322. REPORT ON INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY EFFICIENT SPENDING TARGETS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than April 1, 2016, and April 1, 2017, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report

on the status and effectiveness of efforts to reduce administrative costs for the intelligence community during the preceding year.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report under subsection (a) shall include for each element of the intelligence community the following:

(1) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to devise alternatives to government travel and promote efficient travel spending, such as teleconferencing and video conferencing.

(2) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to limit costs related to hosting and attending conferences.

(3) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to assess information technology inventories and usage, and establish controls, to reduce costs related to underutilized information technology equipment, software, or services.

(4) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to limit the publication and printing of hard copy documents.

(5) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to improve the performance of Federal fleet motor vehicles and limit executive transportation.

(6) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to limit the purchase of extraneous promotional items, such as plaques, clothing, and commemorative items.

(7) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to consolidate and streamline workforce training programs to focus on the highest priority workforce and mission needs.

(8) Such other matters relating to efforts to reduce intelligence community administrative costs as the Director may specify for purposes of this section.

SEC. 323. ANNUAL REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF LAW OR EXECUTIVE ORDER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 511. ANNUAL REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF LAW OR EXECUTIVE ORDER.

“(a) **ANNUAL REPORTS REQUIRED.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall annually submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on violations of law or executive order relating to intelligence activities by personnel of an element of the intelligence community that were identified during the previous calendar year.

“(b) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall, consistent with the need to preserve ongoing criminal investigations, include a description of, and any action taken in response to, any violation of law or executive order (including Executive Order No. 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note)) relating to intelligence activities committed by personnel of an element of the intelligence community in the course of the employment of such personnel that, during the previous calendar year, was—

“(1) determined by the director, head, or general counsel of any element of the intelligence community to have occurred;

“(2) referred to the Department of Justice for possible criminal prosecution; or

“(3) substantiated by the inspector general of any element of the intelligence community.”

(b) **INITIAL REPORT.**—The first report required under section 511 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a), shall be submitted not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **GUIDELINES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the head of each element of the intelligence community, shall—

(1) issue guidelines to carry out section 511 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) submit such guidelines to the congressional intelligence committees.

(d) **TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 510 the following new item:

“Sec. 511. Annual report on violations of law or executive order.”

(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to alter any requirement existing on the date of the enactment of this Act to submit a report under any provision of law.

SEC. 324. ANNUAL REPORT ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For each fiscal year and along with the budget materials submitted in support of the budget of the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report for such fiscal year on each intelligence activity of each intelligence component of the Department, as designated by the Under Secretary, that includes the following:

(1) The amount of funding requested for each such intelligence activity.

(2) The number of full-time employees funded to perform each such intelligence activity.

(3) The number of full-time contractor employees (or the equivalent of full-time in the case of part-time contractor employees) funded to perform or in support of each such intelligence activity.

(4) A determination as to whether each such intelligence activity is predominantly in support of national intelligence or departmental missions.

(5) The total number of analysts of the Intelligence Enterprise of the Department that perform—

(A) strategic analysis; or

(B) operational analysis.

(b) **FEASIBILITY AND ADVISABILITY REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report that—

(1) examines the feasibility and advisability of including the budget request for all intelligence activities of each intelligence component of the Department that predominantly support departmental missions, as designated by the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, in the Homeland Security Intelligence Program; and

(2) includes a plan to enhance the coordination of department-wide intelligence activities to achieve greater efficiencies in the performance of the Department of Homeland Security intelligence functions.

(c) **INTELLIGENCE COMPONENT OF THE DEPARTMENT.**—In this section, the term “intelligence component of the Department” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101).

SEC. 325. REPORT ON POLITICAL PRISON CAMPS IN NORTH KOREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Sec-

retary of State, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on political prison camps in North Korea.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) describe the actions the United States is taking to support implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the eventual establishment of a tribunal to hold individuals accountable for abuses; and

(2) include, with respect to each political prison camp in North Korea to the extent information is available—

(A) the estimated prisoner population of each such camp;

(B) the geographical coordinates of each such camp;

(C) the reasons for confinement of the prisoners at each such camp;

(D) a description of the primary industries and products made at each such camp, and the end users of any goods produced in such camp;

(E) information regarding involvement of any non-North Korean entity or individual involved in the operations of each such camp, including as an end user or source of any good or products used in, or produced by, in such camp;

(F) information identifying individuals and agencies responsible for conditions in each such camp at all levels of the Government of North Korea;

(G) a description of the conditions under which prisoners are confined, with respect to the adequacy of food, shelter, medical care, working conditions, and reports of ill-treatment of prisoners, at each such camp; and

(H) unclassified imagery, including satellite imagery, of each such camp.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form and may include a classified annex if necessary.

SEC. 326. ASSESSMENT OF SECURITY OF DOMESTIC OIL REFINERIES AND RELATED RAIL TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis shall conduct an intelligence assessment of the security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure.

(b) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees—

(1) the results of the assessment required under subsection (a); and

(2) any recommendations with respect to intelligence sharing or intelligence collection to improve the security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure to protect the communities surrounding such refineries or such infrastructure from potential harm that the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 327. ENHANCED CONTRACTOR LEVEL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 506B(c) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3098(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11), by striking “or contracted”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (13); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) The best estimate of the number of intelligence collectors and analysts contracted by each element of the intelligence community and a description of the functions performed by such contractors.”.

SEC. 328. ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFICACY OF MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING TO FACILITATE INTELLIGENCE-SHARING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Program Manager of the Information Sharing Environment, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives an assessment of the efficacy of the memoranda of understanding signed between Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial agencies to facilitate intelligence-sharing within and separate from the Joint Terrorism Task Force. Such assessment shall include—

(1) any language within such memoranda of understanding that prohibited or may be construed to prohibit intelligence-sharing between Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial agencies; and

(2) any recommendations for memoranda of understanding to better facilitate intelligence-sharing between Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial agencies.

SEC. 329. REPORT ON FOREIGN MAN-MADE ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE WEAPONS.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the threat posed by man-made electromagnetic pulse weapons to United States interests through 2025, including threats from foreign countries and foreign non-State actors.

(b) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 330. REPORT ON UNITED STATES COUNTER-TERRORISM STRATEGY TO DISRUPT, DISMANTLE, AND DEFEAT AL-QAEDA AND ITS AFFILIATED OR ASSOCIATED GROUPS.

(a) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive report on the United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be prepared in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Defense, and the head of any other department or agency of the United States Government that has responsibility for activities directed at combating al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups.

(3) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A definition of—

(i) al-Qaeda core, including a list of which known individuals constitute al-Qaeda core;

(ii) an affiliated group of al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an affiliate group of al-Qaeda;

(iii) an associated group of al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an associated group of al-Qaeda; and

(iv) a group aligned with al-Qaeda, including a description of what actions a group takes or statements it makes that qualify it as a group aligned with al-Qaeda.

(B) A list of any other group, including the organization that calls itself the Islamic State (also known as “ISIS” or “ISIL”), that adheres to the core mission of al-Qaeda, or who espouses the same violent jihad ideology as al-Qaeda.

(C) An assessment of the relationship between al-Qaeda core and the groups referred to in subparagraph (B).

(D) An assessment of the strengthening or weakening of al-Qaeda and the groups referred to in subparagraph (B) from January 1, 2010, to the present, including a description of the metrics that are used to assess strengthening or weakening and an assessment of the relative increase or decrease in violent attacks attributed to such entities.

(E) An assessment of whether or not an individual can be a member of al-Qaeda core if such individual is not located in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

(F) An assessment of whether or not an individual can be a member of al-Qaeda core as well as a member of a group referred to in subparagraph (B).

(G) A definition of defeat of core al-Qaeda.

(H) An assessment of the extent or coordination, command, and control between core al-Qaeda and the groups referred to in subparagraph (B), specifically addressing each such group.

(I) An assessment of the effectiveness of counterterrorism operations against core al-Qaeda and the groups referred to in subparagraph (B), and whether such operations have had a sustained impact on the capabilities and effectiveness of core al-Qaeda and such groups.

(4) **FORM.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 331. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON RETRAINING VETERANS IN CYBERSECURITY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to Congress a feasibility study on retraining veterans and retired members of elements of the intelligence community in cybersecurity.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a business meeting has been scheduled before the Committee on En-

ergy and Natural Resources. The business meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the nomination of Colette D. Honorable to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by email to sam_fowler@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on December 9, 2014, at 6 p.m., in room S-216 of the Capitol Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 9, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Social Security: Is a Key Foundation of Economic Security Working for Women?”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 9, 2014, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Authorization for the use of Military Force Against ISIL.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 9, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Campus Sexual Assault: the Roles and Responsibilities of Law Enforcement.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Human Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 9, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The State of Civil and Human Rights in the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 9, 2014, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Inequality, Opportunity, and the Housing Market."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS, HUMAN RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY, AND GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 9, 2014, at 10 a.m., to hold an International Operations and Organizations, Human Rights, Democracy, and Global Women's Issues subcommittee hearing entitled "ISIL's Reign of Terror: Confronting the Growing Humanitarian Crisis in Iraq and Syria."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kelly Tribble Spencer, a detailee in my office, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that William Conlon, an intern in my personal office, be granted floor privileges for December 11, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that James Reeve, a defense fellow in Senator KAINE's office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the 113th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alison Mueller, of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, be granted floor privileges for the rest of December 9, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAKING REVISIONS TO TITLE 36 UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1067 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1067) to make revisions in title 36, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1067) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DORIS MILLER DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4199 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4199) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Waco, Texas, as the "Doris Miller Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4199) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNIZING 20 YEARS SINCE THE GENOCIDE IN RWANDA

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 363, S. Res. 413.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 413) recognizing 20 years since the genocide in Rwanda, and affirming it is in the national interest of the United States to work in close coordination with international partners to help prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and mass atrocities.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Coons amendment to the resolution, which is at the desk, be agreed to and the Senate proceed to vote on the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3993) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To provide that nothing in the resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war)

On page 6, beginning on line 14, strike "events; and" and all that follows through "(8) supports" on line 15 and insert the following: "events;

(8) clarifies that nothing in this resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war; and

(9) supports

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 413), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Coons amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3994) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Amend the twelfth whereas clause of the preamble to read as follows:

Whereas, in September 2005, the United States joined other members of the United Nations in adopting United Nations General Assembly Resolution 60/1, which affirmed that the international community has a responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity;

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

(The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 AND 2015

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Intelligence Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4681 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that the Feinstein substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3995) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 4681), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The following consists of the explanatory material to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

This joint explanatory statement shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

This explanatory statement is accompanied by a classified annex that contains a classified Schedule of Authorizations. The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated by reference in the Act and has the legal status of public law.

The classified annex and classified Schedule of Authorizations are the result of negotiations between the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to reconcile differences in their respective versions of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The congressionally directed actions described in Senate Report No. 113-233, the classified annex that accompanied Senate Report No. 113-233, and the classified annex that accompanied House Report No. 113-463 should be carried out to the extent they are not amended, altered, substituted, or otherwise specifically addressed in either this Joint Explanatory Statement or in the classified annex to this Statement.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION

The following is a section-by-section analysis and explanation of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Section 101. Authorization of appropriations

Section 101 lists the United States Government departments, agencies, and other elements for which the Act authorizes appropriations for intelligence and intelligence-related activities for Fiscal Year 2015.

Section 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations

Section 102 provides that the details of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for intelligence and intelligence-related activities and the applicable personnel levels by program for Fiscal Year 2015 are contained in the classified Schedule of Authorizations and that the classified Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President.

Section 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments

Section 103 is intended to provide additional flexibility to the DNI in managing the civilian personnel of the Intelligence Community (IC). Section 103 provides that the DNI may authorize employment of civilian personnel in Fiscal Year 2015 in excess of the number of authorized positions by an amount not exceeding three percent of the total limit applicable to each IC element under Section 102. The DNI may do so only if necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions.

Section 104. Intelligence Community Management Account

Section 104 authorizes appropriations for the Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA) of the DNI and sets the authorized personnel levels for the elements within the ICMA for Fiscal Year 2015.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Section 201. Authorization of appropriations

Section 201 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$514,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2015 for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL MATTERS

Section 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law

Section 301 provides that funds authorized to be appropriated by the Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in compensation or benefits authorized by law.

Section 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities

Section 302 provides that the authorization of appropriations by the Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity that is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Section 303. National intelligence strategy

Section 303 amends the National Security Act of 1947 to require the DNI to develop a comprehensive national intelligence strategy every four years beginning in 2017.

Section 304. Software licensing

Section 304 amends Section 109 of the National Security Act of 1947, which requires

chief information officers within the IC to prepare biennial inventories and assessments concerning the use and procurement of software licenses, to make certain enhancements to the biennial assessments required under Section 109.

Section 305. Reporting of certain employment activities by former intelligence officers and employees

Section 305 requires the head of each element of the IC to issue regulations that require an employee occupying positions with access to particularly sensitive information within such element to sign a written agreement that requires the regular reporting of any employment by, representation of, or the provision of advice relating to national security to the government of a foreign country, or any person whose activities are supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized by any government of a foreign country, for a two-year period after the employee ceases employment with the IC element.

Section 306. Inclusion of Predominantly Black Institutions in intelligence officer training program

Section 306 amends the National Security Act of 1947 to include predominantly black institutions in the intelligence officer training programs established under Section 1024 of the Act.

Section 307. Management and oversight of financial intelligence

Section 307 requires the DNI to prepare a plan for management of the elements of the IC that carry out financial intelligence activities.

Section 308. Analysis of private sector policies and procedures for countering insider threats

Section 308 directs the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees an analysis of private sector policies and procedures for countering insider threats.

Section 309. Procedures for the retention of incidentally acquired communications

Section 309 requires the head of each element of the IC to adopt Attorney General-approved procedures that govern the retention of nonpublic telephone or electronic communications acquired without consent of a person who is a party to the communications, including communications in electronic storage.

The procedures required under this section shall apply to any intelligence activity that is reasonably anticipated to result in the acquisition of such telephone or electronic communications to or from a United States person not otherwise authorized by court order, subpoena, or similar legal process, regardless of the location where the collection occurs. The procedures shall prohibit the retention of such telephone or electronic communications for a period in excess of five years, unless the communications are determined to fall within one of several categories, enumerated in subsection (b)(3)(B), for which retention in excess of five years is authorized, to include communications that have been affirmatively determined to constitute foreign intelligence or counterintelligence, communications that are reasonably believed to constitute evidence of a crime and are retained by a law enforcement agency, and communications that are enciphered or reasonably believed to have a secret meaning.

Because it may be necessary in certain instances for IC elements to retain communications covered by this section for a period

in excess of five years that do not fall into the categories specifically enumerated in subsection (b)(3)(B), subsection (b)(3)(B)(vii) provides flexibility for the head of each element of the intelligence community to authorize such extended retention where the head of the element determines that it is necessary to protect the national security of the United States. In the absence of such a determination, Section 309 is intended to establish a default rule for intelligence collection activities, not otherwise authorized by legal process, that requires agencies to delete communications covered by this section after five years, unless a determination is made that the communications constitute foreign intelligence or counterintelligence or otherwise meet the retention requirements set forth in this section.

Section 310. Clarification of limitation of review to retaliatory security clearance or access determinations

Section 310 makes a technical amendment to Section 3001(b)(7) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to clarify that the policies and procedures prescribed by that section (to permit individuals to appeal adverse security clearance or access determinations) are only required to apply to adverse security clearance or access determinations alleged to be in reprisal for having made a protected whistleblower disclosure.

Section 311. Feasibility study on consolidating classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples

Section 307 requires the DNI to conduct a feasibility study on consolidating classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples in the IC and to provide a report to the congressional intelligence committees summarizing the feasibility study.

Section 312. Sense of Congress on cybersecurity threat and cybercrime cooperation with Ukraine

Section 312 expresses the sense of Congress concerning cybersecurity threat and cybercrime cooperation between the United States and Ukraine.

Section 313. Replacement of locally employed staff serving at United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation

Section 313 requires the Secretary of State to ensure that every supervisory position at a U.S. diplomatic facility in the Russian Federation is occupied by a citizen of the United States who has passed a background check and to provide Congress with a plan to further reduce reliance on locally employed staff.

Section 314. Inclusion of Sensitive Compartmented Information Facilities in United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation and adjacent countries

Section 314 requires that each U.S. diplomatic facility that is constructed in, or undergoes a construction upgrade in, the Russian Federation, any country that shares a land border with the Russian Federation, or any country that is a former member of the Soviet Union, shall be constructed to include a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility. The Secretary of State may waive the requirements of this section upon a determination that it is in the national security interest of the United States.

SUBTITLE B—REPORTING

Section 321. Report on declassification process

Section 321 requires the DNI to submit a report to Congress describing proposals to improve the declassification process and

steps the IC could take or legislation that may be necessary, to enable the National Declassification Center to better accomplish the missions assigned to the Center by Executive Order 13526.

Section 322. Report on intelligence community efficient spending targets

Section 322 requires the DNI to submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees on the status and effectiveness of efforts to reduce administrative costs for the IC during the preceding year.

Section 323. Annual report on violations of law or executive order

Section 323 requires the DNI to report annually to the congressional intelligence committees on violations of law or executive order by personnel of an element of the IC that were identified during the previous calendar year. Under the National Security Act, the President is required to keep the congressional intelligence committees fully and currently informed of the intelligence activities of the United States government. Nonetheless, this annual reporting requirement is necessary to ensure that the intelligence oversight committees of the House and Senate are made fully aware of violations of law or executive order, including, in particular, violations of Executive order 12333 for activities not otherwise subject to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Section 324. Annual report on intelligence activities of the Department of Homeland Security

Section 324 requires the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the DHS to provide the congressional intelligence committees with a report on each intelligence activity of each intelligence component of the Department that includes, among other things, the amount of funding requested, the number of full-time employees, and the number of full-time contractor employees. In addition, Section 324 requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report that examines the feasibility and advisability of consolidating the planning, programming, and resourcing of such activities within the Homeland Security Intelligence Program (HSIP).

The HSIP budget was established to fund those intelligence activities that principally support missions of the DHS separately from those of the NIP. To date, however, this mechanism has only been used to supplement the budget for the office of Intelligence and Analysis. It has not been used to fund the activities of the non-IC components in the DHS that conduct intelligence-related activities. As a result, there is no comprehensive reporting to Congress regarding the overall resources and personnel required in support of the Department's intelligence activities.

Section 325. Report on political prison camps in North Korea

Section 325 requires the DNI to submit a report on political prison camps in North Korea to the congressional intelligence committees.

Section 326. Assessment of security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure

Section 326 requires the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis to conduct an intelligence assessment of the security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure.

Section 327. Enhanced contractor level assessments for the intelligence community

Section 327 amends the National Security Act of 1947 to require that the annual personnel level assessments for the IC, required under Section 506B of the Act, include a separate estimate of the number of intelligence collectors and analysts contracted by each element of the IC and a description of the functions performed by such contractors.

Section 328. Assessment of the efficacy of memoranda of understanding to facilitate intelligence-sharing

Section 328 requires the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis to provide appropriate congressional committees with an assessment of the efficacy of the memoranda of understanding signed between Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial agencies to facilitate intelligence-sharing within and separate from the Joint Terrorism Task Force. This study should help identify any obstacles to intelligence sharing between agencies, particularly any obstacles that might have impeded intelligence sharing in the wake of the April 2013 bombing of the Boston Marathon, and find improvements to existing intelligence sharing relationships.

Section 329. Report on foreign man-made electromagnetic pulse weapons

Section 329 requires the DNI to provide appropriate congressional committees with a report on the threat posed by manmade electromagnetic pulse weapons to United States interests through 2025.

Section 330. Report on United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups

Section 330 requires the DNI to provide appropriate congressional committees with a report on the United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups.

Section 331. Feasibility study on retraining veterans in cybersecurity

Section 331 requires the DNI to submit to Congress a feasibility study on retraining veterans and retired members of elements of the IC in cybersecurity.

DENOUNCING THE USE OF CIVILIANS AS HUMAN SHIELDS BY HAMAS AND OTHER TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS IN VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 616, H. Con. Res. 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment and an

amendment to the preamble and an amendment to the title.

(Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic.)

(Strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic.)

H. CON. RES. 107

Whereas the use of human shields is unconscionable and morally unacceptable;

Whereas since June 15, 2014, there have been over 2,000 rockets fired by Hamas and other terrorist organizations from Gaza into Israel;

Whereas Hamas uses civilian populations as human shields by placing their missile batteries in densely populated areas and near schools, hospitals, and mosques;

Whereas Israel dropped leaflets, made announcements, placed phone calls, and sent text messages to the Palestinian people in Gaza warning them in advance that an attack was imminent, and went to extraordinary lengths to target only terrorist actors and to minimize collateral damage;

Whereas Hamas urged the residents of Gaza to ignore the Israeli warnings and to remain in their houses and encouraged Palestinians to gather on the roofs of their homes to act as human shields;

Whereas on July 23, 2014, the 46-Member UN Human Rights Council passed a resolution to form a commission of inquiry over Israel's operations in Gaza that completely fails to condemn Hamas for its indiscriminate rocket attacks and its unconscionable use of human shields, with the United States being the lone dissenting vote;

Whereas public reports have cited the role of Iran and Syria in providing material support and training to Hamas and other terrorist groups carrying out rocket and mortar attacks from Gaza;

Whereas throughout the summer of 2006 conflict between the State of Israel and the terrorist organization Hezbollah, Hezbollah forces utilized innocent civilians as human shields;

Whereas al Qaeda, Al-Shabaab, Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and other foreign terrorist organizations typically use innocent civilians as human shields;

Whereas the United States and Israel have cooperated on missile defense projects, including Iron Dome, David's Sling, and the Arrow Anti-Missile System, projects designed to thwart a diverse range of threats, including short-range missiles and rockets fired by non-state actors, such as Hamas;

Whereas the United States provided \$460,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 for Iron Dome research, development, and production;

Whereas, during the most recent rocket attacks from Gaza, Iron Dome successfully intercepted dozens of rockets that were launched against Israeli population centers; and

Whereas 5,000,000 Israelis are currently living under the threat of rocket attacks from Gaza: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the use of innocent civilians as human shields;

(2) calls on the international community to recognize and condemn Hamas' use of human shields;

(3) places responsibility for the rocket attacks against Israel on Hamas and other terrorist organizations, such as Palestine Islamic Jihad;

(4) supports the sovereign right of the Government of Israel to defend its territory and its citizens from Hamas' rocket attacks, kidnapping attempts, and the use of tunnels and other means to carry out attacks against Israel;

(5) expresses condolences to the families of the innocent victims on both sides of the conflict;

(6) supports Palestinian civilians who reject Hamas and all forms of terrorism and violence, desiring to live in peace with their Israeli neighbors;

(7) supports efforts to demilitarize the Gaza Strip, removing Hamas's means to target Israel, including its use of tunnels, rockets, and other means; and

(8) condemns the United Nations Human Rights Council's biased resolution establishing a commission of inquiry into Israel's Gaza operations.

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be agreed to, the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, and that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and that the committee-reported amendment to the title be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the title was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A concurrent resolution denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations."

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2992

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2992, introduced earlier today by Senator GILLIBRAND, is at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2992) to amend title 10, United States Code, to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform

Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHATZ. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2014

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, December 10, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House message to accompany H.R. 3979.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHATZ. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:53 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, December 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 9, 2014:

POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

TONY HAMMOND, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 14, 2018.

NANCI E. LANGLEY, OF HAWAII, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 22, 2018.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

VIRGINIA TYLER LODGE, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2019.

RONALD ANDERSON WALTER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PETER MICHAEL MCKINLEY, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN.

RICHARD RAHUL VERMA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO MR. ENNIS ANTOINE JR.

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the accomplishments of a dear friend and colleague, Mr. Ennis Antoine Jr. Over the last twenty years, Mr. Antoine has left an indelible impression on the city of Atlanta, Georgia through his entrepreneurial advances in real estate and philanthropic endeavors.

Whether it be in his church, his community, or business, Mr. Antoine strives to turn any challenge into an opportunity. In 2004, Mr. Antoine moved from a promising career in journalism to pursue his passions in the realm of real estate, marking the beginning of a career that would be recognized as among the most prolific in the booming real estate market of Atlanta. Later, in 2008, Mr. Antoine made history by becoming the first African American to be honored with the Realtor of the Year award for his outstanding commercial accomplishments during a time in which Georgia was still reeling from the Great Recession. Recently, the Atlanta Board of Realtors elected to honor Mr. Antoine by making him their 90th president and the first African American president in the history of the organization.

Throughout his distinguished career, Mr. Antoine has used his success to empower those around him. Well known by his friends and family for a seemingly inexhaustible amount of energy, Mr. Antoine spends much of his weekends volunteering at his local church as a deacon and assistant pastor, in addition to also mentoring youth.

On many week nights, he can be found teaching real estate classes, where he passes on the practical business skills he has accumulated through years of shaping the Atlanta real estate market.

When Hurricane Katrina decimated his hometown of New Orleans, Mr. Antoine took in over 40 friends and relatives whose homes and livelihoods had been destroyed by the flood waters.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to not only honor the impressive achievements of this man and his recent election as the President of the Atlanta Board of Realtors, but also to commend his compassionate contributions to my Congressional district and to the great State of Georgia. I ask my colleagues to join me in venerating this distinguished individual.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT MERWIN CEO OF MILLS-PENINSULA HEALTH SERVICES ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the accomplished career of a distinguished Californian, Mr. Robert Merwin of San Mateo County, who is retiring at the end of 2014 from his position as Chief Executive Officer of Mills-Peninsula Health Services, a post he has held since January, 1996.

A resident of San Carlos, California, Bob Merwin is a 1971 graduate of the United States International University, and earned his M.B.A. from UCLA in 1973. He began his career in hospital management in 1973 as Assistant Executive Director of the Long Beach Community Hospital. He progressed up the corporate ladder at Long Beach, joined Pacific Presbyterian Medical Center, then came to Mills-Peninsula in 1987 as Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer.

Bob Merwin has served our community as a member of the San Mateo Rotary Club, the American College of Health Care Executives, as Chair of the West Bay Hospital Conference, and Chair of the Hospital Consortium of San Mateo County.

He is a past director of the American Red Cross Bay Area and a member of the Finance Committee of the Health Plan of San Mateo.

Mills-Peninsula has thrived under Bob Merwin's leadership. He has improved relations between physicians and management, contained costs while increasing productivity, and helped develop a strategic plan for the combined hospitals. Under his leadership a new 241 bed acute care facility, Mills-Peninsula Medical Center was constructed. It is a state-of-the-art, \$640 million, 450,000 square foot facility that is a source of pride to our entire community.

Bob Merwin is married to Jean Merwin and he is the father of Michael and Megan. He enjoys golf, tennis and photography.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring Bob Merwin for his stellar career in hospital management and for his extraordinary contributions to our community and our country.

MEDICAID AND WOMEN'S HEALTH

HON. DAVID LOESACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. LOESACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to act before the end of

this year to improve access to care for low-income women in America. The Medicaid primary care bump, which expires on December 31st, should be extended and must be expanded to include women's health.

The current program has improved access to care for low-income Americans by increasing reimbursement for primary care and vaccine administration codes in Medicaid to Medicare levels. However, women's health was left out of the original provision. I think it is critical that we correct this oversight.

Ob-gyns deliver primary and preventative care to women, and an ob-gyn is often the only doctor a woman sees on a regular basis. In Iowa, Ob-gyns are considered primary care under our state Medicaid program. However, the federal law as written says they are not, making it harder for low-income women to get needed care. Extending and expanding the Medicaid primary care access bump would make care available to women in need.

In Iowa, providers receive only 77% in Medicaid reimbursement compared to Medicare for primary services. This affects a physician's willingness to accept new Medicaid patients, and 23% of women Medicaid beneficiaries report problems with finding a new doctor who will accept their insurance due to low Medicaid payment rates, compared to 7% of Medicare beneficiaries and 13% of women with private insurance.

I support extending the Medicaid primary care access bump and expanding it to include women's health so that all Iowa women can access the critical primary and preventative care services they need. I would like to thank colleagues of both parties for introducing legislation to do just this.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER 2 WILLIAM C. SMITH

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor retired United States Army Chief Warrant Officer 2 William C. Smith who passed away on Friday, November 28, 2014.

William "Bill" Smith made the decision at a young age to join the military and serve our country. After graduating from high school, he enlisted to serve in the United States Army.

Soon after joining the Army, Bill came back home to marry his 3rd grade sweetheart, Mona Joye Swanson of Mount Jewett, Pennsylvania. He was named Honor Graduate in 1951 at his graduation from the Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) Academy, achieving the highest grades in all phases of the course. He also attended Winona State University in Minnesota. Bill continued to serve in the Army for

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

22 years at duty stations in New York, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Colorado, Texas, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Germany, and Korea.

In his later military years, he served in Bravo Battery, 3rd battalion (Hercules), 68th Artillery, Army Air Defense Command, as a Nike missile technician, and retired as a Chief Warrant Officer 2. During his service he was awarded with an Army Commendation Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Army Forces Reserve Medal, and an Expert Missile Man Badge.

After leaving the military in 1968, Bill accepted a job with Texas Instruments (TI) and the family settled in Plano, Texas. He worked for TI until 1990, when he retired after 22 years, attaining the "Gold Badge" level.

On November 28, 2014, William Carl Smith was laid to rest. His legacy will live on for many generations, as Bill is survived by his and Mona's nine children, 20 grandchildren, 24 great-grandchildren, and many nieces and nephews. He will forever be remembered as a caring man who cherished family values and who was dedicated to serving our Great Nation.

America thanks Bill and his family for their service and sacrifice on behalf of our country.

As I close, I ask everyone to continue praying for our country during these difficult times. I also ask everyone to pray for our military men and women who protect us from external threats and our first responders who protect us from internal threats right here at home.

God bless our military men and women, and God bless the United States of America.

FUTURE PEARLAND FOOTBALL HEROES ARE YOUNG BUT MIGHTY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pearland Patriots for winning the 2014 Bay Area Football League championship.

Their dominating victory caps off a year of excellent performance against tough opponents, and is a testament to their hard work and focus throughout the season. The discipline that carried them through the championship game will bring continued success as they advance in their athletic careers and build on the Pearland community's great legacy in football.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to the Pearland Patriots for winning the Bay Area Football League championship. We look forward to their continued success both on and off the field.

HONORING BARBARA BAYMON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Barbara Baymon

who is a remarkable Leader and Public Servant.

Ms. Barbara Baymon holds a B.A. degree in Speech Communication from Mississippi Valley State University and an M.A. degree from Arkansas State University.

Ms. Baymon teaches a variety of speech courses in the department of Communication and is also the Director of Theater. She is the Coordinator for the Speech Communication major.

Each semester, Ms. Baymon directs one or more productions that features MVSU students and is performed on campus and on the road. Her duties also include serving on various departmental and university committees.

Ms. Baymon is also active in her community. She is an Alderwoman for Isola and President of Humphrey County Hospital Board of Directors.

Her memberships include Alpha Kappa Mu Honor Society, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., Mississippi Theater Association, Mississippi Communication Association, International Communication Association and Southern Conference on Afro-American Studies, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Barbara Baymon, a leader and public servant, for her dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAVID E. GLOWINSKI FOR 37 YEARS OF FEDERAL SERVICE IN THE DE- FENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life's work of David E. Glowinski. For the better part of four decades, Mr. Glowinski has served the Defense Contract Management Agency with distinction. On January 2, 2015, Mr. Glowinski will retire from federal service after more than 37 years.

David E. Glowinski was born in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. A graduate of Wilkes University, David graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in Economics and a Master's in Business Administration. After finishing school, David began working for the Department of Defense in August 1977. He was stationed at General Dynamics in Eynon, where he worked as Quality Assurance Specialist. In 1980, David became an Industrial Specialist and has served in that capacity until the present time.

During his time with the Department of Defense, Mr. Glowinski built up a reputation for being an outstanding worker and vigilant steward of resources. David was well known for his superior technical skills and constantly relied on for his technical expertise at General Dynamics. He was often called upon to complete complex delivery predictions and notices for Top 500 contractors. In addition, Mr. Glowinski managed expedited customer requests which assisted early delivery in support of critical worldwide missions. Because of his dedica-

tion, Mr. Glowinski was recognized for outstanding performance in each of his 37 years at General Dynamics.

I take great honor in congratulating Mr. Glowinski on his retirement from federal service. His career with the Defense Contract Management Agency has been exceptional. I offer my thanks for his service to our country, and I wish him the best in retirement.

HONORING THE FRALINGER STRING BAND'S 100TH ANNIVER- SARY

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Fralinger String Band as it celebrates its 100th anniversary on December 18, 2014.

The Fralinger String Band was founded on December 18, 1914 by a group of young men playing music on a street corner in South Philadelphia where physician Dr. John Fralinger operated a neighborhood drug store, in the heart of Pennsylvania's 1st Congressional District. The doctor, known for his interest in promoting promising youth, would sponsor the band. The J.J. Fralinger String Band would make its debut in the New Year's Day Mummies Parade, a Philadelphia tradition, on January 1, 1915, just two weeks after its founding.

The band has won an unmatched 16 first-place prizes in the Mummer's Parade in the last 50 years, and was the first string band to use the saxophone and the first to appear in a major motion picture. The band served as a goodwill ambassador for Philadelphia and traveled throughout both the United States and the world, in Miss America Pageant Parades, and the International Chinese New Year Parade in Hong Kong.

Over its 100-year history, the Fralinger String Band has been led by the friends and family members of Dr. Fralinger and operates today as a non-profit corporation run entirely by volunteers. The band's clubhouse is still located in the heart of South Philadelphia, just feet from the original Fralinger Pharmacy.

I invite you and all of my colleagues to join me in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Fralinger String Band. May its commitment to performing for and entertaining people of all ages be an inspiration to all of us in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING HARRY WAMPLER

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to recognize one of the most admired public servants in my District on the occasion of his 80th birthday.

Harry Wampler has served my State with distinction for many decades, and he has one

of the most well-known last names in my District.

His family founded Wampler's Sausage in 1937 with just \$38 worth of supplies, and today, most folks in East Tennessee could probably sing the Wampler's Sausage jingle—"made on the farm in Tennessee."

Wampler's Sausage is an iconic Tennessee company that Harry helped lead. During his successful business career, he has also served as President and CEO of Family Brands International and as a member of the Board of Emeritus of Sun Trust Bank and the Board of Trustees of Baptist Hospital. He is a longtime member of the Civitan Club, serving as President twice and named Civitan "Man of the Year."

For several decades, Harry Wampler has also served the people of Lenoir City in public office, including the Lenoir City Council, the Loudon County Planning Commission, and the Tennessee State Legislature.

He has also held the post of Vice Mayor of Lenoir City, member of the Lenoir City Utilities Power Board, Chairman of the Republican Party of Loudon County, and Deacon of First Baptist Church of Lenoir City, where he served as Chairman several times.

Harry's hard work, personal faith and love of East Tennessee is very well known by his constituents.

He is a very patriotic American and one of the finest public servants I have ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Colleagues and other Readers of the RECORD to join me in wishing a very happy birthday to my friend Harry Wampler and celebrate his impressive service to the people of Loudon County, Tennessee.

APPLAUDING THE PEARLAND OILERS—A TEXAS FOOTBALL POWERHOUSE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pearland Oilers for winning the 2014 South Texas Youth Football Association championship.

Their overpowering performance highlighted the athletic ability and relentless work ethic that carried the Oilers past tough opponents all season. The lessons of previous seasons and defensive greatness have helped these terrific athletes achieve success at the highest level of youth football and will continue to serve them well in future challenges.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to the Pearland Oiler sophomore football team for winning the South Texas Youth Football Association championship. We look forward to their continued success both on and off the field.

TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE "KELLY" KRAUSER KNOTT

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a wonderful young woman, Katherine "Kelly" Krauser Knott, who passed away last week after a long and courageous battle with breast cancer. We will miss Kelly dearly. She brought grace and warmth to everything she did. She was a great colleague, a great wife and mother, and a great friend to all she knew.

Kelly was one of the best parts of the fabric of life for those of us who have the privilege of serving the people here on Capitol Hill. Every day, lawmakers and staff interact with dozens or even hundreds of people who are representing their issues or interests in Congress; but few of these people make the kind of lasting impression that Kelly made on many of us. She was a tireless advocate for her members at the Associated General Contractors of America and later at the National Retail Federation. Many of us had the pleasure of working with Kelly on tough policy issues over the years, and we appreciated her patience, her perseverance and her friendship through all.

Kelly came to Washington, DC from Connecticut with a bachelor's degree from St. Mary's College, Notre Dame in Indiana, and she earned a master's degree in political management from George Washington University. She got her start on Capitol Hill with the late Representative Mel Hancock from southwestern Missouri, and I'm sure it didn't take long for her colleagues in Mr. Hancock's office to recognize that Kelly was a team player and a quiet leader who was always eager to pitch in and help.

The staff and members of the Associated General Contractors of America were fortunate enough to work with Kelly through her marriage to Stewart and birth of her three children. She was a thoughtful, informed and aggressive member of the AGC team. She had a unique way of asserting her position without being too disagreeable. She made friends in the association, became a favorite of members who came to town and had a good way of guiding constituent comments back to the topic of concern without getting in their way. Most of all she was a friend and a person who used her warmth and charm to make others feel good.

Later on, even though her own family was still quite young, Kelly's effective leadership was again at the fore as she became a mentor mom to other young working mothers who learned to count on her as a source of wisdom on balancing work and family responsibilities. While her work was important to Kelly, family always came first. In the last hours of her fight, her thoughts were not about the business of continuing resolutions, issue briefs or committee assignments, but of simply ensuring that the right Christmas tree was brought home to her house so that her treasured children would have all that they needed for Christmas.

Kelly was a wonderful friend and colleague to so many, a trusted advocate on many issues, a loving wife, and a beautiful and enduring role model for her children. We have worried about and prayed for Kelly and her family during the course of her illness. We will continue to worry about and pray for her family as we all deal with the hole in our lives that comes from her passing. We know that her shoes will be impossible to fill; we are privileged to say that we were given the opportunity to call her a friend and colleague.

I am sure that many of my colleagues join me today in saying that our hearts go out to Kelly's husband Stewart, her three beautiful children, Carson (9), Halle (6) and Kendall (6), her loving family, and her friends, too numerous to count.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOSCOV'S

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in partnership with my colleagues, Representative CHARLIE DENT, Representative PAT MEEHAN, and Representative JOE PITTS, to recognize Boscov's, one of the nation's largest family-owned department store chains, on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

Boscov's, headquartered in Berks County, Pennsylvania, was founded by Solomon Boscov in 1914 at 9th and Pike Streets in Reading, Pennsylvania. Solomon emigrated to the United States in 1911, purchased \$8 worth of merchandise, and traveled on foot through Lancaster and Berks Counties selling his wares. Within a year, he had saved enough to purchase a horse and wagon and increase his inventory.

From these humble beginnings, Boscov's has grown to a chain of 43 stores in 6 states with a yearly revenue of over \$1 billion. Currently headed by Solomon's son, Albert, who serves as Chairman and CEO, Boscov's is one of the last family-owned department store chains in the United States. In addition to offering fine merchandise at outstanding value, Albert Boscov has been a tireless advocate for the Greater Reading area and his devotion to the community, through civic and charitable activities, is unrivaled. Throughout its long and storied history, Boscov's has exemplified the notion that quality never goes out of style. And Albert has exemplified the principle of corporate leaders being involved in their community's life and reaching beyond the company office to help those in need.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of its 100 years of faithful service to its customers and community, I and my Pennsylvania colleagues ask that the House join us today in recognizing Boscov's on the exciting occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,991,068,498,107.32. We've added \$7,364,191,449,194.24 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.3 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING THE DESERT VISTA
HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS CROSS
COUNTRY TEAM

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Girls Cross Country Team of Desert Vista High School in Phoenix, Arizona, home of the Thunder. On November 8, 2014, the team won the Division One State Championship in Cross Country, and the team's captain, Senior Dani Jones, set a new course record for Arizona.

This year, for the first time in Desert Vista High School history, the team qualified for the Nike Cross Nationals, a meet that brings together the fastest high school cross country teams and individuals from around the country. On Saturday December 6, 2014, the team took 5th place at this meet, and Dani Jones took 3rd place in the individual category.

This past year, I have had the great honor of running with the team during their early morning practices. The focus, dedication and spirit of these exceptional young women are inspiring.

Congratulations to the Desert Vista High School Girls Cross Country Team, to Team Captain Dani Jones, and to Head Coach Jeff Messer and his dedicated coaching staff. This amazing team consists of exceptional young female athletes, dedicated coaches, and supportive parents.

I am very proud to represent the students and families of Desert Vista High School, and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the accomplishments of these remarkable young women.

HONORING MR. TONY ROACH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable American Soldier, Sergeant First Class Tony Roach, a resident of Shaw, Mississippi.

Sergeant First Class Roach entered the Army Reserves on February 9, 1990, and completed Basic and Advanced Individual Training as an armor crewman at Fort Knox, Kentucky directly after graduating from Shaw High School. He was stationed at Fort Hood, Texas and Camp Shelby, Mississippi. His overseas assignment include Log Base Seitz in Iraq.

SFC Roach was deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, OIF 2004–2005, in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, and Camp Shelby in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, OEF 2006–2014. Most recently, he served eight years as an Observer Controller Team Leader at Camp Shelby in Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

SFC Roach has served with overwhelming admiration at every level within a Tank Platoon to include: Tank Gunner, Tank Commander, Squad Leader and Platoon Sergeant. He has served as an Interim Observer Controller Team Leader, Battalion Operations Sergeant, and Observer Controller Group Leader.

His military education includes 19K (Tanker) OSUT, 88M (Truck Driver), Primary Leadership Development Course, Basic Noncommissioned Officer Course, Advanced Noncommissioned Officer Course, Basic Instructor Course, Recruiting and Retention School, Driver Training Course, Mind Resistant AP Instructor Course.

He furthered his civilian education at Coahoma Community College in Clarksdale, Mississippi where he graduated in 1999 with a technical certification in Barbering.

His awards and decorations include: the Army Commendation Medal, Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal (3RD Award), National Defense Service Medal With Bronze Star (2ND Award), Iraqi campaign Medal with Campaign Star, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal with Campaign Star, Global War On Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, and Armed Forces Reserve Medal with M Device (2nd Award).

Sergeant First Class Roach has two daughters: Laliya and Brianna; and one son, Tony Cordale. Sergeant First Class Roach is the son of Freddy Bryant and Gloria Roach and has 6 siblings: Gloria, Dellia, Nicole, Lee, James, and Isaac.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an amazing American Soldier.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SAN
BRUNO CENTENNIAL

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 100th birthday of the city of San Bruno, California, a city of about 40,000 residents spreading over 5.5 square miles between the flat lowlands near San Francisco Bay and the foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains rising 700 feet above the Pacific Ocean. San Bruno is adjacent to San Francisco International Airport and bestrides the Golden Gate National Cemetery. San Bruno is located in my Congressional District and its scenic beauty and

community life make it one of the most beloved cities on the Peninsula.

San Bruno is filled with natural beauty and stunning views of the ocean and bay. It has superb schools, a beautiful main city park, and top-notch businesses. The city has also contributed to popular culture and sports as it is the hometown of actress Suzanne Somers, soprano Luana DeVol, musician Ron "Pigpen" McKernan and three famous baseball players: Wally Bunker, Keith Hernandez and Pablo Sandoval.

Long before the city of San Bruno was incorporated, the Ohlone people lived in a village here named Urebure. In 1769, the area was explored by a Spanish expedition led by Gaspar de Portola, followed by a more extensive exploration by Bruno de Heceta. That second exploration resulted in the naming of San Bruno Creek which eventually gave the community its name.

When Mission San Francisco de Asis was established to the north, much of the land around today's San Bruno became pasture for livestock. Grazing continued even after the decline of the missions.

The city had its origins in Clark's Station, an 1849 inn that served as a stop on the Butterfield Overland Mail stagecoach route. This inn was eventually renamed Uncle Tom's Cabin. Significant development of San Bruno didn't begin until after the 1906 earthquake. The first public school was completed that year. The paving of California's first state highway, El Camino Real, began in 1912 in front of Uncle Tom's Cabin, eventually replaced by 14 Mile House and subsequently by other structures and businesses. In 1914, San Bruno was incorporated following a campaign by the San Bruno Herald, the local newspaper. Incorporation allowed more streets to be paved and the population rapidly grew from 1,500 residents in 1920 to 3,610 residents in 1930.

San Francisco International Airport opened in 1927. One of the first visitors to SFO was Charles Lindbergh after his historic transatlantic flight. More aviation history was made when Eugene Ely completed the first successful shipboard aircraft landing, taking off from San Bruno's Tanforan race track, and landing on the USS *Pennsylvania* anchored in San Francisco Bay.

Golden Gate National Cemetery was created in 1939 under the direction of the Presidio in San Francisco. Today, the cemetery is the hallowed final resting place of citizen soldiers who defended our freedom from World War II to the present. San Bruno annually honors their sacrifices through multiple ceremonies great and small. This is a community that cherishes those who gave their all so that all might live in freedom and at peace.

The era of World War II left a dark stain on American history in the form of the internment of Japanese American citizens. Tanforan race track became a temporary internment center. Today a memorial plaque at Tanforan mall serves as a reminder that we must learn from history and never again allow such an infringement on civil liberties.

After the war, San Bruno continued to grow. U.S. Route 101, the Bayshore freeway, opened in 1947. San Bruno high school students had to travel to San Mateo and Burlingame, but in 1950, San Bruno finally had its

own high school, Capuchino. Capuchino was the school of a remarkable history teacher who soon entered the State Assembly and then the House of Representatives: Leo J. Ryan. Congressman Ryan loved Capuchino and would sometimes reflect on the lessons that he learned in the classroom from his bright, energetic San Bruno students.

In 1954, the city dedicated a library and city hall. Skyline College, a two year community college, was established in 1960. Later in the 60s, Interstate 280 and 380 were built making San Bruno further accessible and attractive to retail businesses. In 2003, the Bay Area Rapid Transit system extended further into San Mateo County, and a station was opened in San Bruno, further tying this town to others in our region. Just this year, a new train station opened, making rail transit from San Francisco to San Jose even more convenient for San Bruno residents and markedly improving cross-town mobility and safety.

Mr. Speaker, San Bruno's daily life is based upon families. Families go to its churches. Families flock to sporting events, including nationally-competitive youth baseball. Families play in San Bruno Park and walk throughout the community enjoying the small-town atmosphere that makes San Bruno so special. There might be some millionaires or someday perhaps even a billionaire living in San Bruno, but fundamentally the community is where American families live so that they may enjoy great schools and great fun amidst like-minded people dedicated to hard work, honest commerce, and civic engagement.

Its 40,000 residents are a wonderful mix of ethnic backgrounds and ages. Under the steady guidance of Mayor Jim Ruane and councilmembers Rico Medina, Ken Ibarra, Irene O'Connell and Michael Salazar, City Manager Connie Jackson and an amazing city staff, San Bruno has reached the remarkable age of 100 years and yet it is still in its youth. No challenge, not even a 2010 explosion that cost the lives of eight precious souls and changed the laws of this nation, can dampen the love of residents for this beautiful city.

Some like to define a city by its history, but I prefer to defy convention and to instead define it by the predominant characteristic of its residents. When people ask me to describe San Bruno I offer one word in reply: Optimism. It is the defining characteristic of those who create families, the defining characteristic of those who remain after their children have left, and the defining characteristic of a long series of public servants who have walked in the hills of San Bruno, gazed upon its boundaries, and seen only a bright future in the land that lies between a wonderful college in the hills, the grand city park in the south, the great bay to the east, and precious neighbors to the north. Optimism is the drummer boy in the parade of San Bruno's story.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to celebrate the centennial of San Bruno, California. Yesterday, the Ohlone made their livelihoods upon its shores. Today, America thrives in its bosom. Tomorrow, history will be the child of its remarkable citizenry. Congratulations San Bruno, you are America's heartland upon its western shore!

THE "LOST BATTALION"

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over 72 years ago, the 2nd Battalion of the 131st Field Artillery Regiment (36th Division—Texas National Guard) gathered and met for the first time. The 2nd Battalion was predominately made up of a scrappy group of Northwest Texas farmhands who hailed from towns like Abilene, Wichita Falls and Lubbock. About a year after their initial encounter, the group was detached from its division in Texas and sent out west to the San Francisco Bay where they were told that they would soon be on route to PLUM, a code-name for a destination unknown to the boys from the prairie lands of Texas.

The 2nd Battalion arrived in Pearl Harbor a few days later on November 28, but immediately departed after being warned of a possible Japanese attack. The tragic prediction came true, and on December 7, 1941, the 2nd Battalion was informed that Pearl Harbor was indeed attacked by the Japanese and that the United States was now at war. After leaving Hawaii, the Battalion headed over to Brisbane, Australia, where they spent Christmas until boarding a Dutch ship and setting sail for Java, an island in the Dutch East Indies, shortly before New Year's Day. They arrived at Java on January 11 and stayed for nearly two months, sharing the island with troops from the Netherlands and Australia, among other allied countries.

After weeks of uncertainty, the boys started to grow restless as they pondered what their next assignment would be. Then, on February 28, their lives would change forever as they heard a quick succession of loud explosions. At this point explosions were sounding off faster than they could count and it became evident that the war's Pacific Theater was quickly encompassing their temporary island home of Java. As the melting pot of troops watched the horizon, they noticed something that appeared to be men swimming ashore. The dozens they first saw quickly turned into hundreds and the onshore troops soon learned that the men were all sailors aboard the USS *Houston* (a ship that was anchored nearby). The USS *Houston* was made up almost entirely of volunteers from the city of Houston, many of whom were just teenagers. That evening, Japanese forces surrounded and attacked the USS *Houston*, killing all but 368 of the 1,011 men aboard. The surviving sailors swam ashore, joined the 534 men of the 2nd Battalion, and would soon become known as the "Lost Battalion."

Though the allied troops on the beaches of Java held off for as long as they could, they finally succumbed to Japanese forces on March 8 after days of relentless, back-and-forth artillery fire. Within a matter of weeks, all of the remaining soldiers of the 2nd Battalion and the USS *Houston* were together at one camp as Japanese prisoners of war. This group of 902 men, nearly all of whom hailed from Texas, soon disappeared, not to be seen again for three and a half years. They would go on to be known as the "Lost Battalion."

For 42 months, these captured American sailors toiled away in different parts of Pacific Asia. Forced together through a tragic turn of events, these men banded together to overcome a set of truly awful circumstances. Physical beatings were daily and torture came to be expected. Hard labor and starvation were now part of their daily routines. But, perhaps the hardest part of it all was being separated from their families without any chance at communicating with them. Their wives, children, parents and siblings all believed they were dead. Though the Japanese camps attempted to make them wish for that fate, they never gave up hope. It was the memory of their families back in Texas that kept them going each day. Moving from island to island in the darkest, dampest bowels of the Japanese ships' smallest compartments, the men were treated like cattle. Then, once reaching their destinations they would be immediately forced into hard slave labor. Some built roads, some worked in Burmese jungles chopping down trees and some mined coal. One of the worst physical punishments was working on a railway that became known as "The Railroad of Death." Working on this railroad amounted to constant torture. Over 70,000 allied soldiers died after being subjected to these horrible 20-plus hour work days. They were constantly starved, and when they did have the opportunity to eat, their food was rotten and full of insects. These men overcame slavery, torture, malnutrition, beatings and diseases, and came out of the atrocity stronger than ever with a bond that would last a lifetime.

Liberation didn't come until the end of the war, and when it was all said and done, 163 of the 902 men had tragically lost their lives. Among these 163 were 89 from the 2nd Battalion of the 36th Division of the Texas National Guard and 74 sailors from the USS *Houston*. When the surviving men were finally liberated from their hell on earth, they headed back to Texas where a celebration in Wichita Falls was waiting for them. The boys from Texas had such a good time at the celebration that they decided to make it an annual get-together. They used this get-together to not only celebrate their families and lives, but to remember their 163 comrades who perished in Japanese war camps. Though they were now safe and back home with their families, many of them would go on to suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. However, their mental fortitude helped them overcome many of the adversities they faced as POW's and then as victims of PTSD.

The lesson the "Lost Battalion" taught us, and continues to teach us each day, goes further than just patriotism. Their resiliency, friendship, and faith in each other and in God are all important values that would benefit every American individual who chooses to observe them.

The "Lost Battalion" is yet another group of that rare breed we call the Greatest Generation.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING ZUPPARDI
APIZZA ON ITS 80TH ANNIVER-
SARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to join the West Haven community in extending my sincere congratulations to the Zuppari family as they celebrate the 80th Anniversary of their restaurant, and cherished local treasure, Zuppari's Apizza.

As you may know, New Haven and many of its surrounding communities are well known for their Italian cuisine—particularly for our pizza. Zuppari's Apizza has been a local favorite since its opening eight decades ago. Like so many other businesses in and around New Haven, Zuppari's speaks to the immigrant experience. Domenico Zuppari, an immigrant from Maiori, Italy arrived in New Haven in 1921 with little more than a dream and a talent for the family business, bread. He worked as a bread baker with family members before moving to West Haven in 1934, where he opened his own business, Salerno Bakery. His specialty was bread and pizza. Joined by his son, Anthony, upon his return from the Navy in 1946, they opened Zuppari's Apizza as an extension of the bakery. Though both flourished, in later years Anthony made the decision to keep his focus on the pies and the rest, as they say is history.

Zuppari's Apizza is a family business in every sense of the word. Anthony and his wife, Frances, lived above the restaurant, and their children spent their free time watching, learning, and working there. Now run by those third and fourth generations, Zuppari's Apizza is the 7th oldest continuously run family pizzeria in the country, and the 2nd oldest existing pizzeria in Connecticut. Just last year, "The Special," a pie made with mozzarella, mushrooms, and their homemade sausage, made the Daily Meal's list of 101 Best Pizzas in the nation, coming in at #50. "The Special" was named by Anthony and Frances Zuppari and has never changed. Zuppari's also offers not one but two clam pizzas—white, of course—just make sure you specify canned or fresh shucked when ordering. With all of this history, the family has also created a niche by selling hundreds of frozen pizzas to customers around the country each month.

Anthony Zuppari had a simple philosophy "The last bite has to be as good as the first when people eat our pizza." Today, his daughters Lori and Cheryl still hold true to that simple message. Customers are valued and they take pride in putting forth a quality pizza. That is what makes Zuppari's so special. I am happy to rise today to join the West Haven community in extending my heartfelt congratulations to Lori, Cheryl, and the entire Zuppari family as they mark this remarkable milestone. Happy 80th Anniversary!

HONORING MASTER SERGEANT
CHARLES E. MILLER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable American Soldier, Master Sergeant Charles Miller, a resident of Clarksdale, Mississippi.

Master Sergeant Charles E. Miller started his military career, June 1978, at Fort McClellan, Alabama. Master Sergeant Miller was in the first group of Soldiers to participate in the One Station Unit Training (OSUT), this program entailed Soldiers going through Basic Training and Military Occupation Specialty (MOS) training, at the same military post with the same Drill Sergeants. After completing basic training and his military occupation specialty training in January 1978, he is now qualified to be a Military Policeman (MP). Master Sergeant Miller was stationed at Fort Sill, Oklahoma as a Military Policeman, with the 546th MP Company. After 18 months at Fort Sill, Oklahoma Master Sergeant Miller received orders to report to Baumholder, West Germany, as a Physical Security Specialist. At the end of June 1981, MSG Miller ended his time in service, receiving an honorable discharge.

In January 1982, MSG Miller re-enlisted in the U.S. Army at Fort Dix, New Jersey, to attend Truck Driving School. March 1982, after successfully completing the Truck Driver School, he was reassigned to the 66th Engineer (ADM) Company, Fort Hood, Texas. December 1983, MSG Miller was reassigned to Charlie Company 249th Engineer BN., Karlsruhe, West Germany. December 1986, he returned stateside where he was discharged with an Honorable Discharge.

Master Sergeant Miller still wanted to serve his country so he enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve, 479th Ordinance Company, Lyon Mississippi. The 479th ORD. CO. was activated to active duty, September 1990 to support the Gulf War. The 479th Ord. Co., arrived in Saudi Arabia, November 1990. In July 1991, the 479th ORD. Company returned home to receive a Heroes' Welcome.

In July 2001, Master Sergeant Miller was transferred to the 412th Engineer Command, Vicksburg, Mississippi. April 2006, Master Sergeant Miller was called to active duty to support Operation Iraqi Freedom where he was stationed at Baghdad, Iraq. In April 2008, Master Sergeant Miller returned home.

Master Sergeant Miller took the position as First Sergeant (1SG), April 2012, with the 4/323rd REGT, this is a Drill Sergeant Unit, U.S. Army Reserve. Master Sergeant Miller recalls when he was stationed in Germany, assigned to the 249th ENG BN, his First Sergeant at the time asked him if he wanted to go to Drill Sergeant School and he declined. Master Sergeant Miller wishes today that his First Sergeant would have asked him several times and given him more information on becoming a Drill Sergeant. In the reserve component the First Sergeant is just the manager of the unit, he or she does not have to be a Drill Sergeant.

As of March 17, 2014, Master Sergeant Miller is now re-assigned to the 412th Theater Engineer Command, Vicksburg, Mississippi. He speaks highly about the 412th Theater Command, he says, he is now back home. Master Sergeant Miller is fully aware that his military career is now coming to an end, and when he does retire it will be a difficult transition. Serving in the military was never a mistake to him, it is a privilege which he is so glad that he took advantage of to serve our great country.

Master Sergeant Miller has numerous military occupation specialties, he is qualified as an Army Maintenance Management System Clerk, Prescribed Load List Clerk, Ammunition Specialist, Transportation Operator, Military Police, Physical Security Specialist, and Supply Specialist.

During Master Sergeant Miller's military career, he has received numerous awards, not listed in prestigious order to include: Meritorious Service Medal, Army Occupation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Armed Forces Reserve Medal, Army Overseas Service Ribbons, Army Good Conduct Medal, Army Reserve Overseas Training Ribbons, Armed Forces Reserve Medal, Army NCO Professional, Development Ribbon, Army Service Ribbon, Southwest Asia Service Ribbons and Drivers Badge.

Master Sergeant Miller is married to Mrs. Florine Miller and they have 3 daughters: Lakechia, Tiffany, and Alexis; one son, French and 6 grandchildren. Master Sergeant Miller is the son of Eddie & Evelyn Brown, and Willard Hughes and has 2 sisters: Jackie and Shelia; and 5 brothers: Willous, Allen, Reginald, Michael and Willard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a distinguished American Soldier.

HONORING THE NEW PALESTINE HIGH SCHOOL DRAGONS

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the New Palestine High School Dragons on their first state football championship.

The Dragons faced off against the New Prairie Cougars on November 28th at Lucas Oil Stadium. During their first appearance in the Indiana state football finals in more than 20 years, the team made their mark by breaking the record for total points, total yards, and most touchdowns and extra points. In the end, the Dragons won the Class 4A state final 77-42 over the Cougars.

I am proud of these young men for not only their remarkable win, but also for the Hoosier sportsmanship that they each displayed throughout the game. Their dedication to excellence and their perseverance was evident not just in this game, but throughout the entire 2014 season. I want to commend Coach Kyle Ralph and all of the assistant coaches who led these young men through this historic season.

I want to again congratulate the New Palestine Dragons on both their hard-earned victory in the state finals, as well as on their record-breaking 2014 football season. I look forward to hearing about the accomplishments of each of these young men in the future, and I wish the Dragons the best of luck in the 2015 season.

IN RECOGNITION OF LEN STONE

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Len Stone who is departing the Pacifica City Council after serving with distinction during these past four years.

Mr. Stone is a local business owner and resident of Pacifica since 2002. He and his wife, Jessica, have two young children. In addition to his service to the community while on the city council, Len Stone served for five years on the Board of Directors of the Pacifica Chamber of Commerce.

Pacifica is a city nestled between the Pacific Ocean and the hills. Its young families are energetic and often part of Silicon Valley's high tech businesses. Its longtime residents are rightfully proud of many traditions of environmental protection that have shaped modern Pacifica. Newer residents move to Pacifica to enjoy the ocean, Pacifica's great beaches, its strong schools and its natural beauty.

During his four years on the Pacifica City Council, Len Stone focused tirelessly on all of the qualities of Pacifica that make it a special place in this nation. He led the effort to improve economic development. He successfully sought to have an economic development director position created in city government. He worked to recruit new businesses to town, and he wanted to expand the tax base by filling the vacant storefronts that sometimes exist in shopping centers and shopping areas in this marvelous community.

Len is deeply committed to making Pacifica a destination for more people from outside the community, and so his support of tourism is energetic. To this end, he and another councilmember recently negotiated an option on land that will, if purchased and improved, fill the missing link in the coastal trail. With the opening of the Devil's Slide trail just south of Pacifica, the city is an even greater magnet for tourists seeking vigorous, outside excursions. During both his term as mayor and while on the council, Len sought to position Pacifica as an unrivaled place to bring a family for an outdoor adventure.

Len joined the city council during the worst economic downturn in modern times. This downturn hit Pacifica's tax base hard. Residents had to leave town to do major shopping and to enjoy entertainment options such as movies. The city's budget, never flush, was in deficit. Len sought to balance the budget and to retain needed services. As a businessperson, he was aware that new ways of doing things were needed to help close the deficit. It is difficult for a community to change, but if any community can pull together to find

solutions, I have faith that Pacifica is that community. Len, who participated in countless budget and study sessions, demonstrated the energy that many Pacifica residents possess when confronted with challenges.

Mr. Speaker, it is never easy or simple to serve in local government. If times are good then your neighbors expect a great deal. If times are not so great then your neighbors wonder why you are shuttering a popular local field or laying off longtime personnel or considering changes in the services of the city. Len Stone is an example of local councilmembers throughout our nation: he is smart, tenacious, and deeply committed to the community that he serves at great expense to his personal time and family life. Please join with me in honoring the public service of Len Stone, departing city councilmember of Pacifica. Thankfully, he will retire from public life but not from the community that he and his family love. Pacifica will therefore continue to have the talents of this resourceful young man to call upon in the years to come.

S. 1691: "BORDER PATROL AGENT PAY REFORM ACT OF 2014"

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1691, the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014.

This measure would replace the current antiquated overtime system used by the Border Patrol and create a new pay system that results in more hours worked on the border, provides more reliable schedules and paychecks for agents, and saves taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

As Chairman of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I have been focused on increasing border security efforts along our long and porous border and supporting the men and women of the U.S. Border Patrol who defend our nation against drug and human smugglers and others who would do us harm.

This measure supports that effort.

The men and women who secure our borders often work alone, in very remote locations on the border. They cannot simply punch a clock at the end of their shift if they are in pursuit of illicit border crossers. Instead they work irregular hours to track and apprehend dangerous criminal aliens.

This bill will allow front line supervisors to better manage agents' work schedules, saving taxpayers millions of dollars each year. In fact, according to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill will save taxpayers up to \$100 million a year.

Last year, the Office of Special Counsel issued a scathing report about the misuse and abuse of the current overtime system by Customs and Border Protection. This legislation will end such abuse in the future, at the same time increasing the number of hours the Border Patrol can secure the border, which is the equivalent of adding an additional 1,500 Border Patrol agents.

With additional hours on the border, our nation will be more secure as additional agent hours will help gain control of the border, carry out additional law enforcement missions, and apprehend dangerous criminals.

Mr. Speaker, the mission carried out by the men and women of the Border Patrol is extremely dangerous—more than one hundred agents have given their lives protecting our nation.

We owe it to them to give them a stable, predictable paycheck that takes into account the irregular nature of the arduous work they do every day on the border.

So, I want to commend the leadership of the Chief of the Border Patrol, Michael Fisher, and the Deputy Chief of the Border Patrol, Ronald Viteillo, for their commitment to finding sustainable reforms for agent pay, while also improving the security of our border.

I urge my colleagues to support this common sense bill that saves the taxpayers millions of dollars.

HONORING TOMMY "MR. NOTTIE" GUNNS, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man of noble character from Shaw, MS in Bolivar County.

I believe that when you give honor and recognition to someone they should truly deserve it. I am always happy when I meet someone or hear their story about overcoming, rising from obscurity, coming from meager beginnings but leaving a legacy although unaware; which doesn't get the recognition and thanks it really deserves. This is why I want to honor Mr. Tommy Gunns, Jr. a man of "noble" character.

Childhood: Nottie was originally from Egypt, MS in Chickasaw County, MS. He was born in the year 1900 to Mr. Tommy Gunns, Sr. and Mrs. Alberta Gunns. Nottie was raised in a home with his mother, his only sister named Alma, and his stepfather, "Mr. Brick". His parents were sharecroppers and struggled; which was the backdrop for an unstable home environment that easily led to abuse. And Nottie was often times the one subjected to the abuse (verbal and physical) by his stepfather. Since his mother would not protect him and because of years of abuse, he developed the drive early in life to want "better," so he planned to run away, someday. In his plan, he always included Alma, his young sister.

The day came when he ran away and took Alma with him, never returning home. Nottie ran away and arrived in Shaw, MS in 1914. He was a young teenager when he ran away. When Nottie arrived in Shaw, he worked as many odd jobs as he could find and raised his sister alone; vowing to never let anyone else abuse him or his little sister. In fact, he was so protective of her that he never eased up until he had approved of the man she married. He had to be assured the man was not abusive and was a good provider for Alma.

A Young Man and Family Man: As a young man working in Shaw he was able to acquire

many skills and a reputation as a fast learner, hard worker, and a person of good moral character, which equated to a nonsense type of reputation. He was still determined to have a better life and wanted to be respected and treated like a man so he carried himself like a man. Nottie eventually earned that reputation and people began calling him Mr. Nottie or Mr. Gunns. Some of the jobs he worked included driving trucks to haul logs, a loader at the Shaw lumber yard, and sharecropping as a small farmer. While working at the Shaw lumber yard, he learned the skill of carpentry; and became known as a master carpenter around Shaw. Everyone wanted him to do their work.

Mr. Gunns eventually met and married, Nancy Hunt of Shaw, MS. The couple had ten children, 2 died shortly after child birth. Mr. Gunns wanted a big loving family that was full of happy times but serious about life. He directed his journey and based goals in life on his childhood, all that he never had, he was determined to experience before dying. His and Nancy's children are Berna "BB" Gunns-Williams, Nathaniel "Baby Sister" Gunns-Clark, Tommy "Win" Gunns, Jr. (although he is the 3rd), Christine Gunns-Gardner, Torries Gunns, Maurine "Morgan" Gunns-Gray, Shirley Ann "Shelly" Gunns-Juette, and Lonnie Lee Gunns.

As a husband, father, and community member, Mr. Gunns saw the need to become more involved. You see he wanted to be a role model for his children; he wanted to make sure they had a good upbringing and education, so he felt he needed to get involved in the community and help make it happen. Mr. Gunns served as a volunteer fireman for the city. He wasn't trying to be a hero or win a popularity campaign; he just wanted a better life for his children. Mr. Gunns' number one priority was education for all colored children.

Since he was very vocal about education he was asked to become a member of the Board of Trustees for the Shaw Colored School.

The Shaw Colored School only educated children to the 8th grade. Beyond 8th grade the colored children had to travel to Greenville or surrounding towns for a high school education. Mr. Gunns helped changed that. He convinced the Board of Trustees to agree to vote on establishing a curriculum for 9th through 12th grades for Shaw students to be able to get their high school education. So, under his tutelage the first high school graduating class from the Shaw Colored High School was in 1949.

How did he do it? Mr. Gunns had an unyielding faith. That was the same faith that brought him as a young teenage runaway with his little sister, Alma, safely to Shaw, MS during the early 1900s. His faith in God provided him with jobs to take care of himself and his sister as a young boy, alone in the Mississippi Delta. His ability to pick up on things and learn fast paid off because he became that master carpenter. His daughter, Maurine said he could build a house from the ground up. He was a devoted member and deacon of the Strangers Home M.S. Church in Shaw, where he was laid to rest for eternity. And those trying times were no match for his common sense, the old folks called it "mother wit" for survival. It was the foundation of his approach on how to survive in life:

Financial Policy—never spend all your money. Save some for a rainy day.

Child Rearing—everybody has a role and place. Only adults are in charge and children are to stay in their place and do as they are told. He called it his no nonsense approach to raising children. He would often paraphrase Proverbs 13:24, by saying "Spare the rod and spoil the child."

Preparation—your future depends on your education. "All my children are going to college. I had enough children to work and chip in to help pay for everyone's college," he would say.

The End: The first of Mr. Gunns' children to go to college was Berna at the age of 16. This was made possible by two reasons: (1) everyone in the family picked and chopped cotton, and (2) his financial policy of saving money. The children all knew their earnings went to their parents to help provide for the family and save for college. Berna went to Tuskegee Institute in 1950 in Tuskegee, AL. Berna graduated before he died. He was able to see the first of his children to get a college education. His daughter, Berna remembers her father and mother faces as they watched her graduate with all her sisters and brothers watching as well. They knew they had to do it too. Berna went on to become a self-employed, self-made millionaire. She started her own company "Scrubbles Janitorial Service" in her home and grew it to become a multi-million dollar company in Washington, DC. She was able to live that better life because of her fathers' determination to clear the path.

Mr. Gunns didn't live to see another one of his children to go to college, he died in 1954 but he had already planted the seeds for success. Everyone in the family knew their place and role. Mrs. Gunns, his wife and eldest daughter, Berna carried on his mantra for every child of his going to college. Mrs. Gunns continued to work as the cafeteria manager and cook for the Shaw Colored School.

Tommy, his eldest son, became the father figure for his siblings. Since his father had taught him the carpentry trade, Tommy was able to get his father's job at the Shaw Lumber Yard. It was a year later in 1958 that he got the job because graduating from high school was priority in 1957. The family never missed a check; he knew the money was going to help pay for his siblings to finish high school and attend college. Tommy eventually went to college in 1959 by getting a job with Mississippi Vocational College (now called Mississippi Valley State University—MVSU) driving the school bus picking up students in Bolivar and Sunflower County. That was one of the ways he was able to pay his way through college, as well as it served as his transportation to and from the College. The other way was when Dean Isaac offered him a work study job to help build other buildings on campus (i.e., the auditorium, and campus maintenance) because he had seen his work as a student. As a requirement for graduation, Tommy had to build something to show he had mastered his trade. But the requirement was reconsidered when he drove his instructor to Shaw and showed him the house he built along with the blueprint he had drawn. When asked how, Tommy told him "My Dad is a master carpenter and he taught me this stuff

a long time ago." That house was for his best friend, Roy Magee and the family still lives there. In fact, Tommy still has the blueprints he drew. Tommy was a part of the team that built the first house on campus for the first president of Mississippi Valley State University, Dr. James H. White. The house now serves as the National Alumni House on the campus of the University. Tommy did not graduate until 1964 because of split session with his degree in Industrial Arts. He became the Industrial Art instructor for the Shaw School District, working for 30 years until his retirement.

All of Mr. Gunns' children went to college and became very successful in their own rights with good jobs, homes, cars, money to send their children to college, and blessed to see retirement, etc. But Benam and Tommy stood out as the oldest daughter and son after their father's death. As for Mr. Gunns' master carpentry skills, his son, Tommy and grandson, Undra Gunns (son of Torries and Dorothy Washington-Gunns) acquired that skill. So, he lives on in many ways and in many accomplishments without even trying to do so, he left a legacy.

One more mention on how did he do it? Mr. Gunns received only a 2nd grade education. He never learned to read or write. But, his stepfather, "Mr. Brick" taught him how to count. And passed that on to his children by teaching them how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide. That's all he could do in terms of academics. It was his faith in God, his common sense, determination, and ability to count money and perform mathematical operations in his head, and serve on the school board, which sparked change in education in Shaw. All those things got him through life and he was destined to accomplish the things he did. "If you don't walk in purpose, you won't walk in destiny. Find your purpose in life and walk it out" (Quote by: Farrah Gray). Now, that's how he did it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the legacy of Tommy "Mr. Nottie" Gunns, Jr. from the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

IN RECOGNITION OF CAROL KLATT

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Daly City Vice-Mayor Carol Klatt, who after serving on the City Council for 21 years, will be retiring on December 2, 2014.

Carol's commitment to Daly City can be traced back to 1965, when she served as a Girl Scout Leader, fostering good citizenship among Daly City's next generation of women leaders. In 1980, Carol was elected as the President and Secretary of the Serramonte Homeowners Association, and that same year she started to follow the City Council's activities closely. Then in 1991, Carol's enduring commitment to serve the Daly City community resulted in her appointment to the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Carol continued to serve on the Parks and Recreation Commission until she was appointed by the City Council to fill the unexpired

term of former Councilmember Jane Powell in 1993. Carol was first elected in a special election to the City Council in June of 1994 and re-elected later that year in November. She was re-elected in 1998, 2002, 2006, and 2010.

During Carol's 21 years on the City Council, she served as Mayor five times, and earned a reputation as one of the hardest working elected officials in San Mateo County. She has served on numerous local, county and regional boards like the Association of the Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Bay Air Quality Management District, the Clean Community Committee, the Anti-Graffiti Committee, the Airport Land Use Committee, the Airport Roundtable, the Daly City Host Lions, the Mission Street Merchants Association, and the North Peninsula Food Pantry & Dining Center of Daly City, just to name a few.

While on the City Council, Carol served with numerous Daly City Mayors like Al Tegli, Mike Nevin, and Adrienne Tissier, each of whom had a tremendous impact on San Mateo County. As you can see from her numerous volunteer and civic endeavors, Carol Klatt has her own proud legacy of county achievements, and she currently serves with Mayor David Canepa, Councilmember Mike Guingona, Councilmember Sal Torres, and Councilmember Ray Buenaventura.

Daly City was born out of a small town known as Vista Grande over one hundred years ago. Vista Grande was a town of about two thousand people, made up mostly of refugees from the 1906 San Francisco earthquake and fire. The name Daly City was chosen to honor John D. Daly, a local farmer who opened his land to refugees of the disaster.

Today, Daly City is home to a Bay Area-wide rail system, a developing shopping center, and a population of more than 100,000 residents. The city prides itself on its ethnic diversity, with many newcomers from Asia and Central or South American nations. Daly City is known as the Gateway of the Peninsula, as Carol Klatt regularly reminds residents and visitors.

Carol has not only been a friend to me, but to everyone seeking advice on the daily activities occurring in the city. I am sure Carol will be missed dearly by her city council colleagues and countless Daly City residents. I want to wish Carol and her husband John a happy retirement as they move to their new home in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Nelson Mandela once said: "What counts in life is not the mere fact that we have lived. It is what difference we have made to the lives of others that will determine the significance of the life we lead." Carol's life exemplifies the way one should meet this standard.

I ask that the House of Representatives rise with me to commend Carol Klatt for her many years of outstanding public service to the community she loves. Daly City returns her love with the same gusto as a player at the tables proclaiming a royal flush—loudly and with great pride. Las Vegas may be getting Carol Klatt as a resident, but she will remain the Queen of Hearts in Daly City.

CELEBRATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROENGLISH

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 20th anniversary of ProEnglish, a national grassroots organization based in Arlington, VA.

ProEnglish works on Capitol Hill, in the states, in the courts, and in the court of public opinion to defend English as our common language and to make it the official language at all levels of government.

ProEnglish is an effective and vigorous advocate for English language unity, and for the past 20 years, ProEnglish has worked hard to stop harmful, divisive policies such as bilingual education and multilingual ballots.

At the time of their founding, only 18 states had passed laws establishing English as the official language, yet thanks to ProEnglish along with other patriots, 31 states and countless towns, cities, and counties have official English laws today.

Originally founded in 1994 as English Language Advocates, it was renamed ProEnglish and helped defend Arizona's state official English law. This law was the subject of a 10-year long federal court challenge, *Arizonans for Official English v. Arizona* (1997). The case was eventually appealed all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, and the ruling there was important in upholding official English laws in other states.

ProEnglish has filed amicus curiae briefs in a number of successful landmark English cases, including *Home v. Flores* (2009), where the U.S. Supreme Court found that bilingual education (where children are segregated by language and taught primarily in their native tongue) was not the most effective way of teaching children.

In *Anderson v. Utah* (2001), ProEnglish successfully argued in defense of a year 2000 official English ballot initiative that passed by 67% of the popular vote. This ballot initiative declared English as Utah's official language.

ProEnglish has even come to the aid of various small business owners, like Richard and Shauna Kidman in *EEOC v. Kidmans* (2002), who were bullied by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) for implementing lawful English-language workplace policies.

The organization has testified before Congress and various local and state legislatures with the goal of restoring the Melting Pot principle inherent in having a common language. Our common English language has helped make the U.S. the most successful multi-ethnic and multi-racial nation on earth.

Over 90% of the world's nations have an established official language, but despite the high levels of public support, the United States is not one of them. Polls continue to show that immigrants—like all Americans—support official English in overwhelming numbers.

The vast majority of Americans agree that official English laws are necessary to prevent waste, protect freedom, and protect national unity. Official English laws are nondiscrim-

inatory, because they treat all Americans, of whatever background, alike.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize ProEnglish for its 20th anniversary. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in commending ProEnglish on its commitment to preserve English's role as the nation's unifying tongue.

SOUL SANCTUARY OF THE DESERT 10TH ANNIVERSARY LUNCHEON

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Soul Sanctuary of the Desert and the Heart and Soul Luncheon. This month, the Sanctuary is celebrating ten years of helping at-risk families in the community break the cycle of substance abuse and domestic violence. The dedicated volunteers and sponsors who make rehabilitation possible will be honored at the Luncheon. I commend the Soul Sanctuary of the Desert and all those who have participated in this important work in the last ten years.

RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE NICK JOE RAHALL

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of our distinguished colleague from West Virginia, the Honorable NICK JOE RAHALL.

NICK, the current Ranking Member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and former Chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, was first elected to Congress in 1976.

Born in West Virginia, NICK tirelessly worked to improve the lives of his constituents and remained firmly committed to the economic development of his state.

His dedication to our country's transportation and infrastructure systems led him to be a key architect of many transportation reauthorizations, including the Transportation equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21).

Having served in this body since 1977, NICK understands the value of bipartisanship and being able to work with all members, regardless of their party. As such, NICK never let a party label stand in the way of good policy.

NICK's friendship and professionalism will be greatly missed and I wish him the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

HONORING DR. SAMUEL O.
OSUNDE

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Samuel Osunde, who is a remarkable Leader, Director and Public Servant.

Dr. Samuel Osunde received his Ph.D. in Mass Communication from Howard University in Washington D.C. Dr. Osunde has more than 28 years of professional, academic and administrative experience. From 1986 to 1989 he served as the Special Assistant to the President for special projects at Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

While in Baton Rouge, Louisiana Dr. Osunde served as the Creative Director/Senior Copywriter for Partnership Advertising and Ampoule Advertising Companies. He has produced numerous copywriting for advertisements, publicity packets for release to television, radio, and newspapers, has created visualized concepts for product advertising and serves as advertising consultant to mass media companies throughout the United States, Europe and Africa.

Dr. Osunde's research interests include "The Role of Mass Media in Perception Influence," "Media Effects Theory," "Intercultural/International Communication" and "Mass Communication Development". His professional memberships include: Mississippi Communication Association, National Communication Association, Speech Communication Association and the American Communication Association.

Dr. Osunde is the recipient of many academic and professional awards that include, President's Scholar, Chancellor's Scholar Teaching Fellow and the Certificate of Commendation for Outstanding Scholastic Achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing an Outstanding Professor, Leader and Extraordinaire, Dr. Samuel O. Osunde, for his dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

TRIBUTE TO MR. HORACE E.
STACY, JR.

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Horace E. Stacy, Jr., of Lumberton, North Carolina, for his commitment and service to his community, state, and nation. Mr. Stacy is a veteran, public servant, community leader, honorable attorney, devoted family man, and he has been both a mentor to me and a dear friend to my family. I ask you to join me in recognizing his long and honorable career.

As Helen Sharpe and Bob Horne note in their article in The Robesonian, Horace was

born to Horace and Lillian Stacy in my hometown of Lumberton, North Carolina, on September 14, 1929. Horace attended Lumberton High School where he started at offensive and defensive left guard on the football team. After graduation from Lumberton High in 1946, Horace began college at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He graduated in 1950 with an English degree after being inducted into the Order of the Golden Fleece, UNC's most selective honor society.

Horace went on to begin law school at UNC shortly after the Korean War started and after only one semester enlisted in the U.S. Air Force to serve his country. He attended the Air Force language school at Syracuse University for one year, where he learned to read, write, and speak Russian. While stationed in Germany during the Cold War he was a member of a security squadron monitoring Russian aircraft.

Horace returned to law school at UNC in 1954 and graduated in 1956. He was on the staff of The North Carolina Law Review and President of Phi Alpha Delta, a law school service and social fraternity. During his final year of law school he met Miss Joan Purser, whom he would go on to marry in 1957.

Horace joined McLean & Stacy law firm, where I would later practice early in my own legal career under his kind and knowledgeable mentorship. A brilliant jurist, Horace became a prominent attorney in general practice, both criminal and civil. He also became a distinguished civic leader. In 1964, the Mayor and Lumberton City Council appointed him to chair the first Tri-Racial Committee to help prepare for the pending enactment of the Civil Rights Act.

Notably, Horace has been an effective advocate for our state and local libraries. He served as President of Friends of the Robeson County Public Library, has been a library trustee since 1998 and was honored as the Public Library Trustee of the Year in our state in 2010. In 2004, North Carolina Governor Mike Easley appointed Horace to be a member of the State Library Commission of North Carolina, which he would chair for two years. The State Library is the main depository for North Carolina state publications and provides state government agencies with information critical to the formation of public policy.

Horace served as President of the Robeson County Bar Association in 1970. He was a member of the state Board of Law Examiners for 23 years and Chairman for five years. He served on numerous committees of the North Carolina Bar Association and in 2002 was inducted into the General Practice Hall of Fame. Ever a Tar Heel at heart, Horace also served as District Chairman of the Morehead Scholarship Selection Committee.

Driven by love for his community and its people, Horace served as President of the Lumberton Jaycees in 1964 and 1965, and also chaired the Southeastern Regional Medical Center Foundation from 1998 to 2000. In 2005, he was instrumental in the founding of the Robeson County Community Foundation, which raises money and awards grants to nonprofit organizations. Horace's tireless service to his community through these and other leadership roles has resulted in his being revered as "the Dean of Lumberton." Appro-

riately, he was selected to speak on behalf of Lumberton when the city won the All-America City Award in 1970.

A true brother in Christ, Horace has held several offices in Trinity Episcopal Church and served as chancellor of the Episcopal Diocese of East Carolina from 1970 to 1980.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the service, goodness, humility, and character that defines Horace E. Stacy, Jr. His life has created a legacy of civic service that will benefit the citizens of Robeson County and North Carolina for years to come. His personal mentorship and friendship has been a blessing to my family and me, but we are not alone. Horace Stacy gives of himself freely and inspires goodness in all who know him. May God bestow His richest blessings upon Horace and Joan Stacy, their three children, Robin, Jody and Mark, and their six grandsons.

TRIBUTE TO MONTY HALL

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great humanitarian and philanthropist, Monty Hall.

Monty Hall is widely known for his iconic work in daytime television, but what many Americans don't know is that he has spent his life engaged in philanthropic work. Monty Hall has traveled extensively throughout the United States, Canada, and Europe and raised an estimated \$1 billion for charities. He has been honored with more than 500 awards for his tireless work.

In 1975, Monty Hall was elected President of the world's largest children's charity, Variety Clubs International, and in 1981 he was honored with the lifetime title of International Chairman. In 1988, he was awarded the prestigious Order of Canada for his humanitarian works around the world. In 2002, he was inducted into the Order of Manitoba. For the past 35 years, he has hosted the annual Monty Hall/Cedars-Sinai Tennis Tournament to benefit the Diabetes Center and Pancreatic Cancer Program.

It is a tribute to Monty Hall's commitment that the children's wings of four hospitals—UCLA Medical Center, Hahnemann Hospital in Philadelphia, Mount Sinai in Toronto, and Johns Hopkins in Baltimore—all bear his name.

Monty Hall has received honorary doctorates from the University of Manitoba, Haifa University in Israel, and Hahnemann Medical College. He and Marilyn, his beloved wife of 66 years, have three children and five grandchildren.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Monty Hall for his tremendous contributions, which have made lives better for countless individuals in our nation and around the world.

COMMEMORATING THE PASSAGE
OF H.R. 2901, THE PAUL SIMON
WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT OF
2014

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, nearly three-and-a-half years ago, Congressman TED POE and I set out on a joint effort to increase access to clean drinking water and sanitation for the world's poorest. His commitment to work together on this effort was for all of the right reasons. The most important, however, was his clear understanding that politics stops at water.

And last night, our years of work and shared efforts were rewarded when the House passed the bipartisan Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act.

My efforts began over a decade ago, and were encouraged by the late Senator Paul Simon, the namesake of this bill and my 2005 Water for the Poor Act. It's fitting that on this day—the anniversary of his passing on December 9, 2003—Congress would honor his memory by considering a bill that aims to fulfill one of his greatest passions. This country owes him a great deal for his vision and foresight. Thank you, Senator Paul Simon, and to his wife, Patti, who continues to support his important work.

The passage of the Water for the World Act is historic.

Never before has the U.S. had a Global Water Strategy for how to effectively deal with growing water scarcity in all corners of the world. We now have a blueprint on how to help those in need, while at the same time planning for, and then implementing, efforts to prevent and mitigate water-related conflict. The U.S. can no longer afford to play a modest role, and instead must take up the mantle of leadership. This bill ensures that will happen.

None of this would have been possible if it weren't for efforts of literally thousands of people all across the country that took action and urged Congress to pass the Water for the World Act. In October, I joined CHARLIE DENT and over 60,000 of our closest friends in Central Park for a rally calling on Congress to act on this critical legislation. It worked.

The Water for the World Act was endorsed by over 80 NGOs, nearly half of whom are faith-based organizations. While all played a critical role, there are a few that deserve individual recognition.

Going all the way back to 2005, we would have barely moved the needle if it weren't for Malcolm Morris and Mark Winter of Living Water International.

David Douglas has been a constant source of encouragement and support.

I also want to thank Lisa Schechtman of WaterAid, John Sparks of the Millennium Water Alliance, Lisa Bos of World Vision, John Oldfield of WASH Advocates, and Erin Rein ("Reen") of InterAction. They have been on the front lines of this effort, ready to jump into action at a moment's notice.

Others have been indispensable as well, including Habitat for Humanity, Water.org, and the Global Poverty Project.

I also want to thank my House colleagues who personally invested a great deal of time into bringing this bill to the floor. Without TED POE, the issue of increasing access to clean drinking water and sanitation would not have the bipartisan support and appreciation it deserves. He made this happen. Thank you, TED. I also want to thank Chairman ROYCE. The Chairman went out of his way to make Water for the World a priority and is the latest extension of his efforts to meaningfully reform our aid programs.

Just as important to this effort have been our friends and allies at USAID and the Department of State. Starting with former Secretary of State Clinton, who made water a focal point of her time in Foggy Bottom, and her Special Advisor for Water Resources, Dr. Aaron Salzberg. And Christian Holmes at USAID, the first-ever Global Water Coordinator, with whom I look forward to continuing to work.

Finally, as every Member of Congress knows, we wouldn't make much progress on anything if it weren't for the dedicated, hard-working staff that actually run the place. Without the tireless efforts and expertise from Joan Condon and her colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and from Luke Murry in Congressman POE's office, it would have been nearly impossible to secure this important victory for water and sanitation.

I want to conclude by thanking my staff. It seems like generations of Team Blumenauer have been involved in this effort at one point or another. From Judah Ariel to Steph Cappa, to Michael Harold, thank you!

Let's hope this shining example of bipartisan cooperation is not only a source of holiday cheer, but also an example all of us in Congress can draw on in the New Year.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ANNA
E. BARRY SCHOOL FOR BEING
NAMED A NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON
SCHOOL

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Anna E. Barry School of Chicopee, Massachusetts for the honor of being named a National Blue Ribbon School for 2014, and to recognize their achievements both in academic excellence and in narrowing education gaps between students.

The Anna E. Barry School currently enrolls students from kindergarten through fifth grade. In its mission statement, the school states that its purpose is "to educate children . . . in order that they may successfully continue with their education, pursue their aspirations and eventually become contributing community members."

The National Blue Ribbon School Program was established in 1982 to honor elementary, middle and high schools which have excellent performance, or which have substantially reduced the performance gap for disadvantaged student populations. Created under Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell, the program was

designed to celebrate achievement among public and private schools alike, as well as to encourage the sharing of successful teaching strategies.

With just fewer than 7,900 educational institutions having been named National Blue Ribbon Schools, it is an extraordinary achievement for the Anna E. Barry School to be recognized with this award. The uniting feature of National Blue Ribbon Schools is their commitment and dedication to outstanding educational outcomes for their pupils, and I am proud to count a school from the First District of Massachusetts among them.

In being named a National Blue Ribbon School, the Anna E. Barry School has been recognized for their outstanding work improving the results of both students with special educational needs, and those who have English as a second language. The school's accomplishment has been the product of tailored student teaching, the integration of technology, and the engagement of the community. By focusing on individual achievement and establishing positive lines of communication with families, the Anna E. Barry School has not only improved educational outcomes, but has made learning a collaborative exercise between students, parents and teachers.

The success of the school can also be attributed to the dedication of its teachers and administrators in promoting and advancing the students' education. I wish the school, its staff and the students well in their future endeavors, and again congratulate them on this remarkable achievement.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR KEVIN TANN

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Major Kevin Tann, United States Army, for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to the United States of America. Major Tann will be moving on from his current assignment as an Army Congressional Liaison for the House of Representatives to Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

Army Congressional Liaisons provide an invaluable service to both the Military and Congress. They assist Members and staff in understanding the Army's policies, actions, operations, and requirements. Their first hand knowledge of military needs, culture, and tradition is a tremendous benefit to Congressional Staff.

A native of North Carolina, Major Tann graduated from Florida International University in 1999 and was commissioned as Second Lieutenant in the Army's Aviation Branch. He has served in a variety of assignments including service in Alabama, Texas, South Carolina, and the Pentagon. Major Tann was selected for the highly competitive Congressional Fellowship Program and has participated in multiple combat tours in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Major Tann's military awards include the Army Aviator and Parachutist Badges and Bronze Star Medal, as well as the Iraq Campaign Medal. He holds a Bachelor of Science

Degree in Criminal Justice from Florida International University; a Master of Arts in Public Administration from Florida International University; and, a Master of Political Science from George Washington University.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service of Major Tann as he proceeds to the next chapter in his remarkable career and continues to serve our great Nation. On behalf of a grateful Nation, I join my colleagues in recognizing and commending Major Tann for his dedicated service to our Country. For all he and his family have given and continue to give to our Country, we are in their debt. We wish him, his wife Joi, and his son Kevin, all the best as they continue their journey in the United States Army.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOUG
HORNER

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Doug Horner on the occasion of his departure from elected office in my district.

Mr. Horner was first appointed to the Livermore City Council in July of 2007 and succeeded to a second term in 2009. During his time in office, he was twice appointed to serve one year terms as Vice Mayor. He has also represented Livermore on a variety of intergovernmental agencies, including the League of California Cities East Bay Division, the Tri-Valley Transportation Council, the Livermore Pleasanton Fire Department Joint Powers Authority, and the Intergovernmental Committee with the Livermore Area Recreation and Park District and the Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District.

Prior to serving on the City Council, Mr. Horner was an active member of the Livermore Community, having served on the Livermore Planning Commission, the Design Review Committee, and the City's General Plan Review Committee.

Mr. Horner's commitment to open space and the viticulture industry has helped maintain the character and quality of life of Livermore, maintaining the best of aspects of his community for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Horner for his many years of service to the community and wishing him the best in his future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE (DOP)

HON. NIKI TSONGAS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 85th anniversary of the Daughters of Penelope, one of our nation's pre-eminent international women's organizations.

Since its founding in 1929, these committed women of Hellenic descent and admirers of Greek culture have worked tirelessly to promote the ideals of ancient Greece in the fields of education, philanthropy and civic duty.

Today, the Daughters of Penelope and its 250 chapters around the world strive to strengthen the status of women in society, help the victims of domestic violence both in the United States and in Greece, and raise funding for some of today's most important medical research—among other philanthropic causes.

In 2009, this body along with our colleagues in the Senate recognized the work of the Daughters of Penelope and passed resolutions commemorating its many achievements.

After five more years of exceptional work and dedication, I rise to acknowledge these truly outstanding women and their many accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY J. ELLISON,
FOUNDER OF ORACLE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary American visionary, Mr. Larry Ellison, as he steps down from his position as CEO of Oracle, the world-renowned company he founded in Redwood City, California.

Larry Ellison was born in the New York City borough of the Bronx in 1944, and from an early age showed a keen aptitude for math and science. He attended the University of Illinois where he was named Science Student of the Year and the University of Chicago. He was awarded an Honorary Doctorate by Howard University in 2005.

For more than 35 years Larry Ellison has built and guided Oracle to its current position as the world's largest database-software company and one of the biggest providers of business programs. Oracle has a market capitalization of \$185 billion and annual revenues of \$38 billion, numbers that attest to Ellison's technical brilliance, strategic genius and unsurpassed business acumen.

Larry Ellison worked as a technician for Firemen's Fund, Wells Fargo Bank and as a programmer at Amdahl Corporation, where he was part of a team that built the first IBM-compatible mainframe system. In 1999, Ellison, together with his Amdahl colleagues Robert Miner and Ed Oates, founded Software Development Labs which became Oracle after building a database named Oracle for the Central Intelligence Agency.

A Silicon Valley legend, Larry Ellison is a man of widely diverse interests. He has received many honors, including being inducted into the Academy of Achievement in 1997. He is number five on the Forbes list of world billionaires, and is a generous philanthropist who has given millions to many causes, particularly in the field of medicine. He has signed the Giving Pledge which is a commitment to donate most of his wealth to non-profit organizations. He is the father of two, film producers

David and Megan. He's also a pilot and competitive sailor whose team won the America's Cup in 2010 and in 2013.

President John F. Kennedy said, "Americans by nature, are optimistic. They are experimental, inventors, and are builders who build best when called upon to build greatly." Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring Larry Ellison, an American icon, for his extraordinary vision and great contributions to American technology. He has enhanced the leadership of our nation around the world by "building greatly."

A FOND FAREWELL TO THE CONSTITUENTS OF THE 33RD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my profound appreciation to the constituents of the 33rd Congressional District of California. It has been a tremendous privilege for me to serve as their representative in Congress for forty years. While the numbers and boundaries of the district have changed four times, generous constituent support has given me latitude to pursue comprehensive solutions to problems that not only benefit us in the district, but benefit our nation as a whole.

It also has been extremely gratifying for me to have the opportunity to assist individuals and families on a more personal level, from helping reunify families more quickly, to getting Section 8 housing vouchers more efficiently, expediting Social Security and Medicare benefits, cutting red tape to ensure military heroes receive the medals they've earned, and fast-tracking veterans' health care, housing and other benefits.

I am grateful for the support of committed allies in our community who have helped me tackle problems such as safety and pollution at Santa Monica Airport, helicopter noise, veteran homelessness, attempts to commercialize the West LA VA property, traffic gridlock, beach pollution, and so many more. Of course these challenges remain and new ones will emerge, but I have full confidence in the ability of Representative-Elect Ted Lieu to successfully tackle them.

It has been an honor to work with some of the finest elected state and local officials in the nation. I thank my colleagues in the cities of the 33rd Congressional District, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and the California State Legislature for fiercely advocating on behalf of our constituents and working closely with me on federal policies that affect our State.

I have had a long career and an eventful one—and I wouldn't trade any of it. I woke each day looking forward to opportunities to make our country stronger, healthier, and fairer. I will always be grateful for this opportunity and privilege and for the many friendships I've forged over the last forty years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during last week's vote on Roll No. 551, I inadvertently voted "yea." I intended to vote "nay" on Roll No. 551.

REMEMBERING ED LEONG

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that we mourn the loss of Edward J. Leong, who passed away on December 7th, after a lengthy battle with cancer.

Ed served for 36 years in the Office of the House Legislative Counsel, 16 of them as Senior Counsel. He specialized in titles 5 and 39 of the United States Code, the law governing the federal workforce and the United States Postal Service. His sharp mind, relentless pursuit of perfection, and skill ensured the bills considered by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Congress were written in a manner that allow for effective implementation.

Ed was a mentor and teacher to many current and former staff. His professionalism and dedication to his work are an example to this institution. Ed's soft-spoken manner, kind nature, and laugh made him a pleasure to work with.

As Chairman, I extend the sympathy and condolences of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to Ed's wife, Chee Lee, his children Stephen and Anna, and his colleagues—in particular those in the House Office of Legislative Counsel.

HONORING TURLOCK MAYOR JOHN LAZAR

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Turlock Mayor John Lazar on his retirement from the Turlock City Council and to personally thank him for his dedicated, life-long spirit of community service.

Mayor Lazar was born and raised in Turlock and is a graduate of California State University, Stanislaus. In 1976, he served as a page in the U.S. House of Representatives, beginning his long career in public service. His experience includes working as a district representative for U.S. Representative Tony Coelho and as a legislative assistant for Assembly Members Gary Condit and Jack O'Connell. In

1988, he secured his real estate license and began working at Coldwell Bank Central Valley Realtors.

John Lazar was first elected to the Turlock City Council in 1992 and served on the council for 14 years until elected as Mayor of Turlock in 2006. He was appointed to the Stanislaus County Council of Governments, where he served from 1999–2000, California State Mandates Commission from 2000–2005, and the Stanislaus County Local Agency Formation Commission from 2000–2006. He is currently a member of the Emanuel Medical Center Governing Board.

Over the years, Mayor Lazar has received several honors; including receiving the 2007 Turlock Chamber of Commerce's Citizen of the Year, 2002 Central Valley Association of Realtors' Realtor of the Year Award, and the 1995 California Junior Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Young Californian Award.

He has sat on numerous boards, including the Rotary Club of Turlock, Stanislaus County Organization of Governments, Turlock Community Auditorium, and the California Association of Realtors.

Mayor Lazar and his wife, Nellie, have three sons. His hobbies include reading history and biographies and collecting political buttons.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Turlock Mayor John Lazar on his retirement from the Turlock City Council and thanking him for his exemplary leadership and service to the community.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, December 10, 2014

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 10, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

THANKING THE PEOPLE OF THE 23RD DISTRICT OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEG0) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to the wonderful people of the 23rd District of Texas who, for the last 2 years, have given me the great privilege of serving as their voice here in the people's House.

I am living proof that this is a nation of opportunity and that the American Dream still exists. God has blessed me in many ways. I was born into a warm and loving family. My parents, Pete and Elena, taught me to work hard and respect others. I am married to a wonderful wife, Maria Elena, who has stood with me through the peaks and valleys of the last 25 years. We are the parents of a phenomenal son, Nicolas Miguel, who has brought us joy we never knew possible and has taught us the true meaning of love. In addition, though my roots are humble, I have had the privilege of working in this Chamber. Few people get the privilege to serve here.

Yet Congress isn't what it once was. Agreements are few, partisan rancor is

common, statesmanship is rare. Who are the giants of history among us? Where are the statesmen and -women who accomplished historic feats through significant signature legislative achievements?

But we know that progress is still possible. We saw this session that when Congress puts party labels aside and gets to work, like we did on VA reform, we can accomplish some great things for the American people. But those occasions were far too rare.

More often, this Chamber saw bickering and pettiness, and this Congress made history as the least productive and most unpopular Congress in the history of this proud Nation. The American people responded by making history of their own. On election day, a record number of them simply threw up their hands, wondered what is the point, and didn't go to the polls.

It is easy to see why Americans are so tired of politics, to understand why many of us don't check in on election day; when our democracy needs us the most, we check out.

Polarization, discontent, dissatisfaction, disappointment, dismay—all now normal in the course of our public discourse. Old-fashioned values like truth and good manners and respect for others' views and appreciation are no longer in vogue. Candidates and officeholders and super-PACs are shrill and mean—and yes, for some, the word would be even un-Christian—to one another.

Politicians distort truth and attempt to stampede people with fear, and many times our fears or our lack of faith win out. We fail to realize how really truly lucky we are as Americans.

Before chiding people for not meeting their civic responsibilities, Congress as a body should reflect on whether it has been meeting its own responsibility because even Congress complains about Congress, yet it does nothing to change. Most Americans are somewhere in the middle, but that is not where Congress is. In our current system, super-PACs attack those Members who stake out middle grounds.

The American people deserve better than they are getting. Our country deserves better. Our future and our children's future is too important. Both Congress and our country must rise to the occasion and confront and conquer our own internal paralysis. Patriotism must trump partisanship.

A robust democracy requires active participation. Congress—indeed, Amer-

ica—needs all of us. It needs Democrats and Republicans and Libertarians and Latinos and Anglos and African Americans and Asians—Americans all.

Soon I will have the highest title that any American can have—not the title of an elected official, but the title of citizen. And as a citizen, I hope to continue to remind Congress of the importance of governing well and our fellow Americans of the importance of participating in our electoral system.

I have faith that ours is a resilient Nation blessed by God. Despite our frustrations and our fears and our failings, despite ourselves, we still live in the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

Sure, times are tough, but they were tougher for our parents and our grandparents. If you think back a moment and you compare your life to theirs, you can see how far you and all of us have come.

The job now is not to be mad about and continually relive the old battles of the past nor to be afraid of the future, but to look forward and to build our future together.

I leave this institution with no regrets and many accomplishments for the people of home, particularly grateful for the opportunity to work with and serve our veterans and our Active Duty military and amazed at the incredible and still untapped potential of our amazing democracy.

I want to say thank you to each of my employees and thank you again to all the people of the 23rd District of Texas, especially to those I have had the privilege of representing since I first became a State legislator in 1991.

I wish my successor well, and I offer my prayers for all the Members of the 114th Congress. You are capable of doing great things for America when you remember to put people and policy ahead of partisanship and politics.

May God bless Texas, and may God bless the United States of America.

PROUDLY RESTORING OFFICERS OF PRIOR ENLISTMENT RETIREMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the Proudly Restoring Officers of Prior Enlistment Retirement, or PROPER, Act legislation that I will be introducing this week that will support America's

involuntarily separated servicemembers.

For the first time since the 1990s, the Army is shrinking. As our military continues to draw down in the Middle East, all service branches have been tasked with making difficult force reduction decisions.

Our All-Volunteer service has made considerable sacrifices, valiantly fighting two concurrent wars while solely remaining dedicated to the mission at hand.

As the Pentagon continues to implement a drawdown policy, provisions in the law could create unwarranted and unnecessary reductions to military retirement pay for thousands of involuntarily separated servicemembers.

Mr. Speaker, these men and women have honorably served our country and deserve better. For example, some prior enlisted soldiers who received a commission into the officer corps are now facing a difficult situation. Years after being commissioned, the Army has made the determination to relieve these experienced soldiers from military service.

To make the situation worse, many of these individuals do not have the required time in the officer corps and are forced to receive a lesser retirement pension. Mr. Speaker, after having earned an officer's rank, these soldiers have been reduced in rank for retirement purposes.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers have honorably served our country and deserve better. These men and women deserve to collect full pension and benefits equivalent to their service in uniform and not subjected to an arbitrary reduction in rank and pay after being involuntarily separated from the military.

To prevent this injustice, I will soon be introducing the Proudly Restoring Officers of Prior Enlistment Retirement, or PROPER, Act. The PROPER Act does not prevent further troop reduction. It merely assures these soldiers and those affected, through each military branch, can be made financially whole with due respect for their service.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, as The New York Times said in an editorial last week, there is an immigration crisis looming next year, but it has nothing to do with the border. Rather, it is the huge effort that will be needed to fulfill the President's executive actions and get millions—millions—of American families out of harm's way by protecting them from deportation and destruction.

Sure, we are celebrating the series of executive actions taken by the Presi-

dent, but we are also rolling up our sleeves and getting to work. So I want to talk just a little bit about what we are doing in the city of Chicago and what I am hoping my colleagues here in Congress and my colleagues across the country in community-based organizations, the legal community, and immigrant and Latino neighborhoods in every State will do to help with getting people ready to sign up when the window to submit applications opens in 180 days and the government's review of cases begins.

This coming Saturday, the 13th, at 9:30 in the morning I will be at Rebano Church on the north side of Chicago, and more than 500 families have already preregistered for an orientation. We will go over what the President's announcement means for individual immigrants and their families. Then those who have preregistered will have an opportunity for a one-on-one preliminary evaluation of their eligibility from people we are calling family defenders.

We are already scheduling follow-up events this month and into the new year, and we will be ready to accommodate the huge demand for accurate and trustworthy information.

Mayor Rahm Emanuel has been my consistent and outstanding partner in the effort, and we are both committed to making Chicago the model for the rest of the country; and for the advocates, the legal community, the business community, the public sector, we are all working together to make that a reality.

That is right. New York. Listen up, L.A. Get ready, Miami, Houston, and Dallas. We are going to work to protect as many families as we possibly can in the city of Chicago, and we are challenging you to keep up.

But it is not just the major immigrant gateway cities where we need to organize to protect American families. As the President showed us yesterday, cities in the South like Nashville are leading the way to integrate and assimilate immigrant populations. The spirit of inclusion is of utmost importance as we help families come forward, register with the government, submit their paperwork and fingerprints, and get ready and into the system.

I have told my House colleagues that I plan to be on the road a lot at the start of next year, traveling anywhere they need me to travel to help them conduct outreach and educate immigrant communities where they live. But it is not just the blue districts where we must support our immigrant communities and make sure they register. It will be necessary in red districts, too; States like South Carolina, Arizona, and Alabama, States that tried unsuccessfully to push their immigrant community farther underground. I will accept invitation from

those States, too, to get the word out and educate the community in whatever way I can.

I can't tell you how many people have come up to me and said: Congressman, I don't know if this will help my family, my dad, my mom, my neighbor, or my parishioner, but I hope they will not still have to live in fear of deportation.

There are millions who will not be able to come forward and sign up because their cases cannot be reviewed under the President's guidelines. I tell them that what the President has announced is bold, it is broad, and it is extremely generous and helpful to the United States and our immigrants who have no other way to get in the system and on the books; but it cannot go as far and it does not replace the need for congressional action and legislation.

But let us all remember that, by the end of this week, the clock is going to have run out on the best chance the House has had in decades to address immigration in a bipartisan and measured manner. The Senate did half the work by giving us more than a year to craft a bipartisan answer to their proposal, and we tried in many, many different ways to help this House rise to the occasion, to get out of the partisan ditch we have dug for ourselves and to put the country on a path to a safe, legal, orderly immigration system that protects the country and its people by welcoming its strivers and innovators from around the world.

In the end, the House was asleep at the switch and let the country down. But even as I work with people across the country to protect as many American families as possible, I pledge to my colleagues in both parties in the most sincere way possible, please work with us to solve the immigration issue so that we can move forward as a nation.

CELEBRATING LA SALLE HIGH SCHOOL LANCERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today a proud alumnus of Cincinnati's La Salle High School because, for the first time in the school's 54-year history, the Lancers have won the Ohio State football championship.

Last Friday evening the Lancers claimed the title with a 55-20 victory, breaking the record for most points ever scored in an Ohio Division II championship game.

La Salle's offense was so strong this season that in each of their five playoff games they averaged nearly 50 points. Leading the offense was junior running back Jeremy Larkin, who ran over 2,500 yards in just 15 games, scored 42 touchdowns, and is now a finalist for the coveted Ohio Mr. Football Award.

□ 1015

All season long, La Salle competed with the best of the best, finishing with 14 wins and one nail-biting loss to the St. X Bombers, including victories over such powerhouses as Moeller, Elder, and Colerain High Schools.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, La Salle is my alma mater. I graduated in 1971 and played football all 4 years. I played on the defensive line. And in my senior year, we won seven games, lost one—coincidentally, to future Speaker JOHN BOEHNER's Moeller High School, where he played football too, although he had already graduated 3 years earlier—and we tied Elder 0-0 in the Pit and tied St. X's 18-18.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today a very proud alumnus of my high school.

I also want to mention that my brother Dave, who is 10 years younger than me, also played football at La Salle, and he was a defensive back there.

La Salle will always have a special place in my heart. I learned many of life's most important lessons in her halls and on the football field. As a matter of fact, my political career got my start at La Salle when I was first elected to student council there.

La Salle is a great school. I want to thank the coaches and the teachers and the staff and especially the parents who have made the sacrifices to pay the tuition there to make it possible for their sons to receive a tremendous education at La Salle.

Mr. Speaker, boxing legend Muhammad Ali once said "Champions aren't made in the gyms. Champions are made from something they have deep inside them—a desire, a dream, and a vision."

This season, the Lancers had the desire to make every practice count and play every game as if it were their last. They shared a dream that was strong enough to overcome the many distractions that high school kids often face in today's world, and their coaches gave them the vision that their hard work and sacrifice would pay off in the end.

Mr. Speaker, Lancers roll deep. This season illustrated that to the team, the school, and the community. Congratulations on a season well played and a job well done. Go, Lancers.

CONCLUDING MY SERVICE IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor and privilege to serve in Congress for the past 10 years, representing the people of the 13th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

As many of you know, my mother came to this country alone at the age

of 16, a refugee of the Holocaust. America offered her safety, freedom, and opportunity. Her experience of fear and tragedy, resilience and hope inspired my commitment to public service, my love of our country, and all it can be.

As I conclude my congressional service, I want to thank my family and friends who believed in me and supported me, my constituents who trusted me, the civic and elected leaders, activists and advocates who gave voice to the wide array of concerns and causes, and to my talented staff, who enabled me to do all that we did.

I am proud of what we accomplished together, from the new parks and bike paths along the north Delaware River in northeast Philadelphia to the revitalization of main streets in towns across Montgomery County. We made our streets safer, promoted economic growth, and improved the lives of families across the Philadelphia region.

I came to Congress in 2005 at a time of war. As the daughter of a Korean war veteran, I know how important it is for veterans to find meaningful work to support themselves and their families when they come home. That is why my first legislative initiative to become law addressed the needs of young men and women returning from Iraq and Afghanistan by offering incentives to employers to hire our newest veterans.

In the time since that first legislative victory, I have sought to embrace innovative ideas, to find common ground, and to turn these ideas into action. I successfully championed legislation that is now law, including extending tax credits for energy-efficient commercial buildings, establishing incentives that changed the way physicians write prescriptions to reduce errors and save lives, new tax credits and grants to startup biotech companies, and changes in Medicare to improve access to primary care for our seniors.

Ensuring all Americans have access to quality, affordable health care has been a priority for me throughout my professional life, in both the private sector and in elected office. I am proud of the role I played in the achievement of health coverage for all Americans and protecting and strengthening Medicare and advancing access to care for women and for children, including those with preexisting conditions. Today, we see the benefits of this effort, with millions of Americans who now have meaningful health coverage for themselves and their families.

For this success and others, I want to express my appreciation to the other Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who enabled us to get things done for the people we represent and for the Nation. I value the work that we did together, and I value your friendship.

As the only woman in the Pennsylvania delegation, I am proud that I had

the opportunity to stand up for women's rights and for women to be leaders in Pennsylvania and across our Nation.

I am so honored to have served my State and our Nation here in Congress. It is my hope that we, Democrats and Republicans, activists, and everyday Americans can come together to continue to seek ways to ensure safety and security, prosperity and justice, hope and opportunity for the people of our great Nation, just as my mother would have hoped.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN FRANK WOLF, INDEFATIGABLE DEFENDER OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMAN DIGNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Chairman FRANK WOLF of Virginia will cast his last vote this week, capping off a remarkable 34-year career of altruistic deeds, selfless service, bold humanitarian initiatives, and durable achievement.

Both of us got elected in 1980, the Ronald Reagan class. Many of us wanted to have a Special Order tomorrow night, including the gentleman from Virginia, BOB GOODLATTE, to honor him. But he said, "Absolutely not." That is the kind of guy he is. He never seeks any attention. But I am here today. Tough. I am going to speak about him.

At home and overseas, FRANK WOLF, the William Wilberforce of the United States House of Representatives, has been an indefatigable defender of human rights and human dignity. Last week, WORLD magazine named FRANK WOLF the 2014 Daniel of the Year.

Whether it be helping a young mother in a refugee camp in Sudan or political prisoners in Russia or jailed pastors in China or any number of the marginalized and persecuted, FRANK WOLF has always sought to rescue and to protect.

FRANK WOLF is the author of the landmark International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which established both an independent commission and a State Department office led by an ambassador at large wholly dedicated to safeguarding—via sanctions, if necessary—religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I saw firsthand his devotion to human rights in a myriad of ways, including trips with FRANK to a prison camp in the Soviet Union, the infamous Perm camp 35; a gulag in China, Beijing prison number 2, right after Tiananmen Square; Vukovar, a city under military siege during the war in Yugoslavia; and Romania on behalf of persecuted believers, just to name a few. He has chaired the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission with great distinction.

A man of deep Christian faith, FRANK WOLF not only passionately believes in Jesus Christ but “walks” as St. Paul admonishes us, in a way worthy of his calling. FRANK WOLF is a devoted family man. He, along with his wife, Carolyn, have five adult children and 16 grandchildren, all of whom are the apples of his eye.

In his district, FRANK WOLF has delivered as well. His casework is superb and responsive; his staff reflects their boss’ commitment to assist and to solve problems big and small.

As chairman of several Appropriations subcommittees over the years—including his latest assignment as chair of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science—he has authored nine major appropriations laws, including five transportation statutes that funded major projects in his district and throughout the Nation.

FRANK WOLF’s many other accomplishments include: His bipartisan Bring Jobs Back to America Act, designed to return manufacturing jobs to the U.S. from countries like China; raising awareness of the growing threat from cyber attacks; efforts to address America’s unconscionable debt—it is \$18 trillion now—through bipartisan reforms; the formation of two anti-gang task forces operating in the region, as well as the creation of the National Gang Intelligence Center in the FBI; and the funding of the 103-mile Metrorail system.

He led the way in obtaining about \$1 billion to extend Metrorail through Tysons and out to Dulles Airport and to Loudon County. He pushed for lower carpool restrictions on I-66 and has helped many commuters get to the Capitol and to Washington. He led efforts to place Ronald Reagan Washington National and Washington Dulles International airports under a regional authority, providing the capital to build a new terminal at Reagan National and vastly expand Dulles.

He has been a leader in fighting with great tenacity Lyme disease. He has fought to address hunger by creating the Feds Feed Families food drive, which has generated more than 15 million pounds of donated food. And in 2014, he put language into an omnibus bill to create the National Commission on Hunger.

And one of the Nation’s newest national parks is in his 10th District, the Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historic Park, established in 2002 through yet another one of FRANK’s laws.

Finally, let me make it clear: FRANK WOLF’s departure from the House is only the end of his current place of service to humanity and marks a new beginning, a transition to the private sector, where he will continue and even expand upon his extraordinary life’s work.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN MARCIA FUDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to stand with my fellow members of the Congressional Black Caucus to pay tribute to the outstanding leadership of our outgoing chair, MARCIA FUDGE of Ohio.

Chair FUDGE has done much more than occupy a position in her time as CBC chair. She has truly led this caucus at a time where it required active leadership.

It has often been said that Chair FUDGE’s work ethic, problem-solving approach, and coalition building has earned her the reputation as an insightful leader, and over the past year, that leadership has been on display to an impressive degree. Her legislative priorities have included job creation, protecting voting rights, health and nutrition, protecting Medicare and Social Security, education, and housing.

Chair FUDGE’s simple philosophy is reflected in her daily pledge, “To do the people’s work.” That dedicated approach has enabled her to be an extraordinary chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and keep faith with this historic role.

To some, they say we are the conscience of the Congress. But I say, under Chair FUDGE, we have been much, much more because we have not relied just on our conscience. We have risen to levels of involvement not achieved very often in this body.

On a personal note, it has been my pleasure to witness the growth and maturity of a leader I am proud to call not only my chair but my close personal friend as well. And I do not mean that in the way that we often use that word on this floor. She is a close personal friend.

Mr. Speaker, as you see here, we come from various backgrounds and experiences. I am from South Carolina; our chairlady is from Ohio. We have had a different set of experiences, which means that we will not always see things the same way. But what has made her an effective leader is the fact that she can look to the west, to Ms. BARBARA LEE, look south to Ms. JACKSON LEE, go down to Texas to Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, over to Alabama, and bring all of these experiences together and form a cohesive approach.

I am proud to call her my leader and proud to call her my personal friend.

I yield to the gentleman from Detroit (Mr. CONYERS), the dean of the Congressional Black Caucus who, come January 6, will be the dean of the entire United States Congress.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I feel, as all of us do, that we rise today to honor an accomplished public servant, an ef-

fective problem-solver, and a tireless advocate for our society’s most vulnerable, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE of Ohio.

□ 1030

As she concludes her tenure as chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, she makes us all obligated to share our deep appreciation for her courage and her thoughtfulness.

Since taking office 6 years ago, Congresswoman FUDGE has been a national leader in the fight for job creation, the safety net, access to health care, and quality nutrition, and she has been able to motivate some 43 other Members of the Congressional Black Caucus in supporting these issues that have made her so outstanding.

It is fortuitous that she came to lead the Congressional Black Caucus at a time of unprecedented attacks on the Nation’s nutrition-support systems that are essential for saving lives and eliminating the opportunity gap.

She has been unwavering and unstinting in her defense of people who rely on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP—as well as child nutrition and school feeding programs—for survival. There’s no better way to reduce inequality than to ensure that children have access to the nutrition they need to prosper.

As the Senior Member of the Judiciary Committee, I am also extremely grateful for Chairwoman FUDGE’s leadership and extraordinary insight and energy in advocating for voting rights and for victims of excessive force.

Chairwoman FUDGE has played an indispensable role in preserving the CBC’s legacy as the “Conscience of the Congress.”

MOURNING THE LOSS OF JUDY BAAR TOPINKA, ILLINOIS STATE COMPTROLLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, my home State of Illinois mourns the loss of a great friend and a great leader, our State comptroller, Judy Baar Topinka.

I awoke this morning to my phone buzzing incessantly, and I was sad to pick up that phone and hear the news that my friend passed away unexpectedly early this morning. Illinois has lost a great leader.

Judy was somebody who was an institution in Republican politics in my home State. She was the most gregarious politician I have ever met in my life. Judy was somebody who made everyone feel at ease walking through the State capitol in Illinois. I am proud to represent that State capitol now in Springfield, and it is going to be a sad day to walk into that capitol and not see Judy.

Mr. Speaker, Judy was somebody who knew no strangers. If she met you,

whether you were standing out in front of the capitol building guarding the door or if you were the Governor of the State of Illinois, she treated you the exact same way.

She is somebody who inspired me to get into this arena of public service. As a young candidate for State representative in 1996, I had the opportunity to have many people tell me that I shouldn't run, but I had Judy Baar Topinka to thank for encouraging me to go for it. I lost that race, but I made so many friends like Judy.

Judy came to my hometown of Taylorville to do some campaign events with me one day. It was summer. It was a long day of events, and Judy went to my house to lay down and rest for a bit. I had a 1-year-old Boston terrier bulldog who decided that he really liked Judy.

He jumped up on that couch and started kissing her in the only way that my dog knew how. He went right to her face. Instead of helping Judy, we took pictures. Since that day, every single time I have seen Judy Baar Topinka, she asks me about that dog. In 2012, when my dog Bruiser passed away, Judy was actually sad when I broke the news.

Illinois is going to lose not just my friend, but we lose our comptroller who was just reelected. Illinois mourns the loss of Judy, and I stand here today—with no intention of coming to the House floor—to talk about my friend. I mourn the loss of my friend.

Illinois will never be the same without Judy Baar Topinka, and America will never be the same without leaders like her.

THE FAA'S REPORT ON THE RESPONSE TO THE SABOTAGE AND FIRE AT CHICAGO CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is far too common for Members of Congress to come to the floor of this Chamber to weave their narrative of incompetent Federal bureaucracies, lazy and unresponsive members of the unionized Federal workforce, and greedy and irresponsible Federal contractors. I rise today to tell a very different story.

On September 26, 2014, commercial flights in nearly every airport around this country were delayed or canceled after the Chicago Air Route Traffic Control Center, also known as Chicago Center, in Aurora, Illinois, was disabled in an act of sabotage by a disturbed individual.

A fire destroyed the communications equipment that processes flight plan data and enabled air traffic controllers at the facility to communicate with pilots in the 91,000 square miles of airspace for which they are responsible. This could have led to a tragic loss of

life. However, due to the efforts of controllers at Chicago Center and adjacent air traffic control facilities, all planes in the air when Chicago Center lost communications were landed safely.

Nearly 200 of the controllers at Chicago Center then traveled to 12 air traffic control towers and terminal radar approach controls throughout the Midwest to help direct air traffic. At the same time, technicians, mechanics, and electricians were working around the clock to replace damaged equipment and restore the Chicago Center facilities.

In total, they replaced 10 miles of cable, dozens of racks of computers, and 835 communication circuits to restore the center's voice communications, radar flight planning, and weather capabilities.

As a scientist who has installed giant experiments and accelerators on tight time scales, I respect what they have accomplished. Professional restoration crews also removed fire, soot, smoke, and water damage from the affected areas, and all of this was accomplished in just over 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, despite significant challenges, Chicago airports were able to operate at more than 90 percent capacity within days of the fire. One week after the fire, Administrator Huerta visited Chicago Center with me and my colleagues in the Senate to assess the progress of the restoration.

While it was clear that the damage had been extensive, I drew confidence from what I saw. Everyone understood what they needed to do for the sake of the traveling public. They set an aggressive schedule for repairs, and they kept it.

The air traffic controllers, FAA employees, and contractors who responded to this crisis performed admirably and deserve our sincere thanks and appreciation. Under difficult circumstances, members of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association from throughout the Midwest rose to the challenge and kept the flying public safe. Within 4 days of the fire, O'Hare Airport regained its title as the busiest airport in the world.

I would like to say a special thank you to Toby Hauck, the Chicago Center NATCA Facility Representative; Gerry Waloszyk, the Chicago Center PASS facility Representative; Bill Cound, the Chicago Center Air Traffic Manager; Mike Paulsen, the Chicago Center Technical Operations Group Manager; and everyone else who worked to restore Chicago Center. Because of all of you, by October 13, repairs were completed, and Chicago Center returned to full capacity.

Mr. Speaker, important lessons have been learned, that the fire that crippled Chicago Center not only affected flights departing and arriving in the Midwest, but also those flying through Chicago's airspace to reach their destinations.

Between Friday and Sunday, more than 3,000 flights were canceled at O'Hare alone. The estimated cost to the airlines has been reported to be more than \$350 million in total. However, what made this crisis unique wasn't the number of delays or cancelled flights. It was that just one person was able to disrupt the travel plans of so many thousands of people.

The systems that protect the flying public must be made more robust. Although the fundamental redundancy had been built into the system—the ability for nearby radar systems to see into the Chicago airspace—the FAA must and is improving contingency plans to restore service much faster than it was able to do.

In the long term, the best way to ensure the safety and reliability of the National Airspace System is to facilitate the transition to the NextGen air traffic transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, currently, the ground-based radar system is the foundation of the National Airspace System. NextGen will rely on GPS satellites that are more accurate than ground-based radar. It will also include a transition from radio voice communications to a digital network that is similar to the mobile phone service. This transition to NextGen will enable air traffic controllers to reestablish air traffic control services much more quickly after this type of disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in commending the FAA's response team on a job well done and to support the President's request for full funding for implementing NextGen in the 114th Congress.

THE OPEN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the 30 million Americans who suffer from a rare disease. One in ten, Mr. Speaker, 10 percent of the country suffers from a rare disease.

Over 95 percent of these diseases have no treatments because each rare disease impacts a small number of patients. That is why I introduced the OPEN Act, the Orphan Product Extensions Now Accelerating Cures and Treatments.

My bill has the potential to help millions of people, and the idea was born from an event in my district. Over the summer, I held two 21st Century Cures roundtables in my district. The 21st Century Cures is a bipartisan initiative to examine and improve the discovery-development-delivery cycle.

Treatments for patients suffering from chronic and rare diseases, whether it is from medical devices or medicine, must be discovered on the ground level through basic science; developed

into a practical, usable, and marketable product; and delivered to the patients so that the treatment may be effectively utilized.

Mr. Speaker, the first roundtable featured patients and patient advocates. From some of those patients, I heard about the importance of repurposing drugs. This led to the introduction of the OPEN Act. My bill will leverage the free market to incentivize drugs to be repurposed to treat rare diseases and pediatric cancers.

Repurposing drugs has a twofold benefit. First, the OPEN Act has the potential to result in new treatments for individuals with rare diseases. As I mentioned, the vast majority of individuals suffering from rare diseases don't have treatments, let alone cures; yet I hear often about individuals with rare diseases who will take medication that has not been tested for their condition.

The OPEN Act incentivizes the testing of mainstream drugs on rare diseases. This bill opens the door for new treatments. The OPEN Act can also create a new surge in biotechnology jobs and investments. Creating jobs and helping the sick are laudable goals, Mr. Speaker. My bill takes a step toward accomplishing that.

This bill can help millions of people. It will ensure repurposed medications are safe and effective for rare conditions and can be reimbursed through insurance coverage—so important. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation which I introduced with my colleagues, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. HASTINGS.

Helping those with rare diseases is a cause worth supporting, and I am proud to have introduced the OPEN Act.

AMERICA'S BRIGHT ECONOMIC FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take note of the historic gains our economy made last month. With the recent addition of 314,000 new jobs, unemployment under 6 percent, and the best single-year job creation since the 1990s, our economic future looks bright, but we still have work to create a better economic future for American families.

I recently held my second annual hiring event where 400 jobseekers met with 75 employers looking to hire. I also hosted five job search boot camps where we taught jobseekers interview skills, how to prepare a resume, and strategies to successfully navigate hiring events.

My district is home to many innovative centers that will serve as engines in driving America's economy. I recently visited job training facilities

like the Kankakee Area Career Center and the Canadian National job training center which are preparing people for careers in trades and transportation.

□ 1045

With centers like these and workers like the ones we have in Illinois, I am optimistic about America's continued economic recovery. I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue growing jobs here at home.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge two women. The first we have heard about already, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), the great leader of the CBC. MARCIA has taken the CBC to another level. Also, MARCIA has taken a special election freshman like me and helped me make it through my first session.

MARCIA, I want to thank you for the faith you have in me for asking me to become the next CBC Health Care Brain Trust chair. I thank you and I salute you. The CBC is not only fortunate to have you, the Deltas are, the Links are, Congress is, and the great State of Ohio. Thank you so much.

Lastly, like my colleague Representative RODNEY DAVIS, I want to acknowledge the passing of Illinois' comptroller, Judy Baar Topinka. Judy was a true public servant who combined service and fun. She definitely made her mark in Illinois serving as the first female treasurer, the head of the Republican Party, and then as comptroller. Judy had a special way of relating with all people. My thoughts and prayers are with Judy's family, friends, and staff.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional issues involving the President's executive orders on amnesty far transcend the issue of illegal immigration. The President's action strikes at the very heart of our separation of powers. The Constitution reserves to Congress alone the power to enact and alter law, and it charges the President with the responsibility to faithfully execute those laws.

If the President can seize legislative power in this manner and then boast to an audience that he, himself, has changed the law, then the separation of powers becomes meaningless, and our constitutional Republic will have crossed a very bright line that separates a nation of laws from the unhappy societies where rulers boast that the "law is in their mouths."

If this precedent stands, every succeeding President, Republican and Democrat, will cite it as authority to make or alter law by decree. This cannot be allowed to happen.

The question occurs: What can the House do?

Well, it took its first step last week by passing H.R. 5759 that declares the President's action unconstitutional and null and void. This was a symbolic act since the bill is subject to Presidential veto, but it was a warning that the President should have heeded. Obviously, he has not.

What else can the Congress do?

One of the fundamental checks held by Congress is the power of appropriation. It can close the purse by forbidding the use of Federal funds to proceed with this unconstitutional act.

I realize that is a very difficult thing to do with a dysfunctional Senate, but a temporary funding measure into January or February would protect us against the prospect of a government shutdown while we try to engage the Senate to rise in defense of the Constitution. And if the Democratic Senate will not defend our Constitution, and I am afraid that is a strong possibility, a few weeks from now the Republican Senate certainly will.

Why in the world would we want to lock in Federal spending through next September that reflects the priorities of the Democratic Senate that voters just thoroughly repudiated last month? Why in the world would we want to so greatly weaken our position to insist on the complete defunding of the President's unconstitutional act in the next congressional session just 3 weeks hence?

Meanwhile, it is imperative that the House take every action available to engage the Supreme Court to resolve this constitutional crisis. Several States have already filed suit, and the House needs to join them. In addition, the House needs to vote as an institution to challenge this act directly. This is too important to be treated as an afterthought on current litigation over ObamaCare. It needs to be voted on separately, unequivocally, and now.

Since the earliest days of our Republic, the Supreme Court has invalidated legislative acts that conflicted with the Constitution. Now it must be called upon to invalidate an executive act that strikes at the very core of our Constitution. Regardless of the ideologies of individual Justices, I cannot believe that any of them would sit idly by as the Executive seizes such fundamental powers from the legislative branch.

On behalf of the House, the Speaker announced last month that we would fight this act tooth and nail. To adjourn tomorrow, having taken only a symbolic vote, while abandoning our actual powers to challenge this act undermines the credibility of the House majority.

Elements on the extreme left argue that this act was justified due to congressional inaction over immigration reform. They fault the House for not

adopting a Senate immigration measure, but they forget the House passed a strong immigration bill this summer and the Senate refused to consider it.

Since when has congressional disagreement over legislation been license for the President to legislate himself? This argument abandons the Constitution and the rule of law for the expediency of one-man rule. We should recognize such arguments for what they are: the authoritarianism of the extreme left. We should reject these arguments and those who make them.

Mr. Speaker, the Roman Republic died when Julius Caesar seized the legislative authority of the Roman Senate. Repeated acts of usurpation went unchallenged until the constitutional structure of the Republic simply disintegrated.

Let that not be the epitaph of the American Republic. Of this crisis, let history record that men and women of good will on both sides of the aisle joined together to defend the Constitution that they swore to uphold, and that this generation passed that Constitution and all of the freedoms it has preserved, intact and inviolate, to the many generations of Americans who followed.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN MARCIA FUDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand here this morning as a proud American and proud of this Republic which elected the first African American President 6 years ago, and reelected him 2 years ago by an overwhelming vote.

I rise today to celebrate my outstanding colleague and dear friend, Representative MARCIA FUDGE, on the completion of her term as the 23rd chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

I have had the honor and privilege of working along with Representative FUDGE on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee when she first was elected to the House of Representatives in 2008. Since that time, I have watched her thrive as a fearless leader on Capitol Hill, not only for her constituents of Ohio's 11th District, but for African Americans and other underrepresented citizens all over the country and internationally. As chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Representative FUDGE is only the seventh woman to serve in this capacity, and she has been groundbreaking in her fight to tackle difficult issues facing underrepresented communities of color during her 2-year term as chair.

Mr. Speaker, under Representative FUDGE's leadership, the Congressional Black Caucus has continued to be the

conscience of Congress, working tirelessly to steer good policy to the forefront. Over these past 2 years, Representative FUDGE, in her role as chair, has faithfully represented the underrepresented voices as they pertain to job creation, education, health care, national security, and a host of other pressing issues. Her intricate policy knowledge, political savvy, and ability to build coalitions have been of tremendous value to the Congressional Black Caucus and to the Nation.

I can speak on behalf of all of my colleagues—and you have just witnessed them here present in the Chamber—in saying that we will sorely miss her leadership, and we thank her for her service as chair. I am confident that Ms. FUDGE will continue to serve selflessly and devote her time and talents to the CBC and its goals, and I look forward to continuing our important work together because it is far from being over.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLICE DEPARTMENTS AND COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me just thank my colleagues. Certainly, it has been a high honor to serve as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I will express that later on today at our meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the recent tragedies that have occurred in my hometown of Cleveland, Ohio, but also the positive change that can come out of these tragedies.

In November 2012, Malissa Williams and Timothy Russell lost their lives following a high-speed chase involving more than 60 police vehicles. Cleveland police officers fired 137 rounds into their vehicle. The pair were unarmed.

I immediately wrote to the Department of Justice seeking an independent review and investigation surrounding the circumstances that led to this use of deadly force by law enforcement.

Following the death of Michael Brown and the unrest that followed, I again wrote to the Department of Justice in August 2014 asking for action. While waiting on the results of the Department of Justice investigation, tragedy again struck my district on November 22, 2014, when a 12-year-old boy, Tamir Rice, was shot dead by a Cleveland police officer in a park outside the Cudell Recreation Center.

While my heart is still heavy, I believe some good will rise from the ashes of this tragedy.

On Thursday, December 4, Attorney General Eric Holder announced the Department of Justice had concluded its review and found that the Cleveland Division of Police had exhibited systemic deficiencies and engaged in a pattern of excessive force. The city of

Cleveland is committed to righting these wrongs through a court-enforced consent decree.

The DOJ's announcement in Cleveland last week is an encouraging first step to tackling the systemic issues that are plaguing our communities. However, let us not for one second think our work is done. The use of excessive force, particularly when it comes to minority communities, is not a concern unique to Cleveland. The deaths of Michael Brown and Eric Garner are tragic reminders that this is a national concern.

The killing of men of color by those sworn to protect and serve must stay foremost in our minds until it stops.

I am encouraged by the young people who have taken to the streets to protest peacefully. They have finally found something that has energized them to be active and vocal about the change they seek. I urge them to continue to let their voices be heard to keep up the drumbeat for justice.

Having worked in the criminal justice system for many years, I understand more than most that police have a very difficult and dangerous job and deserve our respect and our thanks. Each day our police officers put their lives on the line to protect and serve, and they should be commended for the work they do. Yet we cannot ignore that there exists a feeling of distrust of police in many communities across the country. This must end today. A new era, an era of peace and collaborative community involvement, must begin now.

ENSURING GOVERNANCE OF THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege as well to come to the floor of the House and pay tribute to our outgoing chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Before I do that, however, I believe it is important to say to this body that our charge and responsibility is to ensure the governance of this Nation. As the appropriations omnibus unfolded, I believe the continuing resolution that has been put forward is evidence of the nonresponsibility and the nonthought of those who have the obligation to govern this Nation. I believe it is important to raise the question of where is the objectivity.

The continuing resolution is to fund the Nation's homeland security. That means that we are saying to those who just lost their lives in Yemen, to the Americans who have been seen being beheaded by ISIL, to Boko Haram, al Shabaab, to al Qaeda, and many other franchise terrorists that America will stand bare and unprepared, that her national security will be in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that we speak against a continuing resolution that funds homeland security partially.

Let me also say that I believe in this great Nation. I believe in the Constitution, and I fully realize that the executive order that was issued by the President dealing with the humanitarian relief and the discretion by agencies, prosecutorial discretion, is within the context of his authority under article II.

□ 1100

I am fully aware that the President's executive order was well vetted by constitutional specialists, White House counsel, and the Department of Justice, objectively looking as to whether or not the President was making new law. In this executive order on immigration, no immigration status was conferred, no citizenship was conferred. The only thing that was determined in those executive orders is prosecutorial discretion on deporting individuals and deferring deportation.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the response is extreme. Not funding Homeland Security is extreme. I join with Secretary Johnson in standing against this discriminatory practice on an agency that is crucial to the security of airports and ports and the borders and protecting the American people.

As I ask for a reconsideration, it allows me to speak of a lady who represents the best of the Constitution, and that is Chairwoman FUDGE, who understood the quality of all and the importance of guiding this caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus, around the issues of justice. Let me thank her for the considerations made during tragedies like Trayvon Martin, as we began with briefings and involvement in that case, and looked to support members of the Congressional Black Caucus who were fighting in their districts to bring about justice; her continued support of Members when the tragedies of Michael Brown and Eric Garner occurred, and many other incidents; her balance, as we all have, respecting and appreciating the service of law enforcement officers, including those whom we oversee on the Judiciary Committee: the DEA, the FBI, the ATF, and many others, but recognizing that the Constitution, as she so understands it, must be a document for all.

Let me, particularly, thank Chairwoman FUDGE for her dedicated commitment to the nutrition of children across America. She is almost like Shirley Chisholm, who came to the Agriculture Committee. People wondered what she would do there. But she understood, as a local elected official, that food stamps were not a handout, they were a hand-up. I thank her for that.

And then to lay a marker for the issues of all Members, her under-

standing of the energy industry, particularly in States like Louisiana and Texas, where she encouraged Members to introduce the energy industry to the Congressional Black Caucus in terms of giving information. That is what we are: we learn, we get information.

And then, of course, her commitment to having an international presence, that people would know that the Congressional Black Caucus cares about the international community. That is an important step.

As we move forward in 2015, I wish the incoming chair much success. I think it is extremely important that we say thanks where appreciation is due, and I want to say, "Thank you."

Many people claim friendship, but I will say to you, Chairwoman FUDGE, you have now gotten 40-plus new friends to your portfolio, and we will claim you as a friend because, as we worked together in this last Congress, as we worked with the United States President, President Barack Obama, as we worked with the Senate, as we worked with Federal agencies, as we worked with our community, you became a friend to us.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN MARCIA FUDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend and colleague, a distinguished congresswoman with a sweet name, MARCIA FUDGE, as her tenure as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus ends.

First of all, I want to thank MARCIA FUDGE for welcoming me to Capitol Hill, for being such a good friend and mentor. In my short time in Congress, she has been an invaluable resource to me, and I truly appreciate that.

As a servant of the people, I have long admired her as a woman for not just talking the talk, but for walking it, too.

Secondly, I want to thank MARCIA FUDGE for her phenomenal leadership. She has successfully guided the Congressional Black Caucus in promoting some of the most pressing issues and concerns of the people in our communities. She has been the collective voice of the caucus, bringing light to necessary issues of social and economic justice.

As we have seen with the recent events in the Michael Brown and Eric Garner cases, it is absolutely critical that we have a strong and collective voice to shed light on these injustices and to make positive change in our communities.

She has certainly put the caucus on a solid foundation, which I know my North Carolina colleague, G.K. BUTTERFIELD, will continue.

On behalf of the residents of North Carolina's 12th Congressional District, I salute Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE on her great leadership as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and I say, "Thank you, thank you, thank you."

H.R. 5407 DESERVES A HEARING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say without reservation, hesitation, or equivocation, I have preeminent respect for the constabulary. I have a relative who was a part of the constabulary. I believe that police officers have a very difficult job, and they do it under stressful circumstances, and I believe that most police officers are doing a good job every day.

I also want to say that there are many people without the constabulary, however, who would have us get over Michael Brown, get over Eric Garner, get on with it. And then there are those who say in the alternative—not in these exact words but with words connoting this—they say, if you can't get over Garner, get over Brown, because Garner is a better case for you to take to the court of public opinion.

To these people I say, we can't get over Garner and we can't get over Brown, because if the truth be told, Garner and Brown are two sides of the same coin, two sides of one coin. If the truth be told, without the eye of the camera, without what appears to be clear and convincing evidence, without what appears to be evidence that is beyond reproach, without the eye of the camera, Garner would be Brown. The Garner case is only what it is because the camera was there to capture the essence of what happened.

If the truth be told, without the camera, there would be questions about how Garner was arrested, there would be questions about how he was taken to the ground, there would be questions about whether he made comments about his inability to breathe. How many times did he say, "I can't breathe?" There would be questions about whether or not he made some effort to harm some officer. There would be questions about whether the guns were somehow at risk of being taken from an officer.

If the truth be told, without the eye of the camera, Garner would be Brown.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I have made an appeal to this House to bring H.R. 5407 to the floor. Let it go to a hearing. H.R. 5407 is the TIP Act, the Transparency in Policing Act. H.R. 5407 would accord the Justice Department the opportunity to do a survey and ascertain the cost of equipping municipalities, counties, police departments—the constabulary, if you will—with cameras. Then it would go on to require those that can afford it to have

the cameras, and those that cannot, it provides an exemption to them.

H.R. 5407 is good legislation. It is not a panacea; it won't cure all. For those who are concerned about the camera not being enough to cause a proper decision to be reached before a grand jury, it may not be, but it sure does provide the opportunity to galvanize the country around the notion that something needs to be done. It is not a panacea, not a cure-all, but it does present an opportunity for officers to be exonerated.

H.R. 5407 would do more to help officers than anything out there right now that I can see, because it gives the evidence of what actually occurred at an event, it can cause officers not to be questioned about what they did, and it will cause those who would perpetrate dastardly deeds and fraudulent circumstances upon officers to be properly prosecuted.

H.R. 5407 is a bill that is before the House and has a good many supporters right now, more than 40.

I believe that H.R. 5407 deserves a hearing. I make an appeal, I beseech, and I implore my colleagues, who have the preeminent authority to make a decision as to whether it moves forward, to please give H.R. 5407 an opportunity to be heard. This is not an appeal from one Congressperson; this is an appeal from those who are concerned about proper policing.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSWOMAN MARCIA FUDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I come today unscripted to speak to you about a lady that made a difference in the lives of this Nation. Fifty-nine years and one week ago, Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat so she could make a stand for civil rights and justice. She said she was only tired of giving in.

That day, her remaining in her seat, made a difference for a person like me, a young girl in 1955, who vowed to make a difference because this woman, known as the "Mother of the Modern Civil Rights Movement," took a stand.

In the Third Congressional District last week, Governor Bob Taft, the Central Ohio Transit Authority, my Third Congressional District, and the Ohio State University stood together and hosted hundreds of individuals to talk about redefining our communities, standing up for justice.

I am proud that Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES joined a panel with other scholars like Sharon Davies and Curtis Austin as we talked about moving forward, as we talked about moving forward from the Trayvon Martins, from the Michael Browns, from the Eric Garners, and the list goes on, across this Nation.

We must come together for our children, for our families, and, yes, we must also stand up for justice that meets the standards of the values of this Nation.

Today, I join my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to thank another woman, our Rosa Parks, our Sojourner Truth—Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for being the seventh woman to be the president and the leader of the Congressional Black Caucus.

To you, Congresswoman FUDGE, to you, Mr. Speaker, I say, thank you for the Congressional Black Caucus through her leadership being more than the conscience of the Congress, but for being scholarly, for standing up for justice, for daring to be different, and, also, for understanding agriculture, the judiciary system. You see, she is not only a Member of Congress, she has served as a mayor, she has served as a judge, she is a prominent lawyer. But, more important than all of these, she is a crusader for children, she is a crusader for the least of us, and she understands relationships and partnerships, and working far beyond the CBC. She reaches across both sides of the aisle because, at the end of the day, she really realizes the fight is not about one of us, the fight is for all of us.

□ 1115

CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, I stood here on the House floor to speak out against the troubling surge in global anti-Semitic demonstrations that followed the latest confrontation between Israel and Hamas terrorists. Crimes ranged from the desecration of synagogues and other Jewish institutions and businesses, to murders and acts of violence and terrorism against Jews.

At that time, I had just led a bipartisan coalition of over 70 Members of Congress in speaking out against the rise in anti-Semitism and calling on the United States to continue to be a global leader in combating such acts of hatred wherever they occur. The United States must lead by example which is why I am proud this body has continued to condemn anti-Semitism and support efforts to combat such actions.

With little agreement between the parties and Congress currently, I have been proud to see continual bipartisan cooperation on this issue that not only impacts Jews, but all ethnic, religious, and minority groups; unfortunately, with anti-Semitic violence and incitement continuing to increase dramatically, leading by example is not enough.

That is why I have joined with my good friends, the gentlemen from Florida, Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) in leading over 80 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle to urge the United Nations to take decisive action against anti-Semitic attacks globally.

It is beyond troubling that across the world we are seeing anti-Semitic rhetoric being circulated widely on television, radio, and the Internet and that there are even national political parties that openly espouse racist views. Even more troubling is that these hateful actions are taking place in many of our fellow member states at the U.N.

The United Nations must join the United States in taking actions to encourage member states to become global partners in combating anti-Semitism, which poses a severe threat to international peace and security. The U.N. can stem the surge of anti-Semitism through a variety of methods, including raising awareness of the global prevalence of anti-Semitic attitudes.

The U.N. should urge the adoption, implementation, and enforcement of strong hate crime laws. Hate crime laws demonstrate that a society will not tolerate unlawful actions motivated by bigotry and that minority and ethnic groups are valued members.

It should also encourage countries to expand education on diversity and tolerance because it is crucial that children are brought up in an atmosphere of inclusion and taught the significance of valuing individuals of all backgrounds and religious beliefs.

Additionally, the U.N. must encourage heads of state to forcefully speak out about the dangers of anti-Semitism which can create an environment where violence and escalating tensions can grow and impact all communities.

I thank all of my colleagues in this body who continue to stand up against such bigotry and violent acts of hatred, both here at home and abroad, as we continue to enlist others in our international community to promote freedom and equality under the law. I also want to thank the local Jewish community relations council in my district which recently held a community forum on addressing anti-Semitism.

This is a conversation that must be held in every community across our Nation and around the world. I hope to see the United Nations and all member states join us in expanding this dialogue by denouncing such actions and taking decisive action in their own countries to halt these hate crimes and acts of hatred.

Only by working together across party lines and across the globe can we successfully eradicate such hate in our world.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 10, 2014 at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1474.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1067.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4199.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 4681.

That the Senate passed with amendments H. Con. Res. 107.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Aaron McEmrys, Unitarian Universalist Church of Arlington, Arlington, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Creator God, spirit of light, we come here today with our spirits open to the Sun of Your loving gaze. We come humbled by the work entrusted to us—to tend to Your children—for we know that we are, all of us, Your children, bearers of Your divine spark.

May we remember this no matter how thick the stacks of paper on our desks.

When we are weary, may we be filled with Your generosity of spirit. We will pass it on with interest.

When we don't know which way to turn, may we find stillness and listen for the soft voice of wisdom.

Help us today to do justice, to serve mercy, and to walk humbly with You and the better angels of our nature.

Most of all, beloved God, may we practice the arts of kindness in all that we do and all that we are.

To this we say amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PERLMUTTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND AARON
McEMRYS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to introduce and welcome Reverend Aaron McEmrys from the Unitarian Universalist Church of Arlington, which is in the heart of my congressional district.

Reverend McEmrys is an accomplished religious leader who thrives on collaboration and draws his energy from working with people. He has led a life of service and generosity, caring for his neighbors and working to protect his flock.

I am proud to share his views as a passionate supporter of marriage equality, of addressing the disparity in wealth and income throughout the country, of workers' rights, and addressing the growing problems caused by global climate change.

He has spent years fighting to improve the daily lives of the neediest among us, spending years with the Hopi and Navajo Indian populations.

Reverend McEmrys holds a master's of divinity from the Meadville Lombard Theological School and a bachelor's of science in labor studies from

the National Labor College, so he is well prepared to lead a highly informed and politically engaged congregation.

I am proud to consider him a constituent, a valued constituent, and thank him for opening our day with such a meaningful prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HANNAH AND FRIENDS

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with Representative JOLLY to recognize a wonderful organization in my district dedicated to helping children and adults with special needs, Hannah's House.

Many football fans know the name Charlie Weis. He has coached at the University of Notre Dame, New England Patriots, and the New York Jets.

What many of you don't know is he and his wife, Maura, are passionate about helping people off the field.

In 2003, Charlie and Maura founded Hannah and Friends for their daughter Hannah, who has global developmental delays. They wanted to find a way to inspire a special group of people with abilities different from the athletes that he coached. Hannah and Friends provides grants to low- and middle-income families who have children with disabilities.

Hannah and Friends is helping individuals with special needs every day to realize their potential and plan for their future and to achieve their own personal best.

THE GREAT LAKES

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes represents the largest source of freshwater on this planet. They support more than 1.5 million jobs. They provide those who live near them with countless opportunities for outdoor enjoyment and recreation.

My community of western New York considers its proximity to Lake Erie as one of its greatest assets. We must strive to guard the Great Lakes against imminent and future threats, and this week the House did just that.

Today we introduce the Guarding the Great Lakes Act, which will continue to help protect the Great Lakes from Asian carp and other invasive species. The act will also take necessary steps

to focus on permanent solutions by beginning work on water quality and flood mitigation projects.

Yesterday the House passed the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Act, providing \$300 million in Federal funding annually to support projects related to the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes for each of the next 5 years. These are two excellent steps forward as we continue to protect these great bodies of water.

CONGRATULATIONS, KARON KARAMI

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I am grateful to express my appreciation for Karon Karami, the South Carolina Second Congressional District's scheduler and office manager.

After interning for several months in the Washington office, Karon joined the Wilson team in December 2012. Although a native of Great Falls, Virginia, and a graduate of the University of Virginia, Karon has grown to adopt South Carolina as her second home.

The scheduling position is most challenging, but Karon has excelled. Her ability to connect with constituents, coordinate with my wife, Roxanne, and her eagerness to assist them has made a difference for the citizens of South Carolina.

Beginning in January, Karon will join New Hampshire's First Congressional District Congressman-elect Frank Guinta's office. I know her parents, Mo and Fatemah Karami, are proud of her accomplishments. I wish Karon best wishes and look forward to seeing her future successes.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President should take actions to never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. The President's pardoning of Guantanamo terrorists endangers American families.

"ORION"—INNOVATE, EXPLORE, DISCOVER

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable achievement of the *Orion* spacecraft's first test flight. The project represents the next frontier for NASA's deep space exploration program.

Last Friday, December 5, *Orion* lifted off from Cape Canaveral, and by all accounts, it was a flawless mission. This test flight sent *Orion* 3,604 miles above Earth, traveling at over 20,000 miles per hour.

Orion and the Space Launch System are national priorities aimed at taking

our astronauts to Mars and beyond. This exploration will inspire our Nation and capture the hearts and minds of young Americans.

More importantly, I am proud to say Colorado played an enormous role in making *Orion* a reality. Lockheed Martin and United Launch Alliance facilities played a leading role in this mission.

Other Colorado contractors that played an important role include Lockheed Martin Space Systems, Advanced Solutions Inc., Ball Aerospace, Deep Space Systems, Denver Research Institute, Erickson Metals of Colorado, ISYS Technologies, Red Canyon Engineering, SEAKR Engineering, St. Vrain Manufacturing Syzygx, Syzygx, and TTJ&B Inc.

Orion supports thousands of jobs all around the country and is an engine for innovation and space exploration in our State and the Nation. This is something that we all can be proud of as a Nation, and we look forward to further space exploration.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN MIKE MCINTYRE

(Mr. HUDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my good friend and colleague from North Carolina, Congressman MIKE MCINTYRE. MIKE and I are blessed to represent the southeastern region of North Carolina and some of the most hardworking, genuine, and thoughtful people you will ever meet.

MIKE has his priorities in order. He has dedicated his life to God, his family, and serving his constituents, and he has done so with unparalleled honor and integrity.

In Congress, he has been a voice for common sense, and he has never been afraid to reach across the aisle to get things done for our local communities. During his years of service on the House Agriculture and the House Armed Services Committees, MIKE has, time and again, stood up for issues folks care about back home in North Carolina.

I am honored that I inherited Robeson County from MIKE, a place my family has called home for generations, and I am thrilled to call MIKE and his amazing wife, Dee, my constituents.

I can tell you firsthand that MIKE is respected across southeastern North Carolina because he has a sincere passion for the people he represents and serves.

I thank MIKE MCINTYRE for his leadership to North Carolina over the years. It has been a privilege to get to know MIKE, to call him a friend, and to work with him to make life better for the folks of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will join me in wishing MIKE and Dee well

in their future endeavors. We are going to miss him around here.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to renew the call for Congress to act on comprehensive immigration reform. The job of Congress is to legislate, and immigration reform needs a legislative solution. It is, therefore, disappointing that we will be finishing this Congress in a few days without the House having passed or even voted on comprehensive immigration reform. But I hope that starting immediately in the new Congress, we can work together to pass comprehensive, commonsense, and compassionate legislation that will provide opportunities to those who want to come here and opportunities for the 12 million undocumented residents who are already here.

This legislation can grow our economy, decrease our deficit, secure our borders, protect our workers, unite families, and provide an earned pathway to citizenship. A majority of Americans support this framework, and it has the support of both labor and business as well as religious and civic organizations. Let us come back in January ready to get the job done and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

GRUBER WASN'T TALKING ABOUT REPUBLICANS

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a lot of my Republican friends have been upset with the comments of Jonathan Gruber, where he was quoted accurately as saying about ObamaCare: "A lack of transparency is a huge political advantage. Call it the stupidity of the American voter or whatever."

He also said that they—President Obama and the Democrats—proposed it and it "passed because the American people are too stupid to understand the difference."

Now, I would say to my Republican colleagues: chill out. Don't worry. Not a single Republican voted for that bill. Not a single Republican in the Senate voted for that bill. He wasn't talking about Republicans. He wasn't talking about the Democrats, Independents, or Republicans who voted for Republicans to come to the House or the Senate. He was talking about the people he was paid millions by to work on ObamaCare. That is right—he called the Democrats stupid.

He wasn't talking about Republicans. He knew we were smarter than that.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF COACH VINCENT ASCOLESE

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the life of the legendary North Bergen High School football coach Vincent Ascolese.

Coach Ascolese, a beloved husband, father, grandfather, neighbor, and friend, passed away on December 3 after a long battle with cancer.

His career as a high school football coach spanned 50 years, beginning with 11 years in Hoboken, New Jersey, and then taking over the North Bergen football program in 1973. He retired after the 2011 season as New Jersey's third winningest coach in history.

As a member of the Hudson County Hall of Fame and the New Jersey Football Coaches Hall of Fame, he guided the North Bergen Bruins to 12 Hudson County crowns and six State championships.

As a Jersey City native, Coach Ascolese was named Hudson County Coach of the Year 14 times, and in 1997, he was named the Toyota Coach of the Year for the Eastern United States. In 2011, North Bergen's home field was renamed as the Vincent Ascolese Field.

Coach Ascolese will be remembered for his lasting impact on and off the field and his ability to inspire his players and the community. My thoughts are with the Vincent Ascolese family, former players, and the North Bergen community.

HONORING JOSE DIAZ-BALART

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my friend, journalist, and television anchorman, Jose Diaz-Balart.

For over 30 years, Jose has been reporting on momentous events from international crises to breaking news in order to properly inform his diverse audience.

As the first U.S. journalist to broadcast in two languages—English and Spanish—simultaneously on two networks, Jose has proven to be a valuable voice to the Hispanic American community. Throughout his career Jose has been the recipient of many accolades, including three Emmys, the George Foster Peabody Award, and the 2014 CHCI Medallion of Excellence.

Jose's role in our society should not be taken for granted. There are hundreds of journalists in Cuba and around the world who are being persecuted and imprisoned for showcasing the realities within their own countries. Jose speaks for them.

I congratulate Jose for 30 years within the industry and thank him for his commitment to the principles of independent journalism and freedom of the press.

THE CR/OMNIBUS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last night, the House Rules Committee filed the 2015 government funding bill.

My top priority is keeping the government open, and this bill will prevent the kind of widespread economic damage that would be caused by a government shutdown, but funding the government is more than just about dollars and cents. It is a statement about our national values. We must make difficult choices with limited resources and fight for what we stand for.

This so-called CR/Omnibus provides \$1.1 trillion to fund the government through 2015. It provides funding to combat ISIL and support our troops, fight Ebola in West Africa, and it invests in critical science and research programs.

However, I am deeply disappointed that it responds to the President's executive action on immigration by providing only short-term funding for the Department of Homeland Security. I strongly oppose several controversial policy riders that impact women's health and the environment.

As we begin a meaningful debate on this bill and as the new Congress approaches, we must ensure actions and decisions reflect our values and our ideals to ensure that we protect our country, grow the economy, and provide every American a fair shot at success.

THE CHRISTMAS RESOLUTION

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, it is the most wonderful time of the year, a time when millions of Americans gather together to celebrate Christmas. For many of us, Christmas is a time to remember the humble birth of our Savior on a holy night more than 2,000 years ago in the town of Bethlehem. We give thanks for Jesus' message of love and peace and remember the sacrifice He made for us all. It is a season of giving, of love, and of joy.

According to a recent poll, 9 out of 10 Americans celebrate Christmas. Sadly, however, there is a troubling effort in America led by a vocal minority to remove the symbols and traditions of Christmas from the public arena.

There have been many examples of atheist groups working to remove public nativity displays and other decorations. Just last year in my home State

of Colorado, an anti-religious organization filed a lawsuit against school officials for their support of student-led involvement with Operation Christmas Child.

Mr. Speaker, these petty efforts by groups offended by the religious significance of Christmas violates the freedom of religion our Founding Fathers provided for us in the Constitution. This Congress and in Congresses past, I have introduced a resolution to protect the symbols and traditions of Christmas for those who celebrate the holiday.

The resolution also disapproves of efforts to ban references to Christmas. We must not allow those who chose to take offense to shut down the religious celebration of every other American.

THE 66TH ANNIVERSARY OF HUMAN RIGHTS DAY AND THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my newly introduced resolution which recognizes today as the 66th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the celebration of Human Rights Day.

Sixty-six years ago today, the world spoke for the first time with one voice to proclaim the fundamental rights and freedoms of all people. Today, it is our duty to continue to speak out for human rights for all people. Imprisoned bloggers in Vietnam, LGBT activists in Russia, and murdered students in Mexico all have shown us that there is still a great amount of work left to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to take up my resolution and encourage my colleagues to set aside today to recognize Human Rights Day in honor of all those who are struggling to reclaim their fundamental rights.

SUPPORTING THE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY ACT

(Mr. NOLAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5656, the Global Food Security Act of 2014, which is a recognition here by the House of Representatives of the important lead role that the United States of America can and must play in fighting poverty and hunger throughout the world.

The simple truth is that a hunger epidemic of crisis proportion is spreading across the developing world leading to mass unrest, armed conflict, needless suffering, and death.

Every day, more than 21,000 people die of hunger or hunger-related causes.

The United Nations reports that in developing countries, 842 million people are chronically hungry, one out of every three children who die before the age of 5 die of hunger, and one out of four children suffer mental or physical impairments due to malnutrition.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been more than willing to spend trillions on warfare. Today, I call upon the Congress of the United States to declare war on hunger and give people in need a good reason to be grateful to America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

BORDER PATROL AGENT PAY REFORM ACT OF 2014

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1691) to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the security of the United States border and to provide for reforms and rates of pay for border patrol agents.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1691

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. BORDER PATROL RATE OF PAY.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to strengthen U.S. Customs and Border Protection and ensure that border patrol agents are sufficiently ready to conduct necessary work and will perform overtime hours in excess of a 40-hour workweek based on the needs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and

(2) to ensure U.S. Customs and Border Protection has the flexibility to cover shift changes and retains the right to assign scheduled and unscheduled work for mission requirements and planning based on operational need.

(b) RATES OF PAY.—Subchapter V of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5549 the following:

“§ 5550. Border patrol rate of pay

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘basic border patrol rate of pay’ means the hourly rate of basic pay of the applicable border patrol, as determined without regard to this section;

“(2) the term ‘border patrol agent’ means an individual who is appointed to a position assigned to the Border Patrol Enforcement

classification series 1896 or any successor series, consistent with classification standards established by the Office of Personnel Management;

“(3) the term ‘level 1 border patrol rate of pay’ means the hourly rate of pay equal to 1.25 times the otherwise applicable hourly rate of basic pay of the applicable border patrol agent;

“(4) the term ‘level 2 border patrol rate of pay’ means the hourly rate of pay equal to 1.125 times the otherwise applicable hourly rate of basic pay of the applicable border patrol agent; and

“(5) the term ‘work period’ means a 14-day biweekly pay period.

“(b) RECEIPT OF BORDER PATROL RATE OF PAY.—

“(1) VOLUNTARY ELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days before the first day of each year beginning after the date of enactment of this section, a border patrol agent shall make an election whether the border patrol agent shall, for that year, be assigned to—

“(i) the level 1 border patrol rate of pay;

“(ii) the level 2 border patrol rate of pay; or

“(iii) the basic border patrol rate of pay, with additional overtime assigned as needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(B) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate regulations establishing procedures for elections under subparagraph (A).

“(C) INFORMATION REGARDING ELECTION.—Not later than 60 days before the first day of each year beginning after the date of enactment of this section, U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall provide each border patrol agent with information regarding each type of election available under subparagraph (A) and how to make such an election.

“(D) ASSIGNMENT IN LIEU OF ELECTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)—

“(i) a border patrol agent who fails to make a timely election under subparagraph (A) shall be assigned to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay;

“(ii) a border patrol agent who is assigned a canine shall be assigned to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay;

“(iii) if at any time U.S. Customs and Border Protection concludes that a border patrol agent is unable to perform overtime on a daily basis in accordance with this section, U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall assign the border patrol agent to the basic border patrol rate of pay until such time as U.S. Customs and Border Protection determines that the border patrol agent is able to perform scheduled overtime on a daily basis;

“(iv) unless the analysis conducted under section 2(e) of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 indicates that, in order to more adequately fulfill the operational requirements of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, such border patrol agents should be allowed to elect or be assigned to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay or the level 2 border patrol rate of pay, a border patrol agent shall be assigned to the basic border patrol rate of pay if the agent works—

“(I) at U.S. Customs and Border Protection headquarters;

“(II) as a training instructor at a U.S. Customs and Border Protection training facility;

“(III) in an administrative position; or

“(IV) as a fitness instructor; and

“(v) a border patrol agent may be assigned to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay or the level 2 border patrol rate of pay in accordance with subparagraph (E).

“(E) FLEXIBILITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), and notwithstanding any other provision of law, U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall take such action as is necessary, including the unilateral assignment of border patrol agents to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay or the level 2 border patrol rate of pay, to ensure that not more than 10 percent of the border patrol agents stationed at a location are assigned to the level 2 border patrol rate of pay or the basic border patrol rate of pay.

“(ii) WAIVER.—U.S. Customs and Border Protection may waive the limitation under clause (i) on the percent of border patrol agents stationed at a location who are assigned to the level 2 border patrol rate of pay or the basic border patrol rate of pay if, based on the analysis conducted under section 2(e) of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, U.S. Customs and Border Protection determines it may do so and adequately fulfill its operational requirements.

“(iii) CERTAIN LOCATIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply to border patrol agents working at the headquarters of U.S. Customs and Border Protection or a training location of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

“(F) CANINE CARE.—For a border patrol agent assigned to provide care for a canine and assigned to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay in accordance with subparagraph (D)(i)—

“(i) that rate of pay covers all such care;

“(ii) for the purposes of scheduled overtime under paragraph (2)(A)(ii), such care shall be counted as 1 hour of scheduled overtime on each regular workday without regard to the actual duration of such care or whether such care occurs on the regular workday; and

“(iii) no other pay shall be paid to the border patrol agent for such care.

“(G) PAY ASSIGNMENT CONTINUITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall develop and implement a plan to ensure, to the greatest extent practicable, that the assignment of a border patrol agent under this section during the 3 years of service before the border patrol agent becomes eligible for immediate retirement are consistent with the average border patrol rate of pay level to which the border patrol agent has been assigned during the course of the career of the border patrol agent.

“(ii) IMPLEMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, U.S. Customs and Border Protection may take such action as is necessary, including the unilateral assignment of border patrol agents to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay, the level 2 border patrol rate of pay, or the basic border patrol rate of pay, to implement the plan developed under this subparagraph.

“(iii) REPORTING.—U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit the plan developed under clause (i) to the appropriate committees of Congress.

“(iv) GAO REVIEW.—Not later than 6 months after U.S. Customs and Border Protection issues the plan required under clause (i), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the effectiveness of the plan in ensuring that border patrol agents are not able to artificially enhance their retirement annuities.

“(v) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(I) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(II) the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(vi) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to limit the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assign border patrol agents to border patrol rates of pay as necessary to meet operational requirements.

“(2) **LEVEL 1 BORDER PATROL RATE OF PAY.**—For a border patrol agent who is assigned to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay—

“(A) the border patrol agent shall have a regular tour of duty consisting of 5 workdays per week with—

“(i) 8 hours of regular time per workday, which may be interrupted by an unpaid off-duty meal break; and

“(ii) 2 additional hours of scheduled overtime during each day the agent performs work under clause (i);

“(B) for paid hours of regular time described in subparagraph (A)(i), the border patrol agent shall receive pay at the level 1 border patrol rate of pay;

“(C) compensation for the hours of regularly scheduled overtime work described in subparagraph (A)(ii) is provided indirectly through the 25 percent supplement within the level 1 border patrol rate of pay, and the border patrol agent may not receive for such hours—

“(i) any compensation in addition to the compensation under subparagraph (B) under this section or any other provision of law; or

“(ii) any compensatory time off;

“(D) the border patrol agent shall receive compensatory time off or pay at the overtime hourly rate of pay for hours of work in excess of 100 hours during a work period, as determined in accordance with section 5542(g);

“(E) the border patrol agent shall be charged corresponding amounts of paid leave, compensatory time off, or other paid time off for each hour (or part thereof) the agent is absent from work during regular time (except that full days off for military leave shall be charged when required);

“(F) if the border patrol agent is absent during scheduled overtime described in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

“(i) the border patrol agent shall accrue an obligation to perform other overtime work for each hour (or part thereof) the border patrol agent is absent; and

“(ii) any overtime work applied toward the obligation under clause (i) shall not be credited as overtime work under any other provision of law; and

“(G) for the purposes of advanced training, the border patrol agent—

“(i) shall be paid at the level 1 border patrol rate of pay for the first 60 days of advanced training in a calendar year; and

“(ii) for any advanced training in addition to the advanced training described in clause (i), shall be paid at the basic border patrol rate of pay.

“(3) **LEVEL 2 BORDER PATROL RATE OF PAY.**—For a border patrol agent who is assigned to the level 2 border patrol rate of pay—

“(A) the border patrol agent shall have a regular tour of duty consisting of 5 workdays per week with—

“(i) 8 hours of regular time per workday, which may be interrupted by an unpaid off-duty meal break; and

“(ii) 1 additional hour of scheduled overtime during each day the agent performs work under clause (i);

“(B) for paid hours of regular time described in subparagraph (A)(i), the border patrol agent shall receive pay at the level 2 border patrol rate of pay;

“(C) compensation for the hours of regularly scheduled overtime work described in subparagraph (A)(ii) is provided indirectly through the 12.5 percent supplement within the level 2 border patrol rate of pay, and the border patrol agent may not receive for such hours—

“(i) any compensation in addition to the compensation under subparagraph (B) under this section or any other provision of law; or

“(ii) any compensatory time off;

“(D) the border patrol agent shall receive compensatory time off or pay at the overtime hourly rate of pay for hours of work in excess of 90 hours during a work period, as determined in accordance with section 5542(g);

“(E) the border patrol agent shall be charged corresponding amounts of paid leave, compensatory time off, or other paid time off for each hour (or part thereof) the agent is excused from work during regular time (except that full days off for military leave shall be charged when required);

“(F) if the border patrol agent is absent during scheduled overtime described in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

“(i) the border patrol agent shall accrue an obligation to perform other overtime work for each hour (or part thereof) the border patrol agent is absent; and

“(ii) any overtime work applied toward the obligation under clause (i) shall not be credited as overtime work under any other provision of law; and

“(G) for the purposes of advanced training, the border patrol agent—

“(i) shall be paid at the level 2 border patrol rate of pay for the first 60 days of advanced training in a calendar year; and

“(ii) for any advanced training in addition to the advanced training described in clause (i), shall be paid at the basic border patrol rate of pay.

“(4) **BASIC BORDER PATROL RATE OF PAY.**—For a border patrol agent who is assigned to the basic border patrol rate of pay—

“(A) the border patrol agent shall have a regular tour of duty consisting of 5 workdays per week with 8 hours of regular time per workday; and

“(B) the border patrol agent shall receive compensatory time off or pay at the overtime hourly rate of pay for hours of work in excess of 80 hours during a work period, as determined in accordance with section 5542(g).

“(c) **ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER PREMIUM PAY.**—A border patrol agent—

“(1) shall receive premium pay for night-work in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of section 5545 and Sunday and holiday pay in accordance with section 5546, without regard to the rate of pay to which the border patrol agent is assigned under this section, except that—

“(A) no premium pay for night, Sunday, or holiday work shall be provided for hours of regularly scheduled overtime work described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) or (3)(A)(ii) of subsection (b), consistent with the requirements of paragraph (2)(C) or (3)(C) of subsection (b); and

“(B) section 5546(d) shall not apply and instead eligibility for pay for, and the rate of pay for, any overtime work on a Sunday or a designated holiday shall be determined in accordance with this section and section 5542(g);

“(2) except as provided in paragraph (3) or section 5542(g), shall not be eligible for any

other form of premium pay under this title; and

“(3) shall be eligible for hazardous duty pay in accordance with section 5545(d).

“(d) **TREATMENT AS BASIC PAY.**—Any pay in addition to the basic border patrol rate of pay for a border patrol agent resulting from application of the level 1 border patrol rate of pay or the level 2 border patrol rate of pay—

“(1) subject to paragraph (2), shall be treated as part of basic pay solely for—

“(A) purposes of sections 5595(c), 8114(e), 8331(3)(I), and 8704(c);

“(B) any other purpose that the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may by regulation prescribe; and

“(C) any other purpose expressly provided for by law; and

“(2) shall not be treated as part of basic pay for the purposes of calculating overtime pay, night pay, Sunday pay, or holiday pay under section 5542, 5545, or 5546.

“(e) **TRAVEL TIME.**—Travel time to and from home and duty station by a border patrol agent shall not be considered hours of work under any provision of law.

“(f) **LEAVE WITHOUT PAY AND SUBSTITUTION OF HOURS.**—

“(1) **REGULAR TIME.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For a period of leave without pay during the regular time of a border patrol agent (as described in paragraph (2)(A)(i), (3)(A)(i), or (4)(A) of subsection (b)) within a work period, an equal period of work outside the regular time of the border patrol agent, but in the same work period—

“(i) shall be substituted and paid for at the rate applicable for the regular time; and

“(ii) shall not be credited as overtime hours for any purpose.

“(B) **PRIORITY FOR SAME DAY WORK.**—In substituting hours of work under subparagraph (A), work performed on the same day as the period of leave without pay shall be substituted first.

“(C) **PRIORITY FOR REGULAR TIME SUBSTITUTION.**—Hours of work shall be substituted for regular time work under this paragraph before being substituted for scheduled overtime under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4).

“(2) **OVERTIME WORK.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For a period of absence during scheduled overtime (as described in paragraph (2)(F) or (3)(F) of subsection (b)) within a work period, an equal period of additional work in the same work period—

“(i) shall be substituted and credited as scheduled overtime; and

“(ii) shall not be credited as overtime hours under any other provision of law.

“(B) **PRIORITY FOR SAME DAY WORK.**—In substituting hours of work under subparagraph (A), work performed on the same day as the period of absence shall be substituted first.

“(3) **APPLICATION OF COMPENSATORY TIME.**—If a border patrol agent does not have sufficient additional work in a work period to substitute for all periods of absence during scheduled overtime (as described in paragraph (2)(F) or (3)(F) of subsection (b)) within that work period, any accrued compensatory time off under section 5542(g) shall be applied to satisfy the hours obligation.

“(4) **INSUFFICIENT HOURS.**—If a border patrol agent has a remaining hours obligation of scheduled overtime after applying paragraphs (2) and (3), any additional work in subsequent work periods that would otherwise be credited under section 5542(g) shall be applied towards the hours obligation until that obligation is satisfied.

“(g) **AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE OVERTIME WORK.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to require a border patrol agent to perform hours of overtime work in accordance with the needs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including if needed in the event of a local or national emergency.”.

(c) **OVERTIME WORK.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) In applying subsection (a) with respect to a border patrol agent covered by section 5550, the following rules apply:

“(1) Notwithstanding the matter preceding paragraph (1) in subsection (a), for a border patrol agent who is assigned to the level 1 border patrol rate of pay under section 5550—

“(A) hours of work in excess of 100 hours during a 14-day biweekly pay period shall be overtime work; and

“(B) the border patrol agent—

“(i) shall receive pay at the overtime hourly rate of pay (as determined in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a)) for hours of overtime work that are officially ordered or approved in advance of the workweek; and

“(ii) except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5), shall receive compensatory time off for an equal amount of time spent performing overtime work that is not overtime work described in clause (i).

“(2) Notwithstanding the matter preceding paragraph (1) in subsection (a), for a border patrol agent who is assigned to the level 2 border patrol rate of pay under section 5550—

“(A) hours of work in excess of 90 hours during a 14-day biweekly pay period shall be overtime work; and

“(B) the border patrol agent—

“(i) shall receive pay at the overtime hourly rate of pay (as determined in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a)) for hours of overtime work that are officially ordered or approved in advance of the workweek; and

“(ii) except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5), shall receive compensatory time off for an equal amount of time spent performing overtime work that is not overtime work described in clause (i).

“(3) Notwithstanding the matter preceding paragraph (1) in subsection (a), for a border patrol agent who is assigned to the basic border patrol rate of pay under section 5550—

“(A) hours of work in excess of 80 hours during a 14-day biweekly pay period shall be overtime work; and

“(B) the border patrol agent—

“(i) shall receive pay at the overtime hourly rate of pay (as determined in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a)) for hours of overtime work that are officially ordered or approved in advance of the workweek; and

“(ii) except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5), shall receive compensatory time off for an equal amount of time spent performing overtime work that is not overtime work described in clause (i).

“(4)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), during a 14-day biweekly pay period, a border patrol agent may not earn compensatory time off for more than 10 hours of overtime work.

“(B) U.S. Customs and Border Protection may, as it determines appropriate, waive the limitation under subparagraph (A) for an individual border patrol agent for hours of irregular or occasional overtime work, but such waiver must be approved in writing in

advance of the performance of any such work for which compensatory time off is earned under paragraph (1)(B)(ii), (2)(B)(ii), or (3)(B)(ii). If a waiver request by a border patrol agent is denied, the border patrol agent may not be ordered to perform the associated overtime work.

“(5) A border patrol agent—

“(A) may not earn more than 240 hours of compensatory time off during a leave year;

“(B) shall use any hours of compensatory time off not later than the end of the 26th pay period after the pay period during which the compensatory time off was earned;

“(C) shall be required to use 1 hour of compensatory time off for each hour of regular time not worked for which the border patrol agent is not on paid leave or other paid time off or does not substitute time in accordance with section 5550(f);

“(D) shall forfeit any compensatory time off not used in accordance with this paragraph and, regardless of circumstances, shall not be entitled to any cash value for compensatory time earned under section 5550;

“(E) shall not receive credit towards the computation of the annuity of the border patrol agent for compensatory time, whether used or not; and

“(F) shall not be credited with compensatory time off if the value of such time off would cause the aggregate premium pay of the border patrol agent to exceed the limitation established under section 5547 in the period in which it was earned.”.

(2) **MINIMIZATION OF OVERTIME.**—U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall, to the maximum extent practicable, avoid the use of scheduled overtime work by border patrol agents.

(d) **RETIREMENT.**—Section 8331(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking “and”;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by inserting “and” after the semicolon;

(3) by inserting a new subparagraph after subparagraph (H) as follows:

“(I) with respect to a border patrol agent, the amount of supplemental pay received through application of the level 1 border patrol rate of pay or the level 2 border patrol rate of pay for scheduled overtime within the regular tour of duty of the border patrol agent as provided in section 5550;” and

(4) in the undesignated matter following subparagraph (H), by striking “subparagraphs (B) through (H)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) through (I)”.

(e) **COMPREHENSIVE STAFFING ANALYSIS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall conduct a comprehensive analysis, and submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report, that—

(A) examines the staffing requirements for U.S. Border Patrol to most effectively meet its operational requirements at each Border Patrol duty station;

(B) estimates the cost of the staffing requirements at each Border Patrol duty station; and

(C) includes—

(i) a position-by-position review at each Border Patrol station to determine—

(I) the duties assigned to each position;

(II) how the duties relate to the operational requirements of U.S. Border Patrol; and

(III) the number of hours border patrol agents in that position would need to work each pay period to meet the operational requirements of U.S. Border Patrol;

(ii) the metrics used to determine the number of hours of work performed at each Bor-

der Patrol station, broken down by the type of hours worked;

(iii) a cost analysis of the most recent full fiscal year by the type of full-time equivalent hours worked;

(iv) a cost estimate by the type of full-time equivalent hours expected to be worked during the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(v) an analysis that compares the cost of assigning the full-time equivalent hours needed to meet the operational requirements of U.S. Border Patrol to existing border patrol agents through higher rates of pay versus recruiting, hiring, training, and deploying additional border patrol agents.

(2) **INDEPENDENT VALIDATOR.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Comptroller General receives the report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that—

(A) examines the methodology used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to carry out the analysis; and

(B) indicates whether the Comptroller General concurs with the findings in the report under paragraph (1).

(3) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(f) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to—

(1) limit the right of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assign both scheduled and unscheduled work to a border patrol agent based on the needs of U.S. Customs and Border Protection in excess of the hours of work normally applicable under the election of the border patrol agent, regardless of what the border patrol agent might otherwise have elected;

(2) require compensation of a border patrol agent other than for hours during which the border patrol agent is actually performing work or using approved paid leave or other paid time off; or

(3) exempt a border patrol agent from any limitations on pay, earnings, or compensation, including the limitations under section 5547 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 5547 of title 5, United States Code is amended by—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking, “and” before “5546”; and

(ii) by inserting “, and 5550” after “5546 (a) and (b)”;

and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) Any supplemental pay resulting from receipt of the level 1 border patrol rate of pay or the level 2 border patrol rate of pay under section 5550 shall be considered premium pay in applying this section.”.

(2) Section 13(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (16), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(18) any employee who is a border patrol agent, as defined in section 5550(a) of title 5, United States Code.”.

(3) The table of sections for chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5549 the following:

“5550. Border patrol rate of pay.”.

(h) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate regulations to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 3. CYBERSECURITY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the end of subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.), add the following:

“SEC. 226. CYBERSECURITY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT.—The term ‘collective bargaining agreement’ has the meaning given that term in section 7103(a)(8) of title 5, United States Code.

“(3) EXCEPTED SERVICE.—The term ‘excepted service’ has the meaning given that term in section 2103 of title 5, United States Code.

“(4) PREFERENCE ELIGIBLE.—The term ‘preference eligible’ has the meaning given that term in section 2108 of title 5, United States Code.

“(5) QUALIFIED POSITION.—The term ‘qualified position’ means a position, designated by the Secretary for the purpose of this section, in which the incumbent performs, manages, or supervises functions that execute the responsibilities of the Department relating to cybersecurity.

“(6) SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.—The term ‘Senior Executive Service’ has the meaning given that term in section 2101a of title 5, United States Code.

“(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

“(1) ESTABLISH POSITIONS, APPOINT PERSONNEL, AND FIX RATES OF PAY.—

“(A) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may—

“(i) establish, as positions in the excepted service, such qualified positions in the Department as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Department relating to cybersecurity, including positions formerly identified as—

“(I) senior level positions designated under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code; and

“(II) positions in the Senior Executive Service;

“(ii) appoint an individual to a qualified position (after taking into consideration the availability of preference eligibles for appointment to the position); and

“(iii) subject to the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3), fix the compensation of an individual for service in a qualified position.

“(B) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER LAWS.—The authority of the Secretary under this subsection applies without regard to the provisions of any other law relating to the appointment, number, classification, or compensation of employees.

“(2) BASIC PAY.—

“(A) AUTHORITY TO FIX RATES OF BASIC PAY.—In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall fix the rates of basic pay for any qualified position established under paragraph (1) in relation to the rates of pay provided for employees in comparable posi-

tions in the Department of Defense and subject to the same limitations on maximum rates of pay established for such employees by law or regulation.

“(B) PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS.—The Secretary may, consistent with section 5341 of title 5, United States Code, adopt such provisions of that title as provide for prevailing rate systems of basic pay and may apply those provisions to qualified positions for employees in or under which the Department may employ individuals described by section 5342(a)(2)(A) of that title.

“(3) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION, INCENTIVES, AND ALLOWANCES.—

“(A) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION BASED ON TITLE 5 AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary may provide employees in qualified positions compensation (in addition to basic pay), including benefits, incentives, and allowances, consistent with, and not in excess of, the level authorized for, comparable positions authorized by title 5, United States Code.

“(B) ALLOWANCES IN NONFOREIGN AREAS.—An employee in a qualified position whose rate of basic pay is fixed under paragraph (2)(A) shall be eligible for an allowance under section 5941 of title 5, United States Code, on the same basis and to the same extent as if the employee was an employee covered by such section 5941, including eligibility conditions, allowance rates, and all other terms and conditions in law or regulation.

“(4) PLAN FOR EXECUTION OF AUTHORITIES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress with a plan for the use of the authorities provided under this subsection.

“(5) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in paragraph (1) may be construed to impair the continued effectiveness of a collective bargaining agreement with respect to an office, component, subcomponent, or equivalent of the Department that is a successor to an office, component, subcomponent, or equivalent of the Department covered by the agreement before the succession.

“(6) REQUIRED REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.

“(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and every year thereafter for 4 years, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed report that—

“(1) discusses the process used by the Secretary in accepting applications, assessing candidates, ensuring adherence to veterans’ preference, and selecting applicants for vacancies to be filled by an individual for a qualified position;

“(2) describes—

“(A) how the Secretary plans to fulfill the critical need of the Department to recruit and retain employees in qualified positions;

“(B) the measures that will be used to measure progress; and

“(C) any actions taken during the reporting period to fulfill such critical need;

“(3) discusses how the planning and actions taken under paragraph (2) are integrated into the strategic workforce planning of the Department;

“(4) provides metrics on actions occurring during the reporting period, including—

“(A) the number of employees in qualified positions hired by occupation and grade and level or pay band;

“(B) the placement of employees in qualified positions by directorate and office within the Department;

“(C) the total number of veterans hired;

“(D) the number of separations of employees in qualified positions by occupation and grade and level or pay band;

“(E) the number of retirements of employees in qualified positions by occupation and grade and level or pay band; and

“(F) the number and amounts of recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives paid to employees in qualified positions by occupation and grade and level or pay band; and

“(5) describes the training provided to supervisors of employees in qualified positions at the Department on the use of the new authorities.

“(d) THREE-YEAR PROBATIONARY PERIOD.—The probationary period for all employees hired under the authority established in this section shall be 3 years.

“(e) INCUMBENTS OF EXISTING COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual serving in a position on the date of enactment of this section that is selected to be converted to a position in the excepted service under this section shall have the right to refuse such conversion.

“(2) SUBSEQUENT CONVERSION.—After the date on which an individual who refuses a conversion under paragraph (1) stops serving in the position selected to be converted, the position may be converted to a position in the excepted service.

“(f) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section, the National Protection and Programs Directorate shall submit a report regarding the availability of, and benefits (including cost savings and security) of using, cybersecurity personnel and facilities outside of the National Capital Region (as defined in section 2674 of title 10, United States Code) to serve the Federal and national need to—

“(1) the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

“(2) the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3132(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the matter following subparagraph (E)—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by inserting “or” after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) any position established as a qualified position in the excepted service by the Secretary of Homeland Security under section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002.”.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 225 the following:

“Sec. 226. Cybersecurity recruitment and retention.”.

SEC. 4. HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Homeland Security Cybersecurity Workforce Assessment Act”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(C) the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

(2) CYBERSECURITY WORK CATEGORY; DATA ELEMENT CODE; SPECIALTY AREA.—The terms “Cybersecurity Work Category”, “Data Element Code”, and “Specialty Area” have the meanings given such terms in the Office of Personnel Management’s Guide to Data Standards.

(3) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE MEASUREMENT INITIATIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) identify all cybersecurity workforce positions within the Department;

(B) determine the primary Cybersecurity Work Category and Specialty Area of such positions; and

(C) assign the corresponding Data Element Code, as set forth in the Office of Personnel Management’s Guide to Data Standards which is aligned with the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education’s National Cybersecurity Workforce Framework report, in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) EMPLOYMENT CODES.—

(A) PROCEDURES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish procedures—

(i) to identify open positions that include cybersecurity functions (as defined in the OPM Guide to Data Standards); and

(ii) to assign the appropriate employment code to each such position, using agreed standards and definitions.

(B) CODE ASSIGNMENTS.—Not later than 9 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall assign the appropriate employment code to—

(i) each employee within the Department who carries out cybersecurity functions; and

(ii) each open position within the Department that have been identified as having cybersecurity functions.

(3) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a progress report on the implementation of this subsection to the appropriate congressional committees.

(d) IDENTIFICATION OF CYBERSECURITY SPECIALTY AREAS OF CRITICAL NEED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date on which the employment codes are assigned to employees pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B), and annually through 2021, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall—

(A) identify Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas of critical need in the Department’s cybersecurity workforce; and

(B) submit a report to the Director that—

(i) describes the Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas identified under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) substantiates the critical need designations.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Director shall provide the Secretary with timely guidance for iden-

tifying Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas of critical need, including—

(A) current Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas with acute skill shortages; and

(B) Cybersecurity Work Categories and Specialty Areas with emerging skill shortages.

(3) CYBERSECURITY CRITICAL NEEDS REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall—

(A) identify Specialty Areas of critical need for cybersecurity workforce across the Department; and

(B) submit a progress report on the implementation of this subsection to the appropriate congressional committees.

(e) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STATUS REPORTS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) analyze and monitor the implementation of subsections (c) and (d); and

(2) not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the status of such implementation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we love the Border Patrol and the men and women who serve on the Border Patrol. We cannot thank them enough for the hard and tough duties that they provide. It is difficult. It is hard.

I have been out there in Arizona as they do this out on ATVs, chasing drug runners. It is amazing what they do and how they do it. We love them, and the bill before us, Mr. Speaker, is a good bill to help them and their families, provide a better service to them and their families, but actually save some money for the Federal Government. This is truly a bill, Mr. Speaker, that is a win-win situation. I am honored to have that bill before us today, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 would replace Border Patrol’s current pay system and create a consistent and reliable pay system, enhance border security, and save taxpayers literally hundreds of millions of dollars.

Established in 1924, today’s Border Patrol relies on roughly 21,000 agents

to secure some 6,000 miles of international borders between Mexico and Canada and 2,000 miles of coastal waters surrounding Florida and Puerto Rico.

Properly paying Border Patrol agents and responsibly managing a payroll system are critical to the mission of the United States Customs and Border Patrol, often referred to as CBP.

Thirteen months ago, November 20, 2013, the Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing to examine the Border Patrol’s compensation policies. The hearing focused on a report by the Office of Special Counsel documenting abuse of a type of overtime within the Border Patrol.

The OSC testified to longstanding abuse of overtime within the Border Patrol, including by headquarters employees who regularly extended their day by roughly 2 hours and padding their paychecks by an additional 25 percent.

Administratively uncontrollable overtime, AUO, was established more than 40 years ago to pay employees for “irregular, unscheduled, but necessary overtime.” The Department of Homeland Security is one of the largest users of AUO within the Federal Government, with Border Patrol accounting for more than 75 percent of the paid AUO.

Border Patrol agents receive between 10 and 25 percent of their basic pay through AUO, depending on the average number of irregular overtime performed per week. Generally, agents themselves are responsible for recognizing without supervision the circumstances which require them to remain on duty beyond regular hours.

They are down on the border; they are pursuing somebody who is coming across illegally. You can’t just say, “Well, time to go home.” Oftentimes, they work for hours and hours in continued pursuit of these people that had come across illegally.

Under AUO, most agents earn up to 25 percent of their base salary for time worked in excess of 80 hours in a pay period. Agents may earn additional overtime compensation that is generally paid at 50 percent above the regular rate. Total overtime costs for Border Patrol agents, including pay and benefits, was \$627 million in 2013 while total compensation costs for those agents was \$3.1 billion in that same year.

During the hearing, it became clear that AUO is ill-suited to be meet the needs of today’s Border Patrol. In response, I joined with Senators TESTER and MCCAIN in introducing legislation to provide Border Patrol a cost-effective and flexible overtime system called the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act. DHS pledged to work with the committee to find a solution at an affordable cost, and that is why we are here today.

Mr. Speaker, under current law, Border Patrol agents who work beyond 85.5 hours to meet mission requirements are generally paid time and a half. Under the bill, agents will annually elect one of three pay options: number one, work 100 hours per biweekly pay period and increase their base salary by 25 percent; work 90 hours and receive a 12.5 percent base salary increase; or work no overtime at all.

Unscheduled overtime will be treated as comp time with no monetary compensation. The bill eliminates Fair Labor Standards Act overtime which results in significant savings to the taxpayer.

The Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act generally requires 90 percent of Border Patrol agents to work 100 hours each per pay period while CBP expects that most remaining agents would work 90 hours per pay period. This staffing floor will allow supervisors to more effectively plan border security operations.

To help ensure accountability, the bill requires the Border Patrol to undertake a detailed assessment of its operational requirements and staffing needs at every Border Patrol station within 1 year of enactment and submit it to Congress for review.

□ 1230

The GAO will examine CBP's methodology and analysis and within 90 days submit a report to Congress indicating whether GAO concurs with CBP's assessments. Border Patrol has flexibility in the staffing floor based on the results of that assessment.

The bill grants CBP management authority to unilaterally assign agents to work additional hours if the security situation along the border necessitates it. The bill reflects months of negotiation and congressional review and is supported by the National Border Patrol Council.

I personally cannot thank the National Border Patrol Council enough for their good work, tenacity on this issue, and their deep desire to make the agents' lives better. They represent some 17,000 agents. CBO estimated that implementing the Senate bill, S. 1691, would save roughly \$100 million per year. Costs would decline under Senate bill S. 1691 mostly because Border Patrol agents would no longer receive compensation required under the FLSA.

This is an important bill, Mr. Speaker. There is a lot of good, bipartisan support. If I am not mistaken, it passed unanimously in the Senate. We have held hearings in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I want to personally thank Chairman ISSA for his good work. I also want to thank Leader MCCARTHY and Speaker BOEHNER for allowing this bill to come to the floor. Homeland Security Chairman MCCAUL and Congresswoman MIL-

LER have been pivotal on this. Members from both sides of the aisle, like DAVE REICHERT, Mr. O'ROURKE, and RON BARBER have worked hard on this issue and care about this as well. I, again, appreciate their bipartisan support. And bicameral support, there has been good work from Senator TESTER and Senator MCCAIN, who cares deeply about Border Patrol issues, and certainly Senator CARPER for making this a reality. It is an honor to have this bill before us today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. CHAFFETZ, for not only coming forward to manage this bill, but I thank him because he is the sponsor of a bipartisan bill very similar to the bill before us today, H.R. 3463; and I rise in strong support of S. 1691, the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, a bipartisan bill sponsored by Senators TESTER and MCCAIN.

S. 1691 would enhance the Custom and Border Protection's ability to secure and patrol more than 6,000 miles of our Nation's borders between Mexico and Canada, and 2,000 miles of our coastal waters surrounding Florida and Puerto Rico. It would also respond to the growing threat of cyber attacks. This legislation, which is supported by the administration and the Border Patrol Council, would also save the American taxpayers about \$100 million annually, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

The bill would dramatically simplify the current pay system for our country's more than 21,000 courageous Border Patrol agents by eliminating compensation for overtime through what is called administratively uncontrollable overtime. Under a newly created pay system, Border Patrol agents would have three work schedule and compensation options. They could choose to, one, work 100 hours for each pay period and receive an increase in base salary by 25 percent; two, work 90 hours each pay period and receive an increase in base salary by 12.5 percent; or three, work 80 hours per pay period with no overtime. All unscheduled overtime worked beyond these hours would be treated as compensatory time off, with an annual maximum of 240 hours.

The legislation would also set a minimum staffing requirement requiring that at least 90 percent of Border Patrol agents in any given location work 100 hours every pay period to ensure that Customs and Border Protection has the man-hours it needs to respond to threats and to secure the border.

Under this new system, Border Patrol agents would work millions of hours longer than they do today, which equates to adding 1,500 agents to patrol the Nation's borders.

S. 1691 would require Customs and Border Protection to submit to Con-

gress a staffing plan detailing the agency's operational and staffing requirements to ensure hours worked matched the agency's needs. The Government Accountability Office would also be required to review the plan as an independent check.

This bill would also address concerns regarding past abuses by prohibiting agents at headquarters and training academies and fitness instructors from working more than 80 hours per pay period unless the staffing plan shows a need for these employees to work additional hours.

The legislation would also provide Customs and Border Protection with flexibility to lower the staffing floor set by the bill if the staffing plan shows that the agency can meet its operational requirements in a given location with fewer man-hours.

S. 1691 would also require Customs and Border Protection, in consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, to develop a plan to prevent Border Patrol agents from artificially boosting their retirement annuities by selecting a higher rate of pay than they had historically within 3 years of being eligible to retire. The Government Accountability Office would be required to review this plan and to report to Congress on its effectiveness.

An amendment introduced by Senator CARPER also would add provisions allowing the Department of Homeland Security to recruit and retain cyber professionals by granting authority to hire qualified experts on an expedited basis and to pay them competitive salaries, wages, and incentives. The legislation also would require the Department to report annually on the program's progress.

S. 1691 would provide much-needed reform to the compensation of Border Patrol agents and ensure that the Department of Homeland Security has the personnel it needs to deal with increasing cyber attacks.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to continue to thank some other Members for making this possible.

YVETTE CLARKE has been very helpful. She worked diligently on H.R. 3107, which passed 395-8. It has been included in the Senate version, and I am glad to have her involvement in this.

I also want to thank BLAKE FARENTHOLD for his good work on this. Coming from Texas, he cares deeply about these issues and was very helpful in supporting it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE), an original cosponsor of H.R. 3463, the House companion version of S. 1691.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman NORTON for her work in managing this bill on the floor today and for yielding me this time to speak in support of it. And I especially want to thank my colleague Mr. CHAFFETZ from the State of Utah for his work on the House version of this bill.

On behalf of my community in El Paso, Texas, and especially on behalf of the Border Patrol agents, more than 2,500 in my community, I want to give you our thanks from the largest city on the U.S.-Mexico border.

I support this bill because I do represent more than 2,500 agents in El Paso. In addition, for the more than 21,000 agents on our northern and southern borders, this is an important bill that provides a consistent and reliable pay system that addresses problems in administratively uncontrollable overtime and provides more predictable work schedules for our Border Patrol agents.

We ask these brave men and women to put their lives on the line to do what I think is the toughest job in Federal employment, but so far we have failed to provide financial certainty both to those agents and to their families.

I want to remind my colleagues that El Paso, Texas, the community I have the honor of representing, which is conjoined with Ciudad Juarez to form the largest truly binational community in the world, is the safest city in the State of Texas today. It is the safest city in the United States, and that is not an anomaly. It has been the safest city in America 4 years running, and we have, in large part, to thank the Border Patrol agents who help to secure our border for that. Not only do they keep our communities and our country secure, they do it in a very professional way. In 2013, there were exactly zero complaints filed against the Border Patrol in the El Paso sector. So I want to thank them for the great job that they do.

This bill creates a reliable pay system that responsibly secures our border. Supporting our agents, which this bill does, is the key to keeping our border communities and our country safe.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. O'ROURKE for his passion on this issue. He is a fine gentleman to work with on these types of issues and others. I am happy to serve with him on both Homeland Security and in this body. I thank him for his good work.

There has been good bipartisan work on both sides of the aisle and in both bodies to get to this point today.

I also thank ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her personal commitment to these issues, and Federal workers in general.

This truly is a win-win situation. We make life better for Border Patrol agents and their families. We give

more certainty to them and their families to help them with their mortgages. We also happen to save money for the American taxpayer. I appreciate the creativity and good work to get to this point.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), the ranking member of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished ranking member from the District of Columbia, Ms. HOLMES NORTON, for yielding me this time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) for his leadership on these very important matters of homeland security.

I rise today in support of S. 1691, and I am pleased that today we are considering legislation containing language I introduced earlier this year to address fundamental cyber workforce challenges at the Department of Homeland Security. Important parts of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 3107, the Homeland Security Cybersecurity Boots-on-the-Ground Act, are included in the measure we are considering today.

The cyber workforce language included in S. 1691 generally does two important things. First, it grants special hiring authority to DHS to bring on board topnotch cyber recruits. The Department desperately needs a more flexible hiring process with incentives to secure talent in today's highly competitive cyber skills market. Second, it requires the Secretary of the Department to assess its cyber workforce to give Congress and the Office of Personnel Management a clearer picture of the needs and challenges that DHS faces in carrying out its important cyber mission in helping protect both the dot-gov and dot-com arenas.

Importantly, the bill also directs the Comptroller General to analyze, monitor, and report on the implementation of DHS cybersecurity workforce measures.

Today, many of the Department's top cyber positions are filled by nonpermanent contractors, and DHS reports having difficulty competing with other executive branch agencies and the private sector for talent. In an effort to address DHS's cyber workforce challenges, the Department asked the Homeland Security Advisory Committee to assemble a task force on cyber skills to provide recommendations on the best ways DHS can foster the development of a national cybersecurity workforce and DHS can improve its capability to recruit and retain cybersecurity talent.

The legislation I introduced sought to address a number of the task force's key recommendations, as does this bill, S. 1691. Cybersecurity is a complex mis-

sion for the Department and requires a wide range of talent at all levels. Given the urgent nature of the DHS' recruitment efforts, it is essential the Department have at its disposal certain hiring authorities and training procedures in place.

Before I close, I would like to acknowledge that there is a lot of interest on our side of the aisle to make progress on cybersecurity. Hopefully, in the coming days, old jurisdictional squabbles can be laid aside for the betterment of the country, as was done on this bill, and again, the Oversight Committee can work with the Homeland Security Committee to bring forth critical cybersecurity legislation. We need to put in place legislation to advance the ball with respect to protecting Federal civilian networks and codifying DHS' role.

□ 1245

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I want to say how much I appreciate the views of the two Members who have spoken, the bipartisan way in which this bill has been handled in the House and in the Senate, and look forward to more bipartisanship to come, Mr. CHAFFETZ.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. I look forward to working with her on a host of issues as we serve on the same committee. I can only hope that as many of them can be as bipartisan as possible. We both have a tenacious nature to fight to represent the constituencies which we represent, and do so in the spirit of making this country better.

Really, that is the reason that this bill has come here today with good, broad bipartisan support. I cannot thank enough Brandon Judd from the National Border Patrol Council. He heads that group. He has been absolutely wonderful on this issue, good leadership from him.

It is my honor to recommend to my colleagues and urge all Members to support the passage of S. 1691.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1691.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 AND 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

Sec. 3. Budgetary effects.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations.

Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.

Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Sec. 303. National intelligence strategy.

Sec. 304. Software licensing.

Sec. 305. Reporting of certain employment activities by former intelligence officers and employees.

Sec. 306. Inclusion of Predominantly Black Institutions in intelligence officer training program.

Sec. 307. Management and oversight of financial intelligence.

Sec. 308. Analysis of private sector policies and procedures for countering insider threats.

Sec. 309. Procedures for the retention of incidentally acquired communications.

Sec. 310. Clarification of limitation of review to retaliatory security clearance or access determinations.

Sec. 311. Feasibility study on consolidating classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples.

Sec. 312. Sense of Congress on cybersecurity threat and cybercrime cooperation with Ukraine.

Sec. 313. Replacement of locally employed staff serving at United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation.

Sec. 314. Inclusion of Sensitive Compartmented Information Facilities in United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation and adjacent countries.

Subtitle B—Reporting

Sec. 321. Report on declassification process.

Sec. 322. Report on intelligence community efficient spending targets.

Sec. 323. Annual report on violations of law or executive order.

Sec. 324. Annual report on intelligence activities of the Department of Homeland Security.

Sec. 325. Report on political prison camps in North Korea.

Sec. 326. Assessment of security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure.

Sec. 327. Enhanced contractor level assessments for the intelligence community.

Sec. 328. Assessment of the efficacy of memoranda of understanding to facilitate intelligence-sharing.

Sec. 329. Report on foreign man-made electromagnetic pulse weapons.

Sec. 330. Report on United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups.

Sec. 331. Feasibility study on retraining veterans in cybersecurity.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The term “congressional intelligence committees” means—

(A) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency.

(3) The Department of Defense.

(4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.

(5) The National Security Agency.

(6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(7) The Coast Guard.

(8) The Department of State.

(9) The Department of the Treasury.

(10) The Department of Energy.

(11) The Department of Justice.

(12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.

(14) The National Reconnaissance Office.

(15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

(16) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) **SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101 and, subject to section 103, the authorized personnel ceilings as

of September 30, 2015, for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. 4681 of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AVAILABILITY.**—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President.

(2) **DISTRIBUTION BY THE PRESIDENT.**—Subject to paragraph (3), the President shall provide for suitable distribution of the classified Schedule of Authorizations, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

(3) **LIMITS ON DISCLOSURE.**—The President shall not publicly disclose the classified Schedule of Authorizations or any portion of such Schedule except—

(A) as provided in section 601(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 3306(a));

(B) to the extent necessary to implement the budget; or

(C) as otherwise required by law.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR INCREASES.**—The Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2015 by the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed 3 percent of the number of civilian personnel authorized under such Schedule for such element.

(b) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish guidelines that govern, for each element of the intelligence community, the treatment under the personnel levels authorized under section 102(a), including any exemption from such personnel levels, of employment or assignment in—

(1) a student program, trainee program, or similar program;

(2) a reserve corps or as a reemployed annuitant; or

(3) details, joint duty, or long term, full-time training.

(c) **NOTICE TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify the congressional intelligence committees in writing at least 15 days prior to each exercise of an authority described in subsection (a).

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2015 the sum of \$507,400,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

(b) **AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 794 positions as of September 30, 2015. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account for fiscal year 2015 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2015, there are authorized such additional personnel for the Community Management Account as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a).

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2015 the sum of \$514,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—General Matters

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 303. NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 108 the following:

“SEC. 108A. NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE STRATEGY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in 2017, and once every 4 years thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall develop a comprehensive national intelligence strategy to meet national security objectives for the following 4-year period, or a longer period, if appropriate.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Each national intelligence strategy required by subsection (a) shall—

“(1) delineate a national intelligence strategy consistent with—

“(A) the most recent national security strategy report submitted pursuant to section 108;

“(B) the strategic plans of other relevant departments and agencies of the United States; and

“(C) other relevant national-level plans;

“(2) address matters related to national and military intelligence, including counterintelligence;

“(3) identify the major national security missions that the intelligence community is currently pursuing and will pursue in the future to meet the anticipated security environment;

“(4) describe how the intelligence community will utilize personnel, technology, partnerships, and other capabilities to pursue the major national security missions identified in paragraph (3);

“(5) assess current, emerging, and future threats to the intelligence community, including

threats from foreign intelligence and security services and insider threats;

“(6) outline the organizational roles and missions of the elements of the intelligence community as part of an integrated enterprise to meet customer demands for intelligence products, services, and support;

“(7) identify sources of strategic, institutional, programmatic, fiscal, and technological risk; and

“(8) analyze factors that may affect the intelligence community's performance in pursuing the major national security missions identified in paragraph (3) during the following 10-year period.

“(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on each national intelligence strategy required by subsection (a) not later than 45 days after the date of the completion of such strategy.”

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 108 the following new item:

“Sec. 108A. National intelligence strategy.”

SEC. 304. SOFTWARE LICENSING.

Section 109 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3044) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “usage; and” and inserting “usage, including—

“(A) increasing the centralization of the management of software licenses;

“(B) increasing the regular tracking and maintaining of comprehensive inventories of software licenses using automated discovery and inventory tools and metrics;

“(C) analyzing software license data to inform investment decisions; and

“(D) providing appropriate personnel with sufficient software licenses management training; and”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “usage.” and inserting “usage, including—

“(A) increasing the centralization of the management of software licenses;

“(B) increasing the regular tracking and maintaining of comprehensive inventories of software licenses using automated discovery and inventory tools and metrics;

“(C) analyzing software license data to inform investment decisions; and

“(D) providing appropriate personnel with sufficient software licenses management training; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) based on the assessment required under paragraph (2), make such recommendations with respect to software procurement and usage to the Director of National Intelligence as the Chief Information Officer considers appropriate.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Director of National Intelligence receives recommendations from the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community in accordance with subsection (b)(3), the Director of National Intelligence shall, to the extent practicable, issue guidelines for the intelligence community on software procurement and usage based on such recommendations.”

SEC. 305. REPORTING OF CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES BY FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) RESTRICTION.—Title III of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3071 et seq.) is

amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

“SEC. 304. REPORTING OF CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES BY FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each element of the intelligence community shall issue regulations requiring each employee of such element occupying a covered position to sign a written agreement requiring the regular reporting of covered employment to the head of such element.

“(b) AGREEMENT ELEMENTS.—The regulations required under subsection (a) shall provide that an agreement contain provisions requiring each employee occupying a covered position to, during the two-year period beginning on the date on which such employee ceases to occupy such covered position—

“(1) report covered employment to the head of the element of the intelligence community that employed such employee in such covered position upon accepting such covered employment; and

“(2) annually (or more frequently if the head of such element considers it appropriate) report covered employment to the head of such element.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COVERED EMPLOYMENT.—The term ‘covered employment’ means direct employment by, representation of, or the provision of advice relating to national security to the government of a foreign country or any person whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in major part, by any government of a foreign country.

“(2) COVERED POSITION.—The term ‘covered position’ means a position within an element of the intelligence community that, based on the level of access of a person occupying such position to information regarding sensitive intelligence sources or methods or other exceptionally sensitive matters, the head of such element determines should be subject to the requirements of this section.

“(3) GOVERNMENT OF A FOREIGN COUNTRY.—The term ‘government of a foreign country’ has the meaning given the term in section 1(e) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(e)).”

(b) REGULATIONS AND CERTIFICATION.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each element of the intelligence community shall issue the regulations required under section 304 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees—

(A) a certification that each head of an element of the intelligence community has prescribed the regulations required under section 304 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section; or

(B) if the Director is unable to submit the certification described under subparagraph (A), an explanation as to why the Director is unable to submit such certification, including a designation of which heads of an element of the intelligence community have prescribed the regulations required under such section 304 and which have not.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended—

(1) by striking the second item relating to section 302 (Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries) and the items relating to sections 304, 305, and 306; and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

"Sec. 304. Reporting of certain employment activities by former intelligence officers and employees."

SEC. 306. INCLUSION OF PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS IN INTELLIGENCE OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 1024 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3224) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting "and Predominantly Black Institutions" after "universities"; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) **PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTION.**—The term 'Predominantly Black Institution' has the meaning given the term in section 318 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059e)."

SEC. 307. MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE.

(a) **REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall prepare a plan for management of the elements of the intelligence community that carry out financial intelligence activities.

(b) **CONTENTS OF PLAN.**—The plan required by subsection (a) shall establish a governance framework, procedures for sharing and harmonizing the acquisition and use of financial analytic tools, standards for quality of analytic products, procedures for oversight and evaluation of resource allocations associated with the joint development of information sharing efforts and tools, and an education and training model for elements of the intelligence community that carry out financial intelligence activities.

(c) **BRIEFING TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall brief the congressional intelligence committees on the actions the Director proposes to implement the plan required by subsection (a).

SEC. 308. ANALYSIS OF PRIVATE SECTOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR COUNTERING INSIDER THREATS.

(a) **ANALYSIS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the National Counterintelligence Executive, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees an analysis of private sector policies and procedures for countering insider threats.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The analysis required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a review of whether and how the intelligence community could utilize private sector hiring and human resources best practices to screen, vet, and validate the credentials, capabilities, and character of applicants for positions involving trusted access to sensitive information;

(2) an analysis of private sector policies for holding supervisors and subordinates accountable for violations of established security protocols and whether the intelligence community should adopt similar policies for positions of trusted access to sensitive information;

(3) an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of applying mandatory leave policies, similar to those endorsed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Securities and Exchange Commission to identify fraud in the financial services industry, to certain positions within the intelligence community; and

(4) recommendations for how the intelligence community could utilize private sector risk indices, such as credit risk scores, to make determinations about employee access to sensitive information.

SEC. 309. PROCEDURES FOR THE RETENTION OF INCIDENTALLY ACQUIRED COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED COMMUNICATION.**—The term "covered communication" means any nonpublic telephone or electronic communication acquired without the consent of a person who is a party to the communication, including communications in electronic storage.

(2) **HEAD OF AN ELEMENT OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—The term "head of an element of the intelligence community" means, as appropriate—

(A) the head of an element of the intelligence community; or

(B) the head of the department or agency containing such element.

(3) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term "United States person" has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(b) **PROCEDURES FOR COVERED COMMUNICATIONS.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT TO ADOPT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act each head of an element of the intelligence community shall adopt procedures approved by the Attorney General for such element that ensure compliance with the requirements of paragraph (3).

(2) **COORDINATION AND APPROVAL.**—The procedures required by paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) prepared in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence; and

(B) approved by the Attorney General prior to issuance.

(3) **PROCEDURES.**—

(A) **APPLICATION.**—The procedures required by paragraph (1) shall apply to any intelligence collection activity not otherwise authorized by court order (including an order or certification issued by a court established under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803)), subpoena, or similar legal process that is reasonably anticipated to result in the acquisition of a covered communication to or from a United States person and shall permit the acquisition, retention, and dissemination of covered communications subject to the limitation in subparagraph (B).

(B) **LIMITATION ON RETENTION.**—A covered communication shall not be retained in excess of 5 years, unless—

(i) the communication has been affirmatively determined, in whole or in part, to constitute foreign intelligence or counterintelligence or is necessary to understand or assess foreign intelligence or counterintelligence;

(ii) the communication is reasonably believed to constitute evidence of a crime and is retained by a law enforcement agency;

(iii) the communication is enciphered or reasonably believed to have a secret meaning;

(iv) all parties to the communication are reasonably believed to be non-United States persons;

(v) retention is necessary to protect against an imminent threat to human life, in which case both the nature of the threat and the information to be retained shall be reported to the congressional intelligence committees not later than 30 days after the date such retention is extended under this clause;

(vi) retention is necessary for technical assurance or compliance purposes, including a court order or discovery obligation, in which case access to information retained for technical assurance or compliance purposes shall be reported to the congressional intelligence committees on an annual basis; or

(vii) retention for a period in excess of 5 years is approved by the head of the element of the intelligence community responsible for such retention, based on a determination that retention is necessary to protect the national security of the United States, in which case the head of such

element shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees a written certification describing—

(I) the reasons extended retention is necessary to protect the national security of the United States;

(II) the duration for which the head of the element is authorizing retention;

(III) the particular information to be retained; and

(IV) the measures the element of the intelligence community is taking to protect the privacy interests of United States persons or persons located inside the United States.

SEC. 310. CLARIFICATION OF LIMITATION OF REVIEW TO RETALIATORY SECURITY CLEARANCE OR ACCESS DETERMINATIONS.

Section 3001(b)(7) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(b)(7)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "2014—" and inserting "2014, and consistent with subsection (j)—";

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking "to appeal a determination to suspend or revoke a security clearance or access to classified information" and inserting "alleging reprisal for having made a protected disclosure (provided the individual does not disclose classified information or other information contrary to law) to appeal any action affecting an employee's access to classified information"; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking "information," inserting "information following a protected disclosure,".

SEC. 311. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON CONSOLIDATING CLASSIFIED DATABASES OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND MALWARE SAMPLES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the National Security Agency, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall conduct a feasibility study on consolidating classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples in the intelligence community.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The feasibility study required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An inventory of classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples in the intelligence community.

(2) An assessment of actions that could be carried out to consolidate such databases to achieve the greatest possible information sharing within the intelligence community and cost savings for the Federal Government.

(3) An assessment of any impediments to such consolidation.

(4) An assessment of whether the Intelligence Community Information Technology Enterprise can support such consolidation.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Director of National Intelligence completes the feasibility study required by subsection (a), the Director shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a written report that summarizes the feasibility study, including the information required under subsection (b).

SEC. 312. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CYBERSECURITY THREAT AND CYBERCRIME COOPERATION WITH UKRAINE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) cooperation between the intelligence and law enforcement agencies of the United States and Ukraine should be increased to improve cybersecurity policies between these two countries;

(2) the United States should pursue improved extradition procedures among the Governments of the United States, Ukraine, and other countries from which cybercriminals target United States citizens and entities;

(3) the President should—

(A) initiate a round of formal United States-Ukraine bilateral talks on cybersecurity threat and cybercrime cooperation, with additional multilateral talks that include other law enforcement partners such as Europol and Interpol; and

(B) work to obtain a commitment from the Government of Ukraine to end cybercrime directed at persons outside Ukraine and to work with the United States and other allies to deter and convict known cybercriminals;

(4) the President should establish a capacity building program with the Government of Ukraine, which could include—

(A) a joint effort to improve cyber capacity building, including intelligence and law enforcement services in Ukraine;

(B) sending United States law enforcement agents to aid law enforcement agencies in Ukraine in investigating cybercrimes; and

(C) agreements to improve communications networks to enhance law enforcement cooperation, such as a hotline directly connecting law enforcement agencies in the United States and Ukraine; and

(5) the President should establish and maintain an intelligence and law enforcement cooperation scorecard with metrics designed to measure the number of instances that intelligence and law enforcement agencies in the United States request assistance from intelligence and law enforcement agencies in Ukraine and the number and type of responses received to such requests.

SEC. 313. REPLACEMENT OF LOCALLY EMPLOYED STAFF SERVING AT UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall ensure that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, every supervisory position at a United States diplomatic facility in the Russian Federation shall be occupied by a citizen of the United States who has passed, and shall be subject to, a thorough background check.

(2) EXTENSION.—The Secretary of State may extend the deadline under paragraph (1) for up to one year by providing advance written notification and justification of such extension to the appropriate congressional committees.

(3) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on progress made toward meeting the employment requirement under paragraph (1).

(b) PLAN FOR REDUCED USE OF LOCALLY EMPLOYED STAFF.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with other appropriate government agencies, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan to further reduce the reliance on locally employed staff in United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation. The plan shall, at a minimum, include cost estimates, timelines, and numbers of employees to be replaced.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to infringe on the power of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls.”

SEC. 314. INCLUSION OF SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION FACILITIES IN UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND ADJACENT COUNTRIES.

(a) SENSITIVE COMPARTMENTED INFORMATION FACILITY REQUIREMENT.—Each United States diplomatic facility that, after the date of the enactment of this Act, is constructed in, or undergoes a construction upgrade in, the Russian Federation, any country that shares a land border with the Russian Federation, or any country that is a former member of the Soviet Union shall be constructed to include a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The Secretary of State may waive the requirement under subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that such waiver is in the national security interest of the United States and submits a written justification to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 180 days before exercising such waiver.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Reporting

SEC. 321. REPORT ON DECLASSIFICATION PROGRESS.

Not later than December 31, 2016, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report describing—

(1) proposals to improve the declassification process throughout the intelligence community; and

(2) steps the intelligence community could take, or legislation that may be necessary, to enable the National Declassification Center to better accomplish the missions assigned to the Center by Executive Order No. 13526 (75 Fed. Reg. 707).

SEC. 322. REPORT ON INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY EFFICIENT SPENDING TARGETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2016, and April 1, 2017, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the status and effectiveness of efforts to reduce administrative costs for the intelligence community during the preceding year.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include for each element of the intelligence community the following:

(1) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to devise alternatives to government travel and promote efficient travel spending, such as teleconferencing and video conferencing.

(2) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to limit costs related to hosting and attending conferences.

(3) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to assess information technology inventories and usage, and establish controls, to reduce costs related to underutilized information technology equipment, software, or services.

(4) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to limit the publication and printing of hard copy documents.

(5) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to improve the performance of Federal fleet motor vehicles and limit executive transportation.

(6) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to limit the purchase of extraneous promotional items, such as plaques, clothing, and commemorative items.

(7) A description of the status and effectiveness of efforts to consolidate and streamline workforce training programs to focus on the highest priority workforce and mission needs.

(8) Such other matters relating to efforts to reduce intelligence community administrative costs as the Director may specify for purposes of this section.

SEC. 323. ANNUAL REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF LAW OR EXECUTIVE ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 511. ANNUAL REPORT ON VIOLATIONS OF LAW OR EXECUTIVE ORDER.

“(a) ANNUAL REPORTS REQUIRED.—The Director of National Intelligence shall annually submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on violations of law or executive order relating to intelligence activities by personnel of an element of the intelligence community that were identified during the previous calendar year.

“(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall, consistent with the need to preserve ongoing criminal investigations, include a description of, and any action taken in response to, any violation of law or executive order (including Executive Order No. 12333 (50 U.S.C. 3001 note)) relating to intelligence activities committed by personnel of an element of the intelligence community in the course of the employment of such personnel that, during the previous calendar year, was—

“(1) determined by the director, head, or general counsel of any element of the intelligence community to have occurred;

“(2) referred to the Department of Justice for possible criminal prosecution; or

“(3) substantiated by the inspector general of any element of the intelligence community.”.

(b) INITIAL REPORT.—The first report required under section 511 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a), shall be submitted not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) GUIDELINES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the head of each element of the intelligence community, shall—

(1) issue guidelines to carry out section 511 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) submit such guidelines to the congressional intelligence committees.

(d) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 510 the following new item:

“Sec. 511. Annual report on violations of law or executive order.”.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to alter any requirement existing on the date of the enactment of this Act to submit a report under any provision of law.

SEC. 324. ANNUAL REPORT ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year and along with the budget materials submitted in support of the budget of the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the Department shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report for such fiscal year on each intelligence activity of each intelligence component of the Department, as designated by the Under Secretary, that includes the following:

(1) The amount of funding requested for each such intelligence activity.

(2) The number of full-time employees funded to perform each such intelligence activity.

(3) The number of full-time contractor employees (or the equivalent of full-time in the case of part-time contractor employees) funded to perform or in support of each such intelligence activity.

(4) A determination as to whether each such intelligence activity is predominantly in support of national intelligence or departmental missions.

(5) The total number of analysts of the Intelligence Enterprise of the Department that perform—

- (A) strategic analysis; or
- (B) operational analysis.

(b) **FEASIBILITY AND ADVISABILITY REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report that—

(1) examines the feasibility and advisability of including the budget request for all intelligence activities of each intelligence component of the Department that predominantly support departmental missions, as designated by the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, in the Homeland Security Intelligence Program; and

(2) includes a plan to enhance the coordination of department-wide intelligence activities to achieve greater efficiencies in the performance of the Department of Homeland Security intelligence functions.

(c) **INTELLIGENCE COMPONENT OF THE DEPARTMENT.**—In this section, the term “intelligence component of the Department” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101).

SEC. 325. REPORT ON POLITICAL PRISON CAMPS IN NORTH KOREA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on political prison camps in North Korea.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) describe the actions the United States is taking to support implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the eventual establishment of a tribunal to hold individuals accountable for abuses; and

(2) include, with respect to each political prison camp in North Korea to the extent information is available—

(A) the estimated prisoner population of each such camp;

(B) the geographical coordinates of each such camp;

(C) the reasons for confinement of the prisoners at each such camp;

(D) a description of the primary industries and products made at each such camp, and the end users of any goods produced in such camp;

(E) information regarding involvement of any non-North Korean entity or individual involved in the operations of each such camp, including as an end user or source of any good or products used in, or produced by, in such camp;

(F) information identifying individuals and agencies responsible for conditions in each such camp at all levels of the Government of North Korea;

(G) a description of the conditions under which prisoners are confined, with respect to the adequacy of food, shelter, medical care, working conditions, and reports of ill-treatment of prisoners, at each such camp; and

(H) unclassified imagery, including satellite imagery, of each such camp.

(c) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form and may include a classified annex if necessary.

SEC. 326. ASSESSMENT OF SECURITY OF DOMESTIC OIL REFINERIES AND RELATED RAIL TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis shall conduct an intelligence assessment of the security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure.

(b) **SUBMISSION.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees—

(1) the results of the assessment required under subsection (a); and

(2) any recommendations with respect to intelligence sharing or intelligence collection to improve the security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure to protect the communities surrounding such refineries or such infrastructure from potential harm that the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 327. ENHANCED CONTRACTOR LEVEL ASSESSMENTS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

Section 506B(c) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3098(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11), by striking “or contracted”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (12) as paragraph (13); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) The best estimate of the number of intelligence collectors and analysts contracted by each element of the intelligence community and a description of the functions performed by such contractors.”.

SEC. 328. ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFICACY OF MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING TO FACILITATE INTELLIGENCE-SHARING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Program Manager of the Information Sharing Environment, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives an assessment of the efficacy of the memoranda of understanding signed between Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial agencies to facilitate intelligence-sharing within and separate from the Joint Terrorism Task Force. Such assessment shall include—

(1) any language within such memoranda of understanding that prohibited or may be construed to prohibit intelligence-sharing between Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial agencies; and

(2) any recommendations for memoranda of understanding to better facilitate intelligence-sharing between Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial agencies.

SEC. 329. REPORT ON FOREIGN MAN-MADE ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE WEAPONS.

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the threat posed by

man-made electromagnetic pulse weapons to United States interests through 2025, including threats from foreign countries and foreign non-State actors.

(b) **FORM.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 330. REPORT ON UNITED STATES COUNTER-TERRORISM STRATEGY TO DISRUPT, DISMANTLE, AND DEFEAT AL-QAEDA AND ITS AFFILIATED OR ASSOCIATED GROUPS.

(a) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive report on the United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be prepared in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Defense, and the head of any other department or agency of the United States Government that has responsibility for activities directed at combating al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups.

(3) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A definition of—

(i) al-Qaeda core, including a list of which known individuals constitute al-Qaeda core;

(ii) an affiliated group of al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an affiliate group of al-Qaeda;

(iii) an associated group of al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an associated group of al-Qaeda; and

(iv) a group aligned with al-Qaeda, including a description of what actions a group takes or statements it makes that qualify it as a group aligned with al-Qaeda.

(B) A list of any other group, including the organization that calls itself the Islamic State (also known as “ISIS” or “ISIL”), that adheres to the core mission of al-Qaeda, or who espouses the same violent jihad ideology as al-Qaeda.

(C) An assessment of the relationship between al-Qaeda core and the groups referred to in subparagraph (B).

(D) An assessment of the strengthening or weakening of al-Qaeda and the groups referred to in subparagraph (B) from January 1, 2010, to the present, including a description of the metrics that are used to assess strengthening or weakening and an assessment of the relative increase or decrease in violent attacks attributed to such entities.

(E) An assessment of whether or not an individual can be a member of al-Qaeda core if such individual is not located in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

(F) An assessment of whether or not an individual can be a member of al-Qaeda core as well as a member of a group referred to in subparagraph (B).

(G) A definition of defeat of core al-Qaeda.

(H) An assessment of the extent or coordination, command, and control between core al-Qaeda and the groups referred to in subparagraph (B), specifically addressing each such group.

(I) An assessment of the effectiveness of counterterrorism operations against core al-Qaeda and the groups referred to in subparagraph (B), and whether such operations have had a sustained impact on the capabilities and effectiveness of core al-Qaeda and such groups.

(4) **FORM.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees;
(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 331. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON RETRAINING VETERANS IN CYBERSECURITY.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to Congress a feasibility study on retraining veterans and retired members of elements of the intelligence community in cybersecurity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4681.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD at the end of my remarks the Joint Explanatory Statement prepared by the House and Senate Intelligence Committees.

Mr. Speaker, when Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and I assumed the helm of the committee, we committed to return to the practice of passing the annual intelligence authorization bill, recognizing that it is one of the most critical tools that Congress has to control the intelligence activities of the United States Government. I am proud today that we are bringing the fifth such authorization bill to the floor since Mr. RUPPERSBERGER assumed the role of ranking member and I assumed the role of chairman 4 years ago.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, the bulk of the committee's direction is found in the classified annex to the bill, which is very similar to the version passed by the House earlier this year.

At an unclassified level, I can report that the classified annex increases the President's budget request by less than 1 percent and is consistent with the Bipartisan Budget Act funding caps. Key committee funding initiatives, vital to national security, are preserved in this bill. These funding initiatives are offset by reductions to unnecessary programs and increased efficiencies.

The bill's modest net increase reflects the committee's concern that the

President's request does not properly fund a number of important initiatives and leaves several unacceptable shortfalls when it comes to the matters of national security. The bill also provides substantial intelligence resources to help defeat Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant.

Earlier this year, the House passed its version of this bill with overwhelming bipartisan support. This bill contains all of the provisions that were not previously enacted into law in the fiscal year 2014 bill, along with provisions added by the Senate. None of these provisions are considered controversial, and we have worked through and vetted to make sure that is accurate with both Republican and Democrat staff and Members.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in a very interesting time in history. ISIL is attempting to build a state across the Middle East, from Lebanon to Iraq, including Syria, Jordan, and Israel. The group already controls a swath of land across Iraq and Syria about the size of the State of Indiana, and it is growing. The goal of our counterterrorism strategy is to deny safe haven from which terrorists can plot attacks against the United States and/or our allies. Regrettably, we have not prevented ISIL from establishing such a safe haven, and, as a result, we face a growing threat from that region.

At the same time, state actors like Russia and China view this time as an opportunity to expand their reach and expand their influence. Uneven leadership in recent years has emboldened these adversaries to change the international order, at the expense of U.S. interests.

We rightly demand that our intelligence agencies provide policymakers with the best and most timely information possible on the threats we face. We ask them to track terrorists wherever they train, plan, and fundraise. We ask them to stop devastating cyber attacks that steal American jobs through theft of intellectual property. We ask them to track nuclear and missile threats. We demand they get it right every time.

This bill will ensure that the dedicated men and women of our intelligence community have the funding and authorities and support that they need to meet their mission and to keep us safe.

I take this moment, Mr. Speaker, at a time when certainly voices both around the country and around the world are seeking to condemn the very courageous men and women who show up in the intelligence business to provide the information to keep America safe. They are silent warriors. They are faithful patriots. They don't ask for recognition. They don't ask for time. You don't see their names in the front pages of the paper or on TV. They really don't seek that recognition.

But they seek the very purpose of being the first to be able to develop that one piece of information that might prevent further conflict, it might prevent a terrorist attack, it might prevent a nuclear launch, it might prevent one Nation from attacking another.

In the haze of what seems to be self-loathing these days, by targeting that against these very courageous men and women who cannot defend themselves in public, we are doing a disservice to their courage and their commitment to keep America safe. We find that it is easy to, at some point, go back and point fingers at what we believe may or may not have happened in the work of keeping America safe. It is realistically and holistically unfair that we would do that to these very brave souls who risk their lives today.

But here is the good news for Americans. These folks that work in the shadows understand that they have accepted these dangerous and quiet roles, and they will get up this morning, like they have every other morning, and understand it is between them and the United States when it comes to any terrorist attack, or worse, bigger, broader conflict somewhere in the world.

So they will do their job; they will do their duty; they will do their mission. They will read the papers and fold them and put them on their desk and go about their work, their important work. But it is wrong that years later we ask these people to have to believe that they might have to get a lawyer to do their job.

The next time that America asks them to do something hard and difficult in defense of the United States, we shouldn't be giving them lawyers and subpoenas and the United Nations condemning their actions and looking for prosecutions in their effort to tear the United States down one more level. We ought to be giving them ticker tape parades when they come home from these places and say: Thank you for your sacrifice, and thank you for your family's sacrifice. We can sleep better at night knowing that you have had the courage to stand where no other American was willing to stand in defense of the United States.

I hope they take this as certainly my final bill on this particular floor to encourage them to do their good work, to know that Americans who are kissing their kids and putting them on the bus this morning understand that it takes their efforts to keep this country safe, that somebody that shows up for work and is engaged in international commerce understands that it takes their work to keep America safe. Believe me, outside of this town, people across America understand the value and importance and really the essential work that these people do for the defense of America. We should not condemn

them, we should be proud of their work, and we should stand behind them. This bill I think represents the work in a bipartisan way that allows them to continue that work, to do the work that protects America.

I would be remiss if I didn't thank my good friend DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER. Over the last 4 years, these five budgets could not have happened without your work and your staff's work in making sure that we had the best product available to make sure that the intelligence community had the resources that they need, the policies that they need, the support that they need, and, yes, every once in a while, the kick in the can that they needed.

Mr. Speaker, when DUTCH and I assumed the helm of the Committee, we committed to return to the practice of passing the annual intelligence authorization bill, recognizing that it is one of the most critical tools Congress has to control the intelligence activities of the U.S. Government. I am proud today that we are bringing the fifth such authorization bill to the floor since I assumed the Chairmanship four years ago.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, the bulk of the Committee's direction is found in the classified annex to the bill, which is very similar to the version passed by the House earlier this year.

At an unclassified level, I can report that the classified annex increases the President's budget request by less than one percent and is consistent with the Bipartisan Budget Act funding caps. Key Committee funding initiatives, vital to national security, are preserved in this bill. These funding initiatives are offset by reductions to unnecessary programs and increased efficiencies. The bill's modest net increase reflects the Committee's concern that the President's request does not properly fund a number of important initiatives and leaves several unacceptable shortfalls. The bill also provides substantial intelligence resources to help defeat ISIL.

Earlier this year the House passed its version of this bill by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. This bill contains all of those provisions that were not previously enacted into law in the FY 14 bill, along with provisions added by the Senate. None of those provisions are considered controversial.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in a very interesting time in history. ISIL is attempting to build a state across the Middle East—from Lebanon to Iraq, including Syria, Jordan, and Israel. The group already controls a swath of land across Iraq and Syria. The goal of our counterterrorism strategy is to deny safe haven from which terrorists can plot attacks against the United States and our allies. Regrettably, we have not prevented ISIL from establishing such a safe haven, and as a result we face a growing threat from the region.

At the same time, state actors like Russia and China view this time as an opportunity to expand their reach and influence. Uneven leadership in recent years has emboldened these adversaries to change the international order—at the expense of U.S. interests.

We rightly demand that our intelligence agencies provide policy makers with the best

and most timely information possible on the threats we face. We ask them to track terrorists wherever they train, plan, and fundraise. We ask them to stop devastating cyber attacks that steal American jobs. We ask them to track nuclear and missile threats. And we demand they get it right—every time.

This bill will ensure that the dedicated men and women of our Intelligence Community have the funding and authorities—and support—they need to meet their mission and to keep us safe.

Before closing, I want to take a moment to thank the men and women of this country who serve in our Intelligence Community today. It has been a distinct honor to get to know so many of them, and I am proud to have played a role in contributing to their success.

I would also like to extend thanks to all of my dedicated staff on the Committee who worked hard over the years to get us back on track in passing the annual Authorization bill and in our daily oversight of the Intelligence Community.

Thank you to my current committee staff: Darren Dick, Katie Wheelbarger, Sarah Geffroy, Andy Keiser, Bryan Smith, Ashley Lowry, Susan Phalen, Tom Corcoran, Michael Ellis, Chelsey Campbell, Geof Kahn, Brooke Eisele, Randy Smith, Jim Hildebrand, Shannon Stuart, Rachel Wilson, Lisa Major, Diane Rinaldo. Thank you, as well as to those who are no longer with the staff but played an influential role in committee activities during my tenure as Chairman: Michael Allen, Chris Donesa, Jamil Jaffer, Nathan Hauser, Todd Jones, Frank Garcia, George Pappas, Will Koella, Leah Scott, Fred Fleitz, and Stephanie Pelton.

Finally, a big thank you to our dedicated Security and Information Technology staff who keep us up and running everyday: Brandon Smith, Kristin Jepson and Kevin Klein.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The following consists of the explanatory material to accompany the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

This joint explanatory statement shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

This explanatory statement is accompanied by a classified annex that contains a classified Schedule of Authorizations. The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated by reference in the Act and has the legal status of public law.

The classified annex and classified Schedule of Authorizations are the result of negotiations between the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to reconcile differences in their respective versions of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The congressionally directed actions described in Senate Report No. 113-233, the classified annex that accompanied Senate Report No. 113-233, and the classified annex that accompanied House Report No. 113-463 should be carried out to the extent they are not amended, altered, substituted, or otherwise specifically addressed

in either this Joint Explanatory Statement or in the classified annex to this Statement.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS AND EXPLANATION

The following is a section-by-section analysis and explanation of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Section 101. Authorization of appropriations

Section 101 lists the United States Government departments, agencies, and other elements for which the Act authorizes appropriations for intelligence and intelligence-related activities for Fiscal Year 2015.

Section 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations

Section 102 provides that the details of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for intelligence and intelligence-related activities and the applicable personnel levels by program for Fiscal Year 2015 are contained in the classified Schedule of Authorizations and that the classified Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President.

Section 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments

Section 103 is intended to provide additional flexibility to the DNI in managing the civilian personnel of the Intelligence Community (IC). Section 103 provides that the DNI may authorize employment of civilian personnel in Fiscal Year 2015 in excess of the number of authorized positions by an amount not exceeding three percent of the total limit applicable to each IC element under Section 102. The DNI may do so only if necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions.

Section 104. Intelligence Community Management Account

Section 104 authorizes appropriations for the Intelligence Community Management Account (ICMA) of the DNI and sets the authorized personnel levels for the elements within the ICMA for Fiscal Year 2015.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Section 201. Authorization of appropriations

Section 201 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$514,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2015 for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL MATTERS

Section 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law

Section 301 provides that funds authorized to be appropriated by the Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in compensation or benefits authorized by law.

Section 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities

Section 302 provides that the authorization of appropriations by the Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity that is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Section 303. National intelligence strategy

Section 303 amends the National Security Act of 1947 to require the DNI to develop a comprehensive national intelligence strategy every four years beginning in 2017.

Section 304. Software licensing

Section 304 amends Section 109 of the National Security Act of 1947, which requires

chief information officers within the IC to prepare biennial inventories and assessments concerning the use and procurement of software licenses, to make certain enhancements to the biennial assessments required under Section 109.

Section 305. Reporting of certain employment activities by former intelligence officers and employees

Section 305 requires the head of each element of the IC to issue regulations that require an employee occupying positions with access to particularly sensitive information within such element to sign a written agreement that requires the regular reporting of any employment by, representation of, or the provision of advice relating to national security to the government of a foreign country, or any person whose activities are supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized by any government of a foreign country, for a two-year period after the employee ceases employment with the IC element.

Section 306. Inclusion of Predominantly Black Institutions in intelligence officer training program

Section 306 amends the National Security Act of 1947 to include predominantly black institutions in the intelligence officer training programs established under Section 1024 of the Act.

Section 307. Management and oversight of financial intelligence

Section 307 requires the DNI to prepare a plan for management of the elements of the IC that carry out financial intelligence activities.

Section 308. Analysis of private sector policies and procedures for countering insider threats

Section 308 directs the DNI to submit to the congressional intelligence committees an analysis of private sector policies and procedures for countering insider threats.

Section 309. Procedures for the retention of incidentally acquired communications

Section 309 requires the head of each element of the IC to adopt Attorney General-approved procedures that govern the retention of nonpublic telephone or electronic communications acquired without consent of a person who is a party to the communications, including communications in electronic storage.

The procedures required under this section shall apply to any intelligence activity that is reasonably anticipated to result in the acquisition of such telephone or electronic communications to or from a United States person not otherwise authorized by court order, subpoena, or similar legal process, regardless of the location where the collection occurs. The procedures shall prohibit the retention of such telephone or electronic communications for a period in excess of five years, unless the communications are determined to fall within one of several categories, enumerated in subsection (b)(3)(B), for which retention in excess of five years is authorized, to include communications that have been affirmatively determined to constitute foreign intelligence or counterintelligence, communications that are reasonably believed to constitute evidence of a crime and are retained by a law enforcement agency, and communications that are enciphered or reasonably believed to have a secret meaning.

Because it may be necessary in certain instances for IC elements to retain communications covered by this section for a period

in excess of five years that do not fall into the categories specifically enumerated in subsection (b)(3)(B), subsection (b)(3)(B)(vii) provides flexibility for the head of each element of the intelligence community to authorize such extended retention where the head of the element determines that it is necessary to protect the national security of the United States. In the absence of such a determination, Section 309 is intended to establish a default rule for intelligence collection activities, not otherwise authorized by legal process, that requires agencies to delete communications covered by this section after five years, unless a determination is made that the communications constitute foreign intelligence or counterintelligence or otherwise meet the retention requirements set forth in this section.

Section 310. Clarification of limitation of review to retaliatory security clearance or access determinations

Section 310 makes a technical amendment to Section 3001(b)(7) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to clarify that the policies and procedures prescribed by that section (to permit individuals to appeal adverse security clearance or access determinations) are only required to apply to adverse security clearance or access determinations alleged to be in reprisal for having made a protected whistleblower disclosure.

Section 311. Feasibility study on consolidating classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples

Section 307 requires the DNI to conduct a feasibility study on consolidating classified databases of cyber threat indicators and malware samples in the IC and to provide a report to the congressional intelligence committees summarizing the feasibility study.

Section 312. Sense of Congress on cybersecurity threat and cybercrime cooperation with Ukraine

Section 312 expresses the sense of Congress concerning cybersecurity threat and cybercrime cooperation between the United States and Ukraine.

Section 313. Replacement of locally employed staff serving at United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation

Section 313 requires the Secretary of State to ensure that every supervisory position at a U.S. diplomatic facility in the Russian Federation is occupied by a citizen of the United States who has passed a background check and to provide Congress with a plan to further reduce reliance on locally employed staff.

Section 314. Inclusion of Sensitive Compartmented Information Facilities in United States diplomatic facilities in the Russian Federation and adjacent countries

Section 314 requires that each U.S. diplomatic facility that is constructed in, or undergoes a construction upgrade in, the Russian Federation, any country that shares a land border with the Russian Federation, or any country that is a former member of the Soviet Union, shall be constructed to include a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility. The Secretary of State may waive the requirements of this section upon a determination that it is in the national security interest of the United States.

SUBTITLE B—REPORTING

Section 321. Report on declassification process

Section 321 requires the DNI to submit a report to Congress describing proposals to improve the declassification process and

steps the IC could take or legislation that may be necessary, to enable the National Declassification Center to better accomplish the missions assigned to the Center by Executive Order 13526.

Section 322. Report on intelligence community efficient spending targets

Section 322 requires the DNI to submit a report to the congressional intelligence committees on the status and effectiveness of efforts to reduce administrative costs for the IC during the preceding year.

Section 323. Annual report on violations of law or executive order

Section 323 requires the DNI to report annually to the congressional intelligence committees on violations of law or executive order by personnel of an element of the IC that were identified during the previous calendar year. Under the National Security Act, the President is required to keep the congressional intelligence committees fully and currently informed of the intelligence activities of the United States government. Nonetheless, this annual reporting requirement is necessary to ensure that the intelligence oversight committees of the House and Senate are made fully aware of violations of law or executive order, including, in particular, violations of Executive order 12333 for activities not otherwise subject to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Section 324. Annual report on intelligence activities of the Department of Homeland Security

Section 324 requires the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis of the DHS to provide the congressional intelligence committees with a report on each intelligence activity of each intelligence component of the Department that includes, among other things, the amount of funding requested, the number of full-time employees, and the number of full-time contractor employees. In addition, Section 324 requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report that examines the feasibility and advisability of consolidating the planning, programming, and resourcing of such activities within the Homeland Security Intelligence Program (HSIP).

The HSIP budget was established to fund those intelligence activities that principally support missions of the DHS separately from those of the NIP. To date, however, this mechanism has only been used to supplement the budget for the office of Intelligence and Analysis. It has not been used to fund the activities of the non-IC components in the DHS that conduct intelligence-related activities. As a result, there is no comprehensive reporting to Congress regarding the overall resources and personnel required in support of the Department's intelligence activities.

Section 325. Report on political prison camps in North Korea

Section 325 requires the DNI to submit a report on political prison camps in North Korea to the congressional intelligence committees.

Section 326. Assessment of security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure

Section 326 requires the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis to conduct an intelligence assessment of the security of domestic oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure.

Section 327. Enhanced contractor level assessments for the intelligence community

Section 327 amends the National Security Act of 1947 to require that the annual personnel level assessments for the IC, required under Section 506B of the Act, include a separate estimate of the number of intelligence collectors and analysts contracted by each element of the IC and a description of the functions performed by such contractors.

Section 328. Assessment of the efficacy of memoranda of understanding to facilitate intelligence-sharing

Section 328 requires the Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Intelligence and Analysis to provide appropriate congressional committees with an assessment of the efficacy of the memoranda of understanding signed between Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial agencies to facilitate intelligence-sharing within and separate from the Joint Terrorism Task Force. This study should help identify any obstacles to intelligence sharing between agencies, particularly any obstacles that might have impeded intelligence sharing in the wake of the April 2013 bombing of the Boston Marathon, and find improvements to existing intelligence sharing relationships.

Section 329. Report on foreign man-made electromagnetic pulse weapons

Section 329 requires the DNI to provide appropriate congressional committees with a report on the threat posed by manmade electromagnetic pulse weapons to United States interests through 2025.

Section 330. Report on United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups

Section 330 requires the DNI to provide appropriate congressional committees with a report on the United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda and its affiliated or associated groups.

Section 331. Feasibility study on retraining veterans in cybersecurity

Section 331 requires the DNI to submit to Congress a feasibility study on retraining veterans and retired members of elements of the IC in cybersecurity.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Chairman ROGERS, this is my last opportunity on the floor to thank you again for your leadership. It has, once again, produced a strong, bipartisan, and bicameral Intelligence Authorization Act.

Our committee believes that our Nation's security is too important to be a political football. We have had different views, we argue, but we work it out for the good of American people.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that your legacy of bipartisanship, hard work, rigorous oversight, and problem-solving continues and spreads throughout the Congress. It is amazing what we can accomplish when we work together to solve problems.

I also want to thank our counterparts in the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senators FEINSTEIN and CHAMBLISS, for working very closely with us and each member of our committee. On the Democratic side, I want to ac-

knowledge all the hard work of Mr. THOMPSON—who is sitting here to my left—Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. SEWELL. And I want to thank our staff and the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community who work every day and all night throughout the world to protect us. I do agree with the chairman's statements about those men and women throughout the world who are out there protecting us and putting their lives on the line.

Now, today, we look beyond this Congress. We come together to set the stage for the continuing oversight of intelligence programs, personnel, and dollars. By doing so, we reinforce to the American people, and to the world, that there are checks and balances. We reinforce that the tools we authorize are for the sole purpose of keeping us, our allies, and our partners safe.

In May, the House passed the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 by 345 votes to 19. The Senate, however, took up each year separately. Over the summer, this House passed the FY14 bill, which the President signed.

So, we now take up the FY15 bill, which the Senate amended and sent back to us. This amended bill largely mirrors the relevant portions of the House-passed combined bill.

Passing a detailed Intelligence Authorization Act ensures that our intelligence agencies spend money only on programs Congress is informed of, approves, and can continuously oversee.

□ 1300

Oversight is extremely important. It helps to make sure that everything our intelligence agencies do follows the Constitution and the laws of the United States and maximizes the civil liberties and privacy of Americans. At the same time, the intelligence agencies need the clear authorization, direction, and guidance from Congress to do their vital work to protect and defend America, its allies, and its partners.

The Intelligence Authorization Act is split into four parts: the unclassified legislative text; the unclassified report; the classified annex, which explains our intent for the classified aspects of the bill; and the classified schedule of authorizations.

While we have made cuts to certain areas and added money in others to produce a responsible, well thought out, and fiscally prudent budget, the budget for fiscal year 2015 slightly exceeds the President's request.

While over the last 4 years we have reduced the intelligence community's budget by over a billion dollars, this year's bill acknowledges the need to make corrections after the drastic cuts of sequestration and the Budget Control Act.

Additionally, this bill acknowledges the need to step up our intelligence efforts to counter evolving threats such as ISIL. It is a dangerous world out there, and our bill accounts for that.

Let me also mention some specifics in the bill. First, it continues to emphasize the value of our space programs and endorses aggressive action to decrease our reliance on Russian-made engines to launch our national security satellites.

Two, it makes investments into research and development to defend against next generation threats and to stay ahead of countries like China and Russia. Three, it further improves the continuous evaluation of insider threats while safeguarding privacy and civil liberties.

Next, it enables better intelligence and information sharing to prevent foreign fighters coming in and out of Syria. It also enables cutting-edge Defense Intelligence Agency technology. We must stay ahead of the curve in technology.

The bill also further refines the Department of Defense human intelligence capabilities while supporting communitywide human intelligence efforts to better understand the enemies' plans and intentions. It also establishes increased accountability measures for our most sensitive programs.

The committee has worked with the intelligence community and the Senate to produce this solid, bipartisan bill. This bill also incorporates the valuable floor amendments the House passed in May. It represents a culmination of our committee's work through extensive hearings and briefings, travel, and in-depth studies. The bill is strong, and I am proud to support it.

For the sake of keeping the country, its allies, and partners safe and for the sake of thoroughly overseeing even the most classified intelligence programs, I urge my colleagues to pass the bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thought I would take a moment to extend my thanks to all the dedicated staff on the committee, certainly from the Republican side and to the Democrats as well, who worked hard over the years to get us back on track in passing this annual authorization bill in our daily oversight of the intelligence community.

If you will indulge me, Mr. Speaker, thank you to my current committee staff: Darren Dick, Katie Wheelbarger, Sarah Geffroy, Andy Keiser, Bryan Smith, Ashley Lowry, Susan Phalen, Tom Corcoran, Michael Ellis, Chelsey Campbell, Geof Kahn, Brooke Eisele, Randy Smith, Jim Hildebrand, Shannon Stuart, Rachel Wilson, Lisa Major, and Diane Rinaldo.

Thank you as well to staff who have played an influential role in the committee activities during my tenure as chairman in reengaging this as a force for oversight in the Intelligence Committee: Michael Allen, Chris Donesa, Jamil Jaffer, Nathan Hauser, Todd Jones, Frank Garcia, George Pappas, Will Koella, Leah Scott, Fred Fleitz, and Stephanie Pelton.

Finally, a big thank you to our dedicated security and information technology staff, by the way, who have done well to beat back the hordes of our nation state actors who, for some reason, Mr. Speaker, took a good interest in what we were doing in that classified space, and they kept us up and running every single day: Brandon Smith, Kristin Jepson, and Kevin Klein.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a great member of our committee who specialized in infrastructure and also worked very hard to make sure that our Embassies have the intelligence information they need to protect themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for all the good work you did on the committee as the ranking member. I also want to thank Chairman ROGERS for the good work that he did as the chairman.

Working together, he was very accommodating and allowed all of us to be able to address specific issues that were of concern to us and regarding the security of our great Nation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are going to miss you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the passage of this bill. This bill will provide greater national security for our country and the people that we all represent.

The bill contains two important provisions that I authored that protect our communities at home and diplomatic facilities abroad.

My district is home to several oil refineries, employing thousands of people, providing well-paying, good, middle class jobs, and are a key part of our regional economy.

As domestic oil production continues to increase in the region, I have heard from several of my constituents and my local governments about their growing concern regarding the security of the shipment and storage of crude oil and subsequent refined products. I believe we have the responsibility to protect our workers, our domestic refineries, and our communities from potential threats.

Included in this bill is a provision that directs the Department of Homeland Security Office of Intelligence and Analysis to conduct an assessment of

the security of our Nation's oil refineries and related rail transportation infrastructure. It directs the office to make recommendations on how to improve intelligence collection and sharing of information to better protect those facilities in the surrounding communities from any harm.

Additionally, studies conducted in response to the terrible 2012 attack on Benghazi identified the need for security personnel at U.S. diplomatic posts to receive threat information in a more timely manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. In response to this need, this bill requires the Director of National Intelligence to provide an assessment of the status of threat information sharing between the intelligence community and diplomatic security personnel and to propose actions to help make sure security personnel at U.S. Embassies are better able to request and receive security enhancements in a timely manner.

By making sure our intelligence community is taking concerns seriously and sharing the necessary information, we can better assess and mitigate threats and increase security at home and abroad and make our country safer.

I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this good piece of legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. ADAM SCHIFF, a great member of our committee with a tremendous work ethic. He reads almost every piece of intelligence information and comes to quality and informed conclusions.

He also has focused a lot and specialized in working with legislation involving transparency and accountability and has spent a lot of time on an area that is very important to our Intelligence Committee, the space program.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to join my colleagues in urging the House to support the 2015 Intelligence Authorization Act which has now returned to us from the Senate, but before I address the substance of the bill, I would like to congratulate Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their extraordinary efforts to get this bill passed and to the President.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I know how hard they and the staff have worked to make this happen, and I would especially like to congratulate Chairman ROGERS and wish him well as he prepares to leave the House at the end of the year. It has

been a great pleasure working with you, and I wish you all the very best.

These are challenging days for America's intelligence officers and analysts. As ISIS continues to threaten the Middle East; as Russia's "little green men" continue to coordinate attacks on the Ukrainian Government; as North Korea's young, isolated, and often dangerously erratic leader continues his behavior; and as the international community continues its efforts to secure Iran's agreement to dismantle its nuclear weapons program and infrastructure, our intelligence professionals play a vital role in keeping us safe and secure.

Developing and maintaining actionable intelligence on ISIS is of particular urgency. While the intelligence community has been following ISIS' growth for some time, the group's takeover of a large swath of Syria and Iraq has made it a top intelligence priority.

If we are to be effective in partnering with regional allies to degrade and destroy ISIS, we need to be able to develop the very best intelligence and accurate ground truth. That takes time, and it takes assets—on the ground, in the air, in space—to collect information. It also takes the world class analysts of our intelligence community to turn that information into recommendations for policymakers.

We must also remain focused on Russian efforts to destabilize its neighbors, particularly Ukraine, but also the Baltic States. Our intelligence community has given us insight into Russian involvement in these efforts and into the events that led to the tragic downing of the Malaysian airliner last summer.

The bill also prioritizes vital efforts at nonproliferation and will help give us the tools that we need to assess events on the ground in North Korea and Iran and wherever there is a threat of WMD.

These are but a few of the important matters covered in the Intelligence Authorization bill. As a member of the committee who has been proud to work closely with both the chair and ranking member, I am confident it supports our intelligence professionals while providing oversight that is so critical to the proper functioning of our intelligence agencies.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bipartisan and bicameral bill. It is the single most effective oversight tool we have, and it ensures that our intelligence community has what it needs to keep us and our allies safe. Intelligence is often the first line of defense against a dangerous world. Without it,

we are in the dark, and we are vulnerable.

Finally, once again, let me just say thank you to my good friend, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of the committee, to our colleagues in the Senate, and to the men and women of the intelligence community. It has been my honor and privilege to work with you under your great leadership during the 113th Congress.

I also want to thank the Republican and Democratic staffs for working together. That is what makes it work. You are only as good as your team and your staff.

I also would like to acknowledge the Democratic staff: Staff Director Heather Molino, Amanda Rogers-Thorpe, Bob Minehart, Linda Cohen, Carly Blake, Allison Getty, Deb Haynie, and Michael Bahar.

I also thank staff members who were with us but have retired: Mike Shank, Janet Fisher, and Khizer Sayed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle, from Dutch to Heather, and the whole entire team for putting this product together by putting our country first. It is very important.

I challenge every Member to read this material next year when it is announced that you can review the classified annex. Review the classified annex. I think they will have a better perspective at the huge number of challenges facing the United States when it comes to real threats developing around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would again say thanks to all, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the Intelligence Authorization Act. As a member of the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees, I know these Authorization bills provide the necessary accountability, direction, and resources for those who keep our nation safe.

Today's bill reflects the continuation of the Committee's bipartisan and bicameral work, and I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their strong and consistent leadership on these critical issues.

Today I want to highlight two areas of specific interest to me.

First, this legislation strikes a careful balance between ensuring that our nation's secrets are kept safe and providing appropriate transparency with the American people. There are lawful ways to raise concerns of wrongdoing and procedures to declassify information when appropriate. In the past, Congress has strengthened these avenues, including by enhancing whistleblower protections and the role of Inspectors General.

As it has each year, this bill adds to the mission of counterintelligence to ensure that

information is protected and that the tools utilized by security professionals are handled lawfully and with full consideration for the privacy and civil liberties of our intelligence professionals. This bill continues this important direction, asking the DNI to establish appropriate guidelines to govern how publicly available information can be utilized.

Second, this bill continues to support the work of the men and women at the front lines of cybersecurity. It helps cyber professionals at NSA, FBI, and DHS to hone their tools and skills to protect us, while supporting initiatives to grow the next-generation cyber workforce. And it will further aid the Intelligence Community in understanding and defending certain networks from cyber threats.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of our work on this bill, and I urge its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 4681.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1315

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2244, TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 12, 2014, THROUGH JANUARY 3, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 775 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 775

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 2244) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member

of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of December 11, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day of the second session of the One Hundred Thirteenth Congress after December 11, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my dear friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is considering a rule for consideration of a bill to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, or a program known as TRIA. Without this bill, TRIA is set to expire on December 31, meaning that the House and the Senate must now act or the program will end at the end of this year.

Since TRIA was signed into law in 2002, it has served as an effective means of dealing with the problem of availability of terrorism insurance. TRIA has enabled the private insurance market to provide an essential type of coverage that otherwise may not exist.

However, like many other government programs, TRIA needs to be looked at and reformed in order to serve its original purpose, and that is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker.

Thanks to the leadership of Chairman JEB HENSARLING and Vice Chairman RANDY NEUGEBAUER of the Financial Services Committee, S. 2244 provides for many of those necessary reforms that will protect taxpayers, promote market stability, and provide for economic security for the American people, all in one, brand-new package.

What we are doing here today is important and essential for many people, but it is here to maintain the stability of a marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take us back to 2001, shortly after the terrorist attacks on 9/11. None of us will ever forget where we were when we first heard and saw of the terrorist attacks that attacked our homeland in New York City, at the Pentagon, and in a field in Pennsylvania. The accompanying stories of heroism and the deeds by Americans and others were simply heroism at its finest at a time of attack on this country.

What some might not remember, though, is the remarkable amount of economic uncertainty and damage that was caused to America and in the following weeks and months after 9/11. While we mourned the loss of many loved ones, our economy was shaken to its core.

Those attacks created and caused \$32.5 billion in losses, approximately \$20 billion of which were incurred by insurance companies. A second similar attack would have left the U.S. insurance economy insolvent, which in turn, being insolvent, would have undermined our entire economic structure of the free enterprise system. That is why TRIA was pressed into law, to provide a Federal backstop to avoid an immediate terrorism risk insurance crisis.

Sadly, terrorism has continued to be an ongoing threat to our Nation and, for the foreseeable future, I think that we need to remain vigilant and prepared for those consequences. So the cost of terrorism still looms large, and acts of terrorism are uninsurable risks that could sink our insurance markets without this new, updated program.

In this way, TRIA is a vital economic piece of our Nation's comprehensive security strategy because it allows for the American economy to recover more quickly in the event of an attack. I believe it does more than that. I believe it puts in place building blocks for us to understand responsibility, economic security, and how we would build back based upon rule of law and understanding about what would happen at a time of chaos.

TRIA provides certainty, certainty to our marketplace, by giving policyholders and insurers the tools that they need to understand and to develop a market-based solution to the economic threat that could be posed by terrorism. It gives policyholders and insurance providers the opportunity to model risk and to diversify their expo-

sure with an understanding of what the law would provide.

I am encouraged by the reforms championed by, yesterday, up in the Rules Committee, Chairman JEB HENSARLING from the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, who has placed many of these new items directly into the bill as a result of hard negotiation.

These are called reforms, Mr. Speaker, and three reforms stand out to me as being particularly important.

First, section 102. It would decrease the Federal share of losses under the program by 1 percentage point annually until it equals 80 percent. That means that the Federal taxpayers will be responsible for less of the initial costs incurred after a terrorist attack than under the current law.

Second, section 103. 103 would increase the program trigger to \$200 million in \$20 million increments over 5 years. This means that TRIA would not kick in, the government program would not kick in until there was \$200 million in insurable losses following an attack, ensuring that the government would not only get involved if an attack had a massive impact, but we would know the rules ahead of time.

Third, section 104. Section 104 would increase the amount of Federal assistance that the Treasury Secretary must recoup from the insurance industry following a certified act of terrorism. This means that Federal taxpayers are getting, once again, a better and well-understood deal with insurers than they would have gotten before this important reform.

Finally, S. 2244 would provide a much-needed change to Dodd-Frank. It is a piece of legislation that was passed a few years ago that is causing chaos in the marketplace: higher cost, uncertainty, and overwhelming regulation by the Federal Government. Federal regulators have interpreted parts of Dodd-Frank to apply to nonfinancial companies who are called "end users."

These end users are people who were never expected to become subject to the requirements of Dodd-Frank, such as ranchers, farmers, and small business owners. This Dodd-Frank fix would clarify that true derivatives end users are exempt from the margin requirements applied by Dodd-Frank to derivatives contracts. With this reform, end users will be able to use derivatives to hedge risks, which allows them to maintain low and stable prices for consumers. That, in turn, frees up capital that can be used to create brand-new jobs, current jobs, and to grow our free enterprise system in America.

This fix is not particularly controversial. In fact, the current policy of requiring nonfinancial companies to adhere to the same margin requirements as financial companies was not intended when the original bill passed.

To fix this problem, earlier in this Congress, the U.S. House of Represent-

atives passed H.R. 634. Yes, I voted for it, along with 410 other Members of this body, in a bill presented by and authored by Congressman MICHAEL GRIMM of New York, 411-12, overwhelming, broad bipartisan consensus as we looked at the impact of that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the young chairman of the Financial Services Committee, JEB HENSARLING, for his hard work. I also applaud the vice chairman of the committee, RANDY NEUGEBAUER from Lubbock, Texas, who has worked very hard on this reauthorization of TRIA. It is essentially his bill. It came out of his subcommittee, and he has done yeoman's work to make sure that we understand what the deal is through law, how to protect taxpayers, what the government role is, and it means that we can move forward from here with the certainty that American taxpayers and the industry have a well-understood deal.

I am also glad, though, that this is good for small business; it is good for farmers; it is good for ranchers; it is good for Members of Congress, 411 of us that had voted for pieces of this bill before today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2244 reauthorizes, through December 31, 2020, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, also known as TRIA.

This much-needed reauthorization ensures that the program will continue to protect our Nation's taxpayers in the event of severe loss from an act of terror, while providing the security and stability necessary for our Nation's businesses to grow and invest.

TRIA was a direct response by the Federal Government to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and the resulting disruptions from that act of terrorism to coverage under commercial policies in the marketplace.

Since 2002, it has provided companies with affordable access to terrorism insurance coverage, while serving as a backstop for insurers against the most severe terrorism-related losses.

Currently, in order to receive payment for claims, insurance companies must pay a deductible equivalent to 20 percent of the previous year's direct earned premium for covered commercial lines.

□ 1330

Furthermore, the insured loss must be at least \$100 million before the Federal Government will cover 85 percent of each company's losses up to \$100 billion, with the other 15 percent of losses the obligation of insurers.

In addition to extending TRIA by 6 years, S. 2244 also makes a number of important changes to the program. Gradually, as Mr. SESSIONS explained, it will increase the program's threshold from \$100 million to \$200 million as well as slightly increase the amount the government recoups from private insurers up to 140 percent. Moreover, this legislation decreases the government's share of losses from 85 to 80 percent.

I am pleased to share that the final measure before us today does not include a contentious provision that would have bifurcated TRIA based on the type of terrorist attack, essentially treating nuclear, biological, chemical, and radiological attacks differently than conventional attacks. The reauthorization of TRIA is broadly supported by members of the business community and by many of my colleagues in Congress on both sides of the aisle.

However, while we can agree that TRIA is both necessary and must be reauthorized, S. 2244 also includes an unrelated provision that changes the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. In particular, it exempts manufacturers, energy companies, and agricultural firms, known as end users, from having to put up collateral when they are trading derivatives.

With less than 2 legislative days left before funding for the Federal Government expires, I am troubled by the addition of this extraneous, nongermane derivative end user margin provision, which is a disappointing setback to the progress made during the last few weeks of bipartisan negotiations, and it risks the entire bill's defeat over in the other body.

These last-minute changes to Dodd-Frank were not previously agreed to, as they were included without informing Democrats after an agreement was reached on Monday night. After months of negotiations, my friends, the House Republicans, then announced an emergency Rules Committee meeting with only 2½-hours' notice.

Almost 3,000 lives were lost and an estimated \$40 billion in insured losses sustained in the absolutely horrible attacks of 9/11. TRIA helped our Nation rebuild and recover, and it continues to protect the American people today. Such an important program deserves better than the partisan sleight of hand represented by the last-minute addition.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I note that today we have a speaker for our friends, the Democrats, as well as the vice chairman of the Committee on Financial Services who are here, really, I believe, to give this body a real shot in the arm about how important this legislation is. I think about what a great job the process has gone through and achieved.

I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Then I want to bring him back as he wants to talk a little bit more, but we want to make sure that we get to our colleague from New York before it takes too much time.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for allowing me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation to our country. We have heard a little bit of the history that, after 9/11, the insurance industry took a pretty substantial hit. Their reserves were drained to pay out on these claims. As they were looking at writing new business, they were very concerned about what the future held because America had never experienced that kind of disaster in the past, so they were trying to figure out how to underwrite those in the future. TRIA was put into place temporarily to be a backstop for the industry for them to get back on their feet. They have gotten back on their feet, and their reserves are at all-time highs, and they have had a number of years now to model this risk.

The reason it was originally important to do that was, basically, in order to continue the construction projects or the number of projects around the country, the insurance industry needed some assurance that they wouldn't have to bear that kind of event again.

When we began to look at this process when we knew this was going to expire at the end of this year, we knew that there were kind of three options out there. One was to let the program expire as it was meant to be a temporary program. There were some Members who wanted to do that, and some Members did not. Others wanted to just extend the program the way it was. Under the Bush administration, though, we began a process to begin to reform this and to begin to transition more and more of the risk away from the taxpayers and back to the insurance companies. Unfortunately, when it was last reauthorized, none of those reforms were built into it. Even the President of the United States says that TRIA needs to be reformed, and he has offered up, for example, to change the trigger levels.

One of the things we have done with this bill is we didn't really change the overall structure of TRIA. We could have written a whole new terrorism insurance program. We didn't think that was good for the market. The market had already begun to adapt to the current framework, so we felt, if we worked within the existing framework—changing some of the triggers and some of the knobs on this particular program—that that would begin to allow the industry to take on more of the risk and for the taxpayers to take less of that risk. I think we have accomplished that with this bill.

As has been pointed out, I think a lot of people, quite honestly, don't know a lot about TRIA. One of the things is that the insurance industry takes the first losses under this program. So, if there were a loss today, as the gentleman mentioned, 20 percent of the previous year's premiums, which, if industrywide, would be about \$40 billion today, would go directly to the insurance companies. Should those losses exceed that—should we have another catastrophic event—then what would happen is that the taxpayers and the insurance industry would begin to share those expenses with a provision now. We have strengthened that in this bill. I think one of the more important parts of it is that the taxpayers would get their money back and would get some return on their money. I think we are headed in a good direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I would respond to the point that some extraneous things were put in this bill. When it came over from the Senate, it came over with an extraneous item in it as well, and that was to change the structure of future Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

They also sent over a program which, quite honestly, I agree with, which is something that is in this bill, of allowing your local insurance agent—if he is licensed in or she is licensed in the State one resides in, to do business in other States. None of the policy that is in this bill is new policy. This is policy that this body has voted on in the past. With that, I think we have got a good bill.

I see my good friend from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) over there, and I am anxious to hear her thoughts on that because this is an issue that she has been very interested in.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who is the ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman, my good friend, for yielding and for all of his hard work on this issue and on many others.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because I believe the approach we are taking jeopardizes the passage in the Senate of a good, bipartisan compromise to extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, or TRIA.

TRIA is incredibly important to New York—and to the entire country—and it is critically important that we pass a long-term extension of this bill. After

9/11, all construction in New York City stopped. You could not even build a hot dog stand. Thousands of people lost their jobs, and business ground to a halt because we could not get terrorism insurance. The only insurance available was from Lloyd's of London, and it was difficult to get and incredibly expensive.

If we do not reauthorize TRIA, no business will be able to get terrorism insurance in this country, and all construction will stop, costing thousands of jobs in our country. I must say, of all of the government programs that helped New York rebuild, I would say this program was the most important, and it did not cost taxpayers one dime.

I want to emphasize that I strongly support the TRIA compromise in this bill that was reached between Chairman HENSARLING and Vice Chair NEUGEBAUER, along with Senator SCHUMER and Ranking Member WATERS. However, the deal reached did not include the end user margin bill that is also included in the underlying TRIA bill, which Senator SCHUMER and many other Senators are strongly objecting to.

The reason this was not part of the agreement is that adding unrelated bills that amend Dodd-Frank makes it much more difficult to pass this bill in the Senate. Where there are any changes to Dodd-Frank, many Senators take exception. It is very difficult to pass them. This, unfortunately, jeopardizes the chances of passing this important reauthorization of TRIA in the Senate, and it is extremely important to the overall economy of this country to pass this bill.

Separately, I want to note for the record that I support the end user margin bill, which would simply clarify that end users of derivatives, such as airlines and manufacturers, are not subject to Dodd-Frank's margin capital requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I voted for this bill in committee, which, as noted, passed this body with 400 votes, and also on the floor. However, I strongly oppose this rule because it puts TRIA's passage in the Senate in jeopardy, and this is truly unfortunate.

Before the Rules Committee, Ranking Member WATERS and I suggested that we divide this out, have TRIA and the other bill—the Dodd-Frank, the regulatory bill—separate so that there would not be a problem in the Senate. Unfortunately, that did not happen, and I am extremely concerned that this puts in jeopardy the passage of a bill that is critically important to the economy of this country.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Exactly what the gentlewoman speaks about was part of the long discussion that we had in the Rules Committee yesterday. The gentleman from Dallas, Texas, Chairman HENSARLING, very clearly went through—piece, by piece, by piece—the things which the Senate had added which were extraneous to TRIA and that were in their bill that they passed. Likewise, the chairman outlined what he was for. He described a bill that got 411 votes in this body.

One thing was a very pleasant surprise, and I thought it was very wisely done by the Secretary of the Treasury. I would like to read what Secretary Jacob Lew said in a letter that was addressed on December 7, just this week, to the Honorable CHARLES E. SCHUMER. CHUCK SCHUMER is the leader of this TRIA bill in the Senate.

He said:

Dear Senator Schumer, I want to thank you for your leadership on extending the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act and its program. As you know well, TRIA is critical to our economic and national security. Terrorism insurance is necessary for a broad range of economic activities in areas across the country and would be prohibitively expensive or unavailable in the absence of the program.

There is clear bipartisan support in both the Senate and the House to enact a long-term extension while making reforms to further reduce taxpayer exposure. Time is running short to head off an unnecessary, unprecedented, and disruptive lapse of the program, which is scheduled to expire in just a few weeks.

Given the economic necessity and national security implications of this legislation, TRIA's reauthorization should not be delayed due to disagreements over entirely unrelated financial regulatory issues. I appreciate the hard work you and your bipartisan colleagues are doing to reauthorize a long-term extension of the TRIA.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert this in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, December 7, 2014.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SCHUMER: I write to thank you for your leadership on extending the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) and its Program. As you know well, TRIA is critical to our economic and national security. Terrorism insurance is necessary for a broad range of economic activities in areas across the country, and would be prohibitively expensive or unavailable in the absence of the Program.

There is clear bipartisan support in both the Senate and the House to enact a long-term extension while making reforms to further reduce taxpayer exposure. Time is running short to head off an unnecessary, unprecedented, and disruptive lapse of the Program, which is scheduled to expire in a few weeks.

Given the economic necessity and national security implications of this legislation, TRIA's reauthorization should not be delayed due to disagreements over entirely unrelated financial regulatory issues. I appreciate the hard work you and your bipartisan

colleagues are doing to reauthorize a long-term extension of the TRIA.

Sincerely,

JACOB J. LEW.

□ 1345

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this is from the Secretary of the Treasury, who is asking Mr. SCHUMER, please, let's work to get this done because it makes sense.

I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Lubbock, Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), the vice chairman of the committee, who can further delve into the issues about how important this measure is.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point that we want to continue making here is that when we use the existing framework, the objective here was to give certainty to the industry—both the insurance industry and to the people that the insurance industry is insuring—so that over the next 6 years, they will know what the policy is. But at the same time, we are beginning to transition some of these reforms that hopefully will be a trend for future reauthorizations, should they be necessary. And let me emphasize that: should they be necessary.

One of the things that we do know is that the industry is doing a better job of being able to model what the potential risks are. There is some mitigation going on to make sure that new structures, new facilities take into account preventing the potential for certain types of attacks. So we want to encourage that kind of behavior. But it doesn't encourage that kind of behavior if there isn't some economic incentive. There is no economic incentive if the taxpayers keep having to pick up the bills on a number of these programs.

I am very pleased with the reforms that are built into this. I think we bring the market certainty in that we didn't materially change the program and that we are doing a long-term reauthorization.

I think the interesting thing is—and I think we can make the point—there is really not anything controversial in this bill. Now, there are some people who don't like the fact that there have been some things included in it. But, quite honestly, we are taking up a Senate bill that was sent over to us with extraneous policy built into it. It is policy that, quite honestly, some of us agree with, particularly the NARAB. And why that NARAB provision, NARAB II, is important, as I said earlier, is because your local insurance agent now can do business in adjoining States without having to go take a license test in each individual State. It doesn't preempt the States' ability to regulate the insurance activity in that State but actually streamlines it and basically is a small business bill.

The other issue that has been talked about is this Business Risk Mitigation and Stabilization Act. That is an important piece of legislation because a lot of our small businesses are out there. They are trying to raise capital. They are trying to create jobs. And there are certain risks that they just don't want to take or they feel like it is in the best interest of their business to be able to help someone risk-share that with. And many of the products that they buy to share that risk, the risk factor of doing business with that company is already priced into that transaction.

But we have an overinterpretation here now, where not only are those businesses paying a risk premium but they are also having to put up additional collateral. So this begins to keep the working collateral for the company so that they can invest in new equipment and in things that can help create new jobs in this country.

I want to talk about the fact that 411 people, including the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), voted for this piece of legislation. So this is not something that we are trying to sneak in on anybody. This is something that was voted on, in this House, by 411 votes.

And Mr. Dodd and Mr. Frank, the primary authors of the Dodd-Frank bill, both said that this was never an intention of Dodd-Frank and have spoken in favor of some kind of reform to that in the future.

So this is a good piece of legislation, and I am a little concerned that my colleagues think that it is in jeopardy. Well, the only reason it would be in jeopardy is if our colleagues over on the other side of the building decide, for some reason, that they don't want to reauthorize TRIA. That is certainly a decision that they would be making on their own. But, again, nothing in this bill is policy that has not been considered by this body in the past.

So, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this rule. We need to move this forward. Time is running short, and the marketplace needs that certainty. I am confident that we will pass this bill in the House today, and we are going to encourage our folks over in the Senate to ratify that. We hope the President of the United States will help bring market certainty to the American industry in the future.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time, although I certainly don't intend to use that much time.

But I do wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, since there has been discussion regarding the changes that are extraneous to the base bill—more specifically, the changes with reference to Dodd-Frank—and other changes that the Senate included in the measure that has now come to the House: my understanding is, and I stand to be cor-

rected, that the changes that were made in the Senate were not measures having to do with Dodd-Frank. It appears that that is where the provisions are likely to come into play in that my friends on the other side included the Dodd-Frank language after the negotiations had been put forward.

The fact of the matter is, it does appear that several Members of the other body have indicated that they are opposed to it. I don't believe that means that they are opposed to TRIA, but I do believe it means that they are opposed to changes in Dodd-Frank.

TRIA has been a widely successful program that has created jobs, fostered certainty in the marketplace, and protected U.S. economic security, all at no cost to the taxpayer. Reauthorization, in my judgment, is essential to current and future commercial development in communities all across this country and to our Nation's long-term economic prosperity.

I don't believe my Republican colleagues really want to play chicken with this vital national and economic security program in order to strong-arm the process on an unrelated financial services provision.

You know, Mr. Speaker and friends, when the 113th Congress began, it began with the distinguished Speaker of the House enunciating, among other things, that we would have an open and transparent process.

This is the 83rd closed rule that my friends on the other side have brought to this body. It rivals any in the history of this country, and I have been in the majority and in the minority as a member of the Rules Committee and have seen Members of my party advocate and pass closed rules.

When I came to the body in 1992, I had very little understanding about the process, and I recall very vividly when I went home for the first time—the Democrats were in the majority—and all of the talk on the radio shows that I would appear on was, Your party is passing closed rules. I am not so sure that generally the public is mindful of this inside process, but the essence of it allows that Members who are not on the relevant committees or Members who did not have their amendments made in order before the Rules Committee are precluded under closed rules from having an opportunity to put forward their ideas which might benefit the legislation or, if they feel like the legislation is deserving of burdening it, might very well do that as well.

But I will close by saying that I never thought that we would have 83 closed rules.

I am privileged to be able to serve in the 114th Congress, and my great hope is that we get past this particular method of cutting off other Members in this body from having full participation in the world's greatest deliberative body.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida not only for the effort that we have had today but also at the Rules Committee yesterday, where the committee heard really, really great points, perhaps on both sides, but great points about how important this legislation is not only to the country but to the stability of the marketplace and the ability to keep and grow jobs.

I also heard the gentleman very clearly talk about his displeasure of having a number of closed rules. And I would just thank the gentleman for reminding me, as chairman of the committee, and would respond back that almost every single week we were in session, we put into play more amendments for Democrats than HARRY REID did in 6 years for any Republican in the United States Senate. And I have tried to make sure that what I do is based upon some bit of fairness.

But the facts of the case are, the last time this TRIA bill was on the floor, then-Chairman Barney Frank asked for and received a closed rule, so he did the same thing in 2007. Republicans have also, under these processes, done the same thing, except that in 2005 and 2007, they were done on suspension, meaning that we had about 10 minutes to talk about the effort.

Today what we have tried to do is to have a full debate in the Rules Committee. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), among others, was allowed as much time as anybody wanted to discuss the ideas and fully vet the views of not only the ranking member and the gentlewoman from New York but also the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) to explain to the Rules Committee that most Members are not aware of all the arguments, the real need to make sure that TRIA was done well, and it was better to do it well. And certainly putting a closed rule means we can get through things in these remaining days. Good legislation—this bill is a 411-vote piece of legislation.

You heard from Chairman NEUGEBAUER from Lubbock, Texas—really, the architect of much of this legislation and the person who has the authority and the responsibility to the subcommittee—who worked with Chairman HENSARLING to develop leading-edge ideas that they could feel free to bring to this body and support.

So I think it is just critical that we are here today. We are going to get our work done. It is really noncontroversial, except if we just want to roll over and second-guess what the Senate wants to do. They had their shot at it, and they added some "extraneous measures," none that had been passed with 90-plus percent of their body. We

are going to work through this, and it is going to be doing the right thing for the right reason.

As I have said, I think it is important that we know why we are here, what we are doing. We have talked about the Secretary of Treasury, Secretary Lew, writing a letter to CHUCK SCHUMER, the lead in the Senate, saying, Hey, listen, let's get this thing done. It is so important.

Chairman NEUGEBAUER, Chairman HENSARLING, the just-in-time arrival of a bill, the Rules Committee, a long debate, a long discussion—there is plenty of time to debate on the floor today. Any Member that wanted to could show up here. There is just not a lot to be upset about. It is just really a good mark of the fine work that the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. HENSARLING, have done.

So it was really a pretty interesting meeting yesterday. I got to learn a lot. And the members of the Rules Committee said, this is the right thing to do. Let's not get in the way. It is important to the country.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to say that I think the Secretary is right. I think the chairman of the committee is right. I think the vice chairman of the committee is right. I think many of the people who came up to the Rules Committee yesterday were right.

This is a great piece of legislation. This package will provide a long-term extension to TRIA. It is going to make reforms to protect taxpayers. It is going to make sure the industry understands what it is. It is a bipartisan fix. It is going to include a bill with 411 votes out of this body. I think it is a darn good deal, and I am delighted to do that.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." Vote "yes" on this rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the preliminary estimate of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which was available at the time Rules Committee Report 113-654 was prepared, estimated that the legislation would reduce the deficit by \$457 million over 10 years. The final table provided by CBO estimates that the legislation would reduce the deficit by \$456 million.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting the resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and passing S.

1000 and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 189, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Gowdy	Pittenger
Amash	Granger	Pitts
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Poe (TX)
Bachmann	Graves (MO)	Pompeo
Bachus	Griffin (AR)	Posey
Barber	Griffith (VA)	Price (GA)
Barletta	Grimm	Reed
Barr	Guthrie	Reichert
Barton	Hanna	Renacci
Benishek	Harper	Ribble
Bentivolio	Harris	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rigell
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Roby
Black	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Rogers (MI)
Brat	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rooney
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Roskam
Buchanan	Issa	Ross
Bucshon	Jenkins	Rothfus
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Calvert	Jolly	Ruppersberger
Camp	Jones	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Jordan	Salmon
Carter	Joyce	Sanford
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Chabot	King (IA)	Schock
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Schweikert
Clawson (FL)	Kingson	Scott, Austin
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	Kline	Sessions
Cole	Labrador	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Shuster
Collins (NY)	Lance	Simpson
Conaway	Lankford	Sinema
Cook	Latham	Smith (MO)
Cotton	Latta	Smith (NE)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Long	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Southerland
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Daines	Lummis	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stockman
Denham	Marino	Stutzman
Dent	Massie	Terry
DeSantis	McAllister	Thompson (CA)
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Thornberry
Duffy	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McKeon	Turner
Elmiers	McKinley	Upton
Eshoo	McMorris	Valadao
Farenthold	Rodgers	Wagner
Fincher	Meadows	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Walden
Fleischmann	Messer	Walorski
Fleming	Mica	Weber (TX)
Flores	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Mullin	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Fox	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Nugent	Wittman
Garrett	Nunes	Wolf
Gerlach	Nunnelee	Womack
Gibbs	Olson	Yoder
Gibson	Palazzo	Yoho
Gingrey (GA)	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Gohmert	Pearce	Young (IN)
Goodlatte	Perry	
Gosar	Petri	

NAYS—189

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (NY)	Bustos
Bass	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Beatty	Bonamici	Capps
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Cardenas
Bera (CA)	Brown (FL)	Carney

Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)
Cartwright	Huffman	Payne
Castor (FL)	Israel	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Chu	Jeffries	Peters (CA)
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Peters (MI)
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Pingree (ME)
Clay	Keating	Pocan
Cleaver	Kennedy	Polis
Clyburn	Kildee	Price (NC)
Cohen	Kilmer	Quigley
Connolly	Kind	Rahall
Conyers	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Cooper	Kuster	Richmond
Costa	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Rush
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Levin	Sánchez, Linda T.
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Sánchez, Loretta
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Loebach	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lofgren	Schiff
Delaney	Lowenthal	Schneider
DeBene	Lowey	Schrader
Deutch	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Schwartz
Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Scott (VA)
Doggett	Lynch	Scott, David
Doyle	Maffei	Serrano
Edwards	Maloney,	Sewell (AL)
Ellison	Carolyn	Shea-Porter
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Sherman
Enyart	Matheson	Sires
Esty	Matsui	Slaughter
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Speier
Fattah	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)
Foster	McDermott	Takano
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Fudge	McIntyre	Tierney
Gabbard	McNerney	Titus
Gallo	Meeks	Tonko
Garamendi	Meng	Tsongas
Garcia	Michaud	Van Hollen
Grayson	Miller, George	Vargas
Green, Al	Moore	Veasey
Green, Gene	Moran	Vela
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Visclosky
Hahn	Napolitano	Walz
Hanabusa	Neal	Wasserman
Hastings (FL)	Nolan	Schultz
Heck (WA)	Norcross	Waters
Higgins	O'Rourke	Waxman
Himes	Owens	Welch
Hinojosa	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Holt	Pascrell	Yarmuth
Honda		
Horsford		

NOT VOTING—14

Braley (IA)	Hall	Miller, Gary
Campbell	Hastings (WA)	Negrete McLeod
Capuano	Kelly (IL)	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	LaMalfa	Woodall
Duckworth	Miller (FL)	

□ 1427

Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CHU, and Mr. SCHNEIDER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. TIBERI and THOMPSON of California changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 554 I was detained at a Press Conference. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 554, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

CHESAPEAKE BAY ACCOUNTABILITY AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1000) to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a crosscut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

YEAS—416

Aderholt	Coffman	Frelinghuysen
Amash	Cohen	Fudge
Amodei	Cole	Gabbard
Bachmann	Collins (GA)	Gallo
Bachus	Collins (NY)	Garamendi
Barber	Conaway	Garcia
Barletta	Connolly	Gardner
Barr	Conyers	Garrett
Barrow (GA)	Cook	Gerlach
Barton	Cooper	Gibbs
Bass	Costa	Gingrey (GA)
Beatty	Cotton	Gingrey (NY)
Becerra	Courtney	Goodlatte
Benish	Cramer	Gosar
Bentivolio	Crawford	Gowdy
Bera (CA)	Crenshaw	Granger
Bilirakis	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Bishop (NY)	Culberson	Grayson
Bishop (UT)	Cummings	Green, Gene
Black	Daines	Griffin (AR)
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Griffith (VA)
Blumenauer	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davis, Rodney	Grimm
Boustany	DeFazio	Guthrie
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Brady (TX)	Delaney	Hahn
Brat	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Bridenstine	DelBene	Hanna
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Harris
Brown (GA)	DeSantis	Hartzer
Brown (FL)	DesJarlais	Hastings (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Deutch	Hastings (WA)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Bucshon	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Bustos	Doggett	Hensarling
Butterfield	Doyle	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	Duffy	Higgins
Calvert	Duncan (SC)	Himes
Camp	Duncan (TN)	Hinojosa
Capito	Edwards	Holding
Capps	Ellison	Holt
Cárdenas	Ellmers	Honda
Carney	Engel	Horsford
Carson (IN)	Enyart	Hoyer
Carter	Eshoo	Hudson
Cartwright	Esty	Huelskamp
Cassidy	Farenthold	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Farr	Huizenga (MI)
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Hultgren
Chabot	Fincher	Hunter
Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Chu	Fleischmann	Israel
Cicilline	Fleming	Issa
Clark (MA)	Flores	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Forbes	Jeffries
Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry	Jenkins
Clay	Foster	Johnson (GA)
Cleaver	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Clyburn	Frankel (FL)	Johnson, E. B.
Coble	Franks (AZ)	Johnson, Sam

Jolly	Moran	Schneider
Jones	Mullin	Schock
Jordan	Mulvaney	Schrader
Joyce	Murphy (FL)	Schwartz
Kaptur	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert
Keating	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Scott, Austin
Kelly (PA)	Neal	Scott, David
Kennedy	Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner
Kildee	Noem	Serrano
Kilmer	Nolan	Sessions
Kind	Nugent	Sewell (AL)
King (IA)	Nunes	Shea-Porter
King (NY)	Nunnelee	Sherman
Kingston	O'Rourke	Shimkus
Kinziger (IL)	Olson	Shuster
Kirkpatrick	Owens	Simpson
Kline	Palazzo	Sinema
Kuster	Pallone	Sires
Labrador	Pascrell	Slaughter
Lamborn	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (MO)
Lance	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Langevin	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lankford	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Southerland
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Speier
Latham	Perry	Stewart
Latta	Peters (CA)	Stivers
Lee (CA)	Peters (MI)	Stockman
Levin	Peterson	Stutzman
Lewis	Petri	Swalwell (CA)
Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Takano
LoBiondo	Pittenger	Terry
Loeb	Pitts	Thompson (CA)
Loftgren	Poe (TX)	Thompson (MS)
Long	Polis	Thompson (PA)
Lowenthal	Pompeo	Thornberry
Lowe	Possey	Tiberi
Lucas	Price (GA)	Tierney
Luetkemeyer	Price (NC)	Tipton
Lujan Grisham	Quigley	Titus
(NM)	Rahall	Tonko
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rangel	Tsongas
(NM)	Reed	Turner
Lummis	Reichert	Upton
Lynch	Renacci	Valadao
Maffei	Ribble	Van Hollen
Maloney,	Rice (SC)	Vargas
Carolyn	Richmond	Veasey
Marchant	Rigell	Vela
Marino	Roby	Velázquez
Massie	Roe (TN)	Visclosky
Matheson	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
McAllister	Rogers (MI)	Walden
McCarthy (CA)	Rohrabacher	Walorski
McCarthy (NY)	Rokita	Walz
McCaul	Rooney	Wasserman
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
McCollum	Roskam	Waxman
McDermott	Ross	Weber (TX)
McGovern	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
McHenry	Roybal-Allard	Welch
McIntyre	Royce	Wenstrup
McKeon	Ruiz	Westmoreland
McKinley	Runyan	Whitfield
McMorris	Ruppersberger	Williams
Rodgers	Rush	Wilson (FL)
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Meadows	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
Meehan	Salmon	Wolf
Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Womack
Meng	T.	Woodall
Messer	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
Mica	Sanford	Yoder
Michaud	Sarbanes	Yoho
Miller (MI)	Scalise	Young (AK)
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Young (IN)
Moore	Schiff	

NOT VOTING—18

Adams	Gibson	Miller, Gary
Braley (IA)	Green, Al	Negrete McLeod
Burgess	Hall	Norcross
Campbell	LaMalfa	Pocan
Capuano	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	Miller (FL)	Waters

□ 1436

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 555, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following vote: S. 1000—Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall No. 555 on passage of the Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014 under suspension of the rules, I would have voted "yes."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 155, answered "present" 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

YEAS—261

Aderholt	Bustos	Cook
Amodei	Butterfield	Cooper
Bachmann	Byrne	Cotton
Bachus	Calvert	Courtney
Barber	Camp	Cramer
Barletta	Capito	Crenshaw
Barr	Capps	Crowley
Barrow (GA)	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Beatty	Carney	Culberson
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Bilirakis	Carter	Daines
Bishop (GA)	Cassidy	Davis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Black	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Blackburn	Chabot	DeBene
Blumenauer	Cicilline	DesJarlais
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Boustany	Clarke (NY)	Diaz-Balart
Brady (TX)	Clay	Dingell
Brat	Cleaver	Doggett
Bridenstine	Coble	Doyle
Brooks (AL)	Cole	Duncan (SC)
Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Edwards

Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long

Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeke
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascarell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

NAYS—155

Adams
Amash
Bass
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Cartwright
Chaffetz
Chu
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Crawford
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney

Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Takano
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Wagner
Walorski
Petri
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

Maffei
Maloney
Malone
Carolin
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Nolan
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens
NOT VOTING—17

Barton
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Capuano
DeLauro
Duckworth
Forbes
Gohmert
Grijalva
Hall
Kennedy
Larsen (WA)

□ 1447

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Stated for:
Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 556, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4007. An act to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2952. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2444. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

S. 2519. An act to codify an existing operations center for cybersecurity.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R.

2719) to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) *The Transportation Security Administration has not consistently implemented Department of Homeland Security policies and Government best practices for acquisition and procurement.*

(2) *The Transportation Security Administration has only recently developed a multiyear technology investment plan, and has underutilized innovation opportunities within the private sector, including from small businesses.*

(3) *The Transportation Security Administration has faced challenges in meeting key performance requirements for several major acquisitions and procurements, resulting in reduced security effectiveness and wasted expenditures.*

SEC. 3. TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION ACQUISITION REFORM.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296; 116 Stat. 2312) is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE XVI—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY "Subtitle A—General Provisions

"SEC. 1601. DEFINITIONS.

"In this title:

"(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The term 'Administration' means the Transportation Security Administration.

"(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration.

"(3) PLAN.—The term 'Plan' means the strategic 5-year technology investment plan developed by the Administrator under section 1611.

"(4) SECURITY-RELATED TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'security-related technology' means any technology that assists the Administration in the prevention of, or defense against, threats to United States transportation systems, including threats to people, property, and information.

"Subtitle B—Transportation Security Administration Acquisition Improvements

"SEC. 1611. 5-YEAR TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT PLAN.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall—

"(1) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, develop and submit to Congress a strategic 5-year technology investment plan, that may include a classified addendum to report sensitive transportation security risks, technology vulnerabilities, or other sensitive security information; and

"(2) to the extent possible, publish the Plan in an unclassified format in the public domain.

"(b) CONSULTATION.—The Administrator shall develop the Plan in consultation with—

"(1) the Under Secretary for Management;

"(2) the Under Secretary for Science and Technology;

"(3) the Chief Information Officer; and

"(4) the aviation industry stakeholder advisory committee established by the Administrator.

"(c) APPROVAL.—The Administrator may not publish the Plan under subsection (a)(2) until it has been approved by the Secretary.

“(d) **CONTENTS OF PLAN.**—The Plan shall include—

“(1) an analysis of transportation security risks and the associated capability gaps that would be best addressed by security-related technology, including consideration of the most recent quadrennial homeland security review under section 707;

“(2) a set of security-related technology acquisition needs that—

“(A) is prioritized based on risk and associated capability gaps identified under paragraph (1); and

“(B) includes planned technology programs and projects with defined objectives, goals, timelines, and measures;

“(3) an analysis of current and forecast trends in domestic and international passenger travel;

“(4) an identification of currently deployed security-related technologies that are at or near the end of their lifecycles;

“(5) an identification of test, evaluation, modeling, and simulation capabilities, including target methodologies, rationales, and timelines necessary to support the acquisition of the security-related technologies expected to meet the needs under paragraph (2);

“(6) an identification of opportunities for public-private partnerships, small and disadvantaged company participation, intragovernment collaboration, university centers of excellence, and national laboratory technology transfer;

“(7) an identification of the Administration's acquisition workforce needs for the management of planned security-related technology acquisitions, including consideration of leveraging acquisition expertise of other Federal agencies;

“(8) an identification of the security resources, including information security resources, that will be required to protect security-related technology from physical or cyber theft, diversion, sabotage, or attack;

“(9) an identification of initiatives to streamline the Administration's acquisition process and provide greater predictability and clarity to small, medium, and large businesses, including the timeline for testing and evaluation;

“(10) an assessment of the impact to commercial aviation passengers;

“(11) a strategy for consulting airport management, air carrier representatives, and Federal security directors whenever an acquisition will lead to the removal of equipment at airports, and how the strategy for consulting with such officials of the relevant airports will address potential negative impacts on commercial passengers or airport operations; and

“(12) in consultation with the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, an identification of security-related technology interface standards, in existence or if implemented, that could promote more interoperable passenger, baggage, and cargo screening systems.

“(e) **LEVERAGING THE PRIVATE SECTOR.**—To the extent possible, and in a manner that is consistent with fair and equitable practices, the Plan shall—

“(1) leverage emerging technology trends and research and development investment trends within the public and private sectors;

“(2) incorporate private sector input, including from the aviation industry stakeholder advisory committee established by the Administrator, through requests for information, industry days, and other innovative means consistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

“(3) in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, identify technologies in existence or in development that, with or without adaptation, are expected to be suitable to meeting mission needs.

“(f) **DISCLOSURE.**—The Administrator shall include with the Plan a list of nongovernment

persons that contributed to the writing of the Plan.

“(g) **UPDATE AND REPORT.**—Beginning 2 years after the date the Plan is submitted to Congress under subsection (a), and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress—

“(1) an update of the Plan; and

“(2) a report on the extent to which each security-related technology acquired by the Administration since the last issuance or update of the Plan is consistent with the planned technology programs and projects identified under subsection (d)(2) for that security-related technology.

“SEC. 1612. ACQUISITION JUSTIFICATION AND REPORTS.

“(a) **ACQUISITION JUSTIFICATION.**—Before the Administration implements any security-related technology acquisition, the Administrator, in accordance with the Department's policies and directives, shall determine whether the acquisition is justified by conducting an analysis that includes—

“(1) an identification of the scenarios and level of risk to transportation security from those scenarios that would be addressed by the security-related technology acquisition;

“(2) an assessment of how the proposed acquisition aligns to the Plan;

“(3) a comparison of the total expected lifecycle cost against the total expected quantitative and qualitative benefits to transportation security;

“(4) an analysis of alternative security solutions, including policy or procedure solutions, to determine if the proposed security-related technology acquisition is the most effective and cost-efficient solution based on cost-benefit considerations;

“(5) an assessment of the potential privacy and civil liberties implications of the proposed acquisition that includes, to the extent practicable, consultation with organizations that advocate for the protection of privacy and civil liberties;

“(6) a determination that the proposed acquisition is consistent with fair information practice principles issued by the Privacy Officer of the Department;

“(7) confirmation that there are no significant risks to human health or safety posed by the proposed acquisition; and

“(8) an estimate of the benefits to commercial aviation passengers.

“(b) **REPORTS AND CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than the end of the 30-day period preceding the award by the Administration of a contract for any security-related technology acquisition exceeding \$30,000,000, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives—

“(A) the results of the comprehensive acquisition justification under subsection (a); and

“(B) a certification by the Administrator that the benefits to transportation security justify the contract cost.

“(2) **EXTENSION DUE TO IMMINENT TERRORIST THREAT.**—If there is a known or suspected imminent threat to transportation security, the Administrator—

“(A) may reduce the 30-day period under paragraph (1) to 5 days to rapidly respond to the threat; and

“(B) shall immediately notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives of the known or suspected imminent threat.

“SEC. 1613. ACQUISITION BASELINE ESTABLISHMENT AND REPORTS.

“(a) **BASELINE REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before the Administration implements any security-related technology acquisition, the appropriate acquisition official of the Department shall establish and document a set of formal baseline requirements.

“(2) **CONTENTS.**—The baseline requirements under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) include the estimated costs (including lifecycle costs), schedule, and performance milestones for the planned duration of the acquisition;

“(B) identify the acquisition risks and a plan for mitigating those risks; and

“(C) assess the personnel necessary to manage the acquisition process, manage the ongoing program, and support training and other operations as necessary.

“(3) **FEASIBILITY.**—In establishing the performance milestones under paragraph (2)(A), the appropriate acquisition official of the Department, to the extent possible and in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall ensure that achieving those milestones is technologically feasible.

“(4) **TEST AND EVALUATION PLAN.**—The Administrator, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall develop a test and evaluation plan that describes—

“(A) the activities that are expected to be required to assess acquired technologies against the performance milestones established under paragraph (2)(A);

“(B) the necessary and cost-effective combination of laboratory testing, field testing, modeling, simulation, and supporting analysis to ensure that such technologies meet the Administration's mission needs;

“(C) an efficient planning schedule to ensure that test and evaluation activities are completed without undue delay; and

“(D) if commercial aviation passengers are expected to interact with the security-related technology, methods that could be used to measure passenger acceptance of and familiarization with the security-related technology.

“(5) **VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION.**—The appropriate acquisition official of the Department—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), shall utilize independent reviewers to verify and validate the performance milestones and cost estimates developed under paragraph (2) for a security-related technology that pursuant to section 1611(d)(2) has been identified as a high priority need in the most recent Plan; and

“(B) shall ensure that the use of independent reviewers does not unduly delay the schedule of any acquisition.

“(6) **STREAMLINING ACCESS FOR INTERESTED VENDORS.**—The Administrator shall establish a streamlined process for an interested vendor of a security-related technology to request and receive appropriate access to the baseline requirements and test and evaluation plans that are necessary for the vendor to participate in the acquisitions process for that technology.

“(b) **REVIEW OF BASELINE REQUIREMENTS AND DEVIATION; REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—

“(1) **REVIEW.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The appropriate acquisition official of the Department shall review and assess each implemented acquisition to determine if the acquisition is meeting the baseline requirements established under subsection (a).

“(B) **TEST AND EVALUATION ASSESSMENT.**—The review shall include an assessment of whether—

“(i) the planned testing and evaluation activities have been completed; and

“(ii) the results of that testing and evaluation demonstrate that the performance milestones are technologically feasible.

“(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after making a finding described in clause (i), (ii), or

(iii) of subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that includes—

“(A) the results of any assessment that finds that—

“(i) the actual or planned costs exceed the baseline costs by more than 10 percent;

“(ii) the actual or planned schedule for delivery has been delayed by more than 180 days; or

“(iii) there is a failure to meet any performance milestone that directly impacts security effectiveness;

“(B) the cause for such excessive costs, delay, or failure; and

“(C) a plan for corrective action.

“SEC. 1614. INVENTORY UTILIZATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Before the procurement of additional quantities of equipment to fulfill a mission need, the Administrator, to the extent practicable, shall utilize any existing units in the Administration’s inventory to meet that need.

“(b) TRACKING OF INVENTORY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish a process for tracking—

“(A) the location of security-related equipment in the inventory under subsection (a);

“(B) the utilization status of security-related technology in the inventory under subsection (a); and

“(C) the quantity of security-related equipment in the inventory under subsection (a).

“(2) INTERNAL CONTROLS.—The Administrator shall implement internal controls to ensure up-to-date accurate data on security-related technology owned, deployed, and in use.

“(c) LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish logistics principles for managing inventory in an effective and efficient manner.

“(2) LIMITATION ON JUST-IN-TIME LOGISTICS.—The Administrator may not use just-in-time logistics if doing so—

“(A) would inhibit necessary planning for large-scale delivery of equipment to airports or other facilities; or

“(B) would unduly diminish surge capacity for response to a terrorist threat.

“SEC. 1615. SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING GOALS.

“Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that includes—

“(1) the Administration’s performance record with respect to meeting its published small-business contracting goals during the preceding fiscal year;

“(2) if the goals described in paragraph (1) were not met or the Administration’s performance was below the published small-business contracting goals of the Department—

“(A) a list of challenges, including deviations from the Administration’s subcontracting plans, and factors that contributed to the level of performance during the preceding fiscal year;

“(B) an action plan, with benchmarks, for addressing each of the challenges identified in subparagraph (A) that—

“(i) is prepared after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the heads of Federal departments and agencies that achieved their published goals for prime contracting with small and minority-owned businesses, including small and disadvantaged businesses, in prior fiscal years; and

“(ii) identifies policies and procedures that could be incorporated by the Administration in

furtherance of achieving the Administration’s published goal for such contracting; and

“(3) a status report on the implementation of the action plan that was developed in the preceding fiscal year in accordance with paragraph (2)(B), if such a plan was required.

“SEC. 1616. CONSISTENCY WITH THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION AND DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND DIRECTIVES.

“The Administrator shall execute the responsibilities set forth in this subtitle in a manner consistent with, and not duplicative of, the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Department’s policies and directives.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by striking the items relating to title XVI and inserting the following:

“TITLE XVI—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

“Subtitle A—General Provisions

“Sec. 1601. Definitions.

“Subtitle B—Transportation Security Administration Acquisition Improvements

“Sec. 1611. 5-year technology investment plan.

“Sec. 1612. Acquisition justification and reports.

“Sec. 1613. Acquisition baseline establishment and reports.

“Sec. 1614. Inventory utilization.

“Sec. 1615. Small business contracting goals.

“Sec. 1616. Consistency with the Federal acquisition regulation and departmental policies and directives.”.

(c) PRIOR AMENDMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any amendment made by title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 as in effect before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains an assessment of the Transportation Security Administration’s implementation of recommendations regarding the acquisition of security-related technology that were made by the Government Accountability Office before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF SUBTITLE B OF TITLE XVI.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains an evaluation of the Transportation Security Administration’s progress in implementing subtitle B of title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by section 3, including any efficiencies, cost savings, or delays that have resulted from such implementation.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON FEASIBILITY OF INVENTORY TRACKING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit a report to Congress on the feasibility of tracking security-related technology, including software solutions, of the Administration through automated information and data capture technologies.

SEC. 6. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF TSA’S TEST AND EVALUATION PROCESS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) an evaluation of the Transportation Security Administration’s testing and evaluation activities related to security-related technology;

(2) information on the extent to which—

(A) the execution of such testing and evaluation activities is aligned, temporally and otherwise, with the Administration’s annual budget request, acquisition needs, planned procurements, and acquisitions for technology programs and projects; and

(B) security-related technology that has been tested, evaluated, and certified for use by the Administration but was not procured by the Administration, including the reasons the procurement did not occur; and

(3) recommendations—

(A) to improve the efficiency and efficacy of such testing and evaluation activities; and

(B) to better align such testing and evaluation with the acquisitions process.

SEC. 7. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, a bill that I introduced in July of last year, which passed the House unanimously 1 year ago.

This commonsense, bipartisan legislation is the culmination of 2 years of collaborative efforts by my colleagues in the House and Senate and 4 years of strong oversight by the Transportation Security Subcommittee.

H.R. 2719 will save significant tax dollars by forcing TSA to make thoughtful, informed decisions about what kinds of technology to deploy in our Nation’s airports. We simply cannot afford to see TSA repeat the mistakes of the past which have resulted in technologies such as “puffer machines” and body scanners being pulled out of airports prematurely and others sitting idle in warehouses, never to see the light of day.

H.R. 2719 requires TSA to develop and share with industry and the public a detailed 5-year technology investment plan. The bill gives Congress early warning about any cost overruns, delays, or technical failures encountered by TSA.

It ensures that TSA is implementing acquisition best practices as identified

by the Government Accountability Office and other experts. It also mandates a better process for managing security equipment in TSA's inventory. Finally, the Senate strengthened the bill by, among other things, requiring more consultation with experts in the public and private sectors during the acquisition process.

I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. McCaul, for his assistance in moving this bill through the committee and the House, as well as the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, for his work alongside myself and our chairman. I really appreciate the work and cooperation of Mr. THOMPSON and the ranking member for our subcommittee, Mr. RICHMOND. Again, their work made this a better bill.

I would also like to thank Senator AYOTTE for introducing a companion bill in the Senate and leading the effort to see it through the Senate Commerce Committee and the full Senate. I would also like to thank Senators ROCKEFELLER, THUNE, and TESTER and their staffs for their strong support and their important efforts to move this bill.

Finally, I would like to thank the 18 industry groups that have endorsed this bill, including the Security Manufacturers Coalition, Airlines for America, Airports Council International—North America, the American Association of Airport Executives, the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, the Security Industry Association, the U.S. Travel Association, and many others who provided valuable feedback and worked with us throughout this process.

I will insert into the RECORD a letter from these groups and others.

NOVEMBER 12, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Senate Majority Leader, U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Minority Leader, U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS REID AND MCCONNELL: Together our associations proudly represent the strength of the aviation, aerospace, and travel industry, which combined contribute billions of dollars to the U.S. economy every year and maintain thousands of high-tech jobs in the United States. We write to express our strong support for S. 1893, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act introduced by Senator Kelly Ayotte (R-NH) and S. 1804, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act introduced by Senator Jon Tester (D-MT). Companion versions (H.R. 2719 and H.R. 1204) of these two bills passed the House of Representatives with overwhelming bipartisan support on December 3, 2013, and were reported unanimously from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on July 24, 2014.

Both bills were developed with significant input from our industries and represent important progress toward streamlining the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) acquisition process and improving de-

cision-making, by including industry stakeholders on issues affecting aviation security. These no-cost, common-sense bills will benefit the transportation industry by requiring TSA to conduct meaningful private sector engagement and coordination, strategic planning, and transparent technology procurements, which will save taxpayer dollars and strengthen security in the long term.

As associations concerned with improving aviation safety and security, we ask that you bring S.1804/H.R. 1204 and S. 1893/H.R. 2719 to the Senate floor for the Senate's prompt consideration and passage in order to send these critical bills to the President for his signature.

Sincerely,

American Association of Airport Executives, Airlines for America, Aeronautical Repair Station Association, General Aviation Manufacturers Association, International Air Transport Association, National Association of State Aviation Officials, NetJets Association of Shared Aircraft Pilots, Security Manufacturers Coalition, U.S. Travel Association, Airports Council International—North America, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Cargo Airline Association, Helicopter Association International, National Air Transportation Association, National Business Aviation Association, Security Industry Association, Southwest Airlines Pilots Association, National Air Carrier Association.

Mr. HUDSON. This no-cost, bipartisan legislation will go a long way toward improving transparency and accountability for TSA. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act.

For years, both as chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I have been troubled by the way TSA goes about technology acquisition. Time and again, taxpayer dollars have been wasted on technologies that either do not work or cannot be upgraded to meet the agency's need.

I have also been troubled by TSA's apparent inability to effectively manage its inventory of security-related technology and meet its goals for contracting with small and disadvantaged businesses.

The bill before us today addresses these concerns through greater transparency and accountability. In this age of tight budgets, TSA cannot purchase technologies on a whim and outside of robust acquisition controls. Under H.R. 2719, of which I was proud to be an original cosponsor, TSA will be required to develop and publish a multiyear technology investment plan that will guide the agency's security-related technology purchases.

This plan will give both the agency and Congress a clear understanding of how taxpayer dollars will be allocated in future years.

The bill also requires TSA to develop a plan for managing its inventory of security-related technologies. Last year, the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General found that TSA had more than 17,000 items in its warehouse inventory, at an estimated cost of \$185 million. The IG concluded that TSA may be able to put approximately \$800,000 per year to better use by managing its inventory more effectively.

For fiscal year 2012, TSA's goal for prime contracting with small businesses was set at 23 percent; yet the agency barely reached 16 percent. While TSA improved its performance in 2013, it still failed to meet its goal for prime contracting with small businesses.

To address TSA's chronic problems meeting its small business contracting goal, the bill requires TSA to consult with other Federal agencies that get small business contracting done and done right. Under H.R. 2719, TSA will be required to develop an action plan for improving its performance and report to Congress on its progress in implementing the plan.

□ 1500

For too long TSA has relied upon the same limited number of companies to develop and produce the security-related technologies it puts into the field. Doing so comes at the peril of small and minority-owned businesses that are essential to innovation. This dynamic also results in additional cost to taxpayers due to a lack of competition in the marketplace.

H.R. 2719 received the unanimous support of the Committee on Homeland Security and this full House later last year. The Senate amendment to this bill that we are considering today makes minor and beneficial modifications.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. I have no further speakers. If the gentleman from Mississippi has no further speakers, I am prepared to close once the gentleman does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have one speaker before I close. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. THOMPSON for his leadership as ranking member and formerly chair, and Mr. HUDSON. Let me also acknowledge Mr. RICHMOND, who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

It is clear that this committee, Homeland Security overall, has worked together for the betterment of the national security of this Nation, and

these legislative initiatives in particular. I remember distinctly the hearings, the collaboration with a number of groups, and so I rise today to speak on the transportation security bill regarding best practices to improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes.

The Transportation Security Administration, now under Homeland Security, is one of our vital organs that relates to the security of America. We only need look at special holidays throughout the Nation and throughout the year and realize how vital the aviation system is and how important it is to work together with the Transportation Security Administration, covering TSOs and certainly a large component of research and technology dealing with the security of our airports.

This initiative is an important one. It is almost unspeakable to have this size of inventory, some \$185 million in assessment, languishing in warehouses under the name of the Transportation Security Administration.

Over the years as a ranking member and chairwoman on Transportation Security and now Border Security, likewise I have joined my colleagues in fighting for small businesses because there lies technology.

So this initiative to open the doors for the idea of a multiyear technology investment plan and underutilized innovation opportunities that can be provided in this area of security I believe is very important, and then of course to insist that 16 percent not be the number that we rely upon in terms of investment and opportunity for minorities and small businesses.

I support this initiative, and I must at this moment add my support for the legislation dealing with insisting on an aviation security advisory committee. I want to congratulate Mr. THOMPSON on that and indicate that the issue of aviation security matters needs collaboration.

Let me finish by saying, as we experienced over the last year, a decision to add or take away what item you could bring through security—we found out that collaboration on this is crucial.

So this is an important initiative, and I thank both the managers on the floor, and I support both of these initiatives and congratulate them for moving the security of America further.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to thank Subcommittee Chairman HUDSON and Ranking Member RICHMOND for working in collaboration to develop this important legislation.

I would also like to acknowledge the bipartisan staff work that went in to getting us to this point. Specifically, I want to acknowledge Brian Turbyfill on my staff and Amanda Parikh on the majority staff for their work on this legislation over the past 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the Senate amendment to H.R. 2719 so that this bill can be enacted and TSA's acquisition process is on a path to improvement.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the former chairman for his kind remarks and for the collaborative nature in which we have worked throughout this Congress. I appreciate his leadership and advice. I believe we have done good work, and we have done it because we have listened to each other and we have worked well together. I appreciate your leadership, as well as that of CEDRIC RICHMOND, the ranking member on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge that this would not be possible had they not worked so closely with us. I would also like to thank the chairman for mentioning our staffs. Our staffs have worked very hard, they have worked in a bipartisan manner, and I attach myself to his compliments for our staff there and thank him for that kindness.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the accomplishments we have made on this subcommittee. In particular I am proud of this piece of legislation, H.R. 2719. It was developed with input from stakeholders in an exhaustive process with subject matter experts across government and industry to address different deficiencies we had identified throughout the TSA's acquisition process.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on Senator AYOTTE's amendment to H.R. 2719, and let's send this bill to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2719, the "Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act."

H.R. 2719 addresses longstanding concerns that I and other Members of this Committee have raised about the Transportation Security Administration's stewardship of taxpayer funds when pursuing, acquiring, and deploying security-related technologies.

Importantly, the bill also seeks to address TSA's lackluster record of contracting with small businesses.

Last year, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, of which I am the Ranking Member, held a hearing with industry stakeholders where we heard from representatives of both small and large businesses on how to improve TSA's acquisition practices and to engage with small businesses more effectively.

There are ample small, minority-owned and disadvantaged businesses that are ready, willing and able to provide services and tech-

nologies to TSA that would enhance our security and likely reduce contracting costs.

If TSA cannot identify such businesses, I will be happy to refer them to some.

The bill takes a significant step toward holding TSA accountable for achieving its goals for contracting with small and disadvantaged businesses by requiring the agency to develop an action plan to accomplish its goals and report to Congress on how it plans to get there.

I thank the Subcommittee Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HUDSON, for his willingness to include small businesses in the discussion as we developed the legislation before the House today.

I also congratulate Chairman HUDSON on his work on this legislation.

As the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I was proud to work with the Chairman to lay the groundwork for this legislation through multiple hearings with both industry and TSA.

The bill tackles head on the lack of transparency and accountability that has plagued TSA's acquisition practices since the Agency's inception.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to H.R. 2719 is sound, bipartisan legislation that deserves the support of the Full House.

I would like to express my gratitude to Chairman HUDSON for the bipartisan manner in which he operated the Subcommittee on Transportation Security this Congress.

I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman in his new role as a Member on the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

With that Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the bill.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, which was developed, introduced, and championed by the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HUDSON. The Senate amendment to H.R. 2719, offered by Senator AYOTTE, would strengthen the underlying bill and ensure that TSA is consulting stakeholders throughout the technology acquisition process. I thank the Senator for working with our Committee to move this common sense bill across the finish line.

As Chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I have seen first-hand the need for TSA to develop a comprehensive investment plan for acquiring new technologies and to use its limited resources in a more efficient and effective manner. H.R. 2719 sets clear mandates for TSA to develop and maintain a five-year acquisition strategy that will help industry make informed investment decisions and lead to more effective technologies in our nation's airports to meet the evolving terrorist threats we face. The requirements of this bill will also ensure that Congress receives early warning and insight into potentially wasteful spending practices, which will strengthen the Committee's oversight and enable TSA to be a better steward of taxpayer dollars.

I would like to thank Chairman HUDSON for his dedicated effort to reform TSA, as well as the Ranking Member of the Full Committee and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee for their strong support of this important legislation, which will hold TSA accountable and increase transparency for the millions of dollars

the agency spends every year on technology. I would also like to express appreciation to the many stakeholder associations that have provided their input and given their support to this no-cost, bipartisan bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the Senate amendment to H.R. 2719 and send this bill to the President for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2719.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AVIATION SECURITY STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1204) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. AVIATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§44946. Aviation Security Advisory Committee

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Transportation Security Administration an aviation security advisory committee.

"(b) DUTIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall consult the Advisory Committee, as appropriate, on aviation security matters, including on the development, refinement, and implementation of policies, programs, rulemaking, and security directives pertaining to aviation security, while adhering to sensitive security guidelines.

"(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall develop, at the request of the Assistant Secretary, recommendations for improvements to aviation security.

"(B) RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEES.—Recommendations agreed upon by the subcommittees established under this section shall be approved by the Advisory Committee before transmission to the Assistant Secretary.

"(3) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The Advisory Committee shall periodically submit to the Assistant Secretary—

"(A) reports on matters identified by the Assistant Secretary; and

"(B) reports on other matters identified by a majority of the members of the Advisory Committee.

"(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Advisory Committee shall submit to the Assistant Secretary an annual report providing information on the activities, findings, and recommendations of the Advisory Committee, including its subcommittees, for the preceding year. Not later than 6 months after the date that the Secretary receives the annual report, the Secretary shall publish a public version describing the Advisory Committee's activities and such related matters as would be informative to the public consistent with the policy of section 552(b) of title 5.

"(5) FEEDBACK.—Not later than 90 days after receiving recommendations transmitted by the Advisory Committee under paragraph (4), the Assistant Secretary shall respond in writing to the Advisory Committee with feedback on each of the recommendations, an action plan to implement any of the recommendations with which the Assistant Secretary concurs, and a justification for why any of the recommendations have been rejected.

"(6) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after providing written feedback to the Advisory Committee under paragraph (5), the Assistant Secretary shall notify the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives on such feedback, and provide a briefing upon request.

"(7) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to briefing the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives under paragraph (6), the Assistant Secretary shall submit to such committees a report containing information relating to the recommendations transmitted by the Advisory Committee in accordance with paragraph (4).

"(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

"(1) APPOINTMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2014, the Assistant Secretary shall appoint the members of the Advisory Committee.

"(B) COMPOSITION.—The membership of the Advisory Committee shall consist of individuals representing not more than 34 member organizations. Each organization shall be represented by 1 individual (or the individual's designee).

"(C) REPRESENTATION.—The membership of the Advisory Committee shall include representatives of air carriers, all-cargo air transportation, indirect air carriers, labor organizations representing air carrier employees, labor organizations representing transportation security officers, aircraft manufacturers, airport operators, airport construction and maintenance contractors, labor organizations representing employees of airport construction and maintenance contractors, general aviation, privacy organizations, the travel industry, airport-based businesses (including minority-owned small businesses), businesses that conduct security screening operations at airports, aeronautical repair stations, passenger advocacy groups, the aviation security technology industry (including screening technology and biometrics), victims of terrorist acts against aviation, and law enforcement and security experts.

"(2) TERM OF OFFICE.—

"(A) TERMS.—The term of each member of the Advisory Committee shall be 2 years. A member of the Advisory Committee may be reappointed.

"(B) REMOVAL.—The Assistant Secretary may review the participation of a member of the Advisory Committee and remove such member for cause at any time.

"(3) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Committee shall not receive pay, allowances, or benefits from the Government by reason of their service on the Advisory Committee.

"(4) MEETINGS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall require the Advisory Committee to meet at least semiannually and may convene additional meetings as necessary.

"(B) PUBLIC MEETINGS.—At least 1 of the meetings described in subparagraph (A) shall be open to the public.

"(C) ATTENDANCE.—The Advisory Committee shall maintain a record of the persons present at each meeting.

"(5) MEMBER ACCESS TO SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of a member's appointment, the Assistant Secretary shall determine if there is cause for the member to be restricted from possessing sensitive security information. Without such cause, and upon the member voluntarily signing a non-disclosure agreement, the member may be granted access to sensitive security information that is relevant to the member's advisory duties. The member shall protect the sensitive security information in accordance with part 1520 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

"(6) CHAIRPERSON.—A stakeholder representative on the Advisory Committee who is elected by the appointed membership of the Advisory Committee shall chair the Advisory Committee.

"(d) SUBCOMMITTEES.—

"(1) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee chairperson, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary, may establish within the Advisory Committee any subcommittee that the Assistant Secretary and Advisory Committee determine to be necessary. The Assistant Secretary and the Advisory Committee shall create subcommittees to address aviation security issues, including the following:

"(A) AIR CARGO SECURITY.—The implementation of the air cargo security programs established by the Transportation Security Administration to screen air cargo on passenger aircraft and all-cargo aircraft in accordance with established cargo screening mandates.

"(B) GENERAL AVIATION.—General aviation facilities, general aviation aircraft, and helicopter operations at general aviation and commercial service airports.

"(C) PERIMETER AND ACCESS CONTROL.—Recommendations on airport perimeter security, exit lane security and technology at commercial service airports, and access control issues.

"(D) SECURITY TECHNOLOGY.—Security technology standards and requirements, including their harmonization internationally, technology to screen passengers, passenger baggage, carry-on baggage, and cargo, and biometric technology.

"(2) RISK-BASED SECURITY.—All subcommittees established by the Advisory Committee chairperson in coordination with the Assistant Secretary shall consider risk-based security approaches in the performance of their functions that weigh the optimum balance of costs and benefits in transportation security, including for passenger screening, baggage screening, air cargo security policies, and general aviation security matters.

"(3) MEETINGS AND REPORTING.—Each subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly and submit to the Advisory Committee for inclusion in the annual report required under subsection (b)(4) information, including recommendations, regarding issues within the subcommittee.

"(4) SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRS.—Each subcommittee shall be co-chaired by a Government official and an industry official.

"(e) SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS.—Each subcommittee under this section shall include subject matter experts with relevant expertise who

are appointed by the respective subcommittee chairpersons.

“(f) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee and its subcommittees.

“(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The term ‘Advisory Committee’ means the aviation security advisory committee established under subsection (a).

“(2) **ASSISTANT SECRETARY.**—The term ‘Assistant Secretary’ means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration).

“(3) **PERIMETER SECURITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘perimeter security’ means procedures or systems to monitor, secure, and prevent unauthorized access to an airport, including its airfield and terminal.

“(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term ‘perimeter security’ includes the fence area surrounding an airport, access gates, and access controls.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The analysis for subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“44946. Aviation Security Advisory Committee.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act. This bill was introduced by my colleague from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

I would like to thank the ranking member for developing this legislation, which would ensure stable, open lines of communication between TSA and a multitude of aviation security stakeholders.

I also thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) for his support and work on this bill in seeing it through committee and the House.

Additionally, our colleagues in the Senate, particularly Senators ROCKEFELLER, TESTER, THUNE, and AYOTTE, played an integral role in bringing this bill to the finish line.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1204, which passed unanimously out of our committee, and passed the House 1 year ago, is an

important piece of legislation that requires exactly the sort of stakeholder outreach that Congress expects from the TSA.

TSA should constantly solicit feedback from the aviation community before making new security policies, especially when these policies could translate into big headaches for the traveling public or the aviation industry.

Last year, we saw firsthand what can happen when TSA tries to make policy decisions in a vacuum. TSA announced it was going to allow small knives and sports equipment to be carried onto airplanes before consulting key stakeholders. The result was a very public disagreement and, eventually, a complete reversal of the decision. Had the process been handled differently, the outcome may have been very different.

The Aviation Security Advisory Committee, or ASAC, already provides important input to TSA on policy decisions, and includes U.S. air carriers, all cargo air carriers, airport operators, flight attendants, law enforcement and many other groups. This bill codifies the existing ASAC into law and gives additional groups a seat at the table.

It also requires TSA to provide feedback on the ASAC recommendations, which it doesn't consistently do today, and makes it possible for the ASAC to discuss sensitive security information, as appropriate.

Eighteen diverse industry associations, including U.S. airlines, airports, the travel industry, general aviation, and technology manufacturers support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2014, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to thank Chairmen MCCAUL and HUDSON and Ranking Member RICHMOND for their support of the measure before us today.

I would like to thank Senator TESTER for working with me to introduce companion legislation.

Finally, I commend Chairman ROCKEFELLER for taking an interest in this legislation and moving it through the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today has gone through regular order and is the product of thoughtful deliberation and bipartisan agreement.

Indeed, the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204 improves upon the bill passed by the House in December of last year by enhancing transparency while preserving the ability of the Aviation Security Advisory Committee to effec-

tively and efficiently conduct its important work.

By concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204, and sending the bill to the President for his signature, the House will be ensuring that stakeholders, including labor organizations, airports, small business operators at airports, and airlines, have a permanent seat at the table when TSA is developing policies and procedures that directly impact their work and businesses.

When Congress established TSA in response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the agency was granted broad latitude to develop, implement, and modify aviation security policies and procedures.

As a result, in many instances, TSA is not required to, and does not go through, the Federal rulemaking process to establish new policies or modify those already on the books.

I have introduced H.R. 1204 to ensure that input from the key stakeholders is sought, received, and considered by TSA. To that end, my bill not only makes the Aviation Security Advisory Committee permanent but puts new requirements on TSA to consult with this body and give its recommendations thoughtful and timely consideration.

It also requires the establishment of subcommittees within the larger Aviation Security Advisory Committee to focus on air cargo security, general aviation security, perimeter security, and security technology.

Whatever your views on TSA, I believe we can all agree that aviation security policymaking should reflect meaningful consultation and coordination with key stakeholders.

Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, H.R. 1204 has broad bipartisan support within Congress and is supported by a wide array of stakeholders. The Senate passed the bill by unanimous consent, and the House initially passed the bill last December with over 400 Members voting in favor.

I urge my colleagues to display the same level of support for the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204 so that this bipartisan legislation can be sent to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bipartisan bill that I believe will make a real difference for the future of aviation security.

I want to thank all those on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Hill who played a key role in moving this bill.

I would also like to thank the staff, not just for their work on this bill, but also the other transportation security bills that we sent to the President this Congress: Brian Turbyfill, Cedric Haynes, Jake Vreeburg, Kyle Klein, Nicole Halavik, Matt Haskins, Gerry Sleaf and Amanda Parikh.

□ 1515

I thank all of you for your service to our country and for your hard work.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” and to send this bill to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204.

Soliciting input from impacted stakeholders is critical to developing effective policies.

H.R. 1204, introduced by Ranking Member THOMPSON, codifies that sentiment by making permanent the Aviation Security Advisory Committee.

The Aviation Security Advisory Committee is a valuable asset to our nation's aviation security because it helps ensure that the policies that TSA develops are responsive to the security challenges and can be effectively integrated.

As the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I have seen firsthand just how critical it is for TSA to solicit and heed stakeholder recommendations.

I congratulate Ranking Member THOMPSON for his stewardship of this legislation and look forward to the House concurring in the Senate amendment so that this legislation can become law.

I would like to take this opportunity to again thank Administrator Pistole for his service.

For over four years, Administrator Pistole led the Transportation Security Administration honorably and effectively.

Thanks to his leadership, TSA is a more efficient, risk-based, agency.

Administrator Pistole is expected to step down from his post at the end of the year. He will be missed.

With that Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Mississippi, the Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. THOMPSON.

This legislation, as amended by the Senate, will ensure that TSA is maintaining open lines of communication with relevant stakeholder groups through the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC). H.R. 1204 codifies the existing ASAC and prohibits TSA from allowing the Committee's charter to lapse, as has happened in the past. It also ensures a diverse group of stakeholders have a seat at the table, requires TSA to provide feedback on the Committee's recommendations, and makes it possible for the Committee to discuss sensitive security information, as appropriate.

The ASAC and all of its members have a vested interest in the security of our nation's critical aviation systems and can help TSA make well-informed, effective policy decisions. The type of collaborative effort that the ASAC fosters is vitally important to our nation's aviation security, and I thank the Ranking Member for developing H.R. 1204 and for his leadership on this issue. I also thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. HUDSON, and the Ranking Member of

the Subcommittee, Mr. RICHMOND, for their commitment to improving TSA. Finally, I wish to thank our colleagues in the Senate for their work on this bill, including Senators TESTER, ROCKEFELLER, THUNE, and AYOTTE.

I urge my colleagues to support the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204 and send this bill to the President for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1204.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 775, I call up the bill (S. 2244) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 775, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 113-654 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

S. 2244

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 101. Extension of Terrorism Insurance Program.

Sec. 102. Federal share.

Sec. 103. Program trigger.

Sec. 104. Recoupment of Federal share of compensation under the program.

Sec. 105. Certification of acts of terrorism; consultation with Secretary of Homeland Security.

Sec. 106. Technical amendments.

Sec. 107. Improving the certification process.

Sec. 108. GAO study.

Sec. 109. Membership of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Sec. 110. Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms.

Sec. 111. Reporting of terrorism insurance data.

Sec. 112. Annual study of small insurer market competitiveness.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Reestablishment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.

TITLE III—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Margin requirements.

Sec. 303. Implementation.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 108(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2014” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

SEC. 102. FEDERAL SHARE.

Section 103(e)(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by inserting “and beginning on January 1, 2016, shall decrease by 1 percentage point per calendar year until equal to 80 percent” after “85 percent”.

SEC. 103. PROGRAM TRIGGER.

Subparagraph (B) of section 103(e)(1) (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(1) by striking “a certified act” and inserting “certified acts”;

(2) by striking “such certified act” and inserting “such certified acts”; and

(3) by striking “exceed” and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting the following: “exceed—

“(i) \$100,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2015;

“(ii) \$120,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2016;

“(iii) \$140,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2017;

“(iv) \$160,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2018;

“(v) \$180,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2019; and

“(vi) \$200,000,000, with respect to such insured losses occurring in calendar year 2020 and any calendar year thereafter.”.

SEC. 104. RECOUPMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF COMPENSATION UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 103(e) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) INSURANCE MARKETPLACE AGGREGATE RETENTION AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (7), the insurance marketplace aggregate retention amount shall be the lesser of—

“(i) \$27,500,000,000, as such amount is revised pursuant to this paragraph; and

“(ii) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such calendar year.

“(B) REVISION OF INSURANCE MARKETPLACE AGGREGATE RETENTION AMOUNT.—

“(i) PHASE-IN.—Beginning in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the amount set

forth under subparagraph (A)(i) shall increase by \$2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to \$37,500,000,000.

“(i) FURTHER REVISION.—Beginning in the calendar year that follows the calendar year in which the amount set forth under subparagraph (A)(i) is equal to \$37,500,000,000, the amount under subparagraph (A)(i) shall be revised to be the amount equal to the annual average of the sum of insurer deductibles for all insurers participating in the Program for the prior 3 calendar years, as such sum is determined by the Secretary under subparagraph (C).

“(C) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the Secretary shall—

“(i) issue final rules for determining the amount of the sum described under subparagraph (B)(ii); and

“(ii) provide a timeline for public notification of such determination.”; and

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “for each of the periods referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)”;

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “for such period”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) [Reserved.]”;

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6), terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 133 percent” and inserting “, terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 140 percent”;

(ii) by inserting “as calculated under subparagraph (A)” after “mandatory recoupment amount”; and

(D) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I)—

(I) by striking “2010” and inserting “2017”; and

(II) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”;

(ii) in subclause (II)—

(I) by striking “2011” and inserting “2018”;

(II) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”; and

(III) by striking “2017” and inserting “2024”; and

(iii) in subclause (III)—

(I) by striking “2012” and inserting “2019”; and

(II) by striking “2017” and inserting “2024”.

SEC. 105. CERTIFICATION OF ACTS OF TERRORISM; CONSULTATION WITH SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1)(A) of section 102 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “concurrence with the Secretary of State” and inserting “consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SEC. 106. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “An entity has” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity has”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—An entity, including any affiliate thereof, does not have ‘control’ over another entity, if, as of the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the entity is acting as an attorney-in-fact, as defined by the Secretary, for the other entity and such other entity is a reciprocal insurer, provided that the entity is not, for reasons other than the attorney-in-fact relationship, defined as having ‘control’ under subparagraph (A).”;

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F) and inserting the following:

“(A) the value of an insurer’s direct earned premiums during the immediately preceding calendar year, multiplied by 20 percent; and”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—

(I) by striking “notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), for the Transition Period or any Program Year” and inserting “notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any calendar year”; and

(II) by striking “Period or Program Year” and inserting “calendar year”;

(C) by striking paragraph (11); and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (16) as paragraphs (11) through (15), respectively; and

(2) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, purchase,”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “, purchase,”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “Program Year” and inserting “calendar year”;

(C) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), as previously amended by section 102—

(I) by striking “the Transition Period and each Program Year through Program Year 4 shall be equal to 90 percent, and during Program Year 5 and each Program Year thereafter” and inserting “each calendar year”;

(II) by striking the comma after “80 percent”; and

(III) by striking “such Transition Period or such Program Year” and inserting “such calendar year”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any Program Year thereafter” and inserting “a calendar year”; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking “the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any other Program Year” and inserting “any calendar year”; and

(D) in subsection (g)(2)—

(i) by striking “the Transition Period or a Program Year” each place that term appears and inserting “the calendar year”;

(ii) by striking “such period” and inserting “the calendar year”; and

(iii) by striking “that period” and inserting “the calendar year”.

SEC. 107. IMPROVING THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term “act of terrorism” has the same meaning as in section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note);

(2) the term “certification process” means the process by which the Secretary determines whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism under section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note); and

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct and complete a study on the certification process.

(c) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include an examination and analysis of—

(1) the establishment of a reasonable timeline by which the Secretary must make an accurate determination on whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism;

(2) the impact that the length of any timeline proposed to be established under paragraph (1) may have on the insurance industry, policyholders, consumers, and taxpayers as a whole;

(3) the factors the Secretary would evaluate and monitor during the certification process, including the ability of the Secretary to obtain the required information regarding the amount of projected and incurred losses resulting from an act which the Secretary would need in determining whether to certify the act as an act of terrorism;

(4) the appropriateness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the consultation process required under section 102(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) and any recommendations on changes to the consultation process; and

(5) the ability of the Secretary to provide guidance and updates to the public regarding any act that may reasonably be certified as an act of terrorism.

(d) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the report required under section 107 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 is submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary shall issue final rules governing the certification process, including establishing a timeline for which an act is eligible for certification by the Secretary on whether an act is an act of terrorism under this paragraph.”.

SEC. 108. GAO STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on the viability and effects of the Federal Government—

(1) assessing and collecting upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Program”), which shall include a comparison of practices in international markets to assess and collect premiums either before or after terrorism losses are incurred; and

(2) creating a capital reserve fund under the Program and requiring insurers participating in the Program to dedicate capital specifically for terrorism losses before such losses are incurred, which shall include a comparison of practices in international markets to establish reserve funds.

(b) **REQUIRED CONTENT.**—The study required under subsection (a) shall examine, but shall not be limited to, the following issues:

(1) **UPFRONT PREMIUMS.**—With respect to upfront premiums described in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) how the Federal Government could determine the price of such upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Program;

(B) how the Federal Government could collect and manage such upfront premiums;

(C) how the Federal Government could ensure that such upfront premiums are not spent for purposes other than claims through the Program;

(D) how the assessment and collection of such upfront premiums could affect take-up rates for terrorism risk coverage in different regions and industries and how it could impact small businesses and consumers in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas;

(E) the effect of collecting such upfront premiums on insurers both large and small;

(F) the effect of collecting such upfront premiums on the private market for terrorism risk reinsurance; and

(G) the size of any Federal Government subsidy insurers may receive through their participation in the Program, taking into account the Program's current post-event recoupment structure.

(2) **CAPITAL RESERVE FUND.**—With respect to the capital reserve fund described in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) how the creation of a capital reserve fund would affect the Federal Government's fiscal exposure under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program and the ability of the Program to meet its statutory purposes;

(B) how a capital reserve fund would impact insurers and reinsurers, including liquidity, insurance pricing, and capacity to provide terrorism risk coverage;

(C) the feasibility of segregating funds attributable to terrorism risk from funds attributable to other insurance lines;

(D) how a capital reserve fund would be viewed and treated under current Financial Accounting Standards Board accounting rules and the tax laws; and

(E) how a capital reserve fund would affect the States' ability to regulate insurers participating in the Program.

(3) **INTERNATIONAL PRACTICES.**—With respect to international markets referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), how other countries, if any—

(A) have established terrorism insurance structures;

(B) charge premiums or otherwise collect funds to pay for the costs of terrorism insurance structures, including risk and administrative costs; and

(C) have established capital reserve funds to pay for the costs of terrorism insurance structures.

(c) **REPORT.**—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(d) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The study and report required under this section shall be made available to the public in electronic

form and shall be published on the website of the Government Accountability Office.

SEC. 109. MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The first undesignated paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 241) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "In selecting members of the Board, the President shall appoint at least 1 member with demonstrated primary experience working in or supervising community banks having less than \$10,000,000,000 in total assets."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to appointments made on and after that effective date, excluding any nomination pending in the Senate on that date.

SEC. 110. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.

(a) **FINDING; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that it is desirable to encourage the growth of nongovernmental, private market reinsurance capacity for protection against losses arising from acts of terrorism.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) shall prohibit insurers from developing risk-sharing mechanisms to voluntarily reinsure terrorism losses between and among themselves.

(b) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish and appoint an advisory committee to be known as the "Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms" (referred to in this subsection as the "Advisory Committee").

(2) **DUTIES.**—The Advisory Committee shall provide advice, recommendations, and encouragement with respect to the creation and development of the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a).

(3) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 9 members who are directors, officers, or other employees of insurers, reinsurers, or capital market participants that are participating or that desire to participate in the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a), and who are representative of the affected sectors of the insurance industry, including commercial property insurance, commercial casualty insurance, reinsurance, and alternative risk transfer industries.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The provisions of this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

SEC. 111. REPORTING OF TERRORISM INSURANCE DATA.

Section 104 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) **REPORTING OF TERRORISM INSURANCE DATA.**—

"(1) **AUTHORITY.**—During the calendar year beginning on January 1, 2016, and in each calendar year thereafter, the Secretary shall require insurers participating in the Program to submit to the Secretary such information regarding insurance coverage for terrorism losses of such insurers as the Secretary considers appropriate to analyze the effectiveness of the Program, which shall include information regarding—

"(A) lines of insurance with exposure to such losses;

"(B) premiums earned on such coverage;

"(C) geographical location of exposures;

"(D) pricing of such coverage;

"(E) the take-up rate for such coverage;

"(F) the amount of private reinsurance for acts of terrorism purchased; and

"(G) such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than June 30, 2016, and every other June 30 thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate that includes—

"(A) an analysis of the overall effectiveness of the Program;

"(B) an evaluation of any changes or trends in the data collected under paragraph (1);

"(C) an evaluation of whether any aspects of the Program have the effect of discouraging or impeding insurers from providing commercial property casualty insurance coverage or coverage for acts of terrorism;

"(D) an evaluation of the impact of the Program on workers' compensation insurers; and

"(E) in the case of the data reported in paragraph (1)(B), an updated estimate of the total amount earned since January 1, 2003.

"(3) **PROTECTION OF DATA.**—To the extent possible, the Secretary shall contract with an insurance statistical aggregator to collect the information described in paragraph (1), which shall keep any nonpublic information confidential and provide it to the Secretary in an aggregate form or in such other form or manner that does not permit identification of the insurer submitting such information.

"(4) **ADVANCE COORDINATION.**—Before collecting any data or information under paragraph (1) from an insurer, or affiliate of an insurer, the Secretary shall coordinate with the appropriate State insurance regulatory authorities and any relevant government agency or publicly available sources to determine if the information to be collected is available from, and may be obtained in a timely manner by, individually or collectively, such entities. If the Secretary determines that such data or information is available, and may be obtained in a timely manner, from such entities, the Secretary shall obtain the data or information from such entities. If the Secretary determines that such data or information is not so available, the Secretary may collect such data or information from an insurer and affiliates.

"(5) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—

"(A) **RETENTION OF PRIVILEGE.**—The submission of any non-publicly available data and information to the Secretary and the sharing of any non-publicly available data with or by the Secretary among other Federal agencies, the State insurance regulatory authorities, or any other entities under this subsection shall not constitute a waiver of, or otherwise affect, any privilege arising under Federal or State law (including the rules of any Federal or State court) to which the data or information is otherwise subject.

"(B) **CONTINUED APPLICATION OF PRIOR CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENTS.**—Any requirement under Federal or State law to the extent otherwise applicable, or any requirement pursuant to a written agreement in effect between the original source of any non-publicly available data or information and the source of such data or information to the Secretary, regarding the privacy or confidentiality of any data or information in the possession of the source to the Secretary, shall

continue to apply to such data or information after the data or information has been provided pursuant to this subsection.

“(C) INFORMATION-SHARING AGREEMENT.—Any data or information obtained by the Secretary under this subsection may be made available to State insurance regulatory authorities, individually or collectively through an information-sharing agreement that—

“(i) shall comply with applicable Federal law; and

“(ii) shall not constitute a waiver of, or otherwise affect, any privilege under Federal or State law (including any privilege referred to in subparagraph (A) and the rules of any Federal or State court) to which the data or information is otherwise subject.

“(D) AGENCY DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, including any exceptions thereunder, shall apply to any data or information submitted under this subsection to the Secretary by an insurer or affiliate of an insurer.”

SEC. 112. ANNUAL STUDY OF SMALL INSURER MARKET COMPETITIVENESS.

Section 108 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) STUDY OF SMALL INSURER MARKET COMPETITIVENESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 30, 2017, and every other June 30 thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a study of small insurers (as such term is defined by regulation by the Secretary) participating in the Program, and identify any competitive challenges small insurers face in the terrorism risk insurance marketplace, including—

“(A) changes to the market share, premium volume, and policyholder surplus of small insurers relative to large insurers;

“(B) how the property and casualty insurance market for terrorism risk differs between small and large insurers, and whether such a difference exists within other perils;

“(C) the impact of the Program’s mandatory availability requirement under section 103(c) on small insurers;

“(D) the effect of increasing the trigger amount for the Program under section 103(e)(1)(B) on small insurers;

“(E) the availability and cost of private reinsurance for small insurers; and

“(F) the impact that State workers compensation laws have on small insurers and workers compensation carriers in the terrorism risk insurance marketplace.

“(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the findings and conclusions of each study required under paragraph (1).”

TITLE II—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS REFORM

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014”.

SEC. 202. REESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title III of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

“SEC. 321. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘Association’).

“(b) STATUS.—The Association shall—

“(1) be a nonprofit corporation;

“(2) not be an agent or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

“(3) be an independent organization that may not be merged with or into any other private or public entity; and

“(4) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, be subject to, and have all the powers conferred upon, a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29–301.01 et seq.) or any successor thereto.

“SEC. 322. PURPOSE.

“The purpose of the Association shall be to provide a mechanism through which licensing, continuing education, and other nonresident insurance producer qualification requirements and conditions may be adopted and applied on a multi-state basis without affecting the laws, rules, and regulations, and preserving the rights of a State, pertaining to—

“(1) licensing, continuing education, and other qualification requirements of insurance producers that are not members of the Association;

“(2) resident or nonresident insurance producer appointment requirements;

“(3) supervising and disciplining resident and nonresident insurance producers;

“(4) establishing licensing fees for resident and nonresident insurance producers so that there is no loss of insurance producer licensing revenue to the State; and

“(5) prescribing and enforcing laws and regulations regulating the conduct of resident and nonresident insurance producers.

“SEC. 323. MEMBERSHIP.

“(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any insurance producer licensed in its home State shall, subject to paragraphs (2) and (4), be eligible to become a member of the Association.

“(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE.—Subject to paragraph (3), an insurance producer is not eligible to become a member of the Association if a State insurance regulator has suspended or revoked the insurance license of the insurance producer in that State.

“(3) RESUMPTION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Paragraph (2) shall cease to apply to any insurance producer if—

“(A) the State insurance regulator reissues or renews the license of the insurance producer in the State in which the license was suspended or revoked, or otherwise terminates or vacates the suspension or revocation; or

“(B) the suspension or revocation expires or is subsequently overturned by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(4) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An insurance producer who is an individual shall not be eligible to become a member of the Association unless the insurance producer has undergone a criminal history record check that complies with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States under subparagraph (K).

“(B) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY HOME STATE.—An insurance producer who is licensed in a State and who has undergone a criminal history record check during the 2-year period preceding the date of submission of an application to become a member of the Association, in compliance with a requirement to undergo such criminal history record check as a condition for such licensure in the State, shall be deemed to have undergone a criminal history record check for purposes of subparagraph (A).

“(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY ASSOCIATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall, upon request by an insurance producer licensed in a State, submit fingerprints or other identification information obtained from the insurance producer, and a request for a criminal history record check of the insurance producer, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(ii) PROCEDURES.—The board of directors of the Association (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘Board’) shall prescribe procedures for obtaining and utilizing fingerprints or other identification information and criminal history record information, including the establishment of reasonable fees to defray the expenses of the Association in connection with the performance of a criminal history record check and appropriate safeguards for maintaining confidentiality and security of the information. Any fees charged pursuant to this clause shall be separate and distinct from those charged by the Attorney General pursuant to subparagraph (I).

“(D) FORM OF REQUEST.—A submission under subparagraph (C)(i) shall include such fingerprints or other identification information as is required by the Attorney General concerning the person about whom the criminal history record check is requested, and a statement signed by the person authorizing the Attorney General to provide the information to the Association and for the Association to receive the information.

“(E) PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receiving a submission under subparagraph (C)(i) from the Association, the Attorney General shall search all criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including records of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Attorney General determines appropriate for criminal history records corresponding to the fingerprints or other identification information provided under subparagraph (D) and provide all criminal history record information included in the request to the Association.

“(F) LIMITATION ON PERMISSIBLE USES OF INFORMATION.—Any information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) may only—

“(i) be used for purposes of determining compliance with membership criteria established by the Association;

“(ii) be disclosed to State insurance regulators, or Federal or State law enforcement agencies, in conformance with applicable law; or

“(iii) be disclosed, upon request, to the insurance producer to whom the criminal history record information relates.

“(G) PENALTY FOR IMPROPER USE OR DISCLOSURE.—Whoever knowingly uses any information provided under subparagraph (E) for a purpose not authorized in subparagraph (F), or discloses any such information to anyone not authorized to receive it, shall be fined not more than \$50,000 per violation as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(H) RELIANCE ON INFORMATION.—Neither the Association nor any of its Board members, officers, or employees shall be liable in any action for using information provided under subparagraph (E) as permitted under subparagraph (F) in good faith and in reasonable reliance on its accuracy.

“(I) FEES.—The Attorney General may charge a reasonable fee for conducting the search and providing the information under

subparagraph (E), and any such fee shall be collected and remitted by the Association to the Attorney General.

“(J) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as—

“(i) requiring a State insurance regulator to perform criminal history record checks under this section; or

“(ii) limiting any other authority that allows access to criminal history records.

“(K) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, which shall include—

“(i) appropriate protections for ensuring the confidentiality of information provided under subparagraph (E); and

“(ii) procedures providing a reasonable opportunity for an insurance producer to contest the accuracy of information regarding the insurance producer provided under subparagraph (E).

“(L) INELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association may, under reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to an insurance producer on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E), or where the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action, as described in paragraph (2).

“(ii) RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS DENIED MEMBERSHIP.—The Association shall notify any insurance producer who is denied membership on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E) of the right of the insurance producer to—

“(I) obtain a copy of all criminal history record information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) with respect to the insurance producer; and

“(II) challenge the denial of membership based on the accuracy and completeness of the information.

“(M) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘criminal history record check’ means a national background check of criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(b) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—The Association may establish membership criteria that bear a reasonable relationship to the purposes for which the Association was established.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLASSES AND CATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may establish separate classes of membership, with separate criteria, if the Association reasonably determines that performance of different duties requires different levels of education, training, experience, or other qualifications.

“(2) BUSINESS ENTITIES.—The Association shall establish a class of membership and membership criteria for business entities. A business entity that applies for membership shall be required to designate an individual Association member responsible for the compliance of the business entity with Association standards and the insurance laws, standards, and regulations of any State in which the business entity seeks to do business on the basis of Association membership.

“(3) CATEGORIES.—

“(A) SEPARATE CATEGORIES FOR INSURANCE PRODUCERS PERMITTED.—The Association may establish separate categories of membership for insurance producers and for other persons or entities within each class, based on the types of licensing categories that exist under State laws.

“(B) SEPARATE TREATMENT FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS PROHIBITED.—No special categories of membership, and no distinct mem-

bership criteria, shall be established for members that are depository institutions or for employees, agents, or affiliates of depository institutions.

“(d) MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association may establish criteria for membership which shall include standards for personal qualifications, education, training, and experience. The Association shall not establish criteria that unfairly limit the ability of a small insurance producer to become a member of the Association, including imposing discriminatory membership fees.

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—In establishing criteria under paragraph (1), the Association shall not adopt any qualification less protective to the public than that contained in the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (referred to in this subtitle as the ‘NAIC’) Producer Licensing Model Act in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014, and shall consider the highest levels of insurance producer qualifications established under the licensing laws of the States.

“(3) ASSISTANCE FROM STATES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association may request a State to provide assistance in investigating and evaluating the eligibility of a prospective member for membership in the Association.

“(B) AUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION SHARING.—A submission under subsection (a)(4)(C)(i) made by an insurance producer licensed in a State shall include a statement signed by the person about whom the assistance is requested authorizing—

“(i) the State to share information with the Association; and

“(ii) the Association to receive the information.

“(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as requiring or authorizing any State to adopt new or additional requirements concerning the licensing or evaluation of insurance producers.

“(4) DENIAL OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may, based on reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to any State-licensed insurance producer for failure to meet the membership criteria established by the Association.

“(e) EFFECT OF MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) AUTHORITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS.—Membership in the Association shall—

“(A) authorize an insurance producer to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance in any State for which the member pays the licensing fee set by the State for any line or lines of insurance specified in the home State license of the insurance producer, and exercise all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out such activities, including claims adjustments and settlement to the extent permissible under the laws of the State, risk management, employee benefits advice, retirement planning, and any other insurance-related consulting activities;

“(B) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for purposes of authorizing the insurance producer to engage in the activities described in subparagraph (A) in any State where the member pays the licensing fee; and

“(C) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for the purpose of subjecting an insurance producer to all laws, regulations, provisions or other action of any State concerning revocation, suspension, or other enforcement action related to the ability of a member to engage in any activity within the scope of authority granted

under this subsection and to all State laws, regulations, provisions, and actions preserved under paragraph (5).

“(2) VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to alter, modify, or supercede any requirement established by section 1033 of title 18, United States Code.

“(3) AGENT FOR REMITTING FEES.—The Association shall act as an agent for any member for purposes of remitting licensing fees to any State pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(4) NOTIFICATION OF ACTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when an insurance producer has satisfied the membership criteria of this section. The States (including State insurance regulators) shall have 10 business days after the date of the notification in order to provide the Association with evidence that the insurance producer does not satisfy the criteria for membership in the Association.

“(B) ONGOING DISCLOSURES REQUIRED.—On an ongoing basis, the Association shall disclose to the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC a list of the States in which each member is authorized to operate. The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when a member is newly authorized to operate in one or more States, or is no longer authorized to operate in one or more States on the basis of Association membership.

“(5) PRESERVATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND MARKET CONDUCT REGULATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting the applicability or continuing effectiveness of any law, regulation, provision, or other action of any State, including those described in subparagraph (B), to the extent that the State law, regulation, provision, or other action is not inconsistent with the provisions of this subtitle related to market entry for nonresident insurance producers, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

“(B) PRESERVED REGULATIONS.—The laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions of any State referred to in subparagraph (A) include laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions that—

“(i) regulate market conduct, insurance producer conduct, or unfair trade practices;

“(ii) establish consumer protections; or

“(iii) require insurance producers to be appointed by a licensed or authorized insurer.

“(f) BIENNIAL RENEWAL.—Membership in the Association shall be renewed on a biennial basis.

“(g) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall establish, as a condition of membership, continuing education requirements which shall be comparable to the continuing education requirements under the licensing laws of a majority of the States.

“(2) STATE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.—A member may not be required to satisfy continuing education requirements imposed under the laws, regulations, provisions, or actions of any State other than the home State of the member.

“(3) RECIPROCITY.—The Association shall not require a member to satisfy continuing education requirements that are equivalent to any continuing education requirements of the home State of the member that have been satisfied by the member during the applicable licensing period.

“(4) LIMITATION ON THE ASSOCIATION.—The Association shall not directly or indirectly

offer any continuing education courses for insurance producers.

“(h) PROBATION, SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.—

“(1) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—The Association may place an insurance producer that is a member of the Association on probation or suspend or revoke the membership of the insurance producer in the Association, or assess monetary fines or penalties, as the Association determines to be appropriate, if—

“(A) the insurance producer fails to meet the applicable membership criteria or other standards established by the Association;

“(B) the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action pursuant to a final adjudicatory proceeding under the jurisdiction of a State insurance regulator;

“(C) an insurance license held by the insurance producer has been suspended or revoked by a State insurance regulator; or

“(D) the insurance producer has been convicted of a crime that would have resulted in the denial of membership pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(L)(i) at the time of application, and the Association has received a copy of the final disposition from a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(2) VIOLATIONS OF ASSOCIATION STANDARDS.—The Association shall have the power to investigate alleged violations of Association standards.

“(3) REPORTING.—The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when the membership of an insurance producer has been placed on probation or has been suspended, revoked, or otherwise terminated, or when the Association has assessed monetary fines or penalties.

“(i) CONSUMER COMPLAINTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall—

“(A) refer any complaint against a member of the Association from a consumer relating to alleged misconduct or violations of State insurance laws to the State insurance regulator where the consumer resides and, when appropriate, to any additional State insurance regulator, as determined by standards adopted by the Association; and

“(B) make any related records and information available to each State insurance regulator to whom the complaint is forwarded.

“(2) TELEPHONE AND OTHER ACCESS.—The Association shall maintain a toll-free number for purposes of this subsection and, as practicable, other alternative means of communication with consumers, such as an Internet webpage.

“(3) FINAL DISPOSITION OF INVESTIGATION.—State insurance regulators shall provide the Association with information regarding the final disposition of a complaint referred pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), but nothing shall be construed to compel a State to release confidential investigation reports or other information protected by State law to the Association.

“(j) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Association may—

“(1) share documents, materials, or other information, including confidential and privileged documents, with a State, Federal, or international governmental entity or with the NAIC or other appropriate entity referred to paragraphs (3) and (4), provided that the recipient has the authority and agrees to maintain the confidentiality or privileged status of the document, material, or other information;

“(2) limit the sharing of information as required under this subtitle with the NAIC or any other non-governmental entity, in cir-

cumstances under which the Association determines that the sharing of such information is unnecessary to further the purposes of this subtitle;

“(3) establish a central clearinghouse, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a central clearinghouse, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators), through which members of the Association may disclose their intent to operate in 1 or more States and pay the licensing fees to the appropriate States; and

“(4) establish a database, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a database, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators) for the collection of regulatory information concerning the activities of insurance producers.

“(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the later of—

“(1) the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014; and

“(2) the date of incorporation of the Association.

“SEC. 324. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a board of directors of the Association, which shall have authority to govern and supervise all activities of the Association.

“(b) POWERS.—The Board shall have such of the powers and authority of the Association as may be specified in the bylaws of the Association.

“(c) COMPOSITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall consist of 13 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, of whom—

“(A) 8 shall be State insurance commissioners appointed in the manner provided in paragraph (2), 1 of whom shall be designated by the President to serve as the chairperson of the Board until the Board elects one such State insurance commissioner Board member to serve as the chairperson of the Board;

“(B) 3 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with property and casualty insurance producer licensing; and

“(C) 2 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with life or health insurance producer licensing.

“(2) STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Before making any appointments pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the President shall request a list of recommended candidates from the States through the NAIC, which shall not be binding on the President. If the NAIC fails to submit a list of recommendations not later than 15 business days after the date of the request, the President may make the requisite appointments without considering the views of the NAIC.

“(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 Board members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall belong to the same political party.

“(C) FORMER STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If, after offering each currently serving State insurance commissioner an appointment to the Board, fewer than 8 State insurance commissioners have accepted appointment to the Board, the President may appoint the remaining State insurance commissioner Board members, as

required under paragraph (1)(A), of the appropriate political party as required under subparagraph (B), from among individuals who are former State insurance commissioners.

“(ii) LIMITATION.—A former State insurance commissioner appointed as described in clause (i) may not be employed by or have any present direct or indirect financial interest in any insurer, insurance producer, or other entity in the insurance industry, other than direct or indirect ownership of, or beneficial interest in, an insurance policy or annuity contract written or sold by an insurer.

“(D) SERVICE THROUGH TERM.—If a Board member appointed under paragraph (1)(A) ceases to be a State insurance commissioner during the term of the Board member, the Board member shall cease to be a Board member.

“(3) PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—In making any appointment pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), the President may seek recommendations for candidates from groups representing the category of individuals described, which shall not be binding on the President.

“(4) STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State insurance commissioner’ means a person who serves in the position in State government, or on the board, commission, or other body that is the primary insurance regulatory authority for the State.

“(d) TERMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), the term of service for each Board member shall be 2 years.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) 1-YEAR TERMS.—The term of service shall be 1 year, as designated by the President at the time of the nomination of the subject Board members for—

“(i) 4 of the State insurance commissioner Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(A), of whom not more than 2 shall belong to the same political party;

“(ii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(B); and

“(iii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(C).

“(B) EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A Board member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term to which the Board member was appointed for the earlier of 2 years or until a successor is appointed.

“(C) MID-TERM APPOINTMENTS.—A Board member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the Board member was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

“(3) SUCCESSIVE TERMS.—Board members may be reappointed to successive terms.

“(e) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The appointment of initial Board members shall be made no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014.

“(f) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

“(A) at the call of the chairperson;

“(B) as requested in writing to the chairperson by not fewer than 5 Board members; or

“(C) as otherwise provided by the bylaws of the Association.

“(2) QUORUM REQUIRED.—A majority of all Board members shall constitute a quorum.

“(3) VOTING.—Decisions of the Board shall require the approval of a majority of all Board members present at a meeting, a quorum being present.

“(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The Board shall hold its first meeting not later than 45 days after the date on which all initial Board members have been appointed.

“(g) RESTRICTION ON CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Board members appointed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) shall not have access to confidential information received by the Association in connection with complaints, investigations, or disciplinary proceedings involving insurance producers.

“(h) ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Board shall issue and enforce an ethical conduct code to address permissible and prohibited activities of Board members and Association officers, employees, agents, or consultants. The code shall, at a minimum, include provisions that prohibit any Board member or Association officer, employee, agent or consultant from—

“(1) engaging in unethical conduct in the course of performing Association duties;

“(2) participating in the making or influencing the making of any Association decision, the outcome of which the Board member, officer, employee, agent, or consultant knows or had reason to know would have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the person or a member of the immediate family of the person;

“(3) accepting any gift from any person or entity other than the Association that is given because of the position held by the person in the Association;

“(4) making political contributions to any person or entity on behalf of the Association; and

“(5) lobbying or paying a person to lobby on behalf of the Association.

“(i) COMPENSATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no Board member may receive any compensation from the Association or any other person or entity on account of Board membership.

“(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.—Board members may be reimbursed only by the Association for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates consistent with rates authorized for employees of Federal agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from home or regular places of business in performance of services for the Association.

“SEC. 325. BYLAWS, STANDARDS, AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.

“(a) ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS.—

“(1) PROCEDURES.—The Association shall adopt procedures for the adoption of bylaws and standards that are similar to procedures under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act’).

“(2) COPY REQUIRED TO BE FILED.—The Board shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, all proposed bylaws and standards of the Association, or any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, accompanied by a concise general statement of the basis and purpose of such proposal.

“(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any proposed bylaw or standard of the Association, and any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, shall take effect, after notice under paragraph (2) and opportunity for public comment, on such date as the As-

sociation may designate, unless suspended under section 329(c).

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject the Board or the Association to the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act’).

“(b) DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THE ASSOCIATION.—

“(1) SPECIFICATION OF CHARGES.—In any proceeding to determine whether membership shall be denied, suspended, revoked, or not renewed, or to determine whether a member of the Association should be placed on probation (referred to in this section as a ‘disciplinary action’) or whether to assess fines or monetary penalties, the Association shall bring specific charges, notify the member of the charges, give the member an opportunity to defend against the charges, and keep a record.

“(2) SUPPORTING STATEMENT.—A determination to take disciplinary action shall be supported by a statement setting forth—

“(A) any act or practice in which the member has been found to have been engaged;

“(B) the specific provision of this subtitle or standard of the Association that any such act or practice is deemed to violate; and

“(C) the sanction imposed and the reason for the sanction.

“(3) INELIGIBILITY OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—Board members appointed pursuant to section 324(c)(3) may not—

“(A) participate in any disciplinary action or be counted toward establishing a quorum during a disciplinary action; and

“(B) have access to confidential information concerning any disciplinary action.

“SEC. 326. POWERS.

“In addition to all the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, the Association shall have the power to—

“(1) establish and collect such membership fees as the Association finds necessary to impose to cover the costs of its operations;

“(2) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, procedures, or standards governing the conduct of Association business and performance of its duties;

“(3) establish procedures for providing notice and opportunity for comment pursuant to section 325(a);

“(4) enter into and perform such agreements as necessary to carry out the duties of the Association;

“(5) hire employees, professionals, or specialists, and elect or appoint officers, and to fix their compensation, define their duties and give them appropriate authority to carry out the purposes of this subtitle, and determine their qualification;

“(6) establish personnel policies of the Association and programs relating to, among other things, conflicts of interest, rates of compensation, where applicable, and qualifications of personnel;

“(7) borrow money; and

“(8) secure funding for such amounts as the Association determines to be necessary and appropriate to organize and begin operations of the Association, which shall be treated as loans to be repaid by the Association with interest at market rate.

“SEC. 327. REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Association shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, a written report regard-

ing the conduct of its business, and the exercise of the other rights and powers granted by this subtitle, during such fiscal year.

“(b) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) with respect to any fiscal year shall include audited financial statements setting forth the financial position of the Association at the end of such fiscal year and the results of its operations (including the source and application of its funds) for such fiscal year.

“SEC. 328. LIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION AND THE BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall not be deemed to be an insurer or insurance producer within the meaning of any State law, rule, regulation, or order regulating or taxing insurers, insurance producers, or other entities engaged in the business of insurance, including provisions imposing premium taxes, regulating insurer solvency or financial condition, establishing guaranty funds and levying assessments, or requiring claims settlement practices.

“(b) LIABILITY OF BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—No Board member, officer, or employee of the Association shall be personally liable to any person for any action taken or omitted in good faith in any matter within the scope of their responsibilities in connection with the Association.

“SEC. 329. PRESIDENTIAL OVERSIGHT.

“(a) REMOVAL OF BOARD.—If the President determines that the Association is acting in a manner contrary to the interests of the public or the purposes of this subtitle or has failed to perform its duties under this subtitle, the President may remove the entire existing Board for the remainder of the term to which the Board members were appointed and appoint, in accordance with section 324 and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, new Board members to fill the vacancies on the Board for the remainder of the terms.

“(b) REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBER.—The President may remove a Board member only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

“(c) SUSPENSION OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS AND PROHIBITION OF ACTIONS.—Following notice to the Board, the President, or a person designated by the President for such purpose, may suspend the effectiveness of any bylaw or standard, or prohibit any action, of the Association that the President or the designee determines is contrary to the purposes of this subtitle.

“SEC. 330. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

“(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.—State laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions purporting to regulate insurance producers shall be preempted to the extent provided in subsection (b).

“(b) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No State shall—

“(A) impede the activities of, take any action against, or apply any provision of law or regulation arbitrarily or discriminatorily to, any insurance producer because that insurance producer or any affiliate plans to become, has applied to become, or is a member of the Association;

“(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it pay fees different from those required to be paid to that State were it not a member of the Association; or

“(C) impose any continuing education requirements on any nonresident insurance producer that is a member of the Association.

“(2) STATES OTHER THAN A HOME STATE.—No State, other than the home State of a member of the Association, shall—

“(A) impose any licensing, personal or corporate qualifications, education, training, experience, residency, continuing education, or bonding requirement upon a member of the Association that is different from the criteria for membership in the Association or renewal of such membership;

“(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it be licensed, registered, or otherwise qualified to do business or remain in good standing in the State, including any requirement that the insurance producer register as a foreign company with the secretary of state or equivalent State official;

“(C) require that a member of the Association submit to a criminal history record check as a condition of doing business in the State; or

“(D) impose any licensing, registration, or appointment requirements upon a member of the Association, or require a member of the Association to be authorized to operate as an insurance producer, in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance for commercial property and casualty risks to an insured with risks located in more than one State, if the member is licensed or otherwise authorized to operate in the State where the insured maintains its principal place of business and the contract of insurance insures risks located in that State.

“(3) PRESERVATION OF STATE DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit a State from investigating and taking appropriate disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of authority of an insurance producer to do business in a State, in accordance with State law and that is not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, against a member of the Association as a result of a complaint or for any alleged activity, regardless of whether the activity occurred before or after the insurance producer commenced doing business in the State pursuant to Association membership.

“SEC. 331. COORDINATION WITH FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

“The Association shall coordinate with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority in order to ease any administrative burdens that fall on members of the Association that are subject to regulation by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, consistent with the requirements of this subtitle and the Federal securities laws.

“SEC. 332. RIGHT OF ACTION.

“(a) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person aggrieved by a decision or action of the Association may, after reasonably exhausting available avenues for resolution within the Association, commence a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, and obtain all appropriate relief.

“(b) ASSOCIATION INTERPRETATIONS.—In any action under subsection (a), the court shall give appropriate weight to the interpretation of the Association of its bylaws and standards and this subtitle.

“SEC. 333. FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITED.

“The Association may not receive, accept, or borrow any amounts from the Federal Government to pay for, or reimburse, the Association for, the costs of establishing or operating the Association.

“SEC. 334. DEFINITIONS.

“For purposes of this subtitle, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term ‘business entity’ means a corporation, association,

partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other legal entity.

“(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ‘depository institution’ has the meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

“(3) HOME STATE.—The term ‘home State’ means the State in which the insurance producer maintains its principal place of residence or business and is licensed to act as an insurance producer.

“(4) INSURANCE.—The term ‘insurance’ means any product, other than title insurance or bail bonds, defined or regulated as insurance by the appropriate State insurance regulatory authority.

“(5) INSURANCE PRODUCER.—The term ‘insurance producer’ means any insurance agent or broker, excess or surplus lines broker or agent, insurance consultant, limited insurance representative, and any other individual or entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates policies of insurance or offers advice, counsel, opinions or services related to insurance.

“(6) INSURER.—The term ‘insurer’ has the meaning as in section 313(e)(2)(B) of title 31, United States Code.

“(7) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.—The term ‘principal place of business’ means the State in which an insurance producer maintains the headquarters of the insurance producer and, in the case of a business entity, where high-level officers of the entity direct, control, and coordinate the business activities of the business entity.

“(8) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE.—The term ‘principal place of residence’ means the State in which an insurance producer resides for the greatest number of days during a calendar year.

“(9) STATE.—The term ‘State’ includes any State, the District of Columbia, any territory of the United States, and Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(10) STATE LAW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘State law’ includes all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other State action having the effect of law, of any State.

“(B) LAWS APPLICABLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—A law of the United States applicable only to or within the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State law rather than a law of the United States.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle C of title III and inserting the following new items:

“Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

“Sec. 321. National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.

“Sec. 322. Purpose.

“Sec. 323. Membership.

“Sec. 324. Board of directors.

“Sec. 325. Bylaws, standards, and disciplinary actions.

“Sec. 326. Powers.

“Sec. 327. Report by the Association.

“Sec. 328. Liability of the Association and the Board members, officers, and employees of the Association.

“Sec. 329. Presidential oversight.

“Sec. 330. Relationship to State law.

“Sec. 331. Coordination with financial industry regulatory authority.

“Sec. 332. Right of action.

“Sec. 333. Federal funding prohibited.

“Sec. 334. Definitions.”.

TITLE III—BUSINESS RISK MITIGATION AND PRICE STABILIZATION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act of 2014”.

SEC. 302. MARGIN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6s(e)), as added by section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), including the initial and variation margin requirements imposed by rules adopted pursuant to paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii), shall not apply to a swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 2(h)(7)(A), or an exemption issued under section 4(c)(1) from the requirements of section 2(h)(1)(A) for cooperative entities as defined in such exemption, or satisfies the criteria in section 2(h)(7)(D).”.

(b) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT AMENDMENT.—Section 15F(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o-10(e)), as added by section 764(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICABILITY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTERPARTIES.—The requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(ii) and (2)(B)(ii) shall not apply to a security-based swap in which a counterparty qualifies for an exception under section 3C(g)(1) or satisfies the criteria in section 3C(g)(4).”.

SEC. 303. IMPLEMENTATION.

The amendments made by this title to the Commodity Exchange Act shall be implemented—

(1) without regard to—

(A) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) through the promulgation of an interim final rule, pursuant to which public comment will be sought before a final rule is issued; and

(3) such that paragraph (1) shall apply solely to changes to rules and regulations, or proposed rules and regulations, that are limited to and directly a consequence of such amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on S. 2244, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have an incredible opportunity before us in the House today, and that is to move significant bipartisan legislation that can accomplish a number of purposes and that will bring greater stability and certainty to the construction markets, to our insurance companies in dealing with the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act. We can also bring greater certainty and stability to our small factories, to our farmers, and to our ranchers—those who are still suffering in this economy. We can bring them certainty and stability by taking care of an unintended consequence of the Dodd-Frank Act, something called the “end user exception” in the derivative title, which may just be, as interpreted, one of the most damaging regulations that many in this body, perhaps, have not heard of.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this is legislation that has been worked on in a bipartisan manner, sometimes a little contentiously, but we have ended up in a place where, I believe, both Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate should be able to come together.

I think it is important to remember, Mr. Speaker, that, particularly as we go into the holiday season—as we go into Christmas—how many working men and women are still lying awake at night, wondering how they are going to be able to fund Christmas for their children at this time. Although we have seen some modest improvements in this economy, there are still over 9 million of our fellow countrymen who are unemployed. Of the number of underemployed—those who wish to have full-time work but who cannot find it—it is almost twice the number, at 18 million. We have 46 million of our fellow countrymen still on food stamps and 45 million at the poverty rate.

One of the most important things we can do here, Mr. Speaker, is to be able to make a positive contribution for financial stability on our household economies, to give greater economic opportunity, particularly at this time, and that is one of the aspects of S. 2244.

We have had a debate about the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act in this body. I was authorized on behalf of the House to negotiate this particular part of this bill, along with Senator SCHUMER, the gentleman from New York, on the Senate side. Over the course of several weeks and several meetings, we have negotiated language on this. Certainly, it doesn't give everything the House wants, and it doesn't give everything the Senate wants. Such is the nature of negotiations in a free society with divided government. For those who care passionately about the reauthorization, this is a long-term reauthorization bill, which most Members have asked for. It is a 6-year reauthorization.

For those who care about taxpayer protections, as I do, there were im-

provements for taxpayer protection. The trigger level has been doubled before TRIA kicks in, meaning there is greater coverage by the insurance companies, a little less for the taxpayers. As for an artificial ceiling on what the industry will contribute, that artificial ceiling now ceases to be in S. 2244. For the first time, taxpayers will actually get some modest rate of return should they be called upon under TRIA to backstop. These are important improvements, and I think conservative and liberal and Republican and Democrat, hopefully, will see something worthy here.

I will point out it is disconcerting—it is disturbing—that those who have backed so many other provisions in this bill now want to say “no” to being able to have a long-term TRIA reauthorization passed. This bill before us includes this end user exemption, which is so important. This isn't for Wall Street. This is for Main Street. It is for a cattle producer in Kansas, named Tracy Brunner, who said:

This mistaken language in Dodd-Frank may very well force me out of the market, subjecting me to even greater risk. My operation is family run. We are not responsible for the failures that led to the passage of Dodd-Frank.

Yet his family-owned farm in Kansas—1,500 miles away from Wall Street—suffers.

Even the ranking member has acknowledged that there have been some unintended consequences to Dodd-Frank. Recently, she was one of 412 Members of this House to vote in favor of the end user exception, which she, herself, called a “clarification”—not an amendment, not a change, but a clarification.

Mr. Speaker, even Mr. Dodd and Mr. Frank of Dodd-Frank, over 4 years ago in colloquy on the House floor and on the Senate floor, said that these provisions were never meant to harm Main Street America; never meant to apply to end users; never meant to apply to the farmers, the ranchers, and the small factory workers.

We have an opportunity to do something very positive. Now, all of a sudden, some across the aisle have said: We can't do this. We believe this is unrelated to TRIA.

Why did the United States Senate, Mr. Speaker, put in a provision that makes a radical change in the requirements to serve on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve? What did that have to do with TRIA? The Senate put that in. NARAB, the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers—the Senate put that in. Two-thirds of this bill is about NARAB. The Senate put it in.

Mr. Speaker, I am not debating the underlying policy issues, but it is, at best, a little bit disconcerting, if not disingenuous, to say, my Lord, the House shouldn't put in an unrelated

provision when the Senate just did it twice.

Then we heard the Senate will not open up Dodd-Frank. What is the Collins amendment? The Collins amendment was sent over by the Senate, not as part of this legislation. They opened up Dodd-Frank. Then again, to quote the ranking member, this is a “clarification.”

We have an opportunity to pass a bipartisan bill not only to bring some stability and certainty to our insurance markets and to our builders, but to farmers and ranchers and small businesses and hurting families at this holiday season. Without any further delay, we should enact S. 2244, as amended.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to shine a light on what has happened in the development of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. I rise today to talk about the fact that the chairman of our committee, of the Financial Services Committee, did not want, at one point, to reauthorize terrorism risk insurance at all, so he strung out the possibility of negotiations for months.

He had decided that he was not going to reauthorize terrorism insurance, and he will tell you that he offered to negotiate with me. The only thing that I ever remember about a conversation that we had was that my chairman said: I will only negotiate this once—starting out in bad faith.

Time went on, and at some point in time, somebody convinced him that to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program was an honorable thing to do, that it was an American thing to do, that it was an important thing to do. This program had been passed and signed on by the President of the United States after 9/11.

The insurance companies, which insure risk, basically said they cannot model terrorism acts. After 9/11, it was decided that we would mandate that they insure but that we would provide a backstop, that we would provide a backstop to ensure that we could rebuild our communities, that we could rebuild these huge venues—these important places in our lives—in the case of a terrorism attack.

When Mr. HENSARLING finally decided that he would negotiate, he ended up in negotiations with Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. SCHUMER and the Democrats basically conceded and gave in on a lot of things. We supported, originally, the Senate bill. We thought the Senate bill was a fine bill that reauthorized terrorism risk for 7 years; and, of course, it had in it the backstop after \$100 million was spent by the industry, and it basically did everything that we wanted it to have done just as it had started out to do.

Mr. HENSARLING came along, and he decided that he wanted to reduce the

time of the reauthorization. I don't know what he started out with, but we ended up with 6 years instead of 7 years. We gave in.

I remember that he wanted bifurcation in the bill. He wanted to distinguish between what kind of terrorist attack, how much it was worth, and whether some of it was worse than others. He talked about bifurcating in ways that you would distinguish between radiological, biological, chemical, and others. We negotiated and negotiated, and, finally, we got that out of Mr. HENSARLING's mind about bifurcation.

□ 1530

Then the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) said that we needed to reduce our backstop. And instead of backstopping after \$100 million, first he talked about \$500 million, secondly he talked about \$250 million, and finally we got him down to \$200 million. And it is over a 5-year period of time. So we said, okay. We negotiated in good faith. We will go along with the changes. We are willing to concede that you have some different thoughts, and that is okay. Let's come together in a bipartisan way and support the reauthorization of terrorism risk insurance.

I was informed later on that my chairman came back to the table with any number of things that had nothing to do with terrorism risk insurance but had more to do with Dodd-Frank because, unfortunately, my chairman and too many Members on the opposite side of the aisle are intent on dismantling Dodd-Frank in any and every way that they possibly can.

And finally, in those negotiations—the way it has been explained to me—they agreed that they would allow him to add just one aspect of the Dodd-Frank bill that had passed this House, to talk about how agriculture and some other industries could lock in some prices so that they could look forward to what a price would be on those commodities, et cetera, that they would have to purchase.

This had nothing to do with terrorism insurance. So I am not saying to the Members that you shouldn't vote for this bill. What I am pointing out is that this is just another attempt for the chairman to indicate in every way that he possibly can and take advantage of any opportunity that presents itself to get a little something in about Dodd-Frank.

What I worry about is not so much what he has put into TRIA; I worry about what is going into the omnibus bill. I worry about the fact that, in addition to this, there is an attempt—if it has not already been done—to place into the omnibus bill a repeal of part of Dodd-Frank that would prevent the biggest banks in America from taking advantage of our consumers by using their hard-earned money to do risky

derivatives trading, which should be pushed out into their subsidiaries and not have the FDIC in any way protect them in doing this.

So what I say is this. We should know and we should understand exactly how the process works. We should know and understand what is being done and why it is being done. If, in fact, there is so much care and concern about TRIA reauthorization, we should have a clean bill with nothing else in it. If we want to debate Dodd-Frank—what we don't like about it, what we like about it—let's do it straight up. Let's not slip it in at the eleventh hour at a time when our backs are up against the wall, at a time when we are closing down this session. And that is what I am opposed to.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds to thank the ranking member for her fascinating, elongated narrative that proves just how reasonable House Republicans were in this negotiation.

I have to correct her yet again, though, and say that I have never said publicly or privately that we should allow the Federal backstop of terrorism to lapse. She is entitled to her own opinions. She is not entitled to her own facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield myself an additional 10 seconds.

And previously she has said that she has been in favor of this provision. She has been in favor of the end user exemption and has said the bill would clarify the intent of the Wall Street Reform Act. I urge the committee to adopt the bill.

So she was for it before she was against it. But whether it be Biggert-Waters, whether it be Export-Import, whether it be end user, she has changed her mind frequently.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the chief deputy majority whip.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend Chairman HENSARLING for bringing this bipartisan agreement and construct to the House floor. It extends a very important Federal backstop against the risk of terror on the American people, small businesses, and substantial businesses as well. As I have said in the past, it is very important that we reauthorize the TRIA program, and the chairman incorporated diverse opinions, including those from across the aisle.

I also want to commend our colleagues from New York, Congressman GRIMM and Congressman KING, for the important work that they did to bring this about today.

As amended, the bill will ensure that terrorism risk protection is available

for the next 6 years, while lessening the taxpayer burden.

Since September 11, the TRIA program has provided an important Federal backstop for businesses that must insure against the devastation of a future attack.

Congressman HENSARLING has worked with our friends across the aisle to make commonsense changes to this program while ensuring that both businesses and taxpayers are not exposed to the risk of future terrorism attacks.

In addition, as amended, this bill will make some very important technical changes to the Dodd-Frank Act by protecting manufacturers, ranchers, and small businesses that need to hedge against business risk.

While this legislation will become law—and I expect a substantial number of my Democratic colleagues to cross the aisle and vote with almost all of the House Republicans and the Democrat Senate to pass this, and a Democrat President to sign this—I urge my other colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come on over. It is a good reform, a necessary reform, and it is going to be a fantastic strong vote that we are going to have in the House of Representatives to do the right thing, both for the taxpayer, the American people, and small businesses, while at the same time protecting against the devastation of a future attack.

I thank the chairman and I also thank subcommittee chair, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for their work on this very important program. It has been a long process, but it shows that the Financial Services Committee can get the deal done.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to correct the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) who is inviting us to come on over.

We have been inviting them, from day one, to come up with a terrorism risk insurance bill reauthorization. So we have been inviting them to come on over. We have had Members on the opposite side of the aisle who have been pleading with them to come over. We have always had 100 percent support on the Democratic side for the reauthorization of terrorism risk insurance, and the Republicans have basically held us up and only negotiated at the last minute. Don't invite us to come over. They can come on over with us.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the ranking member for her leadership and for yielding and for her hard work on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2244, which is critically important to the economy and national security of

the city I am privileged to represent, New York, and to our Nation at large.

After the terrible attacks on 9/11, insurers realized that they could not accurately model for terrorism risk—it was simply too unpredictable, and the market for terrorism insurance completely dried up. No one could get insured. Businesses stopped. The only place we could get insured was Lloyd's of London, and we lost thousands of jobs and our economy came to a standstill.

In response, Congress came together, united and determined, and, in a bipartisan way, passed the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, or TRIA, which provides a government backstop for terrorism insurance.

The goal of TRIA was to make terrorism insurance affordable and available, and that is exactly what it has done. This has come at no cost whatsoever to the American taxpayer.

This bill represents a true bipartisan compromise, and I commend the gentlemen from Texas, Chairmen HENSARLING and NEUGEBAUER, for working with my colleagues, Senator SCHUMER and Ranking Member WATERS, to reach a deal on TRIA.

Initially, the House TRIA bill raised the trigger for the government backstop by a whopping 500 percent, from \$100 million to \$500 million. This would have forced many small- and medium-sized insurers out of the market entirely and would have actually decreased the amount of terrorism insurance available in our country.

Fortunately, this compromise bill only raises the trigger for the government backstop from \$100 million to \$200 million. This modest increase will ensure that small- and medium-sized insurers are not forced out of the market, while also protecting taxpayers. I fully and completely support this compromise.

Importantly, however, the compromise does not include the so-called “bifurcation” proposal, which would have treated nuclear, biological, chemical, and radiological attacks differently from the so-called “conventional” terrorism attacks. This made no sense whatsoever, and this compromise sensibly drops the proposal entirely.

Finally, I am pleased that this bill reauthorizes TRIA for a full 6 years. This will provide much-needed certainty to businesses across our country as they expand and create jobs.

This compromise will ensure that terrorism insurance remains widely affordable and available. This has always been the underlying purpose of TRIA, and I believe that this bill accomplishes that goal.

I would like to commend the gentlemen from Texas, Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman NEUGEBAUER, for recognizing that a long-term reauthorization of TRIA is incredibly im-

portant for our economy. I thank my good friend from New York, PETER KING. He has been a tireless advocate for TRIA, and without his hard work on this bill, we wouldn't be voting on this compromise today. And I thank the gentlewoman from California, Ranking Member WATERS, for working with me on this bill.

I would like to particularly thank my colleague from New York, Senator SCHUMER, for his excellent work in negotiating this compromise.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill because it is the right thing to do for America.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from New York, the ranking member of the Capital Markets Subcommittee, for her support.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), the chairman of the Financial Services Housing and Insurance Subcommittee, the champion and author of the House TRIA bill, and the author of the amendment here. I thank him for his work.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion about this bill, and people were talking about reforms. And you know what? I think what the American people need to understand is why these reforms are important to them. The reason they are important to them is, quite honestly, right now, the taxpayers in this country are underwriting part of the risk for terrorism attacks in this country for the property owners.

What this bill does is it begins to bring certainty for the industry, for the insurers, and also certainty for the people who are building the new buildings and apartment houses and shopping centers and other types of public facilities. It gives them the certainty of what the policy is going to be over the next few years. But I think the important part is that the taxpayers are an additional cushion that is being put between them and any potential loss.

One of the things that has been mentioned, we raised the trigger from \$100 million to \$200 million. That is an important part of that. I think the other issue that we have tried to do with this in order to create this certainty was, we didn't change the overall structure of the TRIA program. We have tried to keep it within the confines of how it has been operating over the last few years, that way, creating the least amount of certainty that we could.

I think the part that isn't mentioned a lot of times is the fact that we did leave in place a deductible, and basically the industry has to take the first loss up to about 20 percent of their annualized premium for the previous year. Today, on an industry-wide basis, that is about \$40 billion. So if you have

got a \$200 million trigger, you have got a \$40 billion cushion between the taxpayers and a potential loss.

The other thing that we did in this bill is we said when we get to the point where after the deductible the taxpayers start sharing that loss, then the taxpayers' portion moves from 85 percent to 80 percent. So that is another cushion.

I think one of the things that we want to let the folks know also is that an additional protection that was built into this bill was the amount of money that the taxpayers could recover if, in fact, they had to put additional money into the TRIA program. So now we have increased that amount substantially.

□ 1545

I am feeling good that we are moving in the right direction, but ultimately, what we need to do is get the taxpayers out of the insurance business. When you look across the board where the taxpayers are having to underwrite insurance-type losses, whether it be flood insurance or mortgage insurance, quite honestly, the government doesn't do well at pricing those.

There are some good things in this bill besides the TRIA reform in that we have that NARAB II. What is that? Well, that is a good small business bill. A lot of people have independent insurance agents in their districts or in their communities or in their States that may want to write business in other States.

To do that today, they have to go pass another license, take another license in that other State. Under NARAB II, they would be able to take their existing license if they meet the requirements in other States and follow those laws. They would be able to underwrite that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, the third piece of this legislation that is important is that we are going to help farmers, ranchers, and small businesses be able to cover the risks that they need without taking a lot of their operating capital, putting that operating capital into a plant, into equipment so they can hire and create more jobs in America. These are all issues that have had bipartisan support in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I now urge my colleagues: let's do something good for the American people, and let's pass S. 2244, as amended.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure, as those who are watching this on C-SPAN across

the Nation, we can comfortably say that what we have in motion on the floor of the House of Representatives is something that Alexander Hamilton leaned over and said to Thomas Jefferson: "My friend, what we have here is an old-fashioned, good old compromise."

Compromise, a word that has been out of our lexicon for so long that the American people are looking for us to put it back in. Well, that is what we have on this floor. It is a compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member because of her tenacity and her leadership because in his vision on the other side, the distinguished Chairman HENSARLING, who is a very good friend, in his own way sought for a \$500 million trigger.

We on our side felt that we wanted to hold to the \$100 million trigger which is when the actual Federal assistance would go into action, and we knew that that was further. I commend the ranking member and I certainly commend Mr. HENSARLING for agreeing and recognizing that we would come to the 200 level.

I also want to thank Mr. HENSARLING for including in this NARAB, that is such an important measure, and many people may not realize this, but we have worked on NARAB for 10 years in the Financial Services Committee. It has been a major part of my whole legislative history in this body every year working on it.

I want to thank you, Chairman HENSARLING, for listening to us, talking, and agreeing to make this a part of this bill that we have before us. Thank you very much for doing that.

The other part, I want to thank both, and I certainly want to thank our ranking member for her wisdom in compromising on the end user. Now, we all know of the differences with Dodd-Frank. I tried to have a clear view on this, and it was very important that we make this technical change, so that we don't let our ranchers, our farmers, and our manufacturers—none of which had anything to do with the Wall Street debacle and none of which are financial institutions—that we will exempt them from the cumbersome and the overbearing need to put margins out when they are doing swaps and derivatives.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an excellent bill, it is a good bill, and it is one that we urge to move forward.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds just to say I heard so many kind words from my friend from Georgia that maybe I need to go back and reexamine the bill; but, indeed, compromise is not a vice, as long as you are advancing your principles, and both sides can advance their principles in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), a valued member of the Financial Services Committee, a tireless ad-

vocate—and occasionally tiring advocate—for TRIA reauthorization.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his mostly kind words.

Very seriously Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. At the outset, let me thank Chairman HENSARLING; Chairman NEUGEBAUER; Ranking Member WATERS; my good friend, Mrs. MALONEY from New York; and also Senator SCHUMER.

As the gentleman from Georgia said, this has been a long and winding road, but we have arrived at a compromise which I believe is worthy of the support of all Members of this body, certainly those of us who strongly support TRIA.

I have been a supporter of TRIA going back now 12, 13 years because after 9/11, we realized it was absolutely essential that TRIA be enacted for not just New York to be rebuilt, but also so that construction be allowed to go forward anywhere around the country where there could be a risk of a terrorist attack which is why Major League Baseball, the NFL, NASCAR, and virtually every large university in the country supports TRIA.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise, and it is a compromise where all of us can find some fault with it, but the bottom line is the essence of TRIA has been sustained, and as we go forward, it is essential, I believe—strongly believe—that it be extended.

Let's make it clear there has not been 1 cent of Federal money expended on TRIA, but during the 13 years it has been in effect, we have had billions of dollars in construction, jobs, and revenues coming into the Federal Government. There is also not one Federal employee involved in administering TRIA.

Mr. Speaker, we are where we are, and 6 years to have that certitude is absolutely essential. I respect those on the other side who may have objections to added provisions in the bill. I would just say: let us keep our eyes on the prize. For those of us who realize how important TRIA is, we are never going to get all we want. I happen to fully support the provision for end users, but even if I didn't, I would still support this bill because it is so essential.

Mr. Speaker, let me just also say in closing that in addition to those I have mentioned, let me also acknowledge Congressman GRIMM for the outstanding work that he has done on this from the day he first came to this body.

In closing, I urge all Members, both parties and both Houses, to support this bill. It is a solid piece of legislation, and all of us can be proud for voting for it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and Members, a special appreciation to Mr. KING who has

worked very, very hard on both sides of the aisle to try and make sure that we did not abandon our citizens in this country and leave them at risk in case of a terrorist attack.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, my chairman held us up for a long time and would not negotiate. He finally came around, but this is typical. He mentioned the flood insurance bill. We never could get him to negotiate on that, and so we had to bypass him to make sure that we didn't put our homeowners at risk. As he mentioned the Ex-Im bill, he has only supported extension of that for a short period of time.

When it comes to helping our citizens and the least of them, it seems as if my chairmen have problems with providing for the average citizen on Main Street, but no problems when we talk about how we can enhance the ability of the biggest banks in America and others to get richer and richer. I thought it would be worthwhile to shed some light on those comments that he made about Ex-Im and about flood and now about TRIA.

We are glad, we are very happy that he finally saw the light, even if he had to insert a little something in it, and he came around, and he is now on the side of the people. This is about patriotism. This is about American citizens. This is about protecting our cities and our neighborhoods at a time when this country has to be sure that it is focused on the safety and security of our citizens.

It is no time to dither around with whether or not we will rebuild neighborhoods in these important venues in case of a terrorist attack; so, yes, we have a compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the Democratic side of the aisle on this. As I said, Democrats were fully supportive of the reauthorization of the terrorism risk insurance program from day one. We have never ever wavered. None of us have ever tried in any way to reduce the program, to change the trigger, et cetera, but we did compromise as we said.

Now, let me speak to the end user part of this. Yes, I worked with Mr. DAVID SCOTT and others because I have always said that on Dodd-Frank, that we have a responsibility to implement what is in law, but I always said I would support technical changes and I would support ways that we work together to straighten out things that were not clear in Dodd-Frank. I have never said that I would not be at the table to deal with these kinds of technical changes, and I was.

When I got up today, I didn't speak about being against the bill. I spoke about what has happened that led us to this point, why we are at the eleventh hour, and the way that the negotiations went on.

Again, TRIA is important, and it should be reauthorized. I wish it had

been a clean bill. It is not, and I hope that we are not going to have to have attempts to undermine Dodd-Frank in every bill that comes along where my chairman sees an opportunity to try and slide something in at the eleventh hour.

I hope that when we talk about negotiations and trying to get together to compromise, to work on things that are in the best interests of this country, that nobody will play games with us, no one will lead us to the point where our backs are up against the wall at the eleventh hour, but we will openly debate these issues, we will listen to the pros and cons on these issues and that we hopefully will come together in the best interests of all of the citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield myself 10 seconds for, Mr. Speaker, those who may be listening could be confused, as are those in the Chamber. I am very curious whether the ranking member is opposed or supporting this bill as amended. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, as I said to you when I first got up, I said to you I wanted to shine light on the bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Does the gentlewoman oppose or support?

Ms. WATERS. And I have done that.

Mr. HENSARLING. It is obvious the gentlelady refuses to answer the question.

Ms. WATERS. Before I finish my remarks on this bill, I will tell you what my position is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and a distinguished member of the House Financial Services Committee as well.

Mr. LUCAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2244, a bill to extend the expiration date of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act. Specifically, I support H.R. 634, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act that is included as a part of this larger effort.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 634 provides critical regulatory relief to end users, the market participants, businesses, and job creators that use derivatives to manage the risks they face in their daily operations. For example, farmers who need to hedge against the volatility of crop prices and manufacturers who need to hedge against the rising input costs of fuel use derivatives as a part of their business plans.

During the consideration of the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress clearly intended to exempt end users from some of the most costly new regulations,

such as margin requirements. Margin requirements needlessly divert working capital away from job-creating production and investment; however, the CFTC has narrowly interpreted the law which has negatively impacted end users and their bottom line.

Mr. Speaker, including the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act in today's bill permanently fixes this issue for end users. It ensures that those businesses which have been exempted from clearing requirements of their trades are also exempted from margining their trades, just as Congress always intended.

The language in H.R. 634 has passed through the Committee on Agriculture by a voice vote and then through the House four other times. As a stand-alone bill, it passed with the support of 411 Members. Other times, as part of a larger package, it continued to receive overwhelming bipartisan support. The House of Representatives has spoken clearly on this issue: end users should not be required to post margin on their transactions.

I thank the chairman for including the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilizations Act in today's bill. It is time to give our farms and our businesses the relief they need from this costly and damaging rule. I urge a vote for TRIA.

□ 1600

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Today I call on my colleagues to pass reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program, a public-private partnership that is vital to continued economic development across the country.

Following the tragic events of 9/11, terrorism became uninsurable. Many insurers left the market, and rates skyrocketed. As a result, thousands of small businesses were impacted, causing job losses and hindering the recovery effort. To address the growing market gap, Congress passed the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, creating a Federal backstop and enticing insurers back.

I can say without a doubt, our efforts were successful. I have witnessed firsthand how this program has helped New York City recover and prosper over the past 12 years. TRIA has provided thousands of small businesses with the certainty needed to manage long-term costs, grow reliably, and create new jobs. In fact, the program has tripled the number of small businesses that have terrorism protection since 2002. Today, over 60 percent of firms now have coverage.

TRIA also ensures rates remain affordable. Under the program, terrorism

coverage averages just 3 to 5 percent of a small business' annual insurance premium.

Is today's bill perfect? No, but it will restore certainty to the marketplace and prevent a rate spike that could force two-thirds of small businesses to stop carrying coverage.

Mr. Speaker, the Government Accountability Office has stated that terrorism remains an uninsurable risk. In light of such findings, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program continues to be a vital component of our economic growth and national security. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to yield a small amount of time to any Democrat Member on the floor who intends to vote "no" on S. 2244, as amended, because I have not heard one say that yet.

Mr. Speaker, I have no takers.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is the incoming chairman of our Housing and Insurance Subcommittee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman NEUGEBAUER for their tireless work on this important issue, and I tell my colleagues that while TRIA is an important program, it is also in need of reform. This bill that we are considering today does just that in a responsible way, and I urge support of it.

Let there be no mistake: this bill reforms the TRIA program. It takes important steps to protect taxpayer dollars and ensure that industry has more skin in the game. Also, I remind my colleagues that without TRIA, it is entirely possible that taxpayers would be on the hook for the entire bill in the wake of a terrorist attack. This legislation includes a strong recoupment mechanism and a higher threshold for Federal assistance, building a program that has a long-term reauthorization with greater protections for taxpayers.

The legislation we are considering today, however, does more than reauthorize TRIA. It also contains important language to ensure derivative end users, including farmers, ranchers, utilities, airlines, and small businesses, can lock in prices, remove volatility from the marketplace, and keep consumer prices stable.

Without this fix, those farmers, ranchers, and Main Street businesses will have to post margin against trades they enter into for the sole purpose of managing their commercial risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage and support of this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the ranking member for her hard work and focus and dedication for getting this done. I know that any time you have things added to a bill so

it is not a clean bill, it makes it difficult. But I thank her and the chairman for working together to make this happen because this is a major bill, significantly important.

As we learned, I think, from the impact of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, this was substantial. When you look at the losses, it was about \$32.5 billion, or \$42.9 billion in 2013 dollars. It was the largest insurance loss in global history at that time. And prior to 9/11, insurance companies generally covered all of the costs of terrorist attacks. After 9/11, terrorism risk insurance quickly became either unavailable or very, very expensive and unaffordable. Furthermore, premiums for workers' compensation insurance increased significantly, and real estate and commercial ventures were stalled because of an inability to attain the requisite insurance coverage.

Now, 9/11 happened in New York, and so, yes, you see New York and New York City Members here supporting the bill. But this is not a bill just about New York. It is about all of America because they did not attack for New York; they attacked New York because it was part of America. We don't know, and we pray that we don't have another attack ever on our homeland again, but it could be somewhere else. It doesn't have to be New York. This is when we should rally around as Americans, as patriots, to ensure that we continue our economy flowing and moving. That is why, even though there are things added and certain things that people don't like, we are trying to figure out how we get this right because it is too important to America to allow TRIA to expire.

Furthermore, when you examine TRIA, it costs taxpayers virtually nothing, yet it continues to provide tangible benefits to our overall economy. TRIA allows for terrorism insurance market stability, affordability, and availability so that those in business, et cetera, can know, predict, and be confident that we will continue to move on. TRIA is a critical part of the U.S. economy's security infrastructure and would ensure a swift recovery in the event of a significant terrorist attack.

Now, in New York, I am proud we have the Freedom Towers up because it also sends a message, is a symbol to those who don't like us that you can't keep us down, that we will get back up on our feet, stronger and better than ever, and that is what makes this country the great country that we are going to rally around and work with one another.

So this TRIA bill is significantly important, and I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on TRIA.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the incoming chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the chairman of the Financial Services Committee for his tenacity and hard work to make sure the American taxpayer is protected, on the hook just a little bit less for the next terrorism attack that could happen in our country, and the private sector is on a little bit more.

I am encouraged by this bipartisan bill because it ensures that my constituents in central, northern, and western Wisconsin can purchase affordable terrorism risk insurance. This 6-year reauthorization is a backstop for all Americans. This is not just a bill for New York, as my friends have mentioned, or Chicago or L.A., but it helps small town America. If you have a small mall in your community or for Lambeau Field in Green Bay, Wisconsin, they can purchase terrorism risk insurance. The reauthorization of this program is incredibly important.

I want to note one other important part, and that is the requirement that we have a community banker as part of the Federal Reserve, making sure that as the Fed goes in to a larger role with rules and regulations, they have a perspective and a view that takes into account small community banks all around America that right now are being crushed by overburdensome rules and regulations.

I commend the chairman on the bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), a valued member of our committee.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I appreciate his work on this very important bill, as well as the work of the subcommittee chairman, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, for this 6-year reauthorization of the terrorism risk insurance bill.

This bill protects taxpayers by reforming the program to reduce potential taxpayer costs associated with the terrorism risk reinsurance program. It builds capacity in the private insurance market, and it ensures access to terrorism insurance for communities like mine in Columbus, Ohio, and southern Ohio, as well as all around America.

The bill provides meaningful reforms by reducing the government's share of losses over time, by increasing the triggering amount over time, and ensuring that the Federal recoupment is increased over time. It also provides important transparency on data collection that will in the future let us know how much money insurance companies are billing for terrorism coverage and what the potential exposure is for terrorism losses. Those are all good things. The other thing that is good is it will build capacity in the private marketplace. When we increase the

trigger, we build capacity in the private marketplace.

But the most important thing is the certainty this bill creates. A multiyear reauthorization ensures that businesses across Ohio and across the entire country get access to terrorism insurance for multiple years. It creates certainty. It is good for jobs, and it is good for commercial development and construction. I think this bill is a very important reform and a great move forward.

I again want to applaud the chairman for all of his work on it, and I applaud the bipartisan support this bill is getting today. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, in that case, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the TRIA amendment to the Senate bill S. 2244 and overall reauthorization, and I really would like to commend Chairman HENSARLING and his staff for their hard work throughout this process.

TRIA's reauthorization is not a Wall Street or big business issue; I believe it is a conservative issue. Illinois and American jobs and prosperity are at stake. If TRIA is not authorized, Illinois' small insurers may be subject to costly rating downgrades or have to exit certain insurance markets altogether, leaving customers in the lurch. In the event of an attack, potential targets like Soldier Field or Chicago skyscrapers would be left without protection for massive economic losses.

TRIA protects the taxpayers because it sets the terms of how our country will cover losses before, instead of after, a terrorist attack.

The Rand Institute has estimated that it protects our taxpayers by as much as \$7 billion. TRIA also ensures the continued viability of long-term construction projects. One estimate found that for the first 14 months after the 9/11 attack, \$15.5 billion of real estate projects in 17 States were stalled or canceled because of continuing scarcity of terrorism insurance. So this backstop either costs very little if it is never used, or it saves taxpayers money if it is.

Each program deserves continuous oversight and periodic review, and TRIA is no different. I commend Chairman HENSARLING for his commitment to examine the program. I believe that

this reauthorization contains conservative reforms that protect the taxpayers from excessive loss and still ensures a functioning terrorism insurance market that doesn't punish businesses—such as Illinois' small insurers—for offering this much-needed terrorism insurance. The end user provision passed by the Financial Services Committee with unanimous support sailed through the House with 411 votes. Congress should come together to support reasonable, bipartisan reforms that provide much-needed relief for Main Street America.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization, known as TRIA.

I would like to commend Chairman HENSARLING and Congressman NEUGEBAUER.

TRIA does not curtail terrorism, but this legislation does protect taxpayers, promotes stable markets, and enhances economic certainty in the face of terrorism.

Another important provision included in this legislation is the bipartisan legislation known as the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act, which the House has passed by 411–12. This is a basic but very important clarification to the highly regulatory Dodd-Frank Act. This reform will ensure that end users, such as manufacturers, ranchers, and small companies, are not subject to the burdensome margin and capital surcharge requirements imposed by the Dodd-Frank Act.

□ 1615

Even the creators of Dodd-Frank have argued in favor of exempting these end users from margin requirements.

Without this essential clarification, small Main Street businesses will have to post additional margins against trades that they enter into for the sole purpose of managing commercial risk.

These transactions do not pose a systemic risk to our financial systems, and they did not cause the 2008 financial crisis. A failure to address this issue will cause serious harm to the Main Street economy.

Instead of investing and expanding their business to create jobs, small business owners are being forced to direct resources to comply with more burdensome and unnecessary regulations coming out of Washington.

This is not a controversial issue. This is a bipartisan provision that 181 Democrats in Congress have already voted for in support. We must not play politics with something as important as TRIA, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM), who for months has played a leading role in bringing both the TRIA title and the end user exemption title to S. 2244.

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation.

But before I begin, I would like to say a very special thank you to Chairman JEB HENSARLING for his outstanding leadership on this bill, as well as Chairman NEUGEBAUER and Ranking Member WATERS.

I am proud to have worked so long and so hard in what I would say was truly a bipartisan manner, so let me also thank and acknowledge my senior Senator from New York, CHUCK SCHUMER, for his tireless efforts and for making TRIA reauthorization one of his top priorities.

I also want to thank my good friend and colleague from New York, PETER KING, for being such a champion on this issue.

As someone who witnessed the tragedy of 9/11 firsthand, and as a Member whose district saw the greatest loss of life during the September 11 attacks, I know all too well the destruction and the suffering that is caused by terrorism. However, as a proud New Yorker, I have also seen the tremendous recovery, a recovery that has taken place since that fateful day. But in order to ensure that such a recovery would be possible in the face of, God forbid, a future attack on our country, as well as to ensure the further economic development across the United States, we must ensure the continuation of TRIA and the vitally important insurance coverage that it provides to projects and facilities that create so many American jobs, like the pending Hudson Yards project in Manhattan, or the Barclay's Center in Brooklyn, as well as our hospitals and universities, such as the Staten Island University Hospital and the College of Staten Island.

I would also like to add my strong support for the inclusion of my legislation, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stabilization Act, which passed, I believe, this House with 411 votes right here in this Chamber and does anything but undermine Dodd-Frank. In fact, what it does, it will actually ensure that commercial end users of derivatives contracts will not be subject to costly and unnecessary margin requirements that needlessly tie up capital and impede job creation.

With that, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this critical, commonsense legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I am pleased that I had an opportunity to be on the floor today managing this legislation on behalf of my caucus. I am pleased that I was able to shine some

light and create some transparency on what has transpired over a long period of time. I am sorry that it had to take this long. I am sorry that my chairman at first refused to support reauthorization. He finally came around and that is good. The negotiations took place and there was a compromise. That compromise is not everything certainly that we would have wanted, but at least it is a compromise that will allow terrorism risk insurance program reauthorization. That is extremely important for all of the reasons that you have heard on the floor here today.

I want to say to my friends on the opposite side of the aisle—some of whom I talked with when it was unclear what the chairman was going to do—I am so pleased that we have been able to relieve your anxiety about what was going to happen. I know that many of you early on were in support of the reauthorization of the terrorism risk insurance program just as it had been framed in the Senate.

So now we are at the point where we have flushed out the fact that this terrorism risk insurance program reauthorization is needed, that businesses and our citizens deserve it, and they should have it. We have also flushed out that adding to this legislation a Dodd-Frank concern was not necessary. It is this kind of interference with the process that oftentimes causes confusion. We would hope that this kind of legislating would not continue.

Let's take up these issues in a way that they are clear, that they can be debated, that we can hear from both sides of the aisle, we can hear the pros and cons, without having to drag it out until the last moment when we feel that you have the opposition up against a wall and they have no choice but to accept whatever you have done because you have a legitimate issue that is before us, even when that issue is attached to something that has nothing to do with that main issue.

Having said that, I am going to move on because we still have work to do as we move toward trying to make sure that we do not shut down this government, that we have the omnibus bill to fund the government and to keep it operating. I am going to move on to deal with the fact that just as this was inserted, the end user provision was inserted in this bill.

In the omnibus bill, we have an even more difficult situation to try and resolve. As a matter of fact, we know that our citizens are at great risk because there is an attempt to repeal an important part of the Dodd-Frank legislation. There is an attempt to make sure that somehow the biggest banks in America have an opportunity to use the taxpayers' dollars to do risky trading and put the taxpayers at risk one more time of having to bail out these institutions that have used the taxpayers' money that was protected by

FDIC, have used their money to do this risky trading.

We simply ask in Dodd-Frank for some of these trades, for some of these derivatives trading ideas, not to be placed in such a fashion that they would cause us to have to say to our consumers and our taxpayers, once again, we are going to have to bail out some big bank because they have failed. We need to protect our consumers, we need to protect our taxpayers. All they have to do is push out, push out these derivatives into their subsidies where they don't have the taxpayers' protection.

So I am going to be working on that. I am going to stand here today and say to my chairman, I am going to ask for an "aye" vote on the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act, and I am going to vote for it. Will you work with me to pay attention to the omnibus bill and help me to negotiate tonight to get out of that bill the risky trading that is now being put back in the bill, the same bill that came through our committee, that was written by Citicorp, that would allow this to happen? Will you work with me to try and prevent this from happening and prevent another bailout of the biggest banks in America with taxpayers' dollars? I am going to support TRIA. Will the gentleman support me getting rid of that in the omnibus bill?

Mr. HENSARLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for the answer.

Mr. HENSARLING. I would point out to the gentlewoman, as I think she knows, it was the Democrat Senate who I believe is putting this in the bill, so perhaps she could negotiate that with Senator SCHUMER.

Ms. WATERS. The gentleman knows that he was involved in the negotiation for placing that in the omnibus bill. I have raised a question with you, even though you are saying you had nothing to do with—

Mr. HENSARLING. Will the gentleman yield on that one point?

Ms. WATERS. Reclaiming my time, I simply asked the gentleman if he would join me in helping, whether he was part of the negotiations or not, as the chair of the Financial Services Committee, where this is one of the biggest issues that we have been confronted with. I know that you care enough about the consumers that you would not want them to have to bail out another AIG, another big bank. I know that you don't want that. I am simply saying that I am going to support the reauthorization of terrorism risk insurance. Will the gentleman support helping to get rid of that risky derivative trading opportunity that has been placed into the omnibus bill by your side of the aisle?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I am glad that the ranking member has had yet another change of heart from her opposition to S. 2244, as amended, that she articulated last evening. It is fascinating to me that as she characterizes other Members of Congress as unpredictable, I guess it is somewhat predictable now that she will change her opinion. I am glad she did.

Rarely have I seen in my congressional career a Member of the House come to the floor quite so vociferous and quite so grumpy about a bill that they have previously supported and now ultimately choose to support. Regrettably, frequently when the ranking member comes to the floor, we enter into a fact-free zone.

I have not been involved in any of the negotiations on the omnibus. If I were involved, we would have far more Dodd-Frank relief in there, since it is a bill that was aimed at Wall Street, hits Main Street, and working men and women across our country are collateral damage. Our economy has slowed down, families can't find work, they have no financial security because of what Dodd-Frank is doing—the sheer weight, volume, complexity load of the regulatory burden. As unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats try to run this economy, they have run it into the ground.

Be that as it may, I look forward to working with the ranking member so that we can get more Dodd-Frank relief to Americans and get this country back to work.

Finally, I once again wish to thank and offer my gratitude to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman NEUGEBAUER, whose leadership in bringing this bill to the floor was indispensable. He has been a rock throughout these proceedings. Every Member who supports the end user exemption, who supports the TRIA compromise, owes an incredible debt of gratitude to Chairman NEUGEBAUER of Lubbock, Texas. I am proud to serve with him on the House Financial Services Committee.

I urge an "aye" vote for all Members of Congress on S. 2244, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the inclusion of H.R. 634, the Business Risk Mitigation and Price Stability Act, as Title III of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. This language, which was also included in H.R. 4413, the Customer Protection and End-User Relief Act, provides an important protection to end-users from costly margining requirements that will divert need capital away from job creation.

I support of this title, I would like to request that the pertinent portions of the Committee on Agriculture report to accompany H.R. 4413 be included in the appropriate place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TITLE 3—END-USER RELIEF

SUBTITLE A—END-USER EXEMPTION FROM MARGIN REQUIREMENTS

Section 311—End-user margin requirements

Section 311 amends Section 4s(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) as added by Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Act to provide an explicit exemption from margin requirements for swap transactions involving end-users that qualify for the clearing exception under 2(h)(7)(A).

"End-users" are thousands of companies across the United States who utilize derivatives to hedge risks associated with their day-to-day operations, such as fluctuations in the prices of raw materials. Because these businesses do not pose systemic risk, Congress intended that the Dodd-Frank Act provide certain exemptions for end-users to ensure they were not unduly burdened by new margin and capital requirements associated with their derivatives trades that would hamper their ability to expand and create jobs.

Indeed, Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act includes an exemption for non-financial end-users from centrally clearing their derivatives trades. This exemption permits end-users to continue trading directly with a counterparty, (also known as trading "bilaterally," or over-the-counter (OTC)) which means their swaps are negotiated privately between two parties and they are not executed and cleared using an exchange or clearinghouse. Generally, it is common for non-financial end-users, such as manufacturers, to avoid posting cash margin for their OTC derivative trades. End-users generally will not post margin because they are able to negotiate such terms with their counterparties due to the strength of their own balance sheet or by posting non-cash collateral, such as physical property. End-users typically seek to preserve their cash and liquid assets for reinvestment in their businesses. In recognition of this common practice, the Dodd-Frank Act included an exemption from margin requirements for end-users for OTC trades.

Section 731 of the Dodd-Frank Act (and Section 764 with respect to security-based swaps) requires margin requirements be applied to swap dealers and major swap participants for swaps that are not centrally cleared. For swap dealers and major swap participants that are banks, the prudential banking regulators (such as the Federal Reserve or Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) are required to set the margin requirements. For swap dealers and major swap participants that are not banks, the CFTC is required to set the margin requirements. Both the CFTC and the banking regulators have issued their own rule proposals establishing margin requirements pursuant to Section 731.

Following the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Act in July of 2010, uncertainty arose regarding whether this provision permitted the regulators to impose margin requirements on swap dealers when they trade with end-users, which could then result in either a direct or indirect margin requirement on end-users. Subsequently, Senators Blanche Lincoln and Chris Dodd sent a letter to then-Chairmen Barney Frank and Collin Peterson on June 30, 2010, to set forth and clarify congressional intent, stating:

The legislation does not authorize the regulators to impose margin on end-users, those exempt entities that use swaps to hedge or mitigate commercial risk. If regulators raise the costs of end-user transactions, they may

create more risk. It is imperative that the regulators do not unnecessarily divert working capital from our economy into margin accounts, in a way that would discourage hedging by end-users or impair economic growth.

In addition, statements in the legislative history of section 731 (and Section 764) suggests that Congress did not intend, in enacting this section, to impose margin requirements on nonfinancial end-users engaged in hedging activities, even in cases where they entered into swaps with swap entities.

In the CFTC's proposed rule on margin, it does not require margin for un-cleared swaps when non-bank swap dealers transact with non-financial end-users. However, the prudential banking regulators proposed rules would require margin be posted by non-financial end-users above certain established thresholds when they trade with swap dealers that are banks. Many of end-users' transactions occur with swap dealers that are banks, so the banking regulators' proposed rule is most relevant, and therefore of most concern, to end-users.

By the prudential banking regulators' own terms, their proposal to require margin stems directly from what they view to be a legal obligation under Title VII. The plain language of section 731 provides that the Agencies adopt rules for covered swap entities imposing margin requirements on all non-cleared swaps. Despite clear congressional intent, those sections do not, by their terms, exclude a swap with a counterparty that is a commercial end-user. By providing an explicit exemption under Title VII through enactment of this provision, the prudential regulators will no longer have a perceived legal obligation, and the congressional intent they acknowledge in their proposed rule will be implemented.

The Committee notes that in September of 2013, the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and the Bank of International Settlements published their final recommendations for margin requirements for uncleared derivatives. Representatives from a number of U.S. regulators, including the CFTC and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve participated in the development of those margin requirements, which are intended to set baseline international standards for margin requirements. It is the intent of the Committee that any margin requirements promulgated under the authority provided in Section 4s of the Commodity Exchange Act should be generally consistent with the international margin standards established by IOSCO.

On March 14, 2013, at a hearing entitled "Examining Legislative Improvements to Title VII of the Dodd-Frank Act," the following testimony was provided to the Committee with respect to provisions included in Section 311:

In approving the Dodd-Frank Act, Congress made clear that end-users were not to be subject to margin requirements. Nonetheless, regulations proposed by the Prudential Banking Regulators could require end-users to post margin. This stems directly from what they view to be a legal obligation under Title VII. While the regulations proposed by the CFTC are preferable, they do not provide end-users with the certainty that legislation offers. According to a Coalition for Derivatives End-Users survey, a 3% initial margin requirement could reduce capital spending by as much as \$5.1 to \$6.7 billion among S&P 500 companies alone and cost 100,000 to 130,000 jobs. To shed some light on Honeywell's potential exposure to margin require-

ments, we had approximately \$2 billion of hedging contracts outstanding at year-end that would be defined as a swap under Dodd-Frank. Applying 3% initial margin and 10% variation margin implies a potential margin requirement of \$260 million. Cash deposited in a margin account cannot be productively deployed in our businesses and therefore detracts from Honeywell's financial performance and ability to promote economic growth and protect American jobs.—Mr. James E. Colby, Assistant Treasurer, Honeywell International Inc.

On May 21, 2013, at a hearing entitled "The Future of the CFTC: Market Perspectives," Mr. Stephen O'Connor, Chairman, ISDA, provided the following testimony with respect to provisions included in Section 311:

Perhaps most importantly, we do not believe that initial margin will contribute to the shared goal of reducing systemic risk and increasing systemic resilience. When robust variation margin practices are employed, the additional step of imposing initial margin imposes an extremely high cost on both market participants and on systemic resilience with very little countervailing benefit. The Lehman and AIG situations highlight the importance of variation margin. AIG did not follow sound variation margin practices, which resulted in dangerous levels of credit risk building up, ultimately leading to its bailout. Lehman, on the other hand, posted daily variation margin, and while its failure caused shocks in many markets, the variation margin prevented outsized losses in the OTC derivatives markets. While industry and regulators agree on a robust variation margin regime including all appropriate products and counterparties, the further step of moving to mandatory IM [initial margin] does not stand up to any rigorous cost-benefit analysis.

Based on the extensive background that accompanies the statutory change provided explicitly in Section 311, the Committee intends that initial and variation margin requirements cannot be imposed on uncleared swaps entered into by cooperative entities if they similarly qualify for the CFTC's cooperative exemption with respect to cleared swaps. Cooperative entities did not cause the financial crisis and should not be required to incur substantial new costs associated with posting initial and variation margin to counterparties. In the end, these costs will be borne by their members in the form of higher prices and more limited access to credit, especially in underserved markets, such as in rural America. Therefore the Committee's clear intent when drafting Section 311 was to prohibit the CFTC and prudential regulators, including the Farm Credit Administration, from imposing margin requirements on cooperative entities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 775, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4861; suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2719; and suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1204.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 7, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—417

Adams	Costa	Griffin (AR)
Aderholt	Cotton	Griffith (VA)
Amodei	Courtney	Grijalva
Bachmann	Cramer	Grimm
Bachus	Crawford	Guthrie
Barber	Crenshaw	Gutiérrez
Barletta	Crowley	Hahn
Barr	Cuellar	Hanabusa
Barrow (GA)	Culberson	Hanna
Barton	Cummings	Harper
Bass	Daines	Harris
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hartzler
Becerra	Davis, Danny	Hastings (FL)
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Hastings (WA)
Bentivolio	DeFazio	Heck (NV)
Bera (CA)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Bilirakis	Delaney	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (NY)	DelBene	Higgins
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Himes
Black	Dent	Hinojosa
Blackburn	DeSantis	Holding
Blumenauer	DesJarlais	Holt
Bonamici	Deutch	Honda
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Horsford
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Doggett	Hudson
Braley (IA)	Doyle	Huelskamp
Brat	Duffy	Huffman
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Brooks (IN)	Edwards	Hunter
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Hurt
Brownley (CA)	Ellmers	Israel
Buchanan	Engel	Issa
Bucshon	Enyart	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Eshoo	Jeffries
Bustos	Esty	Jenkins
Butterfield	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Byrne	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Calvert	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Fincher	Jolly
Capito	Fitzpatrick	Jordan
Capps	Fleischmann	Joyce
Cárdenas	Fleming	Kaptur
Carney	Flores	Keating
Carson (IN)	Forbes	Kelly (IL)
Carter	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Cartwright	Foster	Kennedy
Cassidy	Fox	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Kilmer
Castro (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Chaffetz	Fudge	King (NY)
Chu	Gabbard	Kingston
Ciulline	Gallego	Kinzinger (IL)
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Kirkpatrick
Clarke (NY)	Garcia	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Gardner	Kuster
Clay	Garrett	Labrador
Cleaver	Gerlach	LaMalfa
Clyburn	Gibbs	Lamborn
Coble	Gibson	Lance
Coffman	Gingrey (GA)	Langevin
Cohen	Gohmert	Lankford
Cole	Goodlatte	Larsen (WA)
Collins (GA)	Gosar	Larson (CT)
Collins (NY)	Gowdy	Latham
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Latta
Connolly	Graves (MO)	Lee (CA)
Conyers	Grayson	Levin
Cook	Green, Al	Lewis
Cooper	Green, Gene	Lipinski

LoBiondo Paulsen
Loeb sack Payne
Lofgren Pearce
Long Pelosi
Lowenthal Perlmutter
Lowey Perry
Lucas Peters (CA)
Luetkemeyer Peters (MI)
Lujan Grisham Peterson
(NM) Petri
Luján, Ben Ray Pingree (ME)
(NM) Pittenger
Lummis Pitts
Lynch Pocan
Maffei Poe (TX)
Maloney, Polis
Carolyn Pompeo
Maloney, Sean Posey
Marchant Price (GA)
Marino Price (NC)
Matheson Quigley
Matsui Rahall
McAllister Rangel
McCarthy (CA) Reed
McCarthy (NY) Reichert
McCaul Renacci
McCollum Ribble
McDermott Rice (SC)
McGovern Richmond
McHenry Rigell
McIntyre Roby
McKeon Roe (TN)
McKinley Rogers (AL)
McMorris Rogers (KY)
Rodgers Rogers (MI)
McNerney Rohrabacher
Meadows Rokita
Meehan Rooney
Meeks Ros-Lehtinen
Meng Roskam
Messer Ross
Mica Rothfus
Michaud Roybal-Allard
Miller (MI) Royce
Miller, George Ruiz
Moore Runyan
Moran Ruppertsberger
Mullin Rush
Mulvaney Ryan (OH)
Murphy (FL) Ryan (WI)
Murphy (PA) Salmon
Nadler Sánchez, Linda
Napolitano T.
Neal Sanchez, Loretta
Neugebauer Sanford
Noem Sarbanes
Nolan Scalise
Norcross Schakowsky
Nugent Schiff
Nunes Schneider
Nunnelee Schock
O'Rourke Schrader
Olson Schwartz
Owens Schweikert
Palazzo Scott (VA)
Pallone Scott, Austin
Pascrell Scott, David
Pastor (AZ) Serrano

NAYS—7

Amash Massie
Broun (GA) McClintock
Jones Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell Hall
Capuano Johnson (GA)
Duckworth Miller (FL)
Granger Miller, Gary

□ 1656

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2014 AND 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4681) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 325, nays 100, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 558]

YEAS—325

Adams Cook
Aderholt Cooper
Amodei Costa
Bachmann Cotton
Bachus Courtney
Barber Cramer
Barletta Crawford
Barr Crenshaw
Barrow (GA) Crowley
Barton Cuellar
Beatty Culberson
Becerra Daines
Benishkek Davis (CA)
Bera (CA) Davis, Danny
Bilirakis Davis, Rodney
Bishop (GA) DeGette
Bishop (NY) Delaney
Bishop (UT) DeLauro
Black Denham
Blackburn Dent
Boustany DeSantis
Brady (PA) Deutch
Brady (TX) Diaz-Balart
Braley (IA) Dingell
Brooks (IN) Duffy
Brown (FL) Edwards
Brownley (CA) Ellison
Buchanan Ellmers
Bucshon Engel
Bustos Enyart
Butterfield Esty
Byrne Farenthold
Calvert Fattah
Camp Fincher
Capito Fitzpatrick
Capps Fleischmann
Cárdenas Fleming
Carney Flores
Carson (IN) Forbes
Carter Fortenberry
Cartwright Foster
Cassidy Foxx
Castor (FL) Frankel (FL)
Castro (TX) Franks (AZ)
Chabot Frelinghuysen
Chaffetz Fudge
Cicilline Gabbard
Clay Gallego
Cleaver Gardner
Clyburn Gerlach
Coble Gibbs
Coffman Gingrey (GA)
Cole Goodlatte
Collins (GA) Granger
Collins (NY) Graves (MO)
Conaway Green, Al
Connolly Green, Gene

Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce

NAYS—100

Amash
Bass
Bentivolio
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
DeFazio
DeBene
DesJarlais
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eshoo
Farr
Garamendi
Garcia
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Capuano
Duckworth

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—100

Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Holt
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Kildee
Kingston
Labrador
Lee (CA)
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lummis
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meadows
Mica
Moore
Mulvaney

NOT VOTING—9

Hall
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary

Nadler
Nugent
O'Rourke
Pallone
Perry
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Rangel
Ribble
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Salmon
Sanford
Schakowsky
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tierney
Tipton
Velázquez
Waters
Weber (TX)
Welch
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1704

Mr. SERRANO changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 558 on H.R. 4681, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2719) to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

YEAS—425

Adams	Bridenstine	Clawson (FL)
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Clay
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cleaver
Amodei	Brown (GA)	Clyburn
Bachmann	Brown (FL)	Coble
Bachus	Brownley (CA)	Coffman
Barber	Buchanan	Cohen
Barletta	Bucshon	Cole
Barr	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Bustos	Collins (NY)
Barton	Butterfield	Conaway
Bass	Byrne	Connolly
Beatty	Calvert	Conyers
Becerra	Camp	Cook
Benishek	Capito	Cooper
Bentivolio	Capps	Costa
Bera (CA)	Cárdenas	Cotton
Bilirakis	Carney	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Cramer
Bishop (NY)	Carter	Crawford
Bishop (UT)	Cartwright	Crenshaw
Black	Cassidy	Crowley
Blackburn	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Culberson
Bonamici	Chabot	Cummings
Boustany	Chaffetz	Daines
Brady (PA)	Chu	Davis (CA)
Brady (TX)	Cicilline	Davis, Danny
Braley (IA)	Clark (MA)	Davis, Rodney
Brat	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio

DeGette	Jenkins	Norcross
Delaney	Johnson (GA)	Nugent
DeLauro	Johnson (OH)	Nunes
DelBene	Johnson, E. B.	Nunnelee
Denham	Johnson, Sam	O'Rourke
Dent	Jolly	Olson
DeSantis	Jones	Owens
DesJarlais	Jordan	Palazzo
Deutch	Joyce	Pallone
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Pascarell
Dingell	Keating	Pastor (AZ)
Doggett	Kelly (IL)	Paulsen
Doyle	Kelly (PA)	Payne
Duffy	Kennedy	Pearce
Duncan (SC)	Kildee	Pelosi
Duncan (TN)	Kilmer	Perlmutter
Edwards	Kind	Perry
Ellison	King (IA)	Peters (CA)
Elmers	King (NY)	Peters (MI)
Engel	Kingston	Peterson
Enyart	Kinzinger (IL)	Petri
Eshoo	Kirkpatrick	Pingree (ME)
Esty	Kline	Pittenger
Farenthold	Kuster	Pitts
Farr	Labrador	Pocan
Fattah	LaMalfa	Poe (TX)
Fincher	Lamborn	Polis
Fitzpatrick	Lance	Pompeo
Fleischmann	Langevin	Posey
Fleming	Lankford	Price (GA)
Flores	Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)
Forbes	Larson (CT)	Quigley
Fortenberry	Latham	Rahall
Foster	Latta	Rangel
Fox	Lee (CA)	Reed
Frankel (FL)	Levin	Reichert
Franks (AZ)	Lewis	Renacci
Frelinghuysen	Lipinski	Ribble
Fudge	LoBlundo	Rice (SC)
Gabbard	Loeb	Richmond
Galleo	Loeb	Rigell
Garamendi	Long	Roby
Garcia	Lowenthal	Roe (TN)
Gardner	Lowey	Rogers (AL)
Garrett	Lucas	Rogers (KY)
Gerlach	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)
Gibbs	Lujan Grisham	Rohrabacher
Gibson	(NM)	Rokita
Gingrey (GA)	Luján, Ben Ray	Rooney
Gohmert	(NM)	Ros-Lehtinen
Goodlatte	Lummis	Roskam
Gosar	Lynch	Ross
Goody	Maffei	Rothfus
Granger	Maloney,	Roybal-Allard
Graves (GA)	Carolyn	Royce
Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz
Grayson	Marchant	Runyan
Green, Al	Marino	Ruppersberger
Green, Gene	Massie	Rush
Griffin (AR)	Matheson	Ryan (OH)
Griffith (VA)	Matsui	Ryan (WI)
Grijalva	McAllister	Salmon
Grimm	McCarthy (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
Guthrie	McCarthy (NY)	T.
Gutiérrez	McCauley	Sanchez, Loretta
Hahn	McClintock	Sanford
Hanabusa	McCollum	Sarbanes
Hanna	McDermott	Scalise
Harper	McGovern	Schakowsky
Harris	McHenry	Schiff
Hartzler	McIntyre	Schneider
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Schock
Hastings (WA)	McKinley	Schrader
Heck (NV)	McMorris	Schwartz
Heck (WA)	Rodgers	Schweikert
Hensarling	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Herrera Beutler	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Higgins	Meehan	Scott, David
Himes	Meeks	Sensenbrenner
Hinojosa	Meng	Serrano
Holding	Messer	Sessions
Holt	Mica	Sewell (AL)
Honda	Michaud	Shea-Porter
Horsford	Miller (MI)	Sherman
Hoyer	Moore	Shimkus
Hudson	Moran	Shuster
Huelskamp	Mullin	Simpson
Huffman	Mulvaney	Sinema
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Slaughter
Hunter	Nadler	Smith (MO)
Hurt	Napolitano	Smith (NE)
Israel	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Issa	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Jackson Lee	Noem	Southerland
Jeffries	Nolan	Speier

Stewart	Upton	Webster (FL)
Stivers	Valadao	Welch
Stockman	Van Hollen	Wenstrup
Stutzman	Vargas	Westmoreland
Swalwell (CA)	Veasey	Whitfield
Takano	Vela	Williams
Terry	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (MS)	Wagner	Wittman
Thompson (PA)	Walberg	Wolf
Thornberry	Walden	Womack
Tiberi	Walorski	Woodall
Tierney	Walz	Yarmuth
Tipton	Wasserman	Yoder
Titus	Schultz	Yoho
Tonko	Waters	Young (AK)
Tsongas	Waxman	Young (IN)
Turner	Weber (TX)	

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell	Hall	Miller, George
Capuano	Miller (FL)	Negrete McLeod
Duckworth	Miller, Gary	Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1712

Ms. KAPTUR changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AVIATION SECURITY STAKE- HOLDER PARTICIPATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1204) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 5, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

YEAS—416

Adams	Bentivolio	Brat
Aderholt	Bera (CA)	Bridenstine
Amodei	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Brooks (IN)
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Brown (GA)
Barber	Bishop (UT)	Brown (FL)
Barletta	Black	Brownley (CA)
Barr	Blackburn	Buchanan
Barrow (GA)	Blumenauer	Bucshon
Barton	Bonamici	Burgess
Bass	Boustany	Bustos
Beatty	Brady (PA)	Butterfield
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Byrne
Benishek	Braley (IA)	Calvert

Camp
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei

Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Schweikert
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—5

Amash
Kaptur

Labrador
Massie

Yoho

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Capuano
Duckworth
Ellison
Gingrey (GA)

Hall
Huizenga (MI)
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Negrete McLeod

Scott (VA)
Smith (WA)
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1719

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to attending the funeral of the Honorable Charles Hutton "Bull" Rigdon, Jr., Fort Walton Beach City Council, I missed the following rollcall votes: Nos. 554 through 560 on December 10, 2014. If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 554—H. Res. 775, On Agreeing to the Resolution Providing for consideration of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014; and for other purposes, "aye;" rollcall vote No. 555—S. 1000, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass the Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act of 2014, "aye;" rollcall No. 556—On Approving the Journal, "nay;" rollcall vote No. 557—On Passage of S. 2244—To extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes, "aye;" rollcall vote No. 558—Motion to Suspend the Rules and Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 4681—Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015, "aye;" rollcall vote No. 559—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 2719—To require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve

transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes, "aye;" rollcall vote No. 560—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1204—To amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes, "aye."

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1281) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 12. INFORMED CONSENT FOR NEWBORN SCREENING RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Research on newborn dried blood spots shall be considered research carried out on human subjects meeting the definition of section 46.102(f)(2) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, for purposes of Federally funded research conducted pursuant to the Public Health Service Act until such time as updates to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (the Common Rule) are promulgated pursuant to subsection (c). For purposes of this subsection, sections 46.116(c) and 46.116(d) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall apply only to newborn dried blood spots used for purposes of Federally funded research that were collected not earlier than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promulgate proposed regulations related to the updating of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (the Common Rule), particularly with respect to informed consent. Not later than 2 years after such date of enactment, the Secretary shall promulgate final regulations based on such proposed regulations.

Mrs. ELLMERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (S. 2521) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to provide for reform to Federal information security, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2521

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. FISMA REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking subchapters II and III and inserting the following:

"SUBCHAPTER II—INFORMATION SECURITY

"§ 3551. Purposes

"The purposes of this subchapter are to—

"(1) provide a comprehensive framework for ensuring the effectiveness of information security controls over information resources that support Federal operations and assets;

"(2) recognize the highly networked nature of the current Federal computing environment and provide effective governmentwide management and oversight of the related information security risks, including coordination of information security efforts throughout the civilian, national security, and law enforcement communities;

"(3) provide for development and maintenance of minimum controls required to protect Federal information and information systems;

"(4) provide a mechanism for improved oversight of Federal agency information security programs, including through automated security tools to continuously diagnose and improve security;

"(5) acknowledge that commercially developed information security products offer advanced, dynamic, robust, and effective information security solutions, reflecting market solutions for the protection of critical information infrastructures important to the national defense and economic security of the nation that are designed, built, and operated by the private sector; and

"(6) recognize that the selection of specific technical hardware and software information security solutions should be left to individual agencies from among commercially developed products.

"§ 3552. Definitions

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), the definitions under section 3502 shall apply to this subchapter.

"(b) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subchapter:

"(1) The term 'binding operational directive' means a compulsory direction to an agency that—

"(A) is for purposes of safeguarding Federal information and information systems from a known or reasonably suspected information security threat, vulnerability, or risk;

"(B) shall be in accordance with policies, principles, standards, and guidelines issued by the Director; and

"(C) may be revised or repealed by the Director if the direction issued on behalf of the Director is not in accordance with policies and principles developed by the Director.

"(2) The term 'incident' means an occurrence that—

"(A) actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of information or an information system; or

"(B) constitutes a violation or imminent threat of violation of law, security policies, security procedures, or acceptable use policies.

"(3) The term 'information security' means protecting information and information systems from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction in order to provide—

"(A) integrity, which means guarding against improper information modification or destruction, and includes ensuring information nonrepudiation and authenticity;

"(B) confidentiality, which means preserving authorized restrictions on access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information; and

"(C) availability, which means ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information.

"(4) The term 'information technology' has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40.

"(5) The term 'intelligence community' has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

"(6)(A) The term 'national security system' means any information system (including any telecommunications system) used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency, or other organization on behalf of an agency—

"(i) the function, operation, or use of which—

"(I) involves intelligence activities;

"(II) involves cryptologic activities related to national security;

"(III) involves command and control of military forces;

"(IV) involves equipment that is an integral part of a weapon or weapons system; or

"(V) subject to subparagraph (B), is critical to the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions; or

"(ii) is protected at all times by procedures established for information that have been specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order or an Act of Congress to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or foreign policy.

"(B) Subparagraph (A)(i)(V) does not include a system that is to be used for routine administrative and business applications (including payroll, finance, logistics, and personnel management applications).

"(7) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

"§ 3553. Authority and functions of the Director and the Secretary

"(a) DIRECTOR.—The Director shall oversee agency information security policies and practices, including—

"(1) developing and overseeing the implementation of policies, principles, standards, and guidelines on information security, including through ensuring timely agency adoption of and compliance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

"(2) requiring agencies, consistent with the standards promulgated under such section 11331 and the requirements of this subchapter, to identify and provide information

security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of—

"(A) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency; or

"(B) information systems used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency;

"(3) ensuring that the Secretary carries out the authorities and functions under subsection (b);

"(4) coordinating the development of standards and guidelines under section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) with agencies and offices operating or exercising control of national security systems (including the National Security Agency) to assure, to the maximum extent feasible, that such standards and guidelines are complementary with standards and guidelines developed for national security systems;

"(5) overseeing agency compliance with the requirements of this subchapter, including through any authorized action under section 11303 of title 40, to enforce accountability for compliance with such requirements; and

"(6) coordinating information security policies and procedures with related information resources management policies and procedures.

"(b) SECRETARY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall administer the implementation of agency information security policies and practices for information systems, except for national security systems and information systems described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e), including—

"(1) assisting the Director in carrying out the authorities and functions under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (5), and (6) of subsection (a);

"(2) developing and overseeing the implementation of binding operational directives to agencies to implement the policies, principles, standards, and guidelines developed by the Director under subsection (a)(1) and the requirements of this subchapter, which may be revised or repealed by the Director if the operational directives issued on behalf of the Director are not in accordance with policies, principles, standards, and guidelines developed by the Director, including—

"(A) requirements for reporting security incidents to the Federal information security incident center established under section 3556;

"(B) requirements for the contents of the annual reports required to be submitted under section 3554(c)(1);

"(C) requirements for the mitigation of exigent risks to information systems; and

"(D) other operational requirements as the Director or Secretary, in consultation with the Director, may determine necessary;

"(3) monitoring agency implementation of information security policies and practices;

"(4) convening meetings with senior agency officials to help ensure effective implementation of information security policies and practices;

"(5) coordinating Government-wide efforts on information security policies and practices, including consultation with the Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603 and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

"(6) providing operational and technical assistance to agencies in implementing policies, principles, standards, and guidelines on

information security, including implementation of standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, including by—

“(A) operating the Federal information security incident center established under section 3556;

“(B) upon request by an agency, deploying technology to assist the agency to continuously diagnose and mitigate against cyber threats and vulnerabilities, with or without reimbursement;

“(C) compiling and analyzing data on agency information security; and

“(D) developing and conducting targeted operational evaluations, including threat and vulnerability assessments, on the information systems; and

“(7) other actions as the Director or the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, may determine necessary to carry out this subsection.

“(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall submit to Congress a report on the effectiveness of information security policies and practices during the preceding year, including—

“(1) a summary of the incidents described in the annual reports required to be submitted under section 3554(c)(1), including a summary of the information required under section 3554(c)(1)(A)(iii);

“(2) a description of the threshold for reporting major information security incidents;

“(3) a summary of the results of evaluations required to be performed under section 3555;

“(4) an assessment of agency compliance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40; and

“(5) an assessment of agency compliance with data breach notification policies and procedures issued by the Director.

“(d) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Except for the authorities and functions described in subsection (a)(5) and subsection (c), the authorities and functions of the Director and the Secretary under this section shall not apply to national security systems.

“(e) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SYSTEMS.—(1) The authorities of the Director described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall be delegated to the Secretary of Defense in the case of systems described in paragraph (2) and to the Director of National Intelligence in the case of systems described in paragraph (3).

“(2) The systems described in this paragraph are systems that are operated by the Department of Defense, a contractor of the Department of Defense, or another entity on behalf of the Department of Defense that processes any information the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of which would have a debilitating impact on the mission of the Department of Defense.

“(3) The systems described in this paragraph are systems that are operated by an element of the intelligence community, a contractor of an element of the intelligence community, or another entity on behalf of an element of the intelligence community that processes any information the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of which would have a debilitating impact on the mission of an element of the intelligence community.

“(f) CONSIDERATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the responsibilities under subsection (b), the Secretary shall consider any applicable stand-

ards or guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology and issued by the Secretary of Commerce under section 11331 of title 40.

“(2) DIRECTIVES.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) consult with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology regarding any binding operational directive that implements standards and guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

“(B) ensure that binding operational directives issued under subsection (b)(2) do not conflict with the standards and guidelines issued under section 11331 of title 40.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary to direct the Secretary of Commerce in the development and promulgation of standards and guidelines under section 11331 of title 40.

“(g) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—To ensure fiscal and policy consistency, the Secretary shall exercise the authority under this section subject to direction by the President, in coordination with the Director.

“§ 3554. Federal agency responsibilities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency shall—

“(1) be responsible for—

“(A) providing information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of—

“(i) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of the agency; and

“(ii) information systems used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency;

“(B) complying with the requirements of this subchapter and related policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines, including—

“(i) information security standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(ii) operational directives developed by the Secretary under section 3553(b);

“(iii) policies and procedures issued by the Director; and

“(iv) information security standards and guidelines for national security systems issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(C) ensuring that information security management processes are integrated with agency strategic, operational, and budgetary planning processes;

“(2) ensure that senior agency officials provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets under their control, including through—

“(A) assessing the risk and magnitude of the harm that could result from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of such information or information systems;

“(B) determining the levels of information security appropriate to protect such information and information systems in accordance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, for information security classifications and related requirements;

“(C) implementing policies and procedures to cost-effectively reduce risks to an acceptable level; and

“(D) periodically testing and evaluating information security controls and techniques to ensure that they are effectively implemented;

“(3) delegate to the agency Chief Information Officer established under section 3506 (or comparable official in an agency not covered by such section) the authority to ensure

compliance with the requirements imposed on the agency under this subchapter, including—

“(A) designating a senior agency information security officer who shall—

“(i) carry out the Chief Information Officer's responsibilities under this section;

“(ii) possess professional qualifications, including training and experience, required to administer the functions described under this section;

“(iii) have information security duties as that official's primary duty; and

“(iv) head an office with the mission and resources to assist in ensuring agency compliance with this section;

“(B) developing and maintaining an agencywide information security program as required by subsection (b);

“(C) developing and maintaining information security policies, procedures, and control techniques to address all applicable requirements, including those issued under section 3553 of this title and section 11331 of title 40;

“(D) training and overseeing personnel with significant responsibilities for information security with respect to such responsibilities; and

“(E) assisting senior agency officials concerning their responsibilities under paragraph (2);

“(4) ensure that the agency has trained personnel sufficient to assist the agency in complying with the requirements of this subchapter and related policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines;

“(5) ensure that the agency Chief Information Officer, in coordination with other senior agency officials, reports annually to the agency head on the effectiveness of the agency information security program, including progress of remedial actions;

“(6) ensure that senior agency officials, including chief information officers of component agencies or equivalent officials, carry out responsibilities under this subchapter as directed by the official delegated authority under paragraph (3); and

“(7) ensure that all personnel are held accountable for complying with the agencywide information security program implemented under subsection (b).

“(b) AGENCY PROGRAM.—Each agency shall develop, document, and implement an agencywide information security program to provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, including those provided or managed by another agency, contractor, or other source, that includes—

“(1) periodic assessments of the risk and magnitude of the harm that could result from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, which may include using automated tools consistent with standards and guidelines promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(2) policies and procedures that—

“(A) are based on the risk assessments required by paragraph (1);

“(B) cost-effectively reduce information security risks to an acceptable level;

“(C) ensure that information security is addressed throughout the life cycle of each agency information system; and

“(D) ensure compliance with—

“(i) the requirements of this subchapter;

“(ii) policies and procedures as may be prescribed by the Director, and information security standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(iii) minimally acceptable system configuration requirements, as determined by the agency; and

“(iv) any other applicable requirements, including standards and guidelines for national security systems issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President;

“(3) subordinate plans for providing adequate information security for networks, facilities, and systems or groups of information systems, as appropriate;

“(4) security awareness training to inform personnel, including contractors and other users of information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, of—

“(A) information security risks associated with their activities; and

“(B) their responsibilities in complying with agency policies and procedures designed to reduce these risks;

“(5) periodic testing and evaluation of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices, to be performed with a frequency depending on risk, but no less than annually, of which such testing—

“(A) shall include testing of management, operational, and technical controls of every information system identified in the inventory required under section 3505(c);

“(B) may include testing relied on in an evaluation under section 3555; and

“(C) shall include using automated tools, consistent with standards and guidelines promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(6) a process for planning, implementing, evaluating, and documenting remedial action to address any deficiencies in the information security policies, procedures, and practices of the agency;

“(7) procedures for detecting, reporting, and responding to security incidents, which—

“(A) shall be consistent with the standards and guidelines described in section 3556(b);

“(B) may include using automated tools; and

“(C) shall include—

“(i) mitigating risks associated with such incidents before substantial damage is done;

“(ii) notifying and consulting with the Federal information security incident center established in section 3556; and

“(iii) notifying and consulting with, as appropriate—

“(I) law enforcement agencies and relevant Offices of Inspector General and Offices of General Counsel;

“(II) an office designated by the President for any incident involving a national security system;

“(III) for a major incident, the committees of Congress described in subsection (c)(1)—

“(aa) not later than 7 days after the date on which there is a reasonable basis to conclude that the major incident has occurred; and

“(bb) after the initial notification under item (aa), within a reasonable period of time after additional information relating to the incident is discovered, including the summary required under subsection (c)(1)(A)(i); and

“(IV) any other agency or office, in accordance with law or as directed by the President; and

“(8) plans and procedures to ensure continuity of operations for information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency.

“(c) AGENCY REPORTING.—

“(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each agency shall submit to the Director, the Secretary, the Committee on Government Reform, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the appropriate authorization and appropriations committees of Congress, and the Comptroller General a report on the adequacy and effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices, including—

“(i) a description of each major information security incident or related sets of incidents, including summaries of—

“(I) the threats and threat actors, vulnerabilities, and impacts relating to the incident;

“(II) the risk assessments conducted under section 3554(a)(2)(A) of the affected information systems before the date on which the incident occurred;

“(III) the status of compliance of the affected information systems with applicable security requirements at the time of the incident; and

“(IV) the detection, response, and remediation actions;

“(ii) the total number of information security incidents, including a description of incidents resulting in significant compromise of information security, system impact levels, types of incident, and locations of affected systems;

“(iii) a description of each major information security incident that involved a breach of personally identifiable information, as defined by the Director, including—

“(I) the number of individuals whose information was affected by the major information security incident; and

“(II) a description of the information that was breached or exposed; and

“(iv) any other information as the Director or the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, may require.

“(B) UNCLASSIFIED REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(ii) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—The head of an agency shall ensure that, to the greatest extent practicable, information is included in the unclassified version of the reports submitted by the agency under subparagraph (A).

“(2) OTHER PLANS AND REPORTS.—Each agency shall address the adequacy and effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices in management plans and reports.

“(d) PERFORMANCE PLAN.—(1) In addition to the requirements of subsection (c), each agency, in consultation with the Director, shall include as part of the performance plan required under section 1115 of title 31 a description of—

“(A) the time periods; and

“(B) the resources, including budget, staffing, and training, that are necessary to implement the program required under subsection (b).

“(2) The description under paragraph (1) shall be based on the risk assessments required under subsection (b)(1).

“(e) PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT.—Each agency shall provide the public with timely notice and opportunities for comment on proposed information security policies and

procedures to the extent that such policies and procedures affect communication with the public.

“§ 3555. Annual independent evaluation

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Each year each agency shall have performed an independent evaluation of the information security program and practices of that agency to determine the effectiveness of such program and practices.

“(2) Each evaluation under this section shall include—

“(A) testing of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices of a representative subset of the agency's information systems;

“(B) an assessment of the effectiveness of the information security policies, procedures, and practices of the agency; and

“(C) separate presentations, as appropriate, regarding information security relating to national security systems.

“(b) INDEPENDENT AUDITOR.—Subject to subsection (c)—

“(1) for each agency with an Inspector General appointed under the Inspector General Act of 1978, the annual evaluation required by this section shall be performed by the Inspector General or by an independent external auditor, as determined by the Inspector General of the agency; and

“(2) for each agency to which paragraph (1) does not apply, the head of the agency shall engage an independent external auditor to perform the evaluation.

“(c) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—For each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system, that portion of the evaluation required by this section directly relating to a national security system shall be performed—

“(1) only by an entity designated by the agency head; and

“(2) in such a manner as to ensure appropriate protection for information associated with any information security vulnerability in such system commensurate with the risk and in accordance with all applicable laws.

“(d) EXISTING EVALUATIONS.—The evaluation required by this section may be based in whole or in part on an audit, evaluation, or report relating to programs or practices of the applicable agency.

“(e) AGENCY REPORTING.—(1) Each year, not later than such date established by the Director, the head of each agency shall submit to the Director the results of the evaluation required under this section.

“(2) To the extent an evaluation required under this section directly relates to a national security system, the evaluation results submitted to the Director shall contain only a summary and assessment of that portion of the evaluation directly relating to a national security system.

“(f) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Agencies and evaluators shall take appropriate steps to ensure the protection of information which, if disclosed, may adversely affect information security. Such protections shall be commensurate with the risk and comply with all applicable laws and regulations.

“(g) OMB REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—(1) The Director shall summarize the results of the evaluations conducted under this section in the report to Congress required under section 3553(c).

“(2) The Director's report to Congress under this subsection shall summarize information regarding information security relating to national security systems in such a manner as to ensure appropriate protection for information associated with any information security vulnerability in such system

commensurate with the risk and in accordance with all applicable laws.

“(3) Evaluations and any other descriptions of information systems under the authority and control of the Director of National Intelligence or of National Foreign Intelligence Programs systems under the authority and control of the Secretary of Defense shall be made available to Congress only through the appropriate oversight committees of Congress, in accordance with applicable laws.

“(h) COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall periodically evaluate and report to Congress on—

“(1) the adequacy and effectiveness of agency information security policies and practices; and

“(2) implementation of the requirements of this subchapter.

“(i) ASSESSMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Comptroller General may provide technical assistance to an Inspector General or the head of an agency, as applicable, to assist the Inspector General or head of an agency in carrying out the duties under this section, including by testing information security controls and procedures.

“(j) GUIDANCE.—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary, the Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, and other interested parties as appropriate, shall ensure the development of guidance for evaluating the effectiveness of an information security program and practices.

“§ 3556. Federal information security incident center

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure the operation of a central Federal information security incident center to—

“(1) provide timely technical assistance to operators of agency information systems regarding security incidents, including guidance on detecting and handling information security incidents;

“(2) compile and analyze information about incidents that threaten information security;

“(3) inform operators of agency information systems about current and potential information security threats, and vulnerabilities;

“(4) provide, as appropriate, intelligence and other information about cyber threats, vulnerabilities, and incidents to agencies to assist in risk assessments conducted under section 3554(b); and

“(5) consult with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, agencies or offices operating or exercising control of national security systems (including the National Security Agency), and such other agencies or offices in accordance with law and as directed by the President regarding information security incidents and related matters.

“(b) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system shall share information about information security incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities with the Federal information security incident center to the extent consistent with standards and guidelines for national security systems, issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President.

“§ 3557. National security systems

“The head of each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system shall be responsible for ensuring that the agency—

“(1) provides information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of the information contained in such system;

“(2) implements information security policies and practices as required by standards and guidelines for national security systems, issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(3) complies with the requirements of this subchapter.

“§ 3558. Effect on existing law

“Nothing in this subchapter, section 11331 of title 40, or section 20 of the National Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3) may be construed as affecting the authority of the President, the Office of Management and Budget or the Director thereof, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or the head of any agency, with respect to the authorized use or disclosure of information, including with regard to the protection of personal privacy under section 552a of title 5, the disclosure of information under section 552 of title 5, the management and disposition of records under chapters 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, the management of information resources under subchapter I of chapter 35 of this title, or the disclosure of information to the Congress or the Comptroller General of the United States.”

(b) MAJOR INCIDENT.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) develop guidance on what constitutes a major incident for purposes of section 3554(b) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a); and

(2) provide to Congress periodic briefings on the status of the developing of the guidance until the date on which the guidance is issued.

(c) CONTINUOUS DIAGNOSTICS.—During the 2 year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, with the assistance of the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall include in each report submitted under section 3553(c) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), an assessment of the adoption by agencies of continuous diagnostics technologies, including through the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation program, and other advanced security tools to provide information security, including challenges to the adoption of such technologies or security tools.

(d) BREACHES.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall ensure that data breach notification policies and guidelines are updated periodically and require—

(A) except as provided in paragraph (4), notice by the affected agency to each committee of Congress described in section 3554(c)(1) of title 44, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, which shall—

(i) be provided expeditiously and not later than 30 days after the date on which the agency discovered the unauthorized acquisition or access; and

(ii) include—

(I) information about the breach, including a summary of any information that the agency knows on the date on which notification is provided about how the breach occurred;

(II) an estimate of the number of individuals affected by the breach, based on infor-

mation that the agency knows on the date on which notification is provided, including an assessment of the risk of harm to affected individuals;

(III) a description of any circumstances necessitating a delay in providing notice to affected individuals; and

(IV) an estimate of whether and when the agency will provide notice to affected individuals; and

(B) notice by the affected agency to affected individuals, pursuant to data breach notification policies and guidelines, which shall be provided as expeditiously as practicable and without unreasonable delay after the agency discovers the unauthorized acquisition or access.

(2) NATIONAL SECURITY; LAW ENFORCEMENT; REMEDIATION.—The Attorney General, the head of an element of the intelligence community (as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), or the Secretary of Homeland Security may delay the notice to affected individuals under paragraph (1)(B) if the notice would disrupt a law enforcement investigation, endanger national security, or hamper security remediation actions.

(3) REPORTS.—

(A) DIRECTOR OF OMB.—During the first 2 years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, on an annual basis—

(i) assess agency implementation of data breach notification policies and guidelines in aggregate; and

(ii) include the assessment described in clause (i) in the report required under section 3553(c) of title 44, United States Code.

(B) SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—During the first 2 years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall include an assessment of the status of agency implementation of data breach notification policies and guidelines in the requirements under section 3553(b)(2)(B) of title 44, United States Code.

(4) EXCEPTION.—Any element of the intelligence community (as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) that is required to provide notice under paragraph (1)(A) shall only provide such notice to appropriate committees of Congress.

(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to alter any authority of a Federal agency or department.

(e) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code is amended by striking the matter relating to subchapters II and III and inserting the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—INFORMATION SECURITY

“3551. Purposes.

“3552. Definitions.

“3553. Authority and functions of the Director and the Secretary.

“3554. Federal agency responsibilities.

“3555. Annual independent evaluation.

“3556. Federal information security incident center.

“3557. National security systems.

“3558. Effect on existing law.”

(2) CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT.—Section 8(d)(1) of the Cybersecurity Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7406) is amended by striking “section 3534” and inserting “section 3554”.

(3) HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 223 (6 U.S.C. 143)

(i) in the section heading, by inserting “FEDERAL AND” before “NON-FEDERAL”;

(ii) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, in cooperation with the Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection” and inserting “the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H)”;

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) fulfill the responsibilities of the Secretary to protect Federal information systems under subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code.”;

(B) in section 1001(c)(1)(A) (6 U.S.C. 511(c)(1)(A)), by striking “section 3532(3)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(C) in the table of contents in section 1(b), by striking the item relating to section 223 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 223. Enhancement of Federal and non-Federal cybersecurity.”.

(4) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY ACT.—Section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “section 3532(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 3532(1)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(2)”;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “section 3532(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”.

(5) TITLE 10.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 2222(j)(5), by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(B) in section 2223(c)(3), by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”;

(C) in section 2315, by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)(5)”.

(f) OTHER PROVISIONS.—

(1) CIRCULAR A-130.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall amend or revise Office of Management and Budget Circular A-130 to eliminate inefficient or wasteful reporting. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide quarterly briefings to Congress on the status of the amendment or revision required under this paragraph.

(2) ISPAB.—Section 21(b) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–4(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “the Institute”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “the Secretary of Commerce.”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL H.R. 3979

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and

ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 123

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3979, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction: In section 1207(e)(2), strike “categories I, II, III, VII, and X” and insert “categories I, II, III, VII, X, XI, and XIII”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5771

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 124

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill, H.R. 5771, the Clerk of the House shall amend subsection (a) of section 1 of Division B (relating to Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2014) to read as follows:

“(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ‘Stephen Beck, Jr., Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2014’ or the ‘Stephen Beck, Jr., ABLE Act of 2014’.”.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING AMERICA'S CHARITIES ACT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5806) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent certain expiring provisions related to charitable contributions.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5806

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Supporting America’s Charities Act”.

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED CONTRIBUTION MODIFICATIONS MADE PERMANENT.

(a) MADE PERMANENT.—

(1) INDIVIDUALS.—Section 170(b)(1)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (vi).

(2) CORPORATIONS.—Section 170(b)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking clause (iii).
(b) CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAPITAL GAIN REAL PROPERTY MADE FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES BY NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 170(b)(2) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS BY CERTAIN NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Any qualified conservation contribution (as defined in subsection (h)(1)) which—

“(I) is made by a Native Corporation, and

“(II) is a contribution of property which was land conveyed under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act,

shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate amount of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer’s taxable income over the amount of charitable contributions allowable under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) CARRYOVER.—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation of clause (i), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(2)) as a charitable contribution to which clause (i) applies in each of the 15 succeeding years in order of time.

“(iii) NATIVE CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘Native Corporation’ has the meaning given such term by section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 170(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “subparagraph (B) applies” and inserting “subparagraph (B) or (C) applies”.

(3) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS PRESERVED.—Nothing in this subsection (or any amendment made by this subsection) shall be construed to modify the existing property rights validly conveyed to Native Corporations (within the meaning of section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act) under such Act.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF CHARITABLE DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF FOOD INVENTORY.

(a) PERMANENT EXTENSION.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (iv).

(b) INCREASE IN LIMITATION.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by striking clause (ii), by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clauses:

“(ii) LIMITATION.—The aggregate amount of such contributions for any taxable year which may be taken into account under this section shall not exceed—

“(I) in the case of any taxpayer other than a C corporation, 15 percent of the taxpayer’s aggregate net income for such taxable year from all trades or businesses from which such contributions were made for such year, computed without regard to this section, and

“(II) in the case of a C corporation, 15 percent of taxable income (as defined in subsection (b)(2)(D)).

“(iii) RULES RELATED TO LIMITATION.—

“(I) CARRYOVER.—If such aggregate amount exceeds the limitation imposed

under clause (ii), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)) as a charitable contribution described in clause (i) in each of the 5 succeeding years in order of time.

“(II) COORDINATION WITH OVERALL CORPORATE LIMITATION.—In the case of any charitable contribution allowable under clause (ii)(II), subsection (b)(2)(A) shall not apply to such contribution, but the limitation imposed by such subsection shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the aggregate amount of such contributions. For purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B), such contributions shall be treated as allowable under subsection (b)(2)(A).”.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) DETERMINATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.—If a taxpayer—

“(I) does not account for inventories under section 471, and

“(II) is not required to capitalize indirect costs under section 263A,

the taxpayer may elect, solely for purposes of subparagraph (B), to treat the basis of any apparently wholesome food as being equal to 25 percent of the fair market value of such food.”.

(d) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vi) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—In the case of any such contribution of apparently wholesome food which cannot or will not be sold solely by reason of internal standards of the taxpayer, lack of market, or similar circumstances, or by reason of being produced by the taxpayer exclusively for the purposes of transferring the food to an organization described in subparagraph (A), the fair market value of such contribution shall be determined—

“(I) without regard to such internal standards, such lack of market, such circumstances, or such exclusive purpose, and

“(II) by taking into account the price at which the same or substantially the same food items (as to both type and quality) are sold by the taxpayer at the time of the contribution (or, if not so sold at such time, in the recent past).”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after December 31, 2013, in taxable years ending after such date.

(2) LIMITATION; APPLICABILITY TO CORPORATIONS.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 4. RULE ALLOWING CERTAIN TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENTS ACCOUNTS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 408(d)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (F).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to distributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant

to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARD.—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves here today to once again address a group of tax provisions that need to be made permanent, this time for the sake of those who give to and ultimately benefit from charitable organizations.

Every day, selfless Americans nationwide decide to donate in support of an array of causes, be it finding a cure for cancer, helping underprivileged children succeed in school, or simply providing a meal and shelter that, for some, is hard to come by.

Countless Americans dedicate their lives to these causes and serving their friends and neighbors in need. The three charitable policies in this legislation can provide tremendous support for those good works. However, because these policies are only temporary, they are not nearly as effective as they can or should be. It is well past time that Congress takes the necessary action to support America's charities and those that benefit from their work and make these policies permanent.

What our charities do in America is beyond the power of government to give.

Now, we were close to reaching a bipartisan deal with the Senate that would have made them permanent, but the President decided to play politics and issue a veto threat. Just 2 days before Thanksgiving, the President announced that he considers a policy that encourages donations to food banks to be a giveaway to big corporations. I would like to see the President travel to see the West Midland Family Center food pantry in my district and tell them that they are a corporate giveaway.

The Supporting America's Charities Act, H.R. 5806, fixes what the administration and some Senators decided not to. This legislation will ultimately increase charitable giving by making

these policies permanent and enabling charities to better serve those in need.

These bipartisan proposals previously passed the House in July of this year as part of the America Gives More Act and continue to experience unrivaled support from organizations nationwide. In fact, more than 1,000 charitable organizations—1,032, to be exact—have written every Member of Congress in support of the permanent tax incentives.

Take, for example, a joint letter authored in July by five of America's leading charitable organizations. In discussing their unanimous support for the America Gives More Act, they said:

“The charitable giving incentives being considered by the House have encouraged individuals and small businesses to actively support the development and sustainability of our society. They have spurred contributions, for example, to build health centers, develop counseling programs for at-risk youth, provide nutrition assistance to hungry children, conserve land, and offer art therapy for people with developmental disabilities.”

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I am alone when I say this: policies that prompt donations to health centers, youth counseling programs, and therapy for people with disabilities are not giveaways to corporate America.

Mr. Speaker, just today, I was at Walter Reed Hospital visiting the brain trauma center there that was built for our wounded warriors. It was made possible through private donations and then made as a gift to the United States Government for those men and women who have served so valiantly in our military. That is the kind of giving we need to encourage. That is the kind of giving this legislation would encourage.

As I said last week, the end of the year is fast approaching, and a new tax-filing season is just around the corner. Now is not the time for those who selflessly donate to wonder what tax surprises are waiting for them, no more than it is the time for charitable organizations to grow uncertain about their futures.

There is no goodwill like that of an American, and as Representatives of this great Nation, we should do everything in our power to encourage individuals to give more and help charitable organizations expand their reach nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, as the giving spirit of the holiday season is around us, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle and both Houses of Congress to look at the policies—not the politics—look at the policies here and support those who give and support those who are in need by voting “yes” on H.R. 5806.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me make clear at the outset that this isn't a debate about the excellent work of charities or foundations or their vital role in our society. This House has already taken action to provide for the three provisions included in this bill for this year's tax returns as part of the broad extender bill that passed last week.

When the chairman talks about no surprises, we have already passed through the House and what will become law is an extender bill that makes it clear for this tax season that these provisions are in effect. There is no doubt about that. Everyone who voted in favor of the package has already ensured that taxpayers can benefit from these provisions this year.

Look, this isn't about politics. Frankly, as the lead sponsor originally of one of these bills, I find objectionable any reference to politics. I sponsored that bill regarding food contributions because of my belief that many people wanted to contribute to help supply nutrition.

When the President issued his Statement of Administration Policy, there was no politics at all, zero. He had made that clear in July. I think it is incredible—let me leave it at that—that anyone would say that politics has anything to do with this issue. As I said, these provisions are already going to be available for taxpayers in this tax season.

What this is about, Mr. Speaker, is fiscal responsibility and fiscal priorities. What this bill does is take three provisions out of the many in the extender bill—three—leaving aside whether it is R&D, leaving aside whether it is the education provision, leaving aside whether it is the child tax credit that would expire in terms of its improvements in a couple of years, what this does is to take just these three, important as they are, and say that we are going to make those permanent without paying one dime for them, not one dime, adding \$11 billion to the debt.

I must say—and we have had some back and forth on this—whatever one thought of Chairman CAMP's comprehensive bill—and we had some questions about it, but never questioning the fact that it took some hard work and I think some courage to put these provisions into the context of comprehensive tax reform, and so it is counterintuitive in a way to just pick these three up and to make them permanent unpaid for.

Let me just read the Statement of Administration Policy if I might. I just hope it sets to rest any claim that this is about politics because as an original sponsor of one of these bills, I can just emphasize what propelled me to propose it to all the food pantries I went to and to all of the church groups I

went to who were providing food, to the businesspeople I talked with who were essentially donating food, to their credit, that they couldn't sell and to doing so in a way that it was timely and so that the foods were very easily edible and readily so.

With that spirit—and I hope talking about the spirit of the season—this administration policy, I hope with that spirit it will be received. I quote from it:

The administration supports measures that enhance nonprofits, philanthropic organizations, and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges. The President's Budget includes a number of proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals.

However, the administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 5806, which would permanently extend three current provisions that offer enhanced tax breaks for certain donations. As the administration stated when strongly opposing similar legislation this past July, if this same, unprecedented approach of making certain traditional tax extenders permanent without offsets were followed for the other traditional tax extenders, it would add \$500 billion or more to deficits over the next 10 years, wiping out most of the deficit reduction achieved through the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012. Earlier this year, House Republicans themselves passed a budget resolution that required offsetting any tax extenders that were made permanent with other revenue measures.

As with other similar proposals, Republicans are imposing a double standard by adding to the deficit to continue tax breaks, while insisting on offsetting the proposed extension of emergency unemployment benefits and the discretionary funding increases for defense and nondefense priorities such as research and development in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. House Republicans are also making clear their priorities by rushing to make these tax cuts permanent without offsets even as the House Republican budget resolution calls for raising taxes on 26 million working families and students by letting important improvements to the EITC, the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, and education tax credits expire.

The administration wants to work with the Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen America's charitable sector.

I want to repeat that.

The administration wants to work with the Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen America's charitable sector. However, H.R. 5806 represents the wrong approach.

If the President were presented with H.R. 5806, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to what the gentleman from Michigan said. I have listened to the statement that he read. I

have actually read the statement of the administration's position myself. I see nothing in that that gives any Member a reason to vote "no."

Let me just say Feeding America estimates that H.R. 5806, this bill we are debating tonight, would create 100 million new meals a year. Frankly, I would say to my friend from Michigan: if you are hungry, you can't wait. Let's do this now.

Mr. Speaker, I would say in response to reading a statement of administration position that the President has repeatedly said, "Send me bipartisan measures that we can work on together," there is no more bipartisan issue than helping America's charities help the needy, help those who are hungry, and help those without housing.

In Michigan, our home State, we have a pilot program with a cereal manufacturer that is capturing excess breakfast products. Over 20,000 pounds of food per week are donated. If the tax law was changed, H.R. 5806, seven times that amount would be donated by the company, by the private sector, filling a need that the government is not meeting. A lot of hungry kids don't always get meals outside of school, so they take this cereal home in their backpacks for weekends.

There is no reason to wait. Let's do this now. Look, we passed a 1-year measure on all these other things. That only gives us 2 weeks. For a lot of these charitable provisions, they need a longer window. They need more certainty to put these programs in place and to put the distribution systems in place to get the food and the resources to people in need.

I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GERLACH), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

I had some prepared remarks that I want to give relative to the conservation easement part of this legislation because it is a hugely important issue to the people in southeastern Pennsylvania and many, many other States as well because through conservation easement transactions, tens of thousands of acres are preserved throughout the course of a year in a metropolitan region like Philadelphia and other places around the country that preserves the habitat, the watersheds, preserves the natural resources of that area, allows farmers to keep farming, allows people to hold on to the great open space that creates the vistas and the quality of life that people want to have in their communities.

I had my prepared remarks ready to go to talk about why that is important once again to try to pass legislation to allow for at least some period of time to allow for those transactions to go

forward because of the tax deductibility that would be present in the Tax Code.

But in listening to our colleague from Michigan a few minutes ago, to somehow throw out the proposal that since we passed this already a few weeks ago in a 1-year extension—that 1 year being 2014, the year we are already in, also the year that is going to expire in 21 days—to say somehow at this point in time of this legislative session, that is okay, that is how we will take care of conservation easements in the future, we will pass the 1-year extension as we did in the House, send it to the Senate, it will go ultimately to the President, look at the great job we did for conservation easements here in the United States, we gave them 21 more days' worth of decisionmaking time to determine whether or not they want to move forward with a transaction that will conserve open space and farmland around our country, that is pitiful in all due respect to all of our colleagues here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, we have legislation that has hundreds of cosponsors, Republican and Democrat here in the House. We have that same kind of bipartisan support in the Senate.

We have charities all around the United States calling in to Congress asking that this legislation be passed. Regardless of whether they are a group involved in conservation easements or in other charitable pursuits like food banks or the IRA issue, they want us to do something that we finally can agree to do and get it done by the end of the year.

□ 1745

I don't think that is too much to ask for Congress to do. Here we have the bill right in front of us that, on a wide bipartisan basis, is supported in the House and the Senate. We can pass it to make it a permanent part of the Tax Code so these groups can plan in the future and these individuals can plan in the future for how they want to help their charities in their communities. It is right before us, and yet we still have opposition to basically coming together to do what we all want to do to begin with. We need to really look ourselves in the mirror here over the next 24 hours and really think about why we are here in Congress.

I would hope, regardless of your party affiliation, you have a wonderful opportunity to help the charities in your community by passing this legislation to make a permanent change in the Tax Code, and that is something we can all reflect on in the 113th Congress as one time, one place, one bill we could come together on and help our communities and help our charities. So I ask all of our colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K.

DAVIS), another member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Let me be clear, I yield to no one in terms of my support for programs and activities to help those who are in need. I ardently support Federal tax policies that support charities.

I have hundreds of charities and foundations in my congressional district, and even more throughout the State of Illinois. They all provide tremendous support to individuals in great need. But I don't believe that this bill is necessary at this moment in order to provide those services.

I am disappointed and cannot support this irresponsible bill that adds to the deficit. The Republican leadership talks a great deal about fiscal prudence and even requires in their budget resolution that any tax extender made permanent be offset with other revenue measures.

Republican leadership easily could have paid for this bill by closing a tax loophole or two. Republican leadership easily could have brought up this bill under a rule that allowed an offset to be added. Instead, they have chosen to add to the deficit in a political ploy.

So I say again, Mr. Speaker, and I pledge to my constituents and to the charitable organizations to work in a bipartisan way to advance charitable benefits. However, I cannot support this irresponsible bill. The President has issued a veto threat, and I support the President.

Mr. CAMP. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank him for his leadership on this issue and so many others during his esteemed career here in the people's House. He will be greatly missed as he retires at the end of this Congress.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5806, the Supporting America's Charities Act. This bill reflects the good work that has been done in the Ways and Means Committee during the 113th Congress. It makes permanent important provisions that would continue to allow taxpayers to make contributions from their IRAs to charities, contributions to food inventory, and contributions of conservation easements on a tax-preferred basis.

In the case of these three important provisions, greater permanency will assist taxpayers with their tax planning while helping to advance their charitable goals. Charitable deductions are designed to encourage charitable giving by lowering the cost to privately support charitable organizations. It also recognizes the amounts of income

voluntarily given to charity should be treated differently from most other income spent or otherwise used for personal benefit.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I hope that the Senate does the same.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The way we have acted here, taxpayers will be able to use the IRA rollover for this tax season. That is for sure. People who want to make donations, however they do it, relating to nutrition and food will be able to do that for this tax year.

So the issue is not whether we care much about those provisions. As I said, as someone who has worked so hard in terms of nutrition policy, food donations, who has been to so many pantries, who has been to Forgotten Harvest, worked with them, and Gleaners in southeast Michigan, I know how important it is that these contributions continue. They will under the action of this Congress.

That is not the question. The question is whether this institution will take three provisions out of the extenders bill that we passed and make them permanent, unpaid for—unpaid for—permanent and unpaid for, increasing the deficit by \$11 billion without giving the same consideration to every other single provision in the extender bill, whether it is education or research and development and so many other provisions that also have some urgency to them.

No, I don't think anybody should worry here about voting "no" and having challenge by anybody to their dedication to tax policies that give people incentive to give to charities, to foundations, or to nutrition programs, or their dedication in terms of conservation.

What the majority has decided to do is to take, as I said, out of the extender bill three provisions, knowing that the President would veto them, I guess trying to score points against the President instead of scoring points for those whose programs are in question here.

So that is what this is all about. I want to close by just urging everyone who votes "no" here, you can say with total honesty that you have voted for legislation that makes sure for this tax season, like for all other extenders, that people will be able in this case to give contributions, to deduct them, to roll over their IRAs, whatever. It will be up to the citizen to make that decision. We are providing that opportunity for citizens.

Anyone who tries to undermine the deep dedication of anyone on this side or the President of the United States to the importance of charity I think is doing a real disservice to the Nation and to themselves—and to themselves. I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say briefly, actions speak louder than words. While technically, yes, we are going to make sure that for the last couple of weeks, as my colleague from Pennsylvania so eloquently stated, these tax policies will be in place, we need more than that. I mean, whether it is food inventory or conservation easements, these are long-term policies that we are asking people to get involved in.

Let's talk about southeast Michigan. The gentleman raised it. We know who is doing a lot of the work in Detroit—a lot of foundations are. They are setting up plans and processes to help rebuild that city. They need more than 2 weeks of policy. They need permanent policy. These are simple, bipartisan measures, whether it is food inventory, charitable IRAs, or conservation easements.

Look, we know that the watershed of New York City was protected by conservation easements. They couldn't do that in 2 weeks. The things that we can do with conservation will last decades into the future. They need the intergenerational long-term policy to put these kinds of plans in place.

Even as I mentioned earlier with regard to food inventories and charitable IRAs, those aren't decisions you make on a whim. Whether you are going to turn your IRA over to charity is a decision that you may be looking at the next 20 years of your retirement, do you have the ability to do that or not. It is not something you can do based on just a couple of weeks.

Look, we are the only nation in the world that lets these things expire. I mean, what the gentleman hasn't said is these items were expired for all of 2014. We are going to put them in place for the final 2 weeks, and retroactively we are going to say you are going to be able to make a conservation easement contribution? Well, you can't, and you are not probably going to do it in the next 2 weeks because immediately when the clock hits 2015, you are not going to have the tax policy.

Look, I would ask people, don't just vote in lockstep. Really examine your conscience and whether at this time of year, with the great needs this Nation is facing and has faced really for the last decade, what can we do to make a difference now? Why do we need to wait?

As the gentleman has said, look, we have tried to make these things permanent. That hasn't worked. It hasn't worked in a comprehensive tax overhaul; it hasn't worked in trying to make a lot of these extensions permanent in an agreement between the House and Senate. But these are important, and these will make a difference where government doesn't go.

It is our foundations and our charities that actually innovate in this

area and find out what works. As we know, government isn't the most innovative in this area. That is why these are important to do now.

I think especially in this season of giving we shouldn't just vote because our leaders tell us to or because we have gotten some letter from the administration. We should really look carefully at how we can make a difference, how we can make a difference by this vote that we are going to take and what that will mean for people's lives and the countless families who depend on selfless Americans to make it from day to day. I would urge a "yes" vote on this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5806, a bill that seeks to extend three tax provisions that I strongly support.

Despite my interest in seeing the tax provisions before us extended permanently, I am concerned that doing so in a package without so many other important tax provisions might jeopardize our ability to achieve comprehensive reform of our tax code next Congress. Across the district I represent, my constituents support changing the tax code to make it fair and simple. This will be a difficult process that will require significant work and compromise. Accordingly, I am opposing the bill before us today, but I will seek a permanent extension of these provisions through broader tax reform next Congress.

I am committed to policies that support our social safety net, particularly as our constituents continue to recover from the effects of the economic downturn. But by passing individual extensions, we are leaving important provisions on the table that will benefit our middle-class families. What they need is comprehensive tax reform that levels the playing field and allows everyone to have a fair opportunity to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of frustration that I voted no on H.R. 5806. I strongly support some of the individual provisions; indeed, I am the leading Democratic cosponsor of the provisions relating to charitable contributions from individual retirement accounts.

I have been a leading supporter of land trusts, working closely with them to fix challenges raised by application of the estate tax for instance, and broadly supporting their work across the country to protect and preserve our nation's heritage and open spaces. I have worked hard to improve resources for Oregon's food banks and to end hunger both at home and abroad.

Today, we are abandoning any semblance that this Congress is going to work on major accomplishments before we adjourn.

With this and similar tax extender votes, Congress appears to have given up on deficit reduction, despite my colleagues otherwise voracious appetite for it—an appetite that led to House Republicans attempting to cut nutrition assistance to poor Americans by \$39 billion last year. Section five of this bill, in fact, specifically strikes the Republican's own PAY-GO rules. Budget-busting proposals are roaring through here with no semblance of hon-

oring the Republicans' own budget rules or their budget resolution.

With this and similar tax extender votes, Congress appears also to have given up on tax reform because we are not going to be able to have meaningful tax reform if we are just willy-nilly going to rush all these provisions through.

My colleague, Chairman CAMP, worked for years to produce a deficit-neutral tax reform, which had much to commend it, and I commend him for his hard work. All of these provisions of tax extenders were addressed in his tax reform, but they were dealt with differently. Not all were extended permanently. Some were modified and some were repealed, as part of a deliberative process to evaluate their impact and to not break the bank. This vote—like similar unpaid for permanent tax extender votes—abandons that effort.

This bill is not going to be enacted into law as the President's veto threat makes clear, and Congress will pick up where it left off—and frankly, where Mr. CAMP left off—as we work with our colleagues in the other body and our constituents to move forward on the things that we are all committed to in a way that is fiscally responsible, is bipartisan and thoughtful, to get the outcomes we all share.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5806.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1800

HOWARD COBLE COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2444) to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2444

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is the following:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

- Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 102. Authorized levels of military strength and training.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

- Sec. 201. Commissioned officers.
Sec. 202. Commandant; appointment.
Sec. 203. Prevention and response workforces.
Sec. 204. Centers of expertise.
Sec. 205. Penalties.
Sec. 206. Agreements.
Sec. 207. Tuition assistance program coverage of textbooks and other educational materials.
Sec. 208. Coast Guard housing.
Sec. 209. Lease authority.
Sec. 210. Notification of certain determinations.
Sec. 211. Annual Board of Visitors.
Sec. 212. Flag officers.
Sec. 213. Repeal of limitation on medals of honor.
Sec. 214. Coast Guard family support and child care.
Sec. 215. Mission need statement.
Sec. 216. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request.
Sec. 217. Inventory of real property.
Sec. 218. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees.
Sec. 219. Active duty for emergency augmentation of regular forces.
Sec. 220. Acquisition workforce expedited hiring authority.
Sec. 221. Coast Guard administrative savings.
Sec. 222. Technical corrections to title 14.
Sec. 223. Multiyear procurement authority for Offshore Patrol Cutters.
Sec. 224. Maintaining Medium Endurance Cutter mission capability.
Sec. 225. Aviation capability.
Sec. 226. Gaps in writings on Coast Guard history.
Sec. 227. Officer evaluation reports.
Sec. 228. Improved safety information for vessels.
Sec. 229. E-LORAN.
Sec. 230. Analysis of resource deficiencies with respect to maritime border security.
Sec. 231. Modernization of National Distress and Response System.
Sec. 232. Report reconciling maintenance and operational priorities on the Missouri River.
Sec. 233. Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy assessment.

TITLE III—SHIPPING AND NAVIGATION

- Sec. 301. Repeal.
Sec. 302. Donation of historical property.
Sec. 303. Small shipyards.
Sec. 304. Drug testing reporting.
Sec. 305. Opportunities for sea service veterans.
Sec. 306. Clarification of high-risk waters.
Sec. 307. Technical corrections.
Sec. 308. Report.
Sec. 309. Fishing safety grant programs.
Sec. 310. Establishment of Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee.
Sec. 311. Travel and subsistence.
Sec. 312. Prompt intergovernmental notice of marine casualties.
Sec. 313. Area Contingency Plans.
Sec. 314. International ice patrol reform.
Sec. 315. Offshore supply vessel third-party inspection.
Sec. 316. Watches.

- Sec. 317. Coast Guard response plan requirements.
Sec. 318. Regional Citizens' Advisory Council.

- Sec. 319. Uninspected passenger vessels in the United States Virgin Islands.

- Sec. 320. Treatment of abandoned seafarers.
Sec. 321. Website.
Sec. 322. Coast Guard regulations.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

- Sec. 401. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 402. Award of reparations.
Sec. 403. Terms of Commissioners.

TITLE V—ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION

- Sec. 501. Arctic maritime transportation.
Sec. 502. Arctic maritime domain awareness.
Sec. 503. IMO Polar Code negotiations.
Sec. 504. Forward operating facilities.
Sec. 505. Icebreakers.
Sec. 506. Icebreaking in polar regions.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

- Sec. 601. Distant water tuna fleet.
Sec. 602. Extension of moratorium.
Sec. 603. National maritime strategy.
Sec. 604. Waivers.
Sec. 605. Competition by United States flag vessels.
Sec. 606. Vessel requirements for notices of arrival and departure and automatic identification system.
Sec. 607. Conveyance of Coast Guard property in Rochester, New York.
Sec. 608. Conveyance of certain property in Gig Harbor, Washington.
Sec. 609. Vessel determination.
Sec. 610. Safe vessel operation in Thunder Bay.
Sec. 611. Parking facilities.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

- SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**
Funds are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard as follows:

- (1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, \$6,981,036,000.
(2) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, \$1,546,448,000, to remain available until expended.
(3) For the Coast Guard Reserve program, including personnel and training costs, equipment, and services, \$140,016,000.
(4) For environmental compliance and restoration of Coast Guard vessels, aircraft, and facilities (other than parts and equipment associated with operation and maintenance), \$16,701,000, to remain available until expended.
(5) To the Commandant of the Coast Guard for research, development, test, and evaluation of technologies, materials, and human factors directly related to improving the performance of the Coast Guard's mission with respect to search and rescue, aids to navigation, marine safety, marine environmental protection, enforcement of laws and treaties, ice operations, oceanographic research, and defense readiness, \$19,890,000.
(6) For alteration or removal of bridges over navigable waters of the United States constituting obstructions to navigation, and for personnel and administrative costs associated with the Alteration of Bridges Program, \$16,000,000.

- SEC. 102. AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND TRAINING.**
(a) **ACTIVE DUTY STRENGTH.**—The Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength

for active duty personnel of 43,000 for fiscal year 2015.

(b) **MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS.**—The Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads for fiscal year 2015 as follows:

- (1) For recruit and special training, 2,500 student years.
(2) For flight training, 165 student years.
(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions, 350 student years.
(4) For officer acquisition, 1,200 student years.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

SEC. 201. COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Section 42(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “7,200” and inserting “6,900”.

SEC. 202. COMMANDANT; APPOINTMENT.

Section 44 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: “The term of an appointment, and any reappointment, shall begin on June 1 of the appropriate year and end on May 31 of the appropriate year, except that, in the event of death, retirement, resignation, or reassignment, or when the needs of the Service demand, the Secretary may alter the date on which a term begins or ends if the alteration does not result in the term exceeding a period of 4 years.”.

SEC. 203. PREVENTION AND RESPONSE WORKFORCES.

Section 57 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in subsection (b)—
(A) in paragraph (2) by striking “or” at the end;
(B) in paragraph (3) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and
(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) waterways operations manager shall have knowledge, skill, and practical experience with respect to marine transportation system management; or

“(5) port and facility safety and security specialist shall have knowledge, skill, and practical experience with respect to the safety, security, and environmental protection responsibilities associated with maritime ports and facilities.”;

(2) in subsection (c) by striking “or marine safety engineer” and inserting “marine safety engineer, waterways operations manager, or port and facility safety and security specialist”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(2) by striking “investigator or marine safety engineer.” and inserting “investigator, marine safety engineer, waterways operations manager, or port and facility safety and security specialist.”.

SEC. 204. CENTERS OF EXPERTISE.

Section 58(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **MISSIONS.**—Any center established under subsection (a) shall—

- “(1) promote, facilitate, and conduct—
“(A) education;
“(B) training; and
“(C) activities authorized under section 93(a)(4);

“(2) be a repository of information on operations, practices, and resources related to the mission for which the center was established; and

“(3) perform and support the mission for which the center was established.”.

SEC. 205. PENALTIES.

(a) **AIDS TO NAVIGATION AND FALSE DISTRESS MESSAGES.**—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in section 83 by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$1,500”;

(2) in section 84 by striking “\$500” and inserting “\$1,500”;

(3) in section 85 by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$1,500”; and

(4) in section 88(c)(2) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”.

(b) UNAUTHORIZED USE OF WORDS “COAST GUARD”.—Section 639 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$1,000” and inserting “\$10,000”.

SEC. 206. AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 93(a)(4) of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “, investigate” and inserting “and investigate”; and

(2) by striking “, and cooperate and coordinate such activities with other Government agencies and with private agencies”.

(b) AUTHORITY.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 102. Agreements

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out section 93(a)(4), the Commandant may—

“(1) enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, and other agreements with—

“(A) Federal entities;

“(B) other public or private entities in the United States, including academic entities; and

“(C) foreign governments with the concurrence of the Secretary of State; and

“(2) impose on and collect from an entity subject to an agreement or contract under paragraph (1) a fee to assist with expenses incurred in carrying out such section.

“(b) DEPOSIT AND USE OF FEES.—Fees collected under this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts. The fees may be used, to the extent provided in advance in an appropriation law, only to carry out activities under section 93(a)(4).”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“102. Agreements.”.

SEC. 207. TUITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COVERAGE OF TEXTBOOKS AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS.

Section 93(a)(7) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and the textbooks, manuals, and other materials required as part of such training or course of instruction” after “correspondence courses”.

SEC. 208. COAST GUARD HOUSING.

(a) COMMANDANT; GENERAL POWERS.—Section 93(a)(13) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Treasury” and inserting “the fund established under section 687”.

(b) LIGHTHOUSE PROPERTY.—Section 672a(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Treasury” and inserting “the fund established under section 687”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 687(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Monies received under section 93(a)(13).

“(5) Amounts received under section 672a(b).”.

SEC. 209. LEASE AUTHORITY.

Section 93 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LEASING OF TIDELANDS AND SUBMERGED LANDS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—The Commandant may lease under subsection (a)(13) submerged lands and tidelands under the control of the Coast Guard without regard to the limita-

tion under that subsection with respect to lease duration.

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Commandant may lease submerged lands and tidelands under paragraph (1) only if—

“(A) lease payments are—

“(i) received exclusively in the form of cash;

“(ii) equal to the fair market value of the use of the leased submerged lands or tidelands for the period during which such lands are leased, as determined by the Commandant; and

“(iii) deposited in the fund established under section 687; and

“(B) the lease does not provide authority to or commit the Coast Guard to use or support any improvements to such submerged lands or tidelands, or obtain goods or services from the lessee.”.

SEC. 210. NOTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 103. Notification of certain determinations

“(a) IN GENERAL.—At least 90 days prior to making a final determination that a waterway, or a portion thereof, is navigable for purposes of the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard, the Commandant shall provide notification regarding the proposed determination to—

“(1) the Governor of each State in which such waterway, or portion thereof, is located;

“(2) the public; and

“(3) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(b) CONTENT REQUIREMENT.—Each notification provided under subsection (a) to an entity specified in paragraph (3) of that subsection shall include—

“(1) an analysis of whether vessels operating on the waterway, or portion thereof, subject to the proposed determination are subject to inspection or similar regulation by State or local officials;

“(2) an analysis of whether operators of commercial vessels on such waterway, or portion thereof, are subject to licensing or similar regulation by State or local officials; and

“(3) an estimate of the annual costs that the Coast Guard may incur in conducting operations on such waterway, or portion thereof.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“103. Notification of certain determinations.”.

SEC. 211. ANNUAL BOARD OF VISITORS.

Section 194 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 194. Annual Board of Visitors

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy is established to review and make recommendations on the operation of the Academy.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The membership of the Board shall consist of the following:

“(A) The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, or the chairman’s designee.

“(B) The chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, or the chairman’s designee.

“(C) 3 Members of the Senate designated by the Vice President.

“(D) 4 Members of the House of Representatives designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

“(E) 6 individuals designated by the President.

“(2) LENGTH OF SERVICE.—

“(A) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—A Member of Congress designated under subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) as a member of the Board shall be designated as a member in the First Session of a Congress and serve for the duration of that Congress.

“(B) INDIVIDUALS DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT.—Each individual designated by the President under subparagraph (E) of paragraph (1) shall serve as a member of the Board for 3 years, except that any such member whose term of office has expired shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

“(3) DEATH OR RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.—If a member of the Board dies or resigns, a successor shall be designated for any unexpired portion of the term of the member by the official who designated the member.

“(c) ACADEMY VISITS.—

“(1) ANNUAL VISIT.—The Board shall visit the Academy annually to review the operation of the Academy.

“(2) ADDITIONAL VISITS.—With the approval of the Secretary, the Board or individual members of the Board may make other visits to the Academy in connection with the duties of the Board or to consult with the Superintendent of the Academy.

“(d) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The Board shall review, with respect to the Academy—

“(1) the state of morale and discipline;

“(2) the curriculum;

“(3) instruction;

“(4) physical equipment;

“(5) fiscal affairs; and

“(6) other matters relating to the Academy that the Board determines appropriate.

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of an annual visit of the Board under subsection (c)(1), the Board shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the actions of the Board during such visit and the recommendations of the Board pertaining to the Academy.

“(f) ADVISORS.—If approved by the Secretary, the Board may consult with advisors in carrying out this section.

“(g) REIMBURSEMENT.—Each member of the Board and each adviser consulted by the Board under subsection (f) shall be reimbursed, to the extent permitted by law, by the Coast Guard for actual expenses incurred while engaged in duties as a member or adviser.”.

SEC. 212. FLAG OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 295 the following:

“§ 296. Flag officers

“During any period in which the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, section 1216(d) of title 10 does not apply with respect to flag officers of the Coast Guard.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 295 the following:

“296. Flag officers.”.

SEC. 213. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON MEDALS OF HONOR.

Section 494 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “medal of honor,” each place it appears.

SEC. 214. COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT AND CHILD CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after chapter 13 the following:

“CHAPTER 14—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT AND CHILD CARE

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“Sec.

“531. Work-life policies and programs.

“532. Surveys of Coast Guard families.

“SUBCHAPTER II—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT

“542. Education and training opportunities for Coast Guard spouses.

“543. Youth sponsorship initiatives.

“SUBCHAPTER III—COAST GUARD CHILD CARE

“551. Definitions.

“553. Child development center standards and inspections.

“554. Child development center employees.

“555. Parent partnerships with child development centers.

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“§ 531. Work-life policies and programs

“The Commandant is authorized—

“(1) to establish an office for the purpose of developing, promulgating, and coordinating policies, programs, and activities related to the families of Coast Guard members;

“(2) to implement and oversee policies, programs, and activities described in paragraph (1) as the Commandant considers necessary; and

“(3) to perform such other duties as the Commandant considers necessary.

“§ 532. Surveys of Coast Guard families

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The Commandant, in order to determine the effectiveness of Federal policies, programs, and activities related to the families of Coast Guard members, may survey—

“(1) any Coast Guard member;

“(2) any retired Coast Guard member;

“(3) the immediate family of any Coast Guard member or retired Coast Guard member; and

“(4) any survivor of a deceased Coast Guard member.

“(b) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—Participation in any survey conducted under subsection (a) shall be voluntary.

“(c) FEDERAL RECORDKEEPING.—Each person surveyed under subsection (a) shall be considered an employee of the United States for purposes of section 3502(3)(A)(i) of title 44.

“SUBCHAPTER II—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT

“§ 542. Education and training opportunities for Coast Guard spouses

“(a) TUITION ASSISTANCE.—The Commandant may provide, subject to the availability of appropriations, tuition assistance to an eligible spouse to facilitate the acquisition of—

“(1) education and training required for a degree or credential at an accredited college, university, or technical school in the United States that expands employment and portable career opportunities for the spouse; or

“(2) education prerequisites and a professional license or credential required, by a government or government-sanctioned licensing body, for an occupation that expands employment and portable career opportunities for the spouse.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) ELIGIBLE SPOUSE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible spouse’ means the spouse of a member of the Coast Guard who is serving on active duty and includes a spouse who receives transitional compensation under section 1059 of title 10.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘eligible spouse’ does not include a person who—

“(i) is married to, but legally separated from, a member of the Coast Guard under a court order or statute of any State or territorial possession of the United States; or

“(ii) is eligible for tuition assistance as a member of the Armed Forces.

“(2) PORTABLE CAREER.—The term ‘portable career’ includes an occupation that requires education, training, or both that results in a credential that is recognized by an industry, profession, or specific type of business.

“§ 543. Youth sponsorship initiatives

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant is authorized to establish, within any Coast Guard unit, an initiative to help integrate into new surroundings the dependent children of members of the Coast Guard who received permanent change of station orders.

“(b) DESCRIPTION OF INITIATIVE.—An initiative established under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) provide for the involvement of a dependent child of a member of the Coast Guard in the dependent child’s new Coast Guard community; and

“(2) primarily focus on preteen and teen-aged children.

“(c) AUTHORITY.—In carrying out an initiative under subsection (a), the Commandant may—

“(1) provide to a dependent child of a member of the Coast Guard information on youth programs and activities available in the dependent child’s new Coast Guard community; and

“(2) enter into agreements with nonprofit entities to provide youth programs and activities to such child.

“SUBCHAPTER III—COAST GUARD CHILD CARE

“§ 551. Definitions

“In this subchapter, the following definitions apply:

“(1) CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.—The term ‘child abuse and neglect’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note).

“(2) CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘child development center employee’ means a civilian employee of the Coast Guard who is employed to work in a Coast Guard child development center without regard to whether the employee is paid from appropriated or nonappropriated funds.

“(3) COAST GUARD CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The term ‘Coast Guard child development center’ means a facility on Coast Guard property or on property under the jurisdiction of the commander of a Coast Guard unit at which child care services are provided for members of the Coast Guard.

“(4) COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITION.—The term ‘competitive service position’ means a position in the competitive service (as defined in section 2102 of title 5).

“(5) FAMILY HOME DAYCARE.—The term ‘family home daycare’ means home-based child care services provided for a member of the Coast Guard by an individual who—

“(A) is certified by the Commandant as qualified to provide home-based child care services; and

“(B) provides home-based child care services on a regular basis in exchange for monetary compensation.

“§ 553. Child development center standards and inspections

“(a) STANDARDS.—The Commandant shall require each Coast Guard child development center to meet standards that the Commandant considers appropriate to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the children and employees at the center.

“(b) INSPECTIONS.—The Commandant shall provide for regular and unannounced inspections of each Coast Guard child development center to ensure compliance with this section.

“(c) NATIONAL REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall maintain and publicize a means by which an individual can report, with respect to a Coast Guard child development center or a family home daycare—

“(A) any suspected violation of—

“(i) standards established under subsection (a); or

“(ii) any other applicable law or standard;

“(B) suspected child abuse or neglect; or

“(C) any other deficiency.

“(2) ANONYMOUS REPORTING.—The Commandant shall ensure that an individual making a report pursuant to paragraph (1) may do so anonymously if so desired by the individual.

“(3) PROCEDURES.—The Commandant shall establish procedures for investigating reports made pursuant to paragraph (1).

“§ 554. Child development center employees

“(a) TRAINING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall establish a training program for Coast Guard child development center employees and satisfactory completion of the training program shall be a condition of employment for each employee of a Coast Guard child development center.

“(2) TIMING FOR NEW HIRES.—The Commandant shall require each employee of a Coast Guard child development center to complete the training program established under paragraph (1) not later than 6 months after the date on which the employee is hired.

“(3) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—The training program established under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, instruction with respect to—

“(A) early childhood development;

“(B) activities and disciplinary techniques appropriate to children of different ages;

“(C) child abuse and neglect prevention and detection; and

“(D) cardiopulmonary resuscitation and other emergency medical procedures.

“(4) USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS.—The Commandant may use Department of Defense training programs, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for purposes of this subsection.

“(b) TRAINING AND CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS.—

“(1) SPECIALIST REQUIRED.—The Commandant shall require that at least 1 employee at each Coast Guard child development center be a specialist in training and curriculum development with appropriate credentials and experience.

“(2) DUTIES.—The duties of the specialist described in paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) special teaching activities;

“(B) daily oversight and instruction of other child care employees;

“(C) daily assistance in the preparation of lesson plans;

“(D) assisting with child abuse and neglect prevention and detection; and

“(E) advising the director of the center on the performance of the other child care employees.

“(3) COMPETITIVE SERVICE.—Each specialist described in paragraph (1) shall be an employee in a competitive service position.

“§ 555. Parent partnerships with child development centers

“(a) PARENT BOARDS.—

“(1) FORMATION.—The Commandant shall require that there be formed at each Coast Guard child development center a board of parents, to be composed of parents of children attending the center.

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—Each board of parents formed under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) meet periodically with the staff of the center at which the board is formed and the commander of the unit served by the center, for the purpose of discussing problems and concerns; and

“(B) be responsible, together with the staff of the center, for coordinating any parent participation initiative established under subsection (b).

“(3) FACIA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to a board of parents formed under paragraph (1).

“(b) PARENT PARTICIPATION INITIATIVE.—The Commandant is authorized to establish a parent participation initiative at each Coast Guard child development center to encourage and facilitate parent participation in educational and related activities at the center.”

(b) TRANSFER OF PROVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REIMBURSEMENT FOR ADOPTION EXPENSES.—Section 514 of title 14, United States Code, is redesignated as section 541 and transferred to appear before section 542 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(B) CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES.—Section 515 of title 14, United States Code—

(i) is redesignated as section 552 and transferred to appear after section 551 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section; and

(ii) is amended—

(I) in subsection (b)(2)(B) by inserting “and whether a family is participating in an initiative established under section 555(b)” after “family income”;

(II) by striking subsections (c) and (e); and

(III) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(C) DEPENDENT SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Section 657 of title 14, United States Code—

(i) is redesignated as section 544 and transferred to appear after section 543 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section; and

(ii) is amended in subsection (a) by striking “Except as otherwise” and all that follows through “the Secretary may” and inserting “The Secretary may”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) PART I.—The analysis for part I of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 13 the following:

“14. Coast Guard Family Support and Child Care 531”.

(B) CHAPTER 13.—The analysis for chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to section 514; and

(ii) by striking the item relating to section 515.

(C) CHAPTER 14.—The analysis for chapter 14 of title 14, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, is amended by inserting—

(i) before the item relating to section 542 the following:

“541. Reimbursement for adoption expenses.”;

(ii) after the item relating to section 551 the following:

“552. Child development services.”; and

(iii) after the item relating to section 543 the following:

“544. Dependent school children.”.

(D) CHAPTER 17.—The analysis for chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 657.

(c) COMMANDANT; GENERAL POWERS.—Section 93(a)(7) of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting “, and to eligible spouses as defined under section 542,” after “Coast Guard”.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the amount of funds appropriated for a fiscal year for operating expenses related to Coast Guard child development services should not be less than the amount of the child development center fee receipts estimated to be collected by the Coast Guard during that fiscal year.

(2) CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER FEE RECEIPTS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “child development center fee receipts” means fees paid by members of the Coast Guard for child care services provided at Coast Guard child development centers.

SEC. 215. MISSION NEED STATEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 569 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 569. Mission need statement

“(a) IN GENERAL.—On the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for fiscal year 2016 under section 1105 of title 31, on the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for fiscal year 2019 under such section, and every 4 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an integrated major acquisition mission need statement.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) INTEGRATED MAJOR ACQUISITION MISSION NEED STATEMENT.—The term ‘integrated major acquisition mission need statement’ means a document that—

“(A) identifies current and projected gaps in Coast Guard mission capabilities using mission hour targets;

“(B) explains how each major acquisition program addresses gaps identified under subparagraph (A) if funded at the levels provided for such program in the most recently submitted capital investment plan; and

“(C) describes the missions the Coast Guard will not be able to achieve, by fiscal year, for each gap identified under subparagraph (A).

“(2) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term ‘major acquisition program’ has the meaning given that term in section 569a(e).

“(3) CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN.—The term ‘capital investment plan’ means the plan required under section 663(a)(1).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 15 of title 14, United States Code,

is amended by striking the item relating to section 569 and inserting the following:

“569. Mission need statement.”.

SEC. 216. TRANSMISSION OF ANNUAL COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION REQUEST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 662 the following:

“§ 662a. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a Coast Guard authorization request with respect to such fiscal year.

“(b) COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION REQUEST DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘Coast Guard authorization request’ means a proposal for legislation that, with respect to the Coast Guard for the relevant fiscal year—

“(1) recommends end strengths for personnel for that fiscal year, as described in section 661;

“(2) recommends authorizations of appropriations for that fiscal year, including with respect to matters described in section 662; and

“(3) addresses any other matter that the Secretary determines is appropriate for inclusion in a Coast Guard authorization bill.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 662 the following:

“662a. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request.”.

SEC. 217. INVENTORY OF REAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 679. Inventory of real property

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Commandant shall establish an inventory of all real property, including submerged lands, under the control of the Coast Guard, which shall include—

“(1) the size, the location, and any other appropriate description of each unit of such property;

“(2) an assessment of the physical condition of each unit of such property, excluding lands;

“(3) a determination of whether each unit of such property should be—

“(A) retained to fulfill a current or projected Coast Guard mission requirement; or

“(B) subject to divestiture; and

“(4) other information the Commandant considers appropriate.

“(b) INVENTORY MAINTENANCE.—The Commandant shall—

“(1) maintain the inventory required under subsection (a) on an ongoing basis; and

“(2) update information on each unit of real property included in such inventory not later than 30 days after any change relating to the control of such property.

“(c) RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 30, 2016, and every 5 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that includes—

“(1) a list of all real property under the control of the Coast Guard and the location of such property by property type;

“(2) recommendations for divestiture with respect to any units of such property; and

“(3) recommendations for consolidating any units of such property, including—

“(A) an estimate of the costs or savings associated with each recommended consolidation; and

“(B) a discussion of the impact that such consolidation would have on Coast Guard mission effectiveness.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“679. Inventory of real property.”.

SEC. 218. RETIRED SERVICE MEMBERS AND DEPENDENTS SERVING ON ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 680. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees

“A committee that—

“(1) advises or assists the Coast Guard with respect to a function that affects a member of the Coast Guard or a dependent of such a member; and

“(2) includes in its membership a retired Coast Guard member or a dependent of such a retired member;

shall not be considered an advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) solely because of such membership.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 679 the following:

“680. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees.”.

SEC. 219. ACTIVE DUTY FOR EMERGENCY AUGMENTATION OF REGULAR FORCES.

Section 712(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “not more than 60 days in any 4-month period and”.

SEC. 220. ACQUISITION WORKFORCE EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY.

Section 404(b) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-281; 124 Stat. 2951) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 221. COAST GUARD ADMINISTRATIVE SAVINGS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF OUTDATED AND DUPLICATIVE REPORTS.—

(1) MARINE INDUSTRY TRAINING.—Section 59 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant” and inserting “The Commandant”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(2) OPERATIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Section 651 of title 14, United States Code, and the item relating to such section in the analysis for chapter 17 of such title, are repealed.

(3) DRUG INTERDICTION.—Section 103 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (14 U.S.C. 89 note), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents in section 2 of that Act, are repealed.

(4) NATIONAL DEFENSE.—Section 426 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (14 U.S.C. 2 note), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents in section 1(b) of that Act, are repealed.

(5) LIVING MARINE RESOURCES.—Section 4(b) of the Cruise Vessel Security and Safety Act

of 2010 (16 U.S.C. 1828 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: “No report shall be required under this subsection, including that no report shall be required under section 224 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 or section 804 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006, for fiscal years beginning after fiscal year 2014.”.

(b) CONSOLIDATION AND REFORM OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) MARINE SAFETY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 2116(d)(2)(B) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(B) on the program’s mission performance in achieving numerical measurable goals established under subsection (b), including—

“(i) the number of civilian and military Coast Guard personnel assigned to marine safety positions; and

“(ii) an identification of marine safety positions that are understaffed to meet the workload required to accomplish each activity included in the strategy and plans under subsection (a); and”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 57 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(i) by striking subsection (e); and

(ii) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (e), (f), and (g) respectively.

(2) MINOR CONSTRUCTION.—Section 656(d)(2) of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget under section 1105 of title 31 each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing each project carried out under paragraph (1), in the most recently concluded fiscal year, for which the amount expended under such paragraph for such project was more than \$1,000,000. If no such project was carried out during a fiscal year, no report under this paragraph shall be required with respect to that fiscal year.”.

SEC. 222. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 14.

Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in section 93(b)(1) by striking “Notwithstanding subsection (a)(14)” and inserting “Notwithstanding subsection (a)(13)”; and

(2) in section 197(b) by striking “of Homeland Security”.

SEC. 223. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR OFFSHORE PATROL CUTTERS.

In fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may enter into, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, multiyear contracts for the procurement of Offshore Patrol Cutters and associated equipment.

SEC. 224. MAINTAINING MEDIUM ENDURANCE CUTTER MISSION CAPABILITY.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that includes—

(1) a schedule and plan for decommissioning, not later than September 30, 2029, each of the 210-foot, Reliance-Class Cutters operated by the Coast Guard on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) a schedule and plan for enhancing the maintenance or extending the service life of each of the 270-foot, Famous-Class Cutters operated by the Coast Guard on the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) to maintain the capability of the Coast Guard to carry out sea-going missions with respect to such Cutters at the level of capability existing on September 30, 2013; and

(B) for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the final Offshore Patrol Cutter is scheduled to be commissioned under paragraph (4);

(3) an identification of the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters capable of sea state 5 operations that, if 8 National Security Cutters are commissioned, are necessary to return the sea state 5 operating capability of the Coast Guard to the level of capability that existed prior to the decommissioning of the first High Endurance Cutter in fiscal year 2011;

(4) a schedule and plan for commissioning the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters identified under paragraph (3); and

(5) a schedule and plan for commissioning, not later than September 30, 2034, a number of Offshore Patrol Cutters not capable of sea state 5 operations that is equal to—

(A) 25; less

(B) the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 225. AVIATION CAPABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may—

(1) request and accept through a direct military-to-military transfer under section 2571 of title 10, United States Code, such H-60 helicopters as may be necessary to establish a year-round operational capability in the Coast Guard’s Ninth District; and

(2) use funds provided under section 101 of this Act to convert such helicopters to Coast Guard MH-60T configuration.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Coast Guard may not—

(A) close a Coast Guard air facility that was in operation on November 30, 2014; or

(B) retire, transfer, relocate, or deploy an aviation asset from an air facility described in subparagraph (A) for the purpose of closing such facility.

(2) SUNSET.—This subsection is repealed effective January 1, 2016.

SEC. 226. GAPS IN WRITINGS ON COAST GUARD HISTORY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on any gaps that exist in writings on the history of the Coast Guard. The report shall address, at a minimum, operations, broad topics, and biographies with respect to the Coast Guard.

SEC. 227. OFFICER EVALUATION REPORTS.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a written assessment of the Coast Guard’s officer evaluation reporting system.

(b) CONTENTS OF ASSESSMENT.—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, an analysis of—

(1) the extent to which the Coast Guard's officer evaluation reports differ in length, form, and content from the officer fitness reports used by the Navy and other branches of the Armed Forces;

(2) the extent to which differences determined pursuant to paragraph (1) are the result of inherent differences between—

(A) the Coast Guard and the Navy; and

(B) the Coast Guard and other branches of the Armed Forces;

(3) the feasibility of more closely aligning and conforming the Coast Guard's officer evaluation reports with the officer fitness reports of the Navy and other branches of the Armed Forces; and

(4) the costs and benefits of the alignment and conformity described in paragraph (3), including with respect to—

(A) Coast Guard administrative efficiency;

(B) fairness and equity for Coast Guard officers; and

(C) carrying out the Coast Guard's statutory mission of defense readiness, including when operating as a service in the Navy.

SEC. 228. IMPROVED SAFETY INFORMATION FOR VESSELS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall establish a process that allows an operator of a marine exchange or other non-Federal vessel traffic information service to use the automatic identification system to transmit weather, ice, and other important navigation safety information to vessels.

SEC. 229. E-LORAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not carry out activities related to the dismantling or disposal of infrastructure that supported the former LORAN system until the later of—

(1) the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date on which the Secretary provides to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate notice of a determination by the Secretary that such infrastructure is not required to provide a positioning, navigation, and timing system to provide redundant capability in the event GPS signals are disrupted.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to activities necessary for the safety of human life.

(c) AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, and other agreements with Federal entities and other public or private entities, including academic entities, to develop a positioning, navigation, and timing system, including an enhanced LORAN system, to provide redundant capability in the event GPS signals are disrupted.

SEC. 230. ANALYSIS OF RESOURCE DEFICIENCIES WITH RESPECT TO MARITIME BORDER SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report describing any Coast Guard resource deficiencies related to—

(1) securing maritime borders with respect to the Great Lakes and the coastal areas of the Southeastern and Southwestern United

States, including with respect to Florida, California, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands;

(2) patrolling and monitoring maritime approaches to the areas described in paragraph (1); and

(3) patrolling and monitoring relevant portions of the Western Hemisphere Drug Transit Zone.

(b) SCOPE.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Commandant shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the Coast Guard's statutory missions with respect to migrant interdiction, drug interdiction, defense readiness, living marine resources, and ports, waterways, and coastal security;

(2) whether Coast Guard missions are being executed to meet national performance targets set under the National Drug Control Strategy;

(3) the number and types of cutters and other vessels required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(4) the number and types of aircraft, including unmanned aircraft, required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(5) the number of assets that require upgraded sensor and communications systems to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(6) the Deployable Specialized Forces required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions; and

(7) whether additional shoreside facilities are required to accommodate Coast Guard personnel and assets in support of Coast Guard missions.

SEC. 231. MODERNIZATION OF NATIONAL DISTRESS AND RESPONSE SYSTEM.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the implementation of the Rescue 21 project in Alaska and in Coast Guard sectors Upper Mississippi River, Lower Mississippi River, and Ohio River Valley.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) describe what improvements are being made to the distress response system in the areas specified in subsection (a), including information on which areas will receive digital selective calling and direction finding capability;

(2) describe the impediments to installing digital selective calling and direction finding capability in areas where such technology will not be installed;

(3) identify locations in the areas specified in subsection (a) where communication gaps will continue to present a risk to mariners after completion of the Rescue 21 project;

(4) include a list of all reported marine accidents, casualties, and fatalities occurring in the locations identified under paragraph (3) since 1990; and

(5) provide an estimate of the costs associated with installing the technology necessary to close communication gaps in the locations identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 232. REPORT RECONCILING MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONAL PRIORITIES ON THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of

Representatives a report that outlines a course of action to reconcile general maintenance priorities for cutters with operational priorities on the Missouri River.

SEC. 233. MARITIME SEARCH AND RESCUE ASSISTANCE POLICY ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall assess the Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy as it relates to State and local responders.

(b) SCOPE.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the extent to which Coast Guard search and rescue coordinators have entered into domestic search and rescue agreements with State and local responders under the National Search and Rescue Plan;

(2) whether the domestic search and rescue agreements include the Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy; and

(3) the extent to which Coast Guard sectors coordinate with 911 emergency centers, including ensuring the dissemination of appropriate maritime distress check-sheets.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit a report on the assessment under subsection (a) to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—SHIPPING AND NAVIGATION

SEC. 301. REPEAL.

Chapter 555 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by repealing section 55501;

(2) by redesignating section 55502 as section 55501; and

(3) in the analysis by striking the items relating to sections 55501 and 55502 and inserting the following:

“55501. United States Committee on the Marine Transportation System.”.

SEC. 302. DONATION OF HISTORICAL PROPERTY.

Section 51103 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) DONATION FOR HISTORICAL PURPOSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may convey the right, title, and interest of the United States Government in any property administered by the Maritime Administration, except real estate or vessels, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that such property is not needed by the Maritime Administration; and

“(B) the recipient—

“(i) is a nonprofit organization, a State, or a political subdivision of a State;

“(ii) agrees to hold the Government harmless for any claims arising from exposure to hazardous materials, including asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, or lead paint, after conveyance of the property;

“(iii) provides a description and explanation of the intended use of the property to the Secretary for approval;

“(iv) has provided to the Secretary proof, as determined by the Secretary, of resources sufficient to accomplish the intended use provided under clause (iii) and to maintain the property;

“(v) agrees that when the recipient no longer requires the property, the recipient shall—

“(I) return the property to the Secretary, at the recipient's expense and in the same condition as received except for ordinary wear and tear; or

“(II) subject to the approval of the Secretary, retain, sell, or otherwise dispose of the property in a manner consistent with applicable law; and

“(vi) agrees to any additional terms the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(2) REVERSION.—The Secretary shall include in any conveyance under this subsection terms under which all right, title, and interest conveyed by the Secretary shall revert to the Government if the Secretary determines the property has been used other than as approved by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(B)(iii).”.

SEC. 303. SMALL SHIPYARDS.

Section 54101(i) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2009 through 2013” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

SEC. 304. DRUG TESTING REPORTING.

Section 7706 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “an applicant for employment by a Federal agency,” after “Federal agency,”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by—

(A) inserting “or an applicant for employment by a Federal agency” after “an employee”; and

(B) striking “the employee.” and inserting “the employee or the applicant.”.

SEC. 305. OPPORTUNITIES FOR SEA SERVICE VETERANS.

(a) ENDORSEMENTS FOR VETERANS.—Section 7101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) The Secretary may issue a license under this section in a class under subsection (c) to an applicant that—

“(1) has at least 3 months of qualifying service on vessels of the uniformed services (as that term is defined in section 101(a) of title 10) of appropriate tonnage or horsepower within the 7-year period immediately preceding the date of application; and

“(2) satisfies all other requirements for such a license.”.

(b) SEA SERVICE LETTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 427 the following:

“§ 428. Sea service letters

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide a sea service letter to a member or former member of the Coast Guard who—

“(1) accumulated sea service on a vessel of the armed forces (as such term is defined in section 101(a) of title 10); and

“(2) requests such letter.

“(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 30 days after receiving a request for a sea service letter from a member or former member of the Coast Guard under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide such letter to such member or former member if such member or former member satisfies the requirement under subsection (a)(1).”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 427 the following:

“428. Sea service letters.”.

(c) CREDITING OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES SERVICE, TRAINING, AND QUALIFICATIONS.—

(1) MAXIMIZING CREDITABILITY.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in implementing United States merchant mariner license, certification, and document laws and the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, shall maximize the extent to which United States Armed Forces service, training, and qualifications are creditable toward meeting the requirements of such laws and such Convention.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the

Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the steps taken to implement this subsection.

(d) MERCHANT MARINE POST-SERVICE CAREER OPPORTUNITIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall take steps to promote better awareness, on an ongoing basis, among Coast Guard personnel regarding post-service use of Coast Guard training, education, and practical experience in satisfaction of requirements for merchant mariner credentials under section 11.213 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 306. CLARIFICATION OF HIGH-RISK WATERS.

Section 55305(e) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “provide armed personnel aboard” and inserting “reimburse, subject to the availability of appropriations, the owners or operators of”; and

(B) by inserting “for the cost of providing armed personnel aboard such vessels” before “if”; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘high-risk waters’ means waters so designated by the Commandant of the Coast Guard in the maritime security directive issued by the Commandant and in effect on the date on which an applicable voyage begins, if the Secretary of Transportation—

“(A) determines that an act of piracy occurred in the 12-month period preceding the date the voyage begins; or

“(B) in such period, issued an advisory warning that an act of piracy is possible in such waters.”.

SEC. 307. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) TITLE 46.—Section 2116(b)(1)(D) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 93(c)” and inserting “section 93(c) of title 14”.

(b) COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2006.—Section 304(a) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–241; 33 U.S.C. 1503 note) is amended by inserting “and from” before “the United States”.

(c) DEEPWATER PORT ACT OF 1974.—Section 4(i) of the Deepwater Port Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 1503(i)) is amended by inserting “or that will supply” after “be supplied with”.

SEC. 308. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the number of jobs, including vessel construction and vessel operating jobs, that would be created in the United States maritime industry each year in 2015 through 2025 if liquefied natural gas exported from the United States were required to be carried—

(1) before December 31, 2018, on vessels documented under the laws of the United States; and

(2) on and after such date, on vessels documented under the laws of the United States and constructed in the United States.

SEC. 309. FISHING SAFETY GRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) FISHING SAFETY TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4502(i)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2010

through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

(b) FISHING SAFETY RESEARCH GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4502(j)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2010 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

SEC. 310. ESTABLISHMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 81 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 8108. Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as ‘the Committee’). The Committee—

“(1) shall act solely in an advisory capacity to the Secretary through the Commandant of the Coast Guard on matters relating to personnel in the United States merchant marine, including training, qualifications, certification, documentation, and fitness standards, and other matters as assigned by the Commandant;

“(2) shall review and comment on proposed Coast Guard regulations and policies relating to personnel in the United States merchant marine, including training, qualifications, certification, documentation, and fitness standards;

“(3) may be given special assignments by the Secretary and may conduct studies, inquiries, workshops, and fact finding in consultation with individuals and groups in the private sector and with State or local governments;

“(4) shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations reflecting its independent judgment to the Secretary;

“(5) shall meet not less than twice each year; and

“(6) may make available to Congress recommendations that the Committee makes to the Secretary.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of not more than 19 members who are appointed by and serve terms of a duration determined by the Secretary. Before filling a position on the Committee, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register soliciting nominations for membership on the Committee.

“(2) REQUIRED MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall appoint as members of the Committee—

“(A) 9 United States citizens with active licenses or certificates issued under chapter 71 or merchant mariner documents issued under chapter 73, including—

“(i) 3 deck officers who represent the viewpoint of merchant marine deck officers, of whom—

“(I) 2 shall be licensed for oceans any gross tons;

“(II) 1 shall be licensed for inland river route with a limited or unlimited tonnage;

“(III) 2 shall have a master's license or a master of towing vessels license;

“(IV) 1 shall have significant tanker experience; and

“(V) to the extent practicable—

“(aa) 1 shall represent the viewpoint of labor; and

“(bb) another shall represent a management perspective;

“(ii) 3 engineering officers who represent the viewpoint of merchant marine engineering officers, of whom—

“(I) 2 shall be licensed as chief engineer any horsepower;

“(II) 1 shall be licensed as either a limited chief engineer or a designated duty engineer; and

“(III) to the extent practicable—

“(aa) 1 shall represent a labor viewpoint; and

“(bb) another shall represent a management perspective;

“(iii) 2 unlicensed seamen, of whom—

“(I) 1 shall represent the viewpoint of able-bodied seamen; and

“(II) another shall represent the viewpoint of qualified members of the engine department; and

“(iv) 1 pilot who represents the viewpoint of merchant marine pilots;

“(B) 6 marine educators, including—

“(i) 3 marine educators who represent the viewpoint of maritime academies, including—

“(I) 2 who represent the viewpoint of State maritime academies and are jointly recommended by such State maritime academies; and

“(II) 1 who represents either the viewpoint of the State maritime academies or the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

“(ii) 3 marine educators who represent the viewpoint of other maritime training institutions, 1 of whom shall represent the viewpoint of the small vessel industry;

“(C) 2 individuals who represent the viewpoint of shipping companies employed in ship operation management; and

“(D) 2 members who are appointed from the general public.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Transportation in making an appointment under paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II).

“(c) CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The Secretary shall designate one member of the Committee as the Chairman and one member of the Committee as the Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or incapacity of the Chairman, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman.

“(d) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Committee may establish and disestablish subcommittees and working groups for any purpose consistent with this section, subject to conditions imposed by the Committee. Members of the Committee and additional persons drawn from the general public may be assigned to such subcommittees and working groups. Only Committee members may chair subcommittee or working groups.

“(e) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate on September 30, 2020.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“8108. Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee.”

SEC. 311. TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE.

(a) TITLE 46, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 2110 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b)(1) In addition to the collection of fees and charges established under subsection (a), in providing a service or thing of value under this subtitle the Secretary may accept in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence.

“(2) The value of in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence accepted under this paragraph may not exceed applicable per diem rates set forth in regulations prescribed under section 464 of title 37.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “subsections (a) and (b),” and inserting “subsection (a),”.

(b) TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 664 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsections (e) though (g) as subsections (f) through (h), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e)(1) In addition to the collection of fees and charges established under this section, in the provision of a service or thing of value by the Coast Guard the Secretary may accept in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence.

“(2) The value of in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence accepted under this paragraph may not exceed applicable per diem rates set forth in regulations prescribed under section 464 of title 37.”.

(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not accept in-kind transportation, travel, or subsistence under section 664(e) of title 14, United States Code, or section 2110(d)(4) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, until the Commandant of the Coast Guard—

(1) amends the Standards of Ethical Conduct for members and employees of the Coast Guard to include regulations governing the acceptance of in-kind reimbursements; and

(2) notifies the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the amendments made under paragraph (1).

SEC. 312. PROMPT INTERGOVERNMENTAL NOTICE OF MARINE CASUALTIES.

Section 6101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) NOTICE TO STATE AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—Not later than 24 hours after receiving a notice of a major marine casualty under this section, the Secretary shall notify each State or federally recognized Indian tribe that is, or may reasonably be expected to be, affected by such marine casualty.”;

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking “(1)”;

(B) by redesignating subsection (h)(2) as subsection (i) of section 6101, and in such subsection—

(i) by striking “paragraph,” and inserting “section.”; and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as paragraphs (1) through (4); and

(3) by redesignating the last subsection as subsection (j).

SEC. 313. AREA CONTINGENCY PLANS.

Section 311(j)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “qualified personnel of Federal, State, and local agencies.” and inserting “qualified—

“(i) personnel of Federal, State, and local agencies; and

“(ii) members of federally recognized Indian tribes, where applicable.”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(A) by striking “and local” and inserting “, local, and tribal”;

(B) by striking “wildlife,” and inserting “wildlife, including advance planning with respect to the closing and reopening of fishing areas following a discharge.”;

(3) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “and local” and inserting “, local, and tribal”;

(4) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking “and Federal, State, and local agencies” and inserting “,

Federal, State, and local agencies, and tribal governments”;

(B) by redesignating clauses (vii) and (viii) as clauses (viii) and (ix), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

“(vii) include a framework for advance planning and decisionmaking with respect to the closing and reopening of fishing areas following a discharge, including protocols and standards for the closing and reopening of fishing areas.”.

SEC. 314. INTERNATIONAL ICE PATROL REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 803 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 80301, by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PAYMENTS.—Payments received pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall be credited to the appropriation for operating expenses of the Coast Guard.”;

(2) in section 80302—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “An ice patrol vessel” and inserting “The ice patrol”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “An ice patrol vessel” and inserting “The ice patrol”;

(C) in the first sentence of subsection (d), by striking “vessels” and inserting “aircraft”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 80304. Limitation on ice patrol data

“Notwithstanding sections 80301 and 80302, data collected by an ice patrol conducted by the Coast Guard under this chapter may not be disseminated to a vessel unless such vessel is—

“(1) documented under the laws of the United States; or

“(2) documented under the laws of a foreign country that made the payment or contribution required under section 80301(b) for the year preceding the year in which the data is collected.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“80304. Limitation on ice patrol data.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on January 1, 2017.

SEC. 315. OFFSHORE SUPPLY VESSEL THIRD-PARTY INSPECTION.

Section 3316 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f)(1) Upon request of an owner or operator of an offshore supply vessel, the Secretary shall delegate the authorities set forth in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) with respect to such vessel to a classification society to which a delegation is authorized under that paragraph. A delegation by the Secretary under this subsection shall be used for any vessel inspection and examination function carried out by the Secretary, including the issuance of certificates of inspection and all other related documents.

“(2) If the Secretary determines that a certificate of inspection or related document issued under authority delegated under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to a vessel has reduced the operational safety of that vessel, the Secretary may terminate the certificate or document, respectively.

“(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014, and for each year of the subsequent 2-year period, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives

and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing—

“(A) the number of vessels for which a delegation was made under paragraph (1);

“(B) any savings in personnel and operational costs incurred by the Coast Guard that resulted from the delegations; and

“(C) based on measurable marine casualty and other data, any impacts of the delegations on the operational safety of vessels for which the delegations were made, and on the crew on those vessels.”.

SEC. 316. WATCHES.

Section 8104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders” and inserting “and oilers”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “(except the coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders)”.

SEC. 317. COAST GUARD RESPONSE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) VESSEL RESPONSE PLAN CONTENTS.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require that each vessel response plan prepared for a mobile offshore drilling unit includes information from the facility response plan prepared for the mobile offshore drilling unit regarding the planned response to a worst case discharge, and to a threat of such a discharge.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MOBILE OFFSHORE DRILLING UNIT.—The term “mobile offshore drilling unit” has the meaning given that term in section 1001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701).

(2) RESPONSE PLAN.—The term “response plan” means a response plan prepared under section 311(j) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)).

(3) WORST CASE DISCHARGE.—The term “worst case discharge” has the meaning given that term under section 311(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Coast Guard to review or approve a facility response plan for a mobile offshore drilling unit.

SEC. 318. REGIONAL CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL.

Section 5002(k)(3) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2732(k)(3)) is amended by striking “not more than \$1,000,000” and inserting “not less than \$1,400,000”.

SEC. 319. UNINSPECTED PASSENGER VESSELS IN THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b)(1) In applying this title with respect to an uninspected vessel of less than 24 meters overall in length that carries passengers to or from a port in the United States Virgin Islands, the Secretary shall substitute ‘12 passengers’ for ‘6 passengers’ each place it appears in section 2101(42) if the Secretary determines that the vessel complies with, as applicable to the vessel—

“(A) the Code of Practice for the Safety of Small Commercial Motor Vessels (commonly referred to as the ‘Yellow Code’), as published by the U.K. Maritime and Coastguard Agency and in effect on January 1, 2014; or

“(B) the Code of Practice for the Safety of Small Commercial Sailing Vessels (commonly referred to as the ‘Blue Code’), as pub-

lished by such agency and in effect on such date.

“(2) If the Secretary establishes standards to carry out this subsection—

“(A) such standards shall be identical to those established in the Codes of Practice referred to in paragraph (1); and

“(B) on any dates before the date on which such standards are in effect, the Codes of Practice referred to in paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the vessels referred to in paragraph (1).”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 4105(c) of title 46, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is amended by striking “Within twenty-four months of the date of enactment of this subsection, the” and inserting “The”.

SEC. 320. TREATMENT OF ABANDONED SEAFARERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 111 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 11113. Treatment of abandoned seafarers

“(a) ABANDONED SEAFARERS FUND.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a separate account to be known as the Abandoned Seafarers Fund.

“(2) AUTHORIZED USES.—Amounts in the Fund may be appropriated to the Secretary for use—

“(A) to pay necessary support of a seafarer—

“(i) who—

“(I) was paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)), or for whom the Secretary has requested parole under such section; and

“(II) is involved in an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter that is related to the administration or enforcement of law by the Coast Guard; or

“(ii) who—

“(I) is physically present in the United States;

“(II) the Secretary determines was abandoned in the United States; and

“(III) has not applied for asylum under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

“(B) to reimburse a vessel owner or operator for the costs of necessary support of a seafarer who has been paroled into the United States to facilitate an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter that is related to the administration or enforcement of law by the Coast Guard, if—

“(i) the vessel owner or operator is not convicted of a criminal offense related to such matter; or

“(ii) the Secretary determines that reimbursement is appropriate.

“(3) CREDITING OF AMOUNTS TO FUND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), there shall be credited to the Fund the following:

“(i) Penalties deposited in the Fund under section 9 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1908).

“(ii) Amounts reimbursed or recovered under subsection (c).

“(B) LIMITATION.—Amounts may be credited to the Fund under subparagraph (A) only if the unobligated balance of the Fund is less than \$5,000,000.

“(4) REPORT REQUIRED.—On the date on which the President submits each budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that describes—

“(A) the amounts credited to the Fund under paragraph (2) for the preceding fiscal year; and

“(B) amounts in the Fund that were expended for the preceding fiscal year.

“(b) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to create a private right of action or any other right, benefit, or entitlement to necessary support for any person; or

“(2) to compel the Secretary to pay or reimburse the cost of necessary support.

“(c) REIMBURSEMENT; RECOVERY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel owner or operator shall reimburse the Fund an amount equal to the total amount paid from the Fund for necessary support of a seafarer, if—

“(A) the vessel owner or operator—

“(i) during the course of an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter under this Act that the Coast Guard referred to a United States attorney or the Attorney General, fails to provide necessary support of a seafarer who was paroled into the United States to facilitate the investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication; and

“(ii) subsequently is—

“(I) convicted of a criminal offense related to such matter; or

“(II) required to reimburse the Fund pursuant to a court order or negotiated settlement related to such matter; or

“(B) the vessel owner or operator abandons a seafarer in the United States, as determined by the Secretary based on substantial evidence.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If a vessel owner or operator fails to reimburse the Fund under paragraph (1) within 60 days after receiving a written, itemized description of reimbursable expenses and a demand for payment, the Secretary may—

“(A) proceed in rem against the vessel on which the seafarer served in the Federal district court for the district in which the vessel is found; and

“(B) withhold or revoke the clearance required under section 60105 for the vessel and any other vessel operated by the same operator (as that term is defined in section 2(9)(a) of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901(9)(a)) as the vessel on which the seafarer served.

“(3) OBTAINING CLEARANCE.—A vessel may obtain clearance from the Secretary after it is withheld or revoked under paragraph (2)(B) if the vessel owner or operator—

“(A) reimburses the Fund the amount required under paragraph (1); or

“(B) provides a bond, or other evidence of financial responsibility, sufficient to meet the amount required to be reimbursed under paragraph (1).

“(4) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall notify the vessel at least 72 hours before taking any action under paragraph (2)(B).

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ABANDONS; ABANDONED.—Each of the terms ‘abandons’ and ‘abandoned’ means—

“(A) a vessel owner’s or operator’s unilateral severance of ties with a seafarer; or

“(B) a vessel owner’s or operator’s failure to provide necessary support of a seafarer.

“(2) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the Abandoned Seafarers Fund established under this section.

“(3) NECESSARY SUPPORT.—The term ‘necessary support’ means normal wages and expenses the Secretary considers reasonable

for lodging, subsistence, clothing, medical care (including hospitalization), repatriation, and any other support the Secretary considers to be appropriate.

“(4) SEAFARER.—The term ‘seafarer’ means an alien crew member who is employed or engaged in any capacity on board a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

“(5) VESSEL SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ‘vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States’ has the meaning given that term in section 70502(c), except that it does not include a vessel that is—

“(A) owned, or operated under a bareboat charter, by the United States, a State or political subdivision thereof, or a foreign nation; and

“(B) not engaged in commerce.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1113. Treatment of abandoned seafarers.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1908) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Any penalty collected under subsection (a) or (b) that is not paid under that subsection to the person giving information leading to the conviction or assessment of such penalties shall be deposited in the Abandoned Seafarers Fund established under section 1113 of title 46, United States Code.”.

SEC. 321. WEBSITE.

(a) REPORTS TO SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION; INCIDENTS AND DETAILS.—Section 3507(g)(3)(A) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (ii) by striking “the incident to an Internet based portal maintained by the Secretary” and inserting “each incident specified in clause (i) to the Internet website maintained by the Secretary of Transportation under paragraph (4)(A)”;

(2) in clause (iii) by striking “based portal maintained by the Secretary” and inserting “website maintained by the Secretary of Transportation under paragraph (4)(A)”.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF INCIDENT DATA ON INTERNET.—Section 3507(g)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) WEBSITE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall maintain a statistical compilation of all incidents on board a cruise vessel specified in paragraph (3)(A)(i) on an Internet website that provides a numerical accounting of the missing persons and alleged crimes reported under that paragraph without regard to the investigative status of the incident.

“(ii) UPDATES AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The compilation under clause (i) shall—

“(I) be updated not less frequently than quarterly;

“(II) be able to be sorted by cruise line;

“(III) identify each cruise line by name;

“(IV) identify each crime or alleged crime committed or allegedly committed by a passenger or crewmember;

“(V) identify the number of individuals alleged overboard; and

“(VI) include the approximate number of passengers and crew carried by each cruise line during each quarterly reporting period.

“(iii) USER-FRIENDLY FORMAT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall ensure that the compilation, data, and any other information provided on the Internet website

maintained under this subparagraph are in a user-friendly format. The Secretary shall, to the greatest extent practicable, use existing commercial off the shelf technology to transfer and establish the website, and shall not independently develop software, or acquire new hardware in operating the site.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking “Secretary” and inserting “Secretary of Transportation”.

SEC. 322. COAST GUARD REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an analysis of the Coast Guard’s proposed promulgation of safety and environmental management system requirements for vessels engaged in Outer Continental Shelf activities. The analysis shall include—

(1) a discussion of any new operational, management, design and construction, financial, and other mandates that would be imposed on vessel owners and operators;

(2) an estimate of all associated direct and indirect operational, management, personnel, training, vessel design and construction, record keeping, and other costs;

(3) an identification and justification of any of such proposed requirements that exceed those in international conventions applicable to the design, construction, operation, and management of vessels engaging in United States Outer Continental Shelf activities; and

(4) an identification of exemptions to the proposed requirements, that are based upon vessel classification, tonnage, offshore activity or function, alternative certifications, or any other appropriate criteria.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not issue proposed regulations relating to safety and environmental management system requirements for vessels on the United States Outer Continental Shelf for which noticed was published on September 10, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 55230) earlier than 6 months after the submittal of the analysis required by subsection (a).

TITLE IV—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission \$24,700,000 for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 402. AWARD OF REPARATIONS.

Section 41305 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “, plus reasonable attorney fees”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ATTORNEY FEES.—In any action brought under section 41301, the prevailing party may be awarded reasonable attorney fees.”.

SEC. 403. TERMS OF COMMISSIONERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) TERMS.—The term of each Commissioner is 5 years. When the term of a Commissioner ends, the Commissioner may continue to serve until a successor is appointed and qualified, but for a period not to exceed one year. Except as provided in paragraph (3), no individual may serve more than 2 terms.”; and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (5), and inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) VACANCIES.—A vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. An individual appointed to fill a vacancy is appointed only for the unexpired term of the individual being succeeded. An individual appointed to fill a vacancy may serve 2 terms in addition to the remainder of the term for which the predecessor of that individual was appointed.

“(4) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—

“(A) LIMITATION ON RELATIONSHIPS WITH REGULATED ENTITIES.—A Commissioner may not have a pecuniary interest in, hold an official relation to, or own stocks or bonds of any entity the Commission regulates under chapter 401 of this title.

“(B) LIMITATION ON OTHER ACTIVITIES.—A Commissioner may not engage in another business, vocation, or employment.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) does not apply with respect to a Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission appointed and confirmed by the Senate before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 501. ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION.

(a) ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 89 the following:

“§ 90. Arctic maritime transportation

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure safe and secure maritime shipping in the Arctic including the availability of aids to navigation, vessel escorts, spill response capability, and maritime search and rescue in the Arctic.

“(b) INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION AGREEMENTS.—To carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is encouraged to enter into negotiations through the International Maritime Organization to conclude and execute agreements to promote coordinated action among the United States, Russia, Canada, Iceland, Norway, and Denmark and other seafaring and Arctic nations to ensure, in the Arctic—

“(1) placement and maintenance of aids to navigation;

“(2) appropriate marine safety, tug, and salvage capabilities;

“(3) oil spill prevention and response capability;

“(4) maritime domain awareness, including long-range vessel tracking; and

“(5) search and rescue.

“(c) COORDINATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.—The Committee on the Maritime Transportation System established under section 55501 of title 46, United States Code, shall coordinate the establishment of domestic transportation policies in the Arctic necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

“(d) AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may, subject to the availability of appropriations, enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, or other agreements with, or make grants to, individuals and governments to carry out the purpose of this section or any agreements established under subsection (b).

“(e) ICEBREAKING.—The Secretary shall promote safe maritime navigation by means of icebreaking where necessary, feasible, and effective to carry out the purposes of this section.

“(f) ARCTIC DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘Arctic’ has the meaning given

such term in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 89 the following:

“90. Arctic maritime transportation”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 307 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-281; 14 U.S.C. 92 note) is repealed.

SEC. 502. ARCTIC MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 154. Arctic maritime domain awareness

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall improve maritime domain awareness in the Arctic—

“(1) by promoting interagency cooperation and coordination;

“(2) by employing joint, interagency, and international capabilities; and

“(3) by facilitating the sharing of information, intelligence, and data related to the Arctic maritime domain between the Coast Guard and departments and agencies listed in subsection (b).

“(b) COORDINATION.—The Commandant shall seek to coordinate the collection, sharing, and use of information, intelligence, and data related to the Arctic maritime domain between the Coast Guard and the following:

“(1) The Department of Homeland Security.

“(2) The Department of Defense.

“(3) The Department of Transportation.

“(4) The Department of State.

“(5) The Department of the Interior.

“(6) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

“(7) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

“(8) The Environmental Protection Agency.

“(9) The National Science Foundation.

“(10) The Arctic Research Commission.

“(11) Any Federal agency or commission or State the Commandant determines is appropriate.

“(c) COOPERATION.—The Commandant and the head of a department or agency listed in subsection (b) may by agreement, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, share personnel, services, equipment, and facilities to carry out the requirements of this section.

“(d) 5-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than January 1, 2016 and every 5 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a 5-year strategic plan to guide interagency and international intergovernmental cooperation and coordination for the purpose of improving maritime domain awareness in the Arctic.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the term ‘Arctic’ has the meaning given that term in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 153 the following:

“154. Arctic maritime domain awareness.”.

SEC. 503. IMO POLAR CODE NEGOTIATIONS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and thereafter with the submission of the budget proposal sub-

mitted for each of fiscal years 2016, 2017, and 2018 under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a report on—

(1) the status of the negotiations at the International Maritime Organization regarding the establishment of a draft international code of safety for ships operating in polar waters, popularly known as the Polar Code, and any amendments proposed by such a code to be made to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea and the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships;

(2) the coming into effect of such a code and such amendments for nations that are parties to those conventions;

(3) impacts, for coastal communities located in the Arctic (as that term is defined in the section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111)) of such a code or such amendments, on—

(A) the costs of delivering fuel and freight; and

(B) the safety of maritime transportation; and

(4) actions the Secretary must take to implement the requirements of such a code and such amendments.

SEC. 504. FORWARD OPERATING FACILITIES.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may construct facilities in the Arctic (as that term is defined in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111). The facilities shall—

(1) support aircraft maintenance, including exhaust ventilation, heat, an engine wash system, fuel, ground support services, and electrical power;

(2) provide shelter for both current helicopter assets and those projected to be located at Air Station Kodiak, Alaska, for at least 20 years; and

(3) include accommodations for personnel.

SEC. 505. ICEBREAKERS.

(a) COAST GUARD POLAR ICEBREAKERS.—Section 222 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-213; 126 Stat. 1560) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading by striking “; BRIDGING STRATEGY”; and

(B) by striking “Commandant of the Coast Guard” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “Commandant of the Coast Guard may decommission the Polar Sea.”;

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following:

“(3) RESULT OF NO DETERMINATION.—If in the analysis submitted under this section the Secretary does not make a determination under subsection (a)(5) regarding whether it is cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea, then—

“(A) the Commandant of the Coast Guard may decommission the Polar Sea; or

“(B) the Secretary may make such determination, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014, and take actions in accordance with this subsection as though such determination was made in the analysis previously submitted.”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) STRATEGIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the analysis required under subsection (a) is submitted, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate—

“(A) unless the Secretary makes a determination under this section that it is cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea, a bridging strategy for maintaining the Coast Guard’s polar icebreaking services until at least September 30, 2024;

“(B) a strategy to meet the Coast Guard’s Arctic ice operations needs through September 30, 2050; and

“(C) a strategy to meet the Coast Guard’s Antarctic ice operations needs through September 30, 2050

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—The strategies required under paragraph (1) shall include a business case analysis comparing the leasing and purchasing of icebreakers to maintain the needs and services described in that paragraph.”.

(b) CUTTER “POLAR SEA”.—Upon the submission of a service life extension plan in accordance with section 222(d)(1)(C) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-213; 126 Stat. 1560), the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may use funds authorized under section 101 of this Act to conduct a service life extension of 7 to 10 years for the Coast Guard Cutter *Polar Sea* (WAGB 11) in accordance with such plan.

(c) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not expend amounts appropriated for the Coast Guard for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2024, for—

(A) design activities related to a capability of a Polar-Class Icebreaker that is based solely on an operational requirement of another Federal department or agency, except for amounts appropriated for design activities for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2016; or

(B) long-lead-time materials, production, or post-delivery activities related to such a capability.

(2) OTHER AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available to the Secretary under an agreement with another Federal department or agency and expended on a capability of a Polar-Class Icebreaker that is based solely on an operational requirement of that or another Federal department or agency shall not be treated as amounts expended by the Secretary for purposes of the limitation established under paragraph (1).

SEC. 506. ICEBREAKING IN POLAR REGIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 86 the following:

“§ 87. Icebreaking in polar regions

“The President shall facilitate planning for the design, procurement, maintenance, deployment, and operation of icebreakers as needed to support the statutory missions of the Coast Guard in the polar regions by allocating all funds to support icebreaking operations in such regions, except for recurring incremental costs associated with specific projects, to the Coast Guard.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 86 the following:

“87. Icebreaking in polar regions.”.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. DISTANT WATER TUNA FLEET.

Section 421 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (46 U.S.C. 8103 note) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsections (c) and (e); and
- (2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (f) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

SEC. 602. EXTENSION OF MORATORIUM.

Section 2(a) of Public Law 110-299 (33 U.S.C. 1342 note) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 603. NATIONAL MARITIME STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a national maritime strategy.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) identify—
 - (A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and
 - (B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and
- (2) include recommendations to—
 - (A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;
 - (B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;
 - (C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;
 - (D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;
 - (E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 5560(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and
 - (F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an assessment of authorities under subtitle II of title 46, United States Code, that have been delegated to the Coast Guard and that impact the ability of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to effectively compete in international transportation markets.

(b) REVIEW OF DIFFERENCES WITH IMO STANDARDS.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall include a review of differences between United States laws, policies, regulations, and guidance governing the inspection of vessels documented under the laws of the United States and standards set by the International Maritime Organization governing the inspection of vessels.

(c) DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Commandant enters into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences under subsection (a), the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the assessment required under such subsection.

SEC. 606. VESSEL REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICES OF ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE AND AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the status of the final rule that relates to the notice of proposed rulemaking titled “Vessel Requirements for Notices of Arrival and Departure, and Automatic Identification System” and published in the Federal Register on December 16, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 76295).

SEC. 607. CONVEYANCE OF COAST GUARD PROPERTY IN ROCHESTER, NEW YORK.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard is authorized to convey, at fair market value, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, consisting of approximately 0.2 acres, that is under the administrative control of the Coast Guard and located at 527 River Street in Rochester, New York.

(b) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—The City of Rochester, New York, shall have the right of first refusal with respect to the purchase, at fair market value, of the real property described in subsection (a).

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property described in subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Commandant.

(d) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The fair market value of the property described in subsection (a) shall—

- (1) be determined by appraisal; and
- (2) be subject to the approval of the Commandant.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The responsibility for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with a conveyance under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Commandant and the purchaser.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Commandant may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under subsection (a) as the Commandant considers appropriate and reasonable to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—Any proceeds from a conveyance under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the fund established under section 687 of title 14, United States Code.

SEC. 608. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) CITY.—The term “City” means the city of Gig Harbor, Washington.

(2) PROPERTY.—The term “Property” means the parcel of real property, together with any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 0.86 acres of fast lands commonly identified as tract 65 of lot 1 of section 8, township 21 north, range 2 east, Willamette Meridian, on the north side of the entrance of Gig Harbor, narrows of Puget Sound, Washington.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) CONVEYANCE.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating relinquishes the reservation of the Property for lighthouse purposes, at the request of the City and subject to the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall convey to the City all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Property, notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713).

(2) TERMS OF CONVEYANCE.—A conveyance made under paragraph (1) shall be made—

- (A) subject to valid existing rights;
- (B) at the fair market value as described in subsection (c); and
- (C) subject to any other condition that the Secretary may consider appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) COSTS.—The City shall pay any transaction or administrative costs associated with a conveyance under paragraph (1), including the costs of the appraisal, title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(4) CONVEYANCE IS NOT A MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—A conveyance under paragraph (1) shall not be considered a major Federal action for purposes of section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

(c) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

(1) DETERMINATION.—The fair market value of the Property shall be—

- (A) determined by an appraisal conducted by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary; and
- (B) approved by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An appraisal conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

- (A) be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—
 - (i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and
 - (ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and
- (B) shall reflect the equitable considerations described in paragraph (3).

(3) EQUITABLE CONSIDERATIONS.—In approving the fair market value of the Property under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration matters of equity and fairness, including the City’s past and current lease of the Property, any maintenance or improvements by the City to the Property, and such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) REVOCATION; REVERSION.—Effective on

and after the date on which a conveyance of

the Property is made under subsection (b)(1)—

(1) Executive Order 3528, dated August 9, 1921, is revoked; and

(2) the use of the tide and shore lands belonging to the State of Washington and adjoining and bordering the Property, that were granted to the Government of the United States pursuant to the Act of the Legislature, State of Washington, approved March 13, 1909, the same being chapter 110 of the Session Laws of 1909, shall revert to the State of Washington.

SEC. 609. VESSEL DETERMINATION.

The vessel assigned United States official number 1205366 is deemed a new vessel effective on the date of delivery of the vessel after January 1, 2012, from a privately owned United States shipyard, if no encumbrances are on record with the Coast Guard at the time of the issuance of the new certificate of documentation for the vessel.

SEC. 610. SAFE VESSEL OPERATION IN THUNDER BAY.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not prohibit a vessel operating within the existing boundaries and any future expanded boundaries of the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve from taking up or discharging ballast water to allow for safe and efficient vessel operation if the uptake or discharge meets all Federal and State ballast water management requirements that would apply if the area were not a marine sanctuary.

SEC. 611. PARKING FACILITIES.

(a) ALLOCATION AND ASSIGNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this section, the Administrator of General Services, in coordination with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall allocate and assign the spaces in parking facilities at the Department of Homeland Security St. Elizabeths Campus to allow any member or employee of the Coast Guard, who is assigned to the Campus, to use such spaces.

(2) TIMING.—In carrying out paragraph (1), and in addition to the parking spaces allocated and assigned to Coast Guard members and employees in fiscal year 2014, the Administrator shall allocate and assign not less than—

(A) 300 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2015;

(B) 700 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2016; and

(C) 1,042 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2017.

(b) TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each fiscal year thereafter in which spaces are allocated and assigned under subsection (a)(2), the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the impact of assigning and allocating parking spaces under subsection (a) on the congestion of roads connecting the St. Elizabeths Campus to the portions of Suitland Parkway and I-295 located in the Anacostia section of the District of Columbia; and

(2) progress made toward completion of essential transportation improvements identified in the Transportation Management Program for the St. Elizabeths Campus.

(c) REALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Administrator may revise

the allocation and assignment of spaces to members and employees of the Coast Guard made under subsection (a) as necessary to accommodate employees of the Department of Homeland Security, other than the Coast Guard, when such employees are assigned to the St. Elizabeths Campus.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS OIG MANDATES REVISION ACT OF 2014

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2651) to repeal certain mandates of the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2651

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE CARGO INSPECTION TARGETING SYSTEM.—

(1) REPEAL.—Subsections (g) and (h) of section 809 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–293; 46 U.S.C. 70101 note) are repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 809 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–293; 118 Stat. 1085), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “and (j)” and inserting “and (h)”;

(B) by redesignating subsections (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(b) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT AN ANNUAL REVIEW OF COAST GUARD PERFORMANCE.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 888(f) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 468(f)) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 888 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 468), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively.

(c) ANNUAL REVIEW OF GRANTS TO STATES AND HIGH-RISK URBAN AREAS.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 2022(a)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 612(a)(3)) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2022(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 612(a)), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (4), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “paragraphs (2) and (3)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”; and

(ii) by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 2651.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 2651, the DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014, repeals three reports the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General is required to conduct and submit annually to Congress. The reports include evaluations of the cargo inspection targeting system for international intermodal cargo containers, Coast Guard mission performance, and certain Department of Homeland Security grants.

Without a mandate, the Department's Office of Inspector General can continue to conduct these audits periodically, but at its own discretion. CBO estimates repeal of these mandates will save nearly \$2 million to the taxpayers annually.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: I write to you regarding the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in S. 2651, the “DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014”. The measure passed the Senate by unanimous consent on September 17, 2014 and was additionally referred to the Committee on Homeland Security.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to proceed expeditiously to the House floor, I will forgo further consideration of S. 2651. However, I do so with the following reservation. By eliminating mandates of Inspector General investigations, Congress lessens its voice in oversight of the Department of Homeland Security. Under this lawless Administration, Congress should have more of a voice, not less, in what the Office of Inspector General investigates.

In addition, I will forgo consideration with the mutual understanding that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security is in no way diminished. I further request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of this Committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

Finally, I request you include this letter and your response into the Congressional Record during consideration of S. 2651 on the House floor. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdictional interest in S. 2651, the DHS OIG Mandates Revision Act of 2014.

I appreciate your willingness to forego consideration of S. 2651, and we that by foregoing action on this legislation, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security is in no way diminished. Additionally, I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

Finally, I will include our letters in the Congressional Record during House floor consideration of the bill. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this legislation. As summarized by my colleague from California, it alleviates the Office of Inspector General of the United States Department of Homeland Security from having to perform three annual audits.

Repeating these audits will help to slightly reduce the burden of congressionally mandated reports. All this information is available to us in other forms and it is good to get rid of these reports, which are sometimes not really sent anyway.

By the way, Mr. HUNTER, congratulations on the recently passed Coast Guard legislation.

Furthermore, eliminating the mandate will allow the IG to reallocate resources to something really useful, like finding out what went wrong, wherever it might be. This way, the legislation may improve the oversight of programs and the activities of the Department of Homeland Security, which would be extremely useful to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2651.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES COTTON FUTURES ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and pass the bill (H.R. 5810) to amend the United States Cotton Futures Act to exclude certain cotton futures contracts from coverage under such Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5810

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCLUDING CERTAIN COTTON FUTURES CONTRACTS FROM COVERAGE UNDER UNITED STATES COTTON FUTURES ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c)(1) of the United States Cotton Futures Act (7 U.S.C. 15B(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “except that any cotton futures contract” and inserting the following: “except that—

“(A) any cotton futures contract”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) any cotton futures contract that permits tender of cotton grown outside of the United States is excluded from the coverage of this paragraph and section to the extent that the cotton grown outside of the United States is tendered for delivery under the cotton futures contract.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to cotton futures contracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 5810.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND), my colleague.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5810.

This bill would meet the cotton industry's growing need for a rural contract for cotton on the United States market.

H.R. 5810 offers a simple technical fix that is needed due to the outdated 1916 Cotton Futures Act in terms of recognizing the global cotton trade.

Recent discussions with USDA revealed that the 1916 Cotton Futures Act requires all cotton tendered on a cotton futures contract that is listed for trading on a U.S. exchange to be classified by the USDA. This is unrealistic, both logistically and financially, for non-U.S. cotton stored in warehouses outside the U.S.

The industry's desire to trade and hedge a more modern contract requires

a legislative tweak to the 1916 Cotton Futures Act to allow for any non-U.S. cotton tendered toward this U.S. contract to be inspected and classed by non-USDA personnel.

Our proposal would not change the regulation of the contract, nor the current USDA classing requirement that U.S. cotton must be classified by the USDA personnel.

Additionally, this bill also would not impact fees being generated by the USDA in the classing of U.S. cotton, tendered toward the existing cotton futures.

Here is the bottom line. For the industry to be able to hedge the 2015 cotton crop, they will need a tweak to this futures act that they may petition the CFTC for the new world contract to be listed. If H.R. 5810 is not passed, a new contract would likely be listed at other exchanges in Europe or Singapore.

With such unanimous support for this contract and solution, we hope this effort will be considered technical in nature and adopted quickly.

I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my colleague from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) has just eloquently stated, there is a great need for this, everybody is in agreement on it. The Cotton Number 2 contract is needed as a hedging tool for our cotton industry globally. It is needed so that we can have both delivery points inside as well as outside the United States because our global markets are now more global.

As my colleague, Mr. WESTMORELAND, mentioned, we have not touched this law since 1916. That is nearly 100 years. You can imagine so much has changed. It is very, very much more global, and we do not need to put our cotton participants in trade, in marketing, in commodities at a disadvantage, as was indicated, to other markets.

This is urgent. If we do not move within the next 3 weeks, so that we can have this on the books as law in time for our cotton participants in the United States to be able to function for their year 2015—in the cotton business you start early, you start in January and February, so it is very urgent. The legislation benefits everybody. All participants are in agreement.

The bottom line is that this legislation is about modernization. Our markets, as I said before, have become much more global. It is a technical correction. It will help our cotton farmers, our cotton producers, and those who have to hedge in the marketplace around the world, and it does not—does not—put our cotton industry in the United States at a disadvantage globally.

I certainly urge that we all accept this amendment and move forward

with a very, very important part of American industry, the cotton industry.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As my colleague said, Mr. Speaker, every year, cotton farmers prepare their fields. Off the field they must prepare as well, hedging risk and protecting themselves from possible disaster with cotton futures contracts on U.S. commodity exchanges.

The Cotton Number 2 contract, which is a U.S.-regulated contract, is the benchmark contract for the entire United States cotton industry. However, recently, a wide range of cotton industry participants have recommended the development of a world cotton contract with delivery points inside and outside of the United States. This is in recognition of the global nature of today's cotton industry.

The 1916 Cotton Futures Act requires that all cotton futures contracts that are listed on the U.S. exchange must be classed by the USDA, regardless of where the cotton is being stored. This structure is outdated and does not recognize the global cotton trade that exists today.

H.R. 5810 would simply allow for cotton futures contracts to be offered on a U.S. exchange that is based off of the world market price. This bill would neither change the regulation of the current futures contracts nor the current USDA classing, which requires U.S. cotton be classed again by USDA personnel.

With these technical changes in H.R. 5810, a new cotton futures contract will be available in U.S. commodity markets.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5810. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5810.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5816) to extend the authorization for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5816

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION AND TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

The International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 is amended—

(1) in section 207(a) (22 U.S.C. 6435(a)), by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”; and

(2) in section 209 (22 U.S.C. 6436), by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect as if enacted on December 10, 2014.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENOUNCING USE OF CIVILIANS AS HUMAN SHIELDS BY HAMAS AND OTHER TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 107) denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations in violation of international humanitarian law, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the use of human shields is unconscionable and morally unacceptable;

Whereas since June 15, 2014, there have been over 2,000 rockets fired by Hamas and other terrorist organizations from Gaza into Israel;

Whereas Hamas uses civilian populations as human shields by placing their missile batteries in densely populated areas and near schools, hospitals, and mosques;

Whereas Israel dropped leaflets, made announcements, placed phone calls, and sent text messages to the Palestinian people in Gaza warning them in advance that an attack was imminent, and went to extraordinary lengths to target only terrorist actors and to minimize collateral damage;

Whereas Hamas urged the residents of Gaza to ignore the Israeli warnings and to remain in their houses and encouraged Palestinians to gather on the roofs of their homes to act as human shields;

Whereas on July 23, 2014, the 46-Member UN Human Rights Council passed a resolution to form a commission of inquiry over Israel's operations in Gaza that completely fails to condemn Hamas for its indiscriminate rocket attacks and its unconscionable use of human shields, with the United States being the lone dissenting vote;

Whereas public reports have cited the role of Iran and Syria in providing material support and training to Hamas and other terrorist groups carrying out rocket and mortar attacks from Gaza;

Whereas throughout the summer of 2006 conflict between the State of Israel and the terrorist organization Hezbollah, Hezbollah forces utilized innocent civilians as human shields;

Whereas al Qaeda, Al-Shabaab, Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and other foreign terrorist organizations typically use innocent civilians as human shields;

Whereas the United States and Israel have cooperated on missile defense projects, including Iron Dome, David's Sling, and the Arrow Anti-Missile System, projects designed to thwart a diverse range of threats, including short-range missiles and rockets fired by non-state actors, such as Hamas;

Whereas the United States provided \$460,000,000 in fiscal year 2014 for Iron Dome research, development, and production;

Whereas during the most recent rocket attacks from Gaza, Iron Dome successfully intercepted dozens of rockets that were launched against Israeli population centers; and

Whereas 5,000,000 Israelis are currently living under the threat of rocket attacks from Gaza: Now, therefore, be it

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the use of innocent civilians as human shields;

(2) calls on the international community to recognize and condemn Hamas' use of human shields;

(3) places responsibility for the rocket attacks against Israel on Hamas and other terrorist organizations, such as Palestine Islamic Jihad;

(4) supports the sovereign right of the Government of Israel to defend its territory and its citizens from Hamas' rocket attacks, kidnapping attempts, and the use of tunnels and other means to carry out attacks against Israel;

(5) expresses condolences to the families of the innocent victims on both sides of the conflict;

(6) supports Palestinian civilians who reject Hamas and all forms of terrorism and violence, desiring to live in peace with their Israeli neighbors;

(7) supports efforts to demilitarize the Gaza Strip, removing Hamas's means to target Israel, including its use of tunnels, rockets, and other means; and

(8) condemns the United Nations Human Rights Council's biased resolution establishing a commission of inquiry into Israel's Gaza operations.

Amend the title so as to read: “A concurrent resolution denouncing the use of civilians as human shields by Hamas and other terrorist organizations.”

Mr. ROYCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NAVAL VESSEL TRANSFER ACT OF 2013

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1683) to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign recipients, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1683

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

- (1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and
- (2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

TITLE I—TRANSFER OF EXCESS UNITED STATES NAVAL VESSELS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2013”.

SEC. 102. TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN RECIPIENTS.

(a) TRANSFERS BY GRANT TO MEXICO.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Mexico the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS CURTS (FFG-38) and USS MCCLUSKY (FFG-41) on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(b) TRANSFER BY SALE TO THE TAIPEI ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL REPRESENTATIVE OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES.—The President is authorized to transfer the OLIVER HAZARD PERRY class guided missile frigates USS TAYLOR (FFG-50), USS GARY (FFG-51), USS CARR (FFG-52), and USS ELROD (FFG-55) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (which is the Taiwan instrumentality designated pursuant to section 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3309(a))) on a sale basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761).

(c) ALTERNATIVE TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the authority provided in subsections (a) and (b) and to transfer specific vessels to specific countries, the President is authorized to transfer any vessel named in this title to any country named in this section, subject to the same conditions that would apply for such country under this section, such that the total number of vessels transferred to such country does not exceed the total number of vessels authorized for transfer to such country by this section.

(d) GRANTS NOT COUNTED IN ANNUAL TOTAL OF TRANSFERRED EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—The value of a vessel transferred to another country on a grant basis pursuant to authority provided by subsection (a) shall

not be counted against the aggregate value of excess defense articles transferred in any fiscal year under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(e) COSTS OF TRANSFERS.—Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this section shall be charged to the recipient notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)).

(f) REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the President shall require, as a condition of the transfer of a vessel under this section, that the recipient to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that recipient, performed at a shipyard located in the United States.

(g) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer a vessel under this section shall expire at the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. ENHANCED CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF ARMS SALES, INCLUDING TO THE MIDDLE EAST.

Section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF SHIPMENT OF ARMS.—At least 30 days prior to a shipment of defense articles subject to the requirements of subsection (b) at the joint request of the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the President shall provide notification of such pending shipment, in unclassified form, with a classified annex as necessary, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 202. INCREASE IN ANNUAL LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.

Section 516(g)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(g)(1)) is amended by striking “\$425,000,000” and inserting “\$500,000,000”.

SEC. 203. INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS AT TRAINING LOCATIONS IN SOUTHWEST ASIA.

Section 544(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347c(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The President shall report to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 656(e)) annually on the activities undertaken in the programs authorized under this subsection.”.

SEC. 204. LICENSING OF CERTAIN COMMERCE-CONTROLLED ITEMS.

Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) LICENSING OF CERTAIN COMMERCE-CONTROLLED ITEMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A license or other approval from the Department of State granted in accordance with this section may also authorize the export of items subject to the Export Administration Regulations if such items are to be used in or with defense articles controlled on the United States Munitions List.

“(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The following requirements shall apply with respect to a license or other approval to authorize the export of items subject to the Export Administration Regulations under paragraph (1):

“(A) Separate approval from the Department of Commerce shall not be required for such items if such items are approved for export under a Department of State license or other approval.

“(B) Such items subject to the Export Administration Regulations that are exported pursuant to a Department of State license or other approval would remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce with respect to any subsequent transactions.

“(C) The inclusion of the term ‘subject to the EAR’ or any similar term on a Department of State license or approval shall not affect the jurisdiction with respect to such items.

“(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘Export Administration Regulations’ means—

“(A) the Export Administration Regulations as maintained and amended under the authority of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); or

“(B) any successor regulations.”.

SEC. 205. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REMOVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR REMOVAL OF MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President shall take such actions as may be necessary to require that, at the time of export or reexport of any major defense equipment listed on the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, the major defense equipment will not be subsequently modified so as to transform such major defense equipment into a defense article.

“(B) The President may authorize the transformation of any major defense equipment described in subparagraph (A) into a defense article if the President—

“(i) determines that such transformation is appropriate and in the national interests of the United States; and

“(ii) provides notice of such transformation to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate consistent with the notification requirements of section 36(b)(5)(A) of this Act.

“(C) In this paragraph, the term ‘defense article’ means an item designated by the President pursuant to subsection (a)(1).”.

(b) NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR DEFENSE EQUIPMENT REMOVED FROM UNITED STATES MUNITIONS LIST.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The President shall ensure that any major defense equipment that is listed on the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, shall continue to be subject to the notification and reporting requirements of the following provisions of law:

“(A) Section 516(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(f)).

“(B) Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2415).

“(C) Section 3(d)(3)(A) of this Act.

“(D) Section 25 of this Act.

“(E) Section 36(b), (c), and (d) of this Act.”.

SEC. 206. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF "SECURITY ASSISTANCE" UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.

Section 502B(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "and" at the end; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2)(C) to read as follows:

"(C) any license in effect with respect to the export to or for the armed forces, police, intelligence, or other internal security forces of a foreign country of—

"(i) defense articles or defense services under section 38 of the Armed Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778); or

"(ii) items listed under the 600 series of the Commerce Control List contained in Supplement No. 1 to part 774 of subtitle B of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations;"

SEC. 207. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS OF "DEFENSE ARTICLE" AND "DEFENSE SERVICE" UNDER THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.

Section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3), by striking "includes" and inserting "means, with respect to a sale or transfer by the United States under the authority of this Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States"; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking "includes" and inserting "means, with respect to a sale or transfer by the United States under the authority of this Act or any other foreign assistance or sales program of the United States;"

SEC. 208. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in sections 3(a), 3(d)(1), 3(d)(3)(A), 3(e), 5(c), 6, 21(g), 36(a), 36(b)(1), 36(b)(5)(C), 36(c)(1), 36(f), 38(f)(1), 40(f)(1), 40(g)(2)(B), 101(b), and 102(a)(2), by striking "the Speaker of the House of Representatives and" each place it appears and inserting "the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and";

(2) in section 21(i)(1) by inserting after "the Speaker of the House of Representatives" the following "the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services of the House of Representatives,";

(3) in sections 25(e), 38(f)(2), 38(j)(3), and 38(j)(4)(B), by striking "International Relations" each place it appears and inserting "Foreign Affairs";

(4) in sections 27(f) and 62(a), by inserting after "the Speaker of the House of Representatives," each place it appears the following: "the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives,"; and

(5) in section 73(e)(2), by striking "the Committee on National Security and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives" and inserting "the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives";

(b) OTHER TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.—The Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(A) in section 38—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by redesignating the second subparagraph (B) (as added by section 1255(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Public Law 100-204; 101 Stat. 1431)) as subparagraph (C);

(ii) in subsection (g)(1)(A)—

(I) in clause (xi), by striking "or" and inserting "or"; and

(II) in clause (xii)—

(aa) by striking "section" and inserting "sections"; and

(bb) by striking "(18 U.S.C. 175b)" and inserting "(18 U.S.C. 175c)"; and

(iii) in subsection (j)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "in" after "to"; and

(B) in section 47(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "sec. 21(a)," and inserting "section 21(a),".

(2) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking "Wherever applicable, a description" and inserting "Wherever applicable, such report shall include a description"; and

(B) in subsection (d)(2)(B), by striking "credits" and inserting "credits".

SEC. 209. APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1979.

(a) PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Section 12(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2411(c)) has been in effect from August 20, 2001, and continues in effect on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and notwithstanding section 20 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2419). Section 12(c)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 is a statute covered by section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—Subsection (a) terminates at the end of the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I will include in the RECORD a letter signed by myself and Mr. ENGEL to the Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN F. KERRY,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Today the House of Representatives will pass and send to the President S. 1683, a bill that bolsters allies Taiwan and Mexico with the transfer of U.S. Navy frigates and makes other changes to the law to enhance our security assistance to foreign partners.

As you may know, section 201 of this legislation would amend section 36 of the Arms

Export Control Act to require the President to notify Congress 30 days before shipments of certain defense articles if jointly requested to do so by the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs or the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It is our understanding that the Department may be concerned that this new congressional notification requirement could pose an undue burden on the administration of United States arms transfers.

However, given the comprehensive exchange of information between the Department and the Committee during the congressional review process on U.S. arms sales, we would expect to invoke section 201 only in rare circumstances. For example, a similar authority in section 36(b)(1), providing for a request by the same committees of additional and highly detailed information from the President on a pending Foreign Military Sale, has been used only once in the last seven years.

Likewise, we expect that the current protocols governing the notification of arms sales, a process by which sensitive national security and foreign policy questions are addressed informally before a notification is formally submitted for congressional review, will remain the preeminent means by which the Committee conducts oversight over United States arms transfer policy.

We look forward to continuing to work with you on these important matters in the 114th Congress.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.
ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Ranking Member.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, S. 1683. It would allow the United States to transfer certain decommissioned naval vessels to Taiwan and Mexico. It also makes some technical amendments to U.S. export control laws.

Let me say that I appreciate the broad bipartisan support that the contents of this measure already received because this April, the House passed the underlying bill, H.R. 3470, of which I am the author, the companion legislation to this bill. Mr. ELIOT ENGEL and I were the cosponsors.

I am pleased that this important legislation supporting the defense of our Taiwanese allies has now been passed by the other body. With passage by the House, it will make its way to the President's desk.

On April 10, 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act was established to govern America's relationship with the Republic of China-Taiwan. For 35 years, the act has helped maintain peace and security across the Taiwan Strait and across the Asia-Pacific region.

During this time, Taiwan has undergone a monumental transformation. It has gone from grinding poverty and political repression to the vibrant multiparty democracy that it is today. Taiwan's economy has evolved. It is now our 10th top trading partner.

As chairman, I led two bipartisan delegations to Taipei, Kaohsiung, and Tainan to examine Taiwan's economy

and defense capabilities. Today's legislation is the product of the committee's bipartisan effort to prioritize the U.S.-Taiwan relationship.

This legislation authorizes the President to send four *Perry* class guided missile frigates to Taiwan. These are ships that are greatly needed to augment Taiwan's defense capability. I have seen firsthand the World War II-era submarines—I was on one of them—and the 50-year-old fighter jets that form the core of Taiwan's military.

Congress has made it clear to the administration that it wants more defense sales and more transfers like this to Taiwan, including transfers to support the modernization of its combat aircraft and its submarine fleet. These four guided missile cruisers would bolster Taiwan's defense to ensure that peace in the Taiwan Strait continues to benefit not just Taiwan, but the entire region.

In addition to supporting Taiwan, this legislation also authorizes the transfer of excess decommissioned naval vessels to Mexico. Mr. VARGAS and I recently returned from Mexico City, and transfers such as these help to support the priorities of the U.S. Navy while strengthening the capability of allies and our close partners to meet our shared maritime security objectives.

Finally, the bill includes a provision requested by the Department of Commerce to ensure that our export control regime will continue to protect sensitive information related to export licensing. In particular, it clarifies that the business confidentiality protections of the lapsed Export Administration Act remain in effect under another provision of the law and will continue to protect information related to export licensing.

This provision will both protect U.S. national security and the competitiveness of American exporters while providing time for Congress and the executive branch to modernize the statutory basis for our export control regime.

While I am disappointed that this measure does not include a provision from the House bill that would have expedited U.S. arms sales to close allies, the committee will continue to promote improvements to the foreign military sales process in the next Congress.

Finally, the bill will also clarify that certain business confidentiality protections of the Export Administration Act will continue to protect the information related to export licensing.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1683, the Naval Vessel Transfer Act. This bill includes many of the provisions in H.R. 3470, which the House passed on April 7 and sent to the other body.

I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE for the bipartisan manner in which the original House bill was drafted, considered by the committee, and passed by the House. With today's action on S. 1683, we finish our work on this important legislation.

In the Taiwan Relations Act, the United States made a commitment to support Taiwan's defensive capability. To that end, this bill authorizes the President to transfer up to four surplus U.S. naval vessels to Taiwan. In light of China's increasingly aggressive actions in the Pacific region, it is more important than ever to bolster Taiwan's security.

This bill also authorizes a transfer of two surplus naval vessels to Mexico, a critical defense partner of the United States. These vessels will strengthen Mexico's ability to function effectively with the U.S. Navy in joint operations.

Finally, the bill strengthens congressional review of the licensing and shipment of U.S. defense exports. These provisions are necessary in light of the significant regulatory changes now being implemented by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Defense.

The President's Export Control Reform initiative will modernize our system of regulating trade and defense and dual-use items, and appropriate congressional review must continue to be an integral part of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for S. 1683 so we can send this legislation to the President for signature into law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing examining the promises that were made under the Taiwan Relations Act. That was signed 35 years ago, and there are few pieces of legislation related to foreign policy that have been as consequential as Congress stepping in with this act 35 years ago.

It is the steadfast support of the United States Congress that has helped Taiwan become what it is today: a thriving, modern society that strongly respects human rights, the rule of law, and free markets. Passage of this act is a step towards keeping the promises that we made to Taiwan 35 years ago in that Taiwan Relations Act, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. In closing, Mr. Speaker, as was said, this bill authorizes a transfer of naval vessels to Taiwan and Mexico, two good friends and partners of the United States. It also makes changes to regulating armed transfers and strengthens congressional oversight of the system.

I would once again like to thank Chairman ROYCE for working with us in a bipartisan manner on this important

legislation. I would also like to say that as a freshman Member who may not be serving again on the committee that it was a real honor to serve under the chairman. He in fact acts very bipartisan.

He is a real leader in this country, and I am very proud that he is a Californian. It has been an honor, sir, to serve with you.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would say likewise to Mr. VARGAS for his service on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1683.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Financial Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2270) to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2270

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Insurance Capital Standards Clarification Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF LEVERAGE AND RISK-BASED CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.

Section 171 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5371) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

"(4) BUSINESS OF INSURANCE.—The term 'business of insurance' has the same meaning as in section 1002(3).

"(5) PERSON REGULATED BY A STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR.—The term 'person regulated by a State insurance regulator' has the same meaning as in section 1002(22).

"(6) REGULATED FOREIGN SUBSIDIARY AND REGULATED FOREIGN AFFILIATE.—The terms 'regulated foreign subsidiary' and 'regulated foreign affiliate' mean a person engaged in the business of insurance in a foreign country that is regulated by a foreign insurance regulatory authority that is a member of the

International Association of Insurance Supervisors or other comparable foreign insurance regulatory authority as determined by the Board of Governors following consultation with the State insurance regulators, including the lead State insurance commissioner (or similar State official) of the insurance holding company system as determined by the procedures within the Financial Analysis Handbook adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, where the person, or its principal United States insurance affiliate, has its principal place of business or is domiciled, but only to the extent that—

“(A) such person acts in its capacity as a regulated insurance entity; and

“(B) the Board of Governors does not determine that the capital requirements in a specific foreign jurisdiction are inadequate.

“(7) CAPACITY AS A REGULATED INSURANCE ENTITY.—The term ‘capacity as a regulated insurance entity’—

“(A) includes any action or activity undertaken by a person regulated by a State insurance regulator or a regulated foreign subsidiary or regulated foreign affiliate of such person, as those actions relate to the provision of insurance, or other activities necessary to engage in the business of insurance; and

“(B) does not include any action or activity, including any financial activity, that is not regulated by a State insurance regulator or a foreign agency or authority and subject to State insurance capital requirements or, in the case of a regulated foreign subsidiary or regulated foreign affiliate, capital requirements imposed by a foreign insurance regulatory authority.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) CLARIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In establishing the minimum leverage capital requirements and minimum risk-based capital requirements on a consolidated basis for a depository institution holding company or a nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors as required under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall not be required to include, for any purpose of this section (including in any determination of consolidation), a person regulated by a State insurance regulator or a regulated foreign subsidiary or a regulated foreign affiliate of such person engaged in the business of insurance, to the extent that such person acts in its capacity as a regulated insurance entity.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON BOARD’S AUTHORITY.—This subsection shall not be construed to prohibit, modify, limit, or otherwise supersede any other provision of Federal law that provides the Board of Governors authority to issue regulations and orders relating to capital requirements for depository institution holding companies or nonbank financial companies supervised by the Board of Governors.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION ON ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A depository institution holding company or nonbank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve that is also a person regulated by a State insurance regulator that is engaged in the business of insurance that files financial statements with a State insurance regulator or the National Association of Insurance Commissioners utilizing only Statutory Accounting Principles in accordance with State law, shall not be required by the Board under the authority of this section

or the authority of the Home Owners’ Loan Act to prepare such financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

“(B) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall limit the authority of the Board under any other applicable provision of law to conduct any regulatory or supervisory activity of a depository institution holding company or non-bank financial company supervised by the Board of Governors, including the collection or reporting of any information on an entity or group-wide basis. Nothing in this paragraph shall excuse the Board from its obligations to comply with section 161(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5361(a)) and section 10(b)(2) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(b)(2)), as appropriate.”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VENEZUELA DEFENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND CIVIL SOCIETY ACT OF 2014

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2142) to impose targeted sanctions on persons responsible for violations of human rights of antigovernment protesters in Venezuela, to strengthen civil society in Venezuela, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2142

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Central Bank of Venezuela and the National Statistical Institute of Venezuela stated that the annual inflation rate in Venezuela in 2013 was 56.30, the highest level of inflation in the Western Hemisphere and the third highest level of inflation in the world behind South Sudan and Syria.

(2) The Central Bank of Venezuela and the Government of Venezuela have imposed a series of currency controls that has exacerbated economic problems and, according to the World Economic Forum, has become the most problematic factor for doing business in Venezuela.

(3) The Central Bank of Venezuela declared that the scarcity index of Venezuela reached 29.4 percent in March 2014, which signifies that fewer than one in 4 basic goods is unavailable at any given time. The Central Bank has not released any information on the scarcity index since that time.

(4) Since 1999, violent crime in Venezuela has risen sharply and the Venezuelan Violence Observatory, an independent nongovernmental organization, found the national per capita murder rate to be 79 per 100,000 people in 2013.

(5) The international nongovernmental organization Human Rights Watch recently stated, “Under the leadership of President Chávez and now President Maduro, the accumulation of power in the executive branch

and the erosion of human rights guarantees have enabled the government to intimidate, censor, and prosecute its critics.”.

(6) The Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2013 of the Department of State maintained that in Venezuela “the government did not respect judicial independence or permit judges to act according to the law without fear of retaliation” and “the government used the judiciary to intimidate and selectively prosecute political, union, business, and civil society leaders who were critical of government policies or actions”.

(7) The Government of Venezuela has detained foreign journalists and threatened and expelled international media outlets operating in Venezuela, and the international nongovernmental organization Freedom House declared that Venezuela’s “media climate is permeated by intimidation, sometimes including physical attacks, and strong antimedia rhetoric by the government is common”.

(8) Since February 4, 2014, the Government of Venezuela has responded to antigovernment protests with violence and killings perpetrated by its public security forces.

(9) In May 2014, Human Rights Watch found that the unlawful use of force perpetrated against antigovernment protesters was “part of a systematic practice by the Venezuelan security forces”.

(10) As of September 1, 2014, 41 people had been killed, approximately 3,000 had been arrested unjustly, and more than 150 remained in prison and faced criminal charges as a result of antigovernment demonstrations throughout Venezuela.

(11) Opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez was arrested on February 18, 2014, in relation to the protests and was unjustly charged with criminal incitement, conspiracy, arson, and property damage. Since his arrest, Lopez has been held in solitary confinement and has been denied 58 out of 60 of his proposed witnesses at his ongoing trial.

(12) As of September 1, 2014, not a single member of the public security forces of the Government of Venezuela had been held accountable for acts of violence perpetrated against antigovernment protesters.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ANTIGOVERNMENT PROTESTS IN VENEZUELA AND THE NEED TO PREVENT FURTHER VIOLENCE IN VENEZUELA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States aspires to a mutually beneficial relationship with Venezuela based on respect for human rights and the rule of law and a functional and productive relationship on issues of public security, including counternarcotics and counterterrorism;

(2) the United States supports the people of Venezuela in their efforts to realize their full economic potential and to advance representative democracy, human rights, and the rule of law within their country;

(3) the chronic mismanagement by the Government of Venezuela of its economy has produced conditions of economic hardship and scarcity of basic goods and foodstuffs for the people of Venezuela;

(4) the failure of the Government of Venezuela to guarantee minimal standards of public security for its citizens has led the country to become one of the most violent and corrupt in the world;

(5) the Government of Venezuela continues to take steps to remove checks and balances on the executive, politicize the judiciary, undermine the independence of the legislature through use of executive decree powers, persecute and prosecute its political opponents,

curtail freedom of the press, and limit the free expression of its citizens;

(6) Venezuelans, responding to ongoing economic hardship, high levels of crime and violence, and the lack of basic political rights and individual freedoms, have turned out in demonstrations in Caracas and throughout the country to protest the failure of the Government of Venezuela to protect the political and economic well-being of its citizens; and

(7) the repeated use of violence perpetrated by the National Guard and security personnel of Venezuela, as well as persons acting on behalf of the Government of Venezuela, against antigovernment protesters that began on February 4, 2014, is intolerable and the use of unprovoked violence by protesters is also a matter of serious concern.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD VENEZUELA.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the people of Venezuela in their aspiration to live under conditions of peace and representative democracy as defined by the Inter-American Democratic Charter of the Organization of American States;

(2) to work in concert with the other member states within the Organization of American States, as well as the countries of the European Union, to ensure the peaceful resolution of the current situation in Venezuela and the immediate cessation of violence against antigovernment protestors;

(3) to hold accountable government and security officials in Venezuela responsible for or complicit in the use of force in relation to antigovernment protests and similar future acts of violence; and

(4) to continue to support the development of democratic political processes and independent civil society in Venezuela.

SEC. 5. SANCTIONS ON PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR VIOLENCE IN VENEZUELA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person, including any current or former official of the Government of Venezuela or any person acting on behalf of that Government, that the President determines—

(1) has perpetrated, or is responsible for ordering or otherwise directing, significant acts of violence or serious human rights abuses in Venezuela against persons associated with the antigovernment protests in Venezuela that began on February 4, 2014;

(2) has ordered or otherwise directed the arrest or prosecution of a person in Venezuela primarily because of the person's legitimate exercise of freedom of expression or assembly; or

(3) has knowingly materially assisted, sponsored, or provided significant financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the commission of acts described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(A) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCU-

MENTATION.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be subject to subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, the alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the alien.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1)(A) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The requirement to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under paragraph (1)(A) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(4) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President—

(1) determines that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States; and

(2) on or before the date on which the waiver takes effect, submits to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a notice of and justification for the waiver.

(d) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

(e) TERMINATION.—The requirement to impose sanctions under this section shall terminate on December 31, 2016.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admitted” and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term “financial institution” has the meaning given that term in section 5312 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(4) GOOD.—The term “good” has the meaning given that term in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415) (as continued in effect pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)).

(5) KNOWINGLY.—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(6) MATERIALLY ASSISTED.—The term “materially assisted” means the provision of assistance that is significant and of a kind directly relevant to acts described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a).

(7) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON BROADCASTING, INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION, AND CIRCUMVENTION TECHNOLOGY DISTRIBUTION IN VENEZUELA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (in this section referred to as the “Board”) shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) a thorough evaluation of the governmental, political, and technological obstacles faced by the people of Venezuela in their efforts to obtain accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and information about domestic and international affairs;

(2) an assessment of current efforts relating to broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela, by the United States Government and otherwise; and

(3) a strategy for expanding such efforts in Venezuela, including recommendations for additional measures to expand upon current efforts.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the current level of Federal funding dedicated to broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela by the Board before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) an assessment of the extent to which the current level and type of news and related programming and content provided by the Voice of America and other sources is addressing the informational needs of the people of Venezuela; and

(3) recommendations for increasing broadcasting, information distribution, and circumvention technology distribution in Venezuela.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that today, International Human Rights Day, we consider and debate the bill before us: the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act. The House unanimously passed a similar

measure that I authored and introduced earlier this year, and I urge passage of this measure before us presented by Senators MENENDEZ and RUBIO.

The people of Venezuela, Mr. Speaker, have been crying out for help. They have been begging the United States and all responsible nations to help protect them against the tyranny and brutality under the Maduro regime, the puppets of the oppressive Castro regime in Cuba. I should point out that today, International Human Rights Day, the Castro thugs rounded up and imprisoned 52 human rights activists.

Today, Congress speaks in a unified and bipartisan voice. The human rights situation in Venezuela has actually gotten worse under Maduro since the death of that other Castro sycophant, Hugo Chavez. In fact, since February 12, 2014, also known as National Youth Day in Venezuela, the freedom-seeking people of Venezuela have risen up to challenge the abuses and undemocratic actions being committed by Nicolas Maduro and his lackeys, demanding their most basic and fundamental rights.

Naturally, oppressors have but one option which they never fail to resort to; and Maduro, as we knew he would, responded with a violent crackdown against those who had the courage to challenge his authoritarian rule.

Ever since the peaceful demonstrations against the regime began on National Youth Day, 42 people have been killed, there have been nearly 60 reported cases of torture, and 72 students remain jailed to this day.

Pro-democracy leaders have raised their voices against the abuses of the regime, and they have been persecuted with politically-motivated charges, and those arrested face indescribable cruelty in prison.

□ 1830

Leopoldo Lopez, one of the faces of the democratic opposition, continues to be imprisoned in a military facility. Leopoldo is continuously denied visitors, and his legal proceedings, such as they are, are plagued with irregularities.

Daniel Ceballos, the mayor of the city of San Cristobal, was impeached and arrested by the Maduro thugs earlier this year. Daniel's only crime was to defend his constituents from the repressive abuses of the National Guard deployed to violently quash them.

But these cases, sadly, Mr. Speaker, are not isolated. Earlier this year, Maria Corina Machado, a courageous woman and vocal opposition leader, came to Washington, D.C., came to the United States to speak in front of the Organization of American States on the tragic situation in her homeland of Venezuela. The OAS, the Organization of American States, is a body that is supposed to uphold and protect the

democratic charter and human rights in the Americas.

Maria Corina was blocked by Castro sympathizers, Maduro sympathizers, and their cronies, and she was prevented from even addressing this body. And when she returned home, what happened to Maria Corina Machado? She was illegally stripped of her position in the Venezuelan National Assembly because she dared to speak out against the regime and in favor of human rights.

But the problems of Venezuela go beyond these democratic abuses. Nicolas Maduro's inability to contain a spiraling hyperinflationary economy, marked by shortages of consumer goods, along with a skyrocketing crime rate creates a difficult, almost unbearable situation for Venezuelans to endure.

The legislation before us targets Venezuelan officials responsible for the perpetration of human rights abuses against the citizens of Venezuela. And how do we do that? We deny them visas. We block their property. We freeze their assets here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the distress signal sent to us by the people of Venezuela did not just start in February. For years, the Venezuelan people have been calling out for help, asking us for our assistance, for us to do something, anything that will help stop the terrible human rights abuses of the authoritarian thug Chavez, and now his Mini-Me, Maduro.

Sadly, our administration has been deafeningly silent, embarrassingly silent. It has turned a blind eye to the harsh and brutal reality in Venezuela, has been afraid to speak out and take action against Chavez, and, until now, has been far too afraid to challenge Maduro.

But the United States Congress will act, Mr. Speaker. Let's send a strong signal tonight—not only to the administration, but to the people of Venezuela—that the United States Congress hears, sees, and feels their suffering, and we will not allow their anguish to go unobstructed.

The United States cannot ignore its responsibilities, and we must answer the calls for freedom, for democracy around the globe. We must be the voice for those who are being silenced by their oppressive regimes, and we must stand for the values that we believe in—not just here at home, but everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this bill and sending it to the President's desk, we will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for agreeing to forgo a referral request and committee consideration of S. 2142, the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the Floor.

I agree that your forgoing action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on the Judiciary as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Thank you for agreeing to forgo a referral request and committee consideration of S. 2142, the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the Floor.

I agree that your forgoing action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I will seek to place this letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with the Committee on Financial Services as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2142, the Venezuelan Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014, and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN—thank you for your leadership on this—and also Senator MENENDEZ for his leadership on this legislation. I also want to thank, once again, Chairman ROYCE, who has approached this issue in a bipartisan way, as he always does.

Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN's bill passed the House unanimously in May, and I am pleased that we are now ready to send this bill to the President's desk.

The world has watched closely over the last year as Venezuela's President Nicolas Maduro has stifled the democratic aspirations of the Venezuelan people. Peaceful protesters seeking

basic rights and dignity have been met with violence. Forty-two people were tragically killed and 800 were injured on both sides of the conflict. We mourn all of their losses. At the same time, the Maduro government has arrested political opponents and stood in the way of a free press.

Nearly 10 minutes after his arrest, opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez remains in jail on trumped-up charges. The U.N. Committee Against Torture, seven former Latin American Presidents, and the leaders around the world have called for Leopoldo's release.

Last week, Venezuelan opposition leader and former National Assembly Deputy Maria Corina Machado was charged for conspiring to assassinate President Maduro, another desperate move by a desperate government. Maduro's government even considers the U.S. Ambassador to Colombia in on this bizarre conspiracy. It would be humorous if it wasn't so sad and dangerous.

The legislation that we are considering today makes it clear that Congress will not turn a blind eye to the human rights violations in Venezuela. By stripping human rights violators of their visas, we are saying that those responsible for abuses in Venezuela are not welcome in the United States. By freezing their assets, we are making it clear that those who violate human rights in Venezuela won't have access to financial institutions in the United States.

Venezuela's leaders will say this bill is going to hurt the average Venezuelan citizen. That is nonsense. These sanctions won't touch the oil sector or other vital parts of the Venezuelan economy. They only affect those complicit in the recent crackdowns.

Finally, I will note that this bill gives President Obama needed flexibility to respond to events on the ground in Venezuela. Each and every sanction in this bill can be waived by the President at any time.

Let's stand with the people of Venezuela and support the immediate passage of S. 2142.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to thank and congratulate the vibrant Venezuelan American community in our area in south Florida and, indeed, throughout our great Nation for never forgetting the suffering of their native lands. They have many family members in Venezuela, and they care deeply about what happens in their homeland.

Now they have adopted America as their homeland and they are proud Americans, but they are also very proud of their traditions. It is because

of their desire to go back to a Venezuela one day—that will be free, that will be democratic, that will respect the human rights—that we are here today fighting on their behalf. So thanks to our constituents for making this day a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank my colleague and the gentlewoman from south Florida, who has really been a passionate advocate and whom I have stood in solidarity with on this and so many other issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014. I do so as the proud representative of Westonzuela, my hometown, and one in which we have an incredibly rich and vibrant community of Venezuelans and Venezuelan Americans. As the representative of one of the largest communities of Venezuelans and Venezuelan Americans in the United States, I am here to strongly speak out against the continued, unconscionable abuses of the Maduro government against innocent citizens.

Earlier this year, facing a repressive government and crushing economic conditions, thousands of Venezuelans peacefully protested to demand their basic human rights and dignity. In response, President Maduro and his security forces brutally suppressed their own citizens in the streets and used the judiciary to squash voices championing freedom of expression and democracy. Although President Maduro has tried to further silence these voices by limiting media coverage of the ongoing oppression and repression and terrible economic conditions of his country, we can still hear the demands for justice and for dignity.

This bill would impose sanctions on those individuals in Maduro's regime who have ordered the arrest or prosecution of anyone exercising their right to peacefully assemble or protest, or those who supported those actions. Through our action here today, we signify the determination of the American people to stand for freedom and democracy, and this bill reinforces the sentiments and actions of the U.S. Congress and the Obama administration.

Along with my colleagues, I stand in solidarity with those brave Venezuelans continuing to advocate for their rights, including opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez, who outrageously remains in prison. I look forward to this measure's passage and to President Obama's signature, and working with the Obama administration and our allies to hold these perpetrators of the injustice accountable for their crimes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would like to emphasize, once again, that today's legislation is consistent with our treatment of human rights violators throughout the world.

Will this legislation all of a sudden turn President Maduro and his government into great respecters of human rights? None of us are naive enough to believe this, but what it will do is it will send a message to human rights violators in Venezuela and throughout the world that your visas and your assets in U.S. financial institutions are in peril if you abuse individuals' human rights.

I once again urge my colleagues to support the immediate passage of S. 2142.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to thank our entire south Florida congressional delegation. All of us worked together in a bipartisan way to get this bill to this moment.

I would especially like to thank Senator BOB MENENDEZ, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, along with our own Florida Senator whom we are so proud of, MARCO RUBIO, for their hard work on this bill and, really, for their work on the broader issues of the lack of democracy in our hemisphere, the disrespect for human rights, the lack of the rule of law.

Sadly, in our Western Hemisphere, instead of seeing advances of human rights and advances of democracy, we have seen a sad erosion in these years. We thank all of the Members for always using these esteemed floors to talk about our basic values that we share with our hemispheric neighbors, and that is respect for human rights, respect for democracy, respect for the rule of law, and always to continue to do everything we can to make sure that all of our oppressed brothers and sisters will live in freedom, the freedom that we enjoy so much.

I thank very much our chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ROYCE, for his help and his leadership in this fight.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2142.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2014

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5656) to authorize the Feed the Future Initiative to reduce global poverty and hunger in developing countries on a sustainable basis, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5656

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Global Food Security Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF POLICY OBJECTIVES; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY OBJECTIVES.—It is in the national security interest of the United States to promote global food security and nutrition, consistent with national food security investment plans, which is reinforced through programs, activities, and initiatives that—

(1) accelerate inclusive, agricultural-led economic growth that reduces global poverty, hunger, and malnutrition, particularly among women and children;

(2) increase the productivity, incomes, and livelihoods of small-scale producers, especially women, by working across agricultural value chains and expanding producer access to local and international markets;

(3) build resilience to food shocks among vulnerable populations and households while reducing reliance upon emergency food assistance;

(4) create an enabling environment for agricultural growth and investment, including through the promotion of secure and transparent property rights;

(5) improve the nutritional status of women and children, with a focus on reducing child stunting, including through the promotion of highly nutritious foods, diet diversification, and nutritional behaviors that improve maternal and child health;

(6) align with and leverage broader United States investments in trade, economic growth, science and technology, maternal and child health, and water, sanitation, and hygiene; and

(7) ensure the effective use of United States taxpayer dollars to further these objectives.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President, in providing assistance to implement the Global Food Security Strategy, should—

(1) coordinate, through a whole-of-government approach, the efforts of relevant Federal departments and agencies to implement the Global Food Security Strategy;

(2) utilize, to the extent possible, open and streamlined solicitations to allow for the participation of a wide range of implementing partners via the most appropriate contracting mechanism; and

(3) continue to strengthen existing partnerships between developing country institutions of agricultural sciences with universities in the United States, with a focus on building the capacities of developing nation universities in agriculture.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGRICULTURE.—The term “agriculture” means crops, livestock, fisheries, and forestries.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(3) FEED THE FUTURE INNOVATION LABS.—The term “Feed the Future Innovation Labs” means research partnerships led by United States universities that advance solutions to reduce global hunger, poverty, and malnutrition.

(4) GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY.—The term “Global Food Security Strategy” means the strategy developed and implemented pursuant to section 4(a).

(5) FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY.—The term “food and nutrition security” means access to, and availability, utilization, and stability of, sufficient food to meet caloric and nutritional needs for an active and healthy life.

(6) MALNUTRITION.—The term “malnutrition” means poor nutritional status caused by nutritional deficiency or excess.

(7) RESILIENCE.—The term “resilience” means the ability of people, households, communities, countries, and systems to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses to food security in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth.

(8) RELEVANT FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—The term “relevant Federal departments and agencies” means the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Peace Corps, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the United States African Development Foundation, the United States Geological Survey, and any other department or agency specified by the President for purposes of this section.

(9) SMALL-SCALE PRODUCER.—The term “small-scale producer” means farmers, pastoralists, foresters, and fishers that have a low-asset base and limited resources, including land, capital, skills and labor, and, in the case of farmers, typically farm on fewer than 5 hectares of land.

SEC. 4. COMPREHENSIVE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY.

(a) STRATEGY.—The President shall coordinate the development and implementation of a United States whole-of-government strategy to accomplish the policy objectives set forth in section 2(a), which shall—

(1) support and be aligned with country-owned agriculture, nutrition, and food security policy and investment plans developed with input from relevant governmental and nongovernmental sectors within partner countries and regional bodies, including representatives of the private sector, agricultural producers, including women and small-scale producers, international and local civil society organizations, faith-based organizations, research institutions, and farmers as reasonable and appropriate;

(2) support inclusive agricultural value chain development, with small-scale pro-

ducers, especially women, gaining greater access to the inputs, skills, networking, bargaining power, financing, and market linkages needed to sustain their long-term economic prosperity;

(3) seek to improve the nutritional status of women and children, particularly during the critical first 1,000-day window until a child reaches 2 years of age, with a focus on reducing child stunting;

(4) seek to ensure the long-term success of programs by building the capacity of local organizations and institutions;

(5) integrate resilience strategies into food security programs, such that chronically vulnerable populations are better able to build safety nets, secure livelihoods, access markets, and access opportunities from longer-term economic growth;

(6) develop community and producer resiliency to natural disasters, emergencies, and natural occurrences that adversely impact agricultural yield;

(7) harness science, technology, and innovation, including the research conducted at Feed the Future Innovation Labs, or any successor entities, throughout the United States;

(8) support integrating agricultural development activities among food insecure populations living in proximity to designated national parks or wildlife areas to support wildlife conservation efforts;

(9) leverage resources and expertise through partnerships with the private sector, farm organizations, cooperatives, civil society, faith-based organizations, research entities, and academic institutions;

(10) support collaboration, as appropriate, between United States universities and public and private institutions in developing countries to promote agricultural development and innovation;

(11) set clear and transparent selection criteria for target countries, regions, and intended beneficiaries of assistance to implement the Global Food Security Strategy;

(12) set specific and measurable goals, targets, and time frames, and a plan of action consistent with the policy objectives described in section 2(a);

(13) seek to ensure that target countries respect and promote the lawful land tenure rights of local communities, particularly those of women and small-scale producers; and

(14) include criteria and methodology for graduating countries from assistance to implement the Global Food Security Strategy once the countries have achieved certain benchmarks.

(b) COORDINATION.—The President shall coordinate, through a whole-of-government approach, the efforts of relevant Federal departments and agencies in the implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy by—

(1) establishing monitoring and evaluation systems, coherence, and coordination across relevant Federal departments and agencies; and

(2) establishing platforms for regular consultation and collaboration with key stakeholders, including—

(A) multilateral institutions;

(B) private voluntary organizations;

(C) cooperatives;

(D) the private sector;

(E) local nongovernmental and civil society organizations;

(F) faith-based organizations;

(G) congressional committees; and

(H) other stakeholders, as appropriate.

SEC. 5. ASSISTANCE TO IMPLEMENT THE GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to provide assistance to implement the Global Food Security Strategy pursuant to the authorities of section 103, section 103A, title XII of chapter 2 of part I, and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151a, 2151a–1, 2220a et seq., and 2346 et seq.) notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(b) MONITORING AND EVALUATION.—The President should seek to ensure that assistance to implement the Global Food Security Strategy is provided under established parameters for a rigorous accountability system to monitor and evaluate progress and impact of the strategy, including by reporting to the appropriate congressional committees and the public on an annual basis.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the President \$1,000,600,000 for fiscal year 2015 to carry out this section.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the status of the implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy.

(b) CONTENT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) contain a summary of the Global Food Security Strategy as an appendix;

(2) identify any substantial changes made in the Global Food Security Strategy during the preceding calendar year;

(3) identify the indicators that will be used to measure results, set benchmarks for progress over time, and establish mechanisms for reporting results in an open and transparent manner;

(4) describe the progress made in implementing the Global Food Security Strategy;

(5) assess the progress and results of implementing international food and nutrition security programming;

(6) contain a transparent, open, and detailed accounting of spending by relevant Federal departments and agencies to implement the Global Food Security Strategy, including by listing all recipients of funding or partner organizations and, to the extent possible, describing their activities;

(7) identify any United States legal or regulatory impediments that could obstruct the effective implementation of the programming referred to in paragraph (5);

(8) contain a clear gender analysis of programming that includes established disaggregated gender indicators to better analyze outcomes for food productivity, income growth, equity in access to inputs, jobs and markets, and nutrition;

(9) describe the strategies and benchmarks for graduating target countries and monitoring any graduated target countries;

(10) assess efforts to coordinate United States international food security and nutrition programs, activities, and initiatives with—

(A) other bilateral donors;

(B) international and multilateral organizations;

(C) international financial institutions;

(D) host country governments;

(E) international and local private voluntary, nongovernmental, faith-based organizations, and civil society organizations; and

(F) other stakeholders;

(11) assess United States Government-facilitated private investment in related sec-

tors and the impact of private sector investment in target countries;

(12) include consultation with relevant United States Government agencies in the preparation of the report; and

(13) incorporate a plan for regularly reviewing and updating strategies, partnerships, and programs and sharing lessons learned with a wide range of stakeholders.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The information referred to in subsection (b) shall be made publicly accessible in a timely manner on a consolidated website.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Global Food Security Act, H.R. 5656, is a bipartisan bill with 21 cosponsors, including BETTY MCCOLLUM, our lead Democrat, who has worked very hard on this issue.

I would also like to thank House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE, Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, Ranking Member BASS. I would like to thank JEFF FORTENBERRY, who has played a key role, as well as ERIK PAULSEN and, again, other Members who have joined across the aisle to work on this legislation and to work on the language.

I also want to thank the staff that worked tirelessly on this. In particular, Jenn Holcomb, Kelly Stone from Congresswoman MCCOLLUM's office; Joan Condon, Katy Crosby, and Janice Kaguyutan from the full committee; and from my own staff, Pierro Tozzi. Thank you so much for your work in helping to make this bill a reality and bringing it to the floor.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation which will help provide a long-term solution to global hunger by authorizing and strengthening the existing national food security program coordinated by USAID, commonly known as Feed the Future. This program strengthens nutrition, especially for children during the critical first 1,000-day window—from conception to the child's second birthday. It also teaches small-scale farmers—in particular, women—the requisite techniques and best practices to increase agricultural yield, thereby helping nations achieve

food security, which is something that is, first and foremost, humane but also in the national security interests of the United States.

As USAID Administrator Dr. Rajiv Shah has pointed out—who, I want to point out, parenthetically, has done a tremendous job as the Administrator of USAID—this program encourages self-sufficiency and operates in targeted countries where the host governments have committed to investing in local agricultural development and to undertaking reforms that allow the private sector to flourish. Its hallmarks are the building of local capacity and sustainability, as well as resiliency in linking local entrepreneurs to the global economy, while boosting transparency and accountability.

The end result of this can be seen in lives saved and in lives enriched. In the past year, the Feed the Future program has helped 7 million farmers across the globe to increase harvests, resulting in improved nutrition for some 12.5 million children. To give one example, in Ethiopia, stunting rates were driven down by some 9 percent in just 3 years, resulting in, roughly, 160,000 fewer children suffering from malnutrition.

Yet, today, even though progress has been made, malnutrition is the underlying cause of death for at least 3.1 million children per year around the world and is responsible for 45 percent of all deaths among children under 5. More than 800,000 babies—one in four newborns—die each year because they are born too soon or they are too small as a result of poor maternal nutrition.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first laws that I wrote over 30 years ago was the Child Survival Fund—a \$50 million program that included vaccinating kids to protect against preventable diseases like polio, pertussis, and diphtheria, as well as oral rehydration for kids at risk of death from repeated bouts of diarrheal disease. What we discovered then was that, for mere pennies on the dollar, we could intervene before problems arose, not only saving lives but also saving money in the long term. This Global Food Security Act has the potential to be equally transformative in the lives of so many.

Malnutrition, in addition to death, leads to the stunted growth of children. Stunted children become adults who suffer from diabetes, hypertension, and cardiovascular disease—conditions that not only result in poor health but that also impede earning capacity and result in lower incomes. Of particular concern, women affected by stunting give birth to children who are also likely to be afflicted by this preventable condition, perpetuating the cycle of malnutrition and of poverty.

Adequate nutrition for pregnant women, lactating moms, and all women and adolescent girls of childbearing age needs to be prioritized in food policies

for the sake of children, women, and, by extension, nations. By ensuring comprehensive prenatal, maternal, and robust support, including nutrition—again, through that first 1,000 days of life—government health workers, civil society, and others will not only prevent many deaths, but children will be stronger, healthier, happier; their immune systems will be boosted; and as they matriculate to adulthood, they will be more prosperous. If women of childbearing age are well-nourished, they are healthier and are able to provide nourishment for their children.

I remember being in so many refugee camps. At a Darfur refugee camp, on one of many trips to Africa, I remember the women there were so concerned that they would be able to breastfeed their children, but they were so malnourished that that was next to impossible. After several weeks, they were able to do so.

I should also add, when these children—healthy children—get this kind of help, it also ensures greater not only physical but cognitive development. Healthy children thrive and are empowered to become healthy adults. Again, they can make, because of that, meaningful contributions to their families and society.

Finally, I note that the program authorized by H.R. 5656 is not only penny-wise, but it is also pound-wise. It is economical in the long run, and it should lead to a reduction in the amount of money we spend on emergency food aid. A comprehensive food security strategy outlined in the bill, as well as in the policy, also helps us to do more with less by leveraging our aid with that of other countries, the private sector, NGOs, and especially faith-based organizations, whose great work on the ground in so many different countries impacts so many lives.

By statutorily authorizing this program, which has its roots in the Bush administration and was formalized by President Obama and, thus, is an example of bipartisan success on both the executive and legislative levels, we are also increasing oversight by requiring the administration to report to Congress.

H.R. 5656 demonstrates, again, strong bipartisan support that does exist for assistance, and it is a strategy that truly gives people the tools to let themselves out of poverty and to live healthier and better lives.

I implore you, my colleagues, to vote in favor of it, and, hopefully, this legislation can become law by the end of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5656, the Global Food Security Act of 2014.

I would like to begin by thanking Congressman CHRIS SMITH and Con-

gresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM for authoring this important legislation, which authorizes USAID's Feed the Future Initiative. I would also like to thank Chairman ROYCE for working with us in a bipartisan manner to take this bill up in committee and bring it to the floor.

Around the world, 800 million people suffer from chronic hunger. Malnutrition causes the deaths of 3.1 million children under the age of 5 every year. This is a global crisis. President Obama has made global food security a top priority, and USAID Administrator Raj Shah has done tremendous work in carrying out that policy.

The Feed the Future Initiative focuses on reducing global poverty and hunger in developing countries through agricultural development. This program is only a few years old, but it has already made a real difference in fighting hunger, poverty, and malnutrition.

In 2013, Feed the Future helped nearly 7 million farmers and food producers use new technologies. This initiative has secured more than \$10 billion in private sector commitments to African agriculture, the majority of which has been made by African businesses. It has helped bring 3.5 million hectares of land under improved cultivation and management practices. Last year, the initiative reached more than 12.5 million children with nutritional assistance.

The success of this initiative stems, in part, from the collaboration and partnership of more than 10 U.S. Government agencies, the private sector, NGOs, and American universities. By working together, they have helped to advance real solutions to global hunger, poverty, and malnutrition.

Most importantly, Feed the Future has generated strong buy-in from partner governments in 19 countries across Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia, and Africa. Each host country is required to put forward a country investment plan and contribute a portion of its own GDP to agricultural development. This model ensures that Feed the Future programs are sustainable and can eventually be transferred fully to the host country.

Despite the gains we have made, there is still a lot of work that has to be done. We need continued American leadership in global food security. We need proven programs like Feed the Future to continue its highly effective work in alleviating global hunger and poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Appropriations Committee and also one of the sponsors of the legislation before us.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank my friend and colleague, Chairman CHRIS SMITH, for his steadfast leadership on this issue, this important bill, as well as on so many other concerns that affect vulnerable persons around the world.

Again, Congressman SMITH, you rightly pointed out that Dr. Rajiv Shah, the Agency Director for the United States Agency for International Development, has been steadfast in his leadership on this as well and deserves a tremendous amount of credit.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this important bipartisan initiative to save the lives of hurting people around the world. The United States has a decades-long history on food security, and this act—the Global Food Security Act, also known as Feed the Future—really does three things: it saves lives; it creates sustainable development throughout the world; and it strengthens our own national security by stopping the underlying problems that lead to international instability.

Americans are the most generous people in the world. This bill continues our tradition of generosity in a smart, whole-of-government approach that combines the goodwill of the private sector as well as charities for a 21st century approach to development aid. Feed the Future is one of the most cost-effective and results-oriented international development initiatives that we have championed to date. It is the right thing to do.

Many of some estimated 800 million people throughout the world who suffer from chronic hunger rely on agriculture to make a living. Back in 2007 and 2008, we launched this response to the global food crisis by helping to bring self-sufficiency to struggling agricultural communities worldwide. By working together with partner countries that are invested in taking responsibility for their own success, what started out as a modest program has developed into a serious global commitment to end hunger and improve nutrition standards, especially for vulnerable women and their children.

In 2013 alone, market-based agricultural productivity initiatives funded by Congress reached more than 12.5 million children with good nutrition and has helped some 7 million farmers leverage new agricultural technologies on nearly 10 million acres of land. Importantly as well, Feed the Future has leveraged more than \$10 billion in private sector investment—the majority from African businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very thoughtful measure, which has earned broad-based support from the U.S. agricultural sector, universities nationwide, faith-based nongovernmental organizations, as well as private enterprise. We will never regret the good we can do in helping feed the

hungry, and the return on this investment will surely compound to the benefit of future generations in, perhaps, ways we can never measure.

To everyone who has been involved here and to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I want to thank you all for working in such a bipartisan spirit to get this important bill done.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota, Representative BETTY MCCOLLUM, the coauthor of this bill.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. VARGAS.

Mr. Speaker, the Global Food Security Act is an important bill, and I want to thank my colleagues—Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, Representative BASS, and Representative FORTENBERRY for his kind remarks—for their hard work to get this bipartisan legislation to the floor today. My very biggest “thank you” goes to my great partner in this, Representative CHRIS SMITH.

Thank you, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, in the world’s poorest countries, more than 800 million people are chronically hungry and malnourished. They are struggling and are in desperate poverty, forced to watch as their children suffer and too often die from malnutrition. Children who do survive will remain hungry, and they are so chronically malnourished they are physically and mentally stunted. This malnutrition—this lack of food—hurts not only the individual but the development of an entire country.

With this in mind, former Republican Senator Dick Lugar and I introduced bipartisan-bicameral legislation to call for a comprehensive U.S. food global security strategy in 2009.

□ 1900

But while that bill did not become law, we did build a strong base of bipartisan support around food security, and in 2010, President Obama took up the call to invest in agricultural development and launched Feed the Future.

With the support of Congress, Feed the Future is working to accelerate agriculturally-led economic growth and reduce poverty. It is working with smallholder farmers in 19 countries to help them grow their way out of poverty, improve nutrition for women and children, and create income-generating opportunities.

I have seen the difference our investments in agriculture and nutrition are having in these developing nations. I have met the women farmers who are feeding their families, sending their children to school, and investing in their communities because of Feed the Future. And we need to continue to build on these successes.

The Global Food Security Act will continue to enhance global food security by assisting small-scale farmers, increasing yields, putting more food on

families’ tables, and then selling more food in the market.

Our bill is about partnering with hardworking farmers who are mostly women to make them more successful. It helps to provide them access to the knowledge, the tools, the markets, and the business opportunities because when a woman farmer succeeds, her children and family are healthier, and they are more likely to succeed.

H.R. 5656 is leveraging a unique partnership with NGOs, private sector businesses, educational institutions, and faith-based groups.

Three Minnesota-based businesses—Land O’ Lakes, General Mills, and Cargill—are already partnering with Feed the Future. In fact, General Mills CEO Ken Powell said: “We are hungry to help the farmer in Malawi who, by selling her crop, will generate the money needed to support her family and pay for her children to go to school.”

So the bottom line is, we cannot sit by and do nothing as 800 million hungry people suffer and far too many die from malnutrition. As mothers and fathers are forced to watch their children go hungry, we can do something.

Human dignity, decency, and our own national security demands that we support and sustain this important investment in agricultural development and nutrition.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Global Food Security Act.

Once again, I would like to thank CHRIS SMITH, Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, Representative BASS, and all of our staff—Piero, Kelly, Joan, Janice, and Jenn—for all of their work on this bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means who is also one of the sponsors of this bill.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman SMITH for his hard work and bipartisan leadership, and for bringing a very, very important issue to the floor, and also for his long-time advocacy for lifting people up out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard Members speak on the floor here today very bipartisanly in support of H.R. 5656, the Feed the Future Global Food Security Act. The Feed the Future Initiative embodies the very best of the United States’ foreign aid. It is a new approach. It doesn’t just provide hand-outs but, instead, provides a hand-up to some of the very poorest parts of the world.

Feed the Future is working to bring sustainable agricultural practices to targeted communities around the world to help lift people out of extreme poverty. In fact, in 2013, farmers working with the program applied these improved techniques to over 4 million hectares of land.

The program’s work goes far beyond just increasing yields for farmers though, Mr. Speaker. It is introducing an entrepreneurial spirit into these communities, a business model, an empowerment model. It is increasing family incomes. It is expanding economic growth. And it is opening up new trade opportunities.

This work is also empowering communities to take control of their future by building sustainable local economies. As they become more reliant on themselves, they become less reliant on government assistance. This should always be the goal of our U.S. foreign aid programs.

This program is also leveraging support, as has been mentioned, from the private sector, the civil sector, and the research community. This targeted approach from all of these sides of the equation and the reliance on advanced data and research has allowed them now to achieve these cost-effective results. Those results are very impressive so far: 4.5 million farmers reached, over \$98 million in private sector investment, \$93 million in new local income, and 12.5 million children under the age of 5 receiving very important nutrition programs.

We need to continue to build upon the successes of the Feed the Future Initiative in our efforts to end global poverty. There is no doubt that programs like this are driving a new pathway in foreign aid and bringing along life-changing results.

I want to recognize the bipartisan work that is going on in Congress, along with the leadership also of Dr. Raj Shah at USAID, so that we can continue to help so many.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this very bipartisan legislation and the Feed the Future Initiative.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative JIM MCGOVERN, the cochair of the Anti-Hunger Caucus, who is a real champion for food security not only here domestically but also internationally.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time and for his leadership on these important issues.

I also want to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, and the gentlewoman from Minnesota, BETTY MCCOLLUM, for their leadership in bringing this important bill before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to rise in support of H.R. 5656, the Feed the Future Global Food Security Act of 2014. I remember in 2008 when our former colleague from Missouri, Congresswoman Jo Ann Emerson, and I sat down with researchers from the GAO to talk about how our global food security programs could be improved and made more effective. Their advice was simple: Create a comprehensive government-wide strategy.

I want my House colleagues to know that it was State Department and USAID officials under President George W. Bush who were the first to brainstorm about how to undertake such a comprehensive approach to global food security. And then in 2009, we were lucky enough to have Raj Shah, with his deep experience in agricultural development, evaluation, and analysis, take the helm at USAID. And most of all, we had Hillary Clinton as Secretary of State, who understood the importance of tackling agriculture and nutrition in a comprehensive fashion in order to increase food security, strengthen small farmers, empower women, and develop local and regional agricultural markets.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill helps codify and institutionalize one of our most important and effective global food security programs, Feed the Future, and its related nutrition and agricultural development programs. These programs have a proven track record of success. I want to thank all of the NGOs and private sector partners that have brought these programs to life on the ground.

I have been engaged on global hunger, child nutrition, and food security issues for the past 18 years. I have never been more hopeful that the U.S. is finally pursuing a strategy that works and can make a difference.

Increasing the ability of nations to feed their own people, care for the nutritional needs of their children, increase incomes for their farmers, and help them remain on their land is not just a worthy goal, it is an attainable one. And H.R. 5656 will ensure that the U.S. stays on that course. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that global hunger, I believe, is essentially a political condition. We have the leadership capability, we have the resources, we have the ability to end global hunger. What we need is the political will.

I urge my colleagues, as they support this legislation, to reflect upon the success story of Feed the Future, and let's amplify it even more. This program works. It deserves our support.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the Feed the Future Initiative has been successful in alleviating food insecurity over the last 4 years. This important bill authorizes this proven approach to food security. It is a moral, economic, and security imperative that we continue the fight against hunger and malnutrition.

I think we all need to be thankful for the heart that has gone in here from our colleagues. Certainly we want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, and the gentlewoman from Minnesota, BETTY MCCOLLUM.

Their hearts have been in this and fighting for this. They brought us all together. We appreciate that.

And with that, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS) for his leadership. This truly is a bipartisan bill. I want to again say how grateful I am to the gentlewoman from Minnesota, BETTY MCCOLLUM, to be working with her and her staff. Our staffs are all trying to make sure we have a bill that will make a huge difference not only in putting our arms around the existing program but in strengthening it and taking it to the next level.

I do want to point out that this is about a whole of government strategy: all in on the part of the U.S. Government so that everyone is working on all six cylinders to make sure that sustainable development occurs throughout the world in target countries and, as those targets increase, that it is totally inclusive of women.

When we worked on issues like microtargeting, we found—particularly in most parts of Africa—that women have really stepped up to the plate and have done yeoman's work. They are fully included in this effort.

Again, I want to thank all of my colleagues. I want to thank the leadership, the gentleman from California, KEVIN MCCARTHY, and Speaker BOEHNER, for making sure that this legislation got to the floor. Our hope is that the Senate may take it up. If not, we will be right back here next year. But I do hope that they will take it up because delay is denial. This is an important piece of legislation that will save lives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in strong support of H.R. 5656, the Feed the Future Global Food Security Act of 2014, on the eve of passage of the Fiscal Year 2015 Omnibus that provides just over \$1 billion to the Feed the Future Program. The passage of this bill would authorize this USAID program for one year at just under Fiscal Year 2014 level, bringing stability to this successful program while giving Congress future oversight.

Feed the Future through its whole-of-government approach has been successful in promoting both agricultural-based and market-based development and in improving the nutrition of women and children. This creates healthy populations and gives livelihoods to these families, both of which grow these developing economies.

The focus on food security and agriculture development of Feed the Future started during the Bush Administration and has continued through today.

But, Mr. Speaker, today more than 800 million people around the world still suffer from

chronic hunger. Many of the world's poor live in rural areas and rely on agriculture for a living, and growth in the agriculture sector is one of the best ways to spur the kind of economic growth that reduces poverty.

In 2013 alone, Feed the Future reached more than 12.5 million children with nutrition interventions to help ensure a stronger and more successful future. It has helped nearly 7 million farmers and food producers use new technologies and management practices. And it has leveraged more than \$10 billion through complementary efforts in private sector commitments in African agriculture—the majority from African businesses.

With broad support from U.S. universities, NGOs, faith-based organizations, the private sector, and beneficiaries, Feed the Future authorization offers an opportunity for Congress to put its stamp on this program and ensure that we have the appropriate oversight measures in place.

Passage of this legislation will demonstrate that we are serious about finding common-sense solutions to one of the world's greatest challenges—hunger—creating economic stability overseas that will benefit the American people as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 5656, the Feed the Future Global Food Security Act of 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5656, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, promote sustainable agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2614. An act to amend certain provisions of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012.

IN MEMORY OF MARGARET COLF HEPOLA

(Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great admiration and a little bit of humility because I get to honor the life of a tremendous woman, a friend from southwest Washington who has made a lasting impact on our region. She passed away this week at the age of 97.

A lifelong resident of Clark County, Margaret Colf Hepola could recount the history of southwest Washington in a way that was more complete and exponentially more colorful than any history book. Her great grandparents moved to the Lewis River Valley before Washington had even claimed statehood, and more than 140 years later, Margaret's family still calls our region home.

There are people who live in a community, and then there are people who define what "community" means. Margaret was the latter. She made it one of her life ambitions to share the history of the community she loved and to preserve the memories of those who came before her. Through the Colf family's generous philanthropy, Margaret saved historical landmarks, supported museums, and founded the La Center Library.

Margaret's wit, her grit, and her compassion made her one of the most celebrated women in our entire region. Twice-widowed and a mother of five, Margaret did not let tragedy or the responsibilities of motherhood deter her from giving back to the community that she cared about so deeply. By the time she had reached the ninth decade of her life, Margaret Colf Hepola had become a household name in southwest Washington.

I will conclude today by honoring her legacy, one of a passionate historical preservationist who herself has earned a place in southwest Washington's history books.

□ 1915

HONORING CONGRESSMAN HENRY WAXMAN AND CONGRESSMAN GEORGE MILLER ON THEIR RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order on honoring our retiring Members, Congressman HENRY WAXMAN and Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am the chair of the California Democratic delegation, and we are losing from our membership two spectacular Members who have served with tremendous distinction for 40 years each.

Representative MILLER and Representative WAXMAN were the final two remaining Members of the House elected as part of the historic Watergate class of 1974. Both were instrumental in passing the Affordable Care Act of 2010, which is the culmination of a nearly century-long struggle to guarantee that every American has access to quality and affordable health care.

Representative WAXMAN was one of the most prolific lawmakers in American history. He has a long record of not only legislative, but oversight achievements. He was elected, as I said, in 1974 and reelected 17 times. He chaired the Energy and Commerce Subcommittees on Health and the Environment, the Energy and Commerce Committee from 2009 to 2011, and the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee from 2007 to 2009.

He left his mark all over this body, but the five areas that he will be remembered most about is health care, consumer protection, environmental protection, telecommunications policy, and just many good government laws.

Some of the most important bills that he either wrote or coauthored include: the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments—we can recall when we couldn't breathe in Los Angeles, and that is no longer the case because of Henry's leadership and work preventing smog, air pollution, acid rain, and the depletion of the ozone layer; the Medicaid and CHIP expansion gave coverage and access to health care for children and working families; and his nursing home reforms helped protect the most vulnerable people in America.

The Hatch-Waxman generic drug act gave rise to the generic drug industry, and the Orphan Drug Act gave hope to families across the country whose family members had diseases not lucrative prior to the act. From the Ryan White CARE Act to the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act to the cigarette and smokeless tobacco health warning laws, Henry has been recognized as a leader here.

His oversight efforts were simply marvelous. Looking at waste, fraud, and abuse, he identified over \$1 trillion in wasteful and mismanaged Federal contracts, including billions of dollars in wasteful spending in Iraq and in response to Hurricane Katrina. His oversight of the tobacco industry and the Wall Street collapse are known throughout the country. He has over his 40 years here provided tremendous service to our country.

Our colleague, Representative GEORGE MILLER, has similarly left his mark not only on this body, but on this

country and indeed on this world. Our friend, George, is an aggressive and unapologetic investigator on behalf of taxpayers into the health and safety of children and workers.

He took on asbestos executives, for-profit colleges, subsidized agribusiness, mining corporations, oil companies, and administration officials of both parties. Why? To stand up for the little guy who didn't have a voice.

He chaired three committees during the past 40 years, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families from 1983 to 1992; the Committee on Natural Resources from 1992 to 1994; and the Committee on Education and Labor from 2007 to 2010. He is a longtime cochair to the Democratic Steering Policy Committee. He is among the 50th, as is Henry, consecutive longest-serving Members of Congress in history out of more than 10,000 Members.

His list of accomplishments is too long to read, but they certainly include fair pay for women; investigating sweatshops not only here, but around the world; fighting for pension reform; standing up for occupational safety and occupational disease compensation; international labor standards; the minimum wage; antidiscrimination laws; and the defense of the right to organize and collectively bargain.

The notable legislation written or co-written by GEORGE MILLER include: the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007; the student loan reforms of 2007 and 2010; the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002; the California Desert Protection Act of 1994; the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, now known as the Individuals With Disability Act; and the Pay-As-You-Go Act, PAYGO, passed in 1982 to reduce the deficit and instill greater discipline in the budget process and to ensure that military and nonmilitary spending were treated under the same rules.

He played a key role in shaping the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the response to the worst American recession since the Great Depression.

California is proud of our two colleagues, and many Californians and indeed some honorary Californians are here tonight who would like to say a few words to honor these two outstanding men.

First, I yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. ALAN LOWENTHAL, who represents a district in southern California for his tribute.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentlewoman from San Jose for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am really humbled to have a chance just to say a few words about GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN. As a new Member, I have had the wonderful experience of spending my first 2 years as both Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. MILLER kind of conclude a great career.

A little bit first about GEORGE MILLER: as we pointed out, he is a progressive, he has fought for the environment, he has protected it, he has been a leader in the Natural Resources Committee, and he has fought to protect public lands such as in the 1994 California Desert Protection Act and created Death Valley National Park and Joshua Tree. He was the chief sponsor of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992, also to protect the fish and wildlife.

I came also to the legislature, to the Congress, after chairing education in California, and GEORGE MILLER was a champion and a leader here, and we all looked up to him. As was pointed out already, he did great work on helping to draft the No Child Left Behind Act, and he was a great supporter of school modernization and community colleges—finally, about GEORGE, passion, humor, respected by all, and a zest for political combat.

On the other hand, let's see what people say about my good friend HENRY WAXMAN. Like myself, HENRY's grandparents were Jewish immigrants. We both served in the legislature. The Washington Post said that HENRY WAXMAN is to Congress what Ted Williams was to baseball: a natural.

Ralph Nader once said that HENRY WAXMAN is the only argument against term limits. Senator ALAN SIMPSON once said that HENRY WAXMAN is tougher than a boiled owl, and The Los Angeles Times describes Representative HENRY WAXMAN's tenacity as legendary.

We all know his work on the environment, I am just going to point that out, is legendary not only in terms of the Clean Air Act amendments, but he is also known for the Safe Drinking Water Act amendments; laws reducing childhood lead exposure; the Formaldehyde Standards for Composite Wood Products Act; reduction of greenhouse gases; and taking on, as we all know, the tobacco industry.

In keeping with his role as the defender of the environment, Mr. WAXMAN has served as the chair of the House Safe Climate Caucus. It was a distinct honor for this new Member to serve with him, HENRY WAXMAN, and a greater honor to be selected as the next chairperson of the Safe Climate Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I only hope that I and every Member of this body can live up to the amazing legacies of public service that GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN have left this Congress.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored now to yield to the gentlewoman from California, NANCY PELOSI, the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader of our California Democratic delegation. ZOE LOFGREN, thank you for bringing us together this evening for a very bittersweet circumstance,

that is to say how proud we are to honor the leadership of two great giants of the Congress, HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER. How sad we are that they are leaving us.

I come to the floor, Mr. Speaker, today, to join in celebrating two of the most accomplished Members of this great body, and when I say "most accomplished," I am not just speaking in the context of the present Congress.

I am talking about two of the most accomplished Members of this great body of all time, a pair of Californians with 80 years between them, 80 years of service in the House, retiring with unparalleled record, certainly an unsurpassed record of legislative achievements to their names, Congressman HENRY WAXMAN and Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

I am proud to do that as a Californian and to thank our chairwoman, ZOE LOFGREN, again, for this opportunity.

As they depart for new endeavors at the end of this session, which is in about 48 hours, each of them leaves a legacy of leadership that is felt in the lives of everyday Americans, and that is so important.

In doing so, they are both pioneers. For four decades, HENRY WAXMAN's name has been synonymous with responsible action, extraordinary legislative skills, passionate public service, and bold leadership on behalf of the people of Los Angeles, whom he represents, and the American people. Time and again, HENRY has been the first to appreciate the seriousness of the challenges before us and the first to bring forward solutions to resolve them.

Time does not allow, and other Members will mention so many accomplishments, but I just want to focus on from the start, this is where I saw up close and early, from the start in the early dark days of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, HENRY WAXMAN fought to invest in AIDS research, support treatment, and care prevention and pass the landmark Ryan White CARE Act.

Long before the rest of our Nation awakened to the gathering storm of climate change, early on, Congressman WAXMAN worked to create bold new protections for the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the Earth we call home.

From the first days of his long career, he recognized the urgency of delivering quality, affordable health care to all, and together with some of our other colleagues, with his leadership as chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee, we honored that commitment with the Affordable Care Act.

Also working on the Affordable Care Act from his committee, the Education and Labor Committee, Chairman GEORGE MILLER has left an indelible mark on the laws and the Members of this august body. GEORGE has been the model of a serious and substantive leg-

islator, a champion of working people who has had his hand in some of the most innovative and important legislation of our time.

Members over and over—some already have and others will—talk about his legislative accomplishments. I just will name some. I mentioned the Affordable Care Act; Lilly Ledbetter, the first bill signed by President Obama to end discrimination in the workplace; the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, the last bill that passed by a House Democratic majority; ending discrimination for women in the workplace, for men and women in the military.

One thing I want to mention, this PAYGO—because again this is something I saw firsthand. GEORGE MILLER put together the initiative for pay as you go, so that we were not increasing the deficit as we made investments for our future.

It was 1982; we were at a midterm convention of the Democrats in Philadelphia. GEORGE MILLER had the resolution to pass PAYGO. It was very fiscally sound and responsible. It passed. The resolution passed. It was so revolutionary that they never had a midterm convention again because it was really there not to make speeches but to make change.

In any event, they made that change, and it didn't become effective really until several more years later when President Clinton became President of the United States, and then we went on a pay-as-you-go basis, so whatever we were doing, we were not increasing the deficit.

□ 1930

So he has been a deficit hawk, a very progressive, liberal deficit hawk in the lead on that subject.

So when he was doing the earned income tax cut; Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids; ENDA—really, we haven't passed it yet, but GEORGE has advanced it in the House any number of times—early childhood education to lifetime learning, I keep coming back to the children.

I have said that when people ask me what are the three most important issues facing the Congress, I always say the same thing: our children, our children, and our children. Their health, their education, the economic security of their families, the air they breathe, environment in which they live, a world at peace in which they can reach their fulfillment. No one in the Congress has done more for our children, our children, our children than GEORGE MILLER, GEORGE MILLER, GEORGE MILLER.

So his focus on the children, but having them live in a world at peace has taken him outside of our country. So forceful was he in his advocacy for children in other countries, for fairness and opportunity and social justice, that he became a subject of the Salvadoran death squads. They tried to

search him down in the United States because he was such a fierce champion for fairness in their country as well.

So here we are—two great, very committed people. If you ask them what the secret of their success would be and how they achieved so much, they will be modest—well, sometimes. But what they will both tell you separately and the guidance they give the rest of us, just stick with it. Just keep on working. Just make sure that the other side, whoever that might be, knows you are not going to go away because you have a goal that is responsible, you have an urgency for the people, and you will make sure that you make the difference.

In many ways we all live in a nation shaped, defined, and strengthened by GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN. Their keen vision, abiding determination, courageous leadership have put them in the ranks of the greatest legislators in our history. When they leave this House, we can be certain that they will use their extraordinary knowledge and talent in new venues and in new ways to serve America's children and families.

As we acknowledge them and express our appreciation to them, we also have to acknowledge their spouses. Janet Waxman and Cynthia Miller have contributed 80 years of being spouses to Members of Congress. That is really almost like 80 years each. That is twice as long as serving, to be a congressional spouse with all the sacrifice that that involves.

Tonight we say a heartfelt "thank you" not only to GEORGE and HENRY and voice our gratitude to them, but to the Waxman and Miller families for sharing these great men with our great Nation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague from California, Mr. MARK TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady, the dean of our delegation in California. I come to the floor with tremendous pride and a heavy heart as we say good-bye to two of the greatest liberal legislators California has ever known—HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER.

I had the honor of receiving HENRY WAXMAN's endorsement for my very first congressional bid in 1992, but I had been an admirer of his long before that. I believe HENRY's career will be judged favorably by history.

Going back to his cofounding of the Los Angeles County Young Democrats with Congressman Howard Berman back in 1973, his passion for social justice has long been storied. I have to say, as a Member from the Inland Empire where we suffer from some of the worst air quality in the Nation, I am grateful for HENRY's commitment to clean air.

He has been a stalwart of progressive values, conducting powerful investiga-

tions on water pollution, AIDS, and tobacco, to name a few. Who else could have cajoled executives of tobacco companies to claim that nicotine was not addictive under oath? Only HENRY.

Let me turn to the other liberal titan, GEORGE MILLER. GEORGE's work on education and labor issues are unparalleled, from leading the effort that raised the minimum wage in 2007 to his commitment to protecting Pell grants and expanding college accessibility for all students.

His support of my bid to the Education and the Workforce Committee made one of this teacher's lifelong aspirations a reality. To honor GEORGE, I plan on renaming the committee Education and Labor when we retake the majority.

GEORGE's passion and presence on the House floor and in committee was powerful and will be missed.

The commitment that both these men had to the right issues, not always the easy or popular issues, makes them true public servants and examples for the rest of us to follow.

While there is no question that both HENRY and GEORGE have earned their retirement, the House is losing two of its fiercest liberal voices. I am humbled to have served one term alongside these gentlemen, but selfishly wish that I could work with them for many more years.

In departing, they are leaving big shoes for the rest of us to fill, but I can safely speak for all of us when I say to HENRY and to GEORGE: It has been an honor.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, my neighbor in the San Francisco Bay area.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the California Democratic leader and want to say very simply that Members come and go on the Hill, but some you can't imagine leaving. Tonight I rise to honor two public servants whose departure will leave an extraordinary void for years to come. Like the giant redwoods of California, these men are giants of the Congress.

Representatives HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER have honorably served the State of California and this Chamber for a combined 80 years—we have heard that earlier—exactly 40 each. Both arrived in the shadow of Watergate, ushering in a new era of strong congressional oversight. They led some of the most significant legislative achievements in our history and set the gold standard for active oversight for all who follow.

Representative WAXMAN, the moustache of justice, never backed down. His book chronicling his congressional investigations, "The Waxman Report," is the bible for conducting effective oversight and holding industry and government officials accountable.

His work combating the tobacco industry is one of the greatest public

health achievements of the last century. But it is only one of many accomplishments, including the Clean Air Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Affordable Care Act, and holding the Bush administration accountable throughout the Iraq war.

His truth serum inquiries caused plenty of CEOs to squirm and brought American consumers cleaner air, water, and quality of life. His stature in this Congress is iconic, and his oversight techniques are legendary. He will always be remembered as the grand inquisitor.

Representative MILLER was mentored by Phillip Burton, who famously said: People sent me to Congress to kick A and take names. Well, GEORGE MILLER took that to heart, making his presence felt on the House floor through passionate speeches and actions to match. He didn't mince words or volume.

GEORGE looks like a warm teddy bear, but much like a teddy bear, he is ferocious in protecting his children, all the children in this country. He worked to protect educational opportunity for low-income students and children with disabilities from preschool to graduation. Even in his final days of service, he has worked to expand access to early childhood education through a new White House initiative.

He has also been an unwavering champion for working families and our environment. He fought pay discrimination with the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, has worked to keep college accessible for all, and conserved the California landscape through his tireless efforts to preserve San Francisco Bay.

As chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, Mr. MILLER helped pass the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992, which increased water allocations for San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, and he spent the last 20 years defending those precious gains which benefit the bay area's wildlife, endangered species, and commercially critical salmon runs.

When GEORGE MILLER arrived in D.C., he was intent on extending affordable health care to all, and thanks to his leadership on the Education and the Workforce Committee, nearly 11 million people are newly ensured under the Affordable Care Act. It is not often that Members achieve such lofty goals in Congress, but his masterful work has led to a law for the history books.

HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER have represented the great heights in this Chamber and what can be achieved. I hope that we can all learn from their example and emulate their legacies.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Santa Barbara, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPS, our friend and colleague.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the dean of our California delegation for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it is with such great pride—also mixed with a heavy heart at our pending loss—we gather here this evening to honor two of the giants of the House of Representatives, and they are friends, friends to me, friends to us all, GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN.

HENRY and GEORGE are two of America's greatest public servants, each serving their California constituents and serving the Nation for almost 40 years. But it is not just their longevity that makes them so notable. They have been incredibly effective.

They have used each of their days here in this institution to improve the lives of all Americans. They have taught us who served with them by their example to do the same. They have made their footprint, their imprint on this place indelible for all ages because they have focused on all Americans, and particularly the vulnerable.

Each of them has been especially skilled and adept at combining their keen knowledge of how to get things done here on the Hill with their ability to dive deep into policy and to see how average Americans, everyday Americans, are affected back home in their districts—all Americans. When you look at any major piece of domestic policy over the past 40 years that they have served here, their imprint is felt.

For example, HENRY WAXMAN was so intimately involved in our Nation's best efforts to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid coverage, to improve access to generic drugs so that all Americans can afford their medicine, to protect our air and water. These topics have been covered, have been mentioned, but they are major pieces of legislation. And he has led us in moving toward a clean tech energy economy.

HENRY WAXMAN literally wrote the laws that have improved the lives of so many, including the Ryan White CARE Act for HIV treatment and prevention, the landmark Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, the 2009 Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act.

HENRY, working with you on the Energy and Commerce Committee has been one of the greatest joys that I have experienced here in Congress.

Similarly, GEORGE MILLER has been such a stalwart in protecting middle class families, the ones I worked with in the school district that I used to represent, similar to all the school districts across this country.

You have promoted education and opportunity for the least of these, for all of these.

He authored the last increase in the Federal minimum wage. He passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act so that we could address pay discrimination. Imagine what that means to every woman, every family in this country because of this legislation.

He has led efforts to reform our Nation's education system. As a school nurse, this hits home with me.

He has made college more affordable, to protect our environment and our coastal communities from increased oil drilling. That is an issue that you empowered me to focus on when I came here as a new Member of Congress.

It must be noted that thanks to each of these Members, to the work that you did on the Affordable Care Act, so incredibly important each of you were to this major landmark passage, families now can have the peace of mind knowing that they are not going to go bankrupt just because they get sick.

And while we are going to deeply miss you here in this place next year, as we gather to vote tomorrow, you look around this Chamber during that vote, you can see each of the people you have mentored during your time here, including me.

□ 1945

So while you and your family are going to enjoy a very well-deserved retirement next year, the legacy that you are leaving in this Chamber will live on for a very long time.

On behalf of this Chamber, this Congress, Californians, in my district and throughout the State, and all Americans, I thank you, each of you, both of you.

Ms. LOFGREN. At this point, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI, our colleague.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding this time to me.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are here to thank and honor two of California's greatest congressional legislators and our dear friends, HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER.

This is an especially, as the Leader has said, bittersweet and poignant time because they are our dear friends. We are so proud of them, and we are going to miss them dearly.

The reason why HENRY and GEORGE are so significant here in this body are that they are the architects of the most significant legislation of the last 40 years. You think about anything we have done in this House, whether it is health care, environment, energy, consumer protection, communications, workforce protection, education opportunities, it goes on and on. The reason why they have been so successful and why they are so dearly respected and loved is that they are men of the House, they are men of the people. They love this institution and they honor this institution, and so this institution honors them. They are people, individuals, who understand this country and understand what makes it great, understand that it is the people that they are going to be helping.

HENRY has been a dear friend of mine for over 30 years and his absence will

be keenly felt in the Halls of Congress and in the Energy and Commerce Committee, on which I serve. In his four decades here, HENRY has been a stolid advocate for his constituents in Los Angeles and for this whole Nation and the world too.

On the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have worked closely with HENRY to tackle a number of critical issues facing the country. The Affordable Care Act will forever stand out in my mind as one of the committee's greatest accomplishments, and HENRY has been a true leader in that passage.

We worked together to combat climate change, eliminate the harmful formaldehyde emissions, promote strong net neutrality rules, and expand access to Internet services for more Americans. He has been a true leader.

We are also saying good-bye to my really good friend, GEORGE MILLER. During my time in Congress, he has become a trusted friend and colleague. He led the fight on raising the minimum wage and fighting for a vibrant education system.

But what I remember the most and cherish the most about him is that he leaves such a great legacy on water law and policy in California, from his historic California water reform law that requires the balanced use of our State's scarce water resources to the many battles on the floor fending off ill-conceived attempts to drastically change the distribution of our precious water resources.

With the departure of HENRY and GEORGE, Congress is losing champions of the people whose knowledge and passion will not soon be replaced, but they leave many of us behind who understand how important it is. We say farewell to them, but we also wish them well, and certainly wish their families well.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Napa, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank our California delegation leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize two men that I have had the high honor and the great privilege to serve with for their last 16 years in Congress: GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN. And I have had the unenviable task to try and represent part of GEORGE's old district and, I will tell you, you have got to work about three times as hard just to try and catch up to where he has been.

When I was first elected to Congress, I learned quickly that none of us are able to accomplish anything without the help and the sacrifices of those who came before us. For many of us, myself included, none have helped or sacrificed more than GEORGE and HENRY. They fought the good fight, they have won some incredible battles, and America is a better place for it today.

GEORGE, I remember, I don't know about fondly, but I remember like it was yesterday, joining forces with you to reverse a water decision that a former administration had made that killed 80,000 spawning salmon in my district and economically devastated the area that I represented. Had it not been for you, those people would still be washed up on the rocks. But we came on this floor together and, with your guidance and you as my mentor, we were able to help those folks weather that very, very terrible time. I appreciate your help, and so do they.

It has been said that any of us who experience any success at all in Congress do so on the shoulder of giants. This institution has seen many giants, but none larger than HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER. They are great legislators. They have legislated successfully on everything from health care to education to tobacco to natural resources. They have fought the fights that have made American people live a better life.

We will always read in our history books about the great men and women who have worked in this magnificent institution. I, for one, am thankful that I had the opportunity to serve with two of them. They are living legends, and we should all recognize how fortunate we have been.

Their work and their accomplishments will endure long past their retirement, and our country will forever be a stronger and better place because of GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from over the mountains, Congressman SAM FARR.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much for yielding and being chair of the California Democratic delegation, the largest single delegation in the United States Congress, with its champions of note, GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN.

This is a historical room and this is a historical moment, and that is why it is being recorded and being covered by C-SPAN. This room is historic in that the leaders of the world come to speak here to joint sessions of Congress. We are every day surrounded by the reliefs on the walls here of 23 of the greatest lawgivers in the history of the world, and we are reminded that one person can make a difference.

Tonight, we honor two people, each who have made one hell of a difference. I don't think that I have ever met—and my contacts with these two gentlemen goes way back with GEORGE MILLER when he was 9 years old. He was the pudgy little kid and I was the tall skinny kid. Now I am the pudgy little kid and he is the tall skinny kid.

But he had a dedication for the out-of-doors. We went camping, fishing, and skiing. Our fathers, who were both State senators, introduced us to poli-

tics at the State level, and both of us ended up as staff members in the California State legislature, where, in 1968, HENRY WAXMAN was elected. And GEORGE on the Senate side and myself on the analyst side, but mostly on the assembly side, I worked a lot with HENRY WAXMAN because I was doing constitutional revision work, and one of the few things that HENRY was interested in was constitutional revision. This is really about the history of the state of the Constitution, and he carried these really complicated constitutional amendments to clean up the Constitution. I just remembered the dedication. The style was always one of intellect, very legal, lawyer-like, quiet, but everybody respected him, and we got a lot done.

GEORGE, GEORGE is like his dad. He is the fiery one. In fact, this podium right here I saw broken by GEORGE hitting it. This is a new podium, ladies and gentlemen, thanks to GEORGE MILLER. Now it is adjustable and all kinds of things it didn't used to be in the old days.

Look, behind us is the American flag. There are 50 stars on it. Everybody knows those represent the 50 States. In my opinion, they are going to remind us of the 50 pieces of major legislation that each one of these Members carry. Now, a lot of these people that come through here are famous, and we have had Senator Kennedy and so on being in this House, and we think of the legislation they have created. Look, these gentlemen have done more for this Nation in major legislation than any people in either the Senate or the House.

In fact, little known, but GEORGE MILLER would have been the Speaker of the House when NANCY PELOSI wanted him to run, and he said: "NANCY, this is your job, we are going to make history with you."

These two gentlemen are some of the greatest people that have ever served in the United States Congress, and I hope the record will remember all of their incredible accomplishments because we are a better country and a better world for their service. We are going to greatly miss them.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from East Bay, Congressman ERIC SWALWELL, a new Member of our delegation.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor to pay tribute to two legislators, two lions of the United States Congress whom I am honored to have had the privilege to serve with for 2 years.

HENRY, it is often said that there is nothing more important than one's health, and no one has done more to improve the health of Americans than the gentleman from California, HENRY WAXMAN. He provided better health care for the elderly and poor through improved Medicare and Medicaid programs, offered Federal help to those

with HIV and AIDS, and vastly expanded the use of less expensive generic drugs, on and on and on.

HENRY also worked to advance public health by improving the environment in which we live. This included pushing for legislation to protect the quality of our air, water, and food.

Now, GEORGE, my neighbor, just to the north, I will never forget the first day I met GEORGE. It was in our caucus meeting. He came up to me and he said, "How old are you?" I told him I was 31 years old. He said he was about the same age, just a little bit younger, when he was elected. He gave me one piece of advice. He said, "You are not elected in this town until you are re-elected. You go home every single weekend and you represent your constituents." I saw GEORGE every single weekend flying home on that plane, and I never felt sorry for myself because I know that GEORGE went home for the past 40 years every single weekend.

He has also stood up and advocated for working families. I am fortunate that, besides what he has done for advocating to increase the minimum wage, he came out to my district and talked to our local brothers and sisters in labor about how he can teach me to work with them and listen to them and advocate for them. He stood up for children to make sure that poor kids across our district, across northern California, have access to education and a better chance to expand upon that freedom to dream.

But I think one of the greatest things about GEORGE is not just the legacy and the legislation that he is leaving, but also the Members that he has mentored. When you look at the bills GEORGE has passed into law, it inspires you to be a part of a place that can do good and can do better.

But, perhaps, my favorite memory of GEORGE is coming down onto the House floor as GEORGE has given an impassioned floor speech. GEORGE tends, as you know, to go just a little bit over time, but when he starts to go over time he starts to raise his voice and he starts to bang and bang and bang on that podium as he is standing up for working families and children in our country, and the poor Speaker tries to gavel him down. But never, never, never has anyone been able to gavel down GEORGE MILLER and what he has stood up for in this Congress.

Long live your memory, GEORGE, long live your legacy, and may you continue to inspire all of us to do better.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our new colleague from North Bay, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN.

□ 2000

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

I also rise to join my colleagues in honoring two of the alltime greats of

the United States Congress, GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN.

As many of my colleagues have said, these two will go down in history as some of the most able policymakers, intellectual engines, and progressive champions in the history of the House of Representatives.

People around this country benefit every day from their work in this body from the clean air and clean water that we have because of their work; to human rights and workers' rights; to education to consumer safety; to public land protections; and safer, more affordable pharmaceuticals. The list goes on and on. Let's not forget the millions of people in this country today that have access for the first time to affordable, quality health care because of the very important and historic health care act that they helped bring into law.

This Special Order doesn't give us anywhere near enough time to do justice to these two legislative titans' accomplishments, so I will just mention two that have special meaning to me personally.

HENRY, your work to expand the scope of the Clean Air Act and strengthen its enforcement has been tireless, and over the decades, it has meant huge improvements to the public health care of the American people.

HENRY was one of the leading architects of the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990 that targeted environmental hazards like acid rain, smog, and the thinning ozone layer, and through this work, he helped lay the groundwork for President Obama's important efforts to combat climate change by improving fuel efficiency and cleaning up our power plants.

HENRY has also led the Safe Climate Caucus, a bicameral effort that is attempting to create a climate policy in exile, if you will. Inevitably, the science of this issue will catch up to the minds of our colleagues across the aisle; as well, the duty to future generations will catch up to the hearts of our colleagues across the aisle.

In the meantime, HENRY, the work that you have done in this House has helped keep a positive track on climate change alive, and the work that we accomplish in the years ahead will absolutely be standing on your shoulders.

GEORGE MILLER is my neighbor to the east. Among many, many things, he worked for years to bring California water policy into the modern era, culminating in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act signed into law in 1992 by Republican President George H.W. Bush.

For the first time, under the CVPIA, the Federal Government was required to consider the impacts to California's fish and wildlife when managing the Central Valley Project, one of the world's largest water management systems, but also one that did enormous

damage to fish and wildlife. It moved the pendulum too far in one direction, and it had to be reset, and that is what GEORGE MILLER did.

The CVPIA encouraged more efficient water use, established conservation requirements, and water metering. It started to reform the antiquated water contracts that gave away public water for 40 years at a time at below-market rates.

The law that GEORGE MILLER authored also helped pave the way for the restoration of the San Joaquin River which once supported one of the largest salmon runs on the Pacific Coast.

Although we will miss their daily leadership in our delegation and in Congress, I know that their body of work will continue to stand the test of time. The people of California have been very fortunate to have Congressman MILLER and Congressman WAXMAN representing them for the past 40 years, and it has been a privilege and honor for me to serve with them for the past 2 years.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from Los Angeles, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Tonight is a bittersweet event for all of us of the California delegation. While we are here to celebrate the accomplishments of our colleagues HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER, we are also here to bid farewell to these outstanding statesmen who have made indelible contributions to the House of Representatives and to our Nation.

When I came to Congress in 1993, they had served 18 years as colleagues of my father, former Congressman Edward R. Roybal, who had great respect for these men. As a freshman Member, I remember being very much in awe of them and their accomplishments. HENRY was already considered the health guru, and GEORGE was well-established as a leader in education and labor policy, but their contributions to our country had just begun.

As a Member of the House for the last 22 years, I have seen firsthand the expertise, the passion, and the courage with which they fought for policies and laws to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

While their accomplishments are much too many to mention, HENRY will always be remembered for his championship of universal health coverage, his efforts to ensure the affordability and availability of prescription drugs, and his leadership in tobacco cessation policy.

GEORGE's legacy will be his stewardship of a fair minimum wage, worker protections through secret ballots, and his staunch advocacy for school modernization and student aid expansion.

My constituents and all Americans, including future generations, will benefit from the educational opportuni-

ties, labor protections, clean air and water, and expanded health access that were made possible by these two California statesmen with whom I have the privilege to serve. I will always cherish the opportunities I have to collaborate with them on issues like adult immunization, newborn screening, and education technology.

HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER will leave a void that is nearly impossible to fill and a heritage of critical policy imperatives that will define our efforts in health, education, labor, and environmental justice for many Congresses to come.

These men truly understand the meaning of the responsibility of serving in the House of Representatives. I wish them Godspeed, good health, and sincere thanks for their lifetime of service in doing the people's work in the people's House.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to our colleague from New York, an honorary Californian and a fellow fan of these two great Members, Congressman PAUL TONKO of New York's 20th District.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you to the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

It is an honor this evening to join in the tribute to two very strong individuals who have represented their districts so very well, Representative WAXMAN and Representative MILLER.

One of the benefits and one of the opportunities that comes the way of Members of this House is to stand alongside men and women of greatness who lead not only their home district and State, but the Nation—and the world, for that matter. This evening, we recognize the contributions of HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER.

When I first arrived in the House some three terms ago, my first assignment was on the Education and Labor Committee. I thank you, Representative MILLER for being an outstanding chair who enabled me to join in your sound efforts in providing for the empowerment of children, the strengthening of workers, stamping out gender discrimination, and all sorts of work that addressed not only issues of your home State of California and my district in New York, but the entire Nation—and the world, for that matter. It has been an empowering statement.

To HENRY WAXMAN, the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee when I joined earlier in this third term, it was an honor to join with you, HENRY, and to recognize the great work that you have done on climate change and energy issues, certainly on public health, from the warnings of tobacco to affordable prescription drugs and to move forward with the Affordable Care Act.

It has been an honor. It has been a great treasure to call you colleagues and friends. I want to thank you for your intellect, the institutional memory that you carry with you, and the

passion that you poured forth for your State, your country, and the world.

Thank you so much for your service. We will deeply miss you.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield to our colleague from Maryland, Congressman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It is an honor to stand with the California delegation tonight in saluting two extraordinary Members of the United States Congress, GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN, two friends, two individuals who have been an inspiration to me and so many other Americans.

What is extraordinary about these two men is that they greeted every day of their 40 years here in the United States Congress as if it were their very first day, with the same determination, with the same drive, with the same passion to make our country a little better place than they found it.

Make no mistake, they came here on a mission to build a more just, a more inclusive Nation, where every American has a fair shot at the American Dream, and through that determination and that perseverance, they succeeded.

If you look around the country today, in almost every aspect of American life, these two gentlemen have left their mark, from health care to education to workers' rights to protecting our environment. They have changed the arc of American history.

One quality really stands out when I think about both these individuals: fearlessness and moral courage and a willingness to take on the most powerful special interests on behalf of the common good, no matter the personal risk, no matter the political cost.

They have been warriors for the public good, sometimes happy warriors, sometimes just tough warriors, but always standing up for what is best in America. It is the job of those of us who remain here to dedicate ourselves to carry on the work that these gentlemen carried out for the love of their country.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another distinguished gentleman from Maryland, Congressman JOHN SARBANES.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you for yielding.

It is a privilege to rise and acknowledge the incredible service of GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN. I had the honor of serving with both of them on each of their committees, the Education and the Workforce Committee in the case of GEORGE MILLER, and the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Oversight Committee with HENRY WAXMAN.

As public servants, they are unrivaled. At a time when unfortunately many Americans have become cynical and wonder whether their voice is heard here in Washington, these are

two individuals that when you look back over their careers in public service, you cannot have a shred of cynicism because they got up every day determined to do the right thing to help people across this country.

In the case of HENRY WAXMAN, his fight on behalf of consumers is legendary. His work to guarantee access to affordable health care is before us every day. His desire to see that every citizen be able to live in a world where they have clean air and clean water, a world that is protected against the ravages of climate change, is his legacy. In fact, when it comes to climate change, I think we can say he is the conscience of the Congress.

In the case of GEORGE MILLER, he is somebody who was deeply committed to making sure that the next generation had decent educational opportunities and fought for that during his entire time here in this Congress; of course, he was always putting the priorities and the needs of working families first.

If legislating is a profession, then these two individuals reached the height of that profession. They knew the substance of the work. They fought hard for what they believed in, but they knew how to reach compromise when it was demanded.

As people, they are both decent, ethical, and caring, and most importantly, down to Earth, getting up every day saying, "I have got a job to do," and going out to do it. We will miss them. We thank them for their service. As long as we have the privilege of serving here, we will cherish their legacy.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, RUSH HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. As one who has also chosen to step aside at the end of this term, I want to recognize and thank two legislative giants, HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER. They came at the same time. Although they are very different people, each shows compassion, courage, determination, persistence, powerful mind skill, and even good humor in accomplishing all these things that we have heard about tonight.

I have seen their personal qualities up close. I have been with HENRY as he stands for fairness and justice in Israel. I have been with GEORGE MILLER as he inspects the vanishing glaciers that are the victims of our climate change.

They have worked, as you heard, on elementary and secondary education, worker protection, health care, communication, clean air, clean water, sustaining lands and climates. They will not tolerate those who violate workers' rights, family welfare, and individual opportunity, in America or elsewhere.

We have heard about Central America. I was with GEORGE MILLER in Chile this year when he received the highest medal that country gives, the

O'Higgins Medal, for activities that he did as a freshman from this House when he went to Chile and courageously stood up in the face of Pinochet's terrorism to defend labor and individual rights.

We could go on far beyond the hour that is allotted here. Simply put, their record puts to rest any claim that government doesn't work, that government can't help people, that special interests always prevail. It makes us proud to be Members of this body. It makes us proud to be in the United States of America.

Thank you, GEORGE and HENRY.

□ 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, just squeaking under the wire, and I am not going to do a GEORGE MILLER imitation, talking over the Speaker and pounding the lectern, nor am I going to try and repeat what has come before us in terms of talking about the legendary accomplishments of the two gentlemen. I just want to mention one.

When I first came here, I was privileged to be part of a small discussion group of faith and politics. It had HENRY and GEORGE, and it opened a face to me of people who cared about their colleagues, an extraordinary kindness that both had given to me and my family, and had given a face to this institution that is too often missing now. And I think that may be their greatest contribution.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we are through with an hour. We could have filled many hours, but we say goodbye to these two colleagues. Eighty years of experience and expertise will leave this Chamber.

I looked—in 1974, the top of the charts was "The Way We Were," that was the song, but also on that chart was a song called "Rock On," and that is what we want our two colleagues to do.

We are in their debt. We are impressed. Our country and our world is a better place because of their wonderful service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank two of the finest legislators in California's history for their contributions to our nation and to this body over the past forty years.

HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER were both elected in the post-Watergate Democratic wave election of 1974—one from Southern California, the other from Northern California. They have served together through many legislative battles that have shaped the modern history of our country, and they have each chaired committees during times of momentous change and achievement. It has been my privilege to call both of them my friends, and it will be my disappointment to see both of them leave this House when they retire at the close of the 113th Congress.

HENRY WAXMAN has spent his four decades in Congress as a tireless fighter for clean air and water, a stronger economy that creates opportunities for all Americans, and a strong U.S.-Israel relationship. He worked hard to raise awareness about the dangers of tobacco and worked across the aisle to help lower the cost of drugs used to treat those with rare diseases. HENRY wrote major legislation on food safety to inform consumers about the nutritional value of what they eat and to keep chemical pesticides out of the fruits and vegetables we feed our children.

He and GEORGE MILLER both helped lead the effort to pass the Affordable Care Act and expand access to affordable health insurance to more Americans.

GEORGE has served as Chairman of both the Natural Resources Committee and the Education and Labor Committee—now called Education and Workforce. On the first, he oversaw the passage of legislation that created new national parks, like Joshua Tree and Death Valley, and he worked to protect wildlife across the country and around the world. On the Education and Workforce Committee, of which he is still the Ranking Member, GEORGE helped write legislation to reform and expand student loans, was instrumental in crafting the new G.I. Bill to send Iraq and Afghanistan veterans to college, and worked to pass the College Cost Reduction Act to make higher education more affordable for all Americans. He and I worked together in 2009 to enact statutory PAY-GO rules to ensure that Congress must pay for what it buys—rules GEORGE pioneered in the early 1980's when he wrote the first PAY-GO legislation.

Both GEORGE and HENRY will leave big shoes to fill in the next Congress, and I look forward to working with the Democratic Members their constituents chose to succeed them in order to carry forward the work they have been engaged in for forty years. I join with a grateful nation and a grateful House in thanking them both for their many years of distinguished service to Congress, to the people of California, and to the United States.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the legacy of public service for two of our departing colleagues, Rep. GEORGE MILLER and Rep. HENRY WAXMAN.

I have had the pleasure of serving alongside Reps. MILLER and WAXMAN for over twenty years and it is with great respect and admiration that I say goodbye to them as colleagues, friends and brothers-in-arms.

Since 1975, HENRY and GEORGE have not only served the people of their districts but also our nation as champions of progressive democratic ideals and stewards for the tenets established by our founding fathers. Their legacy as effective legislators is virtually unmatched in the House of Representatives and serves as a reminder that constructive work can lead to positive results in this legislative body.

GEORGE and HENRY together claim responsibility for enacting some of the most important legislation that has come before Congress over the last century. HENRY's leadership on the Clean Air Act, the Ryan White CARE Act, the State Children's Health Insurance Program or the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act are only a few examples of

his passion and dedication. GEORGE's leadership on the California Desert Protection Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, and the Fair Minimum Wage Act were a result of his endless tenacity and compassion.

I will always remember how instrumental each of them was in securing the enactment of the Affordable Care Act; what seven presidents could not accomplish over so many decades, President Obama principally accomplished because of the relentless efforts of each of them.

Whether we found ourselves in legislative foxholes or at the vanguard of new ideas and solutions, we were always in it together for the American people. Their efforts were always led by the desire to serve the best interests, ideals and policies for our nation.

Mr. Speaker, many are called to public service, but few leave legacies that endure the way that Rep. HENRY WAXMAN and Rep. GEORGE MILLER's legacies will endure. As they move on to the next stage of their lives, with their health intact and their heads held high, let us be thankful that we had these champions of American democracy and patriots for America's freedom for forty years.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, HENRY WAXMAN is one of the most prolific and successful legislators in modern congressional history.

After 46 years of serving his constituents in Los Angeles County—my fellow Californian, a champion for health care, for the environment, and consumers—is retiring at the end of the 113th Congress.

Since 2009 Congressman WAXMAN has served as Chairman and Ranking Member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a committee with broad jurisdictions that reach into the daily lives of millions of Americans. His legislative achievements are unparalleled—

The Infant Formula Act, to improve the quality and integrity of infant formula;

The Orphan Drug Act, which gave pharmaceutical companies incentives to develop treatments for rare diseases they had previously ignored;

The Hatch-Waxman Act to create the first ever pathway for generic drugs;

The Clean Air Act to address the problems of urban smog, hazardous air pollution, acid rain, and the depletion of the ozone;

The Ryan White Care Act, groundbreaking legislation to provide medical care for Americans living with HIV/AIDS;

The State Children's Health Insurance Program to ensure all children had access to health insurance;

The Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act to restrict the marketing of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to children and give the FDA jurisdiction to regulate these products; and

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, arguably the most important and far-reaching legislation passed by Congress in a century, creating a framework for universal health coverage for the American people.

Rep. WAXMAN has also authored laws that improved the quality of nursing homes and home health services and that set policy for childhood immunization programs, vaccine compensation, tobacco education programs, communicable disease research, community and migrant health centers, maternal and child

health care, family planning centers, health maintenance organizations, and drug regulation.

Rep. WAXMAN is a strong advocate for women's health, supporting family planning programs and the right of women to freedom of choice with respect to safe and legal abortions.

From 1997–2009, Rep. WAXMAN served as either Chairman or Ranking Member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, conducting investigations into a wide range of important topics from the high cost of prescription drugs to waste, fraud and abuse in government contracting. He also formed a Special Investigations Division that prepared hundreds of investigative reports on local and national topics for Members of Congress.

Mr. WAXMAN's contributions to our country span 40 years in Congress and six years in the California State Assembly. He and his wife Janet have been married for 44 years, they have two children and five beautiful grandchildren, Ari, Maya, Noa, Eva, and Jacob. It's been a great honor to serve with HENRY WAXMAN and I wish him and Janet my full wishes for every blessing.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the great legislators of our time, Congressman HENRY WAXMAN.

I have had the honor of working with HENRY on the Energy and Commerce Committee for many years. In that time, we have worked together on children's health coverage, affordable prescription drugs, environmental protection, and universal health care coverage, the Affordable Care Act.

In Congress, HENRY has served as the Chairman and currently serves as the Ranking Democrat on Energy and Commerce and previously served as the Ranking Democrat for the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

HENRY and I both currently serve as co-chairs of the Democratic Israel Working Group where we have worked together in supporting our nation's partner in peace in the Middle East, Israel.

HENRY, along with fellow Californian, Rep. GEORGE MILLER, are the last two House Members of the "Watergate" Class of 1974 and have left an indelible mark on our chamber. Their leadership will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank HENRY for his years of public service on behalf of millions of Americans who have benefitted from his work from tobacco regulation and reproductive rights to air and water quality standards and ensuring that all Americans have access to health care coverage.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two giants of this House: GEORGE MILLER and HENRY WAXMAN, who will be leaving this institution at the end of this Congress. They will be missed, but their legacies live on the myriad ways that they have made America better.

HENRY and GEORGE have made their marks on this nation through an unwavering commitment to their ideals, dogged hard work and a pragmatism that is too often lacking in this hyper-partisan era. One, or the other—or both, have been instrumental in almost every major piece of domestic policy legislation in the last

few decades and have improved the lives of countless Americans and millions overseas.

As long as GEORGE and HENRY have been in Congress, those who had long been ignored by Washington have been heard. Poor people, the sick, persecuted minorities around the world, and our nation's children have all been lifted up by the work of these two men.

During his 40 years in Congress, GEORGE chaired three committees—the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, the Natural Resources Committee, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce—and through them fought for high quality education not just for a select few students but for all. He has worked to strengthen environmental protections even in the face of aggressive opposition from entrenched interests, and for safe conditions and a living wage for workers in America and overseas.

GEORGE is blessed with boundless energy and has never been satisfied to rest on his laurels—staying engaged to ensure that the bills he has passed are implemented and improved upon. He wrote the legislation that successfully raised the minimum wage in 2007 and has written the bill to increase it again.

He worked across the aisle to write and pass No Child Left Behind and has not wavered from his efforts to improve and fund it.

Beyond his extensive legislative achievements, GEORGE has touched so many lives, including mine when I interned in his office as a college student. At the time, I never imagined I would one day serve alongside him, but it has been a great honor.

HENRY WAXMAN has similarly focused a wide array of causes, focusing on investigating companies whose products had harmed consumers, and questioning and holding accountable corporate executives on behalf of those who otherwise had no opportunity to seek justice.

As Chairman of the House Oversight and Government Committee, HENRY investigated waste, fraud and abuse in the tobacco, finance and energy industries to name only a few.

Conducting investigations and oversight was not enough for him, once he exposed wrongdoing, he would work, sometimes for decades, to translate his findings into legislation. As Chairman of the Energy and Commerce he helped write and oversaw the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the culmination of lifelong work on behalf of uninsured Americans.

HENRY's commitment to human rights, especially the persecution of religious minorities in the former Soviet Union and Iran has given hope to those without hope. His steadfast support of Israel has ensured that our two nations will remain allies and partners.

As dean of the Los Angeles delegation, HENRY has been both a leader on issues facing Angelenos, and a mentor. I consider myself privileged to have had the opportunity to work with him.

Our state and the nation have been lucky to have the decades of service that GEORGE and HENRY have given us. They will be missed from the halls of Congress, but their legacy will continue to shape this institution and nation for decades to come.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, for the past 22 years, I've had the privilege of working along-

side one of the greatest statesmen this institution has ever known—Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

Throughout his 40-year career, Congressman MILLER's work has transformed the lives of children and families, hard working people and our environment. From our country's education system, to labor, to health policy and the preservation of our natural resources, Congressman MILLER has left lasting and profoundly important imprints on our society. From the first day he stepped into the halls of Congress and ever since, he's been a true reformer for the American people.

Congressman MILLER was instrumental in passing the Lily Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which curbs pay discrimination against women. In 1975, he championed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, which for the first time provided children with special needs a free and appropriate public education.

Congressman MILLER paved the way to dramatically improve the quality of meals for children at schools with the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010, and spearheaded transformative legislation to save students billions of dollars in student loan costs while serving as Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. In 1982, he passed the landmark Pay-Go Act to reduce the deficit, instill greater discipline in the budget process, and ensure that military and non-military spending is considered equally.

Congressman MILLER chaired the House Natural Resources Committee and delivered the California Desert Protection Act of 1994, which established Death Valley National Park, Joshua Tree National Park and the Mojave Desert National Preserve. He also unlocked longstanding and fiercely defended taxpayer subsidized domination of California's scarce water resources by agribusiness, quite literally saving our fisheries and water quality.

His accomplishments are countless and far reaching, and his tenacious pursuit to serve his constituents and the American people resonates throughout each and every one of his victories, as well as his defeats.

Nearly every weekend for 40 years, Congressman MILLER has traveled home to his district in the East Bay of San Francisco from Washington, D.C. It's where he has drawn his strength, his inspiration, and his desire to keep fighting the good fight.

GEORGE, you are my brother, my confidant, and I will forever keep in my heart the time we spent working together in Congress. I wish you, Cynthia, your sons and grandchildren every blessing, and know that your tireless spirit will forever be a part of this sacred institution.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the legislative giants of our era. A man who I am proud to call my colleague and my friend, Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

GEORGE first came to Congress as part of the legendary "Watergate Class" of 1974. In the four decades that GEORGE has been a member of this chamber, he has played a key role in the passage of some of our nation's most important education, labor, and health statutes.

GEORGE has served as chairman of three committees: the Select Committee on Chil-

dren, Youth and Families, the Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Education and Labor. He continues his legacy of leadership to this day as co-chair of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee.

GEORGE has been a tenacious fighter in support of workers' rights, students and teachers, workplace safety, the environment, and a livable wage for all working Americans.

As a card carrying member of the Communications Workers of America and someone who shares GEORGE's commitment for working Americans, Congressman MILLER has been a colleague I have continued to look to on issues important to the labor community.

Before I close, I would like to thank GEORGE for his decades of public service on behalf of our nation's working families. Our chamber will be losing one of the true lions of our generation and I wish him and his family all the best.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the long and distinguished career of Congressman HENRY WAXMAN.

Congressman WAXMAN's career speaks for itself. He has been at the forefront of many of the most important legislative and policy battles of the past four decades. From combating Big Tobacco to championing the Affordable Care Act, HENRY has been an indispensable voice in the House. It was an honor to serve with him and I commend his long and storied career.

I had the privilege of serving alongside Congressman WAXMAN on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. During our time together on the Oversight Committee, we focused on investigations into cost overruns and money wasted on reconstruction in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the service of Congressman HENRY WAXMAN in the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the career of Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

I had the pleasure of serving on the Education and Workforce Committee with GEORGE. During his time in Congress, Congressman MILLER has been an outspoken leader on issues related to health care, workers' rights, and quality education. His leadership, knowledge, and mentorship will be sorely missed in Congress.

Congressman MILLER's legacy spans many issues facing Americans including raising the minimum wage, improving conditions for workers, fighting for equal pay for women, protecting the environment and bettering our education system. His 40 years of tireless service have undoubtedly positively improved the lives of countless Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the service of Congressman GEORGE MILLER.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor today to rise and celebrate the accomplishments of two of my friends, and two of the most distinguished leaders to have ever served in the House of Representatives: HENRY WAXMAN and GEORGE MILLER. Their names have become synonymous with statesmanship and a deep commitment to public service.

These two giants leave behind legislative records that are unmatched in scope and

length. When HENRY WAXMAN served as Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee—I had the good fortune of working closely with him on so many of the issues we care about. Whether it was expanding access to affordable healthcare, or ensuring that our environment is protected, HENRY was at the forefront of so much important progress. His leadership on the Affordable Care Act and his championing of Medicare and Medicaid improvements will be remembered as some of his greatest accomplishments in this body. While he has certainly been a friend to us, he has also been a friend to so many who he has never met: the elderly, the infirmed, and those most vulnerable to whom he has dedicated his career.

Few people in this country have done more for America's children than GEORGE MILLER. With a special focus on children from underserved and low-income communities, GEORGE fought tirelessly to fight economic inequalities and to expand opportunities for young people who otherwise would not have had them. From fighting for a stronger K-12 education law to ensuring that people can live on a meaningful minimum wage, GEORGE MILLER has dedicated his career to giving voice to the American worker.

Both of these leaders are proud sons of California, and throughout their careers they have truly lived up to the term "Representative." I look forward to seeing how they will continue to use their talents, knowledge and passions to better serve our nation in the years ahead. Thank you for all of your leadership; it has been an honor to serve with you.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN DOC HASTINGS ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, tonight we celebrate my friend and esteemed colleague, Chairman DOC HASTINGS, for his 20 years of dedicated service in the United States House of Representatives.

DOC has been a constant source of wisdom, of compassion, of patience, and of leadership for our Chamber, and I know that he will be sorely missed by all who have had the pleasure of working with him.

Every day he has represented the people of the Tri-Cities, Yakima, Moses Lake, and all of Central Washington with his tireless commitment.

When he first came to Congress in 1995 to represent Washington's Fourth

Congressional District, he came with his sleeves rolled up ready to get things done. He didn't come to seek the spotlight. He came to Congress to help the people of Central Washington in every way he could, to make their lives better, and that is exactly what he has done.

In his years on Capitol Hill, DOC has been a humble leader and a masterful legislator. It was in 1974 when DOC entered politics. He was elected Franklin County Republican Party Chair and served Franklin County with his tremendous work ethic and attention to detail.

As a proud early supporter of Ronald Reagan, it wasn't long before DOC was chosen as a delegate for Ronald Reagan at the 1976 Republican National Convention.

He went on to serve as a faithful representative in the State legislature from 1979 to 1987. He first ran for Congress in 1992 and came up a little short, but that didn't deter him. In 1994 he ran again, and he soon came to our Nation's Capitol after winning a race against then-incumbent and current Governor of Washington State, Jay Inslee.

That year, Republicans gained control of the House of Representatives for the first time in 40 years, and DOC embodied that spirit of hard work and determination. In all the years I have known him, I have marveled at his ability to get things done without seeking the limelight.

When I came to Congress, I quickly learned that when DOC spoke, people listened. It is because of him that BPA rate increases in the Pacific Northwest were limited. It is because of him that those back home didn't see their electric rates skyrocket.

And it is because of his relationships, both here and at home, that we have been able to build upon the foundation of our economy. It is because of him that we have been able to move forward on so many effective economic solutions for the Pacific Northwest.

DOC has been a steady hand and an instrumental leader in his chairmanship of the House Committee on Natural Resources, and on the House Committee on Ethics.

In his recent work as Natural Resources Chairman, DOC worked to reform the 24-year old Endangered Species Act in an effort to improve species recovery, reduce ESA-related litigation, and ensure taxpayer dollars are spent efficiently and wisely. He worked to make the law work for both species and for people.

His focus has always been on making laws more efficient and effective to help people, and this is no exception. Regardless of the issue, whether it is energy, healthy forests, protecting our dams, irrigation, agriculture, or manufacturing, DOC has championed countless policies that have driven our economy in the Pacific Northwest.

Serving as founder and chairman of the House Nuclear Cleanup Caucus, DOC has tirelessly educated his colleagues about cleaning up nuclear waste created by World War II and Cold War-era nuclear weapon production programs. The program includes waste at Hanford site, which is the world's largest and most complex environmental cleanup effort, and it is DOC who has worked to ensure that cleanups move forward safely and efficiently, and it is DOC that helped the Tri-Cities community prepare for the post-cleanup era.

It goes without saying that those in Washington State are better because of DOC's service. As cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Northwest Energy Caucus, DOC has worked to promote cooperation on issues that impact the continued availability of low-cost hydropower.

He gave us the opportunity to work together on policies like protecting the Northwest's important source of renewable hydropower, addressing the future of the Columbia River Treaty, protecting the Snake River Dams, and integrating wind energy into BPA's transmission systems.

Under DOC's guidance, we have had the opportunity to collaborate to promote a strong future for our regional power system.

As a master of all things rules, he knows the rules better than just about anyone. The Speaker could always turn to him when he needed a steady hand who understood the rules.

What I admire most about DOC is that he is kind and selfless. He is as kind and selfless as he is brilliant.

When our son, Cole, was born, and after he was diagnosed with Down syndrome, DOC was the one that welcomed us back and introduced Cole to the world on the House floor. He is an invaluable legislator, an unmatched mentor, and a man I am proud to call my friend.

DOC's family has always come first. His wife, Claire, has been his partner, by his side 20 years now in service, and I can say from experience it is not easy to have your family on one coast when you are on the other.

Claire and the entire Hastings family have always been a source of continued commitment and unconditional love, and I know DOC feels so blessed to have had that unwavering support.

I thank the Hastings family for sharing with America a tremendous and invaluable leader. His heart has always been with his children and grandchildren, and I know that he will be glad to be able to spend some more time with them.

DOC has filled the role of dean of the Washington delegation, and he is going to be missed. While this great leader will no longer walk the Halls of Congress every day, this institution is better and stronger for having had him

here. Doc will be missed every day, but his legacy will live on in Congress and, of course, all across Eastern Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of our Appropriation Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I will not be lengthy, but I will be very serious.

There are very few people that I have served with in this body these 34 years for me who has more respect and more friends than DOC HASTINGS.

We are personal friends. We are professional friends. And when our wives are back home, we frequently have dinner together, and we talk a lot of politics, we talk about things going on at home, talk about things going on here in this body and the world.

There is nobody more knowledgeable of politics in America than DOC HASTINGS. He knows every congressional district. He knows the politics of that district, and that makes for some great, great conversation.

But I think the most important thing that I could say about DOC HASTINGS is his character, the character that he possesses. Someone once said that "Character is doing the right thing when nobody is looking."

I have seen, time and again, Doc faced with an opportunity, perhaps, that would have meant taking advantage of someone or not doing the right thing, and he always does the right thing. And so that character, that inner being that radiates out to the world, comes through that balding head and reaches out to the world.

Most people don't realize that Doc HASTINGS is one of the biggest NASCAR fans in America. He travels to watch the cars. And of course, most of those started out in the South and still principally are. But Doc loves the NASCAR world, so that makes him a southerner, which is another reason I admire the man.

Well, we are going to miss this man. He has served so well here in so many different important roles: chairman of the Ethics Committee that looks after the ethics of Members of Congress; of course, on the Rules Committee, the hardest working assignment I think anyone has, and his service there was superlative; and of course, the chair he now holds, that has turned out more bills, I dare say, than any other committee of the Congress. I mean, it seems like every day there is a string of Hastings bills that are being considered by the floor.

He is a strong worker, a hard worker. He is conscientious in his work. He is approachable and friendly and likes to take advice.

□ 2030

So we are going to miss this man, and we hope that the folks back in the

home State appreciate just how well loved DOC HASTINGS is here in the U.S. Congress.

So, Doc, we will miss you. We want you to come back from time to time, and I will even buy you dinner. God bless you.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DENNY HECK.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington State.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge, thank, and pay tribute to the service of RICHARD "DOC" HASTINGS on behalf of the people of this country and Washington State.

I have had the privilege to know Doc more than 35 years, and with perverse reference to Mr. ROGERS' earlier comments, I even knew him when he had hair. I had the great privilege to serve in the Washington State House of Representatives with him. We overlapped by 6 or 8 years in the seventies and eighties, and as somebody who wears a different colored jersey—his is red and mine is blue—and this is me engaging in understatement as we had materially different world views—with Doc, it was never, ever, ever, ever personal. He always has a kind word and, frankly, a ready smile for people.

Doc is now finishing up 10 terms—20 years in this Chamber. I don't know that I have ever adequately thanked him for being the very first person to come to my office and extend his hand in friendship and offer to help me in any way he could 2 years ago—something he probably doesn't even remember, so natural an act it was for him but, frankly, so meaningful for me.

Let me leave the wrong impression about all of these differences that Doc and I have—oh, and we do—I also want to assuredly assert that he can be every bit as good an ally as he can be an honorable adversary. The gentlewoman from Washington State has mentioned several of the ways in which Congressman HASTINGS has worked collaboratively with all of us, over a long period of time, on behalf of the interests of Washington State: cleaning up Hanford Reservation. I cannot help but note his signature on a letter advocating the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank—a very meaningful gesture on his part and of tremendous economic importance to our State—and even more generic issues.

As a former U.S. Army Reserve veteran himself, Doc is always front and center, standing proud and tall to do what he can on behalf of the men and women who have served in uniform in this State.

I also want to reiterate the gentlewoman from Washington State's acknowledgment of Congressman HASTINGS' skill over the presiding of this Chamber. Most people don't understand

what an incredible skill that is to do it with such seeming ease, not just to have command of the rules and of the parliamentary procedures.

The very manner in which you comport yourself, Congressman HASTINGS, is truly a thing to be admired. You did it with grace.

Speaking of grace, more than a year ago, one of my dear, dear friends and mentors—someone who also wears my colored jersey—former Governor Booth Gardner, passed away. Congressman HASTINGS was one of the very first people to take the podium to acknowledge the kindness that Governor Gardner extended to Congressman HASTINGS' family, a gesture which he would be very familiar with because it comes so naturally to him as well.

It is a privilege to know you. It is a privilege to have served with you these short 2 years, but I am very proud to have done so. I am proud to have known you all of these years, and I am proud to call you friend, Doc. Most importantly, on behalf of all of the people of Washington State, including the people of the 10th Congressional District, we thank you for your fine, fine public service and for your dedication to all of these issues that you have worked on so ably and in such a dedicated fashion for so many years. Thank you, sir.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you.

I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Vancouver, Washington (Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER), our friend and colleague.

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, it is fun to get to come down here and honor my friend and colleague, Chairman DOC HASTINGS from central Washington. It has been a privilege to get to be right adjacent to Doc.

CATHY, we have been on either side.

In being the younger member of the delegation, the newest member of the delegation, I think your time and your effort and your willingness to bring us along—to bring me along—is invaluable. It is impossible to overstate the influence that Doc has had on this body over the last 20 years. He has been a constant advocate, fighting for the people of his home and our State—and our region, really—and the rest of Washington.

You have been doing it since I was in high school, studying U.S. history.

Unlike a lot of politicians, Doc doesn't seek credit or run to the microphone or brag about his accomplishments. He truly lives by one of his favorite quotes: "It is amazing what you can accomplish if you are not worried about who gets the credit."

I joined the Washington delegation 4 years ago, and from the beginning, Doc has been incredibly generous to me with his time and his wisdom and even

with his dinner invites. Like so many in this body, I truly value his friendship.

During my time here, I have had the privilege—I don't even want to say "of working alongside"—of following along with some of the issues that are incredibly important to my district and of things that DOC has championed. Trust me. Whether it is joining him out at Hanford Nuclear Reservation or teaming up with him to try and advance our Nation's forest policies and best practices, it is plain to see how passionate DOC is about serving the people in central Washington and throughout Washington State.

In this day and age when we hear mostly about a polarized Congress and politicians that no one likes and about people who can't work together, it is important to remember and to focus on those Members who are the opposite—people like DOC—who are always looking to find the common ground, who are looking for solutions, and who are wanting to confront the biggest challenges facing our region. I hope and believe it is how DOC is going to be remembered—as a statesman who always did the right thing by the people at home.

DOC's retirement is certainly a loss for Washington, but I am happy that the pull of being home—the pull of family—has finally won out after having to balance that life on both coasts for so long. When I had my baby girl last year—it feels like 1,000 years ago—DOC was one of the first to ask how we were, how we were doing, what he could do, and to share in the joy of our miracle, and I am truly grateful.

I know, for me, when I am trying to work an issue and I need advice, I am going to miss being able to say, "Well, what do you think?" "How would we do this?" or "What coalition would we build?" "What is the strategy?" That is one of the biggest things I remembered. I shouldn't say "remembered." He is still with us. One of the biggest things I think of when I think of DOC is that his approach is always: let's lay out the strategy to get to our solutions, and let's try this and talk to this person and do it this way and remember this.

It is that intimate knowledge of how this institution works that we are going to be at a loss for, not just here, but even in the Washington delegation. It is having that institutional knowledge and the relationships, because this place, like anything else, is funneled by relationships. His intimate understanding of that and the way he has worked so carefully with people to advance ideas, we are going to miss it. We are going to feel the loss.

We look forward to hearing from you and watching you enjoy your time at home with your kids and your grandkids. Tell us about how great it is from time to time. We are going to miss you.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you.

In closing, I would say, DOC, on behalf of everyone in Washington State and on behalf of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives, we are grateful for your service, your leadership for our region, and your impact on our lives.

As we walk the Halls of Congress, we often think about those who have gone before us and have walked these halls, and we think about the fact that we stand on the shoulders of giants. You have been a giant in our lives, and you have been a giant for Washington State in Congress, and these are just small tokens of our appreciation for your service. Thank you, DOC. May God bless you, and may God bless your family.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Chairman, thank you very much.

I actually came down to the floor this evening, Mr. Speaker, to give my farewell remarks as I am retiring as well as my good friend, DOC HASTINGS.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to just say what a great human being DOC HASTINGS is and what a pleasure it has been for me in my 12 years. Of course, DOC has been here much longer than I, but to rely on his experience and to draw from that and his wisdom and his judgment and his kindness and his great representation of the people of the great State of Washington, it is a pleasure to say farewell to DOC.

I hope I will see you again very, very soon. Thank you, DOC.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague Mr. DOC HASTINGS for his tireless efforts and inexhaustible service on behalf of Washington State. I had the privilege of working closely with him while he was chairman of the Natural Resources Committee on many projects including my Alpine Lakes legislation which we passed just last week. In all things, DOC stands up for his beliefs and the best interests of his constituents and I think there can be no higher praise for a member of Congress. He will be missed in the Washington Delegation as he has shared with all of us the wisdom he has gathered during his 20 years in office. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors and I know he leaves behind a wonderful legacy for Washington State and for America to remember him by.

AN HONOR TO SERVE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY)

is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to rise today for, perhaps, my last time speaking as a Member of this institution.

I rise this evening, first and foremost, to pay a debt of gratitude to Georgia's 11th Congressional District and to the people there, who have graciously allowed me the privilege of serving them for these past 12 years.

Growing up modestly in Augusta, Georgia, I would never have dreamed that, someday, I would be standing where I am today, and I would not have had this opportunity if it weren't for my wonderful constituents in northwest Georgia. I may be biased, Mr. Speaker, but I think the people in my district are the nicest and the most hospitable in this country.

So, to them, on behalf of myself, my family, and my staff, I extend my deepest thanks for allowing us to serve you in this House of Representatives.

To my wife, Billie; my three daughters, Gannon, Phyllis, and Laura-Neill; and my son, Billy, I am forever grateful that you all have stayed by my side and that you have supported me throughout my public service. I wouldn't be where I am today without your sacrifices. To my family, a huge, heartfelt thanks.

Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues, it has been the honor of a lifetime to serve with all of you. The respect I have for each and every one transcends ideology and party line. I have made some of the greatest memories of my life with you, and I hope to stay connected with all of you in the years to come.

Of course, in order to be successful in this body, one must have a great staff. Thank you to each and every one of the staffers who has shown such great devotion in serving the people and in helping me to serve them in the 11th District of Georgia.

Thank you all for joining in my fight to protect the freedoms of the Georgians we serve and for working tirelessly for me for a better America.

I entered into Congress during a time of great unrest, not even 2 years after the 9/11 attacks in New York City. Since then, I have been honored to have been a part of this body as it has faced some of the largest challenges of the new millennia: the global war on terror, the Great Recession, Medicare part D back in 2003, the stimulus response to the financial collapse, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, fighting for fiscal solvency during the fiscal cliff, and a litany of new challenges facing the health care industry due to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

It is my hope that as history examines my actions as a part of this body that the record will show that I always acted and voted the way I thought was

in the best interests of the Georgians I served and, of course, this great Nation.

Now, I can't claim to be perfect. Far from it. Not every piece of legislation I championed passed, but no matter the outcome, I take comfort in knowing that the work that I have offered this body has spurred important debate that betters this institution as a whole and, in turn, our country.

□ 2045

It is that very spirit that led me to cofound the House GOP Doctors Caucus, a group of physicians and health care providers, medical professionals in Congress, people who had served in the medical professions prior to coming here, who utilize our collective first-hand medical expertise to develop patient-centered health reforms for all Americans.

Since the group's founding, we have tackled ObamaCare's threat to the doctor-patient relationship head-on and have played a key role in the fight for SGR reform. That fight continues.

Though it would be hard to let the Doctors Caucus go, to give up that leadership, to say good-bye to my colleagues, I extend my thanks to them, who joined with me as Members of that caucus. And I am confident that the group will continue its valuable work for many, many years to come.

I would also like to take a moment to thank my Democratic colleagues, people like my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who is sitting here in the Chamber. And I would also like to thank Representative GENE GREEN from Texas and many others for putting party lines aside and joining with me to lead on a number of fights, not the least of which is the threat of antibiotic-resistant "superbugs," a growing threat in hospitals all across the country. We worked so hard on that legislation, and we were so proud to see it pass—yes, in a bipartisan fashion—through the Energy and Commerce Committee under the leadership of Chairman UPTON; the vice chairman of the committee; the ranking member of the committee, HENRY WAXMAN; the chairman of the Health Subcommittee, JOE PITTS; and the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee and now ranking member of the overall committee, Mr. FRANK PALLONE. We worked together. And this is the way that exemplifies what public service should be all about, identifying a problem and then working together to solve it without regard to party lines.

But no matter how many problems we solve, there lay, of course, many hurdles ahead: immigration, continued reckless spending, these new, horrible threats in the Middle East, an ever-growing executive branch, and, of course, as I mentioned, health care.

As an OB/GYN physician, it truly worries me to be leaving Congress at a

time when our health care industry has been tipped on its side—I think because of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. It is critical that this country find a more sustainable path to creating quality care and access to physicians. Government bureaucrats have no place between doctors and their patients.

But still, in light of these few frustrations, I have great confidence in this body. If history shows us anything, it is that despite the day-to-day angst of gridlock—and there is plenty of that to go around—this institution remains the greatest representative body the world has ever seen. The hurdles we face in this institution are always overcome, sometimes with more grace than others, and it will survive, as it always has. Our system of government is durable, it is resilient, and it is designed to withstand the test of time. It has been my greatest honor to have played even a small part in it.

But now it is time for my wife, Billie, and me to turn the page. We are looking forward to having the opportunity to check a few more boxes before we leave and then spend more time with all the grandchildren back home in Marietta.

So in short, Mr. Speaker, I guess you could say I am proud of the past, and I am excited for what the future may hold. But today, I am just happy to say that I am leaving. I feel confident that this body is better prepared for the future than it was when even I got here.

I want to thank, again, all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, and, of course, last but not least, the people of Georgia's 11th Congressional District for giving me this opportunity, this honor, and this privilege.

And I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I closed without honoring our military heroes, the men and women and their families who have paid so much sacrifice for this great country.

I think over 40 have given their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan and have paid that last full measure.

I just want to say, I will never forget you, Patti and Jamie Saylor, and your great son, your hero Paul, who gave his life for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity and the time tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON VITAL AND HEALTH STATISTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 306(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 USC 242k), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics for a term of 4 years:

Dr. Vickie M. Mays, Los Angeles, California.

DEPARTING MEMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia, before he leaves the floor, that I wish him the best of luck, Doc. And I wish the other Doc, the gentleman from Washington who has already left the floor, the best of luck. The gentleman from New Jersey, RUSH HOLT, who is going to speak after me, is leaving as well.

And I must say some things about all three of you, if I may, because you fit into these particular characteristics. The three of you are gentlemen. The three of you are real patriots. The three of you are civil in every respect. The three of you have a good sense of the Congress. The three of you have a great respect for the institution. And you will be missed.

God bless you. Godspeed. And good luck to you and your families.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the state of our Nation's economy. I have been waiting for this opportunity, Mr. Speaker. This is the time to do it.

Six years ago, when President Obama raised his hand on the steps of the Capitol of the United States of America and was sworn in as President, we were losing over 800,000 jobs every month, and these were mostly middle-income and lower-income Americans who were out of work. In the final 6 months of President Bush's administration, we lost 3.5 million jobs. By the time the recession was over, 8.8 million Americans were out of work. The ending of that recession technically was in June of 2009, but we did not start to create new jobs until March of 2010, and many of those jobs came from the census that was going on that year.

Our country's gross domestic product, GDP, in the fourth quarter of 2008—the last months of President Bush's administration—decreased by 8.9 percent. That is an unbelievable number. And President Bush was not solely responsible; we all shared in our financial demise. We have been digging ourselves out of this deep, deep hole ever since, with almost no help from our friends on the other side.

And I am glad my friend from Georgia mentioned that legislation that we passed in 2003, plan D. Because right after we lost that debate and lost that vote, we became part and parcel of that legislation which had been democratically passed in this House, although we didn't like it. We cooperated. We didn't try to undercut. We did not try

to minimize. But the record will show that Democrats stood up, shook off their loss, and became part of what American democracy is all about. We cooperated.

Now, what have we had from the other side of the aisle? We have had no cooperation. We have had very little goodwill. We have had, simply speaking, no poetry whatsoever. In fact, just the opposite. We have seen the seeds sown in division, in fear, in disharmony.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which passed in February of 2009, our first response to the crisis, received zero votes from our friends on the other side of the aisle. We know now that this bill saved or created 3.6 million jobs in this country, although it was far too small to dig us out of the hole. But we were on our way.

The Affordable Care Act will allow a new generation of entrepreneurs to create a business, provide incentives for small business to offer health insurance, and attract qualified employees, even cut health care costs growth to unheard of levels, freeing up cash so that businesses can invest more and hire more workers—again, zero votes from our friends on the other side.

And then when you lose, you undermine as much as is humanly possible.

Where was the other side of the aisle when the unemployment insurance for long-term unemployed expired, cutting off 3.6 million Americans, including 350,000 veterans, at the end of September of 2014? When we had lost over 550,000 government jobs, dragging down our economy, our entire economic recovery, instead of working to keep people on the job, my friends on the other side of the aisle were pushing more and more disastrous, job-killing budget cuts.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: The record will bear me out. We now have the lowest number of Federal employees, the lowest amount of employees, since 1966. So when our friends on the other side talk about Big Government, they ought to know about it since they created it. We have had the lowest amount of Federal workers. And for the last 5 or 6 years, many of those workers—forget about us—have not even gotten a cost of living increase.

So you can understand very clearly why the American people are frustrated with the pace of our recovery. And in many ways, I share their frustration. It has taken far too long, and the fruits of the recovery have not been equally distributed.

During the recovery, incomes have been flat for the vast majority of Americans while the folks at the top of the income scale are doing better than ever. No one should try to undermine anybody making a living and a good living, but everybody should be part of making sure that there are shared

fruits on the line and everybody gets a chance and an opportunity.

The stock market is up over 165 percent since the low it hit at the depths of the recession. While stocks have fully recovered and continue to set record highs, the job market has lagged behind, not recovering all the jobs lost in the recession until just 6 months ago, 5 years after the recession officially ended.

In my home State of New Jersey, total employment is still well below where we were at the start of the recession. There are over 130,000 fewer jobs in New Jersey than in December of 2007. Our unemployment rate is nearly a full point higher than the national average. Take heed what happens to your own State, never mind what happens in other States.

Wages have also been stagnant, stuck at around 2 percent for the last few years. If wage growth had been a more robust 4 percent—enough to factor in inflation and growth in productivity—the average worker would be making more than \$3 more per hour today than they are. That is a fact. It is undeniable.

□ 2100

It is undeniable. This is because, for example, during the first 3 years since the end of the recession, the top 1 percent of Americans captured 95 percent of the entire country's income gains. This wage stagnation didn't just start with the recession.

Incomes for the middle class had been stagnant for the past 15 years, and if you adjust for inflation, middle class wages are lower than they were in 1989. That is a fact. There are many reasons for the middle class to feel like they are left out, like the recovery has left them behind. It is because the entire economy is leaving them behind.

This year, it seems like we may have finally begun to turn that corner, and our economic recovery is still and really accelerating. Last week, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the economy created 321,000 jobs.

That makes for 57 straight months of job growth, the longest streak of consecutive months of job creation on record for a total of over 10.9 million new jobs. For the last 10 of these months, we have created over 200,000 jobs per month. That is the first time we have had a streak of that with robust job creation since the 1990s.

The 321,000 jobs created in November brings the total number of jobs created just this year to 2.65 million jobs, so with 1 month to go, we have already created more jobs—get this—than any year since the 1990s. Now, those are some of the statistics about the job numbers you might read in USA Today.

Manufacturing is the linchpin of our economy, adding 28,000 good-paying jobs just last month for a total nearly

of three-quarters of a million new jobs. Wages, as I mentioned, have been stagnant. You will see a nice monthly gain of 0.4 percent.

We have not had a month this year when wages have fallen, and for the first time since 2008, we have had 4 months where they have grown at least 0.3 percent. The average workweek increased to 34.6 hours, meaning more workers are finding full-time employment, instead of part-time jobs.

According to the Labor Department, we are seeing increasing churn in the job market with the highest number of employees being hired for jobs and voluntarily quitting their jobs since early 2008. This means more workers are confident enough in the job market strength to leave and look for a better opportunity.

The first week average of weekly jobless claims has been below 300,000 for the last several months, another welcome sign, and according to the Commerce Department, construction spending increased 1.1 percent in October, including a 1.8 percent increase in home building.

Total construction spending is up 3.3 percent from last year, part of the reason why unemployment amongst construction workers has fallen from 8.6 percent to 7.5 percent for the last year.

I say to the American people: we know it has been a long, tough road over the last couple of years and the last couple of decades; we know many of us have been frustrated that it has taken so long to get back on our feet, but today, the American worker is the strongest in the world.

We should feel good that not only are we on the right track, but we are moving faster. The only thing now that could hold us back is if we sabotage the economy by returning to some of the favorite old tactics, shut the place down, shutting down the government, or defaulting on our national debt. We are now only 1 day away from shutting down the government.

The last time, the tantrum over defending affordable care cost us \$24 billion. I don't know who the austere party is. I don't know who the party is that is going to watch every dime that is being spent. Twenty-four billion dollars is not chump change, and that resulted in 120,000 fewer jobs being created. We are going to have to be a little bit more creative than just shutting down the government. Maybe they will only try to shut down parts of the government.

But this pales in comparison to the negative economic impact of brinkmanship over our country's debt ceiling. We all know just how devastating actually refusing to raise the debt ceiling could be.

Credit markets would freeze, interest rates would skyrocket, and the dollar would crash. Even the possibility of hitting the debt limit does serious

damage for our economy. The first time we did this back in 2011, consumer confidence declined to levels not seen since the Lehman Brothers collapsed in 2008.

Business uncertainty is not what we need. That has led to a slowing of job growth, and our credit rating was downgraded for the first time in our history. All of these economic wounds were self-inflicted.

To his credit, the new majority leader, Senator McCONNELL, has stated he doesn't want another shutdown or default in our debt. However, as our Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, has learned that sometimes the leader of the party will have a hard time keeping his troops in line. Every leader finds that out.

With our recovery finally picking up steam, the ideologues must cast aside their mentality of legislating by taking the economy hostage. This includes not only our debt ceiling and averting a government shutdown, but also the myriad of other deadlines Congress must deal with in the new year: the expiration of the highway funding, preventing a cut in Medicare payments to doctors, and expiring tax provisions.

Republicans and Democrats must come together really to tackle these issues in a way that accelerates our ongoing recovery. We simply cannot get caught up in the endless brinksmanship and bickering that has defined the past 4 years.

Failure to do so would be an insult to the middle class who are just starting to see the fruits of recovery in their pocketbooks. Unemployment is finally down to the lowest rate in years, and we saw a big jump in hourly earnings in this past week.

Combined with the continued drop in gas prices, not once did I ever see someone come to this floor and give the President credit for anything on the other side—not once—whether it was falling gas prices—and we know what happened when the prices went up a few years ago. Not once did we see anything about the 321 new created jobs. Not one person came to this floor.

He has done a few things right, my brothers and sisters, believe it or not, and if you do admit it, nothing is going to happen to you. Believe me, nothing will happen to you.

Combined with these gas prices going down, the positive impact of the President's immigration order, which will bring money into America's Treasury, we are on a track for a great year for the American worker. The best thing Congress could do to make sure that happens is simple: just get out of the way. I say that with all respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

A PRIVILEGE TO SERVE IN THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOLT. I thank my colleague, Mr. PASCRELL from New Jersey, for under-

scoring the importance of what we do here in this House. Those are not just numbers on a page that he was quoting; those are people's lives and livelihoods, and we have work to do.

As I prepare to wind up my service here after 16 years, I seek the indulgence of my friend here and our colleagues to make a few observations for the benefit of my constituents to whom I owe much.

When people call my office, we answer the phone, "Representative RUSH HOLT." Mr. Speaker, here in the House, for each of us, Representative is our title and our job description. It is an honor and a privilege for each of us to represent about three-quarters of a million people, to represent them here in the people's House, this House, that is the focal point of the U.S. Government laid out in article I, section 1, of the Constitution, right at the beginning.

Despite all the well-publicized frustrations of this place, this House is the greatest instrument for justice and human welfare in the world. We are a central part of the most successful experiment in human advancement in history. We must not forget that.

Speaking of not forgetting, we would all do well to develop a stronger sense of history, a sense among ourselves and our country. It is with a sense of history that we realize what progress we have made as a country.

In this time of frustration and cynicism, we should take note: the success of America economically, culturally, and socially has not been an accident, and it was not destined. Our success derives from our chosen system of governing ourselves. Without a sense of history, one cannot recognize progress, and humans need a sense of progress.

When I was first elected to Congress 16 years ago, some people asked me: "Why would a scientist leave a good research institution to get into the muck of politics?" The simple answer was that it was too important not to.

Sure, it was satisfying to win an election in a district where many said it couldn't be done, where no one of my party had been elected in almost anyone's memory, but it was clear to me that this was not a game of politics; it was a fight to defend the soul of America.

I came here an optimist about our country, our people, and their government, and I leave an optimist. I have had the help of many people, volunteers, staff and colleagues, smart, inspiring, tireless. I think of many.

I will mention several by name: my wife, Margaret Lancefield; my chief and deputy chief, Chris Gaston and Sarah Steward; and looking back, I think of those who have died during my time here.

As I speak here in glowing terms about our government, successes of this ingenious system of balancing

competing interests, I would be obtuse not to recognize that many are discouraged about their government. Some politicians even foster distrust in government, taking people beyond the traditional healthy American skepticism to real destructive cynicism.

In every era, there have been naysayers: "The government is broken, special interests rule, and all politicians are corrupt." I know that is not true.

I am reminded daily that through diligent and committed service to the people that a Representative can ensure that each person knows that she or he has a part in our democracy, a direct connection to his or her government, and that cooperative action, yes, government, benefits them.

We must continually show our constituents that we are committed to always improving the mechanisms of good democratic government: voting, legislation, and addressing grievances.

After eight terms, I look back with satisfaction at some things accomplished: preserving land and bits of history; improving educational opportunities; supporting education in science and foreign languages; expanding access to excellent health care, especially mental health care for our military veterans; protecting families' economic security in their nonwage-earning years; protecting postal workers when they are exposed to anthrax; enhancing the reliability, accessibility, and auditability of voting; strengthening civil protections of Muslim Americans and other minority groups; strengthening fairness in the workplace for LGBT workers; and increasing support for scientific research.

Through it all, our primary job, I would say, has been to beat back the cynicism about our ability as Americans to govern ourselves. Of course, we understand that passing laws and appropriating money is only part of a Representative's work.

I have taken opportunities to speak out about injustice, to extol people and programs that work well, to voice support for people who need a kind word and more, a little help. I present a vision for a government—not a government that vanishes, but a government that works for its citizens.

Of course, not all problems can be fixed by government, but it can be reassuring and uplifting to people to know that other people have their backs and can help; yes, that is government.

I continue to speak against intrusive surveillance by government that treats people as suspects first and citizens second. I have joined with others here to preserve our national legacies, our land and resources, a clean environment and to preserve memories of where we come from, and with my science background, I always try to present arguments based on evidence and open review.

On many issues and in many votes, I have found myself outvoted and in a minority, but it helps to recall the words of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg who has spoken about the satisfaction in crafting a strong dissenting opinion with the hope or expectation that it will become the prevailing majority opinion.

□ 2115

I am reminded of many shortcomings and work unfinished. Others may succeed in reviving the Office of Technology Assessment to provide Congress with badly needed assistance. Others remaining in Congress may move our country appreciably toward more sustainable practices. My colleagues here may yet reform the intelligence community. And acting with the recognition that peace is the best security, others may work to move our Nation away from militaristic responses to so many problems.

Again, this work over 16 years has been an honor and a great satisfaction. I thank my family and my staff. Especially, I thank the people of central New Jersey for this opportunity to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 83, INSULAR AREAS AND FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES ENERGY DEVELOPMENT; WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-655) on the resolution (H. Res. 776) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 83) to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for December 9 and the balance

of the week on account of a family medical emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 11, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8203. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon; Modification of Container Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0046; FV14-945-2 FIR] received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8204. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Process for Establishing Rates Charged for AMS Services [Document Number: AMS-LPS-13-0050] (RIN: 0581-AD36) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8205. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0074] (RIN: 0579-AC36) received December 1, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8206. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Avocados Grown in South Florida and Imported Avocados; Clarification of the Avocado Grade Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0069; FV13-915-3 FR] received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8207. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Report on the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2249c; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8208. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8209. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress for the reporting period ending September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8210. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, trans-

mitting Fiscal Year 2014 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8211. A letter from the Departmental Freedom of Information and Privacy Act Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Public Information, Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Regulations [Docket No.: 140127076-4811-02] (RIN: 0605-AA33) received December 4, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8212. A letter from the Administrator, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Corporation's annual financial audit and management report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, in accordance with OMB Circular A-136; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8213. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8214. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of the Treasury received November 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8215. A letter from the Chairman and Members, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8216. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Incorporation by Reference [Docket Number: OFR-2013-0001] (RIN: 3095-AB78) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8217. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting in accordance with Section 647(b) of Division F of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2004, Pub. L. 108-199, the Board's Report on Fiscal Year 2014 Competitive Sourcing Efforts; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8218. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the FY 2014 Performance and Accountability Report, prepared in accordance with the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 and the Government Performance and Results Act Modernization Act of 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8219. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "Certification of Fiscal Year 2015 Total Local Source General Fund Revenue Estimate (Net of Dedicated Taxes) in Support of the District's Issuance of General Obligation Bonds (Series 2014C and 2014D)"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8220. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Performance and Accountability

Report for Fiscal Year 2014, including the Office of Inspector General's Auditor's Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8221. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the semiannual report to Congress on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8222. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/Acting Executive Director, U.S. Election Assistance Commission, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 2014, through September 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8223. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries/Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule; closure — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD610) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8224. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Greater Atlantic Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery; Notification of Butterfish Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 130903775-4276-02] (RIN: 0648-XD603) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8225. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries/Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary inseason rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Thornyhead Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD626) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8226. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries/Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary inseason, closure rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD623) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8227. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries/Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Several Groundfish Species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD624) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8228. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries/Greater Atlantic Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 140214138-4482-02] (RIN: 0648-XD584) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8229. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries/West Coast Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's inseason rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 120814338-2711-02] (RIN: 0648-BE59) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8230. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries/Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska Management Area [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD589) received December 3, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8231. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Report of the Department's Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, covering the first and second quarters of FY 2014, from October 1, 2013, to March 31, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

8232. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 7(a) of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-45), a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2015-03 suspending the limitation on the obligation of the State Department Appropriations contained in Sections 3(b) and 7(b) of this Act for six months as well as the periodic report provided for under Section 6 of the Act, covering the period from June 5, 2014 to the present; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 776. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 83) to require the Secretary of the Interior to assemble a team of technical, policy, and financial experts to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States through the development of energy action plans aimed at promoting access to affordable, reliable energy, including increasing use of indigenous clean-energy resources, and for other purposes; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and for other purposes (Rept. 113-655). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 1. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for comprehensive tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 5825. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent foreign diplomats from being eligible to receive health insurance premium tax credits and health insurance cost-sharing reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5826. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the sewer overflow control grants program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 5827. A bill to exclude "Choose and Cut" Christmas tree producers from the Christmas tree promotion, research, and information order; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5828. A bill to provide for USA Retirement Funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5829. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception for certain public-private research arrangements from the business use test for purposes of determining private activity bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 5830. A bill to provide that in the case of a law enforcement officer who uses deadly force against a person, and thereby causes the death of that person, a hearing shall be conducted before a judge to determine whether there is probable cause for the State to bring criminal charges against the law enforcement officer relating to the death of the person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 5831. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a penalty for violent crimes by certain State or local law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MARINO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 5832. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the enhanced selective discharge authority currently available to the Secretary of a military department to permit a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces who was appointed from the enlisted ranks and has at least 20 years of service, at least four years of which has been commissioned service, to retire in the officer's commissioned rank; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 5833. A bill to require upon request a probable cause hearing in connection with property seizures relating to certain monetary instruments transactions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 5834. A bill to include reasonable costs for high-speed Internet service in the utility allowances for families residing in public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 5835. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act with respect to making progress toward the goal of eliminating tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5836. A bill to assist in the conservation of rare felids and rare canids by supporting and providing financial resources for the conservation programs of nations within the range of rare felid and rare canid populations and projects of persons with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of rare felid and rare canid populations; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 5837. A bill to provide for the establishment of a global affairs strategy and assistance for people of African descent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 5838. A bill to require non-Federal prisons and detention facilities holding Federal prisoners under a contract with the Federal Government to make available to the public the same information pertaining to facility operations and to prisoners held in such facilities that Federal prisons and detention facilities are required to make available; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5839. A bill to amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish a Federal "Grow Your Own Teacher" program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 5840. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to eligible entities to train elementary and secondary school nurses on how to respond to a biological or chemical attack or an outbreak of pandemic influenza in a school building or on school grounds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5841. A bill to establish a grant program to provide States with funds to detect

fraud, waste, and abuse in the State Medicaid programs under title XIX of the Social Security Act and to recover improper payments resulting from such fraud, waste, and abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5842. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to establish a competitive grant program for community colleges to train veterans for local jobs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 5843. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to create protected credit reports for minors and protect the credit of minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 5844. A bill to ban hydraulic fracturing on land owned by the United States and leased to a third party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BASS, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 5845. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5846. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to improve the ability of the United States to protect religious freedom globally through enhanced diplomacy, training, counterterrorism, and foreign assistance efforts, and through stronger and more timely and flexible political responses to religious freedom violations worldwide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5847. A bill to abolish civil asset forfeiture to the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 130. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 83; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3979; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 5771; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr.

CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 777. A resolution recognizing the 66th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the celebration of "Human Rights Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H. Res. 778. A resolution supporting the designation of a week as National Federal Nurse Recognition Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 1.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 5825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 5827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8: The Congress shall have Power To law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports and Excises . . .

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Article 3, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to regulate commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 5829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and the 16th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 5831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 5833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 5834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 5835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 5837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 5838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5842.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 5843.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power. . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 5845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.

"No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.J. Res. 130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 383: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 763: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 851: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 880: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1070: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1179: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1312: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1428: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1695: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1698: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1827: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1953: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2618: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2638: Mr. STEWART and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2767: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 2852: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3101: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3116: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 3543: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3571: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3717: Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 4084: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4161: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4305: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 4612: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 4793: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4828: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4833: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 4860: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 4930: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 4965: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5022: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5101: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5159: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 5190: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 5226: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 5242: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 5280: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5365: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 5382: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5443: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5444: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5524: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5533: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 5589: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5644: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 5663: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 5750: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 5765: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5782: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5807: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 5814: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 5814: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. ROYCE.

H. Res. 109: Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 407: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 582: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 688: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 711: Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Res. 735: Mr. SCHOCK.

H. Res. 755: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H. Res. 772: Mr. LANCE and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.J. Res. 130, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

SENATE—Wednesday, December 10, 2014

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the Author and Finisher of our faith, teach us to rejoice in the privileges You have strewn on our path to be used to bless others.

Lord, strengthen our lawmakers to resist the temptations that would seek to lure them from Your purposes. Give them clear sight that they may know what to do. Give them courage to embark upon the fulfillment of Your will as You provide them with the skills needed to find a way through all our Nation's challenges. Empower them to persevere in doing what is right, enduring to the end. Help them to begin, to continue, and to end all things by trusting You.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, December 10, 2014.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD J. MARKEY, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MARKEY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979, which is the Defense authorization bill—a very important piece of legislation.

I would hope that Senators would understand the quicker we get this done, the sooner we can get to the omnibus and the tax extenders and the other things we have to do before we leave.

I would note that it seems very likely we will have some votes this weekend. Everyone should understand that. If we can work a way not to have them, we will not, but I want everybody on notice that if they are not here this weekend, they could miss votes.

TRIBUTE TO NANCY ERICKSON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when the Senate convened for the first time in April of 1789, there was a lot to do—and that is an understatement—not the least of which was to establish a system of rules to govern proceedings in the U.S. Senate. The first few weeks and months were going to be difficult, as they tried to sort out the structure and organization of this institution, but they had an idea. Two days after achieving its first quorum, the Senate selected a Secretary to oversee the day-to-day operations of what would become the world's greatest deliberative body.

The importance of this position can't be overstated. Senators and their staffs come and go, but the Secretary of the Senate provides much needed stability and support. To put things into perspective, in the entire history of this country—225 years—we have only had 32 Secretaries of the Senate. By contrast, there have been almost 2,000 Senators who have served since its inception. That number will grow, of course, come January.

For the last 8 years, Nancy Erickson has served superbly as Secretary of the Senate. But to be quite honest, that is what we expected her to do when she got this job.

I came to know Nancy when I was the assistant leader, and a friend and confidant of Senator Daschle. Every time I walked in that office, there she was, always so very, very nice. She was a pleasant person. She was always smiling. We had some big issues, but she was always pleasant to everybody.

Her first job here in the Senate was with Tom Daschle. She became his scheduler. But given her abilities, she

quickly assumed more responsibility, eventually becoming deputy chief of staff. When Senator Daschle left the Senate, Nancy transitioned to the Sergeant-at-Arms office, where she worked as a liaison to Democratic Senators and their offices.

Nancy is a native of Brandon, SD. She majored in history and government at Augustana College in Sioux Falls. She moved to Washington, DC, in 1987. Her husband Tom is from Sioux Falls. JOHN THUNE used to purchase suits from Nancy's father-in-law.

Nancy's first job here in the Senate, as I have indicated, was for Senator Daschle. In her current office, Nancy has a collection of South Dakota maps hanging on the walls, one of the railroad tracks across South Dakota in 1886, one of Watertown, SD, and she has others. She even has a Rand McNally map of a long time ago that covers the entire State.

As I indicated, when Senator Daschle left the Senate, Nancy transitioned to the Sergeant-at-Arms office where she worked as liaison to Democratic Senators and their offices. When I became leader and it was time for selecting a new secretary, I didn't look very far. I urged her to consider the position. I am glad she did. I have not regretted that decision, not for a second. She has proven herself to be an excellent manager.

Nancy has 26 departments and about 250 employees directly under her supervision, not to mention the other 6,500 Senate employees who depend on her and her office. She has been faced with some difficult times during her tenure as Secretary of the Senate. There has been a lot of roiling—sequestration, a new health care rollout, and, of course, last year's shutdown. She has confronted each difficult obstacle with skill, composure, and that wonderful smile that she has.

Nancy's success as Secretary stems not only from her excellent abilities but also from her character. She is a genuinely good person and she is very thorough, very thoughtful—I have already said that; very kind—I have already said that; very understanding—I have already said that; and something I haven't said, she is very fair.

Whether she walks the halls here or on the Senate floor, she always has a smile every place she goes. I have said that many times. That is her legacy, and it is a good legacy. I have never—never might be an exaggeration, but extremely rarely—heard her criticize anyone.

Nancy's time as Secretary of the Senate is coming to an end and she will

be greatly missed. She has attended to the Senate's every need, day and night. She has earned a break, and I hope she takes one. I hope she gets to spend some time with her husband Tom, her daughter Drew, and I can still see in my mind's eye that picture she has of little Patrick—that little tiny boy. She had that on her desk forever, and he kept getting bigger and bigger and became an athlete. We had many conversations—and I try not to boast about a lot of things, but I am always anxious to boast about my youngest son, who was a stellar athlete and played on three national championship teams at the University of Virginia—so I have watched Patrick become a college soccer player.

There will never be another Nancy Erickson here in the Senate. People like her don't come along very often. But she leaves a legacy, and it is one that will endure through the history of this great body.

So thank you, Nancy, for your service to the country.

TRIBUTE TO SHEILA DWYER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when Secretary Erickson steps down, so does the Assistant Secretary of the Senate Sheila Dwyer. Sheila has a long history in the U.S. Senate, but Sheila's time started long ago—and I am not going to talk about how long ago, but she was a Senate page during the time, of course, when she was in high school. But after her semester as a page, she, like all these young pages who are here for a semester, returned home to Connecticut. She loves to boast about the great State of Connecticut, and I have listened to her do that for many years. But her heart has always been with the Senate from the time she was a page, and so she returned after her education.

Sheila got a degree from Suffolk University. She returned to the Senate in many different capacities, but we have had wonderful conversations about her time with Chuck Robb. She is a family friend of the Robbs—and I mean a family friend—very close to them. She later worked for Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

I talked to his widow within the past couple of weeks. What a unique man Senator Moynihan was. There is a new book out about him, and I have asked my staff to get a copy of it, which talks about this unusual man. I am anxious to read it because he was brilliant, but also he had a few—he was eccentric in some ways. And Sheila loves to tell privately—and I will not repeat here on the floor—some of the things he did that would appear to a lot of us to be a little bit eccentric. But that was part of his unique quality and she handled him so well—as well as anyone could.

She worked for another man with a huge personality: Senator Fritz Hol-

lings. He would, even though he is over 90 years old, still be here in the Senate except his wife became ill. He is physically strong today, bright of mind, and I can hear this man's voice from where he stood. What a voice he had, a man who was the epitome of what a Senator should look like. He was a handsome man. I repeat, he had this great voice, and he was very tall, stood very erect. I was always very envious of how he could stand so tall, and he has such a sense of humor that is quite remarkable. Sheila is his friend. She visits him in his home in South Carolina now, and she has helped me keep in touch with Fritz Hollings.

Then she worked for me. I was so fortunate. I was looking for someone to do my fundraising during a very difficult election I had before me. I knew who I wanted, but I didn't know that I could get her. Well, we worked things out. And it wasn't just because I offered her more money, it was because she wanted to work with me, and I am so happy that came to be.

For 14 years, she has been part of my team—and I mean part of my team. During that entire time, she has done an incredible job doing my Senate business as a candidate. Doing Senate business here as the Assistant Secretary, she has been the best.

So after having worked for the Senators I have mentioned, including me, when the time came to fill the role of Assistant Secretary of the Senate, she was a perfect candidate, and in this position she has not disappointed me once.

Everyone who has ever worked with Sheila knows she is a meticulous planner. If you want something done—an event—and done right—and I mean done right: help setting up the program, what the flowers are going to look like, what the food is going to be, what time it should start, what time it should end—and she is very, very precise on when it should start and when it should end—we learned that last night during a farewell for a number of Democratic Senators—she really spares no effort, leaves no detail unattended.

Her time here in the Secretary's office has been a smashing success. It is not easy to attend to the needs of 100 Senators—100 Senators—Democrats, Republicans, Independents, their families and staffs, but Sheila handles it with skill and with grace. That is why many call her the "Mayor of Capitol Hill," and for good reason.

Whether she is escorting the President's daughter to the inauguration podium in her bright pink coat, or planning a ceremonial dinner in Statuary Hall, Sheila does the job exceptionally well.

Just one example, 2 years ago the Senate hosted the screening of Steven Spielberg's now legendary film, "Lincoln." There were some real big-shots there. Spielberg, Daniel Day Lewis, the

guy that wrote the script—they were all there. So there were, frankly, a lot of prima donnas there, including of course all the Senators. So it was an exceptionally difficult feat to pull off, coordinating attendance for 100 Senators who all wanted to go to see these famous people.

She was preparing a panel discussion for the cast and crew, all while following strict Capitol protocols as to who could go where and what we could do in the places we went. But she had a secret weapon, and that was she. She didn't know it, but that was the secret weapon. She took care of every possible problem and coordinated every single detail, even down to a makeshift concession stand in the lobby. It was a wonderful event, a marvelous event, because for the briefest moment it brought the Senate together in the spirit of unity that we haven't had in some time. It all happened because of her.

She is very devoted to her family, her mom Lois, about whom she has talked endlessly, and of course her deceased father. I was trying to help in comforting her as I could when she lost her mom Lois. I can't imagine how proud her parents would be—and are, from wherever they are, looking down on us—at the work that Sheila has done in her life. I know how proud I am of her now, as she prepares to move on to her next chapter of life, and I will do everything I can to help that chapter be a good one. I wish her the best.

I, along with the entire Senate, thank her for the steadfast diligent service she has rendered as Assistant Secretary for the last 8 years.

Sheila has a dog she loves, little Ava, and I hope she takes that little dog on a trip to have a good time. I am sure she will.

On a personal note, I wish to say publicly how much she has meant to me. She has been really a part of my family the last 15 years. As most everyone knows, my wife was involved in a really bad accident. Who was there? Sheila. Battling, as she did for 1½ years, ravaging breast cancer, who was there? I would come home after having been unable to do the things around the house. I would have a refrigerator full of food. Not junk—it was wonderful food. She did that not once, not twice, but many, many times. She is my friend—my forever friend.

She interacts with my children as if they were her siblings. She knows everything about them. So even though I will not see her at work every day, as I have for 14 or 15 years, she will always be part of my life.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO SAXBY CHAMBLISS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about my friend and colleague, Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS.

SAXBY, as we all know, is the ultimate southern gentleman. He is a man of his word. He is blessed with the charm and the drawl only a Georgian could possess, and he is far too modest. He shouldn't be. He has a lot to be proud of as he looks back at a storied career here in Congress.

We are talking about one of our Nation's top experts on intelligence and national security. We are talking about a standout champion for the men and women of our military. We are also talking about a Senator who became chair of the Agriculture Committee just 2 years into his first term. That is really quite an accomplishment. But once you get to know SAXBY, it isn't all that surprising.

Before he came to Congress, SAXBY was a smalltown ag lawyer. He still lives in a rural area—a peanut and cotton-farming region far removed from the bright lights of Atlanta. SAXBY has a feel for the issues that could only be acquired from actual on-the-ground experience. He understands the real-world impact of what we discuss here in Washington, and he cares.

On top of that, he has the disciplined work ethic of a minister's son—which makes sense, because he is one. SAXBY is usually the first guy to raise his hand when there is an assignment no one else wants. That is what we saw for him on the Gang of 6, a politically difficult and work-intensive committee if there ever was one.

But SAXBY came here to get things done—not to posture. He takes on projects with the kind of drive and courage we don't often see.

How courageous is SAXBY? Well, he accepted an invitation to go quail hunting with Vice President Cheney, and he lived to tell the tale. The senior Senator from South Carolina remembers the trip very well. He had to be persuaded by SAXBY to come. He still suspects that SAXBY's real motive was to give Cheney a second target.

It wasn't the only time SAXBY cheated death with the Vice President. LINDSEY recalls a meeting in Baghdad with SAXBY, JOE BIDEN, and the Iraqi Prime Minister. Afterward, they boarded a plane and came under fire. Here is what SAXBY said: "I guess the meeting didn't go that well."

So SAXBY is a comedian. But he is also courageous. He is also persuasive. He is really good at getting his way. It is kind of what we would expect from a former door-to-door fruitcake salesman. After hawking loaves of spiced dough, there is not much SAXBY can't sell at this point.

We know he was persuasive enough to convince Julianne to marry him. SAXBY and Julianne met at the Univer-

sity of Georgia. She was Sigma Chi's pledge-class sweetheart—and she soon became SAXBY's sweetheart. The Chamblisses have been inseparable ever since.

Now, just in case SAXBY ever becomes his own category on Jeopardy, here is an interesting piece of trivia. The president of the same pledge class became SAXBY's Democrat challenger in 2008. The two fraternity brothers are still friendly. Here is how this gentleman remembered SAXBY from college. He said he "looked old."

Well, Julianne fell for him anyway, and it is a good thing she did. This former schoolteacher is better than anyone at keeping him centered, and she has even taught students who would go on to serve on SAXBY's staff. So it is really quite a partnership. SAXBY says that the most significant moment of his life is when he met Julianne.

That is really something when we consider how much he loves golf. Last year, SAXBY sank a hole in one squaring off against the leader of the free world—that is, the President of the United States. He has a signed flag to prove it.

But golf is more than just a hobby for SAXBY. It is a way to get things done. More than most people around here, he understands the value of relationships. He is good at whipping votes and picking up intel from both ends of the Capitol. He works across the aisle, and he is unafraid to stand up when something needs to be said.

That is the thing about SAXBY. He doesn't say a lot, but when he does, you know it is significant. You know there is a lot of careful thought behind it.

SAXBY is a serious legislator who approaches his role as vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee in that frame. SAXBY learns things on that committee that would keep anyone up at night. It is a grave responsibility. But SAXBY is perfectly suited to it. He has always stood proudly in defense of our Nation.

We are going to miss his sharp wit, his integrity, and his judgment.

I know SAXBY's staff is going to miss him, too. Some of them have been with him since his days in the House. Well, the Senate's loss is the Chambliss family's gain.

I know SAXBY is looking forward to spending more time with Julianne. I know he can't wait to trade the title of Senator for a new one—Big Daddy. It is what his grandkids call him. He can't wait to see more of them. They are the reason he works so hard here—to build a better future for them, for the next generation.

SAXBY will have plenty of stories to share when he leaves, such as when he hit that hole in one, when he threw out the first pitch for the Braves, and when he made the cover of Peanut Patriot Magazine.

So SAXBY has obviously had a long and interesting career. He deserves some time to focus on his family. We thank him for his dedication to this body and to the people he represents, and we send him every wish for a retirement filled with joy and happiness.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the message to accompany H.R. 3979, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Reid amendment No. 3984 (to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill), to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3985 (to amendment No. 3984), of a perfecting nature.

Reid motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 3986, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 3987 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 3986), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 3988 (to amendment No. 3987), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator INHOFE, the ranking Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, to bring to the floor H.R. 3979. This is the agreement between the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The House of Representatives passed the bill last week by a vote of 300 to 119. If we succeed in the Senate, it will mark the 53rd year in a row that we have enacted this bill that is so essential to the defense of our Nation and to our men and women in uniform and their families.

I thank all the members of the staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee, especially our subcommittee

chairs for the hard work they have done to get us to the finish line on this bill. I thank Senator INHOFE for his close partnership. Before this Congress I had been fortunate to serve with a series of Republican chairmen and ranking members, including JOHN MCCAIN, John Warner, and Strom Thurmond. They understood and appreciated the traditions of our committee and the importance of the legislation we enact every year for our men and women in uniform. That is what this is all about. JIM INHOFE, our ranking Republican in this Congress, has upheld that tradition of bipartisanship and dedication to enacting this important legislation through particularly challenging circumstances.

Our bill includes hundreds of important provisions to authorize the activities of the Department of Defense and to provide for the well-being of our men and women in uniform and their families. The bill will enable the military services to continue paying special pay and bonuses needed for recruitment and retention of key personnel. It strengthens survivor benefits for disabled children of servicemembers and retirees. It includes provisions addressing the employment of military spouses, job placement for veterans, and military child custody disputes. It addresses military hazing, military suicide, post-traumatic stress disorder, and mental health problems in the military. It provides continuing impact to support military families and local school districts.

The bill includes 20 provisions to continue to build on the progress we are starting to make in addressing the scourge of sexual assault in the military. Key provisions will eliminate the so-called good soldier defense, give victims a voice in whether their case is prosecuted in military or civilian courts, give victims the right to challenge court-martial rulings that violate their rights at the court of criminal appeals, and would strengthen the psychotherapist-patient privilege. Last week we received the welcome news that the number of incidents of unwanted sexual contact in the military is down and that more incidents are being reported so victims can receive the care and assistance they need and perpetrators can be brought to justice. With the enactment of the legislation before us and the commitment of military leaders, we hope to build on these trends.

The bill provides continued funding and authorities for ongoing operations in Afghanistan and for our forces conducting operations against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria called ISIS.

As requested by the administration, it authorizes the Department of Defense to train and equip vetted members of the moderate Syrian opposition and to train and equip national and local forces who are actively fighting

ISIS in Iraq. It establishes a counterterrorism partnership fund that provides the administration new flexibility in addressing emerging terrorist threats around the world. In addition, the bill extends the Afghanistan Special Immigrant Visa Program, providing for 4,000 new visas, and addresses a legal glitch that precluded members of the ruling parties in Kurdistan from receiving visas under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The authority provided in this bill to train and equip local forces in Iraq and Syria to take on ISIS is particularly important because our military leaders and intelligence experts have uniformly told us airstrikes alone will not be sufficient to defeat ISIS. American air power has changed the momentum on the ground somewhat and given moderates in the region an opportunity to regroup, but ISIS cannot be defeated without an opposing force to take the fight to it on the ground. To do that, our Arab and Muslim partners must be in the lead because the fight with ISIS is primarily a struggle within Islam for the hearts and minds of Muslims. Training and equipping our moderate Muslim allies gives us a way to move beyond the use of air power to support them in this fight.

Our bill takes steps to respond to Russian aggression in Ukraine by authorizing \$1 billion for a European Reassurance Initiative to enhance the U.S. military presence in Europe and build partner capacity to respond to security threats, of which no less than \$75 million would be committed for activities and assistance to support Ukraine by requiring a review of U.S. and NATO force posture, readiness and contingency plans in Europe and by expressing support for both nonprovocative defense military assistance—both lethal and non lethal—to Ukraine.

The bill adds hundreds of millions of dollars in funding to improve the readiness of our Armed Forces across all branches—Active, Guard, and Reserve—to help blunt some—and I emphasize some—of the negative effects of sequestration. It includes provisions increasing funding for science and technology, providing women-owned small businesses the same sole-source contracting authority that is already available to other categories of small businesses, expanding the No Contracting With the Enemy Act to all government agencies and requiring governmentwide reform of information technology acquisition. Although we were unable to bring the Senate-reported bill to the floor for amendment, we established an informal clearing process pursuant to which we were able to clear 44 Senate amendments—roughly an equal number of Democratic and Republican amendments—and include them in the new bill which is before us.

I am pleased the bill also includes a half dozen provisions to address the

growing cyber threat to critical information systems of the Department of Defense and the Nation. One provision which was added to the bill was the Levin-McCain amendment, which requires the President to identify nations that engage in economic or industrial espionage against the United States through cyber space and provides authority to impose trade sanctions on persons determined to be knowingly engaged in such espionage.

A second provision which arose out of a committee investigation of cyber threats to the Department of Defense requires the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures for identifying contractors that are operationally critical to mobilization, deployment or sustainment of contingency operations and to ensure that such contractors report any successful penetrations of their computer networks. Much more remains to be done, but these are important first steps as we begin to respond to the serious threat posed to U.S. interests by cyber attacks.

With regard to military compensation reform, we adopted a number of proposals to slow the growth of personnel costs in fiscal year 2015, as needed to enable the Department of Defense to begin to address readiness shortfalls in a fiscal environment constrained by sequestration-level budgets, while deferring further changes to be made in future years if sequestration is not adequately addressed.

In particular, the Department requested pay raises below the rate of inflation for 5 years. This bill provides a pay raise below the rate of inflation for fiscal year 2015, deferring decisions on future pay raises to later bills. The Department requested that we slow the growth of the basic allowance for housing by permitting adjustments below the rate of inflation for 3 years. This bill would slow the growth of the basic allowance for housing for fiscal year 2015, deferring decisions on future increases to later bills. The Department requested that we gradually increase copays for TRICARE pharmaceuticals over 10 years. This bill includes a proportionate increase in copays for fiscal year 2015, deferring decisions on future increases to later bills.

These are not steps any of us want to have to take; however, the Budget Control Act of 2011 cut \$1 trillion from the planned Department of Defense budget over a 10-year period. Our senior military leaders told us they simply cannot meet sequestration budget levels without structural changes—canceling programs, retiring weapon systems, and reducing the growth in benefits—to reduce the size and cost of our military.

A year and a half ago when sequestration was first triggered, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that sequestration “will severely limit our ability to implement our defense strategy. It will put the nation at

greater risk of coercion, and it will break faith with men and women in uniform." At a hearing this spring, he told us that "delaying adjustments to military compensation will cause additional, disproportionate cuts to force structure, readiness, and modernization."

The Department of Defense budget proposal also proposed to retire several weapon systems in an effort to meet sequestration-level budget ceilings. For example, the Department proposed to take half of the Navy's fleet of cruisers out of service and to retire the Army's entire fleet of scout and training helicopters. With regard to Navy cruisers, our bill allows the Navy to take two cruisers out of service this year, deferring a decision on additional ships until next year's budget. With regard to Army helicopters, the National Guard objected to the plan to consolidate Apache attack helicopters in the Active component so they can operate at the higher operational tempo needed to both fill their own mission and replace the Kiowa mission. The Guard maintains that the Army should be able to achieve needed savings and meet mission requirements without transferring Apaches from the Reserve components to the Active Army.

Our bill establishes an independent commission on the future of the Army to examine Army force structure and make recommendations as to the best way forward for Army helicopters. Because the Army needs the savings generated by the helicopter restructuring now, the bill would allow the transfer of 48 Apache helicopters—as called for in both the Army plan and the alternative National Guard plan—before the commission reports. Additional transfers would depend on the recommendations of the commission and subsequent Department or congressional action.

Sequestration is damaging enough to our military, but the damage will be far worse if we insist that the Department conduct business as usual without regard to the changed budget circumstances. The budget caps imposed by sequestration mean that every dollar we choose to spend on a program that we refuse to cancel or reduce has to come from another higher priority program. Our senior military leaders have told us that this will mean planes that can't fly, ships that can't sail, and soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who are not properly trained and equipped for the mission we expect them to accomplish. As the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff told us in January, sending troops into harm's way without training, equipment, or the latest technology is a breach of trust with the troops and their families.

The painful measures included in this bill are just a downpayment on the changes that will be needed if seques-

tration is not repealed. Delaying these changes will only make the pain worse later on while damaging the readiness of our troops to carry out their missions when we call upon them.

I am disappointed that we were unable to make further progress in this bill toward the objective of closing the detention facility at Guantanamo, Cuba. The Senate committee-reported bill included a provision that would have allowed the Department of Defense to bring Gitmo detainees to the United States, subject to a series of legal protections, for detention and trial. The provision also included an amendment—this is the provision in the Senate committee-passed bill—which was offered by Senator GRAHAM that would require the President, before authorizing the transfer of any detainees to the United States, to present a plan to Congress and that Congress would be afforded an opportunity to disapprove the plan using expedited procedures. It would have been a joint resolution.

I continue to believe the Gitmo facility undermines our interests around the world and has made it more difficult to try to convict the terrorists who are detained there, and I am disappointed that the House leadership refused to consider this provision even with the Graham amendment.

Finally, our bill includes a lands package that Senator INHOFE and I agreed to include based on the bipartisan, bicameral request of the committees of jurisdiction and the overwhelming support of our colleagues. The contents of the lands package were worked out by the House Natural Resources Committee and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which will be managing that part of the bill on the Senate floor. We have been assured that all provisions have been cleared and that the package has been cleared by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the relevant committees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a full list of the names of our majority and minority staff members, who have given so much of themselves and their families, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Peter K. Levine, Staff Director, John A. Bonsell, Minority Staff Director, Daniel C. Adams, Minority Associate Counsel, Adam J. Barker, Professional Staff Member, Steven M. Barney, Minority Counsel, June M. Borawski, Printing and Documents Clerk, Leah C. Brewer, Nominations and Hearings Clerk, William S. Castle, Minority General Counsel, John D. Cewe, Professional Staff Member, Samantha L. Clark, Minority Associate Counsel, Jonathan D. Clark, Counsel, Allen M. Edwards, Professional Staff Member, Jonathan S. Epstein, Counsel, Richard W. Fieldhouse, Professional Staff Member, Lauren M. Gillis, Staff Assistant, Thomas W. Goffus, Professional Staff Member,

Creighton Greene, Professional Staff Member, Ozge Guzelsu, Counsel, Daniel J. Harder, Staff Assistant, Alexandra M. Hathaway, Staff Assistant, Ambrose R. Hock, Professional Staff Member, Gary J. Howard, Systems Administrator.

Michael J. Kuiken, Professional Staff Member, Mary J. Kyle, Legislative Clerk, Anthony J. Lazarski, Professional Staff Member, Gerald J. Leeling, General Counsel, Daniel A. Lerner, Professional Staff Member, Gregory R. Lilly, Minority Clerk, Jason W. Maroney, Counsel, Thomas K. McConnell, Professional Staff Member, Mariah K. McNamara, Special Assistant to the Staff Director, William G. P. Monahan, Counsel, Natalie M. Nicolas, Minority Research Analyst, Michael J. Noblet, Professional Staff Member, Cindy Pearson, Assistant Chief Clerk and Security Manager, Roy F. Phillips, Professional Staff Member, John H. Quirk V, Professional Staff Member, Brendan J. Sawyer, Staff Assistant, Arun A. Seraphin, Professional Staff Member, Travis E. Smith, Chief Clerk, Robert M. Soofer, Professional Staff Member, William K. Sutey, Professional Staff Member, Robert T. Waisanen, Staff Assistant, Barry C. Walker, Security Officer.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, I have to say what a joy it is to work with Senator LEVIN. I know the public thinks that no Republicans like any Democrats and vice versa—at least those are the flames they try to fan—and that is not true.

I can only think of two issues on which Senator LEVIN and I disagreed with each other. He has been through 16 of the NDAAs as either chairman or ranking member. I am sure that is some kind of a record. But to work with someone who you know will be totally honest with you even when you have a difference of opinion is really a joy. I hope we can be an example for some of the other committees that don't have that much joy when they are working on an issue.

The long history he has had here and the integrity he has expressed will be sorely missed, I have to say to my good friend Senator LEVIN.

As Senator LEVIN said, we will have to get to the bill before we leave. This bill has passed for 52 consecutive years, and that really says something. But each year there is always a problem.

The comment that was made on the land package—I think the process is wrong regardless of the merits of the bill. As was pointed out by Senator LEVIN, it was supported in a bipartisan way by all the appropriate committees; however, that is not us, that is them. The process should not allow others to come in on this bill, so I think it is flawed. I don't think it will happen again. I really don't.

I talked to the people who will be involved in next year's NDAA, which, by the way, we will start working on in February of next year.

I will go over a couple of other reasons why we have to get this bill done.

As I said, we have done this for 52 consecutive years, and I am sure we are going to be able to get this done.

We passed this bill out to the floor from our committee—the committee chaired by Senator LEVIN—on May 23, the day after it was done in the House committee. So we were ready to do this way back in May, and the problem was we could not get it on the floor.

I can remember coming down to the floor with Senator LEVIN and begging people to bring amendments to us. We have to have amendments down here because we can't expect the leader to bring this to the floor unless we know people will work with us on amendments. So eventually they did bring amendments, and we responded. We had many amendments. I don't remember exactly how many amendments were put forth, but I do remember we considered and put 47 amendments into this package—we did it through the big four method, which was the only thing left for us to do—47 amendments divided almost equally between Republicans and Democrats. We considered those amendments and put them in as a part of the bill.

Of course, despite pushing for months that the NDAA be considered under regular order, which we should have done, we find ourselves in the unfortunate situation we are in today. It is reminiscent of last year. Last year we went all the way up to December 26 before we finally passed it.

It would really be a disaster if we didn't pass it. People don't realize that if we don't pass this bill—our last chance is this week because the House will be out of there. There will be no way to have amendments or change anything now from the product we have. We already have a lot of the amendments in, but we can't make changes to them. We can't have another bill because we have run out of time. It will not happen unless it happens with this bill. I know a lot of people would prefer to have something else, although I know this bill is going to pass by a large margin. It is a good bill.

People wonder what would happen if we didn't pass this bill. It would be a disaster. Enlistment bonuses—a lot of these kids have been over there serving, and they have been told they will have certain things, and one of them is the bonuses. Well, all of a sudden, on December 31, if we don't have a bill, those expire and those kids will not have enlistment or reenlistment bonuses.

The incentives are important in order to keep troops with critical skills. We hear a lot about the SEALs and the great work they do. These critical skills incentives will go away on December 31.

There is also incentive pay for pilots. I have researched this because there is a lot of competition out there for our

pilots—pilots for heavy vehicles, as well as strike fighters. Right now there is a competition with the airlines. Everyone wants to hire these guys, so there is competition out there. All of a sudden the flight pay would come out on December 31 if we don't pass this bill, and that means we will lose some of these guys. It is a \$25,000-a-year bonus for these guys over a 10-year period, so it is \$250,000. However, for each one who decides not to come back—to retrain someone to the status of an F-22 would cost about \$17 million. We are looking at bonuses that might be \$25,000, but the alternative, if we don't get this done by December 31, would cost \$17 million for each pilot who needs to be trained. So that is very significant. We have skill incentive pay and proficiency bonuses for all of those. So that singularly would be enough reason to say we have to have it; we just can't do without it. Stopping all military construction, which would be on December 31.

One of the areas where the chairman and I disagree is on Gitmo. We have had a friendly and honest difference of opinion on that. I look at Gitmo as one of the few resources we have that is a good deal for government. We have had it since 1904 and it only costs us \$4,000 and half the time Cuba forgets to charge us, so it is a pretty good deal. There is no place else we can put, in my opinion, the combatants. People say bring them back to the United States. The problem is if we intermingle prisoners at Gitmo with the prison population—these people at Gitmo are not criminals, they are people who teach terrorists. So there are a lot of arguments against bringing Gitmo prisoners to the United States. That in itself would be a 2-hour speech, so I will not get into it now.

There are some areas where the chairman and I disagree and there were a lot of compromises because we knew we had to have the bill. If we don't pass this bill, there will be no European Reassurance Initiative to stand up against Russian aggression. I shouldn't have done this because I was on the ballot this year for reelection, but for the week prior to our election, I went over to see what was happening in Ukraine because Ukraine was having their elections the week before we had our elections. Not many people are aware that in Ukraine, Poroshenko—what happened in their election in Ukraine, a political party cannot have a seat in Parliament unless they get 5 percent of the vote. The vote took place 1 week before our vote. This will be the first time in 96 years that the Communist Party will not have one seat in Parliament. That is amazing. We have to understand what is happening with Putin.

I also went to Lithuania and Estonia and Latvia and those areas in the Baltics. That is another problem we have.

They want to give us the assurance that it is not just Putin in Ukraine, but they are becoming aggressive. I coined the term for what Putin is trying to do, “de-Reaganize” Europe, to try to take out all the freedoms that were there and try to put a coalition together. That is a huge issue, and it is addressed in this bill in a very aggressive way with the reassurance initiative.

Also, if we don't pass this bill, we would not have the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund, which I think we are all aware is so necessary with ISIL on the rampage they are pursuing.

So we have a lot of provisions. I think the chairman did a good job of covering them. A couple of them perhaps might have been overlooked or that I might add for my own personal interests. One is the support of the Aircraft Modernization Program. Historically, we have always had the best of everything, but now when we look at China and at Russia and what they are doing, it is a very difficult situation for us. We had the F-22; the President terminated that program his first year in office. So now we have all of our eggs in the basket in terms of the strike vehicles and the F-35. A lot of people don't like the F-35, but that is what we have to have and that is in this bill to continue with that.

The E-2D surveillance aircraft is one very few people know about. It is one of the ugliest airplanes in the sky, but it is one that is necessary for surveillance and other functions of government.

We have the KC-46 tanker aircraft. We have been using the KC-135 now for decades and we have to go toward a more modern vehicle, and we do have on the books that we will continue to do that, working with the KC-46. So several others—some improvements to the workhorse of the military, the C-130 aircraft, and other vehicles.

Without this bill, we are going to have to stop some of these projects, so think about the cost. We are in the midst of contracts right now that we could be in jeopardy of losing.

The construction on military and family housing is there. It is very significant.

So I think all of these pieces—and one piece I think people are interested in is this will end the reliance on Russian-made rocket engines. We hear a lot about that. This bill includes a timeframe for when the current contracts run out, so that we are going to be developing our own rocket engine. I have heard from a lot of outside experts. Tom Stafford is one of the famous astronauts from Oklahoma. He and I have talked at length about what we are going to be able to do with some of these rocket engines. So I think this is enough reason why we have to do this, and I think everyone realizes that.

We have heard a lot of talk that frankly is not true. Unfortunately, there are some groups that are kind of antimilitary groups that came out with some statements that weren't true and some of the talk show hosts I admire were given information that wasn't quite as accurate as it should have been.

Right now, if we can think of no other single major reason to pass this bill, it is to take care of those individuals who are in the field right now who are fighting. We have the exact count, to make sure we use accurate figures. As of today, 1,779,343 troops in the field or enlisted personnel. These are the ones who can be affected, 1.8 million of them. We would be reneging on the commitments we have made to them.

We have heard criticism that we are somehow cutting their benefits to put in a land package. That just isn't true. We don't need to talk about this because that is not our committee. That is the committee referred to by the chairman in his remarks—the Energy and Natural Resources Committees of the House and the Senate. But it is budget neutral. Over a 10-year period, the CBO says it is budget neutral. So there is no legitimate argument that we are using any of the funds that would otherwise go to the military on the land package.

I have to say the process was wrong. We have done this in the past and we are not going to do it again. We shouldn't have had a land package come in that has nothing to do with defense, but nonetheless it is there. I was offended by the process. Frankly—I have to confess, and it is good for the soul, I guess—I thought after reading it, it was a pretty good bill. If it would have been brought up outside of this bill, I would have still voted for it. But the process is wrong, and I think we all understand that. We did the best we could.

We have these things that are going on right now, and I think we can't take a chance on not having or, for the first time in 53 years, not passing an NDAA bill by the end of the year. It would be a crisis. The system could be criticized for the way it happened. Considering that we passed our bill out of the committee on May 23, we should have had it on the floor. We should have had it done in regular order. We will do everything we can in the future to try to make that happen. For two consecutive years now we have not been able to do that. We have had to go through the system of what they call the Big Four—the chairman and ranking member of the House and the chairman and ranking member of the Senate—to pass this bill. I think in this case we have come up with a good bill. We have been able to incorporate 47 of the amendments that have come from those that were filed to be added on the floor. So we have done the best we can. There is

no other alternative now when we consider what will happen if for some unknown reason this would be the first year in 53 years that we don't have an NDAA bill.

I will just repeat what I started off with; that is, what a joy it has been to work with CARL LEVIN over these years in the capacity of either the chairman or the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. He will be sorely missed. Oddly enough, we also have the same situation happening over on the House side with BUCK McKEON. I served with him when I served in the House. He is going to be retiring after this year as well. So we have two retiring chairmen of what I consider to be the most significant committees in Washington.

We are going to continue to work together for the rest of this bill. We have a good bill, and we are going to uphold our obligation to the 1,779,343 enlisted personnel in the field. We are not going to let them down.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first let me thank Senator INHOFE for his friendship, most importantly, but also for the great partnership we have enjoyed. It has been a real pleasure working with the Senator from Oklahoma. I should perhaps also say we are confident our successors will carry on this tradition as well. Senator McCAIN, the new chairman, and Senator JACK REED will be the new ranking member and they will be carrying on this tradition that we have done everything we know how to do to maintain.

I wish to again thank my good friend JIM INHOFE and his staff who worked so well with the staff on this side. We talk about this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle. In this bill obviously there will be differences—very rarely, by the way, on a partisan basis, even when there are differences. But the aisle sort of disappears when it comes to the Defense authorization bill, and that is the way it should be.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me reclaim my time just to make one other comment. The two people who are sitting here, Peter Levine on your side and John Bonsell on our side, their compatibility in working together is also unprecedented. It doesn't happen very often. I can't speak for the Senator from Michigan, but I can speak for myself, to say that without these two working together I sure could not have participated in a meaningful way. So I thank them as well.

Mr. LEVIN. The Senator from Oklahoma is speaking for both of us, I can assure him, with his comments and so many other comments he made.

I will yield to the Senator from Colorado, but first I wish to thank him for the great contribution he has made to

our committee. I think he is planning on speaking on a different subject. He has played a major role on the Intelligence Committee. I look forward to reading, if not hearing, his remarks on the subject on which I know he has spent a good deal of time. Although he has had perhaps more visibility in terms of the Intelligence Committee, he has been a major contributor on the Armed Services Committee. I can't say we will miss him because I will not be here, but they will miss the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam President, before I start my remarks on the historic day which was yesterday—when it comes to the publication of our long-in-the-making report on the CIA's torture program—I wish to thank the chairman for his leadership, his mentorship, and his friendship. I also am proud obviously to be a part of the Armed Services Committee and to have chaired the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. Again, I extend my thanks to the good men and women in uniform, as did my good friend from Oklahoma. The NDAA bill is a crucial task in front of us. I look forward to one of my last votes as a Senator from the great State of Colorado, and I look forward to casting a vote in favor of the Defense authorization bill.

Again, I wish to thank my two friends who have mentored me and who have led our committee with great elan and intelligence.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Yesterday was a historic day. Almost 6 years after the Senate Intelligence Committee voted to conduct a study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program and nearly 2 years after approving the report, the American people will finally know the truth about a very dark chapter in our Nation's history.

My goal from the start has been twofold. First, I have been committed to correcting the public record on the CIA's multiple misrepresentations to the American people, to other agencies in the executive branch, the White House, and to Congress. Second, my goal has been to ensure that the full truth comes out about this grim time in the history of the CIA and of our Nation so that neither the CIA nor any future administration repeats the grievous mistakes this important oversight work reveals.

The process of compiling, drafting, redacting, and now releasing this report has been much harder than it needed to be. It brings no one joy to discuss the CIA's brutal and appalling use of torture or the unprecedented actions that some in the intelligence community and administration have taken in order to cover up the truth.

A number of my colleagues who have come to the floor over the past 24 hours and discussed this report have referred to 9/11. I, too, will never forget the fear, the pain, and the anger we all felt on that day and in the days that followed. Americans were demanding action from our government to keep us safe. Everyone, myself included, wanted to go to the ends of the Earth to hunt down the terrorists who attacked our Nation and to make every effort to prevent another attack. Although we all shared that goal, this report reveals how the CIA crossed a line and took our country to a place where we violated our moral and legal obligations in the name of keeping us safe. As we know now, this was a false choice. Torture didn't keep us safer after all. By releasing the Intelligence Committee's landmark report, we reaffirm we are a nation that does not hide from its past but must learn from it and that an honest examination of our shortcomings is not a sign of weakness but the strength of our great Republic.

From the heavily redacted version of the executive summary first delivered to the committee by the CIA in August, we made significant progress in clearing away the thick, obfuscating fog these redactions represented.

As Chairwoman FEINSTEIN has said, our committee chipped away at over 400 areas of disagreement with the administration on redactions down to just a few.

We didn't make all the progress we wanted to and the redaction process itself is filled with unwarranted and completely unnecessary obstacles. Unfortunately, at the end of the day, what began as a bipartisan effort on the committee did not end as such, even after my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were repeatedly urged to participate with us as partners.

As my friends in the Senate know, I am a legislator who goes out of his way to form bipartisan consensus. However, it became clear that was not possible here and that is regrettable.

But all told, after reviewing this final version of the committee's study, I believe it accomplishes the goals I laid out and it tells the story that needs to be told.

It also represents a significant and essential step for restoring faith in the crucial role of Congress to conduct oversight. Congressional oversight is important to all of government's activities, but it is especially important for those parts of the government that operate in secret, as the Church Committee discovered decades ago. The challenge the Church Committee members discovered are still with us today: how to ensure that secret government actions are conducted within the confines of the law. The release of this executive summary is testament to the power of oversight and the determination of Chairman FEINSTEIN and the

members of this committee to doggedly beat back obstacle after obstacle in order to reveal the truth.

There are a number of thank-yous that are in order. I start by thanking the chairman for her courage and persistence. I also thank the committee staff director, David Grannis; the staff lead for the study, Dan Jones; and his core study team, Evan Gottesman and Chad Tanner. They toiled for nearly 6 years to complete this report. They then shepherded it through the redaction process, all the while giving up their nights, weekends, vacations, and precious time with family and friends in an effort to get to the truth of this secret program for the members of the committee, the Senate, and now the American people.

They have been assisted by other dedicated staff, including my designee on the committee, Jennifer Barrett. We would not be where we are today without them. I am grateful, beyond words, for their service and dedication. I want them to know our country is grateful too.

Let me turn to the study itself. Much has been written about the significance of the study. This is the study. It is a summary of the CIA's detention and interrogation program. I want to start by saying I believe the vast majority of CIA officers welcome oversight and believe in the checks and balances that form the very core of our Constitution.

I believe many rank-and-file CIA officers have fought internally for and supported the release of this report. Unfortunately, again and again, these hard-working public servants have been poorly served by the CIA's leadership. Too many CIA leaders and senior officials have fought to bury the truth while using a redaction pen to further hide this dark chapter of the Agency's history.

The document we released yesterday is the definitive, official history of what happened in the CIA's detention and interrogation program. It is based on more than 6 million pages of CIA and other documents, emails, cables, and interviews. This 500-page study, this document, encapsulates the facts drawn from the 6,700-page report, which is backed up by 38,000 footnotes.

This is a documentary that tells of the program's history based on the CIA's own internal records. Its prose is dry and spare, as you will soon see for yourself. It was put together methodically, without exaggeration or embellishment. This study by itself—using the CIA's own words—brings the truth to light, and that is what it was intended to do.

The study looked carefully at the CIA's own claims—most notably that the so-called enhanced interrogation techniques used on detainees elicited unique, otherwise unobtainable intelligence that disrupted terrorist plots and saved lives. It debunks those claims conclusively.

The CIA repeatedly claimed that using these enhanced interrogation techniques against detainees was the only way to yield critical information about terrorist plotting. But when asked to describe this critical information and detail which plots were thwarted, the CIA provided exaggerated versions of plots and misattributed information that was obtained from traditional intelligence collection, claiming it came from the use of interrogation techniques that are clearly torture.

This study shows that torture was not effective, that it led to fabricated information, and its use—even in secret—undermined our security and our country more broadly. Our use of torture and I believe the failure to truly acknowledge it continues to impair America's moral leadership and influence around the world, creates distrust among our partners, puts Americans abroad in danger, and helps our enemies' recruitment efforts.

Senior CIA leaders would have you believe their version of the truth—promoted in CIA-cleared memoirs by former CIA Directors and other CIA and White House officials—that while there was some excesses in its detention and interrogation program, the CIA did not torture. Their version would have you believe that the CIA's program was professionally conducted, employing trained interrogators to use so-called enhanced interrogation techniques on only the most hardened and dangerous terrorists.

But as Professor Darius Rejali writes in his book "Torture and Democracy," "To think professionalism is a guard against causing excessive pain is an illusion. Instead, torture breaks down professionalism" and corrupts the organizations that use it.

This is exactly what happened with the CIA's detention and interrogation program. Without proper acknowledgement of these truths by the CIA and the White House, it could well happen again.

In light of the President's early Executive order disavowing torture, his own recent acknowledgement that "we tortured some folks" and the Assistant Secretary of State Malinowski's statements last month to the U.N. Committee Against Torture that "we hope to lead by example" in correcting our mistakes, one would think this administration is leading the efforts to right the wrongs of the past and ensure the American people learn the truth about the CIA's torture program. Not so.

In fact, it has been nearly a 6-year struggle—in a Democratic administration no less—to get this study out. Why has it been so hard for this document to finally see the light of day? Why have we had to fight tooth and nail every step of the way? The answer is simple: Because the study says things that former and current CIA and other

government officials don't want the American public to know. For a while I worried that this administration would succeed in keeping this study entirely under wraps.

While the study clearly shows that the CIA's detention and interrogation program itself was deeply flawed, the deeper, more endemic problem lies in the CIA, assisted by a White House that continues to try to cover up the truth. It is this deeper problem that illustrates the challenge we face today: reforming an agency that refuses to even acknowledge what it has done. This is a continuing challenge that the CIA's oversight committees need to take on in a bipartisan way. Those who criticize the committee's study for overly focusing on the past should understand that its findings directly relate to how the CIA operates today.

For an example of how the CIA has repeated its same past mistakes in more recent years, look at the section of the executive summary released yesterday that deals with the intelligence on the courier that led to Osama bin Laden. That operation took place under this administration in May of 2011. After it was over, the CIA coordinated to provide misinformation to the White House and its oversight committees suggesting the CIA torture program was the tipoff information for the courier. That is 100 percent wrong and signifies the Agency leadership's persistent and entrenched culture of misrepresenting the truth to Congress and the American people. This example also illustrates again the dangers of not reckoning with the past. So while I agree with my colleagues on the committee who argue that doing oversight in real time is critical, I believe we cannot turn a blind eye to the past when the same problems are staring us in the face in the present. Oversight by willful ignorance is not oversight at all.

In Chairman FEINSTEIN's landmark floor speech earlier this year, she laid out how the CIA pushed back on our committee's oversight efforts. Thanks to her speech, we know about the history of the CIA's destruction of interrogation videotapes and about what motivated her and her colleagues to begin the broader committee study in 2009. We know about the CIA's insistence on providing documents to the committee in a CIA-leased facility and the millions of dollars the CIA spent on contractors hired to read, multiple times, each of the 6 million pages of documents produced before providing them to the committee staff. We know about the nearly 1,000 documents that the CIA electronically removed from the committee's dedicated database on two occasions in 2010, which the CIA claimed its personnel did at the direction of the White House. Of course we know about the Panetta review.

I turn to the Panetta review. I have provided more information on the

events that led up to the revelation included in the Panetta review in a set of additional views that I submitted for the committee's executive summary, but I will summarize them.

From the beginning of his term as CIA Director, John Brennan was openly hostile toward and dismissive of the committee's oversight and its efforts to review the detention and interrogation program. During his confirmation hearing, I obtained a promise from John Brennan that he would meet with committee staff on the study once confirmed. After his confirmation, he changed his mind.

In December 2012, when the classified study was approved in a bipartisan vote, the committee asked the White House to coordinate any executive branch comments prior to declassification. The White House provided no comment. Instead, the CIA responded for the executive branch nearly 7 months later, on June 27, 2013.

The CIA's formal response to the study under Director Brennan clings to false narratives about the CIA's effectiveness when it comes to the CIA's detention and interrogation program. It includes many factual inaccuracies, defends the use of torture, and attacks the committee's oversight and findings. I believe its flippant and dismissive tone represents the CIA's approach to oversight—and the White House's willingness to let the CIA do whatever it likes—even if its efforts are armed at actively undermining the President's stated policies.

It would be a significant disservice to let the Brennan response speak for the CIA. Thankfully, it does not have to. There are some CIA officials and officers willing to tell it straight. In late 2013, then-CIA General Counsel Stephen Preston answered a series of questions that I asked about his thoughts on the Brennan response as part of his Armed Services Committee nomination hearing to be General Counsel of the Defense Department.

His answers to the questions about the program contrasted sharply with the Brennan response. For instance, he stated matter of factly that from his review of the facts, the CIA provided the committee with inaccurate information regarding the detention and interrogation program. I have posted on line my questions to Mr. Preston, along with his answers.

Stephen Preston was not alone in having the moral courage to speak frankly and truthfully about the CIA's torture program. There were also other CIA officers willing to document the truth. In March 2009, then-CIA Director Leon Panetta announced the formation of a Director's review group to look at the agency's detention and interrogation program. As he stated at the time, "The safety of the American people depends on our ability to learn lessons from the past while staying focused on the threats of today and tomorrow."

The Director's review group looked at the same CIA documents that were being provided to our committee. They produced a series of documents that became the Panetta review. As I discussed in late 2013, the Panetta review corroborates many of the significant findings of the committee's study. Moreover, the Panetta review frankly acknowledges significant problems and errors made in the CIA's detention and interrogation program. Many of these same errors are denied or minimized in the Brennan response.

As Chairman FEINSTEIN so eloquently outlined in her floor speech on March 11 of this year, drafts of the Panetta review have been provided by the CIA unknowingly to our committee staff years before within the 6 million pages of documents it had provided.

So when the committee received the Brennan response, I expected a recognition of errors and a clear plan to ensure that the mistakes identified would not be repeated again. Instead—this is a crucial point—instead, the CIA continued not only to defend the program and deny any wrongdoing but also to deny its own conclusions to the contrary found in the Panetta review.

In light of those clear factual disparities between the Brennan response and the Panetta review, committee staff grew concerned that the CIA was knowingly providing inaccurate information to the committee in the present day, which is a serious offense, and a deeply troubling matter for the committee, the Congress, the White House, and our country.

The Panetta review was evidence of that potential offense. So to preserve that evidence, committee staff securely transported a printed portion of the Panetta review from the CIA-leased facility to the committee's secure offices in the Senate. This was the proper and right thing to do, not only because of the seriousness of the potential crime, but also in light of the fact that the CIA had previously destroyed interrogation videotapes without authorization and over objections of officials in the Bush White House.

In my view, the Panetta review is a smoking gun. It raises fundamental questions about why a review the CIA conducted internally years ago and never provided to the committee is so different from the official Brennan response and so different from the public statements of former CIA officials. That is why I asked for a complete copy of the Panetta review at a December 2013 Intelligence Committee hearing.

Although the committee now has a portion of the review already in its possession, I believed then, as I do now, that it is important to make public its existence and to obtain a full copy of the report. That is why I am here today, to disclose some of its key findings and conclusions on the Senate

floor for the public record, which fly directly in the face of claims made by senior CIA officials past and present.

For example, as I mentioned earlier, on a number of key matters, the Panetta review directly refutes information in the Brennan response. In the few instances in which the Brennan response acknowledges imprecision or mischaracterization relative to the detention interrogation program, the Panetta review is refreshingly free of excuses, qualifications, or caveats.

The Panetta review found that the CIA repeatedly provided inaccurate information to the Congress, the President, and the public on the efficacy of its coercive techniques. The Brennan response, in contrast, continues to insist the CIA's interrogations produced unique intelligence that saved lives. Yet the Panetta review identified dozens of documents that include inaccurate information used to justify the use of torture and indicates that the inaccuracies it identifies do not represent an exhaustive list. The Panetta review further describes how detainees provided intelligence prior to the use of torture against them.

It describes how the CIA, contrary to its own representations, often tortured detainees before trying any other approach. It describes how the CIA tortured detainees, even when less coercive methods were yielding intelligence. The Panetta review further identifies cases in which the CIA used coercive techniques when it had no basis for determining whether a detainee had critical intelligence at all.

In other words, CIA personnel tortured detainees to confirm they did not have intelligence, not because they thought they did. Again, while a small portion of this review is preserved in our committee spaces, I have requested the full document. Our request has been denied by Director Brennan. I will tell you, the Panetta review is much more than a "summary" and "incomplete drafts," which is the way Mr. Brennan and former CIA officials have characterized it, in order to minimize its significance. I have reviewed this document. It is as significant and relevant as it gets.

The refusal to provide the full Panetta review and the refusal to acknowledge facts detailed in both the committee study and the Panetta review lead to one disturbing finding: Director Brennan and the CIA today are continuing to willfully provide inaccurate information and misrepresent the efficacy of torture. In other words, the CIA is lying. This is not a problem of the past but a problem that needs to be dealt with today.

Let me turn to the search of the Intelligence Committee's computers. Clearly the present leadership of the CIA agrees with me that the Panetta review is a smoking gun. That is the only explanation for the CIA's unau-

thorized search of the committee's dedicated computers in January. The CIA's illegal search was conducted out of concern that the committee staff was provided with the Panetta review. It demonstrates how far the CIA will go to keep its secrets safe. Instead of asking the committee if it had access to the Panetta review, the CIA searched, without authorization or notification, the committee computers that the agency had agreed were off limits.

In so doing, the agency might have violated multiple provisions of the Constitution as well as Federal criminal statutes and Executive Order 12333.

More troubling, despite admitting behind closed doors to the committee that the CIA conducted the search, Director Brennan publicly referred to "spurious allegations about CIA actions that are wholly unsupported by the facts."

He even said such allegations of computer hacking were beyond "the scope of reason." The CIA then made a criminal referral to the Department of Justice against the committee staff who were working on the study. Chairman FEINSTEIN believed these actions were an effort to intimidate the committee staff, the very staff charged with CIA oversight. I strongly agree with her point of view.

The CIA's inspector general subsequently opened an investigation into the CIA's unauthorized search and found, contrary to Director Brennan's public protestations, that a number of CIA employees did, in fact, improperly access the committee's dedicated computers. The investigation found no basis for the criminal referral on the committee staff. The IG also found that the CIA personnel involved demonstrated a "lack of candor" about their activities to the inspector general.

However, only a 1-page unclassified summary of the IG's report is publicly available. The longer classified version was only provided briefly to Members when it was first released. I had to push hard to get the CIA to provide a copy for the committee to keep in its own records. Even the copy in committee records is restricted to committee members and only two staff members, not including my staff member.

After having reviewed the IG report myself again recently, I believe even more strongly that the full report should be declassified and publicly released, in part because Director Brennan still refuses to answer the committee's questions about the search.

In March, the committee voted unanimously to request responses from Director Brennan about the computer search. The chairman and vice chairman wrote a letter to Director Brennan, who promised a thorough response to their questions after the Justice De-

partment and CIA IG reviews were complete. The Chair and Vice Chair then wrote two more letters, to no avail. The Director has refused to answer any questions on this topic and has again deferred his answers, this time until after the CIA's internal accountability board review is completed, if it ever is.

So from March until December, for almost 9 months, Director Brennan has flat out refused to answer basic questions about the computer search; whether he suggested a search or approved it; if not, who did. He has refused to explain why the search was conducted, its legal basis, or whether he was even aware of the agreement between the committee and the CIA laying out protections of the committee's dedicated computer system. He has refused to say whether the computers were searched more than once, whether the CIA monitored committee staff at the CIA-leased facility, whether the agency ever entered the committee's secure room at the facility, and who at the CIA knew about the search both before and after it occurred.

I want to turn at this point to the White House. To date, there has been no accountability for the CIA's actions or for Director Brennan's failure of leadership. Despite the facts presented, the President has expressed full confidence in Director Brennan and demonstrated that trust by making no effort at all to rein him in.

The President stated it was not appropriate for him to weigh into these issues that exist between the committee and the CIA. As I said at the time, the committee should be able to do its oversight work consistent with our constitutional principle of the separation of powers, without the CIA posing impediments or obstacles as it has and as it continues to do today. For the White House not to have recognized this principle and the gravity of the CIA's actions deeply troubles me today and continues to trouble me.

Far from being a disinterested observer in the committee-CIA battles, the White House has played a central role from the start. If former CIA Director Panetta's memoir is to be believed, the President was unhappy about Director Panetta's initial agreement in 2009 to allow staff access to operation cables and other sensitive documents about the torture program.

Assuming its accuracy, Mr. Panetta's account describes then-Counterterrorism Adviser John Brennan and current Chief of Staff Denis McDonough—both of whom have been deeply involved in the study redaction process—as also deeply unhappy about this expanded oversight.

There are more questions that need answers about the role of the White House in the committee's study.

For example, there are the 9,400 documents that were withheld from the

committee by the White House in the course of the review of the millions of documents, despite the fact that these documents are directly responsive to the committee's document request. The White House has never made a formal claim of executive privilege over the documents, yet it has failed to respond to the chairman's request to the documents or to compromise proposals she has offered to review a summary listing of them. When I asked CIA General Counsel Stephen Preston about the documents, he noted that "the Agency has deferred to the White House and has not been substantially involved in subsequent discussions about the disposition of these documents."

If the documents are privileged, the White House should assert that claim. But if they are not, White House officials need to explain why they pulled back documents that the CIA believed were relevant to the committee's investigation and responsive to our direct request.

The White House has not led on this issue in the manner we expected when we heard the President's campaign speeches in 2008 and read the Executive order he issued in January 2009. To CIA employees in April 2009, President Obama said:

What makes the United States special, and what makes you special, is precisely the fact that we are willing to uphold our values and ideals even when it's hard—not just when it's easy; even when we are afraid and under threat—not just when it's expedient to do so. That's what makes us different.

This tough, principled talk set an important tone from the beginning of his Presidency. However, let's fast forward to this year, after so much has come to light about the CIA's barbaric programs, and President Obama's response was that we "crossed a line" as a nation and that "hopefully, we don't do it again in the future."

That is not good enough. We need to be better than that. There can be no coverup. There can be no excuses. If there is no moral leadership from the White House helping the public to understand that the CIA's torture program wasn't necessary and didn't save lives or disrupt terrorist plots, then what is to stop the next White House and CIA Director from supporting torture.

Finally, the White House has not led on transparency, as then Senator Obama promised in 2007. He said then this:

We'll protect sources and methods, but we won't use sources and methods as pretexts to hide the truth. Our history doesn't belong to Washington, it belongs to America.

In 2009 consistent with this promise, President Obama issued Executive Order 13526, which clarified that information should be classified to protect sources and methods but not to obscure key facts or cover up embarrassing or illegal acts.

But actions speak louder than words. This administration, like so many before, has released information only when forced to by a leak or by a court order or by an oversight committee.

The redactions to the committee's executive summary on the CIA's detention and interrogation program have been a case study in its refusal to be open. Despite requests that both the chairman and I made for the White House alone to lead the declassification process, it was given by the White House to the CIA—the same Agency that is the focus of this report. Predictably, the redacted version that came back to the committee in August obscured key facts and undermined key findings and conclusions of the study.

The CIA also included unnecessary redactions to previously acknowledged and otherwise unclassified information. Why? Presumably, to make it more difficult for the public to understand the study's findings. Content that the CIA has attempted to redact includes information in the official, declassified report of the Senate Armed Services Committee, other executive branch declassified official documents, information in books and speeches delivered by former CIA officers who were approved by the CIA's Publication Review Board, news articles, and other public reports.

It is true that through negotiations between the committee, the CIA, and the White House, many of these issues were resolved. However, at the end of the day, the White House and CIA would not agree to include any pseudonyms in the study to disguise the names of CIA officers. In 2009 the CIA and the committee had agreed to use CIA-provided pseudonyms for CIA officials, but in the summary's final version, the CIA insisted that even the pseudonyms should be redacted.

For an agency concerned about morale, this is the wrong approach to take, in my view. By making it less possible to follow a narrative thread throughout the summary, this approach effectively throws many CIA personnel under the bus. It tars all of the CIA personnel by making it appear that the CIA writ large was responsible for developing, implementing, and representing the truth about the CIA's detention and interrogation program. In fact, a small number of CIA officers were largely responsible.

Further, there is no question that the identities of undercover agents must be protected, but it is unprecedented for the CIA to demand—and the White House to agree—that every CIA officer's pseudonym in the study be blacked out. U.S. Government agencies have used pseudonyms to protect officers' identities in any number of past reports, including the 9/11 Commission report, the investigation of the Abu Ghraib detention facility, and the report of the Iran-Contra affair.

We asked the CIA to identify any influences in the summary wherein a CIA official mentioned by pseudonym would result in the outing of any CIA undercover officer, and they could not provide any such examples.

Why do I focus on this? The CIA's insistence on blacking out even the fake names of its officers is problematic because the study is less readable and has lost some of its narrative thread.

But as the chairman has said, we will find ways to bridge that gap. The tougher problem to solve is how to ensure that this and future administrations follow President Obama's pledge not to use sources and methods as pretexts to hide the truth.

What needs to be done? Chairman FEINSTEIN predicted in March—at the height of the frenzy over the CIA's spying on committee-dedicated computers—that "our oversight will prevail," and generally speaking, it has. Much of the truth is out, thanks to the chairman's persistence and the dedicated staff involved in this effort. It is, indeed, a historic event.

But there is still no accountability, and despite Director Brennan's pledges to me in January 2013, there is still no correction of the public record of the inaccurate information the CIA has spread for years and continues to stand behind. The CIA has lied to its overseers and the public, destroyed and tried to hold back evidence, spied on the Senate, made false charges against our staff, and lied about torture and the results of torture. And no one has been held to account.

Torture just didn't happen, after all. Contrary to the President's recent statement, "we" didn't torture some folks. Real actual people engaged in torture. Some of these people are still employed by the CIA and the U.S. Government. There are, right now, people serving in high-level positions at the Agency who approved, directed or committed acts related to the CIA's detention and interrogation program. It is bad enough not to prosecute these officials, but to reward or promote them and risk the integrity of the U.S. Government to protect them is incomprehensible.

The President needs to purge his administration of high-level officials who were instrumental to the development and running of this program. He needs to force a cultural change at the CIA.

The President also should support legislation limiting interrogation to noncoercive techniques—to ensure that his own Executive order is codified and to prevent a future administration from developing its own torture program.

The President must ensure the Panetta review is declassified and publicly released.

The full 6,800-page study of the CIA's detention and interrogation program should be declassified and released.

There also needs to be accountability for the CIA spying on its oversight committee, and the CIA inspector general's report needs to be declassified and released to the public.

A key lesson I have learned from my experience with the study is the importance of the role of Congress in overseeing the intelligence community. It is always easier to accept what we are told at face value than it is to ask tough questions. If we rely on others to tell us what is behind their own curtain instead of taking a look for ourselves, we can't know for certain what is there.

This isn't at all to say that what the committee found in its study is a culture and behavior we should ascribe to all employees of the CIA or to the intelligence community. The intelligence community is made up of thousands of hard-working patriotic Americans. These women and men are consummate professionals who risk their lives every day to keep us safe and to provide the their best assessments regardless of political and policy considerations.

But it is incumbent on government leaders—it is incumbent on us—to live up to the dedication of these employees and to make them proud of the institutions they work for. It gives me no pleasure to say this, but as I have said before, for Director Brennan that means resigning. For the next CIA director that means immediately correcting the false record and instituting the necessary reforms to restore the CIA's reputation for integrity and analytical rigor.

The CIA cannot not be its best until it faces its serious and grievous mistakes of the detention and interrogation program. For President Obama, that means taking real action to live up to the pledges he made early in his Presidency.

Serving on the Senate Intelligence Committee for the past 4 years opened my eyes and gave me a much deeper appreciation of the importance of our role in the balancing of power in our great government. It also helped me understand that all Members of Congress, not only Intelligence Committee members, have an opportunity and an obligation to exercise their oversight powers.

Members who do not serve on the Intelligence Committee can ask to read classified documents, call for classified briefings, and submit classified questions.

This is my challenge today to the American people. Urge your Member of Congress to be engaged, to get classified briefings, and to help keep the intelligence community accountable. This is the only way that secret government and democracy can coexist.

We have so much to be proud of in our great Nation, and one of those matters of pride is our commitment to admit mistakes, correct past actions,

and move forward knowing that we are made stronger when we refuse to be bound by the past.

We have always been a forward-looking Nation, but to be so we must be mindful of our own history. That is what this study is all about. So I have no doubt that we will emerge from a dark episode with our democracy strengthened and our future made brighter.

It has been an honor to serve on this committee, and I will miss doing its important work more than I can say.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I rise today to speak to this body and my fellow Montanans about service.

In preparing to leave the Senate, I add my voice to the voices of many other departing Members who have called for a return to civility in Washington, DC. Politics today is too full of pettiness. Public servants—you and I, as well as those elected to serve in the next Congress—should set the standard with better words and better actions, but we should also lead from the front. I am not saying anything that hasn't already been said, but more of us need to say it. If we are lucky, which we are, we are even blessed to stand in this room and do what we do on behalf of our fellow citizens.

Everyone in this Chamber has a unique story about their roots and their path to public service. Mine began in Butte, MT. I was the son of a union pipefitter in a struggling blue-collar town, and my path led to the military. I enlisted out of high school in the Montana National Guard and soon found a career serving my neighbors and family.

The National Guard—the great citizen wing of our Armed Forces—was a home for me. Leading my fellow soldiers into combat in Iraq in 2004–2005 was a defining experience in my life. Overseeing two successful elections for the Iraqis added a new perspective to my view on democracy. Fighting insurgents drove home how fortunate we are to live in the United States of America and to enjoy the freedoms we often take for granted.

The men of Task Force GRIZ who unfortunately didn't come home with me and the men and women who came back with visible and invisible wounds have truly defined the cost of war for me, and they remind me every single day of the cost of public servants getting it wrong when it comes to our national defense. I have devoted much of my professional life since returning home to accounting for the true cost of war.

Today, from my perspective, the debts are stacked against the democratic process in America in many ways. There is too much money, too

much noise, and too little commitment to finding common ground. Anonymous money masquerading as free speech can poison campaigns. It silences the voices of the majority of American citizens. The concentration of wealth in fewer hands is bad for our society, just as the ability for a handful of the wealthy to carry the loudest megaphones in our elections is bad for our democracy. Elections are starting to look much like auctions. Dark money and circus politics shouldn't prevent the U.S. Senate from honorably living up to the power we have been given.

Growing up in a little house that shook twice a day from the dynamite blasts at the copper mine nearby, I never thought I would be involved in public service. I aspired to have a decent job. I aspired to get an education. I aspired to having the time to fish the lakes and streams I fished with my father. Just the normal stuff. And that normal stuff is what I think most Americans still want today and too often can't achieve.

Public service—becoming a soldier—was my ticket to a better life: a job and a college education. After only a small taste, I discovered that I loved public service. I loved being devoted to something bigger than myself.

We should all remember that Congress can always use more Americans from more walks of life who have discovered public service through unlikely means.

It is the privilege of my life to serve the people of Montana in the seat of Senators Lee Metcalf and Max Baucus. Lee, along with Mike Mansfield, was my Senator while I was growing up in Butte, MT. The great citizen conservationist Cecil Garland said:

It was typical of Lee to fight to give the little guy a voice in government decisions.

In my time in this Chamber, I have tried to follow Lee's example.

The people who need a voice in this Chamber are the ranchers and hardware store owners like Cecil in towns like Lincoln and Dillon. The person who needs a voice in this Chamber is the mother in Troy, MT, who became the primary bread winner when her husband lost his job cutting timber. The person who needs a voice here is the young woman in Shelby, MT, who has done everything right—studied hard and earned her degree—only to be squeezed by too much student debt and too few opportunities. The people who need voices are the servicemembers from Laurel and Great Falls, MT, who returned from the war in Afghanistan and Iraq with delayed onset PTSD and have fallen through the cracks at the VA. They are the entrepreneurs in Big Fork and Bozeman, MT, who have opened small distilleries and faced the tangle of redtape. They are the committed couples across Montana—your neighbors, my family, my friends—who are treated like second-class citizens because of whom they love.

So today I urge my colleagues to lend people like this in each of your States your voice as a Senator in this Chamber.

I am humbled by the number of challenges that face the next Congress. I urge my colleagues to continue to fight to protect Americans' civil liberties. I leave the Senate dismayed by the scope of government surveillance in our everyday life. Congress must always—and I emphasize always—protect the privacy of our citizens.

I remain deeply concerned about the National Security Agency's unconstitutional spying on Americans' communications, the secret backdoors into the Department of Commerce encryption standards, and the gag orders under the FBI national security letter program.

I urge my colleagues to continue fighting for rural America. We need stronger voting rights and more jobs in Indian Country to promote tribal sovereignty and prosperity. We need to keep our farm safety net strong and address brucellosis to protect the livestock industry. We need a stronger commitment to fund and reform the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program and its sister programs. Small county budgets, schools, and roads depend on them. These same rural communities need better management of our national forests—something Congress and the Forest Service need to focus on.

We need an honest conversation and urgent solutions to the incredible challenge posed by climate change. As I said earlier from this same podium, we cannot put our heads in the sand and continue with business as usual.

Members of Congress should be taking responsibility and upholding the oaths we all swore. We should agree with science—climate change is a clear enemy, and Congress must take steps to stop it.

The next Congress should be thoughtful about women and families—from health care decisions to paycheck fairness.

Finally, I implore all of Congress, all of you, to redouble your attention to the crisis of suicide among our veterans. Yesterday the House of Representatives passed the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act. That bill now sits before this body, and we have an opportunity to act. We have an opportunity to pass it. I mentioned the invisible wounds of war already, but if this country were losing 22 servicemembers a day on the battlefield, Americans would be on the streets protesting. Congress would be demanding action. But that is exactly the number of veterans who die by suicide each and every day from across our country. Veteran suicide is an urgent crisis facing our communities, and congressional action is long overdue.

I believe extending the eligibility for combat veterans at the VA is one es-

sential way to address delayed-onset PTSD and reduce the suicide rate among our veterans. This simple fix and other solutions that improve access to mental health for veterans should continue to be a top priority for the next Congress.

It is fitting that in the last days of the 113th Congress, the Senate is sending the President a bill that carries on the public lands legacy of Senators Lee Metcalf and Max Baucus and the thousands of Montanans who worked together to find common ground.

In the words of Randolph Jennings, Senator ROCKEFELLER's predecessor from West Virginia, Lee "was a tireless champion of preserving and protecting our nation's natural heritage for succeeding generations to use and enjoy."

After Lee's death, Max and the rest of the Montana delegation carried on his legacy by passing wilderness designations for the Absaroka-Beartooth, Great Bear, and the Lee Metcalf wilderness areas. In the same spirit, I am honored to join Senator JON TESTER and Senator-elect STEVE DAINES in carrying on their legacy by passing the North Fork Watershed Protection Act and the Rocky Mountain Front Heritage Act. We took a page from Montanans. We sat down together, and we worked out an agreement that protected almost 700,000 acres of the Crown of the Continent. This is how democracy should work.

Forty-two years after the first citizen-driven wilderness, this week Congress is expanding the Scapegoat and Bob Marshall Wilderness areas in Montana. Thirty-eight years after the Flathead River was protected from schemes to dam it and divert it, this week Congress is protecting the Flathead and Glacier National Park forever from efforts to mine it and drill it. Montanans came together. Farmers, ranchers, small business owners, conservationists, hunters, anglers—all worked together to find common ground. Montanans went there first, and their representatives in Congress followed.

When Congress rewards the work of citizens who collaborate, when we finally reach the critical mass in this Chamber to be responsive, that is the day we earn the title of "public servant." Montanans can be hopeful today that government by them and for them still works. They can still effect change. The Senate still listens and serves.

When President Eisenhower left office in 1961, Congress passed legislation at his request that restored his military title. He wanted to be remembered as a career soldier rather than the Commander in Chief.

My 33 years in uniform defined my life. I will always be a soldier. As a soldier, as a husband to my wonderful wife Janet, who has been my partner for 31 years, and as the proud dad of Michael and Taylor, as the father-in-

law to my wonderful daughter-in-law April, and as the grandfather of a little girl named Kennedy, who will inherit this great Nation, I will return to civilian life with great hope for the United States Senate and for the United States of America.

I, along with millions of others, will be watching closely and imploring Members in this Chamber to check politics at the door and instead focus on the future. Honor veterans and their families who sacrifice so much. Honor seniors who have heard promises from you. Honor the most vulnerable amongst us. They are who we always should fight for.

Madam President, I am forever grateful to have served the people of Montana in this building standing side by side with each and every one of you. God bless each and every one of you, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2015 AND 2016

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I am about to ask for unanimous consent to pass a substitute amendment to the Coast Guard bill. Senator VITTER and I hope to get into a bit of a colloquy over it, but first I want to explain what we are doing here.

The Coast Guard bill includes the text of S. 2963, a bill that I introduced to permanently eliminate the requirement that small fishing boats obtain a permit for discharges incidental to normal operation.

This is really important for our small boat fishermen. The bill has 14 cosponsors. I am very happy that Senator MURKOWSKI is now a cosponsor of that important legislation.

This substitute that is at the desk includes that permanent fix so that never again do small fishermen have to worry about being subjected to these permits.

It exempts commercial vessels less than 79 feet from having to get this discharge permit.

We first enacted a moratorium on permits in 2008. We have extended it twice. The current moratorium expires next week. If we don't act, these small vessels will require a permit for the first time. So instead of kicking the can down the road again with these moratoria, I think it is time to say, once and for all, these small vessels do not and will never need a permit. I

think a temporary moratorium leaves thousands of the boat operators and the fishermen in limbo instead of giving them permanent certainty.

They are different from large ships that discharge ballast water and introduce harmful invasive species into our coastal waters. That is why a broad array of groups, including the American Sport Fishing Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Marine Retailers Association of America, the National Marine Manufacturers Association, and many others, support this permanent exemption for our small boats.

I hope colleagues will support this, but I understand there is another proposal coming forward.

I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2444; the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the substitute amendment containing a permanent exemption for discharges from small commercial vessels and fishing vessels—and that is at the desk—be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read three times and passed; the title amendment be agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from California and want to work with her toward a common goal. In that spirit, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify her request and agree to the substitute amendment, which is also at the desk, which includes a 3-year extension of the vessel discharge moratorium.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from California so modify her request?

Mrs. BOXER. I reserve the right to object, but I do not intend to object.

I wish to say I am going to agree to this 3-year moratorium but I am a little stunned as to why we are doing this again. We could give these small boats a permanent exemption. It is an important economic issue.

I don't like this approach, but it is the best we can do. I want the American people and the fishermen to know we tried so hard to get this fixed permanently. But I am glad we have a 3-year moratorium. It is better than nothing, and I will therefore agree to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request, as modified?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment (No. 3997) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 2444), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title amendment (No. 3998) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I wish to weigh in on this issue, because it is a critically important issue for my State—for all coastal States, or any State that has commercial fishermen, as my colleague from California and as my colleague from Louisiana know.

I appreciate the fact that we have come to a place where we are going to save these small fishermen from the potential burden of reporting to EPA for any incidental discharge from their vessels for the next 3 years.

I need to acknowledge the good work of my friend from California. She has recognized that we began this years ago, back in 2008, when we had to work together at that time to get a short-term extension to ensure that our small-vessel owners would not be subjected to these EPA requirements that most people would say: What is this reporting all about?

For those who need a little more graphic detail as to what we are talking about, when you take a commercial fishing vessel out, a 45-foot commercial fishing vessel, and you have a good day fishing, there are some salmon guts on the deck, a little bit of slime, and you hose it off. That would be an incidental discharge that would be reportable to the EPA. And if you fail to report, you could be subject to civil penalties. That is not what we are talking about here.

I think it is important to note that we have two leaders here in the Senate who perhaps approach some of the EPA issues from a different angle. Senator BOXER has been a staunch advocate for making sure that when we are talking about clean air and clean water, we are complying with those regulations. Senator VITTER has also been a staunch advocate for making sure our small businesses, our jobs, and our economic opportunities aren't stymied by these regulations.

So the fact that we have two Members coming together to acknowledge we have to do something to ensure these regulations do not impede the ability of our small fishermen, of our commercial operators in the water—those vessels below 79 feet—that we are not harming them.

In my home State of Alaska, we are talking about 8,500 commercial fishermen who were most anxious that 8 days from now they were going to be put in a position where they were effectively

violating EPA regulations, subject to civil penalties, for the simple act of runoff off of their decks.

So I concur with Senator BOXER, this is something we don't need to be going from year to year to year to address. We don't need to inject this uncertainty into the operations of our hard-working fishing families. We need to have a permanent solution. I want to work with that permanent solution. Senator VITTER has clearly indicated he is willing to help us with that. Senator THUNE in Commerce has made that clear. We know we have to address the ballast issues. We will do that. And I am looking forward to being engaged with that in the 114th Congress.

But for now, I think it is critically important that consensus has been reached. I acknowledge the good work of both the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from California, and Senator THUNE, for getting us to this point where we can take the pressure off of our small commercial operators and ensure that they can do what they do so very well.

I look forward to the next Congress where we are making this permanent and, again, where we are dealing with so many of the other issues. But I thank my colleagues today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I want to make sure I thank Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator BEGICH. When I started this, Senator BEGICH was my first cosponsor and Senator MURKOWSKI made this bipartisan.

I think the important thing was that we could have done it permanently and I just don't want that lost. We could have done it permanently, and we didn't, and that is sad. There are reasons for that. I wasn't born yesterday, as most of you can tell.

I know why it wasn't done. People are going to use this as the little engine that could to drive some other stuff behind it which is not good stuff. I want to see that we can protect our small boats, and I am going to continue to do that. I hope we will work together as we move forward in this new Senate, run by—in the case of the committee I proudly chair—Senator INHOFE, who I think will be very good on this issue; Senator THUNE, who we know is good on this issue.

So we have the pieces in place. And whatever objections there were, I don't think they are really objections to the permanency, they are political objections to try and use this to get some other bad stuff attached to it, and I am not going to let that happen, let me tell you right now, no way, no how. So whatever someone has in their mind that they are going to connect to this little baby, it isn't going to happen, because we can't do that. We can't take one good thing and destroy it. I am not going to let that happen.

Right now we have a 3-year deal put in place. We can breathe easy. If I am someone contemplating buying a small boat, this is one less worry I have. I could have had it permanently; I have it for 3 years. It is too bad, but at least I have it, and that is good.

NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER ACT OF 2014

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 526, S. 2519.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2519) to codify an existing operations center for cybersecurity.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment, as follows:

(Insert the part printed in italic.)

S. 2519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 210G. OPERATIONS CENTER.

“(a) FUNCTIONS.—There is in the Department an operations center, which may carry out the responsibilities of the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H) with respect to security and resilience, including by—

“(1) serving as a Federal civilian information sharing interface for cybersecurity;

“(2) providing shared situational awareness to enable real-time, integrated, and operational actions across the Federal Government;

“(3) sharing cybersecurity threat, vulnerability, impact, and incident information and analysis by and among Federal, State, and local government entities and private sector entities;

“(4) coordinating cybersecurity information sharing throughout the Federal Government;

“(5) conducting analysis of cybersecurity risks and incidents;

“(6) upon request, providing timely technical assistance to Federal and non-Federal entities with respect to cybersecurity threats and attribution, vulnerability mitigation, and incident response and remediation; and

“(7) providing recommendations on security and resilience measures to Federal and non-Federal entities.

“(b) COMPOSITION.—The operations center shall be composed of—

“(1) personnel or other representatives of Federal agencies, including civilian and law

enforcement agencies and elements of the intelligence community, as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)); and

“(2) representatives from State and local governments and other non-Federal entities, including—

“(A) representatives from information sharing and analysis organizations; and

“(B) private sector owners and operators of critical information systems.

“(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center Act of 2014, and every year thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the operations center, which shall include—

“(1) an analysis of the performance of the operations center in carrying out the functions under subsection (a);

“(2) information on the composition of the center, including—

“(A) the number of representatives from non-Federal entities that are participating in the operations center, including the number of representatives from States, nonprofit organizations, and private sector entities, respectively; and

“(B) the number of requests from non-Federal entities to participate in the operations center and the response to such requests, including—

“(i) the average length of time to fulfill such identified requests by the Federal agency responsible for fulfilling such requests; and

“(ii) a description of any obstacles or challenges to fulfilling such requests; and

“(3) the policies and procedures established by the operations center to safeguard privacy and civil liberties.

“(d) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center Act of 2014, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the effectiveness of the operations center.

“(e) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—The provision of assistance or information to, and inclusion in the operations center of, governmental or private entities under this section shall be at the discretion of the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H). The provision of certain assistance or information to, or inclusion in the operations center of, one governmental or private entity pursuant to this section shall not create a right or benefit, substantive or procedural, to similar assistance or information for any other governmental or private entity.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 210F the following:

“Sec. 210G. Operations center.”.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “critical infrastructure” has the meaning given that term under section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101).

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to grant the Secretary of Homeland Security any authority to promulgate

regulations or set standards relating to the cybersecurity of private sector critical infrastructure that was not in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be withdrawn; the Carper substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time; and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 3999) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2519), as amended, was passed.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTECTING AND SECURING CHEMICAL FACILITIES FROM TERRORIST ATTACKS ACT OF 2014

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 578, H.R. 4007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4007) to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility and Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE XXI—CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS

“SEC. 2101. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title—

“(1) the term ‘CFATS regulation’ means—

“(A) an existing CFATs regulation; and
 “(B) any regulation or amendment to an existing CFATs regulation issued pursuant to the authority under section 2107;

“(2) the term ‘chemical facility of interest’ means a facility that—

“(A) holds, or that the Secretary has a reasonable basis to believe holds, a chemical of interest, as designated under Appendix A to part 27 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, at a threshold quantity set pursuant to relevant risk-related security principles; and

“(B) is not an excluded facility;

“(3) the term ‘covered chemical facility’ means a facility that—

“(A) the Secretary—

“(i) identifies as a chemical facility of interest; and

“(ii) based upon review of the facility’s Top-Screen, determines meets the risk criteria developed under section 2102(e)(2)(B); and

“(B) is not an excluded facility;

“(4) the term ‘excluded facility’ means—

“(A) a facility regulated under the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–295; 116 Stat. 2064);

“(B) a public water system, as that term is defined in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f);

“(C) a Treatment Works, as that term is defined in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292);

“(D) a facility owned or operated by the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy; or

“(E) a facility subject to regulation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or by a State that has entered into an agreement with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission under section 274 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2021(b)) to protect against unauthorized access of any material, activity, or structure licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;

“(5) the term ‘existing CFATs regulation’ means—

“(A) a regulation promulgated under section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109–295; 6 U.S.C. 121 note) that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014; and

“(B) a Federal Register notice or other published guidance relating to section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014;

“(6) the term ‘expedited approval facility’ means a covered chemical facility for which the owner or operator elects to submit a site security plan in accordance with section 2102(c)(4);

“(7) the term ‘facially deficient’, relating to a site security plan, means a site security plan that does not support a certification that the security measures in the plan address the security vulnerability assessment and the risk-based performance standards for security for the facility, based on a review of—

“(A) the facility’s site security plan;

“(B) the facility’s Top-Screen;

“(C) the facility’s security vulnerability assessment; or

“(D) any other information that—

“(i) the facility submits to the Department; or
 “(ii) the Department obtains from a public source or other source;

“(8) the term ‘guidance for expedited approval facilities’ means the guidance issued under section 2102(c)(4)(B)(i);

“(9) the term ‘risk assessment’ means the Secretary’s application of relevant risk criteria identified in section 2102(e)(2)(B);

“(10) the term ‘terrorist screening database’ means the terrorist screening database maintained by the Federal Government Terrorist Screening Center or its successor;

“(11) the term ‘tier’ has the meaning given the term in section 27.105 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto;

“(12) the terms ‘tiering’ and ‘tiering methodology’ mean the procedure by which the Secretary assigns a tier to each covered chemical facility based on the risk assessment for that covered chemical facility;

“(13) the term ‘Top-Screen’ has the meaning given the term in section 27.105 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto; and

“(14) the term ‘vulnerability assessment’ means the identification of weaknesses in the security of a chemical facility of interest.

“SEC. 2102. CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM.

“(a) PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is in the Department a Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program, the Secretary shall—

“(A) identify—

“(i) chemical facilities of interest; and

“(ii) covered chemical facilities;

“(B) require each chemical facility of interest to submit a Top-Screen and any other information the Secretary determines necessary to enable the Department to assess the security risks associated with the facility;

“(C) establish risk-based performance standards designed to address high levels of security risk at covered chemical facilities; and

“(D) require each covered chemical facility to—

“(i) submit a security vulnerability assessment; and

“(ii) develop, submit, and implement a site security plan.

“(b) SECURITY MEASURES.—A facility, in developing a site security plan as required under subsection (a), shall include security measures that, in combination, appropriately address the security vulnerability assessment and the risk-based performance standards for security for the facility.

“(c) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF SITE SECURITY PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) REVIEW.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Secretary shall review and approve or disapprove each site security plan submitted pursuant to subsection (a).

“(B) BASES FOR DISAPPROVAL.—The Secretary—

“(i) may not disapprove a site security plan based on the presence or absence of a particular security measure; and

“(ii) shall disapprove a site security plan if the plan fails to satisfy the risk-based performance standards established pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(C).

“(2) ALTERNATIVE SECURITY PROGRAMS.—

“(A) AUTHORITY TO APPROVE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may approve an alternative security program established by a private sector entity or a Federal, State, or local authority or under other applicable laws, if the Secretary determines that the requirements of the program meet the requirements under this section.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES.—If the requirements of an alternative security program do not meet the requirements under this section, the Secretary may recommend additional security measures to the program that will enable the Secretary to approve the program.

“(B) SATISFACTION OF SITE SECURITY PLAN REQUIREMENT.—A covered chemical facility may

satisfy the site security plan requirement under subsection (a) by adopting an alternative security program that the Secretary has—

“(i) reviewed and approved under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) determined to be appropriate for the operations and security concerns of the covered chemical facility.

“(3) SITE SECURITY PLAN ASSESSMENTS.—

“(A) RISK ASSESSMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—In approving or disapproving a site security plan under this subsection, the Secretary shall employ the risk assessment policies and procedures developed under this title.

“(B) PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANS.—In the case of a covered chemical facility for which the Secretary approved a site security plan before the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary may not require the facility to resubmit the site security plan solely by reason of the enactment of this title.

“(4) EXPEDITED APPROVAL PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A covered chemical facility assigned to tier 3 or 4 may meet the requirement to develop and submit a site security plan under subsection (a)(2)(D) by developing and submitting to the Secretary—

“(i) a site security plan and the certification described in subparagraph (C); or

“(ii) a site security plan in conformance with a template authorized under subparagraph (H).

“(B) GUIDANCE FOR EXPEDITED APPROVAL FACILITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall issue guidance for expedited approval facilities that identifies specific security measures that are sufficient to meet the risk-based performance standards.

“(ii) MATERIAL DEVIATION FROM GUIDANCE.—

If a security measure in the site security plan of an expedited approval facility materially deviates from a security measure in the guidance for expedited approval facilities, the site security plan shall include an explanation of how such security measure meets the risk-based performance standards.

“(iii) PROCESS.—In developing and issuing, or amending, the guidance for expedited approval facilities under this subparagraph and in collecting information from expedited approval facilities, the Secretary—

“(I) shall consult with—

“(aa) Sector Coordinating Councils established under sections 201 and 871(a); and

“(bb) appropriate labor organizations; and

“(II) shall not be subject to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, or section 2107(b) of this title.

“(C) CERTIFICATION.—The owner or operator of an expedited approval facility shall submit to the Secretary a certification, signed under penalty of perjury, that—

“(i) the owner or operator is familiar with the requirements of this title and part 27 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, and the site security plan being submitted;

“(ii) the site security plan includes the security measures required by subsection (b);

“(iii) the security measures in the site security plan do not materially deviate from the guidance for expedited approval facilities except where indicated in the site security plan;

“(II) any deviations from the guidance for expedited approval facilities in the site security plan meet the risk-based performance standards for the tier to which the facility is assigned; and

“(III) the owner or operator has provided an explanation of how the site security plan meets the risk-based performance standards for any material deviation;

“(iv) the owner or operator has visited, examined, documented, and verified that the expedited approval facility meets the criteria set forth in the site security plan;

“(v) the expedited approval facility has implemented all of the required performance measures outlined in the site security plan or set out planned measures that will be implemented within a reasonable time period stated in the site security plan;

“(vi) each individual responsible for implementing the site security plan is fully aware of the requirements relevant to the individual’s responsibility contained in the site security plan and is competent to carry out those requirements; and

“(vii) the owner or operator has committed, or, in the case of planned measures will commit, the necessary resources to fully implement the site security plan.

“(D) DEADLINE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date described in clause (ii), the owner or operator of an expedited approval facility shall submit to the Secretary the site security plan and the certification described in subparagraph (C).

“(ii) DATE.—The date described in this clause is—

“(I) for an expedited approval facility that was assigned to tier 3 or 4 under existing CFATS regulations before the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the date that is 210 days after the date of enactment of that Act; and

“(II) for any expedited approval facility not described in subclause (I), the later of—

“(aa) the date on which the expedited approval facility is assigned to tier 3 or 4 under subsection (e)(2)(A); or

“(bb) the date that is 210 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014.

“(iii) NOTICE.—An owner or operator of an expedited approval facility shall notify the Secretary of the intent of the owner or operator to certify the site security plan for the expedited approval facility not later than 30 days before the date on which the owner or operator submits the site security plan and certification described in subparagraph (C).

“(E) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For an expedited approval facility submitting a site security plan and certification in accordance with subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D)—

“(I) the expedited approval facility shall comply with all of the requirements of its site security plan; and

“(II) the Secretary—

“(aa) except as provided in subparagraph (G), may not disapprove the site security plan; and

“(bb) may audit and inspect the expedited approval facility under subsection (d) to verify compliance with its site security plan.

“(ii) NONCOMPLIANCE.—If the Secretary determines an expedited approval facility is not in compliance with the requirements of the site security plan or is otherwise in violation of this title, the Secretary may enforce compliance in accordance with section 2104.

“(F) AMENDMENTS TO SITE SECURITY PLAN.—

“(i) REQUIREMENT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If the owner or operator of an expedited approval facility amends a site security plan submitted under subparagraph (A), the owner or operator shall submit the amended site security plan and a certification relating to

the amended site security plan that contains the information described in subparagraph (C).

“(II) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of this clause, an amendment to a site security plan includes any technical amendment to the site security plan.

“(ii) AMENDMENT REQUIRED.—The owner or operator of an expedited approval facility shall amend the site security plan if—

“(I) there is a change in the design, construction, operation, or maintenance of the expedited approval facility that affects the site security plan;

“(II) the Secretary requires additional security measures or suspends a certification and recommends additional security measures under subparagraph (G); or

“(III) the owner or operator receives notice from the Secretary of a change in tiering under subsection (e)(3).

“(iii) DEADLINE.—An amended site security plan and certification shall be submitted under clause (i)—

“(I) in the case of a change in design, construction, operation, or maintenance of the expedited approval facility that affects the security plan, not later than 120 days after the date on which the change in design, construction, operation, or maintenance occurred;

“(II) in the case of the Secretary requiring additional security measures or suspending a certification and recommending additional security measures under subparagraph (G), not later than 120 days after the date on which the owner or operator receives notice of the requirement for additional security measures or suspension of the certification and recommendation of additional security measures; and

“(III) in the case of a change in tiering, not later than 120 days after the date on which the owner or operator receives notice under subsection (e)(3).

“(G) FACIALLY DEFICIENT SITE SECURITY PLANS.—

“(i) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E), the Secretary may suspend the authority of a covered chemical facility to certify a site security plan if the Secretary—

“(I) determines the certified site security plan or an amended site security plan is facially deficient; and

“(II) not later than 100 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the site security plan and certification, provides the covered chemical facility with written notification that the site security plan is facially deficient, including a clear explanation of each deficiency in the site security plan.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If, during or after a compliance inspection of an expedited approval facility, the Secretary determines that planned or implemented security measures in the site security plan of the facility are insufficient to meet the risk-based performance standards based on misrepresentation, omission, or an inadequate description of the site, the Secretary may—

“(aa) require additional security measures; or

“(bb) suspend the certification of the facility.

“(II) RECOMMENDATION OF ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES.—If the Secretary suspends the certification of an expedited approval facility under subclause (I), the Secretary shall—

“(aa) recommend specific additional security measures that, if made part of the site security plan by the facility, would enable the Secretary to approve the site security plan; and

“(bb) provide the facility an opportunity to submit a new or modified site security plan and certification under subparagraph (A).

“(III) SUBMISSION; REVIEW.—If an expedited approval facility determines to submit a new or modified site security plan and certification as authorized under subclause (II)(bb)—

“(aa) not later than 90 days after the date on which the facility receives recommendations under subclause (II)(aa), the facility shall submit the new or modified plan and certification; and

“(bb) not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the new or modified plan under item (aa), the Secretary shall review the plan and determine whether the plan is facially deficient.

“(IV) DETERMINATION NOT TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES.—

“(aa) REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATION.—If an expedited approval facility does not agree to include in its site security plan specific additional security measures recommended by the Secretary under subclause (II)(aa), or does not submit a new or modified site security plan in accordance with subclause (III), the Secretary may revoke the certification of the facility by issuing an order under section 2104(a)(1)(B).

“(bb) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—If the Secretary revokes the certification of an expedited approval facility under item (aa) by issuing an order under section 2104(a)(1)(B)—

“(AA) the order shall require the owner or operator of the facility to submit a site security plan or alternative security program for review by the Secretary review under subsection (c)(1); and

“(BB) the facility shall no longer be eligible to certify a site security plan under this paragraph.

“(V) FACIAL DEFICIENCY.—If the Secretary determines that a new or modified site security plan submitted by an expedited approval facility under subclause (III) is facially deficient—

“(aa) not later than 120 days after the date of the determination, the owner or operator of the facility shall submit a site security plan or alternative security program for review by the Secretary under subsection (c)(1); and

“(bb) the facility shall no longer be eligible to certify a site security plan under this paragraph.

“(H) TEMPLATES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may develop prescriptive site security plan templates with specific security measures to meet the risk-based performance standards under subsection (a)(2)(C) for adoption and certification by a covered chemical facility assigned to tier 3 or 4 in lieu of developing and certifying its own plan.

“(ii) PROCESS.—In developing and issuing, or amending, the site security plan templates under this subparagraph, issuing guidance for implementation of the templates, and in collecting information from expedited approval facilities, the Secretary—

“(I) shall consult with—

“(aa) Sector Coordinating Councils established under sections 201 and 871(a); and

“(bb) appropriate labor organizations; and

“(II) shall not be subject to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, or section 2107(b) of this title.

“(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to prevent a covered chemical facility from developing and certifying its own security plan in accordance with subparagraph (A).

“(I) EVALUATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall take any appropriate action necessary for a full evaluation of the expedited approval program authorized under this paragraph, including conducting an appropriate number of inspections, as authorized under subsection (d), of expedited approval facilities.

“(ii) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

“(I) any costs and efficiencies associated with the expedited approval program authorized under this paragraph;

“(II) the impact of the expedited approval program on the backlog for site security plan approval and authorization inspections;

“(III) an assessment of the ability of expedited approval facilities to submit facially sufficient site security plans;

“(IV) an assessment of any impact of the expedited approval program on the security of chemical facilities; and

“(V) a recommendation by the Secretary on the frequency of compliance inspections that may be required for expedited approval facilities.

“(d) **COMPLIANCE.**—

“(1) **AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS.**—

“(A) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘nondepartmental’—

“(I) with respect to personnel, means personnel that is not employed by the Department; and

“(II) with respect to an entity, means an entity that is not a component or other authority of the Department; and

“(ii) the term ‘nongovernmental’—

“(I) with respect to personnel, means personnel that is not employed by the Federal Government; and

“(II) with respect to an entity, means an entity that is not an agency, department, or other authority of the Federal Government.

“(B) **AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS.**—The Secretary shall conduct audits or inspections under this title using—

“(i) employees of the Department; or

“(ii) nondepartmental or nongovernmental personnel approved by the Secretary.

“(C) **SUPPORT PERSONNEL.**—The Secretary may use nongovernmental personnel to provide administrative and logistical services in support of audits and inspections under this title.

“(D) **REPORTING STRUCTURE.**—

“(i) **NONDEPARTMENTAL AND NONGOVERNMENTAL AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS.**—Any audit or inspection conducted by an individual employed by a nondepartmental or nongovernmental entity shall be assigned in coordination with a regional supervisor with responsibility for supervising inspectors within the Infrastructure Security Compliance Division of the Department for the region in which the audit or inspection is to be conducted.

“(ii) **REQUIREMENT TO REPORT.**—While an individual employed by a nondepartmental or nongovernmental entity is in the field conducting an audit or inspection under this subsection, the individual shall report to the regional supervisor with responsibility for supervising inspectors within the Infrastructure Security Compliance Division of the Department for the region in which the individual is operating.

“(iii) **APPROVAL.**—The authority to approve a site security plan under subsection (c) or determine if a covered chemical facility is in compliance with an approved site security plan shall be exercised solely by the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary within the Department.

“(E) **STANDARDS FOR AUDITORS AND INSPECTORS.**—The Secretary shall prescribe standards for the training and retraining of each individual used by the Department as an auditor or inspector, including each individual employed by the Department and all nondepartmental or nongovernmental personnel, including—

“(i) minimum training requirements for new auditors and inspectors;

“(ii) retraining requirements;

“(iii) minimum education and experience levels;

“(iv) the submission of information as required by the Secretary to enable determination of whether the auditor or inspector has a conflict of interest;

“(v) the proper certification or certifications necessary to handle chemical-terrorism vulnerability information (as defined in section 27.105 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto);

“(vi) the reporting of any issue of non-compliance with this section to the Secretary within 24 hours; and

“(vii) any additional qualifications for fitness of duty as the Secretary may require.

“(F) **CONDITIONS FOR NONGOVERNMENTAL AUDITORS AND INSPECTORS.**—If the Secretary arranges for an audit or inspection under subparagraph (B) to be carried out by a nongovernmental entity, the Secretary shall—

“(i) prescribe standards for the qualification of the individuals who carry out such audits and inspections that are commensurate with the standards for similar Government auditors or inspectors; and

“(ii) ensure that any duties carried out by a nongovernmental entity are not inherently governmental functions.

“(2) **PERSONNEL SURETY.**—

“(A) **PERSONNEL SURETY PROGRAM.**—For purposes of this title, the Secretary shall establish and carry out a Personnel Surety Program that—

“(i) does not require an owner or operator of a covered chemical facility that voluntarily participates in the program to submit information about an individual more than one time;

“(ii) provides a participating owner or operator of a covered chemical facility with relevant information about an individual based on vetting the individual against the terrorist screening database, to the extent that such feedback is necessary for the facility to be in compliance with regulations promulgated under this title; and

“(iii) provides redress to an individual—

“(I) whose information was vetted against the terrorist screening database under the program; and

“(II) who believes that the personally identifiable information submitted to the Department for such vetting by a covered chemical facility, or its designated representative, was inaccurate.

“(B) **PERSONNEL SURETY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.**—To the extent that a risk-based performance standard established under subsection (a) requires identifying individuals with ties to terrorism—

“(i) a covered chemical facility may satisfy its obligation under the standard by using any Federal screening program that periodically vets individuals against the terrorist screening database, or any successor program, including the Personnel Surety Program established under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) the Secretary may not require a covered chemical facility to submit any information about an individual unless the individual—

“(I) is to be vetted under the Personnel Surety Program; or

“(II) has been identified as presenting a terrorism security risk.

“(3) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall share with the owner or operator of a covered chemical facility any information that the owner or operator needs to comply with this section.

“(e) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.**—

“(1) **IDENTIFICATION OF CHEMICAL FACILITIES OF INTEREST.**—In carrying out this title, the Sec-

retary shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies, States and political subdivisions thereof, relevant business associations, and public and private labor organizations to identify all chemical facilities of interest.

“(2) **RISK ASSESSMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this title, the Secretary shall develop a security risk assessment approach and corresponding tiering methodology for covered chemical facilities that incorporates the relevant elements of risk, including threat, vulnerability, and consequence.

“(B) **CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SECURITY RISK.**—The criteria for determining the security risk of terrorism associated with a covered chemical facility shall take into account—

“(i) relevant threat information;

“(ii) potential economic consequences and the potential loss of human life in the event of the facility being subject to a terrorist attack, compromise, infiltration, or exploitation; and

“(iii) vulnerability of the facility to a terrorist attack, compromise, infiltration, or exploitation.

“(3) **CHANGES IN TIERING.**—

“(A) **MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.**—The Secretary shall document the basis for each instance in which—

“(i) tiering for a covered chemical facility is changed; or

“(ii) a covered chemical facility is determined to no longer be subject to the requirements under this title.

“(B) **REQUIRED INFORMATION.**—The records maintained under subparagraph (A) shall include information on whether and how the Secretary confirmed the information that was the basis for the change or determination described in subparagraph (A).

“(4) **SEMIANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORTING.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, and not less frequently than once every 6 months thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report that describes, for the period covered by the report—

“(A) the number of covered chemical facilities in the United States;

“(B) the average number of days spent reviewing site security or an alternative security program for a covered chemical facility prior to approval;

“(C) the number of covered chemical facilities inspected;

“(D) the average number of covered chemical facilities inspected per inspector; and

“(E) any other information that the Secretary determines will be helpful to Congress in evaluating the performance of the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

“SEC. 2103. PROTECTION AND SHARING OF INFORMATION.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, information developed under this title, including vulnerability assessments, site security plans, and other security related information, records, and documents shall be given protections from public disclosure consistent with the protection of similar information under section 70103(d) of title 46, United States Code.

“(b) **SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the sharing of information developed under this title, as the Secretary determines appropriate, with State and local government officials possessing a need to know and the necessary security clearances, including law enforcement officials and first responders, for the purpose of carrying out this title.

“(c) **SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH FIRST RESPONDERS.**—

“(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary shall provide to State, local, and regional fusion centers (as that term is defined in section 210A(f)(1)) and State and local government officials, as the Secretary determines appropriate, such information as is necessary to help ensure that first responders are properly prepared and provided with the situational awareness needed to respond to security incidents at covered chemical facilities.

“(2) **DISSEMINATION.**—The Secretary shall disseminate information under paragraph (1) through a medium or system determined by the Secretary to be appropriate to ensure the secure and expeditious dissemination of such information to necessary selected individuals.

“(d) **ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS.**—In any proceeding to enforce this section, vulnerability assessments, site security plans, and other information submitted to or obtained by the Secretary under this title, and related vulnerability or security information, shall be treated as if the information were classified information.

“(e) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code), section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’) shall not apply to information protected from public disclosure pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

“SEC. 2104. CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) **NOTICE OF NONCOMPLIANCE.**—

“(1) **NOTICE.**—If the Secretary determines that a covered chemical facility is not in compliance with this title, the Secretary shall—

“(A) provide the owner or operator of the facility with—

“(i) not later than 14 days after date on which the Secretary makes the determination, a written notification of noncompliance that includes a clear explanation of any deficiency in the security vulnerability assessment or site security plan; and

“(ii) an opportunity for consultation with the Secretary or the Secretary’s designee; and

“(B) issue to the owner or operator of the facility an order to comply with this title by a date specified by the Secretary in the order, which date shall be not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary issues the order.

“(2) **CONTINUED NONCOMPLIANCE.**—If an owner or operator continues to be in noncompliance with this title after the date specified in an order issued under paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary may enter an order in accordance with this section assessing a civil penalty, an order to cease operations, or both.

“(b) **CIVIL PENALTIES.**—

“(1) **VIOLATIONS OF ORDERS.**—Any person who violates an order issued under this title shall be liable for a civil penalty under section 70119(a) of title 46, United States Code.

“(2) **NON-REPORTING CHEMICAL FACILITIES OF INTEREST.**—Any owner of a chemical facility of interest who fails to comply with, or knowingly submits false information under, this title or the CFATS regulations shall be liable for a civil penalty under section 70119(a) of title 46, United States Code.

“(c) **EMERGENCY ORDERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding subsection (a) or any site security plan or alternative security program approved under this title, if the Secretary determines that there is a reasonable likelihood that a violation of this title or the CFATS regulations by a chemical facility could result in death, serious illness, severe personal injury, or substantial endangerment to the public, the Secretary may direct the facility, effective immediately or as soon as practicable, to—

“(A) cease some or all operations; or

“(B) implement appropriate emergency security measures.

“(2) **LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.**—The Secretary may not delegate the authority under paragraph (1) to any official other than the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate.

“(d) **RIGHT OF ACTION.**—Nothing in this title confers upon any person except the Secretary or his or her designee a right of action against an owner or operator of a covered chemical facility to enforce any provision of this title.

“SEC. 2105. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.

“(a) **PROCEDURE FOR REPORTING PROBLEMS.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF A REPORTING PROCEDURE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall establish, and provide information to the public regarding, a procedure under which any employee or contractor of a chemical facility may submit a report to the Secretary regarding problems, deficiencies, or vulnerabilities at a covered chemical facility that are associated with the risk of a chemical facility terrorist incident.

“(2) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—The Secretary shall keep confidential the identity of an individual who submits a report under paragraph (1) and any such report shall be treated as a record containing protected information to the extent that the report does not consist of publicly available information.

“(3) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT.**—If a report submitted under paragraph (1) identifies the individual making the report, the Secretary shall promptly respond to the individual directly and shall promptly acknowledge receipt of the report.

“(4) **STEPS TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS.**—The Secretary shall—

“(A) review and consider the information provided in any report submitted under paragraph (1); and

“(B) take appropriate steps under this title if necessary to address any substantiated problems, deficiencies, or vulnerabilities associated with the risk of a chemical facility terrorist incident identified in the report.

“(5) **RETALIATION PROHIBITED.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An owner or operator of a covered chemical facility or agent thereof may not discharge an employee or otherwise discriminate against an employee with respect to the compensation provided to, or terms, conditions, or privileges of the employment of, the employee because the employee (or an individual acting pursuant to a request of the employee) submitted a report under paragraph (1).

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—An employee shall not be entitled to the protections under this section if the employee—

“(i) knowingly and willfully makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or

“(ii) uses any false writing or document knowing the writing or document contains any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry.

“(b) **PROTECTED DISCLOSURES.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit the right of an individual to make any disclosure—

“(1) protected or authorized under section 2302(b)(8) or 7211 of title 5, United States Code;

“(2) protected under any other Federal or State law that shields the disclosing individual against retaliation or discrimination for having made the disclosure in the public interest; or

“(3) to the Special Counsel of an agency, the inspector general of an agency, or any other employee designated by the head of an agency to receive disclosures similar to the disclosures described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(c) **PUBLICATION OF RIGHTS.**—The Secretary, in partnership with industry associations and labor organizations, shall make publicly available both physically and online the rights that an individual who discloses information, including security-sensitive information, regarding problems, deficiencies, or vulnerabilities at a covered chemical facility would have under Federal whistleblower protection laws or this title.

“(d) **PROTECTED INFORMATION.**—All information contained in a report made under this subsection (a) shall be protected in accordance with section 2103.

“SEC. 2106. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

“(a) **OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to supersede, amend, alter, or affect any Federal law that regulates the manufacture, distribution in commerce, use, sale, other treatment, or disposal of chemical substances or mixtures.

“(b) **STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.**—This title shall not preclude or deny any right of any State or political subdivision thereof to adopt or enforce any regulation, requirement, or standard of performance with respect to chemical facility security that is more stringent than a regulation, requirement, or standard of performance issued under this section, or otherwise impair any right or jurisdiction of any State with respect to chemical facilities within that State, unless there is an actual conflict between this section and the law of that State.

“SEC. 2107. CFATS REGULATIONS.

“(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may, in accordance with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, promulgate regulations or amend existing CFATS regulations to implement the provisions under this title.

“(b) **EXISTING CFATS REGULATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 4(b) of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, each existing CFATS regulation shall remain in effect unless the Secretary amends, consolidates, or repeals the regulation.

“(2) **REPEAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall repeal any existing CFATS regulation that the Secretary determines is duplicative of, or conflicts with, this title.

“(c) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary shall exclusively rely upon authority provided under this title in—

“(1) determining compliance with this title;

“(2) identifying chemicals of interest; and

“(3) determining security risk associated with a chemical facility.

“SEC. 2108. SMALL COVERED CHEMICAL FACILITIES.

“(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term ‘small covered chemical facility’ means a covered chemical facility that—

“(1) has fewer than 100 employees employed at the covered chemical facility; and

“(2) is owned and operated by a small business concern (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)).

“(b) **ASSISTANCE TO FACILITIES.**—The Secretary may provide guidance and, as appropriate, tools, methodologies, or computer software, to assist small covered chemical facilities in developing the physical security, cybersecurity, recordkeeping, and reporting procedures required under this title.

“(c) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on best practices that may assist small covered chemical facilities in development of physical security best practices.

“SEC. 2109. OUTREACH TO CHEMICAL FACILITIES OF INTEREST.

“Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall establish an outreach implementation plan, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate Federal and State agencies, relevant business associations, and public and private labor organizations, to—

“(1) identify chemical facilities of interest; and

“(2) make available compliance assistance materials and information on education and training.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-196; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE XXI—CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS

“Sec. 2101. Definitions.

“Sec. 2102. Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

“Sec. 2103. Protection and sharing of information.

“Sec. 2104. Civil enforcement.

“Sec. 2105. Whistleblower protections.

“Sec. 2106. Relationship to other laws.

“Sec. 2107. CFATS regulations.

“Sec. 2108. Small covered chemical facilities.

“Sec. 2109. Outreach to chemical facilities of interest.”.

SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT; REPORTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program” means—

(A) the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards program initially authorized under section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109-295; 6 U.S.C. 121 note); and

(B) the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program subsequently authorized under section 2102(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2;

(2) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security; and

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) **THIRD-PARTY ASSESSMENT.**—Using amounts appropriated to the Department before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall commission a third-party study to assess vulnerabilities of covered chemical facilities, as defined in section 2101 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by section 2), to acts of terrorism.

(c) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program that includes—

(A) a certification by the Secretary that the Secretary has made significant progress in the identification of all chemical facilities of interest under section 2102(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, including—

(i) a description of the steps taken to achieve that progress and the metrics used to measure the progress;

(ii) information on whether facilities that submitted Top-Screens as a result of the identification of chemical facilities of interest were tiered and in what tiers those facilities were placed; and

(iii) an action plan to better identify chemical facilities of interest and bring those facilities into compliance with title XXI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2;

(B) a certification by the Secretary that the Secretary has developed a risk assessment approach and corresponding tiering methodology under section 2102(e)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2;

(C) an assessment by the Secretary of the implementation by the Department of the recommendations made by the Homeland Security Studies and Analysis Institute as outlined in the Institute’s Tiering Methodology Peer Review (Publication Number: RP12-22-02); and

(D) a description of best practices that may assist small covered chemical facilities, as defined in section 2108(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, in the development of physical security best practices.

(2) **ANNUAL GAO REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—During the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress an annual report that assesses the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(B) **INITIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the first report under subparagraph (A).

(C) **SECOND ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than one year from the date of the initial report required under subparagraph (B), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the second report under subparagraph (A), which shall include an assessment of the whistleblower protections provided under section 2105 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, and—

(i) describes the number and type of problems, deficiencies, and vulnerabilities with respect to which reports have been submitted under such section 2105;

(ii) evaluates the efforts of the Secretary in addressing the problems, deficiencies, and vulnerabilities described in subsection (a)(1) of such section 2105; and

(iii) evaluates the efforts of the Secretary to inform individuals of their rights, as required under subsection (c) of such section 2105.

(D) **THIRD ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Comptroller General submits the second report required under subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the third report under subparagraph (A), which shall include an assessment of—

(i) the expedited approval program authorized under section 2102(c)(4) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2; and

(ii) the report on the expedited approval program submitted by the Secretary under subparagraph (I)(ii) of such section 2102(c)(4).

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE; CONFORMING REPEAL.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **CONFORMING REPEAL.**—Section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109-295; 120 Stat. 1388), is repealed as of the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION.

The authority provided under title XXI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2(a), shall terminate on the date that is 4 years after the effective date of this Act.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered; the Carper-Coburn amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the committee substitute, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the

Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4000) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 4007), as amended, was passed.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIRDA ACT OF 2014

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2952 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2952) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that the Carper substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4001) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Cybersecurity Workforce Assessment Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Cybersecurity Category” means a position’s or incumbent’s primary work function involving cybersecurity, which is further defined by Specialty Area;

(2) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security;

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(4) the term "Specialty Area" means any of the common types of cybersecurity work as recognized by the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education's National Cybersecurity Workforce Framework report.

SEC. 3. CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGY.

(A) WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary shall assess the cybersecurity workforce of the Department.

(2) CONTENTS.—The assessment required under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum—

(A) an assessment of the readiness and capacity of the workforce of the Department to meet its cybersecurity mission;

(B) information on where cybersecurity workforce positions are located within the Department;

(C) information on which cybersecurity workforce positions are—

(i) performed by—

(I) permanent full-time equivalent employees of the Department, including, to the greatest extent practicable, demographic information about such employees;

(II) independent contractors; and

(III) individuals employed by other Federal agencies, including the National Security Agency; or

(ii) vacant; and

(D) information on—

(i) the percentage of individuals within each Cybersecurity Category and Specialty Area who received essential training to perform their jobs; and

(ii) in cases in which such essential training was not received, what challenges, if any, were encountered with respect to the provision of such essential training.

(b) WORKFORCE STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, develop a comprehensive workforce strategy to enhance the readiness, capacity, training, recruitment, and retention of the cybersecurity workforce of the Department; and

(B) maintain and, as necessary, update the comprehensive workforce strategy developed under subparagraph (A).

(2) CONTENTS.—The comprehensive workforce strategy developed under paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

(A) a multi-phased recruitment plan, including with respect to experienced professionals, members of disadvantaged or underserved communities, the unemployed, and veterans;

(B) a 5-year implementation plan;

(C) a 10-year projection of the cybersecurity workforce needs of the Department;

(D) any obstacle impeding the hiring and development of a cybersecurity workforce in the Department; and

(E) any gap in the existing cybersecurity workforce of the Department and a plan to fill any such gap.

(c) UPDATES.—The Secretary submit to the appropriate congressional committees annual updates on—

(1) the cybersecurity workforce assessment required under subsection (a); and

(2) the progress of the Secretary in carrying out the comprehensive workforce strategy required to be developed under subsection (b).

SEC. 4. CYBERSECURITY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional

committees a report on the feasibility, cost, and benefits of establishing a Cybersecurity Fellowship Program to offer a tuition payment plan for individuals pursuing undergraduate and doctoral degrees who agree to work for the Department for an agreed-upon period of time.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2952), as amended, was passed.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Carper title amendment be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The title amendment (No. 4002) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: "To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess the cybersecurity workforce of the Department of Homeland Security and develop a comprehensive workforce strategy, and for other purposes."

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014—Continued

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I will be brief, but I want to thank both Senators on the floor, Senators BOXER and VITTER, for working on this issue. It was critical for Alaska's fishermen and really for fishermen across the country. More importantly this will resolve the issue with the Coast Guard bill, which is critical to get done for many other reasons.

First, on the discharge issue, as stated earlier, this is an important waiver for our fishermen in Alaska. This will ensure that a regulation that wasn't going to have any positive impact with regards to what they were attempting to do but would have a negative impact in regards to our fishermen—giving them a 3-year waiver is exceptional because every year we would have a 1-year waiver. So a 3-year waiver is fantastic, but I agree with Senator BOXER that this should be permanent. I would like to watch from the outside in to see how this develops over the years.

The Coast Guard authorization bill was critical to get done. This has many important provisions. As the chair of the committee that dealt with the Coast Guard bill, not only this year but 2 years ago, we have been successful

now at least since I have been chair to ensure the bill passed by unanimous consent and not to have big fights over working out the differences. Again, I thank Senator VITTER for his effort, making sure we move forward on this piece of legislation.

The issue I want to highlight—and then I will close—is that the Coast Guard bill is not only important for our fishermen in Alaska, the 79 feet and under ships, but also many other things. It ensures additional resources for the Arctic and Antarctic and ensures ice-breaking capabilities, including extending the service life of the currently idled *Polar Sea*. It enhances vessel safety information regarding ice and weather conditions and improves the oil spill prevention and response capabilities. It also ensures availability of quality childcare for our Coast Guard personnel. We require Coast Guard personnel to go all over this country. Part of it is their families are obviously with them and making sure they have quality of life aspects that are important for us to continue to recruit and get the best of the best. It also creates educational and portable career opportunities for Active-Duty Coast Guard spouses and eases the transition for Coast Guard personnel into postservice life. It provides inflation adjustment for funding levels for something very important to us in Alaska, the Cook Inlet Regional Citizens Advisory Committee. This group of citizens is involved in ensuring that the community at Cook Inlet—there is a lot of oil activity and fishing activity and other types of activities that are in that region—and citizens are engaged in their input. It is not just industry, but it is industry and citizens working together. This ensures that their funding continues and is inflation adjusted for the future. That is important.

Lastly, a small item, but it allows the Commandant to issue leases on tidelands and submerged lands. That is important because there are parcels of property that the Coast Guard controls that are adjacent to communities, and we need to make sure that there is flexibility for them to do the work they need to do. This piece of legislation was cosponsored by Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senators THUNE, RUBIO, MARIA CANTWELL and many others. This truly is a bipartisan piece of legislation and an example of what we do best when we work together.

Imagine a piece of legislation such as this, an authorization legislation for one of our large agencies, the Coast Guard, now the second time happening without a big fight on the floor, without this back and forth between the House and Senate, but actually getting the work done so our Coast Guard personnel know they have a budget that improves upon their quality of life issues and in my case in Alaska, making sure the Arctic is taken care of. We

also increased and made sure the Coast Guard ongoing replacement programs are there, with \$1.5 billion to continue to increase and improve the Coast Guard programs for our country, which is also very important.

Again, I want to thank the body, thank the folks on both sides of the aisle. As chair of the committee, it was my honor to be able to move this forward, but also I want to give a special thanks to all my staff members who worked on this because without the Senate staff who participated in this work, we could not have gotten the work done. I appreciate that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Madam President. I rise today to express strong concern and opposition to President Obama's Executive amnesty, which I think is clearly, flat-out illegal and unconstitutional.

I announce that because of that I will be voting "no" on the confirmation of Loretta Lynch to become Attorney General—because she would directly help President Obama execute that illegal Executive amnesty, and she would be actively giving him legal cover, if you will—bad legal reasoning—used for PR purposes to further that illegal Executive order. I urge all my colleagues who share my concern about this illegal Executive amnesty to do the same.

I strongly oppose President Obama's recent action for two reasons. The first is I think it is a horrible policy that is going to take a desperate situation of illegal immigration into this country—a situation that has truly reached crisis proportions, including over the last several months with these new waves, for instance, of illegal minors—and make that desperate situation much worse.

Why do I say that? Well, it is common sense. If you take a big action that is going to reward folks who have participated in that illegal crossing, what do you think you are going to get—more of it or less of it? If you reward behavior, you are going to get more of it; if you punish or stop behavior, you will get less of it. So on policy grounds, this Executive action—this illegal Executive amnesty for about 5 million illegal aliens in our country—is going to reward that behavior and produce more of it.

As we have proved, we don't have adequate protections at the border—an adequate system of enforcement in place either at the border or just as importantly at the workplace. It is horrible policy that is going to make the situation worse.

But the second concern I have is much more fundamental, and it goes to the constitutional authority of the President and the fact that this is

clearly beyond his authority because he is acting contrary to statutory law. The Congress and the President have acted together in the past and laid out statutory law about immigration. This is clearly directly contrary to statutory law because the President through this Executive action is not simply saying: I am going to refuse to prosecute this case or that case or even a broad category of cases. He is going even further and saying: I am going to issue work permits to affirmatively say that these people can work legally in our country, to affirmatively say that employers can hire these people, even though that is directly contrary to all sorts of statutory law on the books now.

Every President in the United States has significant powers, obviously, and Presidents have the power to fill in the details of legislation when those details are not clear and when they need to do so to properly execute the law. But that is completely different from doing something contrary to statutory law, and that is what President Obama is doing here.

Several people directly involved in this—including the Supreme Court, including President Obama, ironically—have made this clear: The Supreme Court in the past has recognized that "over no conceivable subject is the power of Congress more complete" than over immigration. So the Supreme Court has said that in all subject matters of law across the board, immigration is squarely in the hands of Congress under the Constitution.

As I said, even more interesting, President Obama in the past, before this illegal Executive order, has said he doesn't have this power. He has repeatedly acknowledged that in the past before he took this action. He said: "This notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true."

Furthermore he said: "For me to simply, through Executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President."

That is what he said when he was defending not taking action before, and he was right. Now he has done exactly what he correctly said before he did not have the power to do.

As I suggested at the beginning of my remarks, the Attorney General is directly related to this immigration issue and this legal constitutional issue. The Attorney General is the top law enforcement officer of the United States. The Attorney General is the top legal expert for the President and for the Federal Government. So I think if we truly believe—as I do and as certainly my Republican colleagues and as several Democrats do, based on their public statements—that this Executive action is wrong, is unconstitutional, is illegal, then we should not confirm an Attorney General who is going to fur-

ther that illegal unconstitutional course of action. To me that is very straightforward. This is not just grabbing someone out of the blue. The Attorney General is directly—directly—related to these issues of the constitutional bounds of law, the constitutional lines between the executive and the legislative—and immigration enforcement. Based on that, I will vote no, and I will strongly push against the confirmation of Loretta Lynch as attorney general, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

If you believe that President Obama's actions are illegal or unconstitutional through executive amnesty, then I think you need to reach the same conclusion, but the attorney general is directly related to these issues of both immigration enforcement and the Constitution.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to ask a fundamental question: Who does Congress work for? Does it work for the millionaires, the billionaires, the giant companies with their armies of lobbyists and lawyers, or does it work for all the people?

People are frustrated with Congress and part of the reason, of course, is gridlock, but mostly it is because they see a Congress that works just fine for the big guys, but it won't lift a finger to help them. If big companies can deploy armies of lobbyists and lawyers to get the Congress to vote for special deals that benefit themselves, then we simply confirm the view of the American people that the system is rigged.

Now the House of Representatives is about to show us the worst of government for the rich and powerful. The House is about to vote on a budget deal—a deal negotiated behind closed doors—that slips in a provision that would let derivative traders on Wall Street gamble with taxpayer money and get bailed out by the government when their risky bets threaten to blow up our financial system. These are the same banks that nearly broke the economy in 2008 and destroyed millions of jobs, the same banks that got bailed out by taxpayers and are now raking in record profits, the same banks that are spending a whole lot of time and money trying to influence Congress to bend the rules in their favor.

You will hear a lot of folks say that the rule that will be repealed in the omnibus is technical and complicated and you shouldn't worry about it because smart people who know more than you do about financial issues say it is no big deal. Well, don't believe them. Actually, this rule is pretty simple. Here is what it is called—the rule

the House is about to repeal, and I am quoting from the text of Dodd-Frank, is entitled "Prohibition Against Federal Government Bailouts of Swaps Entities."

What does it do? The provision that is about to be repealed requires the banks to keep separate a key part of their risky Wall Street speculation so there is no government insurance for that part of their business. As the New York Times has explained, "the goal was to isolate risky trading and to prevent government bailouts" because these sorts of risky trades, called derivatives trades, were "a main culprit in the 2008 financial crisis."

We put these rules in place after the collapse of the financial system because we wanted to reduce the risk that reckless gambling on Wall Street could ever again threaten jobs and livelihoods on Main Street. We put this rule in place because people of all political persuasions were disgusted at the idea of future bailouts. And now, no debate, no discussion, Republicans in the House of Representatives are threatening to shut down the government if they don't get a chance to repeal it.

That raises a simple question: Why? If this rule brings more stability to our financial system and helps prevent future government bailouts, why in the world would anyone want to repeal it, let alone hold the entire government hostage in order to ram through this appeal? The reason, unfortunately, is simple—it is about money and power. Because while this legal change could pose serious risks to our entire economy, it will also make a lot of money for Wall Street banks.

According to Americans for Financial Reform, this change will be a huge boon to a handful of our biggest banks—Citigroup, J.P. Morgan, and Bank of America.

Wall Street spends a lot of time and money on Congress. Public Citizen and the Center for Responsive Politics found that in the runup to Dodd-Frank, the financial services sector employed 1,447 former Federal employees to carry out their lobbying efforts, including 73 former Members of Congress.

According to a report by the Institute for America's Future, by 2010, the six biggest banks and their trade associations employed 243 lobbyists who once worked in the Federal Government, including 33 who worked as chiefs of staff for Members of Congress and 54 who worked as staffers for the banking oversight committees in the House and Senate. That is a lot of former government employees and Senators and Congressmen pounding on Congress to make sure that the big banks get heard.

It is no surprise that the financial industry spent more than \$1 million a day lobbying Congress on financial reform, and that is a lot of money that

went to former elected officials and government employees. Now we see the fruits of those investments.

This provision is all about goosing the profits of the big banks. Wall Street is not subtle about this one. According to documents reviewed by the New York Times, the original bill that is being incorporated into the House spending legislation today was literally written by Citigroup lobbyists who "re-drafted" the legislation, "striking out certain phrases and inserting others." It has been opposed by current and former leaders of the FDIC, including Sheila Bair, a Republican who formerly chaired the agency, and Thomas Hoenig, the current vice chairman of the agency. For those who are keeping score, this is the agency that will be responsible for bailing out Wall Street when their risky bets go south.

I know that House and Senate negotiators from both parties have worked long and hard to come to an agreement on the omnibus spending legislation, and Senate leaders deserve great credit for preventing the House from carrying out some of their more aggressive fantasies about dismantling even more pieces of financial reform, but this provision goes too far. Citigroup is large and powerful, but it is a single, private company. It should not get to hold the entire government hostage to threaten a government shutdown in order to roll back important protections that keep our economy safe. This is a democracy, and the American people didn't elect us to stand up for Citigroup, they elected us to stand up for all the people.

I urge my colleagues in the House—particularly my Democratic colleagues whose votes are essential to moving this package forward—to withhold support from it until this risky giveaway is removed from the legislation. We all need to stand and fight this giveaway to the most powerful banks in this country.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise today to discuss an issue that I believe should be discussed and worked on so much more in Congress. It demands an urgency of action, a dedication, and a focus to address our shortfalls as a nation to live up to our ideals, liberty and justice for all. Equal justice under the law is written on the Supreme Court, and is a theme of our Nation.

It is the source of anguish that I believe is driving protests all over our country right now. From Ferguson to Staten Island, from New Jersey to Oakland, citizens of all races and all backgrounds—Americans are joining together to call for change, and to have this idea that our legal system really should be a justice system.

Now this is an anguish that is not simply the result and the reaction to specific incidents. Yes, there is much discussion about those specific incidents in places such as Staten Island, but it is a reflection of a deeper anguish, an unfinished American business that has lasted for decades.

I feel in my own personal life this sense of gratitude for my unique upbringing. As a young man in 1969, my parents literally had to get a white couple to pose as them to buy the house I grew up in in New Jersey. They literally had to go through the indignity of trying to break barriers of race to move into a town that was all white at the time.

I stand here to tell you I grew up in the greatest place. The citizens of Harrington Park, NJ, are why I am standing here right now. The love and caring that exists in my State is remarkable.

I am also here today because of a city that is a majority Black city, Newark, NJ, that embraced me as a young professional, and where I eventually became mayor.

Through my unique position, I have to say I am able to understand all corners of this country. In an intimate way, I see this anguish that I speak of with so many of my friends and colleagues. I heard it here in the Senate. I have had security guards pull me aside to talk to me about their anguish and frustrations about the criminal justice system. I have had the people who do the work in this body—those who clean our floors or tend to the needs of our Senators—and they feel this frustration about an American legal system that is falling short of American ideals and is not a justice system.

I saw it with my own parents who, with agony and pain, talked to me about not having a margin of error when it comes to dealing with police officers. They would coach me on how I should speak and talk and what I should do with my hands because of the fears they had of the treatment I might have that would be different than other Americans.

I stand today because this cannot simply be reduced to a racial issue. This is the larger questions of justice in our country. This calls to the consciousness of all Americans, and it is sourced by the realities we face in this country where we lead the globe in areas that no American who believes in freedom and liberty should want to lead.

We have had over the last decades of my lifetime an explosion in incarceration that belies the truth of who we are. This Nation has seen this country have an 800-percent increase in the Federal prison population over the last 30 years. Think about that—an 800-percent increase. We now have the very ignominious distinction on the globe for leading the planet Earth in a country

that incarcerates its own citizens. In fact, America is just 5 percent of the globe's population, but we have 25 percent of the world's imprisoned people, and I tell you that is not because Americans have a greater proclivity for criminality, it is because our legal system is not a justice system.

This overincarceration and overcriminality anguishes this Nation, aggravates divisions, undermines freedom and liberty and costs taxpayers so much more money. It is an unnecessary burden and expense that is a self-inflicted wound in this Nation that undermines our prosperity and our success. We spend \$¼ trillion a year locking people up, and the majority of those people are nonviolent offenders.

In fact, over the last decade, right now in America there are more people in prison for drug offenses than all of the people in prison in the 1970s. It is an extraordinary fact. Whether you are Black or White, if you get arrested and charged with a felony crime for doing some things that the last three Presidents of the United States admitted to doing, and then tried and convicted—I say “tried” with hesitancy because the majority of them are plea bargains. As the President knows, if you get convicted of that felony offense, the nondrug violent offense, the collateral consequences to your life are horrendous.

We now live in a nation where the collateral consequences are profound. We now know that time behind bars, even for these nonviolent offenders, reduces people's hourly wages by 11 percent, their annual employment by 9 weeks, their annual earnings by 40 percent. It has a powerful economic impact.

If a person is convicted for possession of controlled substances use, they become ineligible for so many benefits that we would often think we would want these very people to have. They can't get Federal education grants such as a Pell grant. They can't get loans or work assistance. They become ineligible for business licenses, outrageously so. A person convicted of a felony will be denied public housing, even the ability to visit their family in public housing. They could be kicked out of their current housing arrangements. Former inmates can't get jobs, shelter, or loans. They often feel that no option exists other than going back to that slippery slope toward more crime. That is for all the people within the criminal system.

But what is anguishing so many is the clear and undeniable applications of this criminal justice system and the applications of this legal system in unequal ways to different portions of our population.

In my life I have seen that firsthand—how the usage of drugs in different communities where there is no difference between Blacks and Whites

is treated differently based upon their race or their socioeconomic status.

Let me be clear. These issues are American issues, not simply race issues. They affect us all because we are a nation with a profound declaration of independence, but the truth of our country speaks also to an interdependence. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

I point out these facts to let you understand why we have to have such an urgency. African Americans and Whites have no difference in drug usage whatsoever, but an African American who chooses to use marijuana is 3.7 times more likely to be arrested for that usage than someone who is White.

In fact, between 2007 and 2009, drug sentences for African-American men were 13.1 percent longer than those for White men. Usage has no difference, but arrest rates are dramatically higher for African-American men. In fact, for all crimes, when you start breaking the actual data down, you see patterns of discriminatory impact that are unacceptable in a nation this great.

Even for police violence, we have to understand that today nearly 2.5 times more Whites are arrested than Blacks for crimes that are violent and nonviolent—2.5 times more arrests for Whites than Blacks, but somehow African Americans are 21 more times more likely to be shot dead by a police officer.

This is data that should not shock us along racial lines but shock us along American lines. We are the Nation of liberty and justice for all. We are the country of equal protection under the law. African Americans make up just 13 percent of our population but 40 percent of the prison population.

In New Jersey, African Americans are 13.7 percent of New Jersey's population but 62 percent of New Jersey's prison population. Much of that, as clearly the data shows, has come about through the persecution of the American drug policy that is applied to different groups and different effects. The reality for minorities is punishing. By the age of 23, 44 percent of Latino youth will be arrested. We know the sad reality that 1 in 3 black males born in America today can expect, if we make no changes, to be incarcerated at some point in their lives compared to 1 in 87 White males, ages 18 to 64, incarcerated, while 1 in every 12 Blacks is.

I struggled with these issues my whole life. As a mayor of a city constantly working to fight to protect citizens, I know how complicated these problems can be. My police department, ourselves, we dug into the data. We saw that our practices had to be changed, that we had to find better ways of keeping our community safe, but we also knew something deeper. I will never forget when I sat with the head of the FBI in Newark, and I asked him about the violent crime problem:

How are we going to solve this problem?

He looked at me and said: You don't understand, Mayor. We—meaning law enforcement—are not going to solve this problem. What has to be done are changes greater than this.

I watched how young kids get arrested for breaking the law, for smoking marijuana or being caught with possession. Teenagers find themselves—because they have marijuana on them of a certain amount and weight so the charges increase, to being in a school zone which is every place in many cities—now facing mandatory minimums of upwards of 5 years. These teenagers are scared, afraid, knowing they broke the law, but other folks like the last three Presidents have gotten away with it. They get offered it by the prosecutor, overworked, trying hard to serve the public and keep people safe. The prosecutor doesn't give them the mandatory minimum, they give them a deal: Just take time served or a month or 6 months, but they find themselves with a felony conviction. Now they find themselves in a world where they think they have no options. They can't get jobs. They can't get education grants. They can't get hope.

Hopelessness is a toxic state of being, and those kids then often get caught up again into the underground economy, back into the world of drugs.

What we saw in my time as mayor is that so many of the people who ultimately end up being violent criminals started as kids who felt all their options closed in on them because they got caught up in this world of drugs.

One of the worst collateral consequences of the way we are going about prosecuting our criminal legal system is the violence we are seeing from people who think they have no options but to do what they are doing.

I say this all to simply say we must find a way out. If we are America, a system that believes in elevating human potential and believes in ideas of liberty and freedom and deplores this concept that government should take people's liberty for no good means, we have to do something about this issue.

We who believe in freedom, who tell the world to look at our light and our torch and our promise, should evidence something better than leading the globe in incarcerating our own citizens. We, this country, where generation after generation has conquered discrimination against Irish, has conquered discrimination against Italians, has beat back discrimination against Catholics, has stood up to discrimination against Jews, has fought against Jim Crow and slavery; advancing not toward Black ideals or Jewish ideals or Irish ideals, but the common ideals that bind us as brothers and sisters of justice, of freedom, of equality—we

have to do better than lead the globe in incarceration, to have a legal system that subjects more of its people and minorities toward search and scrutiny than seizure and arrest. This we cannot tolerate.

Why I stand so confidently with a faith in my Nation that we can do better does not just stem from this hallowed history. It also stems from the President. Right now in America there are States doing incredible things, incredible things, to change away this reality.

I am proud of my State. We have gone far but not far enough. In New Jersey, between 1999 and 2012, we reduced our prison population 26 percent. Guess what. During that same period of time, New Jersey saw a 30-percent reduction in violent crime. We showed to America that we are better than this. We can give more liberty to people, lowering our prison population, having a disproportionate effect on minorities, and actually drive down crime as well.

We are not the only State. New York's prison population is down 24 percent from the late 1990s. This is due almost entirely to reforms of the Rockefeller drug laws, policies that sent thousands of people to prison often serving sentences for low-level crimes. Over that same period, New York reduced its crime by more than half, lowering prison populations, disproportionately affecting African Americans and Latinos and lowering crimes.

Texas reduced its prison population in 2013 dramatically and has seen decreases in both crime and recidivism rates. All of these States can do more, but why has the Federal Government done little to nothing to follow suit?

I am proud of what is going on in the Senate with many of my colleagues. I came and joined this body when people pulled together to begin legislation such as the Smarter Sentencing Act or, more recently, the REDEEM Act I did in partnership with RAND PAUL.

I am so proud that this issue cuts across political sides, that we have Democrats and Republicans, red States and blue States, all beginning to say we can do better. I am here today to end my remarks with that call to the consciousness of our country. If we have an injustice in our midst with a legal system that is so far away from the justice system to which we should aspire, we have to do better.

I was raised to believe that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. In the words of Langston Hughes: "There's a dream in this land with its back against the wall; to save the dream for one, we must save the dream for all."

I know in my heart that with anguish of millions of Americans being punished by a legal system that has gone way out of control, affecting Blacks and Whites, young people of all back-

grounds, a legal system that patently has a discriminatory impact on minorities, a legal system that steals the people's liberty, we can do better than this. We can save taxpayer money. We can lower our prison incarceration rates. We can elevate the promise of so many now denied their promise, and we can celebrate our American ideals. We need to lead this globe, not in incarceration, by telling the truth of who we are; that America is a land of freedom, of justice, where there truly is liberty and justice for all.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

EPA REGULATIONS

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about regulation today. We end this Congress failing once again for the Congress to take more responsibility for regulation. Items such as the REINS Act, which I have sponsored with Senator PAUL and others and which would require Members of Congress to vote on regulations that had significant economic impact did not get done.

A bill that I introduced with Senator KING from Maine that would create a regulatory review process that got great reviews in every economic and many other papers and magazines did not get done. But what I am seeing in Missouri and around the country is more and more concern that begins to focus on the Congress not doing what it needs to do to keep the regulators under control—legislation that would routinely put an end date on every regulation so that regulation has to be reviewed and regulation has to come up again and be looked at. Frankly, if you combined that with the requirement for the Senate and the House to vote on that regulation, it would be very unlikely that regulations that no longer made sense would be presented another time—having to look at this in a way that makes sense for our economy.

One of the generally used estimates is that \$2 trillion is spent every year in the United States complying with regulations. Well, let's assume that maybe as much as half of that—it could be more—is either duplicative or simply unnecessary. What would happen in our economy if we had \$1 trillion chasing the future rather than trying to needlessly comply with things that no longer make sense.

We have to take more responsibility for that because frankly there is no other way to get our hands on the regulators. The regulators are often out of control and almost always unaccountable. Frankly, they are more unaccountable in the second term of a President than they are in the first term because nobody in the chain of command ever has to go back and answer to the people we work for about the cost of these regulations.

I know in my State of Missouri, people are really concerned about a couple of regulations out there now that are dealing with energy policy and water policy, regulations the EPA has imposed that really do not make sense when you look at the cost of those regulations versus what would be gained by the regulations if they were even possible to comply with.

I think a clear message was sent in November to the next Congress that people want the government to be more responsive, that people want the government to—when you have a cost-benefit analysis of something the government has done, make it a realistic analysis, make it an analysis that would stand the straight-face test, when you say, oh, this is not the emotional cost of worrying about some societal problem that you really cannot quite define, this is what it really costs American families in terms of, for instance, their utility bill.

We look at these regulations that frankly go beyond the capacity of the regulators. I am not suggesting that the Congress is the right place to draft most regulations. I would say that the process of passing a law and saying that we want this agency to figure out how to implement the law is, in fact, the right way to do that. But I would also suggest that then that agency has to come back to the Congress and say: Here is the regulation that we think is the proper implementation. Now you have to vote yes or no. This regulation is the way to go forward with this law.

I think often the regulators now are well beyond what the law allows them to do. There is a case in point I am going to talk about in a minute, the water rule that is out there, where a navigable water was used as a definition of where the EPA had some jurisdiction. Well, I think their view right now is well beyond "navigable." So what would we do about that? There is the ENFORCE the Law Act that I introduced in the Senate and that the House passed months ago with a bipartisan vote, where the Congress would have standing in court to be able to go to court if either House of the Congress thought the President was not enforcing the law as intended, so that the Congress—which now cannot go to court and say that we want a third party to step in right now and define this principle—could go to court and say that we want to know right now what "navigable" meant in 1972 when it was put into law, in the early 1970s, what it meant in 1899 when it was used for the first time, and what it means today.

There is no reason to have a couple of years of trying to comply with a regulation when eventually the Supreme Court will say, as they did a handful of times last year, that the Federal Government does not have jurisdiction to do this or that people were appointed

illegally to a board or commission and that all of the actions they took had to be set aside. This is not a hypothetical case. This is what the Court decided just last year. The ENFORCE the Law Act would give us the capacity not to require a citizen to have to bear the burden of looking at a regulation that is outside the law or does not make sense and would allow the Congress to actually participate in that process at a much earlier time. So I hope in the next Congress we will do in the Senate what the House did and pass something like the ENFORCE the Law Act. I certainly intend to introduce that legislation again, put it on the President's desk, and have that discussion.

The administration recently took the opportunity to roll out a new rule on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. This was an estimate of—this was a rule on air matter, ozone. A new ozone rule came out the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. Believe me, if you have a rule that you think people are going to like, you do not put it out the Wednesday afternoon before Thanksgiving. This is like the—we always watch late Friday afternoon what comes out because that is what whoever is announcing it did not want to announce on Monday. Even a bigger day is the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. We have an air rule now that we have not achieved. We have made great strides in the right direction, but looking at where we are now on this rule and mercury in the air and the quality of the air, we would have to have at least 75- to 85-percent attainment in counties all over America before you could then raise the bar one more time.

This would take the 75-percent standard, or the 75 standard that we have now for particulate matter—the so-called MACT Standards—and reduce it even further. We are not in attainment with the first rule yet. In fact, the EPA just recently, years after the rule, put out the guidelines you would need that were helpful to try to achieve the rule. But as soon as you get the guidelines for the last rule, the EPA wants to say: Oh, here we want to talk about the next rule, even though we just now told you how to begin to think about complying with the last rule. Even though there are nonattainment areas all over the country, we want to move right beyond that and go to the next rule.

That is the kind of thing that should not be allowed to happen. People are still looking for good-paying jobs. They are still looking at a utility bill they want to make sense of. I hope the Congress can be a part of that. The EPA has another rule they have been asking for comment on, the so-called clean powerplant. Well now, who is opposed to that? Nobody. There is nobody who does not want clean power. In fact, the standards for utility powerplants have moved in a very positive direction in the last 10 years.

We have made great gains. The question is, are the next gains worth the economic cost, if the next gains are worth people having utility bills they cannot pay or if the next gains are worth people not having jobs they would otherwise have. That is a discussion we need to have. You know, the wrong utility policies produce an absolute lose-lose. A utility bill goes up, we lose jobs that we otherwise would have, and they go to places that care a whole lot less about what comes out of the smokestack than we do.

So the problem gets better, we lose jobs, and the country that has made the most positive strides in recent years is the country that pays the price for rules that no longer make sense. The rule that is out now—our State is largely coal dependent. We are the fifth most coal-dependent State. We are about 82-percent coal dependent. Of the 1 million comments that have been made on the rule, 305,000 of them came from Missouri families.

There are 1 million comments of people talking about why this rule does not make sense for them. We need to be sure that we do the things that not only meet the legal standard but also meet the commonsense standard as we move forward. The Wall Street Journal recently ran an op-ed—an opinion editorial piece—by Harvard Professor Laurence Tribe, who happened to be one of President Obama's law school professors and who is more often a witness for the left side of an argument than for the right side of an argument.

He joined the world's largest private coal company, Peabody Energy, to criticize the executive overreach in what the EPA is proposing as they propose to regulate carbon emissions from existing powerplants. There is a big difference if you have a rule that talks about what you do in the future for the utility companies than regulating what people have previously decided to do under the old rules.

There is a bill out there that I am a cosponsor of that really tries to use the great resource we have through coal in a most effective way. We do not produce any coal in Missouri any more, but we used to. We do not have any coal mines left in our State. But we have coal-fueled power plants. It is not really a war on coal as far as Missourians are concerned; it is a war on coal-fired plants.

If you built a plant under the old rules and, in fact, it has better air quality than any powerplant has ever had up until this time, as all of our recent plants have had, and you still have life in that plant, but the EPA comes in and says that now you have to meet a new standard with the plant you just built or you built 5 years ago, somebody has to pay that bill.

There is this mythical view that well, it is big industry or it is manufacturing. The most laughable of all is

that somehow the utility companies are going to pay the bill. The utility companies do not pay the bill. People that get a utility bill pay the bill. The people that are most impacted by that are the people who are having a hard time paying their utility bill now.

These are bad policies. I am committed that as a Congress we should do more than we have been doing to accept responsibility for these agencies we fund, for some overall law, that no matter how much they are abusing it by stretching it beyond what the Congress intended, the Congress would have passed—nobody is out there issuing a rule and saying: By the way, we do not have any legal authority to do this. So defining that authority, being sure the rules make sense is important.

On the power rule, on December 2 I filed comments urging that this rule be withdrawn and we think more carefully about the impact it has on jobs that have good take-home pay and about families who have a hard time paying their utility bill now—our retired individuals, our single moms or others who have a hard time paying their utility bill now. We need to continue to look at that.

One other rule I want to talk about, as my time comes to a conclusion here, is the so-called waters of the United States rule. The EPA was given the authority under the Clean Water Act, as I said earlier, to have some authority over navigable waters. Navigable water, beginning in the 1890s, was used in Federal law as a constitutional explanation of why the Federal Government would be involved in water policy, because the Federal Government under the Constitution is involved in commerce.

Navigable and commerce come together. Navigable actually means you can navigate with some sort of vessel that can carry a commercial load. Well, the EPA has now decided, or is in the process of proposing, at least, that navigable waters means any water that can run into any water that could run into any water that can be navigable. I am confident that is not what the Congress intended.

Now, if they want to propose that, that is fine. Through the President and the administration, the EPA can come to Congress and say: We think we ought to control all the water everywhere; let's have a debate about that. And the Congress would not give the EPA that authority.

I hope the next Congress sets as a priority taking responsibility for what the Federal Government does, taking responsibility for these regulators and regulations, being sure we have regulations where we need them that make sense, and that we push back and don't have regulations where all they do is hurt families, hurt jobs, and don't solve the bigger problem. I hope we see

that happen, and I hope the next Congress will be more focused on doing that job than this Congress was.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

(The remarks of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 596 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. I commend the work of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee—especially the chairman, Senator CARL LEVIN of Michigan—on reaching an agreement with the House to complete this important legislation.

It is also appropriate that this legislation be named in honor of both Senator CARL LEVIN and Congressman BUCK MCKEON, the chairmen of their respective committees who this year are retiring after extraordinary service and dedication to the Nation and particularly to the men and women of the armed services. It is another reason why this bill is particularly special—because it represents the culmination of the work of these two extraordinary gentlemen.

For over 50 consecutive years this Senate has passed a defense authorization bill. I hope we will be able to send the bill before us to the President for his signature. We owe it to our servicemembers to pass a law that will support them and enable the DOD to execute this year's budget efficiently and effectively.

This year, once again we have had to make very difficult decisions, especially because of the economic circumstances we face as a nation, the resources, and the threats which are challenging at this moment in our history. But this bill will allow the Department of Defense to combat these current threats, plan for future threats, and provide for the welfare of our brave servicemembers and their families.

While it is disappointing that we are not able to bring this bill to the floor for amendments in regular order because time really is running out, this is a very good bill which is based on the principle of compromise between many parties. It is critical at this moment that we pass it for the men and women in uniform for the United States.

I wish to point out a few highlights of the bill.

First, it authorizes a 1-percent across-the-board pay raise and reauthorizes over 30 types of bonuses and special pays for our men and women in uniform.

It includes numerous provisions that build on the reforms we passed last year to further strengthen and improve sexual assault prevention and response programs. It is unacceptable and it is completely antithetical to the ethic of the military that anyone in uniform would be a predator. To be a soldier, to be a marine, to be a sailor, to be an airman—it is about your subordinates, your comrades, helping them and sacrificing for them, not using them. So we can do more, and we must do more, but I am pleased to see that we have taken important steps and we are following through on these steps.

The legislation in general improves the ability of the Armed Forces to counter emerging and nontraditional threats, particularly cyber warfare. This is a new dimension of warfare. It is one we are coping with, but I don't think anyone should feel we have the technology, the techniques, the operations, and the insights to feel fully competent. This legislation will help us move in that direction.

The legislation also authorizes the full request of \$4.1 billion for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund to sustain the Afghan National Security Forces as the U.S. and coalition forces shift our mission to training, advising, and assisting these forces, letting them take the lead in combat operations. It is very essential.

It also authorizes several train-and-equip programs to assist foreign militaries conducting counterterrorism and counternarcotics operations. Of particular note are programs and resources that will go to Iraq and Syria, where we face serious challenges, where we have to provide the kind of support that is indicated in this legislation.

This year I once again had the honor of serving as the chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee alongside Senator JOHN MCCAIN, the ranking member. Our subcommittee focused on the needs of the Navy, Marine Corps, and strategic mobility forces. We put particular emphasis on supporting Marine and Navy forces engaged in combat operations, improving efficiencies, and applying the savings to higher priority programs. Specifically, the bill includes the required funding for two Virginia-class submarines and a moored training ship and approves other major shipbuilding programs, including funding for two DDG-51 destroyers, the aircraft carrier replacement program, and three littoral combat ship vessels, and it permits incremental funding for another amphibious transport dock ship.

I am particularly pleased about the funding for the Virginia-class sub-

marines and the DDG-1000 destroyers. So many Rhode Islanders build them, design them, and they are an incredible part of our national security. So we are reinforcing shipbuilding programs that are not only under budget and ahead of schedule but are vitally important to the security of the United States.

Along these same lines, I am pleased to note that the bill establishes the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund to provide resources and to manage the construction of the Ohio-class replacement ballistic missile submarine program. According to testimony provided to the Armed Services Committee, the Ohio-class replacement is the Navy's highest priority program. We are currently constructing attack submarines. These submarines are designed to go against other submarines, to deliver special operations troops, and to conduct fire missions from the sea.

The Ohio class will replace our ballistic missile submarines, which are part of our deterrence forces. These submarines have nuclear weapons and are part of our triad, our architecture to deter the use of nuclear weapons; we have to replace them. It cannot be done just with Navy resources because it is not just a Navy program, it is a national security program embracing our nuclear deterrence. This fund is a good starting point for that process, and I am very pleased to see it in the legislation.

Working together with Senator MCCAIN, particularly following Senator MCCAIN's lead, this bill increases accountability for the taxpayers' dollars spent on several major Navy programs. For example, the bill includes a provision to require the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to submit a report of the current LCS test and evaluation master plan for seaframes and mission modules. The report would provide an assessment of whether completion of the test and evaluation master plan will demonstrate operational effectiveness and operational suitability for both seaframes and each mission module.

This is a very important program. We want to make sure we get it right. We want to make sure we build in efficiencies where we can, and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation will help us do that.

The bill also includes language that will continue support of and advance planning for the refueling of the USS *George Washington* aircraft carrier and preclude the Navy from spending any funds to inactivate this ship. Again, this goes to the congressional mandate of having a specified number of aircraft carrier battle groups, and without refueling the *Washington*, we will not meet that legislative mandate. So we hope we will go forward this year and provide the requisite funding to complete the refueling, but at least we are moving in the right direction. I think that is important.

I particularly want to voice my thanks to Senator McCAIN and other members of the Seapower Subcommittee for their diligence, for their leadership, for their assistance in not only giving what our Navy and Marines need, but also making sure that the taxpayers are protected as best we can. And, frankly, we have to do more with respect to efficiencies, economies, and being wise in our allocation of resources.

Before I conclude with my remarks regarding the traditional defense programs, I want to touch on two other aspects of the legislation, one in particular with respect to the Defense act. I am pleased that it includes the HAVEN Act. This is bipartisan legislation that I introduced with Senator JOHANNIS to help more veterans with critical repairs and modifications for their homes so they are safer and more accessible.

This program is directed at our disabled and low income veterans. They find themselves out of the service, they have benefits, but they have needs to fix their homes and this program will help them do that. It establishes a competitive pilot program allowing nonprofit organizations throughout the country to apply for grants administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to help make key improvements to the houses of veterans with disabilities, or low-income veterans.

It is fitting we take this step to give back to those who have made a personal sacrifice for our Nation, and I am particularly delighted I was able to work with Senator JOHANNIS. As I noted in my remarks yesterday, he is retiring, but his decency, integrity, intelligence, and commitment to his constituents and also to the men and women of the Armed Forces will be missed here.

I am also glad that, on a topic not usually found in the defense authorization bill, we reached a bipartisan agreement on a package of public land bills, including two longstanding priorities for my State. For years, I have supported the preservation and renewed development of the Blackstone River Valley and have led the effort to designate parts of that area as a national park, which the bill before us will finally establish.

In 1793, Samuel Slater began the American industrial revolution in Rhode Island when he built his historic mill on the Blackstone River—really the first industrial-scale operation in the United States—and from that, much has ensued. Today, the mills and villages throughout what is now known as the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor in Rhode Island and Massachusetts stand as witness to this important era of our history.

Much credit has to go to Senator John H. Chafee, who picked up the ball

from those who preceded him. In fact, I was told last weekend that this attempt to get recognition goes back as far as a letter to Lady Bird Johnson in the 1960s, asking if she could help get land in the Blackstone Valley preserved. So it has been a long and winding road, and John Chafee was a key person in that process.

Creating a national historic park within the existing corridor would preserve the industrial, natural, and cultural heritage of the Blackstone Valley for future generations. It will improve the use and enjoyment of the natural resources, including outdoor education for young people; it will assist local communities while providing economic development opportunities; and it will increase the protection of the most important and nationally significant cultural and natural resource of the Blackstone River Valley.

I can recall last year inviting Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell to Rhode Island, and we kayaked along the Blackstone River. When I was young, in the 1950s and 1960s, the idea of going into the Blackstone River, which was then frankly an industrial waste zone, would have been ridiculous. Today, we not only use the Blackstone River for recreation but, with this national park designation, we will be able to do so much more.

The public lands package also includes legislation to authorize the National Park Service to look at another river system in Rhode Island and adjacent Connecticut—specifically rivers within the Wood-Pawcatuck Watershed—for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. These rivers are, again, so important to Rhode Island.

One of the things you discover as you go around Rhode Island, particularly after a storm when you can see the true power of these rivers, is that development during the industrial revolution was centered around rivers because water was a source of energy. As a result, many of our communities are clustered around the rivers and have great historic, cultural, recreational, and environmental value.

So let me thank not only my colleagues here but in the House, Congressmen DAVID CICILLINE and JIM LANGEVIN, for their great effort; also the Members of the Massachusetts delegation, because the Blackstone runs into Massachusetts; and I particularly want to thank SHELTON WHITEHOUSE, a stalwart when it comes to all these issues—anything to do with the environment, particularly Rhode Island's environment. His leadership and his support were absolutely critical in getting this measure today included in this bill. I would also like to thank the countless number of stakeholders in Rhode Island and Massachusetts who have tirelessly advocated for the preservation of the Blackstone River Valley all these years.

We have a good national defense authorization bill before the Senate, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it. I look forward to being able to witness, even remotely, the signing of the Levin-McKeon national defense authorization.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, earlier today the former Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, said there was a way to fix ObamaCare. She said: Change the name. She said: Change the name. That was her solution.

Now that is not something she just told a friend. It is something she told many, as she was participating in Politico's "Lessons From Leaders" events. Well, leaders don't blame the failure of a bad product on a name. You can blame it on a lot of things, but the name is not it. After all, the President said he was fond of the name ObamaCare. Apparently, Kathleen Sebelius is taking a page from the playbook of Professor Gruber about underestimating the intelligence of the American people.

This law isn't unpopular because it was named after the President. The law is unpopular because it doesn't work. It is unpopular because it doesn't deliver what the President promised the American people it would. So Democrats can rename this health care system whatever they want and people all across the country are still going to know that the law is failing them.

People have been hit by higher costs—higher copays, higher premiums, higher deductibles. Many of them can't continue to see the doctor who treated them in the past. So no matter what the Democrats and Kathleen Sebelius want to call it, the law remains very unpopular because it is unworkable and it is unaffordable.

As we head into the middle of December, next week, December 15, is the deadline for people to sign up on HealthCare.gov if they want to have their health insurance coverage starting next January—January 1—just a few weeks from now.

That is for people living in the 37 States that use the Federal health care exchange. A lot of people still haven't signed up, and they may learn over the next few days if they do go to the Web site to sign up that their health care and their insurance premiums are actually more expensive next year than they were this year. That is what people continue to see: Health care rates going up in spite of the President's promise.

When President Obama was selling his health care law to the American people, he promised them they would save money. He actually went so far as to say people would save \$2,500 per

year, per family, under his plan. And NANCY PELOSI, the former Speaker of the House, actually went on "Meet the Press" and at one point said: Everyone's rates would go down. Everyone's rates, she said, would go down.

Well, that didn't happen. Now the Obama administration finally admits that people are paying more, not less. Americans buying health insurance through the Federal exchange will see their premiums go up and the administration finally admits it. And that is according to a new report by the Department of Health and Human Services which came out last Thursday.

Democrats said prices would go down, the President promised they would go down, and NANCY PELOSI said they would go down for everyone. Instead, the prices keep going up.

Here is what one person in Syracuse, NY, wrote to his local newspaper last week. Lawrence Petty wrote to the Syracuse Post-Standard last Monday, December 1. He wrote that he has a plan he bought through the State ObamaCare exchange. This year, the cost was about \$664 a month for the couple. Next year, going on the exchange, the rate for the same plan—the same plan, because the President said if you like your plan you can keep it—the same plan is going up from \$664 a month to \$773 a month. That is over \$1,300 extra per year. Mr. Petty asked the newspaper in Syracuse, NY: "So what gives?"

The average increase across the country is less than that, but this man in Syracuse, NY, is looking at a price hike of more than 17 percent. Every Democrat in the Senate voted for the President's health care law—every one of them. The Democratic Senator from New York voted for the health care law—the very State where this man is writing to his newspaper in Syracuse, NY. What do they have to say to this man in Syracuse whose insurance premiums are going up 17 percent next year? How do they respond to this man who is writing to the paper in New York asking "what gives?"

Maybe his question has something to do with what the senior Senator from New York said a couple of weeks ago at the National Press Club, when he admitted that the health care law, in his words, "wasn't the change we were hired to make."

It is not just premiums. They are not the only problem here. The health care law has added so many Washington mandates, so many things people didn't want, can't afford, aren't interested in, don't need, that other costs have gone up as well. That includes the money people have to pay out of pocket for things such as copays, their deductibles. Some people have actually had to delay their medical care because of all these additional expenses. According to a new Gallup poll last month, 33 percent of Americans say

that over the past year they have put off getting medical treatment because of the cost.

Gallup has been asking this same question all the way since 2001, well before the health care law was passed. And this year it is the highest number ever. This is after the President's health care law has been signed into law and has taken effect and the exchanges are in effect—the highest number ever of people not getting care because of the cost.

Two-thirds of these people say they have put off treatment for a serious condition. One of them is a woman named Patricia Wanderlich. She is 61 years old, and she works part time at a landscaping company outside of Chicago, in the President's home State. She told the New York Times that she has a small brain aneurysm that needs monitoring.

She tells her story in an article the New York Times published on October 17 under the headline "Unable to Meet the Deductible Or the Doctor." Patricia has a health insurance plan through ObamaCare that has an annual deductible of \$6,000, so she has to pay for most of her medical expenses up to that amount. Because of that, she says she is skipping this year's brain scan and hoping for the best. She says: "A \$6,000 deductible—that's just staggering."

This is the kind of person ObamaCare was supposed to help. And changing the name of ObamaCare, as Kathleen Sebelius has recommended today, isn't going to solve the problems for this patient with the \$6,000 deductible. She got the insurance, she got the coverage, but she still cannot get care, and that is a fundamental problem with this health care law.

The other thing this New York Times article points out is that people can't meet their deductibles, and they also can't meet their doctor. Patricia told the newspaper that if she switches to a policy with a lower deductible next year, she will get a smaller network of doctors, which means she will lose access to the specialists taking care of her.

A lot of people are finding that they are in the same situation—losing access to their doctors. Sometimes it is because the insurance has these narrow networks of health care providers. Sometimes it is just because the doctors are so overburdened that you can't get an appointment.

There was an Associated Press report that came out over the weekend, the title was: "Health Law Impacts Primary Care Doc Shortage." We already knew there was a shortage of primary care doctors in the country, also a shortage of specialists, also a shortage of nurses. The President's health care law has made it worse.

The Associated Press article quoted an insurance agent in California named

Anthony Halby, who says he has clients tell him that their ObamaCare plan made it extremely difficult for them to find primary care doctors. As he says, "Coverage does not equal access."

He is advising his clients to skip ObamaCare next year and pay more for insurance with a broader network so they can at least see the doctors they want, the doctors they choose, the doctors they need.

He tells people:

The premiums are going to be higher because there's no subsidy. However, I'm going to guarantee you can [actually] keep your doctor.

So people are finding they are paying more, when they were promised by President Obama, by the Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI that they would pay less. But she is the same one who said: First you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it.

So people are having to put off care they need because Washington says they have to pay for things they don't want, they don't need, and they can't afford. People are finding out that coverage isn't the same as care, and millions of people are finding out they can't meet their deductible or their doctor.

That is not what the American people wanted from health care reform. People wanted access to the care they need, from a doctor they choose, at lower cost. That is what they wanted. Instead, what they got are all these new Washington mandates, all these new expenses, all these new problems.

What was the President's solution to that? He said: Put more people on Medicaid. He told Governors around the country to expand the Medicaid Program—make sure people have gotten on Medicaid.

We know that is a system that has been broken for a long time. The question we continue to ask is: Can somebody who has gotten a Medicaid card printed up and given to them or sent to them, can they actually see a doctor?

The Department of Health and Human Services says: Don't worry about that. What did the inspector general say this week? Yesterday in the New York Times: "Half of Doctors Listed as Serving Medicaid Patients Are Unavailable, Investigation Finds."

Who did the investigation? The inspector general of the Department of Health and Human Services. So even though Health and Human Services says all of these doctors are available to take care of Medicaid patients, their own inspector general of the Department says not true—not true. Only half of the doctors listed as serving Medicaid patients are available.

This is what we are dealing with. That is why Republicans are going to vote to repeal the entire health care law. Meanwhile, we will also vote to

strip away the worst and most destructive parts of the law: things such as the arbitrary 30-hour workweek which has been damaging to part-time workers across the country; things such as the unfair medical device tax that sends American jobs overseas, threatens life-saving innovation.

The Republicans are going to talk about finally giving people choices. That is what people want with health care. They want choices. They want availability. They want affordability. That is what they are looking for—available, affordable care and choices, not more Washington mandates—and, finally, giving access to the health care people wanted all along.

Kathleen Sebelius may come out and give a lecture on lessons of leadership. Changing the name of this health care law from ObamaCare to anything else isn't going to make it any better for the people across this country who are finding out that the President's promises were empty promises; that they have been intentionally deceived as to the way this health care law was presented and passed, and now they find out their insurance is less affordable, their costs of care are going up, the availability of that care is going down, and they have lost their choices.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the bill before the Senate today at once represents the best of our Nation and some of the worst of Washington. On the one hand, the primary purpose of the National Defense Authorization Act, or NDAA, represents the best of America. In past years it has been one of the few very consistently bipartisan pieces of legislation considered by the Senate, and it usually has been afforded lengthy debate and open and transparent amendment process on the floor. That is because it is one of the most important and solemn duties of Congress to provide for our national defense.

The United States of America has the best armed services the world has ever seen, not just because of what they do, but because of who they are: honest, courageous, selfless patriots who love our country and have dedicated themselves to protecting and defending our way of life.

Of all the bills that come before Congress, the NDAA deserves to be treated with the kind of integrity and respect with which our military personnel approach their jobs. And yet the process that has unfolded this year in connec-

tion with the NDAA has fallen far short of the standard that our armed personnel have set forth. Congress has waited until the last minute to conduct our most important business, using the holidays to fabricate a false sense of urgency. The Senate majority leader has refused to allow an open and transparent debate, shutting down our ability to offer amendments on the Senate floor to this important piece of legislation.

Finally, only a privileged few Members of Congress have a hand in drafting this bill, which was cobbled together with numerous extraneous provisions behind closed doors.

What used to be an exception to the typical legislative process, the typical legislative sausage making for which Washington has become famous, has been subsumed by the status quo, and it is exactly what is wrong with Washington today.

Each one of us as Members of Congress is here for just one reason: We have been elected to represent and serve the American people. Unfortunately, the twisted, tainted process that has produced this bill prevents all of us from carrying out this responsibility, and it threatens our obligation to do what is right for our men and women in uniform.

As the title suggests, the National Defense Authorization Act is supposed to be a relatively straightforward, largely noncontroversial bill. It is the primary legislative instrument for Congress to exercise its constitutional power granted in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution which is to provide for the common defense. But that is not what we are voting on today; that is not what we are considering in connection with this bill.

This bill, the NDAA for fiscal year 2015, is a legislative hodgepodge that includes those straightforward noncontroversial items that almost all of us support, but also numerous other provisions that are entirely unrelated to national defense.

Most egregiously, the drafters secretly added 68 unrelated bills pertaining to the use of Federal lands—the so-called lands package portion of this bill. They put that into this bill without any opportunity for debate or for a vote on any of those 68 independent bills. None of these bills were included in the version of the NDAA that the Senate Armed Services Committee debated and voted on in May of this year, because had any Member tried to include them in the normal process of our committee, they clearly would have been ruled out of the committee's jurisdiction.

Another outlier in this legislative grab bag is a provision reauthorizing a Defense Department program to train and equip “moderate” Syrian rebels for the next 2 years.

Now we have testimony from some of America's top military leaders warning

us of the immense risks involved in this program. They have told us there is no way to guarantee these efforts won't backfire, further embroiling the U.S. military in volatile and unpredictable parts of the world—in the Middle East, in conflicts in that part of the world. Yet here we are, forced to reauthorize this risky program in order to provide for our troops and the Defense Department.

The authority for this program was first added to the NDAA in the closed committee markup process in May and then later attached to the must-pass spending bill in September, giving Senators the all-or-nothing choice of either approving this controversial program or voting against all other government spending. This is not how Congress is supposed to work.

Congress is supposed to evaluate, debate, and amend individual pieces of legislation based on their own merits, with enough time to inform and educate the American people about what their representatives are doing. Instead, it is politics as usual in Washington. Rather than an open, transparent, and inclusive process, several extraneous and sometimes controversial provisions were added to the NDAA at the last minute by a select few operating entirely behind closed doors.

As we have come to expect from the outgoing majority in the Senate, once the bill appears from behind those closed doors, the American people are denied any real debate or even a chance to read, let alone understand, the bill.

This is a shame, because there are good bipartisan amendments out there, such as the Due Process Guarantee Act, an amendment that Senator FEINSTEIN and I attempted to offer for the Senate's consideration, which would improve the 2015 NDAA by prohibiting the indefinite detention of U.S. persons. Even though the Due Process Guarantee Act received 67 votes of support in the last Congress, it continues to be blocked by these privileged few who cobbled together this bill.

Now at the eleventh hour we are told we have to vote for everything in this legislative medley or vote for none of it. After deliberately allowing time to expire, up to the final moments before the holiday, the Senate majority leader has told the American people that the only way to support our soldiers is to support a distorted legislative process and controversial items that have never been debated in public. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, and others who serve us in the pursuit of our national security interests deserve better.

Many of my colleagues have said that this is a “must-pass” bill. I would put it slightly differently. I would say we must pass legislation without political

gimmicks or procedural games that enable men and women serving our Defense Department to fulfill their missions. We absolutely must pay our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, and authorize our national defense budget as a matter of constitutional responsibility, national security, and moral duty. We must do these things. But not like this. I fear that we in the Senate have perhaps become far too comfortable with the idea that the most important issues such as paying our troops, funding our Defense Department, sending our sons and daughters halfway around the world into harm's way—that it is somehow OK to bend the rules to a breaking point and we allow our colleagues to hijack funding for our men and women in uniform to pass their unrelated political priorities.

There is no doubt that it is easier this way—easier, that is, for Senators. It is easier to outsource our representative duties to a select few and to avoid debate on the tough topics that come up along the way. But that doesn't make it right. As our courageous servicemembers and their families know, easier is rarely best.

The rules governing how a bill becomes a law are not optional. They are not arbitrary, either. They exist for a good reason: to ensure that the will of the American people is heard and followed. If we fail to adhere to the rules, then we fail in the duties we were elected to carry out, and we fail to be a truly representative democracy. But these rules are not self-enforcing. Writing them down doesn't make them so. Unless we hold them true in our hearts and in our minds and in our actions, they will be nothing more than words on paper, mere parchment barriers, as James Madison put it.

If we as an institution can accept a legislative process driven by backroom deals rather than fair and inclusive debate when we are dealing with the most important issues, then when are we ever going to do things the right way?

We can do better. The American people and especially those serving in uniform deserve better; and as we saw in the recent elections, the American people demand we do better. I think we can and we must.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The majority whip.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, many people think that Congress is irrelevant, unimportant, and wastes time with the floor speeches that go nowhere. Yesterday on the floor of the Senate something historic occurred. Standing right back here, the senior Senator from California, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, delivered to Congress and to the Nation a report on the

use of torture by the United States of America. Seated on this side was Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER who, as the predecessor and chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, initiated this investigation into the use of torture. Her speech, which lasted about an hour, was followed by Senator JOHN MCCAIN, who stood up and applauded her for releasing this report.

It is worthy of note that what happened on the floor of this Senate yesterday was an assertion of constitutional principles that goes back to the founding of this country. It was an assertion of the three branches of government and their authority, and the authority of Congress to oversee the executive branch of government, and it got down to basics. Let's remember how we reached the point where this report was put together and delivered to the American people.

I will say at the outset that before I came to this job, I used to practice law and occasionally I would go into a courtroom. I really waited for that moment when I could turn to the jury and say: I want to let you know that my opponent in this case destroyed evidence, and I want to let you know why my opponent destroyed evidence—because what was in that evidence was so terrible they would rather leave it to your speculation of how bad it was than actually to let you read it. That is what started this debate which led to the report. What happened was the Central Intelligence Agency destroyed videotapes of the interrogation of prisoners. After it was discovered that they destroyed them, the Senate Intelligence Committee asked: Why did you destroy those videotapes? They said: Because Congress never asked for them. The Intelligence Committee said: We didn't know they existed.

At that point the Central Intelligence Agency said to the Senate Intelligence Committee: We did nothing wrong, and we invite you, through your staff and members of the committee, to review the cables and emails within the Central Intelligence Agency which prove our case. It proves we did nothing wrong.

I think the CIA was surprised and shocked when the Senate Intelligence Committee took up their invitation. It meant, I understand, 5 years of work. They reviewed some 6 million pages of information. Two staffers from the Senate Intelligence Committee sat in what they call the cave day after day after day, poring through emails and cables to try to reconstruct what happened after 9/11 when the Central Intelligence Agency was interrogating prisoners. It wasn't an easy task. It was made even more difficult when we came to learn that the Central Intelligence Agency hacked into the computers of the Senate Intelligence Committee. It was a tough confrontation between two branches of government,

and it is one that resulted, I think, in the right ending when Senator FEINSTEIN, and the Senate Intelligence Committee, following the lead of Senator ROCKEFELLER, stepped forward and produced this report.

I will reflect for a minute on how we reached this point, but first I will tell you that this report concluded that the CIA repeatedly misled senior officials in the Bush and Obama White Houses about detention and interrogation programs. The report said the CIA falsely told the Justice Department that techniques such as waterboarding helped to obtain lifesaving information that kept our country safe.

The report said the CIA detained more individuals and subjected more individuals to abusive interrogation techniques than it ever disclosed to Congress or the President. The CIA did not disclose the use of brutal interrogation techniques that went way beyond what even the torture memo of the previous administration had authorized.

It is worth noting what brought us to this point, and of course, it was the tragic, horrible events of September 11. After that occurrence, the Bush administration unilaterally decided to set aside treaties and laws that have served us in the past. President Bush's then-White House counsel, Alberto Gonzales, recommended to President Bush that the President ignore the requirements of the Geneva Conventions. The Geneva Conventions were treaties that grew out of World War II and established rules of warfare to protect soldiers and civilians. These treaties were ratified by the United States of America. They are and were the law of the land.

Colin Powell, who was Secretary of State under President Bush, objected to Alberto Gonzales's recommendation. He argued that we could comply with the Geneva Conventions, fight terrorism, and still keep America safe.

Here is what Secretary Powell said at the time about setting aside the Geneva Conventions. This "will reverse over a century of U.S. policy and practice . . . undermine the protections of the law of war for our own troops. . . . It will undermine public support among critical allies, making military cooperation more difficult to maintain."

Today, Secretary Powell's words seem prophetic. Unfortunately, President Bush rejected Secretary Powell's advice and instead followed Alberto Gonzales's recommendations to set aside the Geneva Conventions.

Then in August 2002, the Department of Justice issued the infamous torture memo. The memo said abuse only rises to the level of torture if it causes pain equivalent to organ failure or death. The memo also concluded the President has the authority to order the use of torture even though that torture would be a crime under U.S. law.

The Justice Department of the United States also signed off on the use of torture techniques such as waterboarding. This was in August of 2002. Thanks to the Intelligence Committee report, we now know that the Justice Department's legal advice was based on false information given to them by the CIA.

I have a long history with this issue. It was almost 10 years ago that I stood at this very desk and read into the RECORD a graphic description of an FBI agent's record of abuse of interrogation that she witnessed at Guantanamo Bay. At the time I was criticized by members of the Bush-Cheney administration, but we now know that the description by this FBI agent was accurate, and what she described was authorized by the Bush administration based on false information provided by the CIA.

It was 10 years ago when I first authored legislation to ban cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment of detainees. In June of 2004 America was shocked by the revelations about what had occurred at Abu Ghraib prison. The Bush administration told us these were rogue actions of a few bad players. I introduced my torture legislation in 2004. I wanted to make it clear that America condemned the abuses at Abu Ghraib and stood by our commitment to the humane treatment of prisoners. But what we didn't know was that the administration had approved the use of abusive interrogation techniques in CIA facilities and at Guantanamo Bay. A Defense Department investigation later concluded that these techniques migrated to Abu Ghraib.

I offered my legislation as an amendment to the defense authorization bill. I expected it to be noncontroversial. It was adopted unanimously here in the Senate; however, the Bush administration had it removed in conference.

In the fall of 2004, I tried again. I offered the same amendment to the 9/11 commission intelligence reform legislation. Again, my amendment was adopted unanimously by the Senate, and again in conference negotiations the Bush administration removed it. I didn't understand their opposition to my amendment because the United States ratified the torture convention, a treaty that prohibits cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment, the same thing my amendment said.

A few months later, I had an opportunity to get to the bottom of this. Alberto Gonzales, President Bush's White House counsel, was nominated to be Attorney General. During his confirmation hearings in January 2005, Mr. Gonzales told me the administration believed they had legal authority to subject detainees to cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment. That was the first time that a Bush administration official had acknowledged this legal loophole. The Washington Post called

that testimony "a gross distortion of the law" and cited it as a key reason for opposing the Gonzales nomination to be Attorney General.

After this revelation, Senator MCCAIN asked me if he could take the lead on legislation that I had written to ban cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment. I agreed. There was no better person than JOHN MCCAIN, who in service to the United States of America was a prisoner of war in Vietnam for more than 5 years. He had been subjected to torture because of his service on behalf of our Nation. It became known as the McCain torture amendment. Despite a veto threat from President Bush, the Senate passed the McCain torture amendment in December of 2005 by an overwhelming bipartisan 90-to-9 vote. When the President signed the amendment into law, he issued a signing statement reserving the right to ignore it if he chose.

In June 2006, in the Hamdan decision, the Supreme Court held that the administration was required to follow the Geneva Conventions in its treatment of detainees. The Court took the same position as Secretary Colin Powell had argued years before when President Bush had first decided to disregard the Geneva Conventions.

In September 2006 President Bush publicly acknowledged the CIA detention and interrogation program for the very first time.

In July 2007 President Bush signed an Executive order stating the CIA's detention and interrogation program "fully complies with the obligations of the United States" under the Geneva Conventions and authorizing the use of certain interrogation techniques. Again, the administration twisted the law to justify the use of abusive tactics based on false information provided by the CIA.

In October 2007 the Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings on the nomination of Michael Mukasey to be Attorney General. The hearings were going smoothly until I asked Mr. Mukasey to condemn waterboarding as torture. He refused. That became the focal point of the debate on his confirmation.

On December 6, 2007, the New York Times reported that in November 2005 the CIA had destroyed videotapes showing the CIA's use of abusive interrogation techniques. The next day I sent a letter to Attorney General Mukasey asking the Justice Department to open a criminal investigation into the destruction of CIA interrogation video evidence. I was the only Member of Congress to call for that investigation. In January the Attorney General opened the investigation. The CIA's destruction of these videotapes is what led to this Intelligence Committee report.

Then-CIA Director Hayden suggested that the Intelligence Committee staff

review the operational cables and emails. The Intelligence Committee study was authorized by an overwhelming 14-to-1 bipartisan vote after the SSCI, the Select Committee on Intelligence, found that the cables detailed detention conditions and interrogations far worse than what the CIA had previously described to the committee.

The investigation led to the production of a report that is more than 6,700 pages long, including nearly 38,000 footnotes. It is based on a review of more than 6 million pages of CIA records.

In December 2012 the Intelligence Committee approved this report with a 9-to-6 bipartisan vote. Two months later, in February 2013, I received a briefing on this report before it was redacted. I was so disturbed by what I heard that I personally spoke with the President, then-Secretary of Defense Panetta, and John Brennan, to urge each of them to do everything possible to be briefed on its findings and support its declassification.

In March 2014 I sent a letter to CIA Director Brennan raising serious concerns about the CIA's hacking of Senate Select Committee on Intelligence computers and again urging declassification of the report.

In April 2014 the Intelligence Committee approved the declassification and the public release by an 11-to-3 bipartisan vote.

It is critically important that this has been declassified so the American people can understand what has been done in their name. It was inconsistent with American values. It didn't make us safer, and it must never be repeated again.

Yesterday Senator MCCAIN came to the floor to support Senator FEINSTEIN's disclosure. During the course of his statement on the floor, he said: Our enemies are acting without conscience. America cannot act without conscience. We are called to a higher standard than some because we believe in basic human values and in basic principles, and it may mean that some of the tactics used by our worst enemies are out of bounds for us, as they should be.

What happened with this disclosure is an important reaffirmation of our separation of powers and our constitutional responsibility.

I wish to congratulate Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator ROCKEFELLER, and every member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, but particularly those who voted to go forward time and time again. They were under immense pressure not to do so.

The fact they have held the CIA accountable to the American people, to Congress, and to the President is part of our constitutional responsibility. It reminds people that in a democracy the people govern and the people have a right to know what this government is doing in their name.

There has been a lot of debate since the release of this report, and I assume it will continue. But if it ends with the report in the press, we have not done enough. We have to reform our processes, and let me start with Congress.

I served on the Senate Intelligence Committee for 4 years. It was a daunting assignment. Virtually every hearing is behind closed doors and classified. No one knows here even at the Select Committee on Intelligence unless you tell them afterwards. Testimony before us isn't available to the public. Most of the time, the professionals from the intelligence agencies come before us and speak in the acronyms of their agencies to the point you can't even follow what they are saying. It took me 2 years of sitting there puzzling over what they were saying to finally get an insight into what the committee and its responsibility were all about. That is not right.

We need to make sure that congressional oversight of our intelligence function is up to the job and up to the Constitution. That means more resources put in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. When I served, members of the committee shared a staffer. We each shared a staffer. We didn't even have one staff person working for each of us on these subjects. The amount of money that is being spent, tens of millions of dollars in covert activities and the like, needs to be carefully monitored. As the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I have that responsibility to look at the overall budget on intelligence. There is not enough oversight. We need to make certain that our branch of government is up to that challenge so we can guarantee to the American people that we are doing our job, so that we can be held accountable as we hold the intelligence agencies accountable as well.

I think what happened yesterday is going to be part of the history of the Senate, an important, positive part. I hope it is just the beginning where both political parties come together and accept their constitutional responsibility.

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING SENATORS

Mr. DURBIN. I have some tributes here for my colleagues who are retiring, leaving the Senate. It is a lengthy list of tributes.

TOM HARKIN

To Senator TOM HARKIN, neighboring State of Iowa, whom I worked with over many years on so many important topics, I want to salute him for his service. The highlights of his service include the Americans With Disabilities Act and, of course, the Affordable Care Act. His work on education and medical research is legendary. There was a time when TOM HARKIN and Arlen Specter, Republican of Pennsylvania at that time, set out to double the medical research budget at the National In-

stitutes of Health and they did it. Lives have been saved, people have been spared suffering because they had the political determination and courage to achieve it. I am going to miss TOM HARKIN.

I have served in Congress for a number of years and I have heard an awful lot of speeches. One of the most powerful speeches I ever witnessed in this Senate was delivered by TOM HARKIN in 1990. He gave his speech without uttering a single word. He delivered it entirely in American Sign Language—a language he knows from years of communicating with his brother Frank, who was deaf. In that historic speech in sign language—a first for this body—TOM HARKIN was urging the United States Senate to pass the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The ADA is one of the great civil rights laws of the 20th century. It is often called “the Emancipation Proclamation for Americans with disabilities.” It is a landmark achievement in America's ongoing efforts to create a more perfect union. No one worked harder for its passage than the senior Senator from Iowa, TOM HARKIN. He is often and rightly referred to as “the father of the ADA.”

That speech in 1990 was unique in its use of sign language. In another way, however, it was like nearly every speech TOM HARKIN has given because he was speaking for people whose voices too often are not heard in Congress.

In his 40 years in Congress, TOM HARKIN has been a passionate, often fiery and relentless voice for good people who have often been dealt a bad hand by life. He has been a champion for men like his father, a coal miner with black lung disease, and others who desperately need health care. He has been a champion for people with disabilities—in America and around the world. He has been a champion of children in foreign lands who are trapped in the worst forms of forced labor.

TOM HARKIN has been a champion of working men and women in this country—and of their constitutionally protected right to organize and bargain for decent pay and safe working conditions.

TOM HARKIN has been a leader in safeguarding Medicare and Social Security, and moving people from welfare to work.

The senior Senator from Iowa and I were both very lucky. We are first-generation Americans. Senator HARKIN's mother came to this country from Slovenia; my mother came from Lithuania.

He knows from his own family's experience the love and gratitude that so many immigrants feel for the freedoms and opportunities America has given them and their children. So he has fought for immigration laws that protect America's security at the same

time they honor our heritage as a nation of immigrants.

I want him to know that we will continue our efforts to pass such laws until we succeed—just as we will continue to push for adoption by this Senate of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities until we pass that important treaty.

As are so many others, TOM HARKIN was inspired to public service by the example of President John Kennedy. After working his way through college, Senator HARKIN spent 5 years as a Navy pilot in the 1960s. He had applied to become a pilot for a commercial airline when he received a more compelling offer. In 1969, an Iowa Congressman invited TOM HARKIN to join his Washington, DC staff. He said yes. He also used his GI Bill benefits to earn a law degree from Catholic University.

TOM went back home to Iowa—and then he returned to Washington in 1974, not as a staffer, but as a Member of the House of Representatives. A decade later, Iowa voters elected him to the U.S. Senate. And in 1990 he became the first Democrat ever to be re-elected to the U.S. Senate by Iowa voters. They must have thought that was a good idea because they re-elected him three more times after that.

Today, 40 years after his first election, TOM HARKIN is grayer and wiser. But he has never forgotten where he came from. He is a proud Midwestern progressive who has never forgotten the hope and dignity that smart, compassionate government gave his family when they needed it. And he has never tired of working to make sure that other families have the same chances his family had.

I wish TOM and Ruth, their daughters and grandchildren all the best.

TOM HARKIN leaves a legacy of achievement and compassion. I will miss his presence in this Senate but he and Ruth will always be a part of our Senate family.

KAY HAGAN

KAY HAGAN, my colleague from North Carolina, has done an amazing job. In her one term in the Senate, she really made a name for herself when it came to public service. She stepped up time and again and took tough votes. I know it because as whip I asked her to take on some important issues that would make this a better and stronger nation.

When KAY entered the Senate in those perilous days, America was in crisis. The economy was in freefall. Millions had lost their homes to foreclosure. America was fighting two wars—and though our military is the finest in the world, many of its members were exhausted from multiple deployments.

Six years later, we have made progress in all of these areas. Historians will record that Senator KAY HAGAN helped to make America stronger and better.

Senator KAY HAGAN comes from a family that knows a great deal about serving and sacrificing for America. Her maternal uncle, Lawton Chiles, was a Korean War veteran who represented Florida in the U.S. House and Senate and served as Florida's governor. Her father-in-law was a two-star Marine general, her brother and father both served in the Navy, and her husband is a Vietnam veteran who used the GI Bill to help pay for law school.

Senator HAGAN first learned the ups-and-downs of Congress—literally—by operating the Senators-only elevator while interning for her uncle.

Senator HAGAN is a former ballet dancer—a discipline that demands great discipline and hard work. As a Senator, she has used those same qualities to benefit her State and our Nation.

She served 10 years in the North Carolina State Senate and in those 10 years, she earned a reputation as a commonsense hard-worker interested in results, not partisan fighting. As co-chair of the State Budget Committee, she increased the State's "Rainy Day" fund and balanced five straight budgets. You heard that right—five straight budgets. She also helped make record investments in education, raised teacher pay, and increased the minimum wage.

Here in the U.S. Senate, she has continued to be a leader on education issues, most notably helping to lead a group of Senators to start fixing No Child Left Behind. With her family's military background, it is no surprise that Senator HAGAN has fought hard for military families and veterans. She introduced another bill that is close to my heart and that I will continue to work for. It would prohibit for-profit colleges from using the phrase "GI Bill" in aggressive marketing efforts aimed at separating veterans and servicemembers from their hard-earned education benefits. And she led the successful effort to provide health care to those affected by water contamination at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina, the largest Marine Corps base on the East Coast.

KAY HAGAN will leave this Senate with a proud record of dauntless accomplishment and I am proud to have had the privilege to call her colleague. I thank her for her friendship and service, and I wish her the best in all her future endeavors.

MARK BEGICH

I can't imagine how the Senator from Alaska handles that commute back and forth, but he did it. I said the other day when we spoke about his service that many people don't realize his father was a Congressman before him and he died in a plane crash with Hale Boggs when they were flying back to Alaska to appear at an event. That plane was lost and never recovered. When MARK BEGICH came from Alaska to serve the

United States, he completed the journey his father never could complete. His 6 years of service to Alaska have been extraordinary.

Before he got into politics, though, MARK was a whiz kid entrepreneur. When he was just 16 years old, he got a business license and he and his brother opened two businesses: a nightclub for teens and a vending-machine operation. The business world's loss was our gain.

Senator BEGICH started his political career working as an aide to then-Anchorage Mayor Tony Knowles. At 26, he was elected to the Anchorage Assembly, or city council. And in 2003, he became the first native-born Alaskan to serve as mayor of Anchorage.

In 2008, he dared to take on an Alaska legend: Senator Ted Stevens. When the votes were counted, MARK had become the first Democrat since Mike Gravel in 1981 to represent Alaska in the U.S. Senate.

As a Senator, MARK BEGICH has been a voice for working families in Alaska and across America. He has diligently and doggedly pursued common-sense, bipartisan solutions to big challenges. In all things, MARK's heart is always with Alaska. He has helped to protect Alaska fisheries, promoted renewable energy development in the State, and made sure Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson remains strong and active.

Here is something about MARK my colleagues may not know. In 2011 he was part of a four-man team in the Hotline's live annual trivia contest. His teammates were three House members: DENNIS ROSS, Tom Davis, and Martin Frost. They were up against a formidable team that included Chuck Todd and Amy Walters. No one gave MARK's team a prayer of winning. But once again, MARK BEGICH scored an upset victory. He is to DC political trivia what Ken Jennings is to Jeopardy: A memorable champion.

But the actions for which he will be remembered are very far from trivial. When MARK BEGICH and others in the Class of 2008 arrived in the Senate America's economy was in freefall. Millions of families had lost their homes to foreclosure—the worst foreclosure crisis in America since the Great Depression. America was fighting two wars. Our military is the finest in the world. Many of its members were exhausted from multiple deployments. On top of that, an outdated policy of "don't ask, don't tell" forced some servicemembers to lie about who they were in order to serve the Nation they love. Time after time, Senator MARK BEGICH took brave and principled votes that have made America better and stronger—militarily, economically, and socially.

This son of one of Alaska's great families has well earned—and will always hold—a place in our Senate family.

TIM JOHNSON

TIM JOHNSON and I came to the Senate together, TIM from South Dakota. He eventually became chairman of the banking committee after he faced one of the toughest physical challenges any Senator has ever faced, a debilitating brain injury that left him physically limited but never limited in spirit and intelligence. Thank God, with Barb at his side, he continued in public service to serve the State of South Dakota.

I am going to miss my great friend TIM JOHNSON.

He and I go back quite a ways. We served together in the House—and we came to the Senate together in 1996. That year, TIM JOHNSON was the only Senate candidate to defeat an incumbent U.S. Senator in a general election.

He won that first Senate election the old-fashioned way—with dedication, hard work, and a lot of shoe leather. I think he knocked on every door in South Dakota—twice. Dedication, humility, and unbelievable hard work—those are the values TIM learned as a fourth-generation South Dakotan. And they are the values that have exemplified his entire career.

In 1986, TIM JOHNSON was a semi-obscure state legislator from Vermillion, SD when he decided to run for his State's only seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. TIM might have been the only person who thought he had a chance of winning that race, but he surprised people. He did win—and he has never lost an election since. Eight consecutive statewide victories and zero losses. That is quite an accomplishment.

Here is another interesting fact about TIM JOHNSON: During his first term in the House, he was responsible for passing more legislation than any of the other 50 first-term Members.

In his 36 years of public service, TIM JOHNSON has been a strong voice for family farmers and ranchers in South Dakota and across America. He is a longtime advocate of Federal support for renewable energy—especially ethanol and wind energy. He helped lead the effort to pass the Country of Origin Label Act—the COOL Act, for short—to let consumers know if the meat they feed their families was raised in America.

Senator JOHNSON has been a leading advocate for Native Americans. He has fought especially hard for the members of the Lakota and Dakota tribes—descendants of the legendary Indian leaders Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse—who call South Dakota home.

TIM JOHNSON has fought for a livable minimum wage. He helped strengthen America's health safety net by voting to create the Children's Health Insurance Program and to expand Medicaid to those who need it. He voted for the Affordable Care Act, which passed this Senate without a vote to spare. That was a difficult vote for many but I believe that history will show it was the

right vote for America, and TIM JOHNSON was on the right side of history.

As chairman of the Senate Banking Committee these last 3 years, TIM JOHNSON has played an historic role in helping to implement the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform law and prevent a repeat of the kinds of abuses that nearly crashed our economy in 2008. He has moved forward despite intense opposition to reform from both inside and outside of Congress.

One of the most important of the Dodd-Frank reforms was the creation of a new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Chairman JOHNSON pressed successfully for Senate confirmation of Richard Cordray to head that new bureau so it would have a strong leader at the helm.

While he is justifiably proud of the legislative victories that bear his imprint, TIM JOHNSON may be even more proud of the constituent services he and his staff have given the people of South Dakota. Helping a veteran secure a proper disability rating or helping a senior citizen receive the Social Security and Medicare coverage he or she is due may not make headlines, but it makes a huge difference in the lives of individuals. TIM JOHNSON and his staff understand that.

I will never forget seeing TIM JOHNSON walk onto the Senate floor on September 5, 2007—less than a year after a brain hemorrhage nearly killed him. The courage and strength it took to come back from such a trauma is hard to imagine. Senator MARK KIRK, my partner from Illinois, told me that during his own recovery from a stroke, if he ever felt like giving up, he would ask himself: “What would TIM JOHNSON do?”

Dedication to public service is a family trait in the Johnson Family. Barb’s work on behalf of children and families has made life better for so many. Kelsey is an advocate for breast cancer awareness and research. Brendan is the U.S. Attorney for the District of South Dakota. And Brooks is in the National Guard following Army service in Bosnia, Kosovo, South Korea, Afghanistan, and Iraq.

Some time ago, the chief and people of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe honored Senator JOHNSON by bestowing on him a Lakota name. His Lakota name is Wacante Ognake. In English, it means “holds the people in his heart.”

That is the spirit that has guided TIM JOHNSON throughout his public life.

I wish TIM and Barb the very best in all their future endeavors.

SAXBY CHAMBLISS, TOM COBURN, AND MIKE JOHANNES

I want to say a word about three others on the other side of the aisle who are retiring: SAXBY CHAMBLISS of Georgia, TOM COBURN of Oklahoma, and MIKE JOHANNES of Nebraska. I got to know them when I gathered with one of these gangs, as they call them around

here, to talk about deficit reduction. We spent more time together trying to explore the Federal budget in ways to reduce our deficit in a thoughtful manner so that we really got to know one another and respect one another.

There is a world of difference in our political values and philosophies, but each of them in their own way made a positive contribution toward making this a stronger nation.

I remember well the day Senator CHAMBLISS announced that he would not let Grover Norquist and Grover’s “no tax increases ever” demand dictate the terms of a deficit-reduction plan. That needed to be said, and it took political courage. Although Senator CHAMBLISS will not be with us when the Senate convenes in January, I hope his example will be with us. And I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

Senator TOM COBURN and I come from different parts of the country and different ends of the political spectrum, but we found there is a lot we agree on. I have always believed, as Senators Paul Douglas and Paul Simon said, that being a liberal doesn’t mean you have to be a “wastrel.” Senator COBURN knows that being a conservative and protecting America’s economy demands more than blind budget-cutting. His nickname is “Doctor No,” but when it comes to wishing him well as he steps down from the Senate, my colleagues join me in a resounding “yes.”

Finally, here is a suggestion for when you have watched all of the “shouting head” political TV talk shows you can take: Listen to Senator MIKE JOHANNES. MIKE’s quiet, reasonable approach was a real asset not only to the Gang of Eight negotiations, but to the entire Senate. We will miss his calm demeanor and his good-faith efforts to find smart, fair solutions to tough challenges.

None of them is running for re-election so I can’t hurt them politically by saying that I regard each of these Senators as friends. They showed political courage when partisanship would have been easier.

I wish them the best in all their future endeavors.

CARL LEVIN

Last night it was my honor to salute CARL LEVIN of Michigan for his 36 years of service in the U.S. Senate. He has done so many things so well. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he has produced this contentious and challenging bill year after year, both as ranking member and as chairman. As chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, he really raised that subcommittee to a new level. He tackled some of the most complex issues of our day, particularly when it came to corporate abuse. He spent the time to get the facts right. When he had a hearing, he made an extraordinary contribution to the public

dialogue about reforming our law and making this a better nation.

When I was first elected to the Senate, people back home said to me: Well, now that you have been in the Senate a year or two, which Senators do you respect the most?

I said then, and I will repeat it today, if I had a tough, important decision, one I was wrestling over, an issue or a vote, and I could only reach out to a couple of Senators at the time, one would be Paul Sarbanes of Maryland, now retired, and the other is CARL LEVIN. That is still a fact.

Long before CARL LEVIN was elected to the U.S. Senate it was clear that he had a gift for politics. Picture this—true story: At Central High School in Detroit, CARL LEVIN was elected class president. He won that race after, as he tells it, “running around with a piece of matzoh telling other students: ‘This is what happens to bread without LEVIN.’” How’s that for a slogan?

As much as I hate to think about it, soon we will have a United States Senate without LEVIN—for the first time in 36 years. Our only consolation is that CARL LEVIN leaves a legacy of good and important laws. He also leaves a powerful example of what can be achieved when we choose integrity over ideology . . . and our common good over confrontation.

A Jewish publication in Detroit wrote a while back that CARL LEVIN and his brother, Congressman Sandy Levin, both deserve “honorable menschen awards”—with the accent on “mensch”—for their historic service to our Nation. I agree wholeheartedly. Senator LEVIN’s keen intellect, honesty and fair-mindedness—his decency and unfailing civility—have earned him the respect of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Many years ago I was an intern for a great Senator, Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois. Every year now, the University of Illinois presents a “Paul Douglas Ethics in Government Award” to an elected leader who shares Senator Douglas’ deep commitment to social and economic justice, and efficient government. The recipient of the Paul Douglas Ethics in Government Award in 2006 was Senator CARL LEVIN. Paul Douglas would have approved that choice heartily.

As was Paul Douglas, CARL LEVIN has been a foot soldier for justice. Paul Douglas was a leader in the effort to pass a strong Federal Civil Rights Act. In 1964, the year that law finally passed, CARL LEVIN was appointed the first general counsel for the Michigan Civil Rights Commission.

Paul Douglas believed in government and he hated government waste. He used to say: “You don’t have to be a wastrel to be a liberal.” CARL LEVIN reminds us that: “There are some things that only government can do, so we need government. But we don’t need an

inefficient, wasteful, arrogant government.”

CARL LEVIN was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1978. Before that, he was active for 15 years in Detroit and Michigan State politics. He taught law before he entered politics. He also held some other interesting jobs—including driving a cab in Detroit and working on a DeSoto assembly line.

He showed up in Washington in 1979 driving a 1974 Dodge Dart with a hole in the floorboard. He was still driving that same car to the Capitol 10 years later. That tells us something about CARL LEVIN's devotion to the U.S. auto industry, its workers and unions.

When General Motors and Chrysler faced potential collapse in 2008, he pressed Congress and a new president to support the companies with billions of dollars in loans.

Those loans have since been repaid and Chrysler and GM are not only solvent, they are making a profit. The U.S. auto industry is in the midst of its fastest expansion since 1950.

CARL LEVIN is a champion as well of America's military, military families and veterans. He has served on the Armed Services Committee since coming to the Senate 36 years ago. He is one of Congress's most respected voices on national security and military issues.

Some years back he used his power on the Armed Services Committee to question the procurement practices of the military. He asked: Why was the Pentagon spending thousands of dollars apiece for things like toilet seats and hammers? He said: We need more money for soldiers and less wasteful spending for contractors. With the world growing more volatile and complex and increasing pressure to reduce defense budgets, those are questions we must all be willing to ask.

As a ranking member and then chair of the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Senator LEVIN's piercing intellect and his patient mastery of complex issues helped, over and over, to expose and correct serious wrongdoing.

As PSI chairman in 2002, he led a probe of the activities of Enron Corp; the investigation resulted in legislation to improve the accuracy and reliability of corporate disclosures.

From white collar crime, to money laundering, abusive tax shelters, and gasoline and crude oil price-gouging, he has pursued the subjects of every investigation with nonpartisan vigor, seeking results, not spotlights.

The list of laws bearing his imprint is long and historic: The Competition in Contracting Act of 1984; Social Security Disability Benefits Reform, 1984; The Anti-Kickback Enforcement Act, 1986; The Whistleblower Protection Act, 1989; The Ethics Reform Act in 1989; The Lobbying Disclosure Act in 1995—the first major lobbying reform in 50 years.

The list goes on and on. Senator LEVIN voted: To repeal “Don't Ask, Don't Tell”; to protect voting rights; and to limit the influence of private-interest money in elections.

He has voted to support American manufacturing—and stop giving tax breaks to corporations to ship American jobs overseas.

He supported my efforts to change bankruptcy laws to allow deserving homeowners to save their homes in foreclosures.

He voted to regulate tobacco as a drug—another issue that is personal for me.

I will always remember Senator LEVIN's vote on the Iraq war resolution. For years before 9/11, he warned anyone who would listen that America was threatened by terrorism. When the horrific attacks came, he supported pursuing the attackers in Afghanistan.

A year later, he and I were among just 23 Senators to vote against the Iraq War. He voted no, even though he was then chair of the Armed Services Committee. That took extraordinary moral and political courage, and history has shown he was right.

CARL LEVIN is the longest-serving Senator in Michigan history, surpassing another Senate legend, Arthur Vandenberg. As he proved long ago when he was elected president of his high school council, he is a natural-born politician. But like Senator Vandenberg, he is more than a politician; he is a statesman.

I will miss his presence in this Senate and I wish him, and his wife Barbara, all the best in the future.

MARK UDALL

MARK UDALL, my friend from Colorado and the Presiding Officer's colleague. As I said last night, I served with his dad. His dad may have been the funniest public servant I ever served with. What a wit, what a sense of humor. He once said: If you have politics in your bloodstream, only embalming fluid will replace it.

Thank goodness the Udalls have politics in their bloodstream. Mo Udall served in the House of Representatives, candidate for President; MARK UDALL's uncle, Stewart Udall, who was Secretary of Interior under President John Kennedy; TOM UDALL, MARK's cousin, the son of Stewart Udall, serves as Senator of New Mexico; MARK UDALL himself, what a great person.

I can remember so many things about his public service, but I remembered, especially last night, when he lost his brother and came before our caucus lunch and talked about the love he had for that man and what that loss meant to him. It touched the heart of everyone in the room. It gave us an insight into the heart of MARK UDALL as a person.

He was committed to a number of causes. His wife Maggie and he have given so much time to the environment

and preserving our national heritage, but he also showed great courage when it came to his service on the Senate Intelligence Committee. Even as a new member of that committee, he stepped up for principles and values, and I am glad he did, preserving our rights and liberties as American citizens and fully supporting the disclosure that Senator FEINSTEIN made yesterday with her report.

MARK has fought to protect Americans' privacy rights with thoughtful reforms of the NSA and the PATRIOT Act.

In keeping with his family's tradition, he has made protecting our environment and our precious natural resources a top priority. He has been a leader in addressing climate change as a growing threat to our national security. He organized support in the Senate for legislation that would require 15 percent of electricity to be generated from renewable sources by 2021.

And in the 2013 Defense Authorization Act, MARK UDALL led the effort to allow the Pentagon to continue to develop and use renewable energy.

During his one term, MARK UDALL made more dauntless decisions and achieved more good for America than many Senators who have served far longer.

He supported a recovery act that helped turn the tide against the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. He voted for the most far-reaching financial reform since the Great Depression and he supported one of the biggest investments in college affordability since the GI Bill. Millions of Americans are back at work and millions of Americans know the security that comes with affordable health care, in part, because of his courage.

The famed explorer Edmund Hillary once said, “Human life is far more important than just getting to the top of a mountain.”

For MARK UDALL, being a U.S. Senator has been about something more important than acquiring power. It has been about using that power to preserve our precious natural treasures and make life better for others.

Mo Udall would be proud of the U.S. Senator his son has become, and I am certainly proud to have worked with him.

I have been in the Senate now for 18 years, and I have seen many come and go. But we have lost, sadly, in this departure of these Members some of our best.

MARY LANDRIEU

I will close by mentioning the one whose fate was determined the last, and that was MARY LANDRIEU of Louisiana. She has been a great Senator for Louisiana. She worked harder and achieved more for that State than, obviously, the people of that State realized. There wasn't an issue that came before us that MARY didn't stand up

and say: Now let me tell you how that affects Louisiana, and usually make an ask which was fulfilled.

Let me add one other grace note when it comes to her personal and public life. MARY and her husband have adopted two children. They are the light of their lives. Her dedication to the cause of adopted children has really made a difference not just to the United States but in the world. I am sure she didn't get a lot of political reward for it, but thank goodness she put a big part of her life and her public life into standing up for the rights of adopted children and adoptive parents, encouraging more and more, so the kids would have a loving home as part of their lives. It was just one of the things that MARY worked on, but it was one of the things I will remember. I am going to miss her and her service to the U.S. Senate.

MARY bleeds Louisiana. Her father is the legendary statesmen Moon Landrieu, former New Orleans mayor, HUD Secretary under President Jimmy Carter, and Judge of Louisiana's 4th Circuit Court. Her brother, Mitch, is the current Mayor of New Orleans.

MARY—the eldest of the eight siblings—learned important political lessons early. She was taunted in early grade school about her father's pro civil rights stands in the 1960s. Those experiences taught her that taking the right position sometimes makes you unpopular—but you do it anyway.

MARY was only 23 when she entered the Louisiana House of Representatives in 1980. She went on to serve as a member of her State's senate.

MARY is a formidable fighter for Louisiana. In her State's darkest hours, during Hurricane Katrina and in the aftermath of that terrible catastrophe, she stood strong. She was exactly the right person for Louisiana. More than any other single official, she deserves the credit for directing billions of dollars in relief and rebuilding money to her hometown and home State.

Governor Bobby Jindal's Secretary of Administration had this to say about MARY LANDRIEU: "She's relentless; once she starts, she will not stop. And once she's on your side, she's on your side."

This is what St. Tammany Parish Sheriff Jack Strain remembers about Katrina: "The very first federal representative we had on the ground after Katrina was MARY LANDRIEU . . . when water was still in our houses and neighborhoods. . . . She spoke to my deputies and offered assistance to them."

Perhaps the best description of MARY LANDRIEU was offered by her mentor, former Senator John Breaux, who calls her "a pit bull with Louisiana charm."

In 2009, when Hurricane Katrina was just a dim, bad memory for some, Senator LANDRIEU made sure the stimulus bill included a provision that ended up

allowing the state to rebuild Charity Hospital, the cornerstone of health care for many low-income New Orleans families.

Senator LANDRIEU has been a champion of the energy industry—so crucial to the economy of her State and her Nation. She has fought to preserve Social Security and Medicare and other safety net programs that provide dignity and security for so many. She has fought to defend voting rights, women's right, and children's right. She has earned a spot in heaven with her work to promote adoption. She provided a crucial vote to pass the Affordable Care Act, knowing full well that it would cost her politically. If that doesn't earn her a spot in heaven, it will at least earn her a place in history as a profile in courage.

With her political genes and determination, I know that MARY LANDRIEU will continue to be a force in Louisiana and American politics for years to come. And while I will miss seeing her every day in this Senate, I look forward to seeing her fight for what is right for many, many more years. It has been an honor to serve with her.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX EXTENDERS AND OMNIBUS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, as we come to the close of the 113th Congress, I wish to speak for a few minutes about why I think we should be optimistic about the future and what we can and must do to take advantage of the opportunities that lie ahead.

Despite economic slowdowns throughout much of the world among developing and developed Nations alike, America's economy continues to steadily grow. Just last Friday we got great news that our economy created more than 300,000 jobs in the month of November. That marks 57 straight months, or nearly 5 years, of positive job growth numbers. For the first time since Bill Clinton was President of this Nation, we have averaged more than 200,000 new jobs per month for 10 straight months.

Particularly in the economy is an area of growth and opportunity that I have focused on in my time before coming into public service and in my 4 years here. That is American manufacturing, an industry about which I have spoken at length here on the Senate floor and have worked with my colleagues to craft and assemble a group of bipartisan bills that can help move American manufacturing forward.

The news this last month was good, as it has been for months, for years

now, about American manufacturing, which continues to grow as well. There were 28,000 new American manufacturing jobs last month, which continued this steady climb. It has now created more than 750,000 new jobs over the last 4 years. Manufacturing jobs are great jobs. They typically are higher wage and higher skill and have higher benefits than jobs in any other sector. They are good, middle-class jobs you can raise a family on. They deal with one of the biggest ongoing remnants of the great recession, which is the lack of real wage growth in our economy. So I am excited to see that manufacturing jobs continue to grow in our economy and to talk about the things we can and should do to help sustain this growth in manufacturing.

We have reason to be optimistic, but we cannot be complacent. As much as we built momentum over the last year since the recession, and especially this year, there is, of course, no natural law, no economic fundamental principle that says it will not turn back around. We need to sustain our positive direction, particularly in this sector, particularly as we move toward the 114th Congress.

I am proud that Congress last year passed a 2-year budget to create some stability and some certainty for our country and economy. We have gotten out of the way and allowed our businesses and workers to do what they do best, to move our economy forward. In the next few days we will have chances to do the same when we vote on a number of bills, one that, most importantly, will keep our government running, not for a few days or weeks or months, but the overwhelming majority of this government will be authorized and funded through next September.

The funding bills that are included in this omnibus continue investments in innovation and continue to move our country forward. There is a whole rash of bills that I have been interested in and engaged in as a member of the Appropriations Committee that are valuable programs, that will strengthen manufacturing—for example, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which has done amazing work on the ground in Delaware, helping small and medium manufacturers to be competitive, to train their workforce in current skills, to grow into the spaces of the world economy where we have real opportunity. This bill will help sustain the funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership nationally.

There are several other programs related to innovation in the Department of Energy. For example, sustained funding for the ARPA-E, for an innovative model that helps fund cutting-edge, category-redefining research and investment in energy and in clean energy manufacturing and in technology deployment.

There are also opportunities for us to continue to put Americans to work through investments in infrastructure. As someone who lives on Amtrak 16 hours a week, I am thrilled with the outcomes for both the Amtrak budget and for the TIGER grant programs, a tool used by the Department of Transportation to help incentivize innovative transportation projects that break through bottlenecks and help put Americans back to work.

There are so many different ways that the work of this bipartisan committee, the Appropriations Committee, helped move our economy forward that at times are not focused on here on the floor or in the general press coverage. It is such a large and comprehensive bill, the omnibus. But I wanted to take a moment and highlight a few ways in which the omnibus invests in innovation, in competitiveness, and in moving our economy forward. I am also grateful, in some ways most importantly, that it includes emergency funding to respond to Ebola, both at home and abroad, which will be critical to helping stamp out this deadly virus at its origin in West Africa and in protecting Americans here at home and others around the world.

The appropriations bills that were shepherded through the dozen subcommittees give us reason to be optimistic about the future because the Chair, Senator MIKULSKI, and the Vice Chair, Senator SHELBY, have done a laudable job of listening to each other, of working together, and of crafting a bipartisan bill here in the Senate, which I hope the Members of this body will study, consider, and move forward and adopt.

As we move to complete the business of funding the government, we would be remiss if we did not also take stock of the opportunities in front of us we have not yet grasped. There is unfinished work to be done. This week we will also almost certainly pass a 1-year tax extenders bill, which will carry forward certain temporary tax credits and deductions, but for just the 1 year.

Although the extension for many businesses and many sectors is better than nothing, it signifies a missed opportunity on our part. Much of what has made me optimistic over the last year is how much our economy has begun to thrive in a stable fiscal environment, in a more predictable regulatory environment. Yet, this 1-year extension does not do much to give businesses the certainty they need to predict and plan for the future.

I have worked hard with Democrats and Republicans alike to expand and make permanent the research and development tax credit, which is particularly relevant to manufacturing, because manufacturing is the most R&D-intensive sector in the American economy. Manufacturers invest more in R&D than any other part of the Amer-

ican landscape. This 1-year extension misses an opportunity to either make the R&D tax credit permanent, or to make it more accessible.

I was excited to have the opportunity early on here to team up with two Republican Senators, MIKE ENZI of Wyoming and PAT ROBERTS of Kansas, to find ways to make the R&D tax credit more accessible to early-stage and startup companies, companies with high growth potential, but because of the way the R&D tax credit has been structured and used for decades, do not have the opportunity to access it.

The Startup Innovation Credit Act, which I introduced with Senator ENZI, would have further expanded the access to the R&D credit for startups. The bipartisan Innovators Job Creation Act, which I introduced with Senator ROBERTS, would have expanded the credit to innovative small businesses as well. Both of those bills passed on a bipartisan basis out of the Finance Committee and were part of a package being advanced here in the Senate but will not be part of the ultimate 1-year extenders considered later this week.

I wanted to highlight that as we look forward there are opportunities still in front of us for us to tackle the challenges and to seize the opportunities, to take things that are important to manufacturing and to move them forward. There are lots of other bills in the mix that will be adopted this week, either by unanimous consent or as part of larger packages, and a number of them relate to manufacturing. I am optimistic that we will adopt a national manufacturing strategy bill that I have worked hard on with Republican Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois. I am optimistic that a bipartisan manufacturing hubs bill that Senator SHERROD BROWN of Ohio and Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri have worked hard together to craft and to hone and to get to a place where it is ready to be passed—that they both will make it across the finish line to the President's desk.

But just this past week, I stood on this floor with Senator KELLY AYOTTE of New Hampshire and we spoke about a bill that is not yet ready for adoption, but we will take up next year, the Manufacturing Skills Act, which helps to focus and prioritize the investments in manufacturing skills training at the State and municipal level all over the country in partnership with the Federal Government.

What I wanted to do today was to simply highlight a few perhaps underappreciated, underrecognized areas of legislative action on a bipartisan basis in this Chamber that helped put some lift under the steady forward progress of the manufacturing sector in our country and to express my hope that we can find ways to continue to work together on a bipartisan basis to keep our economic momentum going in the year and the Congress ahead.

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING SENATORS

As I close, I would also like to thank those of our colleagues who will be leaving the Senate after the New Year.

It is an incredible privilege to work in this Chamber and to represent the people. Every day I am awed by the dedication and talent of many of my colleagues, public servants who come to work to fight for their States and their government.

To those who are ending their service in the Senate, know that I value your friendship and partnership. It has been an honor to work with you, and I thank you for all you have done for our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of some of the public lands provisions that were included in this year's National Defense Authorization Act. Before I do so, I wish to recognize the work Senators LEVIN and INHOFE have put into this bill and their dedication to reach an agreement with the House so that this bill could move forward on time, as it has done over the past 50 years.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I hear every day about the sacrifice our servicemembers make to protect our country. Passing the authorization bill that helps ensure they have the equipment they need and the resources required to meet the mission they are tasked with is very important.

While I am pleased the Senate will be moving forward on this bill, I wish to note that the bill's reduction in servicemembers' benefits concerns me. I do believe Members should have had the chance and the right to debate and amend it, and I hope the Senate will have the opportunity to do so in the future.

This year the final Defense bill includes several Nevada public land priorities that will spur economic development and job creation in our State while enhancing U.S. national security. I have been working on many of those proposals since I was first elected to Congress in 2006.

I thank incoming Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee chair LISA MURKOWSKI for her leadership and work on this public lands package. We have been working together for many years on many of the bills included in the package, and I am pleased to see they are finally getting across the finish line.

Let me first clarify that just because some of these bills are related to public lands does not mean they have a direct relationship to defense and protecting our national security. My Nevada Copper bill will protect domestic production of copper—the second most used mineral at the Department of Defense—as well as directly benefit two bases that are located in the State of Nevada.

As the Presiding Officer knows, roughly 85 percent of the land in Nevada is controlled by the Federal Government. This presents our local and State governments with many unique challenges. Our communities' economies are directly tied to the way the Federal Government manages those lands. They often work closely with me to develop legislative solutions to their problems.

Whereas out East local governments can acquire land on their own to build public works projects, out West, unfortunately, we have to get the permission of Congress. That is why reducing the Federal estate and increasing access to our public lands has been one of my top priorities in Congress, and this package goes a long way toward accomplishing these goals. It resolves over 60 of these types of issues throughout the West. In total, over 110,000 acres of land will be removed from Federal ownership and utilized for mineral production, timber production, infrastructure projects, and other community development. In addition, it releases approximately 26,000 acres of current wilderness study areas, which unlocks lands to be used for multiple use.

It is very important to discuss the eight Nevada provisions today to show my colleagues in the Senate the many hoops our western communities have to go through to take the same steps many eastern communities can accomplish in a single day.

The Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act is a jobs bill I first introduced while in the House, but it has been held up by the Senate for many years because of gridlock.

This bill allows the city of Ely to partner with Nevada Copper to develop roughly 12,500 acres of land surrounding the Nevada Copper Pumpkin Hollow Project site to be used for mining activities, industrial and renewable energy development, and recreation.

Senate passage is the final hurdle to more than 1,000 new jobs at an average wage of over \$85,000 per year. The mine will contribute nearly \$25 million in property and net proceeds taxes per year that would be distributed to the State, to Lyon County, their schools, the hospital district, and the Mason Valley Fire Protection District.

In addition, Nevada Copper plans to invest \$80 million in infrastructure for the mine and processing facilities that can be utilized to support other land uses and economic development.

This bill will transform the local economy of one of the counties in our Nation that are struggling most during this recent economic downturn.

As I said before, copper is the second most used mineral at the Department of Defense and is considered an essential mineral for weapons production. Copper is also the primary mineral

from which other strategic and critical metals, such as rhenium, are derived. A domestic supply of this important resource greatly benefits our national security.

Second, there is a provision in this package that will allow Naval Air Station Fallon to acquire over 400 acres of BLM land for a safety arc for an explosive ordnance-handling facility and to construct much needed family housing at the station. Both of these plans will greatly benefit mission operations and the quality of life for our brave service-members serving there. The station first asked for these lands over 20 years ago. I am pleased their wait can finally come to an end.

Third, the package includes the Pine Forest Recreation Enhancement Act—a proposal that has been in the works in Humboldt County for nearly a decade. Just north of the Black Rock Desert, the Pine Forest offers a diverse landscape of sagebrush, aspen, and rock formations. Scenic lakes and reservoirs offer world-class trout fisheries. From the ranchers who make their livelihood on grazing allotments to conservationists intent on preserving a rugged landscape, anyone familiar with the place agrees it is special.

In addition to conserving these areas, the bill releases areas from wilderness that needs watershed restoration and treatment due to a high wildfire threat. It also provides for the construction of additional campsites and accommodations for motorized camping.

The initial work on the Pine Forest bill was grassroots-driven, transparent, and ultimately supported unanimously by all stakeholders and local governments in this county.

Fourth, the package includes the Elko Motocross and Tribal Conveyance Act—another bill I first introduced in the 111th Congress as a Member of the House. The commonsense bill conveys 275 acres of BLM lands to Elko County for a public motocross park. Additionally, it provides 373 acres to the Elko Band of Te-Moak Tribe for housing and tribal economic development.

Outdoor recreation and tourism are such important parts of life in Nevada. Opening up this land will benefit the residents of northern Nevada for years to come.

Fifth, this land package also includes the Las Vegas Valley Public Land and Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Act, which is the culmination of several years of effort to conserve the ancient Tule Springs fossil beds while providing job-creation opportunities and critical civilian and military infrastructure that will be necessary to meet the needs of the Las Vegas Valley.

After working with stakeholders at every level, I am pleased that we can navigate a path forward for southern Nevada.

While serving in the House, I also introduced legislation in both the 110th and 111th Congresses to convey parcels of BLM land to the Nellis Air Force Base to create an off-highway vehicle park in the Nellis Dunes and to convey land to the Nevada System of Higher Education to expand educational opportunities for southern Nevadans.

Those smaller bills were ultimately included in S. 973 in this Congress, so I am pleased that 6 years of work on this Tule Springs legislation will finally become a reality.

The final three Nevada bills included in the lands package are newer proposals but achieve long-term economic development objectives that the affected communities have long asked for.

The Fernley Economic Self-Determination Act provides Fernley the opportunity to purchase up to 9,114 acres of Federal land within the city boundaries for the purpose of economic development.

Fernley was incorporated in 2001. Since incorporation, the city has been working with private business partners and State and Federal regional agencies to develop a long-term economic development plan. These parcels have significant potential for commercial and industrial development, agricultural activities, and the expansion of community events.

Similarly, the Carlin Economic Self-Determination Act allows Carlin to purchase up to 1,329 acres of BLM lands. This city, located in Elko County, is completely landlocked by the Federal Government. Without this legislation, it would be impossible for their leaders to meet the demands for the expansion of their growing population needs.

Finally, the Storey County provision conveys over 1,700 acres of BLM lands to Virginia City. These properties have been occupied for decades by individuals who purchased them or acquired them legally; yet their continued residency is trespass, according to the Federal Government.

It is a very burdensome oversight by the Federal Government that must be resolved for the sake of my constituents. They have struggled for years, haunted by this error that is the result through no fault of their own.

These small public lands proposals are going to make a major impact on Nevada's economy. They have been developed at the local level and signed off on by the local communities.

I understand my colleagues' concerns that they would have liked the opportunity to debate and vote on more amendments to this bill. I, too, filed a number of amendments that I wished to see considered, and I will continue pushing those priorities next year. But

right now Congress has a rare opportunity to pass this public lands package that enables important mining, energy development, ranching, and timber work to go forward, generating economic and employment opportunities for my State, other States, and local residents.

Let's get the government off these Nevadans' backs and allow them to do what they do best; that is, create jobs. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Maryland.

APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor today during the consideration of the national defense authorization to bring my colleagues up to date on the appropriations bill.

As we know, the continuing resolution expires on Thursday at midnight, but I am here to talk about some good news. The Appropriations Committee on both sides of the dome—the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate, working in a conference committee—has completed its work. This legislation is now as we speak heading to the Rules Committee and to the House. Hopefully it will head to the House for tomorrow, on to the Senate tomorrow night and into Friday. This means no government shutdown, no government on auto pilot, and we fund the government through the rest of the fiscal year for 2015, except Homeland Security, which will be a continuing resolution.

What we are talking about here is a monumental achievement. It is a monumental achievement showing how we can work together, we can govern, and we can get the job done.

Working on a bipartisan basis in the Senate, we worked in our subcommittees, and we held our hearings. We held 60 hearings in 60 days and did a good bit of our markups. We were able to work on our Senate appropriations. Over in the House, they did the same thing. But then, alas, when we got to September, we had to go on a continuing resolution until December 11.

I, as a rule, don't like continuing resolutions. We have 12 subcommittees, and I had hoped, under the time I chaired the committee and held the gavel, that we could consider one bill at a time and bring it to the Senate floor. Alas, partisan politics, gridlock, deadlock, gamesmanship, and showmanship prevented all of that.

But you know what, we on the Appropriations Committee, working with our vice chair, Senator SHELBY of Alabama, kept ourselves on track. Then we met in the conference committee, first our subcommittee chairs and then Chairman ROGERS, Senator SHELBY, Congresswoman LOWEY, and myself. We worked together on a \$1 trillion spending bill. That number is breathtaking, but we need to remember that over \$550 billion is in national defense. The rest

is in domestic discretionary. That means everything from veterans, to foreign aid, to school aid, and also funding innovation.

I will talk more explicitly about the bill when it comes to the Senate floor. But for today I wanted everyone to know we are keeping the process going. We actually made the process work. We showed that we could govern. We worked across the aisle. We worked across the dome. We practiced civility. We argued. We debated. We fought. You know, sometimes you give a little, you take a little, but you stand for them all. And I want everyone to know we were able to concentrate and compromise what I call capitulation on principle.

So I wanted to say to my colleagues: Stay steady, stay strong. We expect that the House will pass its rule sometime after 3 o'clock today. That is the framework that enables them to go to the floor tomorrow. They will follow their own rule and hopefully that bill will pass. If it does pass, it will come to the Senate, and we will immediately take it up under the rules the two leaders will have worked on and established. So we look forward to completing the job on the Appropriations Committee within the next 72 hours.

I hope this update is of value to my colleagues as they plan their schedule and wish to participate in the debate and in the discussion. But it is not whether it is of value to us, it is whether it is of value to the Nation. I think what the voters in the last election said was: We have lost confidence in your ability to govern.

I hope over the next 72 hours, by the way we will bring this bill to the floor, we will take a significant step in regaining that confidence and getting out of this whole game of government by crisis, government by artificially imposed deadlines, where all it is, is more drama than debate.

We would like to get back to the regular order. Hopefully, though, we now can move forward on our bill.

I thank the Chair for his attention, and I yield the floor. I note the Senator from Arizona is on the floor so I will not ask for a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

TRIBUTE TO TOM COBURN

Mr. MCCAIN. Today, I would like to offer words of tribute to my departing colleague, Senator TOM COBURN, whose service exemplifies standards of purposefulness, integrity, and decency, to which we should all aspire and whose example ought to inspire the service of new and returning Senators alike.

I am going to miss an awful lot our colleague from Oklahoma. I have always admired TOM for the strength of his convictions and the courage and candor with which he expresses them day after day. "The No. 1 thing people should do in Congress," TOM once said,

"is stay true to their heart." No one in the history of this institution has ever followed that injunction more faithfully than TOM COBURN has.

TOM COBURN has an unshakable faith in the goodness of America, and he has worked diligently with others when he could and alone, if necessary, to make sure government respects the people we serve—respects their hopes and aspirations, their concerns and sacrifices. He has never forgotten he is the people's servant first and last, and they have never had a more genuine and determined champion.

I think TOM has often acted as the conscience of the Senate. He can be unmovable on matters of principle when to do otherwise would harm or do no good for the country. TOM COBURN is sometimes called "Dr. No," affectionately most, if not all, of the time. He has held up more legislation that he thought ill served the public interest than any other Member of this body. He even placed a hold on one of his own bills that he thought no longer met his high standard of accountability after it was reported out of committee. I don't think the American taxpayer has ever had a greater defender than TOM COBURN.

I like to think I have taken a few principled stands when the situation has warranted it, and I have made myself an occasional nuisance in service to what I thought was a good cause. But I have never been so conscientious that I felt obliged to defeat my own legislation. That is a pretty high standard of personal responsibility to meet and a character test of the first order. I am not sure many of us would pass it. I wouldn't. But then, as all his colleagues can attest, TOM COBURN is a person of the very highest character. He possesses the highest virtues—courage, humility, compassion—in an abundance. It has been an honor to serve with him.

As principled as he is, as unwavering as he can be when he believes it necessary, he has also been a brave and determined proponent of compromise when he believed it served the public interest, when it would help build a more prosperous and secure society with more opportunities for more people and brighter futures for our children.

We always have detractors. It comes with the job. Whether TOM was standing on principle or seeking a principled compromise, he stood up to criticism. He stood up to pressure. He stood up to threats and insults and whatever negative personal consequences he might suffer. He stood up to whatever came his way to do what was right for his country. He stood up for the American people, no matter how difficult it was. What better can you say about a public servant?

TOM and I worked together on a lot of things. We fought together to end earmarks and opposed other forms of

wasteful spending. We worked together on oversight projects for the stimulus bill and highway trust fund spending. We also fought for a long time to let veterans decide where they could best receive health care. We made good progress on some issues and not enough on others, but TOM COBURN was always an example and an inspiration to me.

If I could speak more personally, TOM has been more than a paragon to me and to other Members of the Senate. He is first and foremost a kind, considerate, and loyal friend—a friend in good times and bad, a friend who brings out the best in you because he believes in the best part of you. I said earlier TOM COBURN sees the innate goodness in the American people. He also sees it in his colleagues, even when it isn't apparent to other observers.

We have shared happy times together, TOM and I, but TOM has the instinct and the kindness to be the kind of friend who is there when you need him—when you need him most, in moments that aren't so happy.

We all lead pretty good lives here. We get the chance to serve the greatest country in the world and, on occasion, to make history. We are honored and feted and praised more than we deserve. But as all human beings do, we have moments of worry and doubt and disappointment. TOM always has the knack for showing up when I need cheering up. He has made the point over the years of being company when you most need it.

Friendship is a virtue to TOM, and he means to live a virtuous life. You could be working on something with him or opposing each other on an issue, it doesn't matter. If you need him, he will be there for you with a kind word, a piece of advice, a little encouragement or just good company. There are too few people like that in anyone's life not to cherish the hell out of those who are. I cherish my friendship with TOM COBURN, and I always will.

The Senate will be a poorer place without TOM COBURN to set an example of public service for the rest of us. But in gratitude to him for his leadership and friendship, I will try a little harder to live up to his standards, and I hope he will let me know when I fall short.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE TAX CODE

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, there was an opportunity this session to work together in a bipartisan way to provide certainty around the Tax Code for families and farmers and busi-

nesses, at least for 2014 and 2015. There may still be a small window of opportunity to get things done. I certainly support doing that, if we can. But I want to speak to the importance of having some certainty, at least through the end of 2015, as it relates to our tax policy for investing, for the economy, and for homeowners to make decisions.

Back in April, thanks to the leadership of Chairman WYDEN and Ranking Member HATCH, those of us on the Senate Finance Committee worked together closely and passed the EXPIRE Act, a bipartisan bill that would renew tax provisions for 2014 and 2015 so that again people could plan, businesses, and farmers, at least through that 2-year period. It would give businesses and families across the country the certainty they desperately need.

Unbelievably, back at the time when we brought it to the floor, after a bipartisan effort, Republicans in the Senate filibustered it and we could not move it forward. So we have been trying to get this 2-year bill done as the first year has been ticking away. We are now at the end of the first year of the tax bill, and, unfortunately, instead of having a 2-year bill, we now have a bill from the House that contains what we call tax extenders—extending tax policy for the economy, from research and development to homeowners to depreciation for investments and jobs. We have something that is only extended to the end of this year. As our chairman has said, it is a 3-week bill. By the time we get done, it will probably be a 2-week bill.

We need to do more. The chairman, ranking member, and many of us are still trying to do everything we can to get the House to agree to something with more certainty than 2 or 3 weeks. I think it is an embarrassment for the Congress that we are not able to come together and pass the EXPIRE Act to be able to give more certainty.

There is a glimmer of hope though on a piece of tax reform I wish to mention. Frankly, there is disagreement on this on our side of the aisle, and I respectfully disagree with those in the White House on this as well. But there is a bill I hope will move on the suspension calendar in the House around charitable giving.

I can't imagine at this time of year of charitable giving, as we come up to the end of the year and people are making decisions about where to place their dollars, what kinds of causes and so on, that we couldn't come together on a bipartisan bill to deal with donations to food banks and conservation easements that protect our land for the future, that make sure we are not plowing up our land and putting more CO₂ into the air right at the time we are trying to deal with climate issues—land protection, forestry protection for the future; dealing with investments in

our research institutions, dealing with investments in important areas near and dear to my heart—such as the city of Detroit, where our foundations are playing such a critical role in making the investments, whether it is in transportation infrastructure, whether it is job training, whether it is rebuilding the neighborhoods to be able to turn Detroit around. I believe we are going to be able to do that. I know we are going to be able to do that. But a major reason has been the foundations—the Kresge Foundation, the Keller Foundation. There are so many that have been there.

So we have an opportunity prior to going into a larger debate on tax reform to actually take a piece of this, which normally would be, on its substance, very bipartisan, and actually be able to get that done. I am hopeful we will be able to do that before the end of the year because of the important provisions in it.

I go back to though the broader tax bill being sent as a 1-year renewal from the House of Representatives and, as I said, at most is a 3-week bill. By the time it is done, it may end up being a 2-week bill at this point in time. I can't believe people honestly, with a straight face, are calling this tax policy to be able to do this.

There are homeowners who lost their job during the recession and can no longer afford their mortgage payments. They have had their homes foreclosed on or maybe they have been able to do a short sale with their mortgage lender or the bank. For the past year—11 months and 10 days—these families have had no way to know whether we were going to renew the mortgage forgiveness tax relief bill, which I was proud to author as a bipartisan bill back in 2007, which we have continued to renew because we still have families struggling from the recession in terms of their loan.

If we can renew this bill, it will spare families from having to pay income tax on the difference between their mortgage and the value of their home. So if in fact they get loan forgiveness or can work something out with the bank—and if in fact \$20,000 is forgiven on the mortgage or \$30,000 or \$40,000—they don't end up paying taxes on that as income, which is what will happen if we don't get something done.

But we are looking at the fact that these folks, going into 2015, at a time when they are trying to decide what to do on their homes—whether they can keep their mortgage—will be right back in the same situation of not knowing whether they are going to owe thousands of dollars' worth of tax going into next year.

We are seeing a lot of folks trying to keep their homes who had to cut corners in every which way—parents stopped paying toward their kids' college fund or they put off buying new

clothes or they canceled vacations or plans to visit their relatives while they are trying to figure out how to keep a roof over their head. Obviously there are many things that need to be done to support families, but one piece of tax policy that has given them some ability to plan has been this mortgage tax forgiveness bill.

What we are saying is: OK. For 2 weeks you can know that you can refinance with the bank—not next year. We kept you hanging for all of 2014, but for 2 weeks or 3 weeks we will give you some certainty.

So next year more families are going to be stuck with the same wrenching decisions they have this year if we can't at least get a 2-year bill.

When we look at other areas where folks will be left hanging, we have a very important area of the economy creating jobs every day in wind energy. There is a huge supply chain—as the Presiding Officer knows, as someone who cares deeply about manufacturing—from the making of turbines to the installation in the field, to the operations, to the maintenance, all of these are connected to American jobs, good-paying jobs. In fact, one of the big turbines has 8,000 parts in it. Somebody is making those parts. I would suggest to everyone that we can make every one of those in Michigan. I am sure we can make them in other places as well, although we would love to make them in Michigan. But what the industry doesn't know is whether the production tax credit which they depend on will be renewed for more than 3 weeks at the end of the year.

In fact, what the House did say is: You have 3 weeks to make business decisions about hiring new people, growing your business, building more parts for the winter. You have 3 weeks. Go get them—in 3 weeks. So they can't make business decisions, and they are going to have to cut.

In the meantime, that means layoffs, similar to the 30,000 workers who were laid off when Congress waited to the very last minute in 2012; 30,000 people were laid off when the same thing happened in 2012 when the production tax credit renewed at the last minute. Even if this bill passes, extending the production tax credit this week through the end of the year may be too late for 30,000 people, right before the holidays. Merry Christmas. Thirty thousand people not being able to have their job extended, people who could help us lead the world in clean energy production, who could help us develop energy here to be less dependent on foreign oil, but because we don't have the fortitude to extend this even after we had a bipartisan bill—the EXPIRE Act—come out of the Finance Committee last spring, they are looking at job losses.

So 30,000 families are putting holiday gifts on their credit card not knowing

whether they are going to be able to make payments when the bills arrive.

Businesses in the wind power industry make investment decisions on what their taxes will be, similar to any other business, 5 years, 10 years, 15 years into the future.

There have been, by the way, tax breaks for Big Oil for almost 100 years; the first one in 1916 embedded in the Tax Code, never having to be renewed so long-term business decisions can be made. But for their competitors to create jobs and bring prices down through things such as wind or solar or biofuel, it is a slog every year, every 2 years to try to keep these industries going.

Is that fair? It is absolutely not fair. We ought to have the same kind of tax policy. If we are embedding the Tax Code provisions to support oil production, we should be doing the same for wind, the same for solar, the same for biofuels.

What Republicans are doing when they force us into a situation where it is only a 3-week extension is they are basically telling Americans businesses: Don't invest. Don't hire people. We don't want competition to bring prices down on gasoline or prices in electricity. We don't want you to do that. We are unwilling to commit to something that will create jobs beyond somebody we have been fighting to protect for almost 100 years.

So this is a great concern to me. In the process, Americans deserve better. Our businesses and our innovators deserve better. We go out and say we want new innovation to create new kinds of jobs. That is happening. Then the doors are shut over and over again or it takes forever to pry open the door: You have 3 weeks, the door is open, and then it shuts.

Let me talk about another area I am deeply concerned about where people will be hurt if we do not pass the 2-year EXPIRE Act that we put together in the Finance Committee in a bipartisan way; that is, salaried workers such as those at Delphi auto parts manufacturer—which used to be a part of General Motors. During the 2008 rescue of the auto industry, somehow the salaried workers slipped through the cracks in terms of losing portions of their pensions, their health care coverage, and their insurance, and it is not fair.

One woman who worked at Delphi for over 30 years lost nearly half her pension and all of her health care coverage, which she needed for her husband who suffers from chronic pain.

A manager who worked at a Delphi facility in Michigan was so devoted to the people he supervised that he volunteered to retire rather than lay off some workers. Then 4 months after his retirement, he found out he was losing 40 percent of his pension and all of his health care coverage. Most of what was left out of his pension will go toward

paying the cost of his health care, and it was devastating to him and his family.

So we have in this extenders bill, this EXPIRE Act, the health coverage tax credit which was created for people such as these people. I am proud to be a coauthor with Senator BROWN, who has been a real leader on this for people who have lost their benefits that were supposedly guaranteed to them. It does not restore their pension, but this credit pays 72.5 percent of their health care premiums, making it possible for retirees to afford coverage similar to what they could have earned when they were working. It frankly helps people who can't get help in other ways, who fell through the cracks.

The credit expired at the end of 2013, and the bipartisan bill we passed in the spring, in April, renewed that credit. I was very pleased we were able to put this in the bill and thought we were on our way again to help people throughout this year who have been waiting and waiting.

Again, when we passed this in April it was filibustered on the floor by the Republicans. Now we are at 3 weeks left before the end of the year and what we get from the House is a bill that is retroactive for 2014, but it does not even include the health coverage tax credit. So even though this is retroactive for 2014, the people involved—the salaried workers who lost pensions who have been getting some help for their health care at least—will not even get that for this year. There are 20,000 Delphi retirees not only in Michigan and Ohio, but Pennsylvania, Indiana, Wisconsin and Illinois, all who are watching right now this process in the Senate and the House to see what will happen, and are reaching out to their House Members and Senate Members—Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Illinois.

To renew all the other tax provisions but cancel the HCTC is a cruel trick to play on families and certainly is underscored in terms of the holiday season we are getting into now. It is time for our colleagues across the aisle to stop forcing Americans to play a guessing game about their future taxes or their health care.

I regret that the clock has been ticking and running out and left us with no time at this point to get the fairness in the Tax Code that we need. There is still time if we wanted to to pass this EXPIRE Act and send it back to the House, and I am all for it, and I know our chairman, Senator WYDEN, has been working night and day with our colleagues across the aisle to try to make that happen. If it is too late for this year, if the clock runs out, shamefully, and we return next year with our Republican colleagues in the majority, I would suggest a New Year's resolution—to stop doing retroactive extensions—stop doing retroactive extensions when

it involves investments that people have to make that they are not going to be able to do retroactively or decisions about health care or decisions about a home. Start getting serious about making long-term economic decisions.

I know the Presiding Officer agrees with me on this and has spoken with me frequently on this.

Whether it is tax policy, health care policy, infrastructure policy, we need to make long-term decisions and support policies so that businesses can make long-term decisions.

Finally, we need to deliver certainty for families, for small businesses, for manufacturers, for those in alternative energy, for all who are working hard to invest in America across this country. Stop doing retroactive extensions, start working seriously on long-term tax policy and deliver certainty for families and businesses across the country. I think there is still time, if we wanted, to at least give the certainty of next year. Shame on the Congress if that does not happen. But I hope that we will at least commit ourselves that this is the last time this is done this way.

Thank you, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DECLINE OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the American people must make some very fundamental decisions in the coming years, and the most important of them is whether we continue the status quo of American society, and that is in terms of our economics and our politics which includes a 40-year decline of our middle class. Let me repeat that.

We are not just talking about what is happening today. We are not talking about the Wall Street crash of 2008. We are talking about a 40-year decline of the American middle class and an ongoing and growing gap between the very wealthy and everybody else. That is the reality of America now.

We can continue the same old, same old, or we can develop a bold economic agenda that begins the process of creating the millions of jobs we desperately need, an agenda which raises wages so that most of the new jobs being created are not low wage or part time, an agenda which protects our environment, and an agenda which enables us to join the rest of the industrialized world and guarantee health care to all people as a right. That is the issue of our time. Do we continue the status quo, continue the disappearance of the middle class, continue the grow-

ing gap between the very rich and everybody else, or do we have the courage to come up with an agenda that stands for working families and raises wages and provides for our kids and our seniors?

As part of that decision in my view is the reality that we cannot go forward unless we deal with another very important question, and that is, do we as a nation have the courage to take on the enormous economic and political power of the billionaire class? I know many of my colleagues don't like to talk about it. We talk about this and we talk about that, but most Americans in their gut understand that our economic and political life are controlled by a small number of very wealthy people and institutions, including but not limited to Wall Street, the oil companies, the insurance companies, the drug companies, the military-industrial complex, et cetera, and all of their lobbyists who flood Capitol Hill—trying to get this or that provision in tax bills and everywhere else—and, of course, their power in terms of campaign contributions, and especially since this disastrous Supreme Court Citizens United decision. It means the billionaire class can put unlimited sums of money into electing candidates who represent their interests.

Those are the most important questions of our time. Do we have the courage to take on the handful of billionaire special interests who wield so much economic and political power? Do we have the will to push forward an economic agenda that works for working families and not just for the very wealthy?

The long-term deterioration of the middle class, accelerated by the Wall Street crash of 2008, has not been a pretty sight. Today we have more wealth and income inequality than any major country on Earth and the gap between the very rich and everybody else is growing wider. The top 1 percent now owns about 41 percent of the financial wealth of our country, while the bottom 60 percent owns all of 1.7 percent. The top 1 percent owns 41 percent of the financial wealth, the bottom 60 percent owns 1.7 percent. In fact, amazingly enough, the top one-tenth of 1 percent now owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent of the American people. Does anyone believe that is what America is supposed to be about, where the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent?

Today we have the absurd situation, the obscene situation, where one family, the Walton family, the owners of Walmart, are worth about \$148 billion. That is more wealth in that one family than the bottom 40 percent of the American people.

Today in the United States we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth. About

one-quarter of our kids get nutrition through food stamps, and we are the only industrialized country—major country—that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right.

We once led the world in terms of the percentage of our people who graduated college, but today in a highly competitive global economy we are now in 12th place.

In terms of infrastructure, the United States used to have the finest, most envied infrastructure in the world. Today, as I think every citizen of this country knows, our infrastructure, our roads, our bridges, rail, water systems, airports, dams are virtually collapsing. The American Society of Civil Engineers tells us that we need to spend \$3 trillion just to bring our infrastructure up to par. But with infrastructure spending now at its lowest level since 1947, we rank 16th in the world in terms of infrastructure according to the World Economic Forum.

So once we led the world in terms of the numbers of percentages of people graduating college; today we are 12th. Once we led the world in terms of the strength of our infrastructure; today we are the 16th. But we do have the dubious distinction of being first in terms of childhood poverty of any major country.

Real unemployment today is not what the official unemployment states of 5.8 percent; it is over 11 percent when you include those people who have given up looking for work or are working part time. Youth unemployment is over 18 percent.

We hear a lot about Ferguson, MO, and that is a very important issue, but we don't hear enough about the reality that African-American youth unemployment is over 30 percent.

Today in this country millions of Americans are working longer hours for lower wages. In inflation-adjusted-for dollars, the median male worker—listen to this; this is really quite unbelievable and it tells us a little bit as to why the American people are angry. The median male worker—that worker right in the middle of the economy—last year earned \$783 less than he made 41 years ago—\$783 less than he made 41 years ago in inflation-accounted-for dollars. In the explosion of technology, the great global economy, all of the great free trade agreements, and that male worker today is earning over \$700 less than he made in real dollars 41 years ago. The median female worker made \$1337 less last year than she earned in 2007.

Since 1999, the median middle-class family has seen its income go down by almost \$5,000 after adjusting for inflation, now earning less this year than a family earned 25 years ago. Are we better off today than we were 6 years ago when Bush left office and we were hemorrhaging 700,000 jobs a month and the financial system was on the verge of

collapse with a \$1.3 trillion deficit? Of course we are. But if you look at the trends over the last 40 years, the reality is, the middle class in this country is disappearing and almost all new income and wealth is going to the people on top.

The American people must demand that Congress and the White House start protecting the interests of working families, not just wealthy campaign contributors. We need Federal legislation to put the unemployed back to work, raise wages, and make certain that all Americans have health care and education in order to live healthy and productive lives.

We can spend hours dissecting and analyzing the problems of American society, and in my view, they are worse today than at any time since the Great Depression, and if you throw in the planetary crisis of climate change, we may have more problems today facing our Nation than at any time in a very long period.

But what I wish to do today is very briefly throw out and discuss 12 initiatives that I believe, if enacted by the Congress, could begin to address the collapse of the middle class and rebuild our economy. I will just touch on them briefly.

No. 1, as I mentioned earlier, our infrastructure is collapsing—our roads, bridges, water systems, wastewater plants, airports, railroads, and older schools. We spent \$3 trillion—or when we take care of the last veteran, we have spent \$3 trillion fighting a war in Iraq that we never should have fought in the first place.

If over a period of years we were to invest \$1 trillion in rebuilding our infrastructure, we could create 13 million decent-paying jobs, and that is exactly what we have to do. Think of what America would look like if you went around the country and saw work being done on roads, bridges, and cutting-edge technology for our water plants and wastewater plants. We would become more productive and efficient. We would put people back to work.

No. 2, in my view—and I know many of my Republican colleagues don't agree, but the scientific community is united when they say climate change is real, it is caused by human activity, and if we do not reverse and substantially cut back carbon emissions, this planet will become increasingly uninhabitable for our kids and our grandchildren. In my view, we must transform our energy system away from fossil fuels and into energy efficiency and sustainable energy, such as wind, solar, geothermal, et cetera.

When we address energy efficiency and sustainable energy, not only do we lead the world in transforming our energy system and reversing climate change, but we also create a significant number of meaningful and important jobs.

No. 3, in my view, instead of giving tax breaks to large corporations which shut down in America and go to China, we want to invest in new economic models to increase job creation and productivity, and that is giving workers the opportunity to own their own businesses. We have some of that in Vermont, and I know in Ohio there are worker-owned businesses where workers are more productive and feel better about their jobs. I would rather invest in that than in corporations that will shut down in this country and move abroad.

No. 4, I think most people understand that when you have a union to negotiate and engage in collective bargaining, wages are higher and working conditions are better. Today corporate opposition to union organizing makes it extremely difficult for workers to join a union. We need legislation which makes it clear that when a majority of workers signs cards in support of a union, they can have that union.

No. 5, the Federal minimum wage today is a starvation wage of \$7.25 an hour. We need to raise the minimum wage to a living wage. People who work 40 hours a week should not live in poverty.

No. 6, women workers today earn about 78 cents on the dollar to what their male counterparts earn doing the same work. That is not acceptable. We need equal pay for equal work. We need pay equity in our country, and we have to pass that legislation.

No. 7, an issue that we don't talk about enough, and, in fact, has had bipartisan support for many decades, is our disastrous trade policy, NAFTA, CAFTA, and permanent normal trade relations with China. The simple fact is these trade policies have been a disaster for the American worker. Since 2001, we have lost more than 60,000 factories in this country and more than 4.9 million decent-paying manufacturing jobs. Not all of that is attributable to bad trade policies, but a lot of it is. We need to rethink our trade policies and demand that corporate America invest in the United States of America and not in China.

I know that is a radical idea. Imagine going shopping in a department store where we can actually purchase products made in America and not in China, but I think we should be doing that.

No. 8, we are not going to be a successful economy unless our young people have the ability to get the college education they need regardless of the income of their families. Right now it is increasingly difficult for working families to afford college. Many of our young people are coming out of college deeply in debt. In this area we are moving in exactly the wrong direction. Forty, fifty years ago, tuition was virtually free at some of the great public universities in America, such as the

University of California, New York City, and State colleges around country. Today it is unaffordable.

We need to radically rethink higher education in this country. Our goal is that everyone, regardless of income, should be able to get a quality college education and not come out in debt.

No. 9, I think everybody understands the enormous stranglehold that Wall Street has on our economy. Banking is supposed to be the facilitator to get money out in the productive economy where companies are producing products and services and not see Wall Street or financial institutions as an end in itself, but that is exactly what we have right now. We have six financial institutions in this country that have assets equivalent to over 60 percent of the GDP of the United States of America. That is too big, and it gives them too much economic and political power. In my view, they must be broken up and we must bring about a more competitive financial system where money is getting out to the real economy so businesses can create real jobs.

No. 10, and many people don't know this, but the United States is the only major country on Earth that doesn't guarantee health care to all people as a right. Yet we end up spending almost twice as much per capita on health care as any other Nation. In my strong opinion, if we want health care for all and we want to do it in a cost-effective way, we need to move toward a Medicare for all, single-payer system.

No. 11, today in this great Nation, millions of seniors are living in poverty, and that number is growing, and we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country. We must strengthen the social safety net, not weaken it. Instead of talking about cutting Social Security or cutting Medicare or cutting Medicaid or cutting nutrition programs, we should be expanding those programs. This is a great country, and we should not have millions of people wondering how they are going to be able to buy medicine for their illness or heat their homes in the wintertime. We have to expand the social safety net for our kids, our seniors, and our vulnerable populations.

Last, but certainly not least, at a time of massive wealth and income inequality, we need a progressive tax system in this country which is based on ability to pay. It is not acceptable that major profitable corporations have paid nothing in recent years in Federal income taxes and that corporate CEOs in this country often enjoy an effective tax rate which is lower than their secretaries'.

We are losing about \$100 billion a year from companies that stash their profits in the Cayman Islands, Bermuda, and other tax havens. We need real tax reform. We need to end all of these corporate tax loopholes so we

have the revenue we need to do the important tasks in front of us to rebuild this country.

With that, I think the American people have some fundamental choices to make. Do we continue the status quo from an economic perspective and political perspective or do we demand that Congress start listening to the pain of the middle class and working families of this country and start producing legislation which rebuilds our crumbling middle class?

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Vermont.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, of up to 10 minutes, that Senator MANCHIN be recognized for his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, every year about this time—actually every few months, or maybe every month—there are attempts by Wall Street to again change the rules, cut back consumer protection laws, and change the regulations that protect the American public against Wall Street greed.

It happens almost weekly, it seems, in the Financial Services Committee in the House of Representatives. There are attempts in the Agriculture Committee, beaten back by Senator STABENOW, to her credit, and attempts in the banking committee, beaten back by Chairman JOHNSON, to his credit.

Almost every week, it seems, there are efforts by Wall Street to undermine the protections that we were able to build in under the Dodd-Frank bill to stop Wall Street from doing to the economy what it did in 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008. September of 2008 had been preceded by a decade of deregulation of the financial industry, decades of lobbying by very effective lobbyists for the six biggest Wall Street banks. Risky behavior was rewarded with gargantuan profits for the firms and multimillion-dollar bonuses for the executives.

The CEO of one of the largest megabanks in the history of the world—not just in our country—said: As long as the music is playing, you have got to get up and dance. There is a lot of money to be made on Wall Street, and they have to take advantage of every loophole, particularly those loopholes that their lobbyists create.

This unmitigated greed led to 8 million people losing their jobs, 7 million losing their homes after being foreclosed on because the financial system lacked the necessary safeguards to protect Wall Street. Dodd-Frank was supposed to end all of that. It has made progress by preventing taxpayer bailouts for banks. Risky derivatives trad-

ing was one of the central goals of Dodd-Frank. An amendment by Senator Lincoln, then the Chair of the Agriculture Committee, brought forward an amendment in 2009. Dodd-Frank went through the process.

The day that President Obama signed the Dodd-Frank bill to protect Americans from Wall Street greed, the chief lobbyists for the chief financial trade association in this town said: Now it is half-time. What does “now it is half-time” mean? Well, the bill passed, and Wall Street financiers and lobbyists said, we don’t like that, but now we can go to the regulatory agencies and weaken the rules, delay their implementation, sometimes stop some of the rulemaking, and we can go back to Congress and continue to lobby and weaken these rules.

To give you an example of what has happened, in 1995, the 6 largest banks in the United States had assets equal to 18 percent of the GDP. I don’t want to bore people with numbers, but in 1995, the 6 largest banks had assets equal to 18 percent of GDP. Today they make up 64 percent of GDP. The largest six Wall Street banks—everybody knows their names—are getting larger and larger, increasing their economic power, and as we see almost every day in this Congress and especially in the House of Representatives dominated by tea party Republicans and people at the beck and call of Wall Street, we see their political power growing.

Under the accounting rules applied by the rest of the world, the derivatives holdings of the 6 largest banks—basically insurance policy on top of insurance policy on top of insurance policy as financial instruments—are 39 percent larger than we think they are, which is a difference of about \$4 trillion.

Derivatives were described by Warren Buffett as timebombs—financial weapons of mass destruction carrying dangers that are potentially lethal. Senator LEVIN, who is about to retire from the Senate after 36 years, calls these derivatives nuclear weapons.

According to the New York Times, bank lobbyists wrote provisions dealing with derivatives that will repeal—not to get too technical—the Lincoln language. And here is what the language in section 716 says: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal assistance may be provided to any swaps entity with respect to any swaps, security-based swap, or other activity of the swaps entity.

This is the language that is now Federal law. This language says no more bailouts.

However, the legislation likely to be in front of us, the omnibus we will be facing, because of Wall Street lobbyists, because of Republican financial services members caving to special interests, this provision that says “no more bailouts” is done with. We will

see language now stripped out of Federal law that says “no more bailouts.”

The public needs to understand that if this language passes to strip this language out, if this bill passes, that again bailouts can be imminent—bailouts brought on by Wall Street greed, bailouts brought on by risky trading, now protected by taxpayers. So, in other words, it is heads I win, tails you lose. If I make big bets on derivatives and I am a Wall Street banker, I make tens of millions of dollars. However, if I make big bets and something bad happens, taxpayers get to pay for it. That is the problem with stripping out section 716.

I am not the only one who thinks this. Tom Hoenig, Leader McConnell’s selection to the FDIC board, supports keeping 716 in the law. Sheila Bair—once Senator Bob Dole’s chief of staff, President Bush’s appointment, and then President Obama kept her on as a major Federal regulator—she is opposed to repeal, as has the White House opposed the repeal.

Mark Stefanski, a friend of mine from Third Federal in my neighborhood in Cleveland, in Slovak Village, which is about an \$11 billion bank on the southeast side of Cleveland. That is a bank which makes mortgages. It does not trade in exotic derivatives. He told me: You know, banking should be boring. It is not about taking excessive risks, especially when those excessive risks are underwritten by taxpayers.

That is what abolishing 716—that is what the repeal of the 716 language does. It puts taxpayers on the hook in the form of a future bailout. It is a subsidy today for the six largest banks. It puts taxpayers on the hook in the future, gives all kinds of additional incentives for Wall Street bankers to engage in more risky derivatives trading, and puts us all again under the possibility of a bank bailout.

It simply does not make sense. We have the opportunity to reject this part of this legislation. We owe it to the families in my State, to families in Virginia, to families in Delaware, to families in Georgia, and all over this country. That is why we cannot support a measure that values corporate greed over working America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, first I thank my colleague for giving me this time, and I acknowledge the hard work he has done.

WEISS NOMINATION

I represent the great State of West Virginia. It is a rural State where we believe in commonsense solutions and values. In the Mountain State, we understand the importance of leveling the playing field for community institutions and helping small businesses create and keep jobs. As a Senator from West Virginia, I was sent here to represent the people of Main Street. For

those reasons, I rise today to explain why I must oppose the nomination of Wall Street investment banker Antonio Weiss to be Under Secretary for Domestic Finance at the Department of the Treasury.

I cannot and will not support his nomination because I do not believe he possesses the characteristics and the background we need in an Under Secretary to push for strong Wall Street oversight and to protect our small businesses and financial institutions on Main Streets all across America.

The position to which Mr. Weiss has been nominated is one that would put him at the head of the Treasury's decisionmaking on issues of domestic finance, fiscal policy, government liability, and other related domestic matters. He would oversee critical issues such as Wall Street reform, financing the national debt, housing finance reform, and small business credit. I have serious doubts that Mr. Weiss has the right experience to take on such a role.

It is clear that as the global head of investment banking at Lazard, Mr. Weiss is very talented and experienced in working in financial markets and economic institutions, but as an investment banker on Wall Street, he does not have the experience for this particular oversight position. He has dealt almost entirely with European investment banking, not domestic finance or community banking or regulatory issues of any kind, all of which fall under the jurisdiction of this important position.

Besides not having the right background for the job, the fact that Mr. Weiss is a top corporate dealmaker with a specialization in international financing is in itself troubling to me. He has spent a good deal of his professional career working on mergers and acquisitions for the world's largest corporations. He has spent time in Paris running the firm's European division. There is not a thing wrong with that, but this fits the administration's pattern of choosing Wall Street insiders for senior policy positions instead of those with strong consumer protection or community bank and credit union experience, plain-spoken people who have worked on Main Street.

To make matters worse, the substantial compensation Lazard plans to offer Mr. Weiss upon his confirmation is another reason to be very skeptical. The financial giant is planning to pay him \$20 million if he can win confirmation and come into government service. This kind of arrangement and human nature suggests he will be especially sympathetic to Lazard's lobbying efforts. Public service is a noble cause. A \$20 million golden parachute makes it very hard to gain the public's trust.

With that being said, I do not believe Mr. Weiss can fulfill the duties of Under Secretary of the Treasury Department.

Since joining the Senate banking committee, I have tried to make our banking and financial system work better for small businesses, banks, and middle-class West Virginians and Americans. I will continue to do so. That is why I cannot support this nomination. Mr. Weiss does not have the experience for this particular job.

It is important to send a message that we will no longer allow Wall Street to exclusively make our fiscal policy decisions, especially when they affect so many around this country on Main Street. Economic and banking policies have too often been made without the input of our Nation's midsize banks, community banks, and credit unions. We must strive to have a balanced view of engaging voices on all sides of these important issues. By confirming Mr. Weiss as the Under Secretary, we are putting Wall Street before Main Street. We have already seen from the 2008 crisis how that harmed the Nation as a whole. We do not need to repeat that picture again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO SAXBY CHAMBLISS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wanted to rise very briefly because I know Senator CHAMBLISS is about to give his farewell speech. I commend my dear good friend the Senator from Georgia for his service. I am going to stay through his speech, but I know there will be others who will probably rise afterwards to give accolades, and I wanted to be first in line to salute him for his service, his friendship to so many of us in this body, and my personal good wishes for his future. I know there will be others later; I thought for a change I would get a word in first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, as my service in the Senate comes to an end, I rise today to say thank you to some of the wonderful people who have been part of a great ride for over 20 years.

We as Americans are fortunate to live in the greatest country in the world; a country where the American dream is still alive and well; a country where, in spite of all of our problems, we are the envy of the free world; a country where a preacher's kid from rural southern Georgia can rise to be elected to the House of Representatives and then to the Senate.

We as Members of the Senate are fortunate to have the opportunity to serve. We are blessed to be able to work in such a historic venue as we are in this afternoon. As we come into our offices and into this building every day, there are some things we take for

granted. So to the entire Capitol Hill workforce, from those who clean our offices, to those who change the lightbulbs, provide our food, maintain our subways, keep us safe and secure, and to all of those in between, I say thank you. You are very professional in what you do, and you always do it with a smile.

To the floor staff and the cloakroom staff for both the majority and the minority, thanks for putting in the long hours, listening to often boring speeches, reminding us when we have not voted, scheduling floor time, reminding us of the rules, and making sure our mistakes are at a minimum.

I am fortunate to have been surrounded by great staff during all of my 20 years in the House and Senate, mostly young people from varied backgrounds who are the brightest minds my State and my country have to offer. They are committed patriots and loyal to the core. To those current and former members of my staff, thank you for your service to me and to the State of Georgia.

I have been served by four chiefs of staff: Rob Leeborn, Krister Holladay, Charlie Harman, and Camila Knowles. Every office plan that each one of them put together starts with providing better constituent service than any other Member of the House or the Senate. I am extremely proud that our record shows we achieve the goal of doing just that. I have even had government agency personnel call my office asking for guidance on cases from other offices.

I have often said that my greatest satisfaction from this job comes not from negotiating major pieces of legislation but from being able to help Georgians with difficulties they are experiencing and having a positive impact on their lives.

I am particularly blessed to have three members of my staff who have been with me for all 20 years. My deputy chief Teresa Ervin, Debbie Cannon, and Bill Stembridge have walked every mile with me and have been so valuable. Thanks, guys.

My greatest support comes from my family. My wife Julianne, my daughter Lia and her husband Joe, my son Bo and his wife Bess, along with our grandchildren—John, Parker, Jay, Kimbrough, Anderson, and Ellie—have all been somehow involved on the campaign trail.

Come the 28th day of this month, Julianne and I will have been married for 48 years, having met at the University of Georgia a couple of years before that. For tolerating a husband who had a 24/7 job for 20 years, for being a single mom part of that time, and for understanding why I could not get home until Christmas Eve some years, I say thank you, sweetheart.

I am privileged today to represent almost 10 million Georgians who are the most wonderful people God ever put on

this earth. I lost my first primary election and went on to win each of my next seven races. I won every one of those seven races because I shared the values of my constituents, I outworked each of my opponents, and I had better ideas and the best advisers and staff. Thanks, Tom and Paige.

Thanks to Senators Nunn and Miller for their regular advice and counsel. Thanks to my three leaders, Senator Lott, Senator Frist, and Senator MCCONNELL, each of whom provided me with strong leadership and always listened to me even when I had ideas that might have been different from their ideas.

I am often asked what I will miss most about the Senate. The answer is very easy. I will miss my friends and the relationships we have developed over the years. Senator ISAKSON and I entered the University of Georgia 52 years ago in September and became friends immediately. We have been the dearest of friends ever since. He is without question the most trusted friend and adviser I have. I will miss our daily conversations.

My three best buddies from my House days, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, Congressman TOM LATHAM, and Senator RICHARD BURR, along with Senator TOM COBURN, have been the legislative collaborators, dinner partners, golfing buddies, confidants, and numerous other things that should not be mentioned on the floor of the Senate.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM is like a member of my family. We have traveled the world together many times, hearing a lot. I have no plans to write a book, but if I did, LINDSEY GRAHAM's anecdotes would fill a chapter.

Senator FEINSTEIN has been a great chairman and partner on the Intelligence Committee. I will miss her leadership, her wisdom, her friendship, and those late-afternoon glasses of California wine.

My most productive time in the Senate has been spent with my dear friend Senator MARK WARNER. Our work with the Gang of 6, which included Senators DURBIN, CONRAD, COBURN, CRAPO, and then later Senators JOHANNES and BENNET, represents the very best of everything about the Senate. We spent, literally, hundreds of hours together debating ideas and trying to solve major problems, and we came very close. Senator WARNER's insight, his wanting to solve problems, and his political inspiration are lessons that I will carry with me forever.

As the Senate now goes forward under new leadership, I have two comments. First, the Senate should return to regular order. Senator MCCONNELL has indicated that will be the case, and it should be.

The rule change by the current majority changed the institution of the Senate in a negative way. I hope the rule is changed back to require 60 votes

on all issues, including judges and nominees. Some of those most vocal favoring the rules change lost their elections, and while the rules change did not cost them their election, it is very clear that the American people wanted a change in the leadership that changed the rule. Regular order will help in restoring trust and confidence to the world's most deliberative body.

Second, it is imperative that the issue of the debt of this country be addressed. Just last week our total debt surpassed \$18 trillion. We cannot leave the astronomical debt our policies have generated for our children and grandchildren to fix. It is not rocket science; it is what must be done.

Cutting spending alone—for example, sequestration—is not the solution. Raising taxes is not the solution. As Simpson-Bowles, Domenici-Rivlin and the Gang of 6 all agreed, it will take a combination of spending reduction, entitlement reform, and tax reform to stimulate more revenue. Hard and tough votes will have to be taken, but that is why we get elected to the Senate. The world is waiting for America to lead on this issue. If we do, the U.S. economy will respond in a very robust way. The Gang of 6 laid the foundation for this problem to be solved, and it is my hope that we do not leave the solution for the next generation.

I close with what I have enjoyed most about Congress, and that is the opportunity that I have had to spend with the men and women in uniform and those in the intelligence world, all of whom are willing to put their lives in harm's way for the sake of our freedom.

Whether it was Robins Air Force Base, Kabul, Ramadi, Jalalabad, Khowst or Dubai, I always get emotional telling the men and women how proud I am of them and how blessed we as Americans are to have them protecting us. They are special people who sacrificed much for the sake of all 300 million Americans.

Let us also remember and be thankful for the families of those military and civilian personnel who likewise make a commitment to America. As we head into another Christmas season, many of those families will not have at home their spouse, their parent, their son or their daughter.

May God bless them. May God bless this great institution, and may God continue to bless our great country.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from California is recognized.

TRIBUTES TO SAXBY CHAMBLISS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Senator CHAMBLISS, my remarks are personal. We worked together for the past 8 years on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. For 4 years we have worked as chair and cochair. We have exchanged

views, we have negotiated bills, and we have shared information. We have been there through very tough times and some very pleasant times. It is very hard for me to see you go.

I have learned to trust you. I respect you. We have worked together. The committee put together a Benghazi report. We worked very hard. We found areas of agreement.

Senator COLLINS of the committee is here, and Senator WARNER is here. Am I missing anyone else from the committee? There is Senator BURR, who will be the new chairman, and Senator COATS, Senator COBURN. We were able to come together and put together a report unanimously, and it was really because of your leadership.

As I watched, what became very apparent is that maybe your side isn't as fractious as my side is. You were able to say yes, we can do this or no, we can't do that, and you reflected your Members. That made it very easy for me, and I am very grateful.

Yesterday we disagreed. You have never taken a cheap shot. We worked together at the same time to move our intelligence authorization bill. There was one last glitch which you worked out, and that bill passed unanimously last night.

Together we have worked to put together an information-sharing bill for what is probably our No. 1 defensive issue, which is cyber and the attacks that have taken 97 percent of our businesses into difficulties.

You have compromised, and I have compromised. Unfortunately, on our side, we have some unsolved issues. So, hopefully, I will be able to pick up with Senator BURR where we left off, and we will be able to get that job done next year.

What I want you to know—and I said this to you in another way—that it was such a wonderful experience for me to work with you. This is the hard part. We are only here for an instant in eternity, and the only thing that matters is what we do with that instant.

What I want you to know is you have really done yeoman's work in that instant, and I am very grateful to have the pleasure of working with you. I have learned from you, and I wish you all good things.

Thank you very much, Senator CHAMBLISS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. I rise to pay tribute to my friend, SAXBY CHAMBLISS.

I will admit to you this is a speech I never wanted to make. I never wanted to make it because we have had a wonderful relationship in this body for the past 10 years. We have done everything together.

He has had my back, and I have had his back. He is a great friend, and I will miss him. But I am not a selfish guy. He married one of the finest women I

have ever known, Julianne Chambliss, who is one of the best friends my wife has.

Although he is leaving us and I will miss the crutch I have used for so long, Julianne is getting her SAXBY back. For Julianne, her family, and those grandkids he loves so much, that is exactly what SAXBY wants to do.

Georgia has had some great Senators: Richard Russell, who was really the master of the Senate; Zell Miller, a former Governor of Georgia, a great friend of mine and a great mentor of our State; and Sam Nunn, one of the finest in national defense and foreign policy our State ever offered. SAXBY will be the fourth on the Mount Rushmore of Georgia Senators who have served Georgia with distinction and with class.

I want to tell SAXBY this in person. For 10 years we have done joint conferences. We have messed up twice. When I messed up he covered my back and when he messed up I covered his.

In 2008 when he almost lost a race and got into a runoff in December in Georgia, I rode a bus for 21 straight days introducing him three times a day and eating barbecue every single day for dinner and for lunch. That is a price to pay that only friendship will bring out.

He is a dear friend, a trusted person. I love him very much and I love his family very much.

I could talk all day, but I wanted to open and close by saying, SAXBY, I love you. The State is going to love having you back. This country is going to miss you, but my grandchildren are safer, my State is better, and our relationship has never been stronger.

May God bless you and your family in every endeavor you undertake, and may God bless the United States of America.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MANCHIN. First, I would say I have only been in the Senate for 4 years. When I came, let's just say it was not what I expected. For that, you look for a little bit of respite, if you will.

I looked at my colleagues and my friends on the Republican side. I didn't come to the Senate looking at what side you were on. I looked at basically the person I was dealing with.

There was a person who befriended me almost from my first day, knowing that the transition was a challenge. He stepped up to the plate with a few of my other friends over there—I see Senator COBURN behind him—and basically took me under the wing and said: Listen, we can all work together and get along. What we do here is bigger and for the greater good than what we do for ourselves.

SAXBY not only showed me, but basically I was able to follow and watch

what he did. This Chamber should be filled right now—it really should be from all sides—but the bottom line is the Senator is loved by everybody. I never heard an ill word said about SAXBY CHAMBLISS, the distinction he carries as far as the Senate and as a human being.

I say to the Senator, your family and your priorities are correct. Your moral compass is working and working well. I can only tell you thank you. As someone from the other side of the aisle and as a fellow colleague and a fellow American, you are an inspiration to us all.

SAXBY, there will not be another SAXBY, but I am glad they gave you to me for this short period of time of 4 years. Some of you—I look at JOHNNY, and I envy JOHNNY. For 52 years he has been your close friend.

There is your partner in crime back there, Senator BURR. We hope he doesn't tell it all when he gets up.

But with that being said, there are so many people who have a relationship that is unmatched and that is because of you.

I say, my dear friend, my hat is off to you. Thank you, and God bless you for what you have done for the United States of America, for Georgia, but most importantly for all of us. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, this moment is bittersweet for me.

I spent more time with SAXBY than I have with my own wife for the past 20 years. We have done everything together. Those vacation spots he mentioned—Kabul, Baghdad—I was right beside him.

We traveled to areas of the world that others wouldn't venture to, and there was a reason he was there. He was concerned about America's future, he was concerned about his children's future, and he was in a position to have an impact on it to make it better for them in the future. That is why he served. It is obvious to all of our colleagues that he is a lot older than I am, but he has worked just as hard as the youngest Member of this institution.

Even though we have seen each other's children grow up, and now we have seen them all married off, he deserves the time to go home and spend some time with his grandchildren and, more importantly, to get to know his wife again.

I want to say, Senator FEINSTEIN, I like red wine just as much as SAXBY does. I probably can't be bought as cheaply as he could, but I do look forward to continuing to work with you and, more importantly, to continue to do the work on the Intelligence Committee that really does build on what SAXBY started in the year 2000 as we went on the House Intelligence Committee together.

There is only one way to sum up SAXBY CHAMBLISS. He is a true southern gentleman. He is absolutely a statesman, but what everybody who meets SAXBY understands is this. He is a great American, he loves this country, he loves this institution, and some piece of him will remain here when he leaves at the end of this year. He will have an impact on what happens even though his presence may not be here.

We wish him Godspeed in life after.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I am a bit out of order here. I was waiting for some of my colleagues who have spent a bit more time here than I to speak, but I wanted to take this opportunity to add my sincere thanks to SAXBY CHAMBLISS for the kind of person he is and the kind of leadership he has provided and the kind of example he has set during his time in Congress and in the Senate.

I was privileged to be able to come back to the Senate and join the group of people who shared the same deep concerns I had shared. The reason I did come back was due to the threats to our country from abroad and the fiscal plunge into debt that is going to affect our country dramatically in the future if we don't deal with it. But having the privilege of being with the people who have set such an example has been a great privilege for me.

If I were a producer and director of a movie I was going to have come out about the Senate, I would want SAXBY to be the leading man. First of all, he looks like a Senator, and he has that southern calm presence that most of us envy and he just seems to fit the profile. The next choice would have to be for the leading lady, and you couldn't find a more gracious, beautiful, supportive leading lady than Julianne Chambliss. Together, they just make a stunning couple.

I have had the privilege of traveling with them and seeing them in different places and in different situations, and what a tremendous gift it is to be with the both of them. So the Senate and many of us here will dearly miss SAXBY CHAMBLISS. He comes from a line of distinguished Senators representing the State of Georgia, and as Senator BURR said, he fits right into that long list of people whose tenure here has been remembered for decades and will continue to be remembered for decades.

His commitment to our men and women in uniform, his service to the agriculture community but particularly, in my experience, his leadership of the Intelligence Committee has been leadership this country has needed in a time of dire circumstances. His work with Chairman FEINSTEIN in dealing with the daily pressures and weight of responsibility that falls on the leadership—and all of us who serve on the committee but particularly the leadership of the Intelligence Committee—

has probably been as great in the last several years as any time in our history. Very difficult decisions have had to be made.

I know I sometimes stagger out of that committee thinking, this is more than I can get my mind around. This is more than I can get my arms around in terms of how do we deal with some of these threats and some of these challenges that have popped up all over the world in various manifestations. Yet the solid leadership on the Republican side with SAXBY CHAMBLISS has united us in a way that has forged a real bond and a desire to work in a nonpartisan basis to live up to our responsibility to provide oversight for the intelligence community and to be a part of helping make those decisions that are so important and so formative in terms of how we deal with these particular issues.

So I thank SAXBY for the person he has been, the person he is, and the person he will continue to be, for the example he has set, for his friendship, and for his extraordinary leadership. I know the refrigerator will be stocked with Coca Cola, there will be Georgia peanuts in his pocket, maybe a little bit of bourbon in a drawer somewhere, and he will have a tee time at Augusta just about any time he wants. I wish him the very best as he and Julianne go forward with their life. He has left his mark here and certainly he has left his mark on me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, a lot has been said about SAXBY already, but I have an observation I have noticed over the last 10 years since I have been here, and it is about leadership. We see elected leadership on both sides, but then we see real leadership. We see the person people go to for advice. We see the person people go to for counsel. We see the person whom people go to for wisdom and judgment. That is what I have noticed the last 10 years.

More than anybody in this body, whether it is from the other side of the aisle or this side of the aisle, the person whose counsel is most sought is that of SAXBY CHAMBLISS. That is real leadership that is earned, and it needs to be recognized and honored for what it is. Because what it says is his leadership comes without judgment on the person asking the question, without condemnation of a position that may be different than his. It is giving of himself for the benefit of the rest of us.

Hear, hear, my friend from Georgia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to stand and pay tribute to SAXBY CHAMBLISS. I think the first time I got to work around SAXBY was when I was nominated as the Secretary of Agriculture, and I think the first

hearing SAXBY chaired as chairman of the Senate ag committee might have been that hearing.

I arrived in Washington, and I was scared to death. I had no idea what to expect. But I met with SAXBY, and I knew immediately that when I was in that hearing I was going to be treated with dignity and with respect because he wouldn't have it any other way. That is the way he did business.

Fortunately, I was confirmed, and that started our working relationship. In those years, I would not try to argue that we agreed on every nuance of farm policy. I am positive there were times when SAXBY was convinced I didn't understand a thing about southern agriculture. But he was patient and he was determined to represent all of agriculture, whether it was the South, the Midwest or the West. His goal was to be a chairman of the ag committee for all of agriculture. It was during that time the farm bill was written, and he was a tough negotiator. He had a mind in terms of where he was headed and he was going to stand up for his people and I came to respect him so much.

It was in the Senate though where I truly began to understand his talent. I can't tell you how many times we have been in a caucus meeting and somebody would ask the most intricate, difficult question relating to intelligence and national security, and invariably we would turn to SAXBY. SAXBY would stand and, in that quiet but forceful way he has, he would walk us through the intricacies of the issues. On whatever the topic was, he would explain it in a way that literally everybody in the room understood. They got it. Watch out. You had better be prepared to be Senators with the information he had given us.

What has impressed me so much, and I know I speak for my colleagues when I say this, is he could do the same thing with the most intricate issues relative to farm policy or ag policy or finance or the Federal budget. The breadth of his knowledge is absolutely unbelievable.

I thank you, SAXBY, for the many times you probably disagreed with me immensely but treated me thoughtfully and respectfully and listened to my opinion. I saw you do that with other Members in this body. I thank you for your service. As one of the retiring Members, I will look forward to the opportunity to spend more time with you. I hope our paths cross many times in the future because I know I will be the better for it.

God bless you, my friend, and best wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. The junior Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Your words.

Mr. PORTMAN. Look. I am so proud to be here to say a couple of words

about my friend SAXBY. As you have heard from my colleagues, he is beloved. By the way, two of those who spoke are Senators who are also choosing to leave us. TOM COBURN talked about leadership. I will tell you, they are leaving a huge void.

I got to know SAXBY when he came to the House of Representatives. I was there in the early 1990s, and we became friends. Although I am from Ohio and he is a son of the South, he and Julianne embraced me and Jane, and I got to know his son Bo—such a great family.

But I didn't truly get to know him until I was the U.S. Trade Representative and my job was to try to open markets for U.S. agricultural products around the world. That required looking at something called subsidies—agriculture subsidies. This is a dangerous area in terms of politics, and MIKE JOHANNIS is very well aware of this as an ex-Secretary of Agriculture, having been at my side during some of these negotiations.

My job was to come to the Senate ag committee and talk about what we were up to and try to find out how much flexibility there was for us to get these markets open that were so important for our farmers and ranchers but entailed considerable political risk. I learned a new SAXBY CHAMBLISS there. That is when I saw the leadership that was talked about earlier.

SAXBY was willing to not just be constructive but to take that risk and to be totally discreet and confidential in dealing with very sensitive issues. I came away with a whole new level of understanding about SAXBY and therefore a new respect for him, his character, and his willingness to do what was right.

More recently, of course, we have seen his leadership on other issues: standing up for our men and women in uniform. My colleagues, to me, he has been the guardian at the gate, giving us all comfort as ranking member of the Intelligence Committee. We live in a dangerous, volatile world, and knowing SAXBY was there, clear-eyed, disciplined, discreet, and able to tell it like it was and tell it like it is today, I think has given not just us but our families and all Americans considerable comfort. So I appreciate his service there.

Finally, I admire his willingness to step up on this issue of our national debt. This is again not an easy issue, and he joined with some colleagues to promote some proposals. Again, my colleagues who are leaving know this, TOM COBURN, in particular; MIKE JOHANNIS, whom I will always have a great deal of respect for the way he has handled that issue as well.

Despite everything we have heard about him today though, perhaps his greatest accomplishment has yet to be mentioned; that is, the fact that he

played golf with the President of the United States and managed to get a hole in one. The press report from that day says two things that are very interesting. First, it says he hit the hole in one on the south course. The son of the South chose to use the south course, of course, for his hole in one, but, second, it says "he was choking up on a 5-iron."

Taking nothing away from his hole in one—and it sounds like it wasn't as long a shot as he explained to me it might have been—but choking up on a 5-iron makes no sense to me. There is nobody more poised, more smooth. I have never seen him choke on anything.

SAXBY, we are sad to see you leave but happy to see you spend more time with Julianne, the kids, and the beloved Bulldogs. Godspeed, my friend.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise to thank my friend SAXBY CHAMBLISS. Senator COBURN spoke about leadership. We are very much going to miss Senator COBURN, Senator JOHANN, and Senator CHAMBLISS in this body.

But what he said is very true; because as someone who has only served here for 4 years, one of the people who has been most welcoming to me and a mentor and role model and someone from whom I have sought advice is SAXBY CHAMBLISS.

As we look at this body and people whom we can emulate as role models, SAXBY CHAMBLISS is one of those role models. Not only is he incredibly knowledgeable on the issues that are so important to this Nation—and I can say, having served with him on the Armed Services Committee, he is one of the most knowledgeable people in this country, not only on what we need to do to keep the country safe because of his role on the Intelligence Committee, but also what we need to ensure that our men and women in uniform have the very best to keep our country safe. SAXBY has a deep understanding and very much loves our men and women in uniform, and has stood up for them in ensuring that they have gotten what they need to keep this country safe.

From my perspective, he is someone who is going to be so missed in this body, because he has understood that you can stand on principle, as he has, for the important challenges facing this Nation—whether it is keeping us safe, or addressing the national debt that threatens not only our security but the prosperity of America; but he has also done it in a way that he has been able to build relationships—relationships within our own conference in the Republican Caucus, where he is a go-to leader, where people like me seek his advice on how to get things done—but also, as we can see here, relationships across the aisle.

As we go into the new Congress, I hope as SAXBY goes on to do other important things with his lovely family and Julianne and his children and grandchildren, that we will follow the example of SAXBY CHAMBLISS of what it means to work together, of what it means to be respectful of each other to get things done for this country, and to address the great challenges that SAXBY has done so much important work on—including keeping our Nation safe and making sure that America remains strong.

SAXBY, I want to thank you for being so welcoming to me, for being a role model, and for being someone who I think is an example of what it means to serve this country with distinction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING SENATORS
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, TOM COBURN, AND MIKE
JOHANN

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, in the new Congress we will welcome 12 new Republican Senators, and that is wonderful. They are great people. They are excited. They are enthusiastic. I think they are going to do wonderful things. So there are 12 new Republican Members coming into the new Senate, and I am looking and we are going to lose 3 of our Republican colleagues. I am thinking, maybe that is about the right ratio; it is about 4 to 1.

But these are three individuals who are unbelievable in what they have been able to do in the relationships they built, the friendships, and the work they have done on behalf of the American people. So I am looking at that statistic and I am thinking: Wow, these are three great people who have done the work of many, and I think they have laid the foundation in many ways for us to get to a majority: Senator JOHANN, Senator COBURN, and Senator CHAMBLISS. I think they have done a lot of that work required for us to get to majority.

We have heard about the great Senator from Georgia. But I think the things I am going to talk about for a minute in regard to SAXBY CHAMBLISS apply to the two individuals sitting here with him. They are cut from the same cloth: Senator COBURN, Senator JOHANN, true public servants. People who ran for the right reason; people who serve for the right reason. I think we could ask anybody in this body on either side of the aisle, and they would tell us that these three individuals served for the right reasons, and served to the very best of their ability the American people—not just the people of their State, but the American people. They will be remembered long after they are gone. They will be remembered because of the great, wonderful people they are, for the relationships they have built, and for that service. So I echo Senator AYOTTE's comments.

Senator COBURN touched on it, too. One of the first people I looked to as a mentor when I came here 4 years ago was SAXBY CHAMBLISS. Now, that doesn't seem intuitively like something I would do—I am from North Dakota, he is from Georgia. MIKE JOHANN has been a mentor of mine since Governor days, so for more than a decade. But one of the first people I looked to as a mentor was SAXBY CHAMBLISS, and I don't even know why. It was one of those things that immediately you like the guy. But as you listened to him a little bit, you respected the guy. You thought: This guy has something to say. He knows what he is doing. But then, it is that relationship thing—that thing where he goes out of his way to work with you, to help you, to understand what you are trying to do in a friendly way, with great humor, and he does it naturally. It is just who he is. It is automatic. I think Senator ISAKSON really put his finger on it: It is just the way he is. You are naturally drawn to him.

I think we could talk to any of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and they would tell you the same thing: integrity, honesty, intelligence; somebody you can work with, somebody who cares, somebody who always has the best interests of the American people at heart.

I had the opportunity to work with him on the farm bill, and I was counting on Senator COBURN to kind of jump in there and do it with him, but that didn't happen right away. I am kidding a little bit. But we couldn't have had a farm bill without Senator CHAMBLISS.

When I think how difficult it is to move legislation like that, particularly over the course of the past year, and realize that a farm bill really isn't so much Republican/Democratic—it really isn't. If you look at how a farm bill works, that is not the makeup. It comes down to people who know and understand agriculture, who understand the importance of a good farm bill for our farmers and ranchers, but understand also that our farmers and ranchers across the country create the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world. It is not perfect, but every American benefits every day from the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world.

So when I think of my State of North Dakota, or Senator COBURN's great State of Oklahoma, or Senator JOHANN's State of Nebraska—we all produce all of these different ag products. We raise all these crops, we raise all these animals. And there are so many people out there, so many farmers and ranchers—they don't know SAXBY CHAMBLISS. But I will tell you what: They owe him a great big thank you. They really do, because without him we wouldn't have a good farm plan for this country.

The reality is it is not just the farmers and ranchers. It is true for so many

people across this country: They may not know SAXBY CHAMBLISS, but they owe him a lot. He is somebody who epitomizes the very best of this institution.

I know his wife Julianne is here. I have to admit, when I first met her I thought it was his daughter because she is so young and beautiful. I am teasing him a little. But she is fantastic. And the same thing—she was immediately a friend and a mentor to my wife Mikey.

When we talk about SAXBY CHAMBLISS, TOM COBURN, MIKE JOHANNIS, it doesn't get any better than that. We will miss them a lot.

I wish all three of them Godspeed, and may God bless you in your next career.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF SANDY HOOK

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I add my congratulations to Senator CHAMBLISS. It is strange, coming here in the last 2 years and getting to serve only 2 years with giants in the Senate like SAXBY, like TOM HARKIN, and like Senator ROCKEFELLER, whose legacies will live on.

Knowing what a good soul Senator CHAMBLISS is, I bet he would enjoy the Newtown Labor Day parade. I have a picture of it here.

We had the 53rd annual Newtown Labor Day parade this last year. This is the biggest event that happens in Connecticut on Labor Day. It is a celebration of the town. There are 120 different groups that make up the parade. There is the Newtown High School marching band. This year Grand Marshall Sydney Eddison was proudly marching at the front. The Litchfield Hills Pipe Band and newer groups such as the Marching Cobras of New York were there this year. It is a must-stop if you are a Senator, Governor, or Congressperson. We all march together at the front of the parade regardless of party. It is a really fantastic and wonderful place.

This year there were marchers from the Avielle Foundation; a truck decorated in pink promoting a culture of kindness. Sandy Hook Elementary School had a float called "The Magic School Bus to Sandy Hook School." It had a positive message of "Think You Can, Work Hard, Get Smart, Be Kind," and the judges selected Sandy Hook School's float as the winner in the best school category.

It is a reminder that Sandy Hook is a positive place; Newtown is a positive place—a place that is rebounding as we come upon the 2-year anniversary, the 2-year memorial of the tragic shooting in that town that took the lives of 20 6- and 7-year-olds, and 6 of their teachers who were sworn to protect them.

Senator BLUMENTHAL and I have come to the floor today to mark that 2-year anniversary and to talk for a brief

few moments about what has happened over the last 2 years—what has happened that has been positive, and the work that is left to still be done.

There are a lot of positive things that have happened. It is impossible to try to find any good that comes out of this, but the foundational work that has happened in the memory of these children is remarkable.

The Jessica Rekos Foundation was formed in an effort to pay homage to Jessica's love of horses and her love of whales. They opened up a summer camp where kids ages 6 to 10, the age that Jessica was when she passed, could be able to enjoy horses, learn how to ride and take care of them. They raise money to sponsor the Orca Fellowship, which is dedicated to conservation initiatives for the orca whale.

I mentioned the Avielle Foundation. Avielle's brilliant parents started a foundation seeking to do new research into brain activity. They have a new PSA video to highlight the need to understand the aspects of the brain that can lead to aggression and violence.

Ana Grace Marquez-Greene. Her family is a musical family. They started a foundation which tries to identify ways to build stronger communities. Her father is a wonderful jazz musician, and he recently released an album called "Beautiful Life." The proceeds all go to this effort.

Sandy Hook Promise, a group of families, is asking schools and communities to take a simple first step to ending violence. That first step is to talk to children and teens about how to be a good bystander—to look out for those first signs of trouble, and to report anything that may seem out of the ordinary.

We frankly have seen how that small act can make a big difference. Just last week a young man was arrested in Utah after he admitted he had brought a gun to school with the intent to shoot a girl he had a falling out with and then his plans were to open fire on the rest of his classmates, but a student heard about it and tipped off authorities so he could be stopped before he carried out his plan. That is what Sandy Hook Promise is trying to do in the wake of this tragedy, to spread the word that those small acts can make a difference.

I will talk for a few minutes about what hasn't been done when it comes to policy changes, but there is a lot that has happened when it comes to policy as well. In Connecticut we passed the strongest antigun violence measure in the country. It cracks down on illegal guns and invests more resources into identifying trouble spots before they happen. Washington State just passed a new referendum with 60 percent of the vote that extends their background check systems to private sales and to transfers. In Colorado they

passed a strong new law as well. On the private sector side retailers are stepping up. Big retailers from Starbucks to Chipotle, to Target have taken proactive steps, separate and aside from anything government has done, to keep firearms out of their stores. So there are a lot of positives that have happened in the private sector and in the public sector, and hopefully we can build on that work. Hopefully Congress can recognize that our silence, our inability to pass anything in the 2-year period of time since Sandy Hook passed, effectively makes us complicit in the continuing assault on students all across this country.

Here is the map. In the 2 years since Newtown, there have been 95 different school shootings all across the country. Ninety-five different school shootings have occurred. During the last 3 months alone, there were 17 school shootings, including a single week where there was one every day, five events over the course of 5 days. This is an absolute epidemic that is happening all across this country since Sandy Hook. Why I say we are complicit is that when there is no response from Congress, when there is not a single legislative act passed to try to do something about this, it sends a message of quiet endorsement of what is happening. I know that is not our intent. I know that is not in the hearts or minds of any of our Members, but people notice when every week there is a new story of a school shooting all across the country and Congress does absolutely nothing about it while the private sector and State legislatures step up to do something about it. So this is a day when we remember what happened 2 years ago, but it is also a day in which we should feel ashamed that we haven't done a single thing to try to stem this tide.

I get it that we are not going to get a background check bill passed in the next 2 years, but why not work on mental health funding? Why not have everybody in this Chamber spend 5 minutes of your time reading the report that was just released by the Connecticut child advocate detailing the history of Adam Lanza's intersection with the mental health system during his early years and adolescence and how it failed step after step, year after year, month after month—a lack of followup, a lack of coordination, a lack of diagnosis. We have a mental health system in this country that is broken and can be fixed—yes, with some more resources but just with better coordination. That is something we can work on together over the next 2 years. So we can say when this chart gets peppered with another 50 dots by this time next year that we didn't just stand silent.

Nobody is more articulate than Senator BLUMENTHAL in talking about that day, and I don't want to relive it on

this floor, except to share the most powerful testimony I have heard about what happened that day.

This is a community that is recovering, but it is still a community in crisis. We don't lose 20 little boys and girls and just come back to life in 2 years. It is a resilient community, but it is a community that still hurts, and it hurts in part because they don't see us doing anything about it.

So before I yield the floor to Senator BLUMENTHAL to say a few words, I wish to close with somebody else's words. I have shared these words on the floor before, but they are just as powerful now as they were the last time I read them.

This is Neil Heslin testifying before Congress in February of 2013. He is still Jesse Lewis's father, one of the little boys who was killed that day. So as we think about what happened 2 years ago in Sandy Hook and we think about the charge we have before us and we think about the fact that there are those of us such as myself and Senator BLUMENTHAL and others who will not rest until we honor their memories by our actions, let me give you these words:

On December 14, Jesse got up and got ready for school. He was always excited to go to school. I remember on that day we stopped by Misty Vale Deli. It's funny the things you remember.

I remember Jesse got the sausage, egg and cheese he always gets, with some hot chocolate. And I remember the hug he gave me when I dropped him off. He just held me, and he rubbed my back. I can still feel that hug.

And Jesse said, "It's going to be alright. Everything's going to be okay, Dad." Looking back it makes me wonder. What did he know? Did he have some idea about what was going to happen? But at the time I didn't think much of it. I just thought he was being sweet.

Jesse had this idea that you never leave people hurt. If you can help somebody, you do it. If you can make somebody feel better, you do it. If you can leave somebody a little better off, you do it.

They tell me that's how he died. I guess we still don't know exactly what happened at that school. Maybe we'll never know. But what people tell me is that Jesse did something different.

When he heard the shooting, he didn't run and hide. He started yelling. People disagree on the last thing he said. One person who was there said he yelled "run." Another person said he told everybody to "run now." Ten kids from my son's class made it to safety. I hope to God something Jesse did helped them survive that day.

What I know is that Jesse wasn't shot in the back. He took two bullets. The first one grazed the side of his head. . . . The other hit him in the forehead. Both bullets were fired from the front. That means that the last thing my son did was look Adam Lanza straight in the face and scream to his classmates to run. The last thing he saw was that coward's eyes.

Before he died, Jesse and I used to talk about maybe coming to Washington someday. He wanted to go up to the Washington monument. When we talked about it last year Jesse asked if we could come and meet the President.

. . . Jesse believed in you.

This is Neil Heslin, his father talking.

. . . Jesse believed in you. He learned about you in school and he believed in you. I want to believe in you, too. I know you can't give me Jesse back. Believe me, if I thought you could, I'd be asking you for that.

But I want to believe that you will think about what I told you here today. I want to believe you'll think about it and then you'll do something about it, whatever you can do to make sure no other father has to see what I've seen.

That is a pretty powerful message, a message that on the 2-year anniversary mark of that horrible tragedy we would be wise to listen to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

MR. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, on December 14, 2012, we saw evil, but we also saw good. We saw tragedy, but we also saw actions that should continue to inspire us.

The evil was in a deranged young man who committed unspeakable and unimaginable horrific acts, but the good was exemplified by the police, the emergency responders, and the teachers who not only risked their lives but saved other ones. The good was something that came forward in the days and months and in the past 2 years.

Often I visit the playgrounds that have been built throughout the State of Connecticut in memory of those children, in memory of Charlotte Bacon in West Haven and Ana Grace Marquez-Greene in Hartford, Jessica Rekos in Fairfield, and Dylon Hockley in Westford, and Victoria Soto in Stratford. I visit them to watch children playing, children often the same age as the wonderful, beautiful children who perished on that day, and parents about the same age as the teachers who lost their lives, sixth-grade educators.

On that day parents in Newtown took their children to school, kissed them goodbye and went about their days, went to work to plan play dates and snack breaks and holiday parties, and just hours into that morning many parents were standing at the Sandy Hook Volunteer Fire Station where I also went that day. What I saw was through the eyes of a parent, not just a public official, the cries of grief, the faces, and voices filled with tears and longing. Those images I will never forget, and they have redoubled my own determination to try to make America safer and better, to keep faith with those 26 wonderful people whose lives were lost that day, and more than 30,000 people who perished in the United States as a result of violence simply because many of them were in the wrong place at the wrong time—on the street or in neighborhoods or in their own home.

The good that is done every day by our police and firemen and emergency

responders to try to stem and stop this epidemic of violence cannot overcome the flood of guns in our Nation and cannot compensate for the lack of effective measures to make America safer and better by making our laws against gun violence more effective.

I will never forget that day or any of the victims or their families, and I hope America never forgets them as well. We are memorializing now their wonderful lives by acts of kindness, but the best and truest way to memorialize them in history is to approve effective, commonsense, sensible measures against gun violence.

In the aftermath of those horrific events of December 14, all of Connecticut, certainly in Newtown, and our State came together to lift those who were so devastatingly impacted, and those families have shown incredible strength. They sat in the gallery, they came to visit us and our colleagues urging action. Congress's failure to act is contemptible and unconscionable and a betrayal of those individuals. The action that is ultimately truest and best as a memorial to them will be for this Congress to act.

In Newtown and around the Nation, every community in some way was affected in those days and in some way came together with Newtown. So my hope is still that that spirit will be an inspiration to action, that it will be an impetus to the Congress for effective, commonsense measures that will protect countless others who are in danger and who will die if Congress does not act.

More than 60,000 firearm deaths have occurred since December 14, 2012. There are 32,000 firearm deaths per year. Those families have demonstrated unrelenting resolve, and so should we, and we will. It took more than 10 years for the Brady law to be approved, even after a President of the United States was almost assassinated and his Press Secretary, Jim Brady, was severely injured and paralyzed.

I hope it will not take 10 years for action to be taken by Congress, but we need the persistence and perseverance that will carry us through whatever it takes to achieve lasting reform.

I have been proud to serve as a member of the Judiciary Committee and to have worked hard for this measure, helping to lead the effort to approve the ban on high-capacity magazines as well as assault weapons and background checks. But a mental health initiative and school safety initiative have also been part of what we need do. I will continue my work on those efforts—mental health and school safety bills I have introduced, including the Lori Jackson Domestic Violence Survivor Protection Act.

Lori Jackson was estranged from her husband. She obtained a court order against him because of the real evidence of danger from him. Unfortunately, that court order failed to save

her life because it was only temporary, and it failed to take away the guns her husband had. The Lori Jackson Domestic Violence Survivor Protection Act will fill that gap in our laws now.

Women are five times as likely to die as a result of domestic violence when there is a gun in the home. One in five women are victims of domestic violence at some point in their lives. That is the reason we need to continue this fight on many fronts. Since that day or about then, on December 14, I have worn a bracelet and I still do. The writing has faded and is no longer visible, but the one thing it said was, "Love wins." I truly believe that love won in Newtown, that love won when Connecticut's legislature passed a strong and effective measure. It was the next step. It is not the end of the work, but the next step. I believe that love won through the grace and courage and strength of the families of those children and the loved ones of the teachers who lost their lives.

I believe love wins every day in our classrooms around the Nation when teachers work hard—and they work hard—and resolve to keep their children safe. Love wins every day when someone stands up and speaks out against gun violence. Love will win, eventually. Honor will win. We will honor those children, and we will celebrate the love they felt so deeply and unconditionally—as only children can—unqualifiedly for their parents and their community. I believe that love will win eventually as long as we keep working.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

FAA MODERNIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2012

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 2614 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2614) to amend certain provisions of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2614) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2614

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ROLLOVER OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED IN AIRLINE CARRIER BANKRUPTCY.

(a) EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE CLAIM FOR REFUND.—Section 1106(a)(3) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (26 U.S.C. 408 note) is amended by striking "2013" and inserting "2015".

(b) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—Section 1106(c) of such Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)(i), by inserting "or filed on November 29, 2011," after "2007,"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by striking "terminated or" and inserting "terminated,"; and

(B) by inserting "or was frozen effective November 1, 2012" after "Pension Protection Act of 2006".

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

TAXPAYERS RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I wish to spend a few minutes to talk as in morning business. I am not going to offer a unanimous consent request, but I am putting the majority leader on notice that I will do that before we leave today or tomorrow or whenever we leave.

Yesterday the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, Senator CARPER, and I, thought we cleared all holds on the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act. I wish to give a little history about that because for 2 years the House and Senate, in conjunction with the committees, have been working on this bill. The history goes back to a bill that was passed with President Obama, myself, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator CARPER, and it was the Federal Financial Transparency and Accountability Act, usaspending.gov. It was the first start towards transparency in terms of how and where we spend our money.

Quite frankly, as we got that bill through Congress, with we heard the same thing from OMB that Senator REID is representing today. President Bush and his OMB Director didn't want that bill. They didn't think the American people ought to know where their spending was going. They didn't think the American taxpayer ought to have the right to hold us accountable to know where we spent the money, on which programs, and how.

Interestingly, under Republican leadership, we passed that bill against the wishes of the OMB Director of the Bush administration, and that bill became law. The President has touted that bill as the first in a long line of transparency which his administration has

embraced—the idea that the American people ought to know where their money is being spent.

Since that time, we passed the DATA Act, which will move us towards better quality in terms of usaspending.gov, and then we have the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act, which the majority leader objected to yesterday.

Here is what the Taxpayers-Right-To-Know Act says. It says the taxpayer has the right to know how many programs we have in each department, how much spending is going on in each program, and where the money is being spent. It is pretty simple, straightforward stuff that we ought to know about our government.

The question that I am asking is, Why would anybody in this body object to us knowing where our money is being spent? Why would anybody in this body object to knowing how many programs each agency has? Why would anybody in this body object to coordinating with all the transparency things that we have done thus far and make it so that 2 years from now the American people can actually see where their money is being spent, how much is being spent on each program in each State and at what location.

If somebody can give me an honest explanation and a logical reason for why we wouldn't want to do that, I will take that, and I will not offer another unanimous consent request. But the answer from OMB is that it is too hard to work. It is not too hard to work. That is exactly what the Bush administration said when we said we are going to have the transparency act and usaspending.gov. They said it was too hard, and we can't do it. We can do it.

The American people are owed that explanation, they are owed that transparency, and this administration, through its claims of being the most transparent administration should step forward and release this hold.

So before we leave here, I will offer the unanimous consent request again. If it is objected to, we will know that it has nothing to do with reality. It has nothing to do with honesty, it has nothing to do with integrity, it has nothing to do with truth, it has nothing to do with being transparent with the American people, and it has everything to do with the Federal Government saying that it is just too hard to be honest with the American people to allow them to see where we are spending the money.

I find that is really unacceptable for us, as Members of the Senate. For a Member of the Senate to stand up and say, I object to doing that, tells us that we have a long way to go on much, much bigger problems if we are going to play the game just because something is a little bit tough to do, and we are going to fall for complaining that we just can't get it done.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I wish to salute my friend and colleague from Oklahoma. I don't agree with probably 80 to 90 percent of what he says, but I really respect him. He is a person of integrity who really cares. When you shake his hand and make a deal, a deal is done, which is a rarity around here, and we wish him the best.

Today I rise to discuss the recently released report by the Senate Intelligence Committee. As a representative of one of the most targeted cities in the world, I feel compelled to speak about this report. I want to say clearly that I am troubled by many of its findings.

First, the many members of the CIA and the intelligence community selflessly serve this Nation and put their lives on the line. They are patriots who are committed to protecting and serving America, keeping her safe from those very real enemies who are actively seeking to do the unspeakable in terms of harm. We owe the members of the CIA and the Intelligence Committee their due recognition and gratitude. We salute them for protecting us. In many cases, they risk their lives to protect us and our freedom.

But as with many institutions in our society, be it part of the government or part of the private sector, transparency and accountability for mistakes are an essential part of the process that preserves the balance in our democracy. The fact of the matter is this report lays bare some very troubling activities on the part of the CIA. It warrants a close examination. When we find the conduct of the CIA to be grossly counter to the Nation's ideals, we must reckon with that and make sure we never go back to the days when our government sanctioned torture.

Here, I agree with my colleague and friend from across the aisle, Senator MCCAIN. He has been an unimpeachable voice on this topic, and has said time and again that these actions were torture, and that torture besmirches the honor of this great Nation.

I also agree with the remarks made by Vice President JOE BIDEN, that only a great Nation and only an open and free society can forthrightly take ownership of their mistakes, find ways to change those policies, and move positively forward on both the domestic and international levels.

It is doubtless this report contains lessons that our intelligence community must take to heart—for their goal must be to protect our Nation without sacrificing what it stands for.

Before I go any further, I wish to recognize the many years of hard work, diligence, and courage—yes, courage—on the part of my colleagues on the Intelligence Committee and their staffs for putting this report together.

I particularly wish to recognize my dear friend and colleague, the chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, for her work with this report. She has been a fearless, yet level-headed chair of the committee for many years now. She is just what you would envision as an ideal chair.

I thank her for her excellent report, where once again, she has been both fearless and level-headed.

An extensive report like this one deserves careful review, but at first reading, two things have been made very clear. First, the CIA undoubtedly went too far in its pursuit of intelligence from captured sources abroad.

As I have said in formal proceedings in this legislature before, I am absolutely opposed to waterboarding and deplore some of the tactics depicted in this report.

I believe our intelligence community can obtain information using methods that are not anathema to our Nation's values.

Second, the report makes it clear that there was a breakdown of communication between the CIA and the administration at the time of these events.

There is no doubt we live in a dangerous world. There are threats abroad and threats here in the homeland. We cannot expect to counteract these threats and protect our people and to do so in a responsible way if the CIA and the executive branch are not effectively communicating with one another.

I was astounded to learn that the report asserts that over 4 years went by without the President having full knowledge of some of the CIA's actions detailed in this report. That simply cannot be the *modus operandi* for the CIA. They are accountable to the government and to the people and cannot behave without proper oversight. There is so much to unpack in this report. I urge my colleagues patience and a careful examination of the work produced by my colleagues on the Intelligence Committee. It should be out in front of the American people, and now it is. We must take a very, very close look at it.

The United States, its government, and its people must take stock of this account and reckon with the conclusions of the study. We have hundreds of thousands of brave men and women posted around the world, tasked with the difficult job of keeping us safe. We should always be mindful of their dedication and thankful for their sacrifice. Their mission is demanding. It is never-ending and nearly all of them perform with a level of professionalism beyond reproach.

However, from time to time, it is important for us to review those actions to make sure they meet the hard scrutiny of our Nation's ideals while still protecting its people.

In that light the Senate Intelligence Committee report is an extremely important document for us all to examine.

Again, I thank my colleagues, especially my friend Senator FEINSTEIN, for their exhaustive and exemplary work on this report.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISIS AND AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. CASEY. I rise today to discuss the fight against ISIS and the debate we are having here in the Senate and across the country about the authorization for use of military force, known by the acronym AUMF.

The debate about the appropriate use of force is, I believe, healthy for our country. The American people deserve to know when and how our servicemembers are going to be deployed to protect our national security interests. All Senators in this body have an abiding obligation to take the time to learn about this issue and to ask questions about our strategy, to thoroughly debate the strategy and the issues that relate to the authorization for use of force, and then we have an obligation to vote on the grave question of the use of military force.

It has been 6 months since ISIS began its major offensive in Iraq, taking control of key border crossings and the city of Mosul. The President has laid out since that time a strategy for combating ISIS through all available means—military action, diplomatic coalition building, coordinating efforts to cut off financing and recruitment, and providing humanitarian assistance.

The Administration has taken these actions under previous authorizations. In these weeks and months I have consulted with Administration officials, both military and civilian, outside experts and former diplomats, as I know many of our colleagues have. I also have listened to my constituents in Pennsylvania. We owe it to the American people to have a debate and a vote on a new authorization for use of military force that clarifies, and if necessary, places limitations on the President's authority in this fight against ISIS.

We know that 1,830 servicemembers, 91 of whom were from Pennsylvania, have been killed in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and 3,482 servicemembers, of which 197 were from Pennsylvania, have been killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Those are two conflicts, and in Pennsylvania alone the killed-in-action number was 91 in Afghanistan and 197 in Iraq.

Thousands more have been wounded in action from Pennsylvania and from

across the country—some of them grievously, permanently injured because of their service. I am mindful, as I know many are here, that with both the 2001 and 2002 authorizations for use of force, Congress moved very quickly to take that action. I understand that. We know in hindsight that in the case of Iraq, at least, mistakes were made because leaders did not take the time to debate and ask tough questions and demand answers to those tough questions. I believe it is appropriate for us to do the following: thoroughly debate this AUMF, as we should every time we consider sending U.S. servicemembers into harm's way; second, to be prepared to continually reassess and debate our strategy against ISIS to ensure it is achieving our national security goals.

We all hope to develop an AUMF that has broad bipartisan support. However, our priority must be to give the President clear and specific authority to continue the fight against ISIS.

The Administration should have come forward with a recommendation early in the process for what they would like to see in an authorization for use of military force. I welcomed Secretary Kerry's testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday. That hearing was an important step in the right direction.

It is appropriate for the Congress to not only conduct rigorous oversight of the executive branch's decisions about military force but also, from time to time, to take steps to shape or place boundaries around the Administration's strategy. I appreciate Chairman MENENDEZ's efforts to craft an AUMF proposal that satisfies the needs of the Administration and the concerns from both sides of the aisle and across our country.

The Congress should move forward with an authorization for use of military force which addresses the following:

First, this AUMF should not allow for any significant deployment of U.S. troops in traditional ground combat roles. This is consistent with what the President has determined is necessary at this time. We also need to see nations in the region step up to do the fighting. We can't just have—to use an old expression from Pennsylvania—coat holders. That is someone that says you go do the fighting and I will hold your coat while you fight.

We need a real coalition which we have in place now but it has to be built and strengthened and fortified and sustained. That coalition, especially in the case of members of the coalition from the region, will contribute fighters to the battlefield because it is their region. It is their conflict as much as it is for other nations in the coalition.

When I say we cannot have a coalition of coat holders, I am serious about that. We need a coalition that will help us. We have already done a lot, and our

people have, our taxpayers have, and our soldiers have. We need a real coalition that will do the fighting.

We also know that ISIS has taken American hostages before and will try to do so again. If, for example, the Administration has a chance to bring one of these Americans home, I want them—the Administration—to take action expeditiously and with clear authority. If the Administration disagrees with the current proposal for authorization for exceptional circumstances or operations—for example, a search and rescue operation inside Syria or the recovery of an American hostage—the Administration should propose to us language they find acceptable to use in those difficult situations.

Second, this authorization for force should not be geographically limited. ISIS and its associated forces do not and will not respect sovereign borders. However, I would like to see language that requires the Administration consult closely with Congress if they want to consider U.S. military operation against ISIS in countries beyond Iraq and Syria. Expanding this fight geographically could have the unintended effect of prompting unrest in other countries or pushing recruits into the arms of ISIS.

Third, this authorization for use of force should have a reasonable timeline—something along the order of 3 years—with the explicit option for the administration to extend it a bit longer if needed. We cannot know exactly how long it will take us and our coalition partners to degrade and defeat this terrorist organization. However, the AUMF should not be open-ended in the way that the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs were. We have seen how difficult it is to shift gears or even to repeal an existing authorization for use of military force.

Fourth, and finally, this authorization must also address the nonmilitary components of the administrations's strategy. I was one of the first Members to call for greater support for the moderate well-vetted Syrian opposition. We know that opposition, especially in the north, is fractured and suffering, especially under the continual onslaught from Mr. Assad's barrel bombs—not to mention other actions he has taken against the opposition.

Although efforts to support them are ramping up, the brutal Assad regime has done significant damage. That is an understatement. Further, the Assad regime continues to commit unspeakable atrocities against Syrian civilians, starving, torturing, or indiscriminately murdering them in violation of international law and U.N. Security Council resolutions—that is plural.

I have also emphasized on a bipartisan basis with Senator RUBIO several years ago the importance of cutting off

ISIS's finances. This could include airstrikes against known oil-smuggling pipelines or additional sanctions against facilitators. I should say with Senator RUBIO that the financing efforts or the cutting off of the financing was this year. I have worked with him in other years on other parts of Syrian policy.

As we have heard multiple administration leaders today say, there is no purely military solution to this conflict with ISIS. I would also say that if we have an authorization for force, this bill should include strict reporting requirements that press the administration to answer a series of questions:

First, what are you going to do to support the moderate opposition in Syria? I have raised this over and over again with the administration and still do not have satisfactory answers.

Second, what steps are you taking to address the Assad regime's brutal barrel bomb campaign, and what are you doing to bring about a political settlement to the conflict in Syria?

Third, how is the military campaign helping to cut off the financial support that ISIS is receiving, as I mentioned before?

There is strong bipartisan agreement that ISIS proposes a clear and proximate if not immediate threat to our national security interests and those of our partners. I believe we can reach the same level of bipartisan agreement on an authorization for the use of military force.

We have no greater or more sacred responsibility than to carefully and thoroughly consider when and how we send American men and women in uniform into harm's way. I urge my colleagues in both parties to engage in this debate and to work expeditiously to pass an authorization for the use of military force. I would have preferred and I know many would have preferred that we would have passed a bill before we adjourn this year, knowing that in this holiday season there are servicemembers already deployed away from home, from their families, to support this operation, Operation Inherent Resolve.

If we cannot get that done by the end of this year, where the debate would not be fully developed enough to pass an authorization, we must get it done early in 2015. It must be among our first orders of business in the new year, in the new Congress when we come back in early January. This is a very grave matter. It is among the highest and most difficult responsibilities Congress has. I believe we will discharge that obligation with a full debate, with a debate that is well-informed and a debate that every Member participates in before we make a decision about the authorization for the use of force.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss title 30 of the National Defense Authorization Act, or NDAA, the title of which has become referred to as the lands package. As with most of the items Congress considers, this provision has generated some controversy. For my part, however, it appears that many of the concerns here are outpaced by the substance of good public lands policy being advanced here and the economic development opportunities it will generate.

The bill the committees of jurisdiction included in the package all have some form of committee procedure in either the House or the Senate. Thirty-four of the measures have passed the House on suspension. Another nine have passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

It is also worth noting that because the Federal Government owns so much land, particularly in the Western United States, Congress has to approve all sorts of transactions involving these public lands no matter how small the tracts might be.

On the substance, I believe the bipartisan group who assembled this package of bills struck a pretty good balance, deferring to intrastate priorities that will promote responsible economic growth. In Arizona, for example, I was pleased to see the inclusion of the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act. This is a bill sponsored by my colleague JOHN MCCAIN. I was happy to join him to advance the measure. It also shares bipartisan support in the House among Members of Arizona's House delegation: Representatives GOSAR, KIRKPATRICK, FRANKS, SALMON, and SCHWEIKERT.

At its core, this bill will facilitate access to the largest copper ore deposit in North America. By some estimates the economic impact of the mine could exceed \$60 billion over the course of the mine operations. It will support approximately 3,700 direct and indirect jobs annually.

It is also worth noting that copper is a critical component in most technologies, from weapon systems, to computers, to automobiles, to turbines that generate electricity, to name a few.

This mine would supply an amount of copper roughly equivalent to 25 percent of the U.S. demand.

Also notable is what this bill does in terms of conservation. It would preserve more than 5,300 acres of conservation land in Arizona.

Despite the broad benefits for economic development and conservation as well as the bill's bipartisan support, there has been some opposition. We have done our best to include some provisions that address those concerns. For instance, the land exchange would not occur until after the completion of a NEPA environmental impact statement. It will also generate a special

management area around the large escarpment known as Apache Leap. Likewise, it will provide protections for Native Americans to continue traditional gathering and ceremonies after the land exchange has been completed so long as it remains safe to do so.

I would also note that Resolution Copper has proactively sought ways to address its anticipated water needs. To that end, I was encouraged to learn that the company has entered into a contract with the Gila River Indian Community to use a portion of the tribe's water supplies to meet the long-term needs of the mine. This is further evidence of how the measure, even before it is passed, can help foster economic opportunities for Indian and non-Indian communities around the State.

I would also like to take a moment to talk about a couple of the other positive provisions in the lands package. From a resource management perspective, it would support further economic activity on Federal lands by conveying approximately 110,000 acres of land out of the Federal estate. This includes not only the aforementioned Resolution Copper project but also a Copper mine in Nevada, timber harvests in Alaska, and coal production in Montana.

The lands package also includes a provision that would streamline the permitting process for oil and gas leases. This is critical. We have seen the pace of oil and gas production on Federal lands decline in recent years while development on private lands has increased significantly. This measure also improves the permitting process for grazing and makes a downpayment on so-called payment in lieu of taxes, or PILT. This is critical in helping communities that are burdened with tracts of Federal land to meet the obligations of providing services related to those lands without a corresponding tax base. This applies to a lot of the land in rural Arizona.

Although reasonable people can disagree, I believe this is a good measure for the State of Arizona and the United States as a whole. I am pleased to see that it will advance as part of this package. I know the lands package was difficult to negotiate. They always are. It has achieved strong bipartisan support. I think it does strike the right balance between deference to intrastate concerns and Federal lands decisions. I urge support of the legislation.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am on the floor this evening for "Time to Wake Up" speech No. 82.

Scientists tell us that the evidence for climate change is now "unequivocal"—not a word often used in scientific writing. The American people know that climate change is real.

In a new poll released by the insurance firm Munich Re, 8 out of 10 Americans believe the climate is changing. They see it happening around them. The American people also know we need to cut our carbon pollution if we are to avoid the worst effects of climate change. We can't keep burning carbon-polluting fossil fuels indiscriminately. Seven out of 10 Americans put using more carbon-free energy, such as solar and wind, among the best ways to battle climate change.

Changing the way we generate power will help cut emissions from the largest sources of carbon pollution in the country, our coal-fired powerplants. The Energy Information Administration notes that coal generates less than 40 percent of our country's electricity while it generates 75 percent of the carbon pollution from the power sector.

The 50 dirtiest coal plants in America emit more carbon pollution than all of South Korea or all of Canada, which brings us to the war on coal.

Every effort to protect the American people from coal pollution has been denounced by the fossil fuel industry and its various mouthpieces as a "war on coal." When EPA proposed limits on emission from new powerplants, we heard "war on coal." When EPA promoted limits on existing powerplants, "war on coal." For mercury limits, ozone limits, particulate limits, always "war on coal."

The war on coal is a fabrication. The denial machine, funded by fossil fuel money, literally owns the war on coal. The Web site waroncoal.com is owned by American Commitment, a 501(c)(4) nonprofit that has been funded by the Koch brothers-backed group Freedom Partners. War-on-coal is a public relations strategy, a catchphrase, a gimmick that serves to distract people from the harm coal wreaks on us.

Dr. Drew Shindell is a professor at Duke University. He worked at NASA for two decades. Last week in the Environment and Public Works Committee he said:

We hear a lot up here on Capitol Hill about the war on coal; what we forget about is coal's war on us.

So let's talk about the so-called war on coal versus coal's war on us. When Republicans talk about President Obama's war on coal, they leave a lot out. They leave out that coal companies have shifted to big open-topped mines—what is called mountaintop removal—so they can lay off miners and still produce the same amount of coal. They leave out that coal simply can't

compete with today's cheaper, cleaner burning natural gas.

In 2012 Duke Energy's own CEO acknowledged that EPA's proposed climate rule for new powerplants was not to blame. This is what he said:

The new climate rule is in line with market forces anyway. We're not going to build any coal plants in any event.

"We're not going to build any coal plants in any event," he said.

He continued:

You're going to choose to build gas plants every time, regardless of what the rule is.

That is not a regulatory war on coal; that is the free market operating.

EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan for existing powerplants is the newest PR front in the imaginary war on coal. EPA projects that the Clean Power Plan will yield between \$55 billion and \$93 billion in benefits per year by 2030, compared to \$7 billion to \$9 billion to comply with the rule. That math makes it a winner for the American people. Some war on coal. What would they expect us to do—give up \$90 billion at the high end in benefits for the American people in order to avoid a \$9 billion compliance cost, again at the high end? Again, \$90 billion for the American people versus \$9 billion in compliance—who wouldn't take that deal?

If the Obama administration is waging a war on coal, it has a funny way of going about it. Coal exports grew by 44 percent from 2008 to 2012. The Obama administration keeps opening up Federal lands to coal extraction, awarding many leases at below-market rates. It actually took a Federal judge in Colorado to tell the Obama Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service to factor the cost of climate change into their cost-benefit analysis of coal mining leases. The Federal agencies had looked at only one side of the ledger. They counted the economic benefits of mining coal but not the costs. Some war on coal. Two years ago the Obama Army Corps of Engineers fast-tracked environmental review of a proposed coal export terminal on the Columbia River in Oregon. Local communities and tribes objected, and the State of Oregon denied the permit for the project. If that is what a Federal war on coal looks like, somebody didn't get the memo.

On the other side, let's look at what coal's war on us looks like. Evidence that mining and burning coal harms our health and our environment and our oceans is undeniable. It is this other side of the coal ledger which hits home in Rhode Island and Connecticut and many other States, and it is that side which the polluters want to ignore and obscure with "war on coal" rhetoric.

Burning coal releases carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. That warms our atmosphere, bringing changes we are already seeing in sea-

sons, weather, and storms. There is a strong association between global warming and the kinds of rain bursts that flooded homes and businesses in Rhode Island in 2010, for instance.

Coal burning contributes to the formation of toxic ground-level ozone, which is a cause of the bad air days in my home State of Rhode Island. Kids with asthma in the emergency room in Rhode Island are connected with midwestern powerplants that burn coal and pump often unscrubbed emissions up smokestacks designed to move the problem downwind—out of State, out of mind.

Don't overlook our oceans, which absorb about one-third of the carbon pollution being emitted and most of the excess heat. As a result, oceans are becoming more acidic, water temperatures are rising, and sea levels are rising across the globe. In Rhode Island the sea is up nearly 10 inches at the tide gauge at Naval Station Newport since the 1930s, when we had our great hurricane of 1938.

So whether you have a flooded home or are a mom with a child with asthma in the emergency room or somebody with coastal property facing 10-inch higher seas, there are costs to coal. This is all virtually indisputable, and it follows immutable laws of nature. Damage to coastal homes and infrastructure from rising seas and erosion, asthma attacks in children triggered by smog, forests dying from beetle infestations and unprecedented wildfire seasons, farms ravaged by worsened drought and flooding—these are all real costs to Americans. This other side of the coal ledger counts too.

It even hits home in coal country, where blowing up mountaintops pollutes streams and harms folks around the mining operations. West Virginia University has linked the dust thrown up by these mountaintop mines to lung cancer among nearby residents.

Coal-fired powerplants are the biggest sources of mercury pollution in the United States, and they also emit arsenic, acid gases, and other toxins.

Dr. Shindell, whom I mentioned earlier, is an expert in atmospheric chemistry and health. Here is what he told the EPW Committee last week:

Of all of the sources of the emissions that lead to poor air quality in the United States, coal burning is the single largest, causing by my calculations about 47,000 premature deaths per year. That happens to be larger than the total number of Americans killed in all of the years of the Vietnam War by hostile fire.

If you look at the casualties, the Federal Government isn't waging a war on coal. If there is any war, coal is waging a war on us.

This is business as usual for the polluter industry and its propaganda apparatus. Coal companies have long fought public health standards, mine worker protections, and compensation for ailments such as black lung disease,

as well as efforts to address acid rain or reduce toxic pollutants, such as mercury, that cause brain damage in kids.

In 1989 Southern Company's CEO Edward Addison testified that acid-rain controls would increase electricity rates in States with the most coal power by 10 to 20 percent by 2009. Well, we couldn't evaluate that prediction then, but now we can. This is a fact: In the 10 States with the most coal, rates actually fell. Big Coal's war on the truth has a long history.

I recently had the opportunity to visit West Virginia with Senator MANCHIN to learn about what coal means to the Mountain State economy. I get it. We need to care about the miners, the truckers, the powerplant operators, the engineers, and others who make their living in this industry. It would be wrong to ignore their plight, just as it is wrong when the coal industry tries to ignore the effects of its carbon pollution.

I think we need a carbon fee to correct the market and to slow climate change. I am sure I will hear that is a war on coal. It is not. It is simple fairness. It is simply paying for the mess you cause. That is not war. It is not even punishment. It is just fair accounting, taking both sides of the ledger into account.

When people do that—economists and scientists—they calculate the cost of carbon pollution as what they call the social cost of carbon. The administration estimates the social cost of carbon at around \$40 per ton of carbon pollution—\$40 per ton. The effective cost to polluters for causing that mess is zero.

My carbon fee bill would correct that. It would correct what even economists and groups as conservative as the American Enterprise Institute agree is a market failure, and then return every dollar of the fee to the American people. That could include transition assistance for coal workers—and assistance for communities far from coal mines, like in Rhode Island, facing these costs of climate change. It is also becoming increasingly clear that a revenue-neutral carbon fee will spur innovation, create jobs, and boost the economy nationwide.

So it is time to end the polluters' holiday from responsibility. It is time to see through their fanciful war on coal, and protect those facing the effects of coal's war on us and coal's war on the truth. It is time to seize the economic benefit of a clean energy economy. It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. I am so happy to follow him on the floor today and to see him again. We have worked together on so many important

issues. It is wonderful to see the Pre-designing Officer to be back on the floor.

I come today for a very special reason. I am so proud to present to the Senate a package of lands bills that have been included in the Defense Authorization Act.

What is significant about this particular package is it is quite large, and it is the first package in almost 6 years and almost three Congresses, which is quite an accomplishment for our committee.

I am so proud of the staff of our committee, Energy and Natural Resources. I made this a priority when I took over as Chair 9 months ago. It was a long shot to see if we could put any package at all together that had eluded us for several Congresses, but I worked very closely with my counterpart, Congressman HASTINGS, in the House. We met on several occasions with our top staff and committed to do all we could to see what was possible.

One of the important principles that made this grand compromise possible—and there are Republican bills and Democratic bills; it is very well balanced as between the parties, but also geographically in projects and expansions of parks, creation of new parks, and land transfers. The principle that we followed is it is revenue neutral. Some of these bills raise money, some of these bills spend money, but the lands package is revenue neutral. I think the taxpayer is going to get some extraordinary value in the package being presented today.

In addition, one of the principles I pushed very strongly is to make sure that this package included opportunities for the development of our natural resources. We are very proud of our wilderness areas. We are very proud of our parks. We are very proud of our areas that are off limits to economic development. But there are parts of the Federal landscape of public lands that should be developed—whether it is forests, or oil and gas, or hard-rock mining, for the benefit of the taxpayer and for our overall economy. That was a very important principle for me and of course for Congressman HASTINGS.

We also wanted to make sure that we expanded our national park system. Again, this has been a 6-year hiatus, almost three Congresses. We have not been able to make any progress on adding to the beautiful heritage areas and special national park system that America is known for and helped to pilot for the world. Next year will be the 100th anniversary of the founding of the National Park Service, and we are excited about the additional eight new national parks that will be created by this lands package, and it expands the boundaries of six existing national parks.

One of the expansions I want to note particularly is in Texas, in San Antonio. It expands the San Antonio Mis-

sions National Historical Park. The reason I am excited about this is because the San Antonio missions are next on the list in the United States sites to be designated as world heritage sites. I had a great opportunity to help our only site in Louisiana, Poverty Point, achieve that designation just a few months ago. What an extraordinary action it was to be there when we cut the ribbon on a site that is going to continue to be excavated that we believe is over 3,500 years old, with a very sophisticated Native American settlement on these beautiful raised mounds in one of the highest points in the Louisiana-Mississippi delta area. I was excited to see that San Antonio missions will be next. This puts these sites on the same level as the Grand Canyon and other really extraordinary international places of cultural significance. So that is one example.

In the new national parks, it has only taken us 200-something-plus years, with Senator CARPER and Senator COONS, to get a national park in Delaware. They were the only State without a national park. Although they are small in size, they are very important as they are the first State in the Union. So as it would be appropriate, the name of their park is the First State National Park. So now every State in the United States has at least one national park. Of course, some States have many more. Our commitment is to continue this great heritage for our Nation for generations to come.

This package represents a major milestone in our work to reach a consensus across party lines. We will clear much of the backlog of the public lands bill that has built up in the Senate, last passed in the omnibus package 5 years ago. It is worth noting the Congressional Budget Office has again scored this as revenue neutral.

Let me speak for a minute about a few Louisiana priorities. Although most of these bills do not have anything to do with Louisiana—we did not have any major expansion efforts of any of our parks to present—I did wish to discuss two meaningful impact on the economy of my State.

The first provision will ensure the economic vitality and viability of the Toledo Bend hydroelectric project located on the beautiful Sabine River on the Louisiana-Texas border. Toledo Bend provides power to thousands of Louisiana homes and serves as an economic engine for our western border with Texas.

The project was first licensed in 1963. Russell Long and our congressional delegation were very instrumental in getting this dam for hydropower established in our State. Although we are known for oil and gas, we do have some hydropower in our State. It was relicensed in August—I am proud of, with my support and leadership—for an additional 50 years, which is a terrific

certification on the part of the Federal Government that this project is fulfilling its original goals and objectives. Not only is it generating power, it is providing an extraordinary recreational opportunity.

This project includes a dam which impounds a 185,000-acre reservoir, the largest manmade body of water in the South, and a powerhouse capable of generating 81 megawatts of electricity. The project is operated primarily for water supply purposes, secondarily for hydropower, and thirdly for recreation. But it has become an extremely popular recreational site both on the Texas side and on the Louisiana side. It is an interesting project, because we have joint jurisdiction. The Texas Commission runs its side, the Louisiana Commission runs our side, and it occupies about 3,800 acres of Federal land in a narrow 3-foot strip along the shore of the reservoir where it borders the Sabine National Forest and Indian mounds.

Under current law, just because of that 3-foot strip, the forest, land, and other Federal agencies were claiming jurisdiction just because of this very narrow edge around the Toledo Bend. So we eliminated their jurisdiction. It gave the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission the basis to impose annual charges. We didn't think that would be fair, so we carved out a much-needed exemption that would prohibit undue regulation, and allow the local governmental structures and appropriate Federal agencies to determine the best use of this land. Local zoning ordinances will apply, local rules about what areas can be developed privately and publicly. There is plenty of public access to this reservoir. We hope, and I anticipate, that it will be another momentum builder for the economic development in this region.

Significantly for me—I have worked on it for many years, because I have been aware of this since I was a legislator years ago and the real need to develop this as a really first-class destination for resorts, hotels, marinas—not only for the people who live and have property there, but for visitors who may come from all over the region.

In addition, Fort Polk is situated only about 40 miles away. So it is within driving distance for soldiers and their families for recreation. It is really quite beautiful. It is isolated. We don't have quite enough highway infrastructure I think for us to develop it in a way that we really should, but that will come with time. But this was a very important step to get the 50-year certification to move forward. And now our local communities—the parishes of Sabine, DeSoto, and Vernon—can lean forward and dream and plan for how this area can be developed.

The second Louisiana-related provision authorizes the National Park

Service to study areas along the Lower Mississippi River in Plaquemines Parish for the potential addition to the national park system. It is just a study, but this Lower Mississippi area is of course rich in cultural history. It was first traveled by Spanish explorers in the 1500s and later, in 1699, became the site of the first fortification on the Lower Mississippi River known as Fort Mississippi.

The area to be studied includes several other historic fortifications, including Fort St. Philip, which played a key role during the Battle of New Orleans and was the final major battle of the War of 1812. While Andrew Jackson's forces were successful on land, it was William Overton's 10-day defense of the back door to New Orleans that helped seal the American victory.

Fort Philip, and its companion fort located across the river, Fort Jackson, also played a pivotal role during the siege of New Orleans during the Civil War. These two forts, with their withering crossfire, held the Union Navy at bay for 12 days. And the history goes on and on.

These special places are tangible links to the dramatic stories of our Nation's history and deserve to be studied for inclusion in our national park system.

Let me underscore again how important I think is the principle of developing our public resources in the right ways—preserving what we can, conserving what we must, but developing what we can for the benefit of the taxpayer. That is one of the underlying principles of this grand compromise. I recognize that to break the logjam, particularly with the House of Representatives, we needed to find a way to address both the development of natural resources and conservation and preservation, as well as the expansion of our public lands and public parks. This package reflects that balance. Let me mention a couple of the economic development provisions.

We will convey 70,000 acres in the Tongass National Forest to Sealaska, an Alaska Native corporation, to complete its land settlement under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. This legislation has been a long-standing priority for Senator BEGICH and Senator MURKOWSKI. I thank them both for their extraordinary leadership in working on this land transfer.

This bill has been considered in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for years, and the final language was carefully negotiated with the Department of Agriculture. So I thank the Department for helping us work out this extraordinary land transfer.

Another provision which was included at the request of Senator MCCAIN and Senator FLAKE and which has been worked on by the Arizona delegation is a land exchange in Arizona

between the Forest Service and the Resolution Copper company to allow development of a major copper mine. My friend TRENT FRANKS has been a leader in this area as well in the House and in his legislative district, and I have had good conversations with him. This may be the deepest copper mine in the United States of America. It is going to be one of the richest in the world.

There was some original language in this legislation that was perhaps not as responsible as it should have been—or as sensitive maybe is a better word—to some of the needs or requests of some of the nearby tribes. We tried to address some of their concerns in the final language. We haven't, of course, settled all complaints, but we have settled as many as we can.

This is an extraordinarily valuable asset for the people of the United States, and the people of the United States own this land and right now own the potential copper that would come out of this mine. I most certainly, through my staff, have insisted and negotiated that the taxpayers get a fair exchange, that they are not underpaid in any way in this transfer and this development. I am very hopeful that the Forest Service, which will continue under the authorization in this bill to negotiate, will make sure the taxpayers of the United States are paid fairly for the exchange of this very valuable property, which will create many jobs in Arizona and which will create opportunities for economic development in our whole country and around the world, as copper is a very valuable substance. One of my overriding conditions for approval was to make sure the taxpayers get a full benefit.

While the Sealaska and Resolution Copper provisions have drawn most of the attention in this bill, in total the package includes many other prominent Federal land conveyances, all which will allow for community services such as cemeteries and schools, provide land for development by local communities, allow for outdoor recreational opportunities, and increase management efficiencies for both public and adjacent private land.

The package also wonderfully includes almost 250,000 acres of new wilderness designations, including in Washington State. I thank Senator CANTWELL and Senator MURRAY for their advocacy for their State and for our Nation. Senator TESTER has been a strong proponent for the State of Montana, Senator REID in the State of Nevada, and in the State of Colorado, Senator BENNET and Senator MARK UDALL, and, of course, in New Mexico we have had some expansion of wilderness areas. Each of these bills was the product of years of discussion among stakeholders and each State's congressional delegation.

In addition to wilderness designations, the package will protect the wa-

tershed of over 360,000 acres of natural forest lands adjacent to Glacier National Park and will designate 200,000 Forest Service and BLM lands in Montana as the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Heritage area and protect 70,000 acres of the Hermosa Creek Watershed in Colorado.

Among the eight new national parks are two in Maryland and New York that celebrate the life of Harriet Tubman, known, of course, for her great role in civil rights and developing the Underground Railroad and for so many other things she did as a leader at that time. Our new national parks will protect 80,000 acres of forest land and volcanic peaks in New Mexico; designate the first national park in Delaware; protect fossil resources outside of Las Vegas; and interpret the story of the World War II Manhattan Project in Washington State, which was so important to Representative HASTINGS. Tennessee and New Mexico are, of course, also included in that history and the Colt firearms company in Hartford, CT, which is an unusual kind of park to celebrate, but it is part of the American development of manufacturing, and the Colt firearms company played a major role. So we have that included in this bill.

The individual bills that are included have been developed with local support and in many cases have been priorities of Senators for years. I am pleased to have played a pivotal role in building this comprehensive package, and it took a lot of compromising and an awful lot of hard work.

I thank the lead Senator on the Defense bill, Mr. LEVIN, for allowing us to be part of the Defense authorization bill, along with Senator JACK REED, whom I spoke with on many occasions along with Senator LEVIN, because without their support I don't know if this bill could have survived standing alone with one or two strong objections still out there. But they can't fight the Defense authorization bill. Tucking it in a bill that is going to pass and will not be vetoed is a way to move these bills forward.

It does enjoy broad and deep bipartisan support from literally hundreds of Members of Congress, and hundreds of staffers have spent hours and hours, and the executive branch—particularly Interior and Agriculture—has spent hours negotiating the fine details of this package.

I thank David Brooks, who is a lead staff member with our committee, Energy and Natural Resources, who has been a magnificent staffer here in the Senate for many years. He is known as the Senate expert on public lands, and that title certainly is appropriate for a man who knows so much and cares deeply about our public spaces and finding the right balance between preservation, conservation, and development.

I thank Liz Craddock, who is my staff director for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, who was absolutely tireless. Not only running the committee in my absence, sometimes when I was on the campaign trail, but also taking appropriate time to come and work with me for reelection and in addition putting together, with David, this package while all this was going on is really a testimony to their professionalism. I thank them very much.

I thank all the Members of my side particularly for their patience and their understanding as we worked through this package of almost 80 to 90 bills and the subcommittees that worked so well moving them forward.

I will submit this for the RECORD. There may be other Senators, I am sure, who want to put in individual remarks for the parks and projects and land swaps, but I think it is pretty remarkable that we have cleared up 6 years of backlog at zero expense to the taxpayer with extremely broad and deep bipartisan support.

I will only say as one of my last remarks on the Senate floor that it is possible to find common ground if we are willing to look for it and work hard enough to find it. We need to have our eyes open a little wider. We need to put our shoulder to the wheel a little bit stronger, and if we can do that, we can move a lot of significant legislation through that benefits generations of our citizens and taxpayers for years to come.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I have come down to the floor today to talk about the package of public lands measures included in the House-passed Defense bill. I am told we are likely to vote on that bill as early as tomorrow in the Senate.

Within the lands package is a measure we worked on called the Hermosa Creek Watershed Protection Act.

The watershed, which is pictured here, is a beautiful parcel of national forest land up the road from Durango in the southwest corner of Colorado.

I will say at the outset that our office may have introduced the bill in the Senate, but it was really the people I represent in southwest Colorado who wrote every bit of this piece of legislation.

Over 6 years ago, a diverse group of local citizens, mountain bikers, anglers, outfitters, local officials, and

many others all got together to talk about the future of the land. Everyone involved liked to visit the area for recreation or to do business there. Their discussion was to developing a plan to manage the area so everyone could enjoy it and benefit from the multiple uses well into the future.

Over the Memorial Day weekend in 2011, the Hermosa workgroup invited my family and me for a hike through the watershed and to join the discussion, and we took them up on that offer.

We loaded up the van, drove to Durango, and met the working group at the Hermosa Creek trailhead.

My youngest daughter Anne, who was then probably about 8, made a hiking stick out of a nearby fallen branch, and we started up the trail with 40 or so others from the local community.

The Presiding Officer knows this area well. As we climbed higher and higher, we were overcome by the beauty around us and the forests and valleys and crystal-clear streams and unspoiled views in almost every direction.

After about an hour, the group pulled off the forest service trail into a meadow, and as Anne, Halina, and Caroline Bennet, my three daughters, made me a dandelion necklace out of the dandelions that were there, we started a discussion about what this area meant to the people who were on this trip.

The sportsmen came to fish for native Colorado cutthroat trout and for back-country elk hunting. The mountain bikers came to enjoy single-track riding trails known throughout the country and throughout the world. The local water districts love Hermosa because it provides clean water for the city of Durango, and workers in the timber and mining industry stress that some of the watershed could contribute to extractive development in the future.

The upshot of the discussion we had in the meadow that afternoon was an agreement to work together on a bill, a balanced bill that managed the watershed so it would contribute to the local economy long into the future. More than just working on this bill, I think the people in that meadow set out to prove that people in this country can still work together and set an example for the U.S. Congress.

After nearly 3½ years of negotiations since that hike, we are on the verge of passing that bill and sending it to the President for his signature. The Hermosa Creek Watershed Protection Act governs the entire watershed. It includes provisions to allow for multiple uses, such as timber harvesting for forest health, continued access for Colorado's snowmobilers—a critical provision to allow Silverton's winter economy to continue to prosper.

The bill enhances opportunities for back-country fishing made possible by

the great work of Trout Unlimited and Colorado Parks and Wildlife to reintroduce native cutthroat trout to the watershed.

The bill also adds—importantly—nearly 40,000 acres to the National Wilderness Preservation System, lands that provide unique and important opportunities for solitude and reflection, lands that will remain undeveloped forever so that they will always have clear streams to fish and lush forests for local outfitters to take clients into the forest on horseback.

I am proud to report that the bill has the unanimous bipartisan backing of the two county commissions involved, the San Juan County Commission and the La Plata County Commission. I thank those commissioners for their leadership, collaboration, and their vision, and the two local towns, Durango and Silverton. It has the support of the Hermosa Creek Workgroup, ranging from hardrock miners to environmental groups. These are the people we say can never get along and can never get anything done because everybody has to get only their position and disregard the position that the other has, and we have proven that is not true, as I said, ranging from hardrock miners to environmental groups such as the San Juan Citizens Alliance, Conservation Colorado, and The Wilderness Society.

It has the support of sportsmen, Trout Unlimited, and the back-country hunters and anglers.

The Hermosa bill is also supported by the local water district, the Southwestern Water Conservation District.

The outdoor recreation community—including the Colorado Snowmobile Association, Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition, and the Trails 2000 mountain bike group—supports the measure. And support for Hermosa is especially strong from the local business community. Companies as diverse as fly shops, car dealerships, the Durango Chamber, and Mercury Payment Systems, one of the area's largest employers, all agree that protected public lands add to the region's quality of life and help them attract topnotch talent to the region.

This bill grew from the grassroots up. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents worked together to cement a long-term plan for their community's future.

I thank Senator UDALL, a long-time champion for Colorado's public lands and wilderness, for joining me as a cosponsor of the bill.

I also wish to thank Congressman SCOTT TIPTON, our partner in the House, for supporting this bill and demonstrating that bipartisanship still exists in some corners of the Capitol. He has been outstanding to work with, as has his staff, and I look forward to collaborating on other conservation measures in the future.

To close and bring this back to the beginning—I see my colleague is here—

I don't have to convince most people that Colorado is a special place. Many people from all over the United States have been to our State to ski our mountains, run our rivers, or climb a 14er.

The Hermosa Creek watershed represents some of the best Colorado has to offer. It deserves to be protected, and that is what this bill does.

However, in some respects, I wish Hermosa didn't have to pass this way. This lands package is a great achievement. It came through a robust bipartisan and bicameral process, and that work is something truly to be commended.

At the same time, I think the Hermosa Creek bill could have passed by unanimous consent years ago as a stand-alone bill, or as part of another smaller, bipartisan, bicameral package that didn't have to wait almost 6 years while local communities all across the country have been left in limbo. People there don't work on the same time that people here work, and their expectations are that we are going to move things along. No one should object to bipartisan, commonsense measures that are widely supported. But instead of regular order, we are left voting on large packages of lands bills every number of years.

In fact, save one wilderness bill that passed earlier this session, Congress has not passed a wilderness bill since 2009. Congress has not passed one wilderness bill since 2009—I suppose we passed one.

Last Congress was the first time a session of Congress hadn't passed a wilderness bill in the 50-year history of the Wilderness Act. That had never happened before, whether the Senate was Democratic or the Senate was Republican, whether the House was Democratic or Republican, or whether the President was a Democrat or a Republican. It never happened before. This Congress—provided the vote goes well tomorrow—will have waited until the eleventh hour.

The 2009 bill, which was one of the very first ones I voted on as a Senator, created 2 million acres of new wilderness.

The package we will vote on tomorrow contains several hundred thousand acres more, including nearly 40,000 new wilderness acres, as I mentioned in the Hermosa bill. While that is great progress, and it truly is, I wish we were doing more.

Despite dozens of other widely supported conservation proposals that have been introduced this session, there are only four other wilderness bills included in this package. Once again, I am strongly supportive of the package, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes. But in the new Congress we ought to hit the reset button and truly honor the intent of the Wilderness Act—which President Johnson signed

into law 50 years ago—by passing more wilderness bills. I can't think of a better anniversary present for the landmark law than for the 114th Congress to return and pass more of these bills.

Let's defy expectations about what the change in the majority means here. Let's lift up the bipartisan work that is happening around here and pass more of these bills.

Historically conservation has been a bipartisan issue going all the way back to Teddy Roosevelt, and I hope we might return to the cooperation we have seen in the decades since then and get some more wilderness and conservation done for the American people.

This is a glorious and beautiful country that we all represent. We ought to save some of it for our kids and grandkids by passing this package and coming together on some others.

I urge yes on the bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer for all of his work to make sure we could bring this lands bill together with the NDAA bill.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I thank my colleague from Alaska for allowing me to go ahead with my remarks.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank my colleague and his comment about the courtesy for allowing him to go first. I think the Senator from Colorado was scheduled to go first, and we were just a little bit behind, so I was pleased to listen to my friend's comments about one of the provisions in this NDAA lands bill, and I thank him for those comments.

I also wish to acknowledge the comments of the Senator from Louisiana, our chairman of the Energy Committee. I have had the pleasure and privilege of working with her as the ranking member on the committee now for the past 6 to 8 months since she has held the chair. But even before that, I have had the honor and privilege of working with her on so many energy issues.

As the Senator from Louisiana was detailing the contents of this lands package that is contained within the NDAA bill, I was reminded of what a good partnership we have had working together on the committee. They are not exactly easy issues that come before us. They generate a level of controversy—certainly a level of debate and dialog—but there has always been good, civil debate and dialog as we try to work through some very difficult issues.

As Senator LANDRIEU leaves the Senate at the end of this Congress, I want her to know, as I stated in committee just this morning, how much I have appreciated the good work she has done,

not only on energy issues, but the good work she has done on behalf of the people whom she represents in Louisiana.

If there is anybody who exemplifies the word "tenacious," it is MARY LANDRIEU, and I think the people of her State have enjoyed the benefit of the very tenacious approach and how my friend and colleague takes care of those she represents. I thank the Senator for that.

I too wish to add my comments this evening in support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and more specifically, to the public lands package, which is title 30.

As Senator LANDRIEU detailed in greater specificity, what we have here is a collection of smaller bills related to public lands. Just because a bill is small and somewhat discreet in terms of its area of impact, it doesn't mean these are not issues that are critically important to the people of that State, critically important to that region.

With so many of these bills that are now part of this package, we have spent months—and in some cases we have spent years—developing, considering, refining, amending, and working through these packages. We have spent weeks negotiating which ones will actually be in the package that we have before us in title 30. We have now arrived at this point where we have a bipartisan and bicameral consensus in support of it.

What I wish to do with my time this evening is to explain how this package is fundamental to economic development in our Western States.

I also wish to lay out what this package is as well as what it isn't because I think there have been some misconceptions about what is contained in this. I also want to provide a little bit of insight into the process by which we crafted this and why it is now time for the Senate to do what the House has already done in passing it by a very overwhelming margin.

But before we get into the substance of some of these measures, I think the Senate needs to understand why we want this package, why we need to pass it now rather than waiting until the next Congress or perhaps the one after that or perhaps whenever we have a slow day around here. So I will proceed to the basics of some of this.

It is probably best described by just looking at the map. The dominant landowner in the United States is the Federal Government. The Federal Government, like it or not, owns roughly 640 million acres of land. That is more than one-quarter of our country that is held by the Federal Government. Ninety-three percent of these lands are clustered in just 12 Western States. So we can see here our Federal fault line. These 12 Western States are areas where less than 50 percent of the land

is owned or held by the State and private interests. When we look at this divide, on this side, more than 95 percent is state-controlled land.

So we have a situation where in many of our Eastern States the Federal Government owns just a small fraction of the lands. But if we look to some of our Western States and we look at the extent of Federal ownership, this is where the picture comes into greater focus. In Wyoming, 42.3 percent of the State of Wyoming is held in Federal lands. In my State of Alaska, 69 percent of the State of Alaska is federally owned. Nevada walks away with No. 1, where over 80 percent of the State of Nevada is held by the Federal Government.

For folks back on the east coast, what does that mean? Let's say it presents some real difficulties for us in the West. Say we want a minor land conveyance—not a big deal. But if a person lives in a State such as New York with less than 1 percent of Federal lands, chances are that person can go see a real estate attorney and they can have a document drawn up, and they might even be able to draw it up in 1 day or maybe it takes a couple of days, but a person can complete a transaction without too much difficulty. If a person tries to do a conveyance in 1 of our 12 Western States, where 93 percent of the Federal lands are, it is a different story. Chances are a person will not have the same luck as they might in New York. Even if they are seeking the smallest of land conveyances, say 1 acre—just 1 acre is all we want to move from the Federal side to the State side, to a local side, to the private side—a person does not go see an attorney. A person needs to go talk to one of the four Federal land management agencies to get approval for their request, and they are not done there. Then a person needs to go see their Congressman and their Senator because they need Federal legislation to make it happen. It honestly takes an act of Congress. In the East, in places where land ownership is different than it is in the West, people can handle all of these conveyances. We can work through some of what we are seeing in this public lands package. We can do it through private transactions. But in the West, it takes an act of Congress for a land conveyance.

That is why we see hundreds of public lands bills introduced each Congress. It underscores why their passage is so critical to economic development and to job creation in our country. I have to admit, I am pleased the Senator from New Mexico is in the chair today, coming from a State such as New Mexico, which is at 41.77 percent. The Presiding Officer knows full well what we are talking about when we talk about the imperative of our communities that are asking for a little relief when it comes to a land convey-

ance, and the level it rises to is not the city council, it is not the mayor or the legislator or the Governor, it is a Congressman and Senator, and ultimately signed into law by the President of the United States.

So what are we actually looking at in this package? After truly months of negotiations, perhaps a few near-death experiences, and many temptations to walk away, we have agreed to a balanced, budget-neutral, revenue-neutral, bicameral, bipartisan package contained in title 30. These provisions that are contained here will create jobs. They will create thousands of American jobs. They will cut the redtape to energy production. They will boost American mineral production. They protect multiple use and public recreation. They convey Federal land for community development. They protect our treasured lands through measured conservation, and they provide new means for private dollars to support our national parks.

We have included a bipartisan provision to streamline oil and gas permitting on our Federal lands. It is supported by the Western Governors' Association. It cleared the Senate by unanimous consent before the elections. So think about that. So many things get tied up in the politics of elections, but this was so important to so many, on a bipartisan basis, on a regional basis, we moved it through the Senate by unanimous consent.

We have included a provision to address the backlog of the grazing permit renewals for our western ranchers to ease their burdens. Then there is another provision we have included that will help to hopefully protect the collapse of the timber industry in Southeastern Alaska with the conveyance to our Alaska Native peoples—a promise that has been 40 years—40 years—in achieving.

We have included a major priority for Arizona. This is an issue Senator LANDRIEU spoke to, an extensively negotiated land exchange led by Senator MCCAIN and Senator FLAKE. I know Senator MCCAIN has been working on this for a decade to find a way to responsibly open a copper deposit that could meet 25 percent of our country's needs while at the same time taking incredible care to protect and maintain access to cultural resources and traditional uses of those lands.

There is another provision that relates to Nevada which also facilitates development of a different copper mine. But now think about this. We are going to have an opportunity in Nevada and in Arizona to extract copper. Our military needs copper. The construction industry needs copper. The automotive industry needs copper. The renewable energy industry needs copper. There are so many benefits to be had here.

We have some provisions that are contained in this package that perhaps

generate fewer headlines but are still hugely important for local communities. Probably the best example of this is a provision for a school in Minnesota. This is a measure we have been working on with Senator FRANKEN. But it facilitates a land exchange of just 1 acre—1 acre to a school in Minnesota—a single, lonely acre. We probably have people saying, So do we really have to pass a bill in order to make that happen? The simple answer is yes. That is why we are here. That is why we are including these provisions—so many provisions—in this very important bill.

I also want to mention what the package is not—what it does not do, what it does not contain, and some of the parade of horrors that certain groups have been saying that in fairness, they are not looking again to the balance we have achieved with this overall package.

We saw some rightful concerns emerge before this title was finalized. Everybody's ears always perk up when they hear “public lands package,” wondering what it is going to be. But we have seen some inaccurate criticisms emerge even after the release. It is one thing if they haven't seen what is in it. It is another thing to look at it and then be critical of it.

As I mentioned earlier, this is a balanced, revenue-neutral package. We have taken great care to make sure it is not all focused on new wilderness, new parks. In Western States, and particularly coming out of Alaska, we are just not going to have the support we need if it is all focused on wilderness and parks, so it is not. There is a conservation piece, absolutely, and it is a strong conservation piece, and I think it is a good, balanced one. But we also have the very important development piece that is critical to what is contained within.

To those who have spoken out against creating new national parks, given the maintenance backlogs that I think we recognize—it could be as high as \$20 billion. I get it. I agree with Senator COBURN that we must address the backlog issues, the maintenance issues, and I thank him for the scrutiny he and his staff have given to this issue and the report they came out with. We are going to be working to address that in a manner that is constructive and long term. I want to reduce the backlogs, and we will do it.

Again, this has been judged to be revenue neutral. Through its passage, we could make progress on the backlog issue.

One provision that is contained in the bill that will help is the authorization of a National Park Service commemorative coin. There are 75 Senators who are cosponsors that will allow for additional funds to be raised. Senator COBURN has a measure in here that will allow for appropriate recognition of volunteers to our national

parks. We have also tailored this package to include the wilderness provisions, but it is a discrete number. All of these have strong local and congressional support. We are looking at less than 250,000 acres in all, and actually from a practical perspective, far less than that. Most of these provisions were sponsored by a House Republican. Some have been endorsed by a Governor or a State legislature. With others, we are simply making it official. Nearly half of what would become wilderness is already managed as if it were wilderness. It is in wilderness study areas or it is in roadless area designation.

This is not a zero-sum game because we should be focused on the productive value of our public lands above all else. But for those who are kind of keeping score—is this acre per acre—I want to remind people that the package transfers almost 110,000 acres of Federal land into State or private hands through conveyances, exchanges, and sales. We are also releasing more than 26,000 acres of land from wilderness study back into multiple use. Examples of what those lands could be used for include building of transmission lines or motorized recreation.

I know some have raised issues about the various studies that are contained within the bill which, in my view, are more a matter of due diligence than anything else. Because a further act of Congress will be required before any new park, any new museum or wild or scenic designation can be established, and then we have the funding aspect of it as well. So, again, these are studies. This is not the creation of a new museum. This is not the creation of a new park. These are studies.

I think it is also important to reiterate that we have taken great care to protect private property. We have forbidden the use of eminent domain and the condemnation of private property. We have also set a positive precedent by eliminating the potential use of buffer zones around designated lands.

Again, I am going to say it one more time: This package is the result of bipartisan and bicameral negotiation, weeks of meetings amongst Members and staff of the committees of jurisdiction, the committees that have crafted the overall NDAA bill, leadership in both Chambers, and many individual Members.

For those who would suggest that this package was somehow hastily assembled, that this is some kind of rush to judgment, it is at the end of a very long and actually a very traditional process. We have considered, debated, and amended these provisions over the course of Congress using the committee process and the House and Senate floor when we could. Every bill within this package has been reviewed by the committees of jurisdiction. We are not haphazardly over anybody. At

least 30 bills have passed the House and 7 have passed the Senate. Even though we haven't devoted time to a large package of individual bills, some of these provisions have been considered in multiple Congresses. You may look through the list, and they look like reruns. It is because we have tried, and the process didn't allow for full completion.

What we have with title 30 builds upon the lands and natural resource provisions that were included in the initial House-passed NDAA. These were provisions that were primarily the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee's jurisdiction.

We have seen in the past the NDAA bill include public lands packages. It has happened enough times that the House leaders actually name the House Resources Committee as official conferees to it. But I think what is very important for us to remember about this lands package is that what we have done, this effort, has taken no time and no funding away from our military or our veterans, nor has its inclusion held the NDAA back for a single moment here.

I think we would all prefer a process where we could take the time to bring up Senator BENNET's bill on the floor and talk about it and have him tell us about all the magic of this region, but we haven't seen that in this body in far too long. I would prefer that process where all these bills could be considered individually on their own, but know that we have reviewed everything closely. This is a revenue neutral package. We found the right balance and reached bipartisan and bicameral agreement. We don't need to start over. We don't need to be working these same bills in a new Congress. We don't need to see a groundhog's day with so many of these measures that are small but are so important to these Western States. It is time to finish this. It is time to pass these reasonable measures. So I would encourage the Senate to support this package as part of the larger NDAA bill so that we can fulfill our responsibility to those in the Western States and those who have public lands that we are happy to have, but we also need to know we can have a level of responsiveness within our system to allow us to work those lands.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Alaska for her tireless efforts on the lands bill and the NDAA bill and the bipartisan spirit she brought to all of these negotiations over a long period of time. She is to be commended for it. I don't think we would be anywhere close to where we are without her work. I thank her for that.

I am here to speak briefly about the Intelligence Committee's report on the

CIA's interrogation methods. I support the committee's decision to release the report. As a country, it shows we have the courage to face the truth no matter how ugly that truth may be. Coloradans need to know the truth. The American people deserve to know the truth. Our willingness to face this difficult truth reminds us that we live and we are lucky to live in the most open and transparent democracy the world has ever known. Unlike the acts brought to light by the Intelligence Committee report, the willingness for self-examination is something to be celebrated about America.

The report will be the subject of significant debate over the coming weeks and months and maybe even years, as it should be. Nobody should be cavalier about the risks that are associated with the release of this information, but this is a discussion our country needs to have.

Although I am still reviewing the report, a couple of things are pretty clear at the outset.

First, the use of so-called enhanced interrogation techniques failed to secure accurate information or cooperation from detainees. The very first finding of the report says:

While being subjected to the CIA's enhanced interrogation techniques and afterwards, multiple CIA detainees fabricated information, resulting in faulty intelligence. Detainees provided fabricated information on critical intelligence issues, including the terrorist threats which the CIA identified as its highest priorities.

Not only has torture not made the country safer, it may have made us less safe—at least according to this report.

Second, the report reveals that the CIA withheld information from the FBI, the State Department, and the Director of the Office of National Intelligence. It denied access to detainees and provided inaccurate information about the interrogation tactics. Information was withheld from former Secretary of State Colin Powell out of concern he would "blow his stack if he were to be briefed on what's been going on." The CIA repeatedly misled Congress and impeded oversight by its own inspector general.

The report rebuts any notion that these brutal tactics led to actionable intelligence that made our country safer. It highlights the lengths to which people systematically misled other agencies, the Congress, and for years the American people. But most significantly, this report—and I thank the Presiding Officer for his service on the Intelligence Committee. It is a committee that by definition people can't learn very much about, and I know it takes a lot of time and an awful lot of work that can go underappreciated. But this week we are learning why the work on that committee is so important.

Most significantly, as I was saying, this report has reminded us that the use of torture is completely at war with who we are as a country and the ideals we hold. Throughout our country's history, our American values—the notion that all people are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable, sustainable rights—have sustained us through our most difficult times. They helped us triumph in World War II and eventually led to the fall of communism during the Cold War. They have attracted millions of immigrants to our shores. They inspired generations of Americans to rectify the inequality that exists in their own time to create a more perfect union. In fact, the values of democracy and human dignity are what brought my mother and her family to the United States after surviving the horrors of the Holocaust in Poland. It was a place that they called beautiful America, as much an idea as it was a place to them. Torture is repugnant to these fundamental American ideals.

It is often said that the strength of our democratic institutions is tested during times of crisis. Understanding what happened and ensuring we won't use torture again will help our democratic institutions persevere in the future and serve future generations as well as the generations that were here before. It will demonstrate that we are better and we are stronger than our enemies. It will ensure that our uniquely American values will continue to inspire people like my mother and her parents all across the globe.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAVEN ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues Chairman LEVIN of the Committee on Armed Services and Chairman JOHNSON of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. I join with my colleagues to speak about the inclusion of the HAVEN Act in the National Defense Authorization Act we are considering today. The HAVEN Act, which I sponsored along with Senator JOHANNES, authorizes a pilot program to help make repairs or modifications that are necessary for disabled or low-income veterans to stay in their homes. The HAVEN Act lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to which it has been

referred. However, working in close coordination with the chairman of the banking committee, we were able to include this measure in the NDAA bill, in recognition of its potential to assist veterans of our armed services who are in need; isn't that correct, Chairman JOHNSON?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Senator REED is correct, I thank him for working with me on this matter and for his continued advocacy on behalf of veterans.

Mr. LEVIN. I would like to thank both Senator REED and Chairman JOHNSON for working with our committee to include the HAVEN Act within the bill we are considering today.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES BAKER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, James Baker has served the State of Vermont with great distinction over many years, and I was saddened when he announced his retirement in 2009 after 3 decades with the Vermont State Police. To no one's surprise, he finished his tenure there at the top, as commander.

But we knew retirement would not last long for a man of his talents.

In 2010, Jim Baker answered the call to step in where he was most needed, taking the helm of the Rutland City Police Department when the department and the community were beset by turmoil. Chief Baker's leadership and loyalty was infectious, and his plan to serve for only a few months turned into a few years.

During that time, Chief Baker pulled together a team of committed neighbors, businesspeople and community organizers to face the challenges head-on. They tackled blighted neighborhoods and encouraged new investment. They sent a strong message to drug dealers: NOT in our community. And they developed a statistical mapping system to reduce crime in the city's worst-hit blocks. This effort, known as "Project VISION," has shown great success.

With Rutland now on a steady course, one might think Chief Baker would again be thinking of retirement, but that will not be the case. Instead, Jim Baker will be bringing his leadership talents to Washington D.C., where he will serve as director of law enforcement and support with the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Rutland's loss is our Nation's gain. I look forward to a continued working relationship with Jim, and thank him for his dedication and leadership to the State of Vermont. I ask that the following profile of Jim Baker, which recently appeared in the Vermont weekly *Seven Days*, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *Seven Days*, Nov. 19, 2014]

INFLUENTIAL POLICE CHIEF HAS A NEW GIG

(By Mark Davis)

When Jim Baker first took over Rutland's scandal-plagued police department in the winter of 2012, he had a running joke with the mayor.

In department-head meetings during which a particularly vexing problem arose, Baker would hold up his city-issued notebook and point to the first word of his job title. "Mayor, mayor, look—'interim,' OK?" Baker would say to Mayor Chris Lours. "That question is for the next guy."

Baker, a former head of the Vermont State Police, initially signed on for a six-month stint as Rutland's chief of police. Nearly three years later, he still occupies the corner office at the Rutland police station.

Baker is widely credited with stabilizing the department, initiating a statistics-based policing program and rallying dozens of community groups to fight the city's drug problem. "He was the driving force not just to turn around a dysfunctional department but in helping the renaissance of the city," Lours said. "It would not have happened without him."

But now, talk of the "next guy" is no joke.

Although the mayor had started preliminary contract discussions to keep Baker around for a couple more years, the chief decided it was time for something less stressful. In December, Baker is leaving for a position with the International Association of Chiefs of Police, a Washington, D.C., think tank.

"I burn a lot of jet fuel when I get into a situation like I found here," said Baker, who has preferred working short stints—no longer than a few years—during his lengthy law-enforcement career. The D.C. opportunity, he said, will enable him to engage in national and international issues on a less demanding schedule.

A New York native and Southern Vermont College graduate, Baker methodically climbed the ladder during the 30 years he worked at Vermont State Police. He held nearly every position there, including director, before retiring in 2009.

Baker says it is unlikely he'll ever stop working. After leaving the state police, he launched a consulting business and became something of a Mr. Fix-It for Vermont law enforcement. Then a scandal rocked the Vermont Police Academy: A training coordinator committed suicide after his computers were seized during a child-pornography investigation. It prompted the director of the academy to resign, and in 2010, Baker took over that job for several months with the intention of rooting out problems and improving morale.

Next Baker spent a few months as interim police chief in Manchester. That's when Lours and Rutland Police Commissioner Larry Jensen came calling. They convinced Baker to come aboard for six months to help "settle down" a department in the midst of its own scandal.

The Rutland force had been in disarray since 2010, when state police busted former sergeant David Schauwecker for viewing pornography on his work computer and removing a pornographic video from an evidence locker for personal use. After he accepted a plea deal, Schauwecker was fired. Rutland aldermen urged the police commission to do the same to then-chief Tony Bossi, but they said no; Bossi finally resigned in early 2012.

The Rutland Herald asked for documents related to the investigation, but the city's police department refused. So the newspaper sued—and won: In 2013, the Vermont Supreme Court ordered the department to release the records, which revealed that, years earlier, two other Rutland officers had also watched porn on the job.

Meantime, the city wasn't faring much better than its police department. Once a boomtown fueled by railroads and a marble quarry, Rutland's economy had lagged for decades. Out-of-state drug dealers moved in as property values plummeted, downtown went dormant and vacant buildings proliferated. Drugs had decimated large swaths of the city long before Gov. Peter Shumlin devoted his 2014 State of the State address to Vermont's "opiate epidemic."

Known throughout Vermont as "Rut-Vegas"—a moniker that Baker forbade his officers from using inside the station—the city was the brunt of countless jokes.

Then, in September 2012, a tragedy illustrated the severity of the city's plight. A 23-year-old Rutland man passed out while driving through downtown, as a result of inhaling gas from an aerosol can. His foot remained on the accelerator, and, moving at 80 miles per hour, he slammed into a bank of parked cars outside the Discount Food and Liquidation Center. Carly Ferro, a 17-year-old Rutland High School senior, had just worked a shift in the store and was walking to her father's car when she was struck and killed.

"That was the tipping point," Baker said. "That was the single incident where people in the community said they had finally had enough and starting rallying around the police department and the neighborhoods."

To tackle Rutland's growing list of urban ills, Baker and a few others organized regular meetings with housing agencies, social workers, neighborhood activists, lawyers, mental health experts, educators and city hall workers.

The group that formed called itself Project VISION—Viable Initiatives and Solutions through Involvement of Neighborhoods—and focused on problems related to drugs, crime, housing and jobs. Its monthly meetings, which attracted 70 to 100 people, helped build public support for a methadone clinic that opened earlier this year, among other initiatives.

Seeking further collaboration, Baker invited mental health workers, social workers, prosecutors, probation officers and domestic violence experts to relocate their offices to the police station.

Meanwhile, inside the police force, the chief aimed to strengthen relations with residents and institute smarter enforcement. He helped create a crime-mapping project that plotted the details of every police call—whether for a family fight or a noise disturbance—into a database. Every two weeks, officers and members of Project VISION reviewed "hot spots" and developed strategies to defuse them.

Baker also instructed his officers to stop measuring success by arrest numbers. "We're not focused on arrests or how much drugs

were seized, but on working through problems," Baker said.

When his first six-month contract was up, Baker signed a one-year extension, then two more, the last of which paid him \$125,000 a year. "I saw some opportunity, that I thought I could contribute," Baker said. "I found out there were some people in the community working very hard to get it right."

Among them was Linda Justin. A Rutland native who had become increasingly distraught by the city's decline, she and her husband, Bill Beckim, cashed out their 401(k), bought a derelict building in Rutland's Northwest neighborhood, and in January 2013 opened the Dream Center, where they host youth groups, prayer sessions, meetings, block parties and free meals. One day, Justin called Baker looking for an answer to a neighbor's question.

After talking for a while, Baker realized, "Oh my gosh, you guys are doing what we're talking about doing," the chief recalled.

Baker started to join Justin and Beckim on their neighborhood walks, chatting with residents about problems and their ideas for making things better. "He doesn't just sit in his office and direct," Justin said. "He gets his hands right in it. He's a real person. He's down-to-earth."

And while no one is declaring victory, officials say Rutland is improving. Calls for police service have dropped since Project VISION launched, and Baker said the department is registering double-digit drops in burglaries and property crimes this year.

Rutland police have had a lot of help. Federal authorities conducted a three-year operation in the city and have been responsible for most of the prosecutions against prominent drug dealers operating there. Vermont Attorney General Bill Sorrell tasked one of his prosecutors to focus exclusively on Rutland; assistant attorney general Ultan Doyle works out of the downtown police station.

Its porn scandal may be over, but the department still isn't perfect.

In September, two officers were suspended after a brawl outside a Rutland bar.

In a pending lawsuit filed in January 2013, Andrew Todd, a former Rutland police officer and now a Vermont State Police trooper, describes a culture of police misconduct and cover-ups, and alleges that superiors subjected him to racial abuse.

Todd, who is African American, claims he brought several concerns to higher-ups but that little was done. The alleged misconduct, including officers stealing, having sex and sleeping while on duty, occurred before Baker came to Rutland. Though Todd left the department before Baker arrived, he has alleged that Baker tried to "influence" an outside review of the Rutland police department.

Baker declined to comment on the lawsuit.

In three years, nearly half of the department's roster has turned over, through firings and attrition. Baker says he is proud of the holdovers who were willing to adapt to his methods. "It would have been very easy for those folks to bunker down, wait me out," Baker said. "My track record is pretty clear—I don't stay anywhere very long."

The mayor is intent on continuing Baker's legacy. Guiding the search for a new chief, Louras said, will be his or her ability to adopt Baker's methods.

That includes the continuation of Project VISION. In recent months, Baker handed off much of his work there to Capt. Scott Tucker. The community agencies that populate the top floor of police headquarters aren't

going anywhere. And the monthly Project VISION meetings still attract a crowd.

"You can't lead," Baker said, "if no one is following you."

THANKING CURRENT AND PAST DEMOCRATIC STAFF OF THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to thank the current and past Democratic staff of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence for their hard work and diligence on the Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency's Detention and Interrogation Program.

Committee staff spent 7 years preparing the report, going through more than 6 million pages of documents and writing a final report that is over 6,700 pages, including 38,000 footnotes. Staff worked incredibly long hours over many years and sacrificed time with their families and friends. They overcame significant obstacles to put out this report. They took no short-cuts in their research. And they took no liberties with the facts.

The staff produced a report of historic importance, which will be studied for many years to come. Because of their work, the true facts about the CIA's interrogation program under President Bush are now available for all Americans to understand. Because of their work, we as a country can commit that never again will we repeat these mistakes. This report, and the work of the staff, is an outstanding example of the constitutional oversight role that the Senate can and should play.

I want to particularly thank David Grannis, the committee's staff director and Daniel Jones, the lead staffer and author of much of the report. Many other committee staffers past and present participated in producing the report including: Evan Gottesman, Chad Tanner, Alissa Starzak, Nate Adler, Jennifer Barrett, Nick Basciano, Michael Buchwald, Jim Catella, Eric Chapman, John Dickas, Lorenzo Goco, Andrew Grotto, Tressa Guenov, Clete Johnson, Michael Noblet, Michael Pevzner, Tommy Ross, Caroline Tess, James Wolfe, and Andy Johnson.

REMEMBERING JUDY BAAR TOPINKA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to one of Illinois' great pioneers, State Comptroller Judy Baar Topinka. Judy passed away suddenly last night at the age of 70. She was the only woman in our State to hold two State constitutional offices, and her leadership built bridges for countless women.

Born in 1944 to William and Lillian Baar, Judy and her family lived in Riverside, near Cicero and Berwyn, two blue-collar Chicago suburbs. Her mother ran a real estate business while her

father fought in World War II. She went to Northwestern University and graduated with a degree in journalism from the university's Medill School in 1966.

Judy became a reporter for a suburban Chicago newspaper chain and rose through the ranks to editor. But in 1980, she decided to run for the Illinois House. She said she ran because the corrupt officials were ignoring the community.

Her trademark humor and her work ethic served her well and she went to serve as State senator from 1985 until 1995. In 1994, she became the first woman in Illinois history to hold the post of State treasurer and then went on to set another first as the only State treasurer to be reelected to three consecutive terms. Judy was a consummate public servant. A few weeks ago, she was re-elected as State comptroller and was about to start her second term.

Judy never shied away from taking tough stands or making the hard decisions. When it was not popular among many in her party, she was an advocate of women's rights and gay rights. When both parties needed to be held accountable, she was fearless. She was always a straight talker.

She was one of a kind. Judy could play the accordion, and she spoke four languages—English, Czech, Spanish, and Polish. She loved dance polkas and really was Illinois' Polka Queen. Anyone who knew her also knew about her beloved dogs and their preference for McDonald's cheeseburgers. In an era where far too many are stuck on talking points, Judy said what she thought and did it with style.

In a political world of cocker spaniels she could be a bulldog taking a bite out of both Democrats and right-wing Republicans without missing a beat. She was a blue-collar, immigrants' kid who lit up the room with her quick wit and boundless energy.

Illinois lost someone special. My prayers and thoughts go out to her son Joseph, her new granddaughter Alexandra Faith, and the rest of her family.

NOMINATION OF THO DINH-ZARR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today I address the Senate on the nomination of Dr. Tho "Bella" Dinh-Zarr of Texas to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, NTSB.

Dr. Dinh-Zarr is uniquely qualified to serve as a Member of the NTSB. Dr. Dinh-Zarr currently holds the position of Director of the U.S. office of the FIA Foundation, an independent nonprofit charity based in the United Kingdom which supports activities that promote international road safety research and sustainable mobility. I have been informed that, prior to assuming her current role, Dr. Dinh-Zarr also served as the Foundation's Road Safety Director

from 2007–2014. Dr. Dinh-Zarr has extensive professional experience with traffic and highway safety issues, working previously as Director of North America's Make Roads Safe Campaign for Global Road Safety, a scientist at the National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration, and as National Director of Traffic Safety Policy for the American Automobile Association.

I would like to highlight some of Dr. Dinh-Zarr's connections to our shared home State of Texas—in particular, her education and work experience at some of our well-known academic and research institutions. Dr. Dinh-Zarr and her family escaped Vietnam in 1975, eventually taking up residence along the Gulf Coast in Galveston, TX. From an early age, Dr. Dinh-Zarr developed an awareness of the region's extensive multi-modal transportation network and the importance of rail, marine, and pipeline safety in her community. One of her first jobs was working at the Galveston Railroad Museum, an institution dedicated to preserving the region's storied history of rail transportation through educational exhibits and programs. Dr. Dinh-Zarr earned both a Masters of Public Health and a Ph.D. in Health Policy and Injury Prevention from the University of Texas School of Public Health. She is a graduate of Rice University and worked as a Research Associate at the Texas A&M Transportation Institute, TTI, widely recognized as one of the premier transportation research agencies in the country.

The NTSB plays a critical role in advancing transportation safety. The agency is charged with investigating transportation-related accidents and making recommendations aimed at preventing future events. In order to best meet its goal of improving safety across our Nation's transportation system, the NTSB must ensure safety recommendations are reasonable, balanced and evidence-based. The agency's investigative and advocacy responsibilities must be considered in light of the unique and diverse safety challenges confronting our States, where innovative and tailored solutions can often more effectively reduce or eliminate the likelihood of future incidents or injury versus a one-size-fits-all approach. Toward this end, NTSB must place a high priority on transparency and accountability, working to ensure communities, individuals, small businesses, and all others impacted by its work are provided adequate opportunities to be heard.

I am confident that Dr. Dinh-Zarr is up to the challenge. She will not only bring to the position a wealth of knowledge and experience, but also a Texan's sense of compassion and dedication to the service of others. I am pleased to join her friends and family, members of Vietnamese American

community in Texas and across the country, and many others in support of this well-qualified nominee.

INSURANCE CAPITAL STANDARDS CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with Senators BROWN and JOHANNIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in June of this year the Senate passed by unanimous consent, S. 2270, urgent legislation I introduced with Senators BROWN and JOHANNIS to address the capital requirements that apply to insurance companies under Federal supervision pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Act. This legislation clarifies the Federal Reserve's authority to recognize the distinctions between banking and insurance when implementing section 171 of the Dodd-Frank Act, ensuring that bank-centric capital standards are not applied to such companies' regulated insurance activities.

One of the central elements of the Dodd-Frank Act was stronger capital rules for both banks and certain non-bank financial institutions. Two sections of the Dodd-Frank Act accomplished this—section 165, which applies to large bank holding companies and to non-bank systemically important financial institutions, SIFIs, and section 171, which applies minimum capital standards to insured depository institutions, depository institution holding companies, including insurance savings and loan holding companies, and to SIFIs.

Insurance companies, specifically insurance savings and loan holding companies, are different from banks. Insurers must match long-term obligations to their policyholders with long-term assets, mostly bonds, while banks have more callable obligations—securities and loans and mortgages—and fund them with deposits as well as a mix of debt and equity of varying maturities and durations. The Dodd-Frank legislation reflected this reality, both in its text and in the legislative history, which repeatedly recognizes that the business of insurance is unique and presents different risks.

Mr. BROWN. I and other original co-sponsors and strong supporters of S. 2270 have, like you, been disappointed by the regulators' failure to recognize that they have the authority to implement the Collins amendment as it applies to insurers in a manner that tailors the capital requirements for insurers to reflect the substantial differences between insurers and depository institutions. We continue to believe that the regulators could solve this problem using their existing authority. This legislation shows that there is strong bipartisan support for addressing this issue. As you know, 31

of your colleagues and I cosponsored the bill, and the legislation passed the Senate with unanimous support in early June.

S. 2270 is narrowly crafted to only address this issue as it relates to insurance companies and insurance savings and loan holding companies. If you are a bank, or another entity that owns a bank, you will be subject to the full force of the Collins amendment for your banking activities. At the same time, if you are a financial organization engaged in insurance which is also engaged in bank activities, including derivatives market making, those activities would be subject to the Collins amendment.

To accomplish the goal of directing the Federal Reserve to tailor rules for insurance, our legislation permits the Federal Reserve to create a non-Basel III regime for the insurance operations of supervised entities. The legislation allows the Fed to work with State insurance regulators to develop appropriate insurance-based capital standards for insurance activities.

Mr. JOHANNIS. I am an original cosponsor of this legislation and appreciate your long-standing partnership on this issue. The bill clarifies that, in establishing the minimum leverage capital and risk-based capital standards under section 171, the Federal Reserve Board is not required to include activities or companies that are engaged in the business of insurance and are subject to State insurance regulation, including State insurance capital requirements. Similarly, regulated foreign affiliates or subsidiaries engaged in the business of insurance and subject to foreign insurance regulation and foreign insurance capital requirements that have not been deemed to be inadequate also may be excluded from section 171 capital standards. We believe it is worth noting that the Government Accountability Office found that the State risk-based capital rules performed well during the financial crisis.

The bill allows the insurance capital requirements that have been effective to continue to determine the capital requirements for the activities of insurance companies and groups that are supervised by the Federal Reserve Board. Furthermore, activities of a holding company supervised by the Federal Reserve Board that are not the business of insurance would remain subject to the capital standards under section 171. In determining insurance versus non-insurance activities of a supervised entity, the legislation provides regulators with the flexibility to tailor the rules for certain affiliates or subsidiaries of insurance companies that are necessary to the business of insurance, including, for example, affiliates or subsidiaries that support insurance company general and separate accounts.

Our legislation defines “business of insurance” by reference to section 1002 of the Dodd-Frank Act, and under this definition the business of insurance means “the writing of insurance or the reinsuring of risks by an insurer, including all acts necessary to such writing or reinsuring and the activities relating to the writing of insurance or the reinsuring of risks conducted by persons who act as, or are, officers, directors, agents, or employees of insurers or who are other persons authorized to act on behalf of such persons.” The reference to this definition of the “business of insurance” will help ensure that insurance activities of federally supervised companies are subject to tailored capital rules, whether those activities are undertaken by the insurance companies themselves or by their affiliates or subsidiaries on their behalf.

Ms. COLLINS. We also want to ensure that the Federal Reserve uses its authority to tailor capital rules for insurance operations of entities under its supervision, regardless of the size of the subsidiary insured depository institution. As we have stated, under this legislation and under current law, the Basel banking regime and the Collins amendment requirements will continue to apply to all insured depository institutions. It would be at odds with sound public policy and the intent of this legislation for the Federal Reserve to impose a Basel banking capital regime on the entire enterprise of an insurer that happens to also own a sizable insured depository institution—the depository institution in that operation will already be subject to banking rules, but the insurance operations should not be.

Mr. BROWN. Another important provision of our legislation addresses the issue of insurance accounting for a small number of non-publicly traded insurance companies. While every publicly traded company in the United States is required by the Federal Securities laws to prepare consolidated financial statements under Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, GAAP, all insurance companies in the United States—whether in mutual or stock form of organization—are required by their State insurance regulators to utilize an accounting method known as Statutory Accounting. Indeed, most mutual insurance companies only use Statutory Accounting in preparing their financial statements.

Statutory Accounting Principles, SAP, are generally more conservative than GAAP because they are specifically designed to promote insurer solvency and the ability to pay claims instead of measuring an insurer’s value as a going concern. SAP does not allow a number of non-liquid or intangible assets to be included on an insurer’s balance sheet and provides less favorable accounting treatment for certain expenses. In both the text of the Dodd-

Frank Act and its legislative history, Congress recognized the acceptability of SAP for holding companies engaged in insurance activities coming under Federal Reserve jurisdiction. Specifically, Congress 1) directed the Federal Reserve to rely on existing reports and information provided to State and other regulators (which for insurance companies would have been prepared according to SAP); and 2) included Senate report language stating that Federal Reserve assumption of jurisdiction over savings and loan holding companies engaged in the business of insurance did not reflect a mandate to impose GAAP. However, in proposed rulemakings, the Federal Reserve expressed its intention to require all companies to eventually prepare GAAP financial statements-consistent with their existing model for all bank holding companies. Imposing such a mandate on companies using only SAP would cost insurers a substantial amount to take on multi-year financial projects yielding minimal, if any, supervisory benefit to regulators.

S. 2270 makes clear that under Section 171 of the Dodd-Frank Act and the Home Owners’ Loan Act, such a mandate is inappropriate where the holding company is a non-publicly traded insurance company that is only required to prepare and file SAP statements. Nothing in this provision prevents the Federal Reserve from obtaining any information it is otherwise entitled to obtain from a SAP-only insurer.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I and the many other supporters of S. 2270 are pleased that this legislation has passed the Senate. It is critical that this legislation be enacted this year. We look forward to its enactment this year and working with regulators as they implement appropriate, tailored capital rules for insurers under their supervision.

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I applaud the passage of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act. Across the United States, newborns are screened routinely for certain genetic, metabolic, hormonal and functional disorders. Most of these birth defects have no immediate visible effects on a baby but, unless detected and treated early, they can cause serious physical problems, developmental disability and, in some cases, death.

Fortunately, most infants are given a clean bill of health when tested. In cases where newborns are found to have metabolic disorders or hearing impairment, early diagnosis and proper treatment are crucial in making the difference between healthy development and lifelong infirmity.

Newborn screening has been saving lives for more than 50 years, but programs vary from State to State. To address disparity among States' newborn screening capabilities, Congress passed the original Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2008, P.L. 110-204, legislation I sponsored with Senator Chris Dodd. The law established national newborn screening guidelines and helped facilitate comprehensive newborn screening in every State in America and the District of Columbia.

Before passage, some States offered as few as only four of the recommended tests, and only 11 States and D.C. required the recommended screening for all disorders. Today, 42 States and D.C. require screening for at least 29 of the 31 treatable core conditions, and both parents and physicians are more aware of the availability and necessity of newborn screening.

To maintain the important work of newborn screening programs, I am a proud sponsor of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Reauthorization Act of 2013. This legislation will allow States to continue improving their programs to help medical providers promptly diagnose and treat conditions which could result otherwise in irreversible brain damage, permanent disability, or death.

I very much appreciate and commend the hard work of my colleagues and their staffs here in the Congress, the administration, and the public health community to ensure that this program will continue to help States provide critical, timely, and lifesaving newborn screening for our youngest Americans.

DODD-FRANK REFORM

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, 14 years ago, Congress made a grave mistake. In the dead of night, as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2001, Congress passed a little-noticed provision that prohibited all meaningful oversight and regulation of swaps, which then were the latest financial product in the fast-growing financial derivatives market. In that new regulatory void, the swaps markets grew to unprecedented size and complexity. It was the swaps market that ultimately lead to unprecedented taxpayer bailouts of some of the largest financial institutions in the world.

Some have estimated that the cost of the last crisis was \$17 trillion—with a “t”. To the families across the country, it meant lost jobs, home foreclosures and reduced home values for those who did not lose their homes. Far too many of my constituents, far too many Americans, are still struggling to recover. It was all enabled by Congress passing a financial regulatory provision with little consideration, tucked inside a funding bill.

We enacted the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protec-

tion Act, in part, to address the significant risks posed by swaps and other financial derivatives. Section 716 was a key component of the financial reforms. That provision is titled “Prohibition Against Federal Government Bailouts of Swaps Entities.” It explicitly prohibited taxpayer bailouts of banks that trade swaps. It set out a plan to help achieve that goal, by requiring bank holding companies to move much of their derivatives trading outside of their FDIC-insured banks.

This provision has come to be known as the “swaps push out” provision. Four years after its enactment, however, banking regulators have yet to finalize a rule to enforce compliance. Before they do, some in Congress want to relieve them of the obligation altogether.

Some of the largest bank holding companies prefer to conduct their swaps trades in their government-backed, FDIC-insured banks because they have better credit ratings, which means lower borrowing costs and therefore higher profits. But because the activity is within the bank, it puts the Federal Government—and taxpayers—directly on the hook for those bets that, as we saw in the financial crisis, can be unlimited in number, because banks can create an unlimited number of “synthetic” derivatives related to a particular financial asset.

A couple years ago, JPMorgan Chase lost billions of dollars on a bad bet in the credit derivatives markets. The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair, conducted an extensive investigation and issued a 300-page bipartisan report with its findings. JPMorgan's risky trading by its bank was a disaster—costing the bank over \$6 billion. It was receiving the taxpayer subsidy the whole time.

To be clear, Section 716 does not cure all the risks posed by swaps. But it was an important part of the effort to protect us from another crisis. Along with the creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Merkley-Levin provisions on proprietary trading and conflicts of interest, these reforms form the backbone of the Dodd-Frank Act's safeguards.

By repealing this provision, we would ignore the lessons of the last financial crisis and weaken Dodd-Frank's protections against the next crisis.

American families and businesses deserve better than this. If there are provisions in the Dodd-Frank Act that need to be improved or reformed, the appropriate Senate committees should review, evaluate, and modify them. They should be given time on the Senate floor for further review and improvement. The proponents of this legislation should explain why they think that deregulating swaps—before we ever started re-regulating them—is the right course of action. They should explain why taxpayers should run the

risk of bailing out risky swaps trades gone bad. They should explain why, despite the loss of millions of jobs and trillions of dollars the last time Congress deregulated derivatives, this time will be different. A legislative vehicle is the right place for considering these issues, not an urgent appropriations bill.

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING SENATORS

SAXBY CHAMBLISS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, as the current session of Congress comes to a close it is our custom to take a moment to express our appreciation for the service of our colleagues who are retiring and will not be with us when the next session begins in January. We will miss them all. Over the years their experience and insights on a number of issues have been a very valuable part of our debates and deliberations.

I know I will especially miss SAXBY CHAMBLISS. His work here on the floor and in his committee assignments has played an important role in our consideration of a number of issues over the years. Simply put, he has been a great champion for conservative causes during his service in the House and Senate and he has made a difference for his constituents in many, many ways. He is a man of principle and he has a great gift for expressing his viewpoint in a thoughtful, clear and interesting manner. He is so persuasive, in fact, that even if you disagree with him he makes you take a moment to reconsider your position just to be sure you have not missed something.

Before he began his years of public service to the people of Georgia, SAXBY proved to be the kind of individual who would have been a success at just about anything he decided to pursue. Fortunately, the path he chose to follow in his life brought him to the Nation's capital to represent Georgia—first in the House of Representatives and later in the Senate.

SAXBY served four terms in the House. It was a challenge that he enjoyed because it gave him a chance to sit on the committees that were taking a closer look at our intelligence organizations to be certain they would be ready to face any future threats to our national security. Georgia was proud to see that they had elected someone to Congress who was hard not to notice. He did such a good job, in fact, he was encouraged to run for the Senate.

When he arrived in this chamber, he had already established himself as one of our leading conservative voices. That did not surprise any of us. He has a calm, even way of expressing himself and articulating how his principles play out in whatever issue we have before us.

One great attribute that SAXBY brought with him to his work in the

Congress was his willingness to work with people who did not always agree with him. He knew there would come a time when they would agree with him on something no matter how many times they had disagreed in the past. When the situation presented itself that was what he would focus on.

Simply put, SAXBY believes very strongly in making progress and getting results. He is not all that concerned about who gets credit for it. As the old adage reminds us, for SAXBY, it is all about leaving things a little better at the end of the day today than they were yesterday.

Over the years SAXBY has always found a way to make progress no matter how rough the road seemed to be. It has been one of the guiding principles behind SAXBY's 20 years of service. His commitment to moving forward has enabled him to leave his mark in Georgia and throughout much of the United States.

Now that this chapter of SAXBY's life has come to a close, I am not sure what he has planned for his next great adventure. He just does not strike me as someone who will be content to sit on the sidelines. I am sure we will be hearing from him from time to time with some words of encouragement and support—and a suggestion or two. In fact, I am looking forward to it.

SAXBY, thank you for your service in the House and the Senate. In your 20 years of service in the House and the Senate you have not only been a witness to the history of your home State of Georgia and our Nation, you have helped to write it. Because of you the Nation is stronger, safer and more secure. Yours is a record of leadership of which you should be very proud.

Diana joins in sending our best wishes to you. From one Sigma Chi brother to another, you have made a difference because you have always led the best way—by example. What others are content to talk about you have stepped up to do the work needed to get the job done and because of that you have been able to make a difference—an important and long lasting one.

MIKE JOHANNIS

Mr. President, as the current session of Congress comes to a close it is our tradition to take a moment to express our appreciation for the faithful service of those of our colleagues who will be returning home at the end of the year. We appreciate their hard work and great service on behalf of their home States and our Nation. We will miss them and the thoughtful suggestions and good ideas they have brought to our deliberations on the issues before us.

The word "service" brings to mind one of our retiring colleagues, MIKE JOHANNIS. MIKE has followed a path that has brought him from his service as the Mayor of Lincoln, to his post as the Governor of Nebraska, on to serve

in the President's Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture and then on to the floor of the United States Senate. He has made important contributions at each post and now, as he has decided with the support and guidance of his family, "it is time to close this chapter in his life."

As a former mayor myself I have a great deal of regard for MIKE and his commitment to the people that he has served for many, many years. He has a great understanding of his home State of Nebraska and the workings of its State and local government. He understands the challenges that face his home State in the present, and the hopes and dreams of the people of Nebraska for the future.

It did not take long to discover that MIKE is a workhorse, not a showhorse. He is not someone to land on a weekend talk show every week talking about what needs to be done—he would rather be in committee or on the floor every day doing it. In everything he did MIKE always brought along an abundance of Nebraska common sense. He used that special gift of his and his varied background as a starting point for finding common ground and a workable solution on a number of issues that would be acceptable to all.

During his service in the Senate it has been good to have a neighbor to work with who understands agriculture and our rural way of life. He has been a great help in making the case clear to the Congress about the difference between living on a farm and living in a big city or town.

That is why I will not be the only one who will miss him. Our rural communities in the West will miss his ability to understand the problems of rural America and what should be done to address them.

MIKE has also been one to focus on the money side of each issue that came to the Senate. He knows how important it is for us to get a handle on our Nation's finances to ensure that our children and grandchildren will not have to clean up the financial mess we are going to leave them if we are not careful. MIKE has said that our failure to act will cause our financial problems to appear sooner than we might think.

I am sorry to see MIKE go when there is so much to be done that could use his understanding not only of the issues, but from his experience, the impact they will have on the local, State and national level.

Still we know where to find him whenever we could use some of his Nebraska-rooted common sense. Thanks, MIKE, for your service to the State of Nebraska and to our Nation. You can be proud of what you helped to accomplish and the seeds you planted that will lead to more accomplishments in the years to come.

Thanks for your leadership and thanks for your friendship, too. Diana

joins in sending our best wishes to you and our appreciation for all you have done. Please keep in touch with us. We will always be pleased to hear from you.

CARL LEVIN

Mr. President, once again, as is our tradition here in the Senate, we take a moment to express our appreciation for the service of those Members who will be retiring at the end of the year. We will miss them, their good ideas and thoughtful suggestions, and their concern and active involvement in the challenges facing our Nation in a number of areas.

It is hard to mention the word "service" and not have CARL LEVIN come to mind. As a former local official myself, I have a great deal of respect and regard for all those who have worked their way up from the local level to the Senate.

For CARL the great adventure of his political life began with his service on the Detroit City Council. During his 8 years on the council CARL probably had enough run-ins with the Federal bureaucracy that he decided he had to do something about it. For him that meant a run for the Senate.

CARL's election and his subsequent service in the Senate have shown him to be quite an effective legislator and a force for the positions he has taken on a long list of issues. He has been a Member of the Senate since 1979 and he has hit a number of milestones since then that reflect the length and production of his service.

It is important to emphasize that CARL's service in the Senate has never been about longevity, it is been about results. That is why he has been a part of so many issues that needed someone with his talents, skills and abilities to help move them through. Such an issue has been his great support for our Nation's military and our veterans.

CARL has been working for the benefit of those who have served in our Armed Forces since he first walked in the door of the Senate. Determined that they reap the benefits they have earned with their service, CARL joined the Armed Services Committee to ensure our military and our veterans were getting what they deserved and required both during and after their service.

That is one of the main reasons why he is currently serving as the Chairman of our Armed Services Committee. He wanted to make a difference for those who were sacrificing so much to serve in our Nation's military. I don't think our servicemen and women—and our Nation's veterans—have ever had a better friend than CARL LEVIN.

Now he is closing the chapter of this great adventure of his life. With his service he has made a difference in more ways than I could ever hope to mention in my brief remarks. In the process CARL has touched more lives

for the better than we will ever know with his commitment to the day-to-day issues that affect us all—like education, the environment and health care. He has had an impact on his home State and our Nation that will be felt for a long time to come.

Thank you, CARL, for your service in the Senate. I know I join with the people of Michigan in expressing our appreciation to you for dedicating so much of your life to making our Nation a better place for us all to live. That is why your constituents have always been there to express their appreciation of your work here in the Senate with their votes. That is also why no other Senator has ever represented Michigan as long as you have.

Diana joins in sending our best wishes to you for all you have accomplished and for your close and personal attention to the needs of our Armed Forces and the concerns of our veterans. Thanks, too, for your friendship. We will miss you, but I am certain we will be in touch.

TOM HARKIN

Mr. President, it is hard to believe how quickly this session of Congress has come to an end. Before that final gavel brings it to a close, however, it is good to have this time to express our appreciation for the service of those Members who will be retiring at the end of the year. They all have a lot to be proud of—from their first speech here on the floor to their representation of their State over the years.

Those words can not help but bring to mind TOM HARKIN. I have had a chance to come to know him and work with him as the Chairman of the health committee. I have been very impressed with his dedication to his work and his determination to make a difference for the people who voted to hire him on for the job—and all Americans in all of the States.

I think one of the reasons why we were able to work together has to do with his Wyoming background. TOM spent some of the best years of his life in Rock Springs and I can not help but think that his time there made a big difference in his life.

TOM has quite a remarkable record of service to the people of Iowa and it is clear they feel the same about him. They have sent him back to the Senate to serve as their representative for five terms in the House and five terms in the Senate. During his service in the Senate I appreciated having the opportunity to work with him as the ranking member of the committee. In addition, the leadership he has provided the committee as chairman has enabled him to take an active role on issues that will have an impact on his home State and the rest of the country for many years to come.

If I were to name just a few of the issues on which TOM has made a difference I would begin with his work on

behalf of those living with disabilities that resulted in the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act. TOM's groundbreaking legislation was written to help ensure all Americans would have an opportunity to lead more fulfilling and productive lives. In the days to come, his work on this issue will continue to provide the support that will help those living with disabilities to work toward their goals in life—and achieve them.

I also wanted to point out his work with our education system. TOM understands the importance of a good education and the difference it makes in young lives—today and tomorrow. Thanks to his hard work and determination students of all ages have a new appreciation for the fact that an education consists of more than just a few years in a classroom—it is a lifelong adventure, a journey that never ends because there is always something new to learn, some new skill that will make someone a more valuable member of the workforce.

I am sure he has heard it before but it is pretty clear that TOM HARKIN is Iowa, through and through. He has devoted so many years of his life to the people of his State and they are greatly appreciative of his efforts—and the results he has been able to achieve.

Now, as TOM has made clear, it is time for someone else to step up to the plate and continue the work he has begun on so many issues. There is no question that you will be a difficult act to follow. For all those years TOM's heart and soul has been in Iowa while his mind and his focus has been in the nation's capital, working to make Iowa a better place to live.

Now TOM's remarkable career in the House and the Senate has come to a close and this chapter of his great adventure of serving the people of Iowa here in Congress has concluded. While we did not always agree on the best way to get things done we always agreed that we needed to focus on what we could do to have the greatest impact on the lives of Americans all across the country. Fortunately, I think we succeeded in many ways and TOM will be remembered for those positive results—and so many more.

One last TOM HARKIN memory has to do with his popcorn tradition. I know I am not the only one who hopes it will continue. I do not think a single visitor to your office or that section of the building will ever forget the wonderful aroma your Iowa popcorn sent all around the area. For visitors from back home it must have been a touch that made them feel right at home. It was just more proof that you never lost sight of the people back home and they loved you for that.

Thank you, TOM HARKIN, for all you have brought to the House and the Senate over the years. You have made it clear what the people of Iowa expect

from their government and what you were working so hard to achieve for them. Thank you for your service, thank you for your dedication to making our Nation a better place to live and most of all, thank you for your friendship. You have not only been a witness to the history of your State and our country, you have helped to write each chapter over the years. In the days to come your achievements will continue to inspire the next generation of our leaders who will want to do what you have done. I am sure they can count on you for your insights, suggestions and advice. Diana joins in sending our best wishes to you.

MARK PRYOR

Mr. President, it is one of the Senate's great traditions at the close of each session of Congress to take a moment to note the service of those of our colleagues who be leaving the Senate at the end of the year. It is a time for us to express our appreciation to our fellow Senators for their service and share what we have learned from them as we worked together to make a difference in our states and in our nation.

I have often thought that MARK has one great overriding rule that has guided him in his work in the Senate, "Is this what the people of Arkansas sent me here to do?" More often than not the answer to that question has helped him to develop a strategy to get things done that were designed to make his home State and our nation better places to live.

Ask just about any one of us here in the Senate what has made MARK PRYOR such an effective legislator and you will get the same answer—bipartisanship. In fact, he was so good at it, we might need to come up with a different word to explain his strategy, something like Pryor-itize. For MARK, the best way to get things done was to get everyone involved—all parties, all sides of an issue, and representatives of every point in between—together and then take the best of what everyone had to offer to form a coalition that would bring his legislative effort to a successful conclusion.

That is why both parties would often try to recruit him for their legislative projects. Each party knew he had a great ability to persuade that would help to bring other members together to support their efforts.

I have often said that serving in the Senate is a great adventure. If it were anything else, it would be too much like work and too hard a job to take on. Because it is an adventure it is something more—it is a chance to take on the greatest challenge there is, leaving the world a better place than we found it when we first walked through the doors of the Senate, and find new, creative, and inventive ways to make it happen.

As he closes this chapter of his life, his Senate adventure, MARK can be

very proud of his efforts, and his successes over the years. He has a great deal to be proud of and I hope it brings him the satisfaction that comes from knowing he has taken on a difficult job and done it well.

I know I will miss seeing MARK around campus here in Washington, DC. I will miss his willingness to help on those tough challenging issues we always seen to have before us. I will also miss his words of faith and determination that he would share with us during our prayer breakfasts.

I hope you will keep in touch with us in the days to come with news of your next great adventure in life. Thank you for your service to our country, thank you for your focus on making Arkansas and our nation better places to live, and, most of all, thank you for your friendship. Good luck in all your future endeavors. God bless.

TIM JOHNSON

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to honor my friend and colleague from South Dakota, Senator TIM JOHNSON, who is retiring at end of this year. TIM has an impressively long career in public service, representing his home State of South Dakota in Congress for the last 28 years.

TIM is often described as “a work horse, not a show horse,” and with good reason. His values, passion and work ethic are reflected in the projects he has championed and the constituent services he has provided for the people of South Dakota. Following his AVIM in 2006, Senator JOHNSON came into the national spotlight which he so seldom sought. All were inspired by his perseverance and dedication to the people of South Dakota to return to do the work he loves, and the Senate has been better for it.

As a member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, TIM championed important water projects to bring clean drinking water to rural communities and Indian reservations, pressed for the development of renewable fuels, and supported efforts to build vital infrastructure throughout rural America. Through his position on the Appropriations Committee, he fought to see these efforts through from planning to completion.

Farmers and ranchers throughout his State could count on TIM to be a strong voice for agriculture, advancing their priorities in numerous farm bills. His leadership on country of origin labeling, COOL, laid important groundwork to support our Nation's producers and ensure consumers know where their food comes from—a fight that continues today.

TIM has also been a champion for veterans, working to improve the benefits they are owed and connecting South Dakota veterans with support and services in their communities. He was able to secure advanced appropriations for the Veterans Administration, pro-

viding budget certainty and ensuring access to health care for those who have so bravely served their country.

TIM has a strong relationship with the tribes in South Dakota and is considered a steadfast and valued friend in Indian Country. He has tirelessly pressed for the Federal Government to meet its treaty and trust responsibilities. While significant challenges remain, TIM JOHNSON's legacy as an advocate for Native American issues has improved the quality of life on many reservations. This commitment will be missed both in the Senate and on the Indian Affairs Committee.

Senator JOHNSON brought his passion for rural and Native American issues to the Senate Banking Committee. Under his chairmanship, the work of the committee highlighted the often-overlooked needs in these communities—and he was a champion during our efforts on housing finance reform to make sure they could receive the resources they so desperately need. Strengthening small community banks, improving housing, and reauthorizing critical highway and transit programs are just a few of the initiatives Chairman JOHNSON undertook, and it was a pleasure working under his leadership.

Throughout all of these accomplishments, accolades, and challenges, TIM has remained true to his roots. He has never taken his public service for granted and has always considered it a privilege to serve the people of South Dakota. The impact of his work during his time in Congress will be seen in communities throughout his State for years to come, and he has certainly left his mark on South Dakota politics. I wish him the very best as he and his wife Barbara embark on this new chapter and get to enjoy more time with their family back in South Dakota.

MIKE JOHANNES

Mr. President, I also wish to honor my colleague from Nebraska, Senator MIKE JOHANNES, who is retiring from the Senate at the end of this year. Senator JOHANNES has been a friend since I started in the Senate, and I appreciate his willingness to work with me towards our shared goals. He is one of only two current Senators to have served as a Governor and cabinet Secretary, providing him with a tremendous amount of wisdom on how to get things done. It is his incredible knowledge and strong Midwestern work ethic that I admire most about him.

For more than 30 years, Senator JOHANNES has been a strong voice for the people of Nebraska. His first act in public service was in 1983 as a County Board member in Lancaster County. He later went on to serve as both Councilman and Mayor of Lincoln. He would eventually become Governor of Nebraska and Secretary of Agriculture under President George W. Bush. Senator JOHANNES set no limits to his po-

tential; readily serving in any capacity he could to make our great Nation a better place.

Senator JOHANNES and I serve together on the Agriculture Committee and I greatly admired the thoughtfulness and expertise he brought to the negotiations on the Farm Bill. His knowledge as a former Agriculture Secretary was unmatched and ensured many improvements were made throughout the debate. Senator JOHANNES never forgot about our farmers and always kept his eye on providing them with the best possible outcome he could.

We also had the privilege of working together on the Banking and Housing Committee. He and I worked together with a bipartisan group of committee members to draft and advance legislation reforming the housing finance system to protect the American taxpayer from another bailout and to guarantee that another housing crisis does not happen again. Once again, his voice on behalf of rural America during these talks was critical and something that I greatly appreciated.

Senator JOHANNES has never been about taking credit or seeking the spotlight. He maintained a strong, hard work ethic throughout his time in the Senate and was one who was willing to cross the aisle to get things done. The American people expect that of their representatives, and Senator JOHANNES met those expectations on behalf of Nebraska.

I will miss having him as my colleague in the Senate, but I also know that his wife and family will enjoy the free time they will have with him. I wish him happiness and success in the next chapter of his life.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL GAMEL-McCORMICK

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as I approach the end of my Senate career, I cannot help but reflect on the role that my tremendous staff members have played in advancing my policy goals and, indeed, advancing the important work the American people over the years. I have been blessed to have worked with truly remarkable individuals who have worked tirelessly to promote initiatives that will improve the lives of ordinary Americans.

Among my own legislative and policy priorities over the years, none has been greater for me than advancing the rights of persons with disabilities. I am proud and honored to have been the chief Senate sponsor of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the last of the great civil rights laws of the 20th century—one that has correctly been called the Emancipation Proclamation for persons with disabilities. That legislation sought, once and for all, to fully enfranchise people with disabilities and to fully integrate them into the fabric of American life, guided by

four great principles—equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic sufficiency. Over the last quarter century, that legislation has resulted in a quantum leap forward in the civil rights and daily quality of life of millions of Americans with disabilities.

However, even with that quantum leap forward, much work remains to be done to advance the rights of people with disabilities both in the United States and around the world. And over the last several years, no one has worked harder to advance this unfinished agenda of disabilities rights than Michael Gamel-McCormick, who served on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee as my lead K-12 staffer through the markup of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and subsequently as a team leader on disability policy.

Throughout his career, Michael has worked to improve the lives of children and other people with disabilities. He came to the HELP Committee from the University of Delaware, where he was dean of the College of Education and Human Development and where he had previously served as a departmental chair and director of the Center for Disability Studies. Prior to that, Michael served, variously, as director of an early intervention program in West Virginia, director of children's services at an urban community services agency, and as a preschool and kindergarten teacher. Michael also consulted worldwide in helping other countries to establish their own systems to support persons with disabilities and to expand early learning opportunities.

Michael's deep experience and knowledge was evident as soon as he arrived at the HELP Committee. Immediately, Michael became an integral and trusted member of my staff. His initial work on the committee was as an education policy advisor, lead staffer on K-12 education, and an expert on the intersection of education and inequality. His expertise and leadership were critical in crafting and passing in committee the Strengthening America's Schools Act. As an education policy adviser, Michael was also deeply involved in shaping policies to strengthen the education of children with disabilities.

After serving as a senior education advisor, Michael assumed the role of my chief disability policy advisor, spearheading a number of important initiatives, including two important committee reports on persons with disabilities. The first report, on the continued use of seclusions and restraints in our schools, exposed the inappropriate and often dangerous use of physical restraints on and unsupervised exclusion of many children, especially children with disabilities, in U.S. schools. That report was accompanied by important legislation to finally prohibit these outdated and ineffective

measures. The second report, "Fulfilling the Promise: Overcoming Persistent Barriers to Economic Self-Sufficiency for People with Disabilities," investigated the barriers that people with disabilities face as they seek to rise out of poverty and enter the middle class. This report found that living with a disability is both economically and socially costly, and that significant barriers—especially logistical barriers and discrimination—continue to stand in the way of the economic security of people with disabilities. Specifically, the report said this:

Twenty-four years ago, Congress passed the Americans with Disabilities Act. We have been successful at meeting many of the goals of the ADA. We have increased the accessibility of our buildings, our streets, even our parks, beaches and recreation areas. And we've made our books and TVs, telephones and computers more accessible as well. And for many Americans with disabilities, our workplaces have become more accessible as well.

But far too few people with disabilities are in the workforce! The unemployment rate for people with disabilities is 12.8 percent, more than double the six percent unemployment rate for people without disabilities. Of the almost 29 million people with disabilities over 16 years of age, less than 20 percent participate in the workforce compared with nearly 70 percent of those without a disability.

Not content to identify a problem, Michael also seeks to solve them. His most enduring legacy as my disability policy director will be his work to promote the employment of persons with disabilities through the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, which was signed into law earlier this year. That law will ensure that young people with disabilities get the experiences they need to succeed in work settings. To obtain those experiences, the bill requires State vocational rehabilitation programs to work hand-in-hand with local secondary schools. The bill also ensures that employers will have the information necessary to recruit, hire, and retain people with disabilities.

These efforts will directly address the high unemployment rate among people with disabilities, smooth the transition of young people with disabilities into the competitive integrated workforce, and help employers to support their employees with disabilities. I am especially proud of these provisions. And I am very grateful to Michael, who successfully endeavored to enact them in the face of long odds.

I had the good fortune to travel with Michael to China earlier this year, where we sought to identify opportunities for international cooperation on disability policy and to work with the Chinese Government to strengthen its own policies and programs to assist and empower the millions persons with disabilities in that country. On the trip, not only was Michael incredibly helpful and knowledgeable, but he also

proved to be a good humored and indefatigable travel partner.

Last and certainly not least, I want to salute Michael's heroic efforts over the past year to advance the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The CRPD, as it is known in shorthand, is a United Nation's treaty modeled after our own Americans with Disabilities Act, with a goal of exporting the same advances enjoyed by persons with disabilities in the United States to countries around the world. The United States has always been a city on a hill when it comes to disability policy, and the CRPD offers an opportunity for us to play a more robust leadership role in advancing disability rights across the globe. Unfortunately, despite broad support for the CRPD among business leaders, faith leaders, and in the disability policy community, the CRPD ran up against significant and, I might add, spurious opposition here in the Senate. In fact, after failing to be ratified in the 112th Congress, the treaty was all but declared dead.

However, at my urging and direction, Michael worked tirelessly to revive the moribund treaty, reaching out to Republicans, enlisting the assistance of business interests and activating grassroots networks around the country in support of the treaty. At the end of the day, the Senate was still not able to overcome the misinformed objections of a number of Senators who blocked consideration of the treaty. But Michael's efforts to resurrect and advance the treaty in the face of daunting odds were remarkable. Thanks to Michael's work, we came closer than ever before to passing the CRPD. I certainly haven't given up the fight to pass the CRPD, and I am grateful to Michael for all that he did to advance the cause of global disability rights.

It is no exaggeration to say that Michael has enriched the lives of countless individuals. Because of his work, young children have been exposed to the rich environments that they need for early learning. Because of his work, young people with disabilities will receive the supports and experiences they need to secure gainful employment. Because of his work, school-aged children will receive developmentally appropriate discipline and direction rather than the cruelty of seclusion and physical restraints. And because of his work, countless individuals with disabilities will work, live, laugh, and flourish in their communities alongside friends, colleagues, and neighbors.

This is a living legacy that Michael Gamel-McCormick deserves to be very proud of. I am deeply grateful for his service to the committee, to the American people, and to me personally. And I wish him great success in his future endeavors on behalf of people with disabilities here in America and across the globe.

TRIBUTE TO BETH STEIN

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, in 1997, Beth Stein, a talented young woman armed with a razor-sharp mind and relentless attention to detail, arrived on Capitol Hill as counsel to a true American hero, U.S. Senator John Glenn. As his investigative counsel, Beth played a key role in the inquiry into campaign finance abuses in the 1996 election. And she helped to lead investigations into other critical issues, including food safety, Medicare fraud, waste, and abuse, and the relationship between thyroid cancer rates and exposure to nuclear fallout from Nevada testing in the 1940s. After working for Senator Glenn, Beth went on to serve as election counsel to Representative STENY HOYER and as Judiciary Committee counsel to U.S. Senator MARIA CANTWELL.

The work of a U.S. Senator is only as good as the staff that he or she hires, and in 2004 I was fortunate to convince Beth to join my staff, where she has served ever since. Throughout that time, she has served in a number of different capacities, distinguishing herself in each and every one of them. I owe a debt of gratitude to so many of my staff members across my career, but I would be remiss if I did not single out Beth for her especially meritorious contributions to my office over the past decade.

Beth began her work in my office as counsel, providing excellent advice on myriad constitutional and civil rights issues, among other things. One of her most noteworthy accomplishments from this time related to the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, located not far from Burlington, IA. The history of the covert nuclear weapons program at the IAAP is a fascinating one that I could recount for hours. Suffice it to say that for decades the men and women of the Iowa Ammunition Plant worked on a secret nuclear weapons program, handling highly radioactive materials with protective gear of only cotton gloves—gloves that were intended to protect the weapons material from contact with humans, not to protect humans from contact with dangerous radioactive materials.

After my office helped to uncover the long history of dangerous working conditions at the IAAP, we still had to address the needs of hundreds of men and women who were exposed to radioactive materials and to try and help them receive compensation and health care to deal with the high rates of cancer and respiratory disease associated with their work. For years we struggled with various Federal agencies. We tried to seek a legislative fix. We sought an administrative remedy. It was finally under Beth's leadership that the men and women of the IAAP were designated a special exposure cohort, which made them eligible for compensation and medical care to ac-

count for medical expenses and lost wages. It is not an exaggeration to say that, but for Beth's efforts, the former workers of the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant might still be waiting on the Federal Government to appropriately compensate them for their service to our nation.

So much did I value Beth's work that when she decided that she wanted to take a step back and spend more time with her kids, I convinced her not to leave the payroll entirely but to stay on to work on special projects. In that capacity, Beth played a critical role in one of my proudest achievements, the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act of 2008. This law was written in response to several Supreme Court decisions narrowing the definition of disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act. These narrow interpretations led to the denial of the ADA's protections for many individuals that Congress intended to protect under the ADA. The ADAAA made a number of changes to restore the intent of the ADA and to ensure that its protections were broadly available to persons with disabilities. Though the ADAAA passed the Senate by unanimous consent, a fact that is a credit to the Senate, one should not take from this the idea that it was easy. It required long negotiations and difficult choices involving Congress, the administration, disability rights organizations, and business interests. Beth played a critical role in these negotiations, deftly managing both the politics and the policy. The result of her steady guiding hand is abundantly clear today: the ADA, as amended by the ADAAA, continues its impact as one of the landmark civil rights laws of the 20th century, the Emancipation Proclamation for Persons with Disabilities.

When I became chair of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, one of my first acts was to establish an investigative unit to provide critical oversight and investigations work. There was no question in my mind that Beth, with her relentlessness, eye for detail, and penchant for sifting through detritus to reveal the truth, was the person for the job. As my chief investigative counsel, she has delivered time and again, for example, uncovering labor abuses by government contractors that led to a White House Executive order clamping down on such abuses. Beth also played a key role in producing HELP Committee reports on the abusive use of seclusions and restraints in our Nation's schools, on barriers that stand in the way of the economic security of persons with disabilities, and on the rapid growth of e-cigarettes and their marketing.

Most noteworthy was Beth's leadership of the HELP Committee's investigation of abuses in the for-profit sec-

tor of higher education. This investigation spanned several years and culminated in the release of a multi-volume report detailing in remarkable detail the abuses by some for-profit colleges—in particular, their misuse of taxpayer funds, their poor educational outcomes, and the need for greater Federal oversight of these schools. This investigation was monumental both in its scale and in its level of detail. Beth oversaw every aspect of this very delicate investigation, which resulted in much greater scrutiny of the for-profit industry and which also put the investigations arm of the HELP Committee on the map.

About a year ago, I asked Beth to return to my personal office to serve as legislative director. In that capacity, she has done yeoman's work managing the legislative staff, helping in the unenviable job of closing our Senate office, and continuing to provide the excellent counsel that had made her indispensable for the past decade. And she has done all of this while continuing in her role as chief investigations counsel for the HELP Committee.

Mr. President, when I was growing up, my parents didn't talk politics. We didn't know politicians. But we knew this: When my family hit rock bottom in the late years of the Depression, with my father out of work and with no way to provide for his family, the government gave us a hand up. Dad got a postcard in the mail notifying him to report for employment with the Work Projects Administration, the WPA. Dad always said that Franklin Roosevelt gave him a job. That opportunity gave my father dignity and enough money to put food on the table, and, maybe most important of all, it gave him hope.

As a proud Midwestern progressive, I have fought to give opportunity and hope to those who truly need it and deserve it, including working families seeking affordable health care and childcare, family farmers struggling to stay on the land, young people paying for college, and seniors seeking financial security in their retirement years.

But I haven't done it alone. Every Senator stands on the foundation of his or her staff, and on my staff Beth Stein has been a rock-solid cornerstone in that foundation. For her counsel, intelligence, and excellent work, and for helping me to be the best servant I can be to the people of Iowa and the United States, for working alongside me to do our best to give people hope, I extend my deepest gratitude to my counselor and friend Beth Stein.

TRIBUTE TO MILDRED OTERO

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President. As a boy growing up in rural Cumming, IA, population 150, I could never have imagined that I would one day serve in Congress. My father had a sixth-grade education. He spent most of his life working in coal mines, and all he had to show for it was a case of black lung disease. My mother was an immigrant, raising six kids in our little two-bedroom house. My parents did not talk politics. We did not know politicians. But we knew this: When my family hit rock bottom in the late years of the Depression, with my father out of work and with no way to provide for his family, the government gave us a hand up. Dad got a postcard in the mail, notifying him to report for employment with the Work Projects Administration, the WPA. Dad always said that Franklin Roosevelt gave him a job. That opportunity gave my father dignity, and enough money to put food on the table. Maybe most important of all, it gave him hope.

As a proud Midwestern progressive, my career has been guided by a desire to give hope to those who truly need it and deserve it, to provide a ladder of opportunity to working families seeking affordable health care and child care, family farmers struggling to stay on the land, and seniors seeking financial security in their retirement years. There is no rung on the ladder of opportunity more important than education, from rich early learning experiences, to college, and beyond.

As I have endeavored to give people hope and to provide them with a ladder of opportunity, I have not done it alone. I have been blessed to have one of the most capable staffs on Capitol Hill. I rise today to extend a personal thanks to one of the best, my chief education counsel, Mildred Otero, who has stood stalwartly alongside me in my efforts to secure for every American a quality education from cradle to career.

Mildred came to Washington in 2003 as a Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute Public Policy Fellow, working for then-Senator Hillary Clinton. Over the years, she has also worked at the Children's Defense Fund, for Senator JACK REED, and at the Department of State. Before joining the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, Mildred served as Senior Policy Officer at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, helping to lead its Federal advocacy efforts for U.S. programs.

When she arrived at the HELP Committee, she brought with her sterling credentials, unmatched knowledge of education policy, and a reputation as a tough but fair negotiator. Most importantly, she brought with her a commitment to children and a determination to confront the savage inequalities in America's public education system, and these priorities have been the founda-

tion of all the work that she does. For Mildred, "leave no child behind" is not a slogan, it is an imperative, an obligation that motivates her every day to strive to do what is best for the children of our country, especially those who are born into disadvantage.

Mildred's commitment to our children and her determination to extend a hand up to the disadvantaged have borne fruit in significant accomplishments since she joined the HELP Committee.

Foremost among these accomplishments was passage last summer of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, a bill to update and strengthen our Nation's job training programs. Frankly, to call enactment of this bill an accomplishment is a huge understatement. This is a bill that had been stalled for years due to one disagreement after another, each seemingly as intractable as the next. But for Mildred, what others see as an intractable disagreement is just another challenge to work through with creativity and diplomacy. Work through them she did, one after another, until all that was left was final passage of the bill. It is testament to Mildred's determination, creativity, and skill that the final bill passed by a vote of 95-3. As a result of her work on this bill, millions of Americans will be able to upgrade their skills, obtain better jobs, and ultimately, better their lives and the economic security of their families.

Mildred and her team also successfully guided into the law improvements to the Child Care and Development Block Grant, which allocates more than \$5 billion annually and supports more than 1.5 million children across the country. The last reauthorization of this program took place 18 years ago, at a time when child care was principally seen as a work-support activity and only incidentally as something that could have a positive impact on the development of children. Today, backed up by impressive scientific research, we know that this program can and should be much more. In addition to providing vital work support for parents, it should be a rich early-learning opportunity for children. These are exactly the kinds of improvements that Mildred shepherded into law. Among other things, the bill requires States to improve education and training requirements, strengthens licensing requirements, and stipulates that States must demonstrate how they are meeting the needs of the most vulnerable children, especially children with disabilities.

I would be remiss if I did not also mention Mildred's effort in the K-12 and higher education spaces. Last summer, the HELP Committee, under Mildred's guidance, passed the Strengthening America's Schools Act of 2013. This bill, an update to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act,

provided a framework to ensure that all children graduate from high school with the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college and their careers. With Mildred's guidance, the Strengthening America's Schools Act focused greater attention on early childhood, encouraged equity through fair distribution of resources, and maintained a laser focus on helping all children, but especially disadvantaged children, to succeed in school.

Mildred brought similar energy to her efforts this year on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, efforts that culminated with the introduction of the Higher Education Affordability Act. For generations, a college education has been the pathway to the middle class, but new challenges are threatening that promise for many families in Iowa and across the country. College affordability, skyrocketing student debt, transparency—these are high stakes issues for students and families. The Higher Education Affordability Act seeks changes to our system of higher education in order to make college more affordable and accessible, and to restore and strengthen the ladder of opportunity—a ladder that has been growing weaker and that is in need of repair.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said that "life's most urgent and persistent question is: what are you doing for others?" During her tenure as a senior counselor on the HELP Committee, Mildred has answered that question in powerful ways, and in particular through her tireless efforts to bring greater equity to public education at all levels. We respect her expertise, and we admire the strong moral voice that she has brought to the Committee. I am deeply grateful to Mildred for her superb leadership of the Committee's Education Office, and I wish her the very best in her future endeavors.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DON HOUSE

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to honor Don House, who will retire as the Walnut Ridge Mayor after 4 years of public service to the citizens of the community.

Mayor House constantly stressed the spirit of cooperation within and between each city department, and the importance of good work ethic among its employees. That is why when he began his service as mayor he met with all of the community's employees.

Don led a reorganization of the police department in an effort to serve the needs of the community more responsibly, including a crackdown on drug dealers and drug manufacturers within the city. Don also oversaw the completion of the Northeast Arkansas Water Authority project, improving the water quality in Walnut Ridge.

In addition to serving as mayor, Don lived in Lawrence County most of his life, owned House-Gregg Funeral Home—a local funeral home and family business, and held office in the Arkansas State House of Representatives.

I applaud Don for his outstanding achievements and success as city mayor. My staff and I have enjoyed working with Mayor House on the projects important to Walnut Ridge. I am truly appreciative of his dedication, leadership, and eagerness to serve Arkansas.●

RECOGNIZING THE IDAHO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation's 75th year as an organization.

The Idaho Farm Bureau, which was started in 1939 in Murtaugh as an organization of farm and ranch families, has represented the interests of Idaho producers in addressing agriculture and natural resources issues. The organization is focused on "formulating action to achieve educational improvement, economic opportunity, and social advancement and thereby, to promote the national well-being."

Idaho is home to more than 25,000 farms and ranches. Farm families support our communities and are central to our economy and our State's culture. The pressures on these hard-working producers meeting the food needs of a growing world population are increasing as the pressures on our natural resources increase. Consideration of how policy changes affect this bedrock is critical to long-term economic growth and the success of our State and Nation.

From providing input on the farm bill, to transportation legislation and Federal regulation affecting the farm and ranch community, including Endangered Species Act concerns, the Idaho Farm Bureau has helped ensure that Idaho producers' voice is heard in a broad array of local and Federal policy discussions. I have greatly valued the input of farm bureau leadership, staff and members. I look forward to continuing to work with this seasoned Idaho organization in shaping agriculture and natural resources policy to ensure that it best meets the needs of Idaho producers.

Congratulation to the Idaho Farm Bureau and its membership on this significant milestone. I wish you continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN CHARLES STEELE

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I wish to honor Benjamin Charles Steele, a veteran of World War II.

On behalf of all Montanans and all Americans, I stand to say "thank you" to Ben for his service to our Nation.

It is my honor to share the story of Ben's service in World War II, because no story of bravery—especially not one from our "greatest generation"—should ever be forgotten.

Ben was born on November 11, 1917, in Roundup, MT. The son of ranchers, Ben loved the outdoors. Sometimes he would sneak out of school by pretending to go to the bathroom, but instead would jump on his horse and head for the ranch.

Ben was 22 when he enlisted in the Army Air Corps in Missoula, MT on September 9, 1940.

In September of 1941, Ben was assigned to serve in the Philippines.

Ben had barely arrived in country when the Army gave him a rifle and told Ben "now you're in the infantry."

The Japanese attacked on December 8. A few weeks later, Ben's unit was evacuated from Clark Field and ordered to the Bataan Peninsula. In January 1942, Ben was sent to the front lines.

Three months later, the front lines collapsed. Soon after, Ben's unit was captured and he and his fellow soldiers began the infamous Bataan Death March.

Ben marched for 6 days and was fed only two cups of rice. The American captives were tormented by the Japanese soldiers. They were forced to walk closely together, and if a prisoner stumbled, or worse, fell, they were bayoneted or shot and killed.

Ben was a prisoner for three and one-half years. During this time, at great risk to himself, he secretly made drawings of the torture and cruelty he and his fellow prisoners endured. On one construction project, 324 prisoners started work beside Ben. By the end, Ben was one of only 50 surviving prisoners.

Ben then was sent to Japan where he did hard labor in the Japanese mines. He was liberated once the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, with Ground Zero less than 80 miles from Ben's coal mine. When he was freed, Ben had dysentery, pneumonia, malaria, blood poisoning and beriberi.

Ben was discharged from the U.S. Air Force on July 10, 1946. After beginning his art career drawing on the concrete floor of a prison in the Philippines, Ben pursued a formal art education. In 1955, he received a master's in art from the University of Denver.

Ben then taught art at Montana State University-Billings. To this day, he continues to recreate the images of his imprisonment through drawings and paintings.

Ben was never "officially" assigned to the infantry; the military just handed him a weapon and told him to go fight—and he did. He fought for months before he was captured.

Ben is now 97 years old, living in a nursing home in Billings, MT, fighting his last battle—and still painting. Ben

never requested any medals or recognition for his brave and incredible service. A true World War II veteran, Ben feels he simply did the job he was sent to the Philippines to do.

But today, it is my honor to honor Ben Steele's true heroism, sacrifice, and dedication to service by including his story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you, Ben.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:56 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2759. An act to release the City of St. Clair, Missouri, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the St. Clair Regional Airport.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1378. An act to designate the United States Federal Judicial Center located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the "John Rhoades Federal Judicial Center" and to designate the United States courthouse located at 333 West Broadway in San Diego, California, as the "James M. Carter and Judith N. Keep United States Courthouse".

H.R. 5059. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5086. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5185. An act to reauthorize the Young Women's Breast Health Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009.

H.R. 5701. An act to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of federally recognized tribes in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5705. An act to modify certain provisions relating to the Propane Education and Research Council.

H.R. 5764. An act to authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5781. An act to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following measure was discharged from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5471. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange

Act of 1934 to specify how clearing requirements apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5086. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Chief Standing Bear National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 5781. An act to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2992. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 10, 2014, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 229. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 3900 Woodland Avenue in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as the "Corporal Michael J. Crescenzo Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".

S. 1434. An act to designate the Junction City Community-Based Outpatient Clinic located at 715 Southwind Drive, Junction City, Kansas, as the Lieutenant General Richard J. Seitz Community-Based Outpatient Clinic.

S. 2673. An act to enhance the strategic partnership between the United States and Israel.

S. 2917. An act to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases.

S. 2921. An act to designate the community based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 310 Home Boulevard in Galesburg, Illinois, as the "Lane A. Evans VA Community Based Outpatient Clinic".

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 182. A bill to provide for the unencumbering of title to non-Federal land owned by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, for purposes of economic development by conveyance of the Federal reversion interest to the City (Rept. No. 113-289).

S. 398. A bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-290).

S. 776. A bill to establish the Columbine-Hondo Wilderness in the State of New Mexico, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-291).

S. 841. A bill to designate certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado as wilderness, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-292).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1328. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the archeological site and surrounding land of the New Philadelphia town site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-293).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1419. A bill to promote research, development, and demonstration of marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-294).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1750. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-295).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1971. A bill to establish an interagency coordination committee or subcommittee with the leadership of the Department of Energy and the Department of the Interior, focused on the nexus between energy and water production, use, and efficiency, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-296).

S. 2031. A bill to amend the Act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-297).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 2104. A bill to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown (Rept. No. 113-298).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2379. A bill to approve and implement the Klamath Basin agreements, to improve natural resource management, support economic development, and sustain agricultural production in the Klamath River Basin in the public interest and the interest of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-299).

S. 2602. A bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington (Rept. No. 113-300).

S. 2873. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acknowledge contributions at units of the National Park System (Rept. No. 113-301).

By Ms. LANDRIEU, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 885. An act to expand the boundary of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-302).

H.R. 1241. An act to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Inyo National Forest, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113-303).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Report to accompany S. 2094, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel (Rept. No. 113-304).

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1317. A bill to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2014 through 2016 and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 2993. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the determination of cohort default rates and provide for enhanced civil penalties, and to authorize the establishment of an institutional risk-sharing commission; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2994. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to facilitate the administration and enforcement of antidumping and countervailing duty orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2995. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out a pilot program to work with municipalities that are seeking to develop and implement integrated plans to meet wastewater and stormwater obligations under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2996. A bill to create a limited population pathway for approval of certain antibacterial drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2997. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

S. Res. 596. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the need for reconciliation in Indonesia and disclosure by the United States Government of events surrounding the mass killings during 1965–66; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 597. A resolution commemorating and supporting the goals of World AIDS day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. COATS):

S. Res. 598. A resolution expressing condolences to the family of Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig and condemning the terrorist acts of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 287

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 287, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve assistance to homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 610

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits.

S. 877

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to allow public access to research of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1256

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1256, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.

S. 1695

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1695, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 2047

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2047, a bill to prohibit the marketing of electronic cigarettes to children, and for other purposes.

S. 2084

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2084, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require the Secretary of the Interior to publish and make available for public comment a draft economic analysis at the time a proposed rule to designate critical habitat is published.

S. 2581

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2581, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 2807

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2807, a bill to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2930

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 2930, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of an evaluation of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3980

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3980 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5771, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 596—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NEED FOR RECONCILIATION IN INDONESIA AND DISCLOSURE BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OF EVENTS SURROUNDING THE MASS KILLINGS DURING 1965–66

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 596

Whereas, on October 1, 1965, six Indonesian Army generals were killed by military personnel, including members of Indonesia's Presidential Guard, and these killings were blamed on the Indonesian Communist Party and labeled an "attempted Communist coup d'état";

Whereas this alleged coup was used to justify the mass killing of alleged supporters of the Indonesian Communist Party, with estimates of the number of dead ranging from 500,000 to 1,000,000 killed;

Whereas the targeted individuals were predominantly unarmed civilians, and often included members of trade unions, intellectuals, teachers, ethnic Chinese, and those involved in the women's movement;

Whereas these killings and the imprisonment of up to 1,000,000 targeted individuals were done without due process of law;

Whereas the targeted individuals were subject to extrajudicial execution, torture, rape, forced disappearance, forced labor, and forced eviction;

Whereas the United States Central Intelligence Agency in a 1968 research study described the period as one of the worst mass murders of the twentieth century;

Whereas the United States Government provided the Indonesian Army with financial, military, and intelligence support during the period of the mass killings, and did so aware that such killings were taking place as recorded in partially declassified documents in the Department of State history, "Foreign Relations of the United States", pertaining to this period;

Whereas, within months of military leader Suharto's assumption of the presidency following the mass killing, the United States Government began sending economic and military support to Suharto's military regime, and played an indispensable role in its consolidation of power;

Whereas aid to the Suharto government continued for more than three decades, despite on-going crimes against humanity committed by the Suharto government, including mass killing and other gross violations of human rights during the invasion and subsequent 24-year occupation of East Timor;

Whereas perpetrators of the 1965–66 mass killings have largely lived with impunity, and the survivors and descendants of the victims suffer continuing discrimination economically and for decades had limited civil and political rights, as noted in the 2012 Indonesia National Commission on Human Rights report;

Whereas the United States Government has not yet fully declassified all relevant documents concerning this time period, and full disclosure could help bring historical clarity to atrocities committed in Indonesia between 1965 and 1966;

Whereas the United States Government has in recent years supported the declassification and release of documents in support of truth and reconciliation efforts following periods of violence in countries such as Chile and Brazil;

Whereas open dialogue about alleged past crimes against humanity and past human rights violations is important for continued efforts to reconcile populations of Indonesia and to ensure a stable, sustainable peace that will benefit the region and beyond;

Whereas, Indonesia has undergone a remarkable democratic transition over the last two decades, and is the world's third largest democracy with the largest Muslim population in the world;

Whereas through free and fair elections, the people of Indonesia have elected new leaders who now have the opportunity to establish a culture of accountability in partnership with the country's vibrant civil society, press, academia, and human rights activists;

Whereas the relationship between the United States and Indonesia is strong and involves many shared interests, as reflected in the 2010 United States-Indonesia Comprehensive Partnership, including democracy and civil society, education, security, climate and environment, energy, and trade and investment;

Whereas the economic relationship between the United States and Indonesia is strong, with bilateral goods trade exceeding \$27,000,000,000 and with major United States companies making significant long-term investments in Indonesia; and

Whereas strong relations between the United States and Indonesia are mutually beneficial to both countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the mass murder in Indonesia in 1965–66;

(2) expresses great concern about the lack of accountability enjoyed by those who carried out crimes during this period;

(3) urges political leaders in Indonesia to consider a truth, justice, and reconciliation commission to address alleged crimes against humanity and other human rights violations, and to work to mend differences and animosity that remain after the 1965–66 mass killings; and

(4) calls on the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and others involved in developing and implementing policy towards Indonesia during this time period to establish an interagency working group to—

(A) locate, identify, inventory, recommend for declassification, and make available to the public all classified records and documents concerning the mass killings of 1965 and 1966, including records and documents pertaining to covert operations in Indonesia from January 1, 1964 through March 30, 1966;

(B) coordinate with Federal agencies and take such actions as necessary to expedite the release of such records to the public; and

(C) submit a report to Congress describing all such records, the disposition of such records, and the activities of the Interagency Group.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, our Nation and Indonesia enjoy a strong relationship, reflected in the U.S.-Indonesia Comprehensive Partnership of 2010. This partnership is robust and growing. It serves both of our countries for bilateral, regional, and global cooperation. The election of

President Widodo in July was a step forward—part of a great democratic tradition—over the past two decades in Indonesia. We are working together for economic growth, for the environment, and for our security.

This is progress—and to be encouraged. Indonesia has a major role to play as a regional and global leader, but in that role it must be an inclusive democracy. Key to this is to address past human rights abuses—specifically the mass murders committed in 1965 to 1966. Next year is the 50th anniversary of those killings.

I rise today, International Human Rights Day, to submit a resolution concerning those events, which Indonesia's own Human Rights Commission has labeled a crime against humanity. But let me be clear. This is not a censure of the people of Indonesia or Indonesia's new government; it is an opportunity for justice and for reconciliation.

The events took place decades ago. The reasons behind them are complex, but that cannot justify the past or forgetting those who suffered under it, nor can we ignore our own government's role during that time.

My resolution proposes two things:

First, I urge Indonesia's new government to create a truth and reconciliation commission to address these crimes. Second, I urge our own government to establish an interagency working group and to release relevant classified documents. We should make clear what was known to us, and we should make this information available.

It is a painful history to recall. On October 1, 1965, six Indonesian Army generals were killed. According to scholars, these generals were killed by military personnel, but their deaths were blamed on Indonesia's Communist Party, which was used to justify mass murders.

The next few months were horrific for the Indonesian people. The CIA has called it one of the worst periods of mass murder in the 20th century. Hundreds of thousands were killed. Many others were imprisoned, tortured, raped, starved, and disappeared across the country. These individuals were targeted for their alleged association with communism, but they came from all walks of life, including women's groups, teachers, intellectuals, and others. Most were unarmed, and none had due process of law.

The United States provided financial and military assistance during this time and later, according to documents released by the State Department, and General Suharto consolidated his power, ruling from 1967 to 1998.

Some may ask, why is this resolution needed? Why now? This is why. The survivors and descendants of victims continue to be marginalized. Many of the killers continue to live with impu-

nity. Very few Americans are aware of these historical events or our government's actions during this time. These events demand our attention and resolution as we work together to build a strong Asia-Pacific partnership.

I am proud to serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. An important goal is the development of peaceful, stable democracies—democracies that provide security and hope to their own people and economic opportunity for businesses in my State and across the United States.

Indonesia is the world's third-largest democracy. Its population is diverse. It has the largest Muslim majority population in the world. It has faced many challenges and continues to move forward. A strong U.S.-Indonesia relationship benefits both of our countries. I offer this resolution in support of that relationship and Indonesia's continued progress as a growing democracy and a vital U.S. ally.

SENATE RESOLUTION 597—COMMEMORATING AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF WORLD AIDS DAY

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 597

Whereas an estimated 35,000,000 people were living with HIV/AIDS as of the end of 2013;

Whereas the United Nations Millennium Development Goals established a global target of halting and beginning to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS by 2015;

Whereas the 2001 United Nations Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS mobilized global attention and commitment to the HIV/AIDS epidemic and set out a series of national targets and global actions to reverse the epidemic;

Whereas the 2011 United Nations Political Declaration on HIV and AIDS provided an updated framework for intensified efforts to eliminate HIV and AIDS, including redoubling efforts to achieve by 2015 universal access to HIV prevention, treatment, care, and support, and to eliminate gender inequalities and gender-based abuse and violence and increase the capacity of women and adolescent girls to protect themselves from the risk of HIV infection;

Whereas the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria was launched in 2002 and, as of November 2013, supported programs in more than 140 countries that provided antiretroviral therapy to 6,600,000 people living with HIV/AIDS and antiretrovirals to 2,100,000 pregnant women to prevent transmission of HIV/AIDS to their babies;

Whereas the United States is the largest donor to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria;

Whereas, for every dollar contributed to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria by the United States, an additional \$2 is leveraged from other donors;

Whereas the United States President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) initiative was proposed by President George W. Bush and passed Congress on a bipartisan vote in 2003, and remains the largest commitment in history by any nation to combat a single disease;

Whereas, as of the end of September 2014, PEPFAR supported treatment for 7,700,000 people, up from 1,700,000 in 2008, and in 2012, PEPFAR supported the provision of antiretroviral drugs to 750,000 pregnant women living with HIV to prevent the transmission of HIV from mother to child during birth;

Whereas PEPFAR directly supported HIV testing and counseling for more than 56,700,000 people in fiscal year 2014;

Whereas considerable progress has been made in the fight against HIV/AIDS, with the number of new HIV infections estimated at 2,100,000 in 2013, a 38 percent reduction since 2001, new HIV infections among children reduced to 240,000 in 2013, a reduction of 58 percent since 2001, and AIDS-related deaths reduced to 1,500,000 in 2013, a 35 percent reduction since 2005;

Whereas increased access to antiretroviral drugs is the major contributor to the reduction in deaths from HIV/AIDS, and HIV treatment reinforces prevention because it reduces, by up to 96 percent, the chance the virus can be spread;

Whereas the World Health Organization (WHO) has revised its guidelines for determining whether HIV positive individuals are eligible for treatment, thereby increasing the number of individuals eligible for treatment from about 15,900,000 to 28,600,000;

Whereas 13,600,000 people in low- and middle-income countries had access to antiretroviral therapy as of June 2014;

Whereas 19,000,000 of the 35,000,000 people living with HIV globally do not know their status, according to a 2014 UNAIDS report;

Whereas, although sub-Saharan Africa remains the epicenter of the epidemic with approximately 1,100,000 AIDS-related deaths in 2013, there have also been successes, with an approximate 33 percent decline in new HIV infections from 2005 to 2013 and a 39 percent decrease in the number of AIDS-related deaths in sub-Saharan Africa between 2005 and 2013;

Whereas stigma, gender inequality, and lack of respect for the rights of HIV positive individuals remain significant barriers to access to services for those most at risk of HIV infection;

Whereas President Barack Obama voiced commitment to realizing the promise of an AIDS-free generation and his belief that the goal was within reach in his February 2013 State of the Union Address;

Whereas the international community is united in pursuit of achieving the goal of an AIDS-free generation;

Whereas a UNAIDS 2014 report on the state of the global epidemic assessed that AIDS could be ended as a public health threat by 2030 if a fast-track response is taken and certain targets are realized by 2020, and further noted that doing so would avert nearly 28,000,000 new HIV infections and 21,000,000 AIDS-related deaths by 2030;

Whereas, during the Ebola Virus Disease outbreak of 2014, countries with PEPFAR-strengthened lab capacity, human capacity, and health facility capacity were able to contain Ebola outbreaks;

Whereas, in August 2014, PEPFAR and the Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF) launched an initiative to double the total number of children receiving treatment over the next two years in ten countries;

Whereas December 1 of each year is internationally recognized as World AIDS Day; and

Whereas, in 2014, the theme for World AIDS Day commemorations was "Focus, Partner, Achieve: An AIDS-free Generation": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World AIDS Day, including seeking to get to zero new HIV infections, zero discrimination, and zero AIDS-related deaths;

(2) applauds the goals and approaches for achieving an AIDS-free generation set forth in the PEPFAR Blueprint: Creating an AIDS-free Generation, as well as the targets set by United Nations member states in the 2011 United Nations Political Declaration on HIV and AIDS;

(3) commends the dramatic progress in global AIDS programs supported through the efforts of PEPFAR, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and UNAIDS;

(4) urges, in order to ensure that an AIDS-free generation is within reach, rapid action by all nations towards—

(A) full implementation of the Global Plan Towards the Elimination of New HIV Infections Among Children by 2015 and Keeping Their Mothers Alive to build on progress made to date; and

(B) further expansion and scale-up of antiretroviral treatment programs, including efforts to reduce disparities and improve access for children to life-saving medications such as getting antiretroviral HIV medication to the 2,000,000 children with HIV currently unable to access them;

(5) calls for scaling up treatment to reach all individuals eligible for treatment under WHO guidelines;

(6) calls for greater focus on the HIV-related vulnerabilities of women and girls, including those at risk for or who have survived violence or faced discrimination as a result of the disease, and urges more directed efforts to ensure that they are connected to the information, care, support, and treatment they require;

(7) supports efforts to ensure inclusive access to programs and appropriate protections for all those most at risk of HIV/AIDS and hardest to reach;

(8) encourages additional private-public partnerships to research and develop better and more affordable tools for the diagnosis, treatment, vaccination, and cure of HIV;

(9) supports continued leadership by the United States in bilateral, multilateral, and private sector efforts to fight HIV;

(10) stresses the importance of ensuring that HIV and AIDS are central to the post-2015 United Nations development agenda and of advocating for the inclusion of targets under relevant goals towards achieving zero new HIV infections, zero discrimination, and zero AIDS-related deaths;

(11) encourages and supports greater degrees of ownership and shared responsibility by developing countries in order to ensure sustainability of their domestic responses; and

(12) encourages other members of the international community to sustain and scale up their support for and financial contributions to efforts around the world to combat HIV/AIDS.

SENATE RESOLUTION 598—EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF ABDUL-RAHMAN PETER KASSIG AND CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ACTS OF THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT

Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. COATS) submitted the following resolu-

tion; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 598

Whereas Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig was a tireless humanitarian who devoted his life to helping those most in need;

Whereas Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig saved lives across Lebanon, Turkey, and Syria, particularly through the nongovernmental organization he founded, Special Emergency Response and Assistance;

Whereas Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig represented the best qualities of humanity through his work administering medical aid, food and shelter to the people most impacted by the war in Syria;

Whereas Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig served with honor as a United States Army Ranger;

Whereas the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (referred to in this preamble as "ISIL") is a terrorist organization that has committed widespread acts of violence against innocent civilians throughout Iraq and Syria, forcing many people to flee their homeland;

Whereas ISIL has carried out grave atrocities targeting Muslims and religious and ethnic minorities in the region, including women and children, for enslavement, torture, and massacre;

Whereas ISIL has captured and assassinated journalists and humanitarian and health workers, deepening the suffering of a war-torn region;

Whereas ISIL is responsible for the murder of United States citizens; and

Whereas ISIL continues to hold hostages in contravention of international law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

The Senate—

(1) mourns the death of Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig;

(2) expresses condolences to the family and loved ones of Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig;

(3) condemns the terrorist acts by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (referred to in this resolution as "ISIL"), including the targeting of innocent civilians, journalists, and aid workers; and

(4) urges the United States and the international community, working in partnership with the governments and citizens of the Middle East, to address the threat posed by ISIL and the suffering of innocent civilians impacted by the conflict.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution is a declaration of war or authorization to use force.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3996. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3997. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. THUNE)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2444, to

SA 4058. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4059. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4060. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4061. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4062. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4063. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4064. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4065. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4066. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4067. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4068. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4069. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4070. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4071. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4072. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4073. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4074. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4075. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4076. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4077. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4078. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4079. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4080. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4081. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4082. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4083. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4084. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4085. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4086. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4087. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4088. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4089. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4090. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4091. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3996. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LEE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1034. PROHIBITION ON THE INDEFINITE DETENTION OF CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.

Section 4001 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection (a):

“(a) No citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States shall be imprisoned or otherwise detained by the United States except consistent with the Constitution and pursuant to an act of Congress that expressly authorizes such imprisonment or detention.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b)(1) A general authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority, on its own, shall not be construed to authorize the imprisonment or detention without charge or trial of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States apprehended in the United States.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies to an authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

“(3) This section shall not be construed to authorize the imprisonment or detention of a citizen of the United States, a lawful permanent resident of the United States, or any other person who is apprehended in the United States.”.

SA 3997. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. THUNE)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2444, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is the following:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Authorized levels of military strength and training.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

Sec. 201. Commissioned officers.

Sec. 202. Commandant; appointment.

Sec. 203. Prevention and response workforces.

Sec. 204. Centers of expertise.

Sec. 205. Penalties.

Sec. 206. Agreements.

Sec. 207. Tuition assistance program coverage of textbooks and other educational materials.

Sec. 208. Coast Guard housing.

Sec. 209. Lease authority.

Sec. 210. Notification of certain determinations.

Sec. 211. Annual Board of Visitors.

Sec. 212. Flag officers.

Sec. 213. Repeal of limitation on medals of honor.

Sec. 214. Coast Guard family support and child care.

Sec. 215. Mission need statement.

Sec. 216. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request.

Sec. 217. Inventory of real property.

Sec. 218. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees.

Sec. 219. Active duty for emergency augmentation of regular forces.

- Sec. 220. Acquisition workforce expedited hiring authority.
- Sec. 221. Coast Guard administrative savings.
- Sec. 222. Technical corrections to title 14.
- Sec. 223. Multiyear procurement authority for Offshore Patrol Cutters.
- Sec. 224. Maintaining Medium Endurance Cutter mission capability.
- Sec. 225. Aviation capability.
- Sec. 226. Gaps in writings on Coast Guard history.
- Sec. 227. Officer evaluation reports.
- Sec. 228. Improved safety information for vessels.
- Sec. 229. E-LORAN.
- Sec. 230. Analysis of resource deficiencies with respect to maritime border security.
- Sec. 231. Modernization of National Distress and Response System.
- Sec. 232. Report reconciling maintenance and operational priorities on the Missouri River.
- Sec. 233. Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy assessment.

TITLE III—SHIPPING AND NAVIGATION

- Sec. 301. Repeal.
- Sec. 302. Donation of historical property.
- Sec. 303. Small shipyards.
- Sec. 304. Drug testing reporting.
- Sec. 305. Opportunities for sea service veterans.
- Sec. 306. Clarification of high-risk waters.
- Sec. 307. Technical corrections.
- Sec. 308. Report.
- Sec. 309. Fishing safety grant programs.
- Sec. 310. Establishment of Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee.
- Sec. 311. Travel and subsistence.
- Sec. 312. Prompt intergovernmental notice of marine casualties.
- Sec. 313. Area Contingency Plans.
- Sec. 314. International ice patrol reform.
- Sec. 315. Offshore supply vessel third-party inspection.
- Sec. 316. Watches.
- Sec. 317. Coast Guard response plan requirements.
- Sec. 318. Regional Citizens' Advisory Council.
- Sec. 319. Uninspected passenger vessels in the United States Virgin Islands.
- Sec. 320. Treatment of abandoned seafarers.
- Sec. 321. Website.
- Sec. 322. Coast Guard regulations.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

- Sec. 401. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 402. Award of reparations.
- Sec. 403. Terms of Commissioners.

TITLE V—ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION

- Sec. 501. Arctic maritime transportation.
- Sec. 502. Arctic maritime domain awareness.
- Sec. 503. IMO Polar Code negotiations.
- Sec. 504. Forward operating facilities.
- Sec. 505. Icebreakers.
- Sec. 506. Icebreaking in polar regions.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

- Sec. 601. Distant water tuna fleet.
- Sec. 602. Extension of moratorium.
- Sec. 603. National maritime strategy.
- Sec. 604. Waivers.
- Sec. 605. Competition by United States flag vessels.
- Sec. 606. Vessel requirements for notices of arrival and departure and automatic identification system.
- Sec. 607. Conveyance of Coast Guard property in Rochester, New York.

- Sec. 608. Conveyance of certain property in Gig Harbor, Washington.

- Sec. 609. Vessel determination.

- Sec. 610. Safe vessel operation in Thunder Bay.

- Sec. 611. Parking facilities.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for necessary expenses of the Coast Guard as follows:

(1) For the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, \$6,981,036,000.

(2) For the acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore and offshore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, \$1,546,448,000, to remain available until expended.

(3) For the Coast Guard Reserve program, including personnel and training costs, equipment, and services, \$140,016,000.

(4) For environmental compliance and restoration of Coast Guard vessels, aircraft, and facilities (other than parts and equipment associated with operation and maintenance), \$16,701,000, to remain available until expended.

(5) To the Commandant of the Coast Guard for research, development, test, and evaluation of technologies, materials, and human factors directly related to improving the performance of the Coast Guard's mission with respect to search and rescue, aids to navigation, marine safety, marine environmental protection, enforcement of laws and treaties, ice operations, oceanographic research, and defense readiness, \$19,890,000.

(6) For alteration or removal of bridges over navigable waters of the United States constituting obstructions to navigation, and for personnel and administrative costs associated with the Alteration of Bridges Program, \$16,000,000.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZED LEVELS OF MILITARY STRENGTH AND TRAINING.

(a) ACTIVE DUTY STRENGTH.—The Coast Guard is authorized an end-of-year strength for active duty personnel of 43,000 for fiscal year 2015.

(b) MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS.—The Coast Guard is authorized average military training student loads for fiscal year 2015 as follows:

(1) For recruit and special training, 2,500 student years.

(2) For flight training, 165 student years.

(3) For professional training in military and civilian institutions, 350 student years.

(4) For officer acquisition, 1,200 student years.

TITLE II—COAST GUARD

SEC. 201. COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Section 42(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “7,200” and inserting “6,900”.

SEC. 202. COMMANDANT; APPOINTMENT.

Section 44 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: “The term of an appointment, and any reappointment, shall begin on June 1 of the appropriate year and end on May 31 of the appropriate year, except that, in the event of death, retirement, resignation, or reassignment, or when the needs of the Service demand, the Secretary may alter the date on which a term begins or ends if the alteration does not result in the term exceeding a period of 4 years.”.

SEC. 203. PREVENTION AND RESPONSE WORKFORCES.

Section 57 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2) by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) waterways operations manager shall have knowledge, skill, and practical experience with respect to marine transportation system management; or

“(5) port and facility safety and security specialist shall have knowledge, skill, and practical experience with respect to the safety, security, and environmental protection responsibilities associated with maritime ports and facilities.”;

(2) in subsection (c) by striking “or marine safety engineer” and inserting “marine safety engineer, waterways operations manager, or port and facility safety and security specialist”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(2) by striking “investigator or marine safety engineer.” and inserting “investigator, marine safety engineer, waterways operations manager, or port and facility safety and security specialist.”.

SEC. 204. CENTERS OF EXPERTISE.

Section 58(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) MISSIONS.—Any center established under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) promote, facilitate, and conduct—

“(A) education;

“(B) training; and

“(C) activities authorized under section 93(a)(4);

“(2) be a repository of information on operations, practices, and resources related to the mission for which the center was established; and

“(3) perform and support the mission for which the center was established.”.

SEC. 205. PENALTIES.

(a) AIDS TO NAVIGATION AND FALSE DISTRESS MESSAGES.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 83 by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$1,500”;

(2) in section 84 by striking “\$500” and inserting “\$1,500”;

(3) in section 85 by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$1,500”; and

(4) in section 88(c)(2) by striking “\$5,000” and inserting “\$10,000”.

(b) UNAUTHORIZED USE OF WORDS “COAST GUARD”.—Section 639 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$1,000” and inserting “\$10,000”.

SEC. 206. AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 93(a)(4) of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “, investigate” and inserting “and investigate”; and

(2) by striking “, and cooperate and coordinate such activities with other Government agencies and with private agencies”.

(b) AUTHORITY.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 102. Agreements

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out section 93(a)(4), the Commandant may—

“(1) enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, and other agreements with—

“(A) Federal entities;

“(B) other public or private entities in the United States, including academic entities; and

“(C) foreign governments with the concurrence of the Secretary of State; and

“(2) impose on and collect from an entity subject to an agreement or contract under

paragraph (1) a fee to assist with expenses incurred in carrying out such section.

“(b) DEPOSIT AND USE OF FEES.—Fees collected under this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts. The fees may be used, to the extent provided in advance in an appropriation law, only to carry out activities under section 93(a)(4).”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“102. Agreements.”.

SEC. 207. TUITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COVERAGE OF TEXTBOOKS AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS.

Section 93(a)(7) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and the textbooks, manuals, and other materials required as part of such training or course of instruction” after “correspondence courses”.

SEC. 208. COAST GUARD HOUSING.

(a) COMMANDANT; GENERAL POWERS.—Section 93(a)(13) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Treasury” and inserting “the fund established under section 687”.

(b) LIGHTHOUSE PROPERTY.—Section 672a(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “the Treasury” and inserting “the fund established under section 687”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 687(b) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Monies received under section 93(a)(13).

“(5) Amounts received under section 672a(b).”.

SEC. 209. LEASE AUTHORITY.

Section 93 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) LEASING OF TIDELANDS AND SUBMERGED LANDS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—The Commandant may lease under subsection (a)(13) submerged lands and tidelands under the control of the Coast Guard without regard to the limitation under that subsection with respect to lease duration.

“(2) LIMITATION.—The Commandant may lease submerged lands and tidelands under paragraph (1) only if—

“(A) lease payments are—

“(i) received exclusively in the form of cash;

“(ii) equal to the fair market value of the use of the leased submerged lands or tidelands for the period during which such lands are leased, as determined by the Commandant; and

“(iii) deposited in the fund established under section 687; and

“(B) the lease does not provide authority to or commit the Coast Guard to use or support any improvements to such submerged lands or tidelands, or obtain goods or services from the lessee.”.

SEC. 210. NOTIFICATION OF CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 103. Notification of certain determinations

“(a) IN GENERAL.—At least 90 days prior to making a final determination that a waterway, or a portion thereof, is navigable for purposes of the jurisdiction of the Coast Guard, the Commandant shall provide notification regarding the proposed determination to—

“(1) the Governor of each State in which such waterway, or portion thereof, is located;

“(2) the public; and

“(3) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(b) CONTENT REQUIREMENT.—Each notification provided under subsection (a) to an entity specified in paragraph (3) of that subsection shall include—

“(1) an analysis of whether vessels operating on the waterway, or portion thereof, subject to the proposed determination are subject to inspection or similar regulation by State or local officials;

“(2) an analysis of whether operators of commercial vessels on such waterway, or portion thereof, are subject to licensing or similar regulation by State or local officials; and

“(3) an estimate of the annual costs that the Coast Guard may incur in conducting operations on such waterway, or portion thereof.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“103. Notification of certain determinations.”.

SEC. 211. ANNUAL BOARD OF VISITORS.

Section 194 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 194. Annual Board of Visitors

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy is established to review and make recommendations on the operation of the Academy.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The membership of the Board shall consist of the following:

“(A) The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, or the chairman’s designee.

“(B) The chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, or the chairman’s designee.

“(C) 3 Members of the Senate designated by the Vice President.

“(D) 4 Members of the House of Representatives designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

“(E) 6 individuals designated by the President.

“(2) LENGTH OF SERVICE.—

“(A) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—A Member of Congress designated under subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (1) as a member of the Board shall be designated as a member in the First Session of a Congress and serve for the duration of that Congress.

“(B) INDIVIDUALS DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT.—Each individual designated by the President under subparagraph (E) of paragraph (1) shall serve as a member of the Board for 3 years, except that any such member whose term of office has expired shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed.

“(3) DEATH OR RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.—If a member of the Board dies or resigns, a successor shall be designated for any unexpired portion of the term of the member by the official who designated the member.

“(c) ACADEMY VISITS.—

“(1) ANNUAL VISIT.—The Board shall visit the Academy annually to review the operation of the Academy.

“(2) ADDITIONAL VISITS.—With the approval of the Secretary, the Board or individual members of the Board may make other visits to the Academy in connection with the duties of the Board or to consult with the Superintendent of the Academy.

“(d) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—The Board shall review, with respect to the Academy—

“(1) the state of morale and discipline;

“(2) the curriculum;

“(3) instruction;

“(4) physical equipment;

“(5) fiscal affairs; and

“(6) other matters relating to the Academy that the Board determines appropriate.

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of an annual visit of the Board under subsection (c)(1), the Board shall submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the actions of the Board during such visit and the recommendations of the Board pertaining to the Academy.

“(f) ADVISORS.—If approved by the Secretary, the Board may consult with advisors in carrying out this section.

“(g) REIMBURSEMENT.—Each member of the Board and each adviser consulted by the Board under subsection (f) shall be reimbursed, to the extent permitted by law, by the Coast Guard for actual expenses incurred while engaged in duties as a member or adviser.”.

SEC. 212. FLAG OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 295 the following:

“§ 296. Flag officers

“During any period in which the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, section 1216(d) of title 10 does not apply with respect to flag officers of the Coast Guard.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 295 the following:

“296. Flag officers.”.

SEC. 213. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON MEDALS OF HONOR.

Section 494 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “medal of honor,” each place it appears.

SEC. 214. COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT AND CHILD CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after chapter 13 the following:

“CHAPTER 14—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT AND CHILD CARE

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“Sec.

“531. Work-life policies and programs.

“532. Surveys of Coast Guard families.

“SUBCHAPTER II—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT

“542. Education and training opportunities for Coast Guard spouses.

“543. Youth sponsorship initiatives.

“SUBCHAPTER III—COAST GUARD CHILD CARE

“551. Definitions.

“553. Child development center standards and inspections.

“554. Child development center employees.

“555. Parent partnerships with child development centers.

“SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

“§ 531. Work-life policies and programs

“The Commandant is authorized—

“(1) to establish an office for the purpose of developing, promulgating, and coordinating policies, programs, and activities related to the families of Coast Guard members;

“(2) to implement and oversee policies, programs, and activities described in paragraph (1) as the Commandant considers necessary; and

“(3) to perform such other duties as the Commandant considers necessary.

“§ 532. Surveys of Coast Guard families

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The Commandant, in order to determine the effectiveness of Federal policies, programs, and activities related to the families of Coast Guard members, may survey—

“(1) any Coast Guard member;

“(2) any retired Coast Guard member;

“(3) the immediate family of any Coast Guard member or retired Coast Guard member; and

“(4) any survivor of a deceased Coast Guard member.

“(b) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—Participation in any survey conducted under subsection (a) shall be voluntary.

“(c) FEDERAL RECORDKEEPING.—Each person surveyed under subsection (a) shall be considered an employee of the United States for purposes of section 3502(3)(A)(i) of title 44.

“SUBCHAPTER II—COAST GUARD FAMILY SUPPORT

“§ 542. Education and training opportunities for Coast Guard spouses

“(a) TUITION ASSISTANCE.—The Commandant may provide, subject to the availability of appropriations, tuition assistance to an eligible spouse to facilitate the acquisition of—

“(1) education and training required for a degree or credential at an accredited college, university, or technical school in the United States that expands employment and portable career opportunities for the spouse; or

“(2) education prerequisites and a professional license or credential required, by a government or government-sanctioned licensing body, for an occupation that expands employment and portable career opportunities for the spouse.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) ELIGIBLE SPOUSE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible spouse’ means the spouse of a member of the Coast Guard who is serving on active duty and includes a spouse who receives transitional compensation under section 1059 of title 10.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘eligible spouse’ does not include a person who—

“(i) is married to, but legally separated from, a member of the Coast Guard under a court order or statute of any State or territorial possession of the United States; or

“(ii) is eligible for tuition assistance as a member of the Armed Forces.

“(2) PORTABLE CAREER.—The term ‘portable career’ includes an occupation that requires education, training, or both that results in a credential that is recognized by an industry, profession, or specific type of business.

“§ 543. Youth sponsorship initiatives

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant is authorized to establish, within any Coast Guard unit, an initiative to help integrate into new surroundings the dependent children of members of the Coast Guard who received permanent change of station orders.

“(b) DESCRIPTION OF INITIATIVE.—An initiative established under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) provide for the involvement of a dependent child of a member of the Coast Guard in the dependent child’s new Coast Guard community; and

“(2) primarily focus on preteen and teenage children.

“(c) AUTHORITY.—In carrying out an initiative under subsection (a), the Commandant may—

“(1) provide to a dependent child of a member of the Coast Guard information on youth programs and activities available in the dependent child’s new Coast Guard community; and

“(2) enter into agreements with nonprofit entities to provide youth programs and activities to such child.

“SUBCHAPTER III—COAST GUARD CHILD CARE

“§ 551. Definitions

“In this subchapter, the following definitions apply:

“(1) CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.—The term ‘child abuse and neglect’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note).

“(2) CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘child development center employee’ means a civilian employee of the Coast Guard who is employed to work in a Coast Guard child development center without regard to whether the employee is paid from appropriated or nonappropriated funds.

“(3) COAST GUARD CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The term ‘Coast Guard child development center’ means a facility on Coast Guard property or on property under the jurisdiction of the commander of a Coast Guard unit at which child care services are provided for members of the Coast Guard.

“(4) COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITION.—The term ‘competitive service position’ means a position in the competitive service (as defined in section 2102 of title 5).

“(5) FAMILY HOME DAYCARE.—The term ‘family home daycare’ means home-based child care services provided for a member of the Coast Guard by an individual who—

“(A) is certified by the Commandant as qualified to provide home-based child care services; and

“(B) provides home-based child care services on a regular basis in exchange for monetary compensation.

“§ 553. Child development center standards and inspections

“(a) STANDARDS.—The Commandant shall require each Coast Guard child development center to meet standards that the Commandant considers appropriate to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the children and employees at the center.

“(b) INSPECTIONS.—The Commandant shall provide for regular and unannounced inspections of each Coast Guard child development center to ensure compliance with this section.

“(c) NATIONAL REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall maintain and publicize a means by which an individual can report, with respect to a Coast Guard child development center or a family home daycare—

“(A) any suspected violation of—

“(i) standards established under subsection (a); or

“(ii) any other applicable law or standard;

“(B) suspected child abuse or neglect; or

“(C) any other deficiency.

“(2) ANONYMOUS REPORTING.—The Commandant shall ensure that an individual making a report pursuant to paragraph (1) may do so anonymously if so desired by the individual.

“(3) PROCEDURES.—The Commandant shall establish procedures for investigating reports made pursuant to paragraph (1).

“§ 554. Child development center employees

“(a) TRAINING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall establish a training program for Coast Guard child development center employees and satisfactory completion of the training program shall be a condition of employment for each employee of a Coast Guard child development center.

“(2) TIMING FOR NEW HIRES.—The Commandant shall require each employee of a Coast Guard child development center to complete the training program established under paragraph (1) not later than 6 months after the date on which the employee is hired.

“(3) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—The training program established under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, instruction with respect to—

“(A) early childhood development;

“(B) activities and disciplinary techniques appropriate to children of different ages;

“(C) child abuse and neglect prevention and detection; and

“(D) cardiopulmonary resuscitation and other emergency medical procedures.

“(4) USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS.—The Commandant may use Department of Defense training programs, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for purposes of this subsection.

“(b) TRAINING AND CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS.—

“(1) SPECIALIST REQUIRED.—The Commandant shall require that at least 1 employee at each Coast Guard child development center be a specialist in training and curriculum development with appropriate credentials and experience.

“(2) DUTIES.—The duties of the specialist described in paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) special teaching activities;

“(B) daily oversight and instruction of other child care employees;

“(C) daily assistance in the preparation of lesson plans;

“(D) assisting with child abuse and neglect prevention and detection; and

“(E) advising the director of the center on the performance of the other child care employees.

“(3) COMPETITIVE SERVICE.—Each specialist described in paragraph (1) shall be an employee in a competitive service position.

“§ 555. Parent partnerships with child development centers

“(a) PARENT BOARDS.—

“(1) FORMATION.—The Commandant shall require that there be formed at each Coast Guard child development center a board of parents, to be composed of parents of children attending the center.

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—Each board of parents formed under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) meet periodically with the staff of the center at which the board is formed and the commander of the unit served by the center, for the purpose of discussing problems and concerns; and

“(B) be responsible, together with the staff of the center, for coordinating any parent participation initiative established under subsection (b).

“(3) FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) does not apply to a board of parents formed under paragraph (1).

“(b) PARENT PARTICIPATION INITIATIVE.—The Commandant is authorized to establish a parent participation initiative at each Coast Guard child development center to encourage and facilitate parent participation

in educational and related activities at the center.”.

(b) TRANSFER OF PROVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) REIMBURSEMENT FOR ADOPTION EXPENSES.—Section 514 of title 14, United States Code, is redesignated as section 541 and transferred to appear before section 542 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(B) CHILD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES.—Section 515 of title 14, United States Code—

(i) is redesignated as section 552 and transferred to appear after section 551 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section; and

(ii) is amended—

(I) in subsection (b)(2)(B) by inserting “and whether a family is participating in an initiative established under section 555(b)” after “family income”;

(II) by striking subsections (c) and (e); and

(III) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(C) DEPENDENT SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Section 657 of title 14, United States Code—

(i) is redesignated as section 544 and transferred to appear after section 543 of such title, as added by subsection (a) of this section; and

(ii) is amended in subsection (a) by striking “Except as otherwise” and all that follows through “the Secretary may” and inserting “The Secretary may”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) PART I.—The analysis for part I of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 13 the following:

“14. Coast Guard Family Support and Child Care 531”.

(B) CHAPTER 13.—The analysis for chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking the item relating to section 514; and

(ii) by striking the item relating to section 515.

(C) CHAPTER 14.—The analysis for chapter 14 of title 14, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, is amended by inserting—

(i) before the item relating to section 542 the following:

“541. Reimbursement for adoption expenses.”;

(ii) after the item relating to section 551 the following:

“552. Child development services.”; and

(iii) after the item relating to section 543 the following:

“544. Dependent school children.”.

(D) CHAPTER 17.—The analysis for chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 657.

(c) COMMANDANT; GENERAL POWERS.—Section 93(a)(7) of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting “, and to eligible spouses as defined under section 542,” after “Coast Guard”.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the amount of funds appropriated for a fiscal year for operating expenses related to Coast Guard child development services should not be less than the amount of the child development center fee receipts estimated to be collected by the Coast Guard during that fiscal year.

(2) CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER FEE RECEIPTS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “child development center fee receipts”

means fees paid by members of the Coast Guard for child care services provided at Coast Guard child development centers.

SEC. 215. MISSION NEED STATEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 569 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 569. Mission need statement

“(a) IN GENERAL.—On the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for fiscal year 2016 under section 1105 of title 31, on the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for fiscal year 2019 under such section, and every 4 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an integrated major acquisition mission need statement.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) INTEGRATED MAJOR ACQUISITION MISSION NEED STATEMENT.—The term ‘integrated major acquisition mission need statement’ means a document that—

“(A) identifies current and projected gaps in Coast Guard mission capabilities using mission hour targets;

“(B) explains how each major acquisition program addresses gaps identified under subparagraph (A) if funded at the levels provided for such program in the most recently submitted capital investment plan; and

“(C) describes the missions the Coast Guard will not be able to achieve, by fiscal year, for each gap identified under subparagraph (A).

“(2) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term ‘major acquisition program’ has the meaning given that term in section 569a(e).

“(3) CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN.—The term ‘capital investment plan’ means the plan required under section 663(a)(1).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 15 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 569 and inserting the following:

“569. Mission need statement.”.

SEC. 216. TRANSMISSION OF ANNUAL COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION REQUEST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 662 the following:

“§ 662a. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a Coast Guard authorization request with respect to such fiscal year.

“(b) COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION REQUEST DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘Coast Guard authorization request’ means a proposal for legislation that, with respect to the Coast Guard for the relevant fiscal year—

“(1) recommends end strengths for personnel for that fiscal year, as described in section 661;

“(2) recommends authorizations of appropriations for that fiscal year, including with respect to matters described in section 662; and

“(3) addresses any other matter that the Secretary determines is appropriate for inclusion in a Coast Guard authorization bill.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 662 the following:

“662a. Transmission of annual Coast Guard authorization request.”.

SEC. 217. INVENTORY OF REAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 679. Inventory of real property

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Commandant shall establish an inventory of all real property, including submerged lands, under the control of the Coast Guard, which shall include—

“(1) the size, the location, and any other appropriate description of each unit of such property;

“(2) an assessment of the physical condition of each unit of such property, excluding lands;

“(3) a determination of whether each unit of such property should be—

“(A) retained to fulfill a current or projected Coast Guard mission requirement; or

“(B) subject to divestiture; and

“(4) other information the Commandant considers appropriate.

“(b) INVENTORY MAINTENANCE.—The Commandant shall—

“(1) maintain the inventory required under subsection (a) on an ongoing basis; and

“(2) update information on each unit of real property included in such inventory not later than 30 days after any change relating to the control of such property.

“(c) RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 30, 2016, and every 5 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that includes—

“(1) a list of all real property under the control of the Coast Guard and the location of such property by property type;

“(2) recommendations for divestiture with respect to any units of such property; and

“(3) recommendations for consolidating any units of such property, including—

“(A) an estimate of the costs or savings associated with each recommended consolidation; and

“(B) a discussion of the impact that such consolidation would have on Coast Guard mission effectiveness.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“679. Inventory of real property.”.

SEC. 218. RETIRED SERVICE MEMBERS AND DEPENDENTS SERVING ON ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 680. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees

“A committee that—

“(1) advises or assists the Coast Guard with respect to a function that affects a member of the Coast Guard or a dependent of such a member; and

“(2) includes in its membership a retired Coast Guard member or a dependent of such a retired member;

shall not be considered an advisory committee under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) solely because of such membership.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 679 the following:

“680. Retired service members and dependents serving on advisory committees.”.

SEC. 219. ACTIVE DUTY FOR EMERGENCY AUGMENTATION OF REGULAR FORCES.

Section 712(a) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking “not more than 60 days in any 4-month period and”.

SEC. 220. ACQUISITION WORKFORCE EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY.

Section 404(b) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-281; 124 Stat. 2951) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 221. COAST GUARD ADMINISTRATIVE SAVINGS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF OUTDATED AND DUPLICATE REPORTS.—

(1) MARINE INDUSTRY TRAINING.—Section 59 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant” and inserting “The Commandant”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(2) OPERATIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Section 651 of title 14, United States Code, and the item relating to such section in the analysis for chapter 17 of such title, are repealed.

(3) DRUG INTERDICTION.—Section 103 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (14 U.S.C. 89 note), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents in section 2 of that Act, are repealed.

(4) NATIONAL DEFENSE.—Section 426 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (14 U.S.C. 2 note), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents in section 1(b) of that Act, are repealed.

(5) LIVING MARINE RESOURCES.—Section 4(b) of the Cruise Vessel Security and Safety Act of 2010 (16 U.S.C. 1828 note) is amended by adding at the end the following: “No report shall be required under this subsection, including that no report shall be required under section 224 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006, for fiscal years beginning after fiscal year 2014.”.

(b) CONSOLIDATION AND REFORM OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) MARINE SAFETY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 2116(d)(2)(B) of title 46, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(B) on the program’s mission performance in achieving numerical measurable goals established under subsection (b), including—

“(i) the number of civilian and military Coast Guard personnel assigned to marine safety positions; and

“(ii) an identification of marine safety positions that are understaffed to meet the workload required to accomplish each activity included in the strategy and plans under subsection (a); and”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 57 of title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(i) by striking subsection (e); and

(ii) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (e), (f), and (g) respectively.

(2) MINOR CONSTRUCTION.—Section 656(d)(2) of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget under section 1105 of title 31 each year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing each project carried out under paragraph (1), in the most recently concluded fiscal year, for which the amount expended under such paragraph for such project was more than \$1,000,000. If no such project was carried out during a fiscal year, no report under this paragraph shall be required with respect to that fiscal year.”.

SEC. 222. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO TITLE 14.

Title 14, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in section 93(b)(1) by striking “Notwithstanding subsection (a)(14)” and inserting “Notwithstanding subsection (a)(13)”; and

(2) in section 197(b) by striking “of Homeland Security”.

SEC. 223. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR OFFSHORE PATROL CUTTERS.

In fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may enter into, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, multiyear contracts for the procurement of Offshore Patrol Cutters and associated equipment.

SEC. 224. MAINTAINING MEDIUM ENDURANCE CUTTER MISSION CAPABILITY.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that includes—

(1) a schedule and plan for decommissioning, not later than September 30, 2029, each of the 210-foot, Reliance-Class Cutters operated by the Coast Guard on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) a schedule and plan for enhancing the maintenance or extending the service life of each of the 270-foot, Famous-Class Cutters operated by the Coast Guard on the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) to maintain the capability of the Coast Guard to carry out sea-going missions with respect to such Cutters at the level of capability existing on September 30, 2013; and

(B) for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the final Offshore Patrol Cutter is scheduled to be commissioned under paragraph (4);

(3) an identification of the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters capable of sea state 5 operations that, if 8 National Security Cutters are commissioned, are necessary to return the sea state 5 operating capability of the Coast Guard to the level of capability that existed prior to the decommissioning of the first High Endurance Cutter in fiscal year 2011;

(4) a schedule and plan for commissioning the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters identified under paragraph (3); and

(5) a schedule and plan for commissioning, not later than September 30, 2034, a number of Offshore Patrol Cutters not capable of sea state 5 operations that is equal to—

(A) 25; less

(B) the number of Offshore Patrol Cutters identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 225. AVIATION CAPABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may—

(1) request and accept through a direct military-to-military transfer under section 2571 of title 10, United States Code, such H-60 helicopters as may be necessary to establish a year-round operational capability in the Coast Guard’s Ninth District; and

(2) use funds provided under section 101 of this Act to convert such helicopters to Coast Guard MH-60T configuration.

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Coast Guard may not—

(A) close a Coast Guard air facility that was in operation on November 30, 2014; or

(B) retire, transfer, relocate, or deploy an aviation asset from an air facility described in subparagraph (A) for the purpose of closing such facility.

(2) SUNSET.—This subsection is repealed effective January 1, 2016.

SEC. 226. GAPS IN WRITINGS ON COAST GUARD HISTORY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on any gaps that exist in writings on the history of the Coast Guard. The report shall address, at a minimum, operations, broad topics, and biographies with respect to the Coast Guard.

SEC. 227. OFFICER EVALUATION REPORTS.

(a) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a written assessment of the Coast Guard’s officer evaluation reporting system.

(b) CONTENTS OF ASSESSMENT.—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, an analysis of—

(1) the extent to which the Coast Guard’s officer evaluation reports differ in length, form, and content from the officer fitness reports used by the Navy and other branches of the Armed Forces;

(2) the extent to which differences determined pursuant to paragraph (1) are the result of inherent differences between—

(A) the Coast Guard and the Navy; and

(B) the Coast Guard and other branches of the Armed Forces;

(3) the feasibility of more closely aligning and conforming the Coast Guard’s officer evaluation reports with the officer fitness reports of the Navy and other branches of the Armed Forces; and

(4) the costs and benefits of the alignment and conformity described in paragraph (3), including with respect to—

(A) Coast Guard administrative efficiency;

(B) fairness and equity for Coast Guard officers; and

(C) carrying out the Coast Guard’s statutory mission of defense readiness, including when operating as a service in the Navy.

SEC. 228. IMPROVED SAFETY INFORMATION FOR VESSELS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall establish a process that allows an operator of a marine exchange or other non-Federal vessel traffic information service to

use the automatic identification system to transmit weather, ice, and other important navigation safety information to vessels.

SEC. 229. E-LORAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not carry out activities related to the dismantling or disposal of infrastructure that supported the former LORAN system until the later of—

(1) the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date on which the Secretary provides to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate notice of a determination by the Secretary that such infrastructure is not required to provide a positioning, navigation, and timing system to provide redundant capability in the event GPS signals are disrupted.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to activities necessary for the safety of human life.

(c) AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, and other agreements with Federal entities and other public or private entities, including academic entities, to develop a positioning, navigation, and timing system, including an enhanced LORAN system, to provide redundant capability in the event GPS signals are disrupted.

SEC. 230. ANALYSIS OF RESOURCE DEFICIENCIES WITH RESPECT TO MARITIME BORDER SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report describing any Coast Guard resource deficiencies related to—

(1) securing maritime borders with respect to the Great Lakes and the coastal areas of the Southeastern and Southwestern United States, including with respect to Florida, California, Puerto Rico, and the United States Virgin Islands;

(2) patrolling and monitoring maritime approaches to the areas described in paragraph (1); and

(3) patrolling and monitoring relevant portions of the Western Hemisphere Drug Transit Zone.

(b) SCOPE.—In preparing the report under subsection (a), the Commandant shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the Coast Guard's statutory missions with respect to migrant interdiction, drug interdiction, defense readiness, living marine resources, and ports, waterways, and coastal security;

(2) whether Coast Guard missions are being executed to meet national performance targets set under the National Drug Control Strategy;

(3) the number and types of cutters and other vessels required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(4) the number and types of aircraft, including unmanned aircraft, required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(5) the number of assets that require upgraded sensor and communications systems to effectively execute Coast Guard missions;

(6) the Deployable Specialized Forces required to effectively execute Coast Guard missions; and

(7) whether additional shoreside facilities are required to accommodate Coast Guard personnel and assets in support of Coast Guard missions.

SEC. 231. MODERNIZATION OF NATIONAL DISTRESS AND RESPONSE SYSTEM.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the implementation of the Rescue 21 project in Alaska and in Coast Guard sectors Upper Mississippi River, Lower Mississippi River, and Ohio River Valley.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) describe what improvements are being made to the distress response system in the areas specified in subsection (a), including information on which areas will receive digital selective calling and direction finding capability;

(2) describe the impediments to installing digital selective calling and direction finding capability in areas where such technology will not be installed;

(3) identify locations in the areas specified in subsection (a) where communication gaps will continue to present a risk to mariners after completion of the Rescue 21 project;

(4) include a list of all reported marine accidents, casualties, and fatalities occurring in the locations identified under paragraph (3) since 1990; and

(5) provide an estimate of the costs associated with installing the technology necessary to close communication gaps in the locations identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 232. REPORT RECONCILING MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONAL PRIORITIES ON THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report that outlines a course of action to reconcile general maintenance priorities for cutters with operational priorities on the Missouri River.

SEC. 233. MARITIME SEARCH AND RESCUE ASSISTANCE POLICY ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall assess the Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy as it relates to State and local responders.

(b) SCOPE.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the extent to which Coast Guard search and rescue coordinators have entered into domestic search and rescue agreements with State and local responders under the National Search and Rescue Plan;

(2) whether the domestic search and rescue agreements include the Maritime Search and Rescue Assistance Policy; and

(3) the extent to which Coast Guard sectors coordinate with 911 emergency centers, including ensuring the dissemination of appropriate maritime distress check-sheets.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit a report on the assessment under subsection (a) to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—SHIPPING AND NAVIGATION

SEC. 301. REPEAL.

Chapter 555 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by repealing section 55501;

(2) by redesignating section 55502 as section 55501; and

(3) in the analysis by striking the items relating to sections 55501 and 55502 and inserting the following:

“55501. United States Committee on the Marine Transportation System.”.

SEC. 302. DONATION OF HISTORICAL PROPERTY.

Section 51103 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) DONATION FOR HISTORICAL PURPOSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may convey the right, title, and interest of the United States Government in any property administered by the Maritime Administration, except real estate or vessels, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that such property is not needed by the Maritime Administration; and

“(B) the recipient—

“(i) is a nonprofit organization, a State, or a political subdivision of a State;

“(ii) agrees to hold the Government harmless for any claims arising from exposure to hazardous materials, including asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, or lead paint, after conveyance of the property;

“(iii) provides a description and explanation of the intended use of the property to the Secretary for approval;

“(iv) has provided to the Secretary proof, as determined by the Secretary, of resources sufficient to accomplish the intended use provided under clause (iii) and to maintain the property;

“(v) agrees that when the recipient no longer requires the property, the recipient shall—

“(I) return the property to the Secretary, at the recipient's expense and in the same condition as received except for ordinary wear and tear; or

“(II) subject to the approval of the Secretary, retain, sell, or otherwise dispose of the property in a manner consistent with applicable law; and

“(vi) agrees to any additional terms the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(2) REVERSION.—The Secretary shall include in any conveyance under this subsection terms under which all right, title, and interest conveyed by the Secretary shall revert to the Government if the Secretary determines the property has been used other than as approved by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(B)(iii).”.

SEC. 303. SMALL SHIPYARDS.

Section 54101(i) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2009 through 2013” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

SEC. 304. DRUG TESTING REPORTING.

Section 7706 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “an applicant for employment by a Federal agency,” after “Federal agency,”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by—

(A) inserting “or an applicant for employment by a Federal agency” after “an employee”; and

(B) striking “the employee.” and inserting “the employee or the applicant.”.

SEC. 305. OPPORTUNITIES FOR SEA SERVICE VETERANS.

(a) ENDORSEMENTS FOR VETERANS.—Section 7101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) The Secretary may issue a license under this section in a class under subsection (c) to an applicant that—

“(1) has at least 3 months of qualifying service on vessels of the uniformed services (as that term is defined in section 101(a) of title 10) of appropriate tonnage or horsepower within the 7-year period immediately preceding the date of application; and

“(2) satisfies all other requirements for such a license.”.

(b) SEA SERVICE LETTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 427 the following:

“§ 428. Sea service letters

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide a sea service letter to a member or former member of the Coast Guard who—

“(1) accumulated sea service on a vessel of the armed forces (as such term is defined in section 101(a) of title 10); and

“(2) requests such letter.

“(b) DEADLINE.—Not later than 30 days after receiving a request for a sea service letter from a member or former member of the Coast Guard under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide such letter to such member or former member if such member or former member satisfies the requirement under subsection (a)(1).”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 427 the following:

“428. Sea service letters.”.

(c) CREDITING OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES SERVICE, TRAINING, AND QUALIFICATIONS.—

(1) MAXIMIZING CREDITABILITY.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in implementing United States merchant mariner license, certification, and document laws and the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, shall maximize the extent to which United States Armed Forces service, training, and qualifications are creditable toward meeting the requirements of such laws and such Convention.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the steps taken to implement this subsection.

(d) MERCHANT MARINE POST-SERVICE CAREER OPPORTUNITIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall take steps to promote better awareness, on an ongoing basis, among Coast Guard personnel regarding post-service use of Coast Guard training, education, and practical experience in satisfaction of requirements for merchant mariner credentials under section 11.213 of title 46, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 306. CLARIFICATION OF HIGH-RISK WATERS.

Section 55305(e) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “provide armed personnel aboard” and inserting “reimburse, subject to the availability of appropriations, the owners or operators of”; and

(B) by inserting “for the cost of providing armed personnel aboard such vessels” before “if”; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘high-risk waters’ means waters so designated by the Commandant of the Coast Guard in the maritime security directive issued by the Commandant and in effect on the date on which an applicable voyage begins, if the Secretary of Transportation—

“(A) determines that an act of piracy occurred in the 12-month period preceding the date the voyage begins; or

“(B) in such period, issued an advisory warning that an act of piracy is possible in such waters.”.

SEC. 307. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) TITLE 46.—Section 2116(b)(1)(D) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 93(c)” and inserting “section 93(c) of title 14”.

(b) COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2006.—Section 304(a) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-241; 33 U.S.C. 1503 note) is amended by inserting “and from” before “the United States”.

(c) DEEPWATER PORT ACT OF 1974.—Section 4(i) of the Deepwater Port Act of 1974 (33 U.S.C. 1503(i)) is amended by inserting “or that will supply” after “be supplied with”.

SEC. 308. REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the number of jobs, including vessel construction and vessel operating jobs, that would be created in the United States maritime industry each year in 2015 through 2025 if liquefied natural gas exported from the United States were required to be carried—

(1) before December 31, 2018, on vessels documented under the laws of the United States; and

(2) on and after such date, on vessels documented under the laws of the United States and constructed in the United States.

SEC. 309. FISHING SAFETY GRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) FISHING SAFETY TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4502(i)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2010 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

(b) FISHING SAFETY RESEARCH GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4502(j)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking “2010 through 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2017”.

SEC. 310. ESTABLISHMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE PERSONNEL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 81 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 8108. Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as ‘the Committee’). The Committee—

“(1) shall act solely in an advisory capacity to the Secretary through the Commandant of the Coast Guard on matters relating to personnel in the United States merchant marine, including training, qualifications, certification, documentation, and fitness standards, and other matters as assigned by the Commandant;

“(2) shall review and comment on proposed Coast Guard regulations and policies relating to personnel in the United States merchant marine, including training, qualifica-

tions, certification, documentation, and fitness standards;

“(3) may be given special assignments by the Secretary and may conduct studies, inquiries, workshops, and fact finding in consultation with individuals and groups in the private sector and with State or local governments;

“(4) shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations reflecting its independent judgment to the Secretary;

“(5) shall meet not less than twice each year; and

“(6) may make available to Congress recommendations that the Committee makes to the Secretary.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall consist of not more than 19 members who are appointed by and serve terms of a duration determined by the Secretary. Before filling a position on the Committee, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register soliciting nominations for membership on the Committee.

“(2) REQUIRED MEMBERS.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary shall appoint as members of the Committee—

“(A) 9 United States citizens with active licenses or certificates issued under chapter 71 or merchant mariner documents issued under chapter 73, including—

“(i) 3 deck officers who represent the viewpoint of merchant marine deck officers, of whom—

“(I) 2 shall be licensed for oceans any gross tons;

“(II) 1 shall be licensed for inland river route with a limited or unlimited tonnage;

“(III) 2 shall have a master's license or a master of towing vessels license;

“(IV) 1 shall have significant tanker experience; and

“(V) to the extent practicable—

“(aa) 1 shall represent the viewpoint of labor; and

“(bb) another shall represent a management perspective;

“(ii) 3 engineering officers who represent the viewpoint of merchant marine engineering officers, of whom—

“(I) 2 shall be licensed as chief engineer any horsepower;

“(II) 1 shall be licensed as either a limited chief engineer or a designated duty engineer; and

“(III) to the extent practicable—

“(aa) 1 shall represent a labor viewpoint; and

“(bb) another shall represent a management perspective;

“(iii) 2 unlicensed seamen, of whom—

“(I) 1 shall represent the viewpoint of able-bodied seamen; and

“(II) another shall represent the viewpoint of qualified members of the engine department; and

“(iv) 1 pilot who represents the viewpoint of merchant marine pilots;

“(B) 6 marine educators, including—

“(i) 3 marine educators who represent the viewpoint of maritime academies, including—

“(I) 2 who represent the viewpoint of State maritime academies and are jointly recommended by such State maritime academies; and

“(II) 1 who represents either the viewpoint of the State maritime academies or the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

“(ii) 3 marine educators who represent the viewpoint of other maritime training institutions, 1 of whom shall represent the viewpoint of the small vessel industry;

“(C) 2 individuals who represent the viewpoint of shipping companies employed in ship operation management; and

“(D) 2 members who are appointed from the general public.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Transportation in making an appointment under paragraph (2)(B)(i)(II).

“(c) CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The Secretary shall designate one member of the Committee as the Chairman and one member of the Committee as the Vice Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or incapacity of the Chairman, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman.

“(d) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Committee may establish and disestablish subcommittees and working groups for any purpose consistent with this section, subject to conditions imposed by the Committee. Members of the Committee and additional persons drawn from the general public may be assigned to such subcommittees and working groups. Only Committee members may chair subcommittee or working groups.

“(e) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate on September 30, 2020.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“8108. Merchant Marine Personnel Advisory Committee.”.

SEC. 311. TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE.

(a) TITLE 46, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 2110 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b)(1) In addition to the collection of fees and charges established under subsection (a), in providing a service or thing of value under this subtitle the Secretary may accept in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence.

“(2) The value of in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence accepted under this paragraph may not exceed applicable per diem rates set forth in regulations prescribed under section 464 of title 37.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “subsections (a) and (b),” and inserting “subsection (a).”.

(b) TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 664 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsections (e) through (g) as subsections (f) through (h), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e)(1) In addition to the collection of fees and charges established under this section, in the provision of a service or thing of value by the Coast Guard the Secretary may accept in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence.

“(2) The value of in-kind transportation, travel, and subsistence accepted under this paragraph may not exceed applicable per diem rates set forth in regulations prescribed under section 464 of title 37.”.

(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not accept in-kind transportation, travel, or subsistence under section 664(e) of title 14, United States Code, or section 2110(d)(4) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by this section, until the Commandant of the Coast Guard—

(1) amends the Standards of Ethical Conduct for members and employees of the Coast Guard to include regulations governing the acceptance of in-kind reimbursements; and

(2) notifies the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate

and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives of the amendments made under paragraph (1).

SEC. 312. PROMPT INTERGOVERNMENTAL NOTICE OF MARINE CASUALTIES.

Section 6101 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) NOTICE TO STATE AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—Not later than 24 hours after receiving a notice of a major marine casualty under this section, the Secretary shall notify each State or federally recognized Indian tribe that is, or may reasonably be expected to be, affected by such marine casualty.”;

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking “(1)”;

(B) by redesignating subsection (h)(2) as subsection (i) of section 6101, and in such subsection—

(i) by striking “paragraph,” and inserting “section.”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as paragraphs (1) through (4); and

(3) by redesignating the last subsection as subsection (j).

SEC. 313. AREA CONTINGENCY PLANS.

Section 311(j)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “qualified personnel of Federal, State, and local agencies,” and inserting “qualified—

“(i) personnel of Federal, State, and local agencies; and

“(ii) members of federally recognized Indian tribes, where applicable.”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

(A) by striking “and local” and inserting “, local, and tribal”;

(B) by striking “wildlife,” and inserting “wildlife, including advance planning with respect to the closing and reopening of fishing areas following a discharge.”;

(3) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “and local” and inserting “, local, and tribal”;

(4) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking “and Federal, State, and local agencies” and inserting “, Federal, State, and local agencies, and tribal governments”;

(B) by redesignating clauses (vii) and (viii) as clauses (viii) and (ix), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

“(vii) include a framework for advance planning and decisionmaking with respect to the closing and reopening of fishing areas following a discharge, including protocols and standards for the closing and reopening of fishing areas.”.

SEC. 314. INTERNATIONAL ICE PATROL REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 803 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 80301, by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PAYMENTS.—Payments received pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall be credited to the appropriation for operating expenses of the Coast Guard.”;

(2) in section 80302—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking “An ice patrol vessel” and inserting “The ice patrol”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “An ice patrol vessel” and inserting “The ice patrol”;

(C) in the first sentence of subsection (d), by striking “vessels” and inserting “aircraft”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 80304. Limitation on ice patrol data

“Notwithstanding sections 80301 and 80302, data collected by an ice patrol conducted by the Coast Guard under this chapter may not be disseminated to a vessel unless such vessel is—

“(1) documented under the laws of the United States; or

“(2) documented under the laws of a foreign country that made the payment or contribution required under section 80301(b) for the year preceding the year in which the data is collected.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“80304. Limitation on ice patrol data.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on January 1, 2017.

SEC. 315. OFFSHORE SUPPLY VESSEL THIRD-PARTY INSPECTION.

Section 3316 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f)(1) Upon request of an owner or operator of an offshore supply vessel, the Secretary shall delegate the authorities set forth in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) with respect to such vessel to a classification society to which a delegation is authorized under that paragraph. A delegation by the Secretary under this subsection shall be used for any vessel inspection and examination function carried out by the Secretary, including the issuance of certificates of inspection and all other related documents.

“(2) If the Secretary determines that a certificate of inspection or related document issued under authority delegated under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to a vessel has reduced the operational safety of that vessel, the Secretary may terminate the certificate or document, respectively.

“(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014, and for each year of the subsequent 2-year period, the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing—

“(A) the number of vessels for which a delegation was made under paragraph (1);

“(B) any savings in personnel and operational costs incurred by the Coast Guard that resulted from the delegations; and

“(C) based on measurable marine casualty and other data, any impacts of the delegations on the operational safety of vessels for which the delegations were made, and on the crew on those vessels.”.

SEC. 316. WATCHES.

Section 8104 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders” and inserting “and oilers”;

(2) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “(except the coal passers, firemen, oilers, and water tenders)”.

SEC. 317. COAST GUARD RESPONSE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.

(a) VESSEL RESPONSE PLAN CONTENTS.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall require that each vessel response plan prepared for a mobile offshore drilling unit includes information from the facility response plan prepared for the mobile offshore drilling unit regarding the planned response to a worst case discharge, and to a threat of such a discharge.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MOBILE OFFSHORE DRILLING UNIT.—The term “mobile offshore drilling unit” has the meaning given that term in section 1001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701).

(2) RESPONSE PLAN.—The term “response plan” means a response plan prepared under section 311(j) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(j)).

(3) WORST CASE DISCHARGE.—The term “worst case discharge” has the meaning given that term under section 311(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1321(a)).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Coast Guard to review or approve a facility response plan for a mobile offshore drilling unit.

SEC. 318. REGIONAL CITIZENS' ADVISORY COUNCIL.

Section 5002(k)(3) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2732(k)(3)) is amended by striking “not more than \$1,000,000” and inserting “not less than \$1,400,000”.

SEC. 319. UNINSPECTED PASSENGER VESSELS IN THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4105 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b)(1) In applying this title with respect to an uninspected vessel of less than 24 meters overall in length that carries passengers to or from a port in the United States Virgin Islands, the Secretary shall substitute ‘12 passengers’ for ‘6 passengers’ each place it appears in section 2101(42) if the Secretary determines that the vessel complies with, as applicable to the vessel—

“(A) the Code of Practice for the Safety of Small Commercial Motor Vessels (commonly referred to as the ‘Yellow Code’), as published by the U.K. Maritime and Coastguard Agency and in effect on January 1, 2014; or

“(B) the Code of Practice for the Safety of Small Commercial Sailing Vessels (commonly referred to as the ‘Blue Code’), as published by such agency and in effect on such date.

“(2) If the Secretary establishes standards to carry out this subsection—

“(A) such standards shall be identical to those established in the Codes of Practice referred to in paragraph (1); and

“(B) on any dates before the date on which such standards are in effect, the Codes of Practice referred to in paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the vessels referred to in paragraph (1).”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 4105(c) of title 46, United States Code, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is amended by striking “Within twenty-four months of the date of enactment of this subsection, the” and inserting “The”.

SEC. 320. TREATMENT OF ABANDONED SEAFARERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 111 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 11113. Treatment of abandoned seafarers

“(a) ABANDONED SEAFARERS FUND.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a separate account to be known as the Abandoned Seafarers Fund.

“(2) AUTHORIZED USES.—Amounts in the Fund may be appropriated to the Secretary for use—

“(A) to pay necessary support of a seafarer—

“(i) who—

“(I) was paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)), or for whom the Secretary has requested parole under such section; and

“(II) is involved in an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter that is related to the administration or enforcement of law by the Coast Guard; or

“(ii) who—

“(I) is physically present in the United States;

“(II) the Secretary determines was abandoned in the United States; and

“(III) has not applied for asylum under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

“(B) to reimburse a vessel owner or operator for the costs of necessary support of a seafarer who has been paroled into the United States to facilitate an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter that is related to the administration or enforcement of law by the Coast Guard, if—

“(i) the vessel owner or operator is not convicted of a criminal offense related to such matter; or

“(ii) the Secretary determines that reimbursement is appropriate.

“(3) CREDITING OF AMOUNTS TO FUND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), there shall be credited to the Fund the following:

“(i) Penalties deposited in the Fund under section 9 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1908).

“(ii) Amounts reimbursed or recovered under subsection (c).

“(B) LIMITATION.—Amounts may be credited to the Fund under subparagraph (A) only if the unobligated balance of the Fund is less than \$5,000,000.

“(4) REPORT REQUIRED.—On the date on which the President submits each budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that describes—

“(A) the amounts credited to the Fund under paragraph (2) for the preceding fiscal year; and

“(B) amounts in the Fund that were expended for the preceding fiscal year.

“(b) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to create a private right of action or any other right, benefit, or entitlement to necessary support for any person; or

“(2) to compel the Secretary to pay or reimburse the cost of necessary support.

“(c) REIMBURSEMENT; RECOVERY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A vessel owner or operator shall reimburse the Fund an amount equal to the total amount paid from the Fund for necessary support of a seafarer, if—

“(A) the vessel owner or operator—

“(i) during the course of an investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication of any matter under this Act that the Coast Guard referred to a United States attorney or the Attorney General, fails to provide necessary support of a seafarer who was paroled into the United States to facilitate the investigation, reporting, documentation, or adjudication; and

“(ii) subsequently is—

“(I) convicted of a criminal offense related to such matter; or

“(II) required to reimburse the Fund pursuant to a court order or negotiated settlement related to such matter; or

“(B) the vessel owner or operator abandons a seafarer in the United States, as determined by the Secretary based on substantial evidence.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—If a vessel owner or operator fails to reimburse the Fund under paragraph (1) within 60 days after receiving a written, itemized description of reimbursable expenses and a demand for payment, the Secretary may—

“(A) proceed in rem against the vessel on which the seafarer served in the Federal district court for the district in which the vessel is found; and

“(B) withhold or revoke the clearance required under section 60105 for the vessel and any other vessel operated by the same operator (as that term is defined in section 2(9)(a) of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1901(9)(a)) as the vessel on which the seafarer served.

“(3) OBTAINING CLEARANCE.—A vessel may obtain clearance from the Secretary after it is withheld or revoked under paragraph (2)(B) if the vessel owner or operator—

“(A) reimburses the Fund the amount required under paragraph (1); or

“(B) provides a bond, or other evidence of financial responsibility, sufficient to meet the amount required to be reimbursed under paragraph (1).

“(4) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall notify the vessel at least 72 hours before taking any action under paragraph (2)(B).

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ABANDONS; ABANDONED.—Each of the terms ‘abandons’ and ‘abandoned’ means—

“(A) a vessel owner’s or operator’s unilateral severance of ties with a seafarer; or

“(B) a vessel owner’s or operator’s failure to provide necessary support of a seafarer.

“(2) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the Abandoned Seafarers Fund established under this section.

“(3) NECESSARY SUPPORT.—The term ‘necessary support’ means normal wages and expenses the Secretary considers reasonable for lodging, subsistence, clothing, medical care (including hospitalization), repatriation, and any other support the Secretary considers to be appropriate.

“(4) SEAFARER.—The term ‘seafarer’ means an alien crew member who is employed or engaged in any capacity on board a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

“(5) VESSEL SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ‘vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the United States’ has the meaning given that term in section 70502(c), except that it does not include a vessel that is—

“(A) owned, or operated under a bareboat charter, by the United States, a State or political subdivision thereof, or a foreign nation; and

“(B) not engaged in commerce.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following:

“11113. Treatment of abandoned seafarers.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9 of the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (33 U.S.C. 1908) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Any penalty collected under subsection (a) or (b) that is not paid under that subsection to the person giving information leading to the conviction or assessment of such penalties shall be deposited in the

Abandoned Seafarers Fund established under section 11113 of title 46, United States Code.”.

SEC. 321. WEBSITE.

(a) REPORTS TO SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION: INCIDENTS AND DETAILS.—Section 3507(g)(3)(A) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (ii) by striking “the incident to an Internet based portal maintained by the Secretary” and inserting “each incident specified in clause (i) to the Internet website maintained by the Secretary of Transportation under paragraph (4)(A)”;

(2) in clause (iii) by striking “based portal maintained by the Secretary” and inserting “website maintained by the Secretary of Transportation under paragraph (4)(A)”.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF INCIDENT DATA ON INTERNET.—Section 3507(g)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) WEBSITE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall maintain a statistical compilation of all incidents on board a cruise vessel specified in paragraph (3)(A)(i) on an Internet website that provides a numerical accounting of the missing persons and alleged crimes reported under that paragraph without regard to the investigative status of the incident.

“(ii) UPDATES AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The compilation under clause (i) shall—

“(I) be updated not less frequently than quarterly;

“(II) be able to be sorted by cruise line;

“(III) identify each cruise line by name;

“(IV) identify each crime or alleged crime committed or allegedly committed by a passenger or crewmember;

“(V) identify the number of individuals alleged overboard; and

“(VI) include the approximate number of passengers and crew carried by each cruise line during each quarterly reporting period.

“(iii) USER-FRIENDLY FORMAT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall ensure that the compilation, data, and any other information provided on the Internet website maintained under this subparagraph are in a user-friendly format. The Secretary shall, to the greatest extent practicable, use existing commercial off the shelf technology to transfer and establish the website, and shall not independently develop software, or acquire new hardware in operating the site.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking “Secretary” and inserting “Secretary of Transportation”.

SEC. 322. COAST GUARD REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives an analysis of the Coast Guard’s proposed promulgation of safety and environmental management system requirements for vessels engaged in Outer Continental Shelf activities. The analysis shall include—

(1) a discussion of any new operational, management, design and construction, financial, and other mandates that would be imposed on vessel owners and operators;

(2) an estimate of all associated direct and indirect operational, management, personnel, training, vessel design and construction, record keeping, and other costs;

(3) an identification and justification of any of such proposed requirements that exceed those in international conventions applicable to the design, construction, operation, and management of vessels engaging in United States Outer Continental Shelf activities; and

(4) an identification of exemptions to the proposed requirements, that are based upon vessel classification, tonnage, offshore activity or function, alternative certifications, or any other appropriate criteria.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not issue proposed regulations relating to safety and environmental management system requirements for vessels on the United States Outer Continental Shelf for which noticed was published on September 10, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 55230) earlier than 6 months after the submittal of the analysis required by subsection (a).

TITLE IV—FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission \$24,700,000 for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 402. AWARD OF REPARATIONS.

Section 41305 of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “, plus reasonable attorney fees”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ATTORNEY FEES.—In any action brought under section 41301, the prevailing party may be awarded reasonable attorney fees.”.

SEC. 403. TERMS OF COMMISSIONERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(b) of title 46, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) TERMS.—The term of each Commissioner is 5 years. When the term of a Commissioner ends, the Commissioner may continue to serve until a successor is appointed and qualified, but for a period not to exceed one year. Except as provided in paragraph (3), no individual may serve more than 2 terms.”; and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (5), and inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) VACANCIES.—A vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. An individual appointed to fill a vacancy is appointed only for the unexpired term of the individual being succeeded. An individual appointed to fill a vacancy may serve 2 terms in addition to the remainder of the term for which the predecessor of that individual was appointed.

“(4) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—

“(A) LIMITATION ON RELATIONSHIPS WITH REGULATED ENTITIES.—A Commissioner may not have a pecuniary interest in, hold an official relation to, or own stocks or bonds of any entity the Commission regulates under chapter 401 of this title.

“(B) LIMITATION ON OTHER ACTIVITIES.—A Commissioner may not engage in another business, vocation, or employment.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) does not apply with respect to a Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission appointed and confirmed by the Senate before the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 501. ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION.

(a) ARCTIC MARITIME TRANSPORTATION.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is

amended by inserting after section 89 the following:

“§ 90. Arctic maritime transportation

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure safe and secure maritime shipping in the Arctic including the availability of aids to navigation, vessel escorts, spill response capability, and maritime search and rescue in the Arctic.

“(b) INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION AGREEMENTS.—To carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary is encouraged to enter into negotiations through the International Maritime Organization to conclude and execute agreements to promote coordinated action among the United States, Russia, Canada, Iceland, Norway, and Denmark and other seafaring and Arctic nations to ensure, in the Arctic—

“(1) placement and maintenance of aids to navigation;

“(2) appropriate marine safety, tug, and salvage capabilities;

“(3) oil spill prevention and response capability;

“(4) maritime domain awareness, including long-range vessel tracking; and

“(5) search and rescue.

“(c) COORDINATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.—The Committee on the Maritime Transportation System established under section 55501 of title 46, United States Code, shall coordinate the establishment of domestic transportation policies in the Arctic necessary to carry out the purpose of this section.

“(d) AGREEMENTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may, subject to the availability of appropriations, enter into cooperative agreements, contracts, or other agreements with, or make grants to, individuals and governments to carry out the purpose of this section or any agreements established under subsection (b).

“(e) ICEBREAKING.—The Secretary shall promote safe maritime navigation by means of icebreaking where necessary, feasible, and effective to carry out the purposes of this section.

“(f) ARCTIC DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘Arctic’ has the meaning given such term in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 89 the following:

“90. Arctic maritime transportation”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 307 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-281; 14 U.S.C. 92 note) is repealed.

SEC. 502. ARCTIC MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 154. Arctic maritime domain awareness

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant shall improve maritime domain awareness in the Arctic—

“(1) by promoting interagency cooperation and coordination;

“(2) by employing joint, interagency, and international capabilities; and

“(3) by facilitating the sharing of information, intelligence, and data related to the Arctic maritime domain between the Coast Guard and departments and agencies listed in subsection (b).

“(b) COORDINATION.—The Commandant shall seek to coordinate the collection, sharing, and use of information, intelligence, and

data related to the Arctic maritime domain between the Coast Guard and the following:

- “(1) The Department of Homeland Security.
- “(2) The Department of Defense.
- “(3) The Department of Transportation.
- “(4) The Department of State.
- “(5) The Department of the Interior.
- “(6) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
- “(7) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
- “(8) The Environmental Protection Agency.
- “(9) The National Science Foundation.
- “(10) The Arctic Research Commission.
- “(11) Any Federal agency or commission or State the Commandant determines is appropriate.

“(c) COOPERATION.—The Commandant and the head of a department or agency listed in subsection (b) may by agreement, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, share personnel, services, equipment, and facilities to carry out the requirements of this section.

“(d) 5-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than January 1, 2016 and every 5 years thereafter, the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a 5-year strategic plan to guide interagency and international intergovernmental cooperation and coordination for the purpose of improving maritime domain awareness in the Arctic.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the term ‘Arctic’ has the meaning given that term in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 153 the following:

“154. Arctic maritime domain awareness.”

SEC. 503. IMO POLAR CODE NEGOTIATIONS.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and thereafter with the submission of the budget proposal submitted for each of fiscal years 2016, 2017, and 2018 under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a report on—

(1) the status of the negotiations at the International Maritime Organization regarding the establishment of a draft international code of safety for ships operating in polar waters, popularly known as the Polar Code, and any amendments proposed by such a code to be made to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea and the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships;

(2) the coming into effect of such a code and such amendments for nations that are parties to those conventions;

(3) impacts, for coastal communities located in the Arctic (as that term is defined in the section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111)) of such a code or such amendments, on—

(A) the costs of delivering fuel and freight; and

(B) the safety of maritime transportation; and

(4) actions the Secretary must take to implement the requirements of such a code and such amendments.

SEC. 504. FORWARD OPERATING FACILITIES.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may construct facilities in the Arctic (as that term is defined in section 112 of the Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 4111)). The facilities shall—

(1) support aircraft maintenance, including exhaust ventilation, heat, an engine wash system, fuel, ground support services, and electrical power;

(2) provide shelter for both current helicopter assets and those projected to be located at Air Station Kodiak, Alaska, for at least 20 years; and

(3) include accommodations for personnel.

SEC. 505. ICEBREAKERS.

(a) COAST GUARD POLAR ICEBREAKERS.—Section 222 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–213; 126 Stat. 1560) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading by striking “; BRIDGING STRATEGY”; and

(B) by striking “Commandant of the Coast Guard” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “Commandant of the Coast Guard may decommission the Polar Sea.”;

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following:

“(3) RESULT OF NO DETERMINATION.—If in the analysis submitted under this section the Secretary does not make a determination under subsection (a)(5) regarding whether it is cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea, then—

“(A) the Commandant of the Coast Guard may decommission the Polar Sea; or

“(B) the Secretary may make such determination, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of Howard Coble Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2014, and take actions in accordance with this subsection as though such determination was made in the analysis previously submitted.”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) STRATEGIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the analysis required under subsection (a) is submitted, the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate—

“(A) unless the Secretary makes a determination under this section that it is cost effective to reactivate the Polar Sea, a bridging strategy for maintaining the Coast Guard’s polar icebreaking services until at least September 30, 2024;

“(B) a strategy to meet the Coast Guard’s Arctic ice operations needs through September 30, 2050; and

“(C) a strategy to meet the Coast Guard’s Antarctic ice operations needs through September 30, 2050

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—The strategies required under paragraph (1) shall include a business case analysis comparing the leasing and purchasing of icebreakers to maintain the needs and services described in that paragraph.”.

(b) CUTTER “POLAR SEA”.—Upon the submission of a service life extension plan in accordance with section 222(d)(1)(C) of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–213; 126 Stat.

1560), the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may use funds authorized under section 101 of this Act to conduct a service life extension of 7 to 10 years for the Coast Guard Cutter *Polar Sea* (WAGB 11) in accordance with such plan.

(c) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may not expend amounts appropriated for the Coast Guard for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2024, for—

(A) design activities related to a capability of a Polar-Class Icebreaker that is based solely on an operational requirement of another Federal department or agency, except for amounts appropriated for design activities for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2016; or

(B) long-lead-time materials, production, or post-delivery activities related to such a capability.

(2) OTHER AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available to the Secretary under an agreement with another Federal department or agency and expended on a capability of a Polar-Class Icebreaker that is based solely on an operational requirement of that or another Federal department or agency shall not be treated as amounts expended by the Secretary for purposes of the limitation established under paragraph (1).

SEC. 506. ICEBREAKING IN POLAR REGIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 86 the following:

“§ 87. Icebreaking in polar regions

“The President shall facilitate planning for the design, procurement, maintenance, deployment, and operation of icebreakers as needed to support the statutory missions of the Coast Guard in the polar regions by allocating all funds to support icebreaking operations in such regions, except for recurring incremental costs associated with specific projects, to the Coast Guard.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 86 the following:

“87. Icebreaking in polar regions.”.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. DISTANT WATER TUNA FLEET.

Section 421 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2006 (46 U.S.C. 8103 note) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (c) and (e); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) and (f) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

SEC. 602. EXTENSION OF MORATORIUM.

Section 2(a) of Public Law 110–299 (33 U.S.C. 1342 note) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2017”.

SEC. 603. NATIONAL MARITIME STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a national maritime strategy.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify—

(A) Federal regulations and policies that reduce the competitiveness of United States flag vessels in international transportation markets; and

(B) the impact of reduced cargo flow due to reductions in the number of members of the

United States Armed Forces stationed or deployed outside of the United States; and

(2) include recommendations to—

(A) make United States flag vessels more competitive in shipping routes between United States and foreign ports;

(B) increase the use of United States flag vessels to carry cargo imported to and exported from the United States;

(C) ensure compliance by Federal agencies with chapter 553 of title 46, United States Code;

(D) increase the use of third-party inspection and certification authorities to inspect and certify vessels;

(E) increase the use of short sea transportation routes, including routes designated under section 55601(c) of title 46, United States Code, to enhance intermodal freight movements; and

(F) enhance United States shipbuilding capability.

SEC. 604. WAIVERS.

(a) “JOHN CRAIG”.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8902 of title 46, United States Code, shall not apply to the vessel *John Craig* (United States official number D1110613) when such vessel is operating on the portion of the Kentucky River, Kentucky, located at approximately mile point 158, in Pool Number 9, between Lock and Dam Number 9 and Lock and Dam Number 10.

(2) APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall apply on and after the date on which the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating determines that a licensing requirement has been established under Kentucky State law that applies to an operator of the vessel *John Craig*.

(b) “F/V WESTERN CHALLENGER”.—Notwithstanding section 12132 of title 46, United States Code, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating may issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the *F/V Western Challenger* (IMO number 5388108).

SEC. 605. COMPETITION BY UNITED STATES FLAG VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an assessment of authorities under subtitle II of title 46, United States Code, that have been delegated to the Coast Guard and that impact the ability of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to effectively compete in international transportation markets.

(b) REVIEW OF DIFFERENCES WITH IMO STANDARDS.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall include a review of differences between United States laws, policies, regulations, and guidance governing the inspection of vessels documented under the laws of the United States and standards set by the International Maritime Organization governing the inspection of vessels.

(c) DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Commandant enters into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences under subsection (a), the Commandant shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the assessment required under such subsection.

SEC. 606. VESSEL REQUIREMENTS FOR NOTICES OF ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE AND AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the

department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall notify the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the status of the final rule that relates to the notice of proposed rulemaking titled “Vessel Requirements for Notices of Arrival and Departure, and Automatic Identification System” and published in the Federal Register on December 16, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 76295).

SEC. 607. CONVEYANCE OF COAST GUARD PROPERTY IN ROCHESTER, NEW YORK.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Commandant of the Coast Guard is authorized to convey, at fair market value, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, consisting of approximately 0.2 acres, that is under the administrative control of the Coast Guard and located at 527 River Street in Rochester, New York.

(b) RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL.—The City of Rochester, New York, shall have the right of first refusal with respect to the purchase, at fair market value, of the real property described in subsection (a).

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property described in subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Commandant.

(d) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The fair market value of the property described in subsection (a) shall—

(1) be determined by appraisal; and

(2) be subject to the approval of the Commandant.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The responsibility for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental documentation costs, associated with a conveyance under subsection (a) shall be determined by the Commandant and the purchaser.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Commandant may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under subsection (a) as the Commandant considers appropriate and reasonable to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—Any proceeds from a conveyance under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the fund established under section 687 of title 14, United States Code.

SEC. 608. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) CITY.—The term “City” means the city of Gig Harbor, Washington.

(2) PROPERTY.—The term “Property” means the parcel of real property, together with any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 0.86 acres of fast lands commonly identified as tract 65 of lot 1 of section 18, township 21 north, range 2 east, Willamette Meridian, on the north side of the entrance of Gig Harbor, narrows of Puget Sound, Washington.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) CONVEYANCE.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating relinquishes the reservation of the Property for lighthouse purposes, at the request of the City and subject to the requirements of this section, the Secretary shall convey to the City all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Property, notwithstanding the land use plan-

ning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713).

(2) TERMS OF CONVEYANCE.—A conveyance made under paragraph (1) shall be made—

(A) subject to valid existing rights;

(B) at the fair market value as described in subsection (c); and

(C) subject to any other condition that the Secretary may consider appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) COSTS.—The City shall pay any transaction or administrative costs associated with a conveyance under paragraph (1), including the costs of the appraisal, title searches, maps, and boundary and cadastral surveys.

(4) CONVEYANCE IS NOT A MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—A conveyance under paragraph (1) shall not be considered a major Federal action for purposes of section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)).

(c) FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

(1) DETERMINATION.—The fair market value of the Property shall be—

(A) determined by an appraisal conducted by an independent appraiser selected by the Secretary; and

(B) approved by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—An appraisal conducted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(B) shall reflect the equitable considerations described in paragraph (3).

(3) EQUITABLE CONSIDERATIONS.—In approving the fair market value of the Property under this subsection, the Secretary shall take into consideration matters of equity and fairness, including the City’s past and current lease of the Property, any maintenance or improvements by the City to the Property, and such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) REVOCATION; REVERSION.—Effective on and after the date on which a conveyance of the Property is made under subsection (b)(1)—

(1) Executive Order 3528, dated August 9, 1921, is revoked; and

(2) the use of the tide and shore lands belonging to the State of Washington and adjoining and bordering the Property, that were granted to the Government of the United States pursuant to the Act of the Legislature, State of Washington, approved March 13, 1909, the same being chapter 110 of the Session Laws of 1909, shall revert to the State of Washington.

SEC. 609. VESSEL DETERMINATION.

The vessel assigned United States official number 1205366 is deemed a new vessel effective on the date of delivery of the vessel after January 1, 2012, from a privately owned United States shipyard, if no encumbrances are on record with the Coast Guard at the time of the issuance of the new certificate of documentation for the vessel.

SEC. 610. SAFE VESSEL OPERATION IN THUNDER BAY.

The Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not prohibit a vessel operating within the existing boundaries and any future expanded boundaries of the Thunder

Bay National Marine Sanctuary and Underwater Preserve from taking up or discharging ballast water to allow for safe and efficient vessel operation if the uptake or discharge meets all Federal and State ballast water management requirements that would apply if the area were not a marine sanctuary.

SEC. 611. PARKING FACILITIES.

(a) ALLOCATION AND ASSIGNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this section, the Administrator of General Services, in coordination with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall allocate and assign the spaces in parking facilities at the Department of Homeland Security St. Elizabeths Campus to allow any member or employee of the Coast Guard, who is assigned to the Campus, to use such spaces.

(2) TIMING.—In carrying out paragraph (1), and in addition to the parking spaces allocated and assigned to Coast Guard members and employees in fiscal year 2014, the Administrator shall allocate and assign not less than—

(A) 300 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2015;

(B) 700 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2016; and

(C) 1,042 parking spaces not later than September 30, 2017.

(b) TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each fiscal year thereafter in which spaces are allocated and assigned under subsection (a)(2), the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the impact of assigning and allocating parking spaces under subsection (a) on the congestion of roads connecting the St. Elizabeths Campus to the portions of Suitland Parkway and I-295 located in the Anacostia section of the District of Columbia; and

(2) progress made toward completion of essential transportation improvements identified in the Transportation Management Program for the St. Elizabeths Campus.

(c) REALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Administrator may revise the allocation and assignment of spaces to members and employees of the Coast Guard made under subsection (a) as necessary to accommodate employees of the Department of Homeland Security, other than the Coast Guard, when such employees are assigned to the St. Elizabeths Campus.

SA 3998. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2444, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.”.

SA 3999. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2519, to codify an existing operations center for cybersecurity; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Cybersecurity Protection Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Center” means the national cybersecurity and communications integration center under section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3;

(2) the term “critical infrastructure” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101);

(3) the term “cybersecurity risk” has the meaning given that term in section 226 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3;

(4) the term “information sharing and analysis organization” has the meaning given that term in section 212(5) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 131(5));

(5) the term “information system” has the meaning given that term in section 3502(8) of title 44, United States Code; and

(6) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 226. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘cybersecurity risk’ means threats to and vulnerabilities of information or information systems and any related consequences caused by or resulting from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, degradation, disruption, modification, or destruction of information or information systems, including such related consequences caused by an act of terrorism;

“(2) the term ‘incident’ means an occurrence that—

“(A) actually or imminently jeopardizes, without lawful authority, the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of information on an information system; or

“(B) constitutes a violation or imminent threat of violation of law, security policies, security procedures, or acceptable use policies;

“(3) the term ‘information sharing and analysis organization’ has the meaning given that term in section 212(5); and

“(4) the term ‘information system’ has the meaning given that term in section 3502(8) of title 44, United States Code.

“(b) CENTER.—There is in the Department a national cybersecurity and communications integration center (referred to in this section as the ‘Center’) to carry out certain responsibilities of the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H).

“(c) FUNCTIONS.—The cybersecurity functions of the Center shall include—

“(1) being a Federal civilian interface for the multi-directional and cross-sector sharing of information related to cybersecurity risks, incidents, analysis, and warnings for Federal and non-Federal entities;

“(2) providing shared situational awareness to enable real-time, integrated, and operational actions across the Federal Government and non-Federal entities to address cybersecurity risks and incidents to Federal and non-Federal entities;

“(3) coordinating the sharing of information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents across the Federal Government;

“(4) facilitating cross-sector coordination to address cybersecurity risks and incidents, including cybersecurity risks and incidents that may be related or could have consequential impacts across multiple sectors;

“(5)(A) conducting integration and analysis, including cross-sector integration and analysis, of cybersecurity risks and incidents; and

“(B) sharing the analysis conducted under subparagraph (A) with Federal and non-Federal entities;

“(6) upon request, providing timely technical assistance, risk management support, and incident response capabilities to Federal and non-Federal entities with respect to cybersecurity risks and incidents, which may include attribution, mitigation, and remediation; and

“(7) providing information and recommendations on security and resilience measures to Federal and non-Federal entities, including information and recommendations to—

“(A) facilitate information security; and

“(B) strengthen information systems against cybersecurity risks and incidents.

“(d) COMPOSITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall be composed of—

“(A) appropriate representatives of Federal entities, such as—

“(i) sector-specific agencies;

“(ii) civilian and law enforcement agencies; and

“(iii) elements of the intelligence community, as that term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4));

“(B) appropriate representatives of non-Federal entities, such as—

“(i) State and local governments;

“(ii) information sharing and analysis organizations; and

“(iii) owners and operators of critical information systems;

“(C) components within the Center that carry out cybersecurity and communications activities;

“(D) a designated Federal official for operational coordination with and across each sector; and

“(E) other appropriate representatives or entities, as determined by the Secretary.

“(2) INCIDENTS.—In the event of an incident, during exigent circumstances the Secretary may grant a Federal or non-Federal entity immediate temporary access to the Center.

“(e) PRINCIPLES.—In carrying out the functions under subsection (c), the Center shall ensure—

“(1) to the extent practicable, that—

“(A) timely, actionable, and relevant information related to cybersecurity risks, incidents, and analysis is shared;

“(B) when appropriate, information related to cybersecurity risks, incidents, and analysis is integrated with other relevant information and tailored to the specific characteristics of a sector;

“(C) activities are prioritized and conducted based on the level of risk;

“(D) industry sector-specific, academic, and national laboratory expertise is sought and receives appropriate consideration;

“(E) continuous, collaborative, and inclusive coordination occurs—

“(i) across sectors; and

“(ii) with—

“(I) sector coordinating councils;

“(II) information sharing and analysis organizations; and

“(III) other appropriate non-Federal partners;

“(F) as appropriate, the Center works to develop and use mechanisms for sharing information related to cybersecurity risks and

incidents that are technology-neutral, interoperable, real-time, cost-effective, and resilient; and

“(G) the Center works with other agencies to reduce unnecessarily duplicative sharing of information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents;

“(2) that information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents is appropriately safeguarded against unauthorized access; and

“(3) that activities conducted by the Center comply with all policies, regulations, and laws that protect the privacy and civil liberties of United States persons.

“(f) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The provision of assistance or information to, and inclusion in the Center of, governmental or private entities under this section shall be at the sole and unreviewable discretion of the Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H).

“(2) CERTAIN ASSISTANCE OR INFORMATION.—The provision of certain assistance or information to, or inclusion in the Center of, one governmental or private entity pursuant to this section shall not create a right or benefit, substantive or procedural, to similar assistance or information for any other governmental or private entity.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 225 the following:

“Sec. 226. National cybersecurity and communications integration center.”.

SEC. 4. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING NEW AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit recommendations on how to expedite the implementation of information-sharing agreements for cybersecurity purposes between the Center and non-Federal entities (referred to in this section as “cybersecurity information-sharing agreements”) to—

(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(b) CONTENTS.—In submitting recommendations under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) address the development and utilization of a scalable form that retains all privacy and other protections in cybersecurity information-sharing agreements that are in effect as of the date on which the Secretary submits the recommendations, including Cooperative Research and Development Agreements; and

(2) include in the recommendations any additional authorities or resources that may be needed to carry out the implementation of any new cybersecurity information-sharing agreements.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the United States a report on the Center, which shall include—

(a) information on the Center, including—

(1) an assessment of the capability and capacity of the Center to carry out its cybersecurity mission under this Act;

(2) the number of representatives from non-Federal entities that are participating in the Center, including the number of representatives from States, nonprofit organizations, and private sector entities, respectively;

(3) the number of requests from non-Federal entities to participate in the Center and the response to such requests;

(4) the average length of time taken to resolve requests described in paragraph (3);

(5) the identification of—

(A) any delay in resolving requests described in paragraph (3) involving security clearance processing; and

(B) the agency involved with a delay described in subparagraph (A);

(6) a description of any other obstacles or challenges to resolving requests described in paragraph (3) and a summary of the reasons for denials of any such requests;

(7) the extent to which the Department is engaged in information sharing with each critical infrastructure sector, including—

(A) the extent to which each sector has representatives at the Center;

(B) the extent to which owners and operators of critical infrastructure in each critical infrastructure sector participate in information sharing at the Center; and

(C) the volume and range of activities with respect to which the Secretary has collaborated with the sector coordinating councils and the sector-specific agencies to promote greater engagement with the Center; and

(8) the policies and procedures established by the Center to safeguard privacy and civil liberties.

SEC. 6. GAO REPORT.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the effectiveness of the Center in carrying out its cybersecurity mission.

SEC. 7. CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE PLAN; CLEARANCES; BREACHES.

(a) CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE PLAN; CLEARANCES.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.), as amended by section 3, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 227. CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE PLAN.

“The Under Secretary appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H) shall, in coordination with appropriate Federal departments and agencies, State and local governments, sector coordinating councils, information sharing and analysis organizations (as defined in section 212(5)), owners and operators of critical infrastructure, and other appropriate entities and individuals, develop, regularly update, maintain, and exercise adaptable cyber incident response plans to address cybersecurity risks (as defined in section 226) to critical infrastructure.

“SEC. 228. CLEARANCES.

“The Secretary shall make available the process of application for security clearances under Executive Order 13549 (75 Fed. Reg. 162; relating to a classified national security information program) or any successor Executive Order to appropriate representatives of sector coordinating councils, sector information sharing and analysis organizations (as defined in section 212(5)), owners and operators of critical infrastructure, and any other person that the Secretary determines appropriate.”.

(b) BREACHES.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall ensure that data breach notification policies and guidelines are updated periodically and require—

(A) except as provided in paragraph (4), notice by the affected agency to each committee of Congress described in section 3544(c)(1) of title 44, United States Code, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, which shall—

(i) be provided expeditiously and not later than 30 days after the date on which the agency discovered the unauthorized acquisition or access; and

(ii) include—

(I) information about the breach, including a summary of any information that the agency knows on the date on which notification is provided about how the breach occurred;

(II) an estimate of the number of individuals affected by the breach, based on information that the agency knows on the date on which notification is provided, including an assessment of the risk of harm to affected individuals;

(III) a description of any circumstances necessitating a delay in providing notice to affected individuals; and

(IV) an estimate of whether and when the agency will provide notice to affected individuals; and

(B) notice by the affected agency to affected individuals, pursuant to data breach notification policies and guidelines, which shall be provided as expeditiously as practicable and without unreasonable delay after the agency discovers the unauthorized acquisition or access.

(2) NATIONAL SECURITY; LAW ENFORCEMENT; REMEDIATION.—The Attorney General, the head of an element of the intelligence community (as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)), or the Secretary may delay the notice to affected individuals under paragraph (1)(B) if the notice would disrupt a law enforcement investigation, endanger national security, or hamper security remediation actions.

(3) OMB REPORT.—During the first 2 years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, on an annual basis—

(A) assess agency implementation of data breach notification policies and guidelines in aggregate; and

(B) include the assessment described in clause (i) in the report required under section 3543(a)(8) of title 44, United States Code.

(4) EXCEPTION.—Any element of the intelligence community (as such term is defined under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) that is required to provide notice under paragraph (1)(A) shall only provide such notice to appropriate committees of Congress.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by subsection (a) or in subsection (b)(1) shall be construed to alter any authority of a Federal agency or department.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note), as amended by section 3, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 226 the following:

“Sec. 227. Cyber incident response plan.

“Sec. 228. Clearances.”.

SEC. 8. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to grant the Secretary any authority to promulgate regulations or set standards relating to the cybersecurity of private sector critical infrastructure that was not in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **PRIVATE ENTITIES.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to require any private entity—

(1) to request assistance from the Secretary; or

(2) that requested such assistance from the Secretary to implement any measure or recommendation suggested by the Secretary.

SA 4000. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. COBURN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4007, to recodify and reauthorize the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE XXI—CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS**“SEC. 2101. DEFINITIONS.**

“In this title—

“(1) the term ‘CFATS regulation’ means—

“(A) an existing CFATS regulation; and

“(B) any regulation or amendment to an existing CFATS regulation issued pursuant to the authority under section 2107;

“(2) the term ‘chemical facility of interest’ means a facility that—

“(A) holds, or that the Secretary has a reasonable basis to believe holds, a chemical of interest, as designated under Appendix A to part 27 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, at a threshold quantity set pursuant to relevant risk-related security principles; and

“(B) is not an excluded facility;

“(3) the term ‘covered chemical facility’ means a facility that—

“(A) the Secretary—

“(i) identifies as a chemical facility of interest; and

“(ii) based upon review of the facility’s Top-Screen, determines meets the risk criteria developed under section 2102(e)(2)(B); and

“(B) is not an excluded facility;

“(4) the term ‘excluded facility’ means—

“(A) a facility regulated under the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–295; 116 Stat. 2064);

“(B) a public water system, as that term is defined in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f);

“(C) a Treatment Works, as that term is defined in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292);

“(D) a facility owned or operated by the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy; or

“(E) a facility subject to regulation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or by a State that has entered into an agreement with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission under section 274 b. of the Atomic Energy

Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2021(b)) to protect against unauthorized access of any material, activity, or structure licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;

“(5) the term ‘existing CFATS regulation’ means—

“(A) a regulation promulgated under section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109–295; 6 U.S.C. 121 note) that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014; and

“(B) a Federal Register notice or other published guidance relating to section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 that is in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014;

“(6) the term ‘expedited approval facility’ means a covered chemical facility for which the owner or operator elects to submit a site security plan in accordance with section 2102(c)(4);

“(7) the term ‘facially deficient’, relating to a site security plan, means a site security plan that does not support a certification that the security measures in the plan address the security vulnerability assessment and the risk-based performance standards for security for the facility, based on a review of—

“(A) the facility’s site security plan;

“(B) the facility’s Top-Screen;

“(C) the facility’s security vulnerability assessment; or

“(D) any other information that—

“(i) the facility submits to the Department; or

“(ii) the Department obtains from a public source or other source;

“(8) the term ‘guidance for expedited approval facilities’ means the guidance issued under section 2102(c)(4)(B)(i);

“(9) the term ‘risk assessment’ means the Secretary’s application of relevant risk criteria identified in section 2102(e)(2)(B);

“(10) the term ‘terrorist screening database’ means the terrorist screening database maintained by the Federal Government Terrorist Screening Center or its successor;

“(11) the term ‘tier’ has the meaning given the term in section 27.105 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto;

“(12) the terms ‘tiering’ and ‘tiering methodology’ mean the procedure by which the Secretary assigns a tier to each covered chemical facility based on the risk assessment for that covered chemical facility;

“(13) the term ‘Top-Screen’ has the meaning given the term in section 27.105 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto; and

“(14) the term ‘vulnerability assessment’ means the identification of weaknesses in the security of a chemical facility of interest.

“SEC. 2102. CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS PROGRAM.

“(a) **PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is in the Department a Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In carrying out the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program, the Secretary shall—

“(A) identify—

“(i) chemical facilities of interest; and

“(ii) covered chemical facilities;

“(B) require each chemical facility of interest to submit a Top-Screen and any other information the Secretary determines nec-

essary to enable the Department to assess the security risks associated with the facility;

“(C) establish risk-based performance standards designed to address high levels of security risk at covered chemical facilities; and

“(D) require each covered chemical facility to—

“(i) submit a security vulnerability assessment; and

“(ii) develop, submit, and implement a site security plan.

“(b) **SECURITY MEASURES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A facility, in developing a site security plan as required under subsection (a), shall include security measures that, in combination, appropriately address the security vulnerability assessment and the risk-based performance standards for security for the facility.

“(2) **EMPLOYEE INPUT.**—To the greatest extent practicable, a facility’s security vulnerability assessment and site security plan shall include input from at least 1 facility employee and, where applicable, 1 employee representative from the bargaining agent at that facility, each of whom possesses, in the determination of the facility’s security officer, relevant knowledge, experience, training, or education as pertains to matters of site security.

“(c) **APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF SITE SECURITY PLANS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(A) **REVIEW.**—Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Secretary shall review and approve or disapprove each site security plan submitted pursuant to subsection (a).

“(B) **BASES FOR DISAPPROVAL.**—The Secretary—

“(i) may not disapprove a site security plan based on the presence or absence of a particular security measure; and

“(ii) shall disapprove a site security plan if the plan fails to satisfy the risk-based performance standards established pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(C).

“(2) **ALTERNATIVE SECURITY PROGRAMS.**—

“(A) **AUTHORITY TO APPROVE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may approve an alternative security program established by a private sector entity or a Federal, State, or local authority or under other applicable laws, if the Secretary determines that the requirements of the program meet the requirements under this section.

“(ii) **ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES.**—If the requirements of an alternative security program do not meet the requirements under this section, the Secretary may recommend additional security measures to the program that will enable the Secretary to approve the program.

“(B) **SATISFACTION OF SITE SECURITY PLAN REQUIREMENT.**—A covered chemical facility may satisfy the site security plan requirement under subsection (a) by adopting an alternative security program that the Secretary has—

“(i) reviewed and approved under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) determined to be appropriate for the operations and security concerns of the covered chemical facility.

“(3) **SITE SECURITY PLAN ASSESSMENTS.**—

“(A) **RISK ASSESSMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—In approving or disapproving a site security plan under this subsection, the Secretary shall employ the risk assessment policies and procedures developed under this title.

“(B) **PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANS.**—In the case of a covered chemical facility for which

the Secretary approved a site security plan before the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary may not require the facility to resubmit the site security plan solely by reason of the enactment of this title.

“(4) EXPEDITED APPROVAL PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A covered chemical facility assigned to tier 3 or 4 may meet the requirement to develop and submit a site security plan under subsection (a)(2)(D) by developing and submitting to the Secretary—

“(i) a site security plan and the certification described in subparagraph (C); or

“(ii) a site security plan in conformance with a template authorized under subparagraph (H).

“(B) GUIDANCE FOR EXPEDITED APPROVAL FACILITIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall issue guidance for expedited approval facilities that identifies specific security measures that are sufficient to meet the risk-based performance standards.

“(ii) MATERIAL DEVIATION FROM GUIDANCE.—If a security measure in the site security plan of an expedited approval facility materially deviates from a security measure in the guidance for expedited approval facilities, the site security plan shall include an explanation of how such security measure meets the risk-based performance standards.

“(iii) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS TO DEVELOPMENT AND ISSUANCE OF INITIAL GUIDANCE.—During the period before the Secretary has met the deadline under clause (i), in developing and issuing, or amending, the guidance for expedited approval facilities under this subparagraph and in collecting information from expedited approval facilities, the Secretary shall not be subject to—

“(I) section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

“(II) subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; or

“(III) section 2107(b) of this title.

“(C) CERTIFICATION.—The owner or operator of an expedited approval facility shall submit to the Secretary a certification, signed under penalty of perjury, that—

“(i) the owner or operator is familiar with the requirements of this title and part 27 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, and the site security plan being submitted;

“(ii) the site security plan includes the security measures required by subsection (b);

“(iii)(I) the security measures in the site security plan do not materially deviate from the guidance for expedited approval facilities except where indicated in the site security plan;

“(II) any deviations from the guidance for expedited approval facilities in the site security plan meet the risk-based performance standards for the tier to which the facility is assigned; and

“(III) the owner or operator has provided an explanation of how the site security plan meets the risk-based performance standards for any material deviation;

“(iv) the owner or operator has visited, examined, documented, and verified that the expedited approval facility meets the criteria set forth in the site security plan;

“(v) the expedited approval facility has implemented all of the required performance measures outlined in the site security plan or set out planned measures that will be implemented within a reasonable time period stated in the site security plan;

“(vi) each individual responsible for implementing the site security plan has been made aware of the requirements relevant to the individual’s responsibility contained in the site security plan and has demonstrated competency to carry out those requirements;

“(vii) the owner or operator has committed, or, in the case of planned measures will commit, the necessary resources to fully implement the site security plan; and

“(viii) the planned measures include an adequate procedure for addressing events beyond the control of the owner or operator in implementing any planned measures.

“(D) DEADLINE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date described in clause (ii), the owner or operator of an expedited approval facility shall submit to the Secretary the site security plan and the certification described in subparagraph (C).

“(ii) DATE.—The date described in this clause is—

“(I) for an expedited approval facility that was assigned to tier 3 or 4 under existing CFATS regulations before the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the date that is 210 days after the date of enactment of that Act; and

“(II) for any expedited approval facility not described in subclause (I), the later of—

“(aa) the date on which the expedited approval facility is assigned to tier 3 or 4 under subsection (e)(2)(A); or

“(bb) the date that is 210 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014.

“(iii) NOTICE.—An owner or operator of an expedited approval facility shall notify the Secretary of the intent of the owner or operator to certify the site security plan for the expedited approval facility not later than 30 days before the date on which the owner or operator submits the site security plan and certification described in subparagraph (C).

“(E) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For an expedited approval facility submitting a site security plan and certification in accordance with subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D)—

“(I) the expedited approval facility shall comply with all of the requirements of its site security plan; and

“(II) the Secretary—

“(aa) except as provided in subparagraph (G), may not disapprove the site security plan; and

“(bb) may audit and inspect the expedited approval facility under subsection (d) to verify compliance with its site security plan.

“(ii) NONCOMPLIANCE.—If the Secretary determines an expedited approval facility is not in compliance with the requirements of the site security plan or is otherwise in violation of this title, the Secretary may enforce compliance in accordance with section 2104.

“(F) AMENDMENTS TO SITE SECURITY PLAN.—

“(i) REQUIREMENT.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If the owner or operator of an expedited approval facility amends a site security plan submitted under subparagraph (A), the owner or operator shall submit the amended site security plan and a certification relating to the amended site security plan that contains the information described in subparagraph (C).

“(II) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of this clause, an amendment to a site security plan includes any technical amendment to the site security plan.

“(ii) AMENDMENT REQUIRED.—The owner or operator of an expedited approval facility shall amend the site security plan if—

“(I) there is a change in the design, construction, operation, or maintenance of the expedited approval facility that affects the site security plan;

“(II) the Secretary requires additional security measures or suspends a certification and recommends additional security measures under subparagraph (G); or

“(III) the owner or operator receives notice from the Secretary of a change in tiering under subsection (e)(3).

“(iii) DEADLINE.—An amended site security plan and certification shall be submitted under clause (i)—

“(I) in the case of a change in design, construction, operation, or maintenance of the expedited approval facility that affects the security plan, not later than 120 days after the date on which the change in design, construction, operation, or maintenance occurred;

“(II) in the case of the Secretary requiring additional security measures or suspending a certification and recommending additional security measures under subparagraph (G), not later than 120 days after the date on which the owner or operator receives notice of the requirement for additional security measures or suspension of the certification and recommendation of additional security measures; and

“(III) in the case of a change in tiering, not later than 120 days after the date on which the owner or operator receives notice under subsection (e)(3).

“(G) FACIALLY DEFICIENT SITE SECURITY PLANS.—

“(i) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E), the Secretary may suspend the authority of a covered chemical facility to certify a site security plan if the Secretary—

“(I) determines the certified site security plan or an amended site security plan is facially deficient; and

“(II) not later than 100 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the site security plan and certification, provides the covered chemical facility with written notification that the site security plan is facially deficient, including a clear explanation of each deficiency in the site security plan.

“(ii) ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If, during or after a compliance inspection of an expedited approval facility, the Secretary determines that planned or implemented security measures in the site security plan of the facility are insufficient to meet the risk-based performance standards based on misrepresentation, omission, or an inadequate description of the site, the Secretary may—

“(aa) require additional security measures; or

“(bb) suspend the certification of the facility.

“(II) RECOMMENDATION OF ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES.—If the Secretary suspends the certification of an expedited approval facility under subclause (I), the Secretary shall—

“(aa) recommend specific additional security measures that, if made part of the site security plan by the facility, would enable the Secretary to approve the site security plan; and

“(bb) provide the facility an opportunity to submit a new or modified site security plan and certification under subparagraph (A).

“(III) SUBMISSION; REVIEW.—If an expedited approval facility determines to submit a new

or modified site security plan and certification as authorized under subclause (II)(bb)—

“(aa) not later than 90 days after the date on which the facility receives recommendations under subclause (II)(aa), the facility shall submit the new or modified plan and certification; and

“(bb) not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary receives the new or modified plan under item (aa), the Secretary shall review the plan and determine whether the plan is facially deficient.

“(IV) DETERMINATION NOT TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES.—

“(aa) REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATION.—If an expedited approval facility does not agree to include in its site security plan specific additional security measures recommended by the Secretary under subclause (II)(aa), or does not submit a new or modified site security plan in accordance with subclause (III), the Secretary may revoke the certification of the facility by issuing an order under section 2104(a)(1)(B).

“(bb) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—If the Secretary revokes the certification of an expedited approval facility under item (aa) by issuing an order under section 2104(a)(1)(B)—

“(AA) the order shall require the owner or operator of the facility to submit a site security plan or alternative security program for review by the Secretary review under subsection (c)(1); and

“(BB) the facility shall no longer be eligible to certify a site security plan under this paragraph.

“(V) FACIAL DEFICIENCY.—If the Secretary determines that a new or modified site security plan submitted by an expedited approval facility under subclause (III) is facially deficient—

“(aa) not later than 120 days after the date of the determination, the owner or operator of the facility shall submit a site security plan or alternative security program for review by the Secretary under subsection (c)(1); and

“(bb) the facility shall no longer be eligible to certify a site security plan under this paragraph.

“(H) TEMPLATES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may develop prescriptive site security plan templates with specific security measures to meet the risk-based performance standards under subsection (a)(2)(C) for adoption and certification by a covered chemical facility assigned to tier 3 or 4 in lieu of developing and certifying its own plan.

“(ii) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS TO DEVELOPMENT AND ISSUANCE OF INITIAL SITE SECURITY PLAN TEMPLATES AND RELATED GUIDANCE.—During the period before the Secretary has met the deadline under subparagraph (B)(i), in developing and issuing, or amending, the site security plan templates under this subparagraph, in issuing guidance for implementation of the templates, and in collecting information from expedited approval facilities, the Secretary shall not be subject to—

“(I) section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

“(II) subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code; or

“(III) section 2107(b) of this title.

“(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to prevent a covered chemical facility from developing and certifying its own security plan in accordance with subparagraph (A).

“(I) EVALUATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Protecting

and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall take any appropriate action necessary for a full evaluation of the expedited approval program authorized under this paragraph, including conducting an appropriate number of inspections, as authorized under subsection (d), of expedited approval facilities.

“(ii) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that contains—

“(I)(aa) the number of eligible facilities using the expedited approval program authorized under this paragraph; and

“(bb) the number of facilities that are eligible for the expedited approval program but are using the standard process for developing and submitting a site security plan under subsection (a)(2)(D);

“(II) any costs and efficiencies associated with the expedited approval program;

“(III) the impact of the expedited approval program on the backlog for site security plan approval and authorization inspections;

“(IV) an assessment of the ability of expedited approval facilities to submit facially sufficient site security plans;

“(V) an assessment of any impact of the expedited approval program on the security of chemical facilities; and

“(VI) a recommendation by the Secretary on the frequency of compliance inspections that may be required for expedited approval facilities.

“(d) COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘nondepartmental’—

“(I) with respect to personnel, means personnel that is not employed by the Department; and

“(II) with respect to an entity, means an entity that is not a component or other authority of the Department; and

“(ii) the term ‘nongovernmental’—

“(I) with respect to personnel, means personnel that is not employed by the Federal Government; and

“(II) with respect to an entity, means an entity that is not an agency, department, or other authority of the Federal Government.

“(B) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS.—The Secretary shall conduct audits or inspections under this title using—

“(i) employees of the Department;

“(ii) nondepartmental or nongovernmental personnel approved by the Secretary; or

“(iii) a combination of individuals described in clauses (i) and (ii).

“(C) SUPPORT PERSONNEL.—The Secretary may use nongovernmental personnel to provide administrative and logistical services in support of audits and inspections under this title.

“(D) REPORTING STRUCTURE.—

“(i) NONDEPARTMENTAL AND NONGOVERNMENTAL AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS.—Any audit or inspection conducted by an individual employed by a nondepartmental or nongovernmental entity shall be assigned in coordination with a regional supervisor with responsibility for supervising inspectors within the Infrastructure Security Compliance Division of the Department for the region in which the audit or inspection is to be conducted.

“(ii) REQUIREMENT TO REPORT.—While an individual employed by a nondepartmental

or nongovernmental entity is in the field conducting an audit or inspection under this subsection, the individual shall report to the regional supervisor with responsibility for supervising inspectors within the Infrastructure Security Compliance Division of the Department for the region in which the individual is operating.

“(iii) APPROVAL.—The authority to approve a site security plan under subsection (c) or determine if a covered chemical facility is in compliance with an approved site security plan shall be exercised solely by the Secretary or a designee of the Secretary within the Department.

“(E) STANDARDS FOR AUDITORS AND INSPECTORS.—The Secretary shall prescribe standards for the training and retraining of each individual used by the Department as an auditor or inspector, including each individual employed by the Department and all nondepartmental or nongovernmental personnel, including—

“(i) minimum training requirements for new auditors and inspectors;

“(ii) retraining requirements;

“(iii) minimum education and experience levels;

“(iv) the submission of information as required by the Secretary to enable determination of whether the auditor or inspector has a conflict of interest;

“(v) the proper certification or certifications necessary to handle chemical-terrorism vulnerability information (as defined in section 27.105 of title 6, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto);

“(vi) the reporting of any issue of non-compliance with this section to the Secretary within 24 hours; and

“(vii) any additional qualifications for fitness of duty as the Secretary may require.

“(F) CONDITIONS FOR NONGOVERNMENTAL AUDITORS AND INSPECTORS.—If the Secretary arranges for an audit or inspection under subparagraph (B) to be carried out by a nongovernmental entity, the Secretary shall—

“(i) prescribe standards for the qualification of the individuals who carry out such audits and inspections that are commensurate with the standards for similar Government auditors or inspectors; and

“(ii) ensure that any duties carried out by a nongovernmental entity are not inherently governmental functions.

“(2) PERSONNEL SURETY.—

“(A) PERSONNEL SURETY PROGRAM.—For purposes of this title, the Secretary shall establish and carry out a Personnel Surety Program that—

“(i) does not require an owner or operator of a covered chemical facility that voluntarily participates in the program to submit information about an individual more than 1 time;

“(ii) provides a participating owner or operator of a covered chemical facility with relevant information about an individual based on vetting the individual against the terrorist screening database, to the extent that such feedback is necessary for the facility to be in compliance with regulations promulgated under this title; and

“(iii) provides redress to an individual—

“(I) whose information was vetted against the terrorist screening database under the program; and

“(II) who believes that the personally identifiable information submitted to the Department for such vetting by a covered chemical facility, or its designated representative, was inaccurate.

“(B) PERSONNEL SURETY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.—To the extent that a risk-based

performance standard established under subsection (a) requires identifying individuals with ties to terrorism—

“(i) a covered chemical facility—

“(I) may satisfy its obligation under the standard by using any Federal screening program that periodically vets individuals against the terrorist screening database, or any successor program, including the Personnel Surety Program established under subparagraph (A); and

“(II) shall—

“(aa) accept a credential from a Federal screening program described in subclause (I) if an individual who is required to be screened presents such a credential; and

“(bb) address in its site security plan or alternative security program the measures it will take to verify that a credential or documentation from a Federal screening program described in subclause (I) is current;

“(ii) visual inspection shall be sufficient to meet the requirement under clause (i)(II)(bb), but the facility should consider other means of verification, consistent with the facility’s assessment of the threat posed by acceptance of such credentials; and

“(iii) the Secretary may not require a covered chemical facility to submit any information about an individual unless the individual—

“(I) is to be vetted under the Personnel Surety Program; or

“(II) has been identified as presenting a terrorism security risk.

“(C) RIGHTS UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall supersede the ability—

“(i) of a facility to maintain its own policies regarding the access of individuals to restricted areas or critical assets; or

“(ii) of an employing facility and a bargaining agent, where applicable, to negotiate as to how the results of a background check may be used by the facility with respect to employment status.

“(3) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall share with the owner or operator of a covered chemical facility any information that the owner or operator needs to comply with this section.

“(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—

“(1) IDENTIFICATION OF CHEMICAL FACILITIES OF INTEREST.—In carrying out this title, the Secretary shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies, States and political subdivisions thereof, relevant business associations, and public and private labor organizations to identify all chemical facilities of interest.

“(2) RISK ASSESSMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, the Secretary shall develop a security risk assessment approach and corresponding tiering methodology for covered chemical facilities that incorporates the relevant elements of risk, including threat, vulnerability, and consequence.

“(B) CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING SECURITY RISK.—The criteria for determining the security risk of terrorism associated with a covered chemical facility shall take into account—

“(i) relevant threat information;

“(ii) potential severe economic consequences and the potential loss of human life in the event of the facility being subject to attack, compromise, infiltration, or exploitation by terrorists; and

“(iii) vulnerability of the facility to attack, compromise, infiltration, or exploitation by terrorists.

“(3) CHANGES IN TIERING.—

“(A) MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.—The Secretary shall document the basis for each instance in which—

“(i) tiering for a covered chemical facility is changed; or

“(ii) a covered chemical facility is determined to no longer be subject to the requirements under this title.

“(B) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—The records maintained under subparagraph (A) shall include information on whether and how the Secretary confirmed the information that was the basis for the change or determination described in subparagraph (A).

“(4) SEMIANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORTING.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, and not less frequently than once every 6 months thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that includes, for the period covered by the report—

“(A) the number of covered chemical facilities in the United States;

“(B) information—

“(i) describing—

“(I) the number of instances in which the Secretary—

“(aa) placed a covered chemical facility in a lower risk tier; or

“(bb) determined that a facility that had previously met the criteria for a covered chemical facility under section 2101(3) no longer met the criteria; and

“(II) the basis, in summary form, for each action or determination under subclause (I); and

“(ii) that is provided in a sufficiently anonymized form to ensure that the information does not identify any specific facility or company as the source of the information when viewed alone or in combination with other public information;

“(C) the average number of days spent reviewing site security or an alternative security program for a covered chemical facility prior to approval;

“(D) the number of covered chemical facilities inspected;

“(E) the average number of covered chemical facilities inspected per inspector; and

“(F) any other information that the Secretary determines will be helpful to Congress in evaluating the performance of the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

“SEC. 2103. PROTECTION AND SHARING OF INFORMATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, information developed under this title, including vulnerability assessments, site security plans, and other security related information, records, and documents shall be given protections from public disclosure consistent with the protection of similar information under section 70103(d) of title 46, United States Code.

“(b) SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the sharing of information developed under this title, as the Secretary determines appropriate, with State and local government officials possessing a need to know and the necessary security clearances, including law enforcement officials and first responders, for the purpose of carrying out this title, provided that such information may not be disclosed pursuant to any State or local law.

“(c) SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH FIRST RESPONDERS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall provide to State, local, and regional fusion

centers (as that term is defined in section 210A(j)(1)) and State and local government officials, as the Secretary determines appropriate, such information as is necessary to help ensure that first responders are properly prepared and provided with the situational awareness needed to respond to security incidents at covered chemical facilities.

“(2) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary shall disseminate information under paragraph (1) through a medium or system determined by the Secretary to be appropriate to ensure the secure and expeditious dissemination of such information to necessary selected individuals.

“(d) ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS.—In any proceeding to enforce this section, vulnerability assessments, site security plans, and other information submitted to or obtained by the Secretary under this title, and related vulnerability or security information, shall be treated as if the information were classified information.

“(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code), section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’) shall not apply to information protected from public disclosure pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

“(f) SHARING OF INFORMATION WITH MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Secretary from disclosing information developed under this title to a Member of Congress in response to a request by a Member of Congress.

“SEC. 2104. CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) NOTICE OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—

“(1) NOTICE.—If the Secretary determines that a covered chemical facility is not in compliance with this title, the Secretary shall—

“(A) provide the owner or operator of the facility with—

“(i) not later than 14 days after date on which the Secretary makes the determination, a written notification of noncompliance that includes a clear explanation of any deficiency in the security vulnerability assessment or site security plan; and

“(ii) an opportunity for consultation with the Secretary or the Secretary’s designee; and

“(B) issue to the owner or operator of the facility an order to comply with this title by a date specified by the Secretary in the order, which date shall be not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary issues the order.

“(2) CONTINUED NONCOMPLIANCE.—If an owner or operator remains noncompliant after the procedures outlined in paragraph (1) have been executed, or demonstrates repeated violations of this title, the Secretary may enter an order in accordance with this section assessing a civil penalty, an order to cease operations, or both.

“(b) CIVIL PENALTIES.—

“(1) VIOLATIONS OF ORDERS.—Any person who violates an order issued under this title shall be liable for a civil penalty under section 70119(a) of title 46, United States Code.

“(2) NON-REPORTING CHEMICAL FACILITIES OF INTEREST.—Any owner of a chemical facility of interest who fails to comply with, or knowingly submits false information under, this title or the CFATS regulations shall be liable for a civil penalty under section 70119(a) of title 46, United States Code.

“(c) EMERGENCY ORDERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) or any site security plan or alternative security program approved under this

title, if the Secretary determines that there is an imminent threat of death, serious illness, or severe personal injury, due to a violation of this title or the risk of a terrorist incident that may affect a chemical facility of interest, the Secretary—

“(A) shall consult with the facility, if practicable, on steps to mitigate the risk; and

“(B) may order the facility, without notice or opportunity for a hearing, effective immediately or as soon as practicable, to—

“(i) implement appropriate emergency security measures; or

“(ii) cease or reduce some or all operations, in accordance with safe shutdown procedures, if the Secretary determines that such a cessation or reduction of operations is the most appropriate means to address the risk.

“(2) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.—The Secretary may not delegate the authority under paragraph (1) to any official other than the Under Secretary responsible for overseeing critical infrastructure protection, cybersecurity, and other related programs of the Department appointed under section 103(a)(1)(H).

“(3) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may exercise the authority under this subsection only to the extent necessary to abate the imminent threat determination under paragraph (1).

“(4) DUE PROCESS FOR FACILITY OWNER OR OPERATOR.—

“(A) WRITTEN ORDERS.—An order issued by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be in the form of a written emergency order that—

“(i) describes the violation or risk that creates the imminent threat;

“(ii) states the security measures or order issued or imposed; and

“(iii) describes the standards and procedures for obtaining relief from the order.

“(B) OPPORTUNITY FOR REVIEW.—After issuing an order under paragraph (1) with respect to a chemical facility of interest, the Secretary shall provide for review of the order under section 554 of title 5 if a petition for review is filed not later than 20 days after the date on which the Secretary issues the order.

“(C) EXPIRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF ORDER.—If a petition for review of an order is filed under subparagraph (B) and the review under that paragraph is not completed by the last day of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the petition is filed, the order shall vacate automatically at the end of that period unless the Secretary determines, in writing, that the imminent threat providing a basis for the order continues to exist.

“(d) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this title confers upon any person except the Secretary or his or her designee a right of action against an owner or operator of a covered chemical facility to enforce any provision of this title.

“SEC. 2105. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.

“(a) PROCEDURE FOR REPORTING PROBLEMS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF A REPORTING PROCEDURE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall establish, and provide information to the public regarding, a procedure under which any employee or contractor of a chemical facility of interest may submit a report to the Secretary regarding a violation of a requirement under this title.

“(2) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Secretary shall keep confidential the identity of an indi-

vidual who submits a report under paragraph (1) and any such report shall be treated as a record containing protected information to the extent that the report does not consist of publicly available information.

“(3) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT.—If a report submitted under paragraph (1) identifies the individual making the report, the Secretary shall promptly respond to the individual directly and shall promptly acknowledge receipt of the report.

“(4) STEPS TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS.—The Secretary—

“(A) shall review and consider the information provided in any report submitted under paragraph (1); and

“(B) may take action under section 2104 of this title if necessary to address any substantiated violation of a requirement under this title identified in the report.

“(5) DUE PROCESS FOR FACILITY OWNER OR OPERATOR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If, upon the review described in paragraph (4), the Secretary determines that a violation of a provision of this title, or a regulation prescribed under this title, has occurred, the Secretary may—

“(i) institute a civil enforcement under section 2104(a) of this title; or

“(ii) if the Secretary makes the determination under section 2104(c), issue an emergency order.

“(B) WRITTEN ORDERS.—The action of the Secretary under paragraph (4) shall be in a written form that—

“(i) describes the violation;

“(ii) states the authority under which the Secretary is proceeding; and

“(iii) describes the standards and procedures for obtaining relief from the order.

“(C) OPPORTUNITY FOR REVIEW.—After taking action under paragraph (4), the Secretary shall provide for review of the action if a petition for review is filed within 20 calendar days of the date of issuance of the order for the action.

“(D) EXPIRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF ORDER.—If a petition for review of an action is filed under subparagraph (C) and the review under that subparagraph is not completed by the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the petition is filed, the action shall cease to be effective at the end of such period unless the Secretary determines, in writing, that the violation providing a basis for the action continues to exist.

“(6) RETALIATION PROHIBITED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An owner or operator of a chemical facility of interest or agent thereof may not discharge an employee or otherwise discriminate against an employee with respect to the compensation provided to, or terms, conditions, or privileges of the employment of, the employee because the employee (or an individual acting pursuant to a request of the employee) submitted a report under paragraph (1).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—An employee shall not be entitled to the protections under this section if the employee—

“(i) knowingly and willfully makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or

“(ii) uses any false writing or document knowing the writing or document contains any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry.

“(b) PROTECTED DISCLOSURES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit the right of an individual to make any disclosure—

“(1) protected or authorized under section 2302(b)(8) or 7211 of title 5, United States Code;

“(2) protected under any other Federal or State law that shields the disclosing individual against retaliation or discrimination for having made the disclosure in the public interest; or

“(3) to the Special Counsel of an agency, the inspector general of an agency, or any other employee designated by the head of an agency to receive disclosures similar to the disclosures described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

“(c) PUBLICATION OF RIGHTS.—The Secretary, in partnership with industry associations and labor organizations, shall make publicly available both physically and online the rights that an individual who discloses information, including security-sensitive information, regarding problems, deficiencies, or vulnerabilities at a covered chemical facility would have under Federal whistleblower protection laws or this title.

“(d) PROTECTED INFORMATION.—All information contained in a report made under this subsection (a) shall be protected in accordance with section 2103.

“SEC. 2106. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

“(a) OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to supersede, amend, alter, or affect any Federal law that—

“(1) regulates (including by requiring information to be submitted or made available) the manufacture, distribution in commerce, use, handling, sale, other treatment, or disposal of chemical substances or mixtures; or

“(2) authorizes or requires the disclosure of any record or information obtained from a chemical facility under any law other than this title.

“(b) STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—This title shall not preclude or deny any right of any State or political subdivision thereof to adopt or enforce any regulation, requirement, or standard of performance with respect to chemical facility security that is more stringent than a regulation, requirement, or standard of performance issued under this section, or otherwise impair any right or jurisdiction of any State with respect to chemical facilities within that State, unless there is an actual conflict between this section and the law of that State.

“SEC. 2107. CFATS REGULATIONS.

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may, in accordance with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, promulgate regulations or amend existing CFATS regulations to implement the provisions under this title.

“(b) EXISTING CFATS REGULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 4(b) of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, each existing CFATS regulation shall remain in effect unless the Secretary amends, consolidates, or repeals the regulation.

“(2) REPEAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall repeal any existing CFATS regulation that the Secretary determines is duplicative of, or conflicts with, this title.

“(c) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall exclusively rely upon authority provided under this title in—

“(1) determining compliance with this title;

“(2) identifying chemicals of interest; and

“(3) determining security risk associated with a chemical facility.

“SEC. 2108. SMALL COVERED CHEMICAL FACILITIES.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘small covered chemical facility’ means a covered chemical facility that—

“(1) has fewer than 100 employees employed at the covered chemical facility; and

“(2) is owned and operated by a small business concern (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)).

“(b) ASSISTANCE TO FACILITIES.—The Secretary may provide guidance and, as appropriate, tools, methodologies, or computer software, to assist small covered chemical facilities in developing the physical security, cybersecurity, recordkeeping, and reporting procedures required under this title.

“(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on best practices that may assist small covered chemical facilities in development of physical security best practices.

“SEC. 2109. OUTREACH TO CHEMICAL FACILITIES OF INTEREST.

“Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Protecting and Securing Chemical Facilities from Terrorist Attacks Act of 2014, the Secretary shall establish an outreach implementation plan, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate Federal and State agencies, relevant business associations, and public and private labor organizations, to—

“(1) identify chemical facilities of interest; and

“(2) make available compliance assistance materials and information on education and training.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-196; 116 Stat. 2135) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE XXI—CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM STANDARDS

“Sec. 2101. Definitions.

“Sec. 2102. Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program.

“Sec. 2103. Protection and sharing of information.

“Sec. 2104. Civil enforcement.

“Sec. 2105. Whistleblower protections.

“Sec. 2106. Relationship to other laws.

“Sec. 2107. CFATS regulations.

“Sec. 2108. Small covered chemical facilities.

“Sec. 2109. Outreach to chemical facilities of interest.”.

SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT; REPORTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program” means—

(A) the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards program initially authorized under section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109-295; 6 U.S.C. 121 note); and

(B) the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program subsequently authorized under section 2102(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2;

(2) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security; and

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) THIRD-PARTY ASSESSMENT.—Using amounts appropriated to the Department before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall commission a third-party study to assess vulnerabilities of covered

chemical facilities, as defined in section 2101 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by section 2), to acts of terrorism.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program that includes—

(A) a certification by the Secretary that the Secretary has made significant progress in the identification of all chemical facilities of interest under section 2102(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, including—

(i) a description of the steps taken to achieve that progress and the metrics used to measure the progress;

(ii) information on whether facilities that submitted Top-Screens as a result of the identification of chemical facilities of interest were tiered and in what tiers those facilities were placed; and

(iii) an action plan to better identify chemical facilities of interest and bring those facilities into compliance with title XXI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2;

(B) a certification by the Secretary that the Secretary has developed a risk assessment approach and corresponding tiering methodology under section 2102(e)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2;

(C) an assessment by the Secretary of the implementation by the Department of the recommendations made by the Homeland Security Studies and Analysis Institute as outlined in the Institute’s Tiering Methodology Peer Review (Publication Number: RP12-22-02); and

(D) a description of best practices that may assist small covered chemical facilities, as defined in section 2108(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, in the development of physical security best practices.

(2) ANNUAL GAO REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—During the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress an annual report that assesses the implementation of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(B) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the first report under subparagraph (A).

(C) SECOND ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the initial report required under subparagraph (B), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the second report under subparagraph (A), which shall include an assessment of the whistleblower protections provided under section 2105 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, and—

(i) describes the number and type of problems, deficiencies, and vulnerabilities with respect to which reports have been submitted under such section 2105;

(ii) evaluates the efforts of the Secretary in addressing the problems, deficiencies, and vulnerabilities described in subsection (a)(1) of such section 2105; and

(iii) evaluates the efforts of the Secretary to inform individuals of their rights, as re-

quired under subsection (c) of such section 2105.

(D) THIRD ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Comptroller General submits the second report required under subparagraph (A), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the third report under subparagraph (A), which shall include an assessment of—

(i) the expedited approval program authorized under section 2102(c)(4) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2; and

(ii) the report on the expedited approval program submitted by the Secretary under subparagraph (I)(ii) of such section 2102(c)(4).

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE; CONFORMING REPEAL.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 550 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109-295; 120 Stat. 1388), is repealed as of the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION.

The authority provided under title XXI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2(a), shall terminate on the date that is 4 years after the effective date of this Act.

SA 4001. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2952, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess the cybersecurity workforce of the Department of Homeland Security and develop a comprehensive workforce strategy, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Cybersecurity Workforce Assessment Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Cybersecurity Category” means a position’s or incumbent’s primary work function involving cybersecurity, which is further defined by Specialty Area;

(2) the term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security;

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(4) the term “Specialty Area” means any of the common types of cybersecurity work as recognized by the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education’s National Cybersecurity Workforce Framework report.

SEC. 3. CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGY.

(a) WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 3 years, the Secretary shall assess the cybersecurity workforce of the Department.

(2) CONTENTS.—The assessment required under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum—

(A) an assessment of the readiness and capacity of the workforce of the Department to meet its cybersecurity mission;

(B) information on where cybersecurity workforce positions are located within the Department;

(C) information on which cybersecurity workforce positions are—

(i) performed by—

(I) permanent full-time equivalent employees of the Department, including, to the

greatest extent practicable, demographic information about such employees;

(II) independent contractors; and
(III) individuals employed by other Federal agencies, including the National Security Agency; or

(ii) vacant; and

(D) information on—

(i) the percentage of individuals within each Cybersecurity Category and Specialty Area who received essential training to perform their jobs; and

(ii) in cases in which such essential training was not received, what challenges, if any, were encountered with respect to the provision of such essential training.

(b) WORKFORCE STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, develop a comprehensive workforce strategy to enhance the readiness, capacity, training, recruitment, and retention of the cybersecurity workforce of the Department; and

(B) maintain and, as necessary, update the comprehensive workforce strategy developed under subparagraph (A).

(2) CONTENTS.—The comprehensive workforce strategy developed under paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

(A) a multi-phased recruitment plan, including with respect to experienced professionals, members of disadvantaged or underserved communities, the unemployed, and veterans;

(B) a 5-year implementation plan;

(C) a 10-year projection of the cybersecurity workforce needs of the Department;

(D) any obstacle impeding the hiring and development of a cybersecurity workforce in the Department; and

(E) any gap in the existing cybersecurity workforce of the Department and a plan to fill any such gap.

(c) UPDATES.—The Secretary submit to the appropriate congressional committees annual updates on—

(1) the cybersecurity workforce assessment required under subsection (a); and

(2) the progress of the Secretary in carrying out the comprehensive workforce strategy required to be developed under subsection (b).

SEC. 4. CYBERSECURITY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the feasibility, cost, and benefits of establishing a Cybersecurity Fellowship Program to offer a tuition payment plan for individuals pursuing undergraduate and doctoral degrees who agree to work for the Department for an agreed-upon period of time.

SA 4002. Mrs. BOXER (for Mr. CARPER) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2952, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess the cybersecurity workforce of the Department of Homeland Security and develop a comprehensive workforce strategy, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess the cybersecurity workforce of the Department of Homeland Security and develop a comprehensive workforce strategy, and for other purposes.”.

SA 4003. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 30. DEFERRED MAINTENANCE BACKLOG ON FEDERAL LAND.

Section 7(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–9(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) To address the maintenance backlog on Federal land.”.

SA 4004. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 30. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.

Any land designated as a unit of the National Park System or a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System under this title shall not be subject to chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code.

SA 4005. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 30. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITION.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act (or an amendment made by this Act) may be obligated or expended to establish a new unit of the National Park System or to acquire Federal land until the date on which the Secretary of the Interior certifies that the maintenance backlog on Federal land has declined for at least 2 consecutive years.

SA 4006. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION E—EFFECT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS

SEC. 5001. SEALASKA LAND ENTITLEMENT FINALIZATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3002 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5002. BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3031 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5003. COLTSVILLE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3032 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5004. FIRST STATE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3033 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5005. HINCHLIFFE STADIUM ADDITION TO PATERSON GREAT FALLS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3037 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5006. MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3039 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5007. VALLES CALDERA NATIONAL PRESERVE, NEW MEXICO.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3043 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5008. VICKSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3044 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5009. REVOLUTIONARY WAR AND WAR OF 1812 AMERICAN BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3050 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5010. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3051 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5011. NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS AND CORRIDORS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3052 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5012. COMMISSION TO STUDY THE POTENTIAL CREATION OF A NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3056 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5013. ALPINE LAKES WILDERNESS ADDITIONS AND PRATT AND MIDDLE FORK SNOQUALMIE RIVERS PROTECTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3060 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5014. COLUMBINE-HONDO WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3061 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5015. HERMOSA CREEK WATERSHED PROTECTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3062 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5016. NORTH FORK FEDERAL LANDS WITHDRAWAL AREA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3063 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5017. PINE FOREST RANGE WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3064 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5018. ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREA AND WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3065 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5019. WOVOKA WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3066 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5020. WITHDRAWAL AREA RELATED TO WOVOKA WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3067 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5021. ILLABOT CREEK, WASHINGTON, WILD AND SCENIC RIVER.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3071 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5022. MISSISQUOI AND TROUT WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS, VERMONT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3072 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5023. WHITE CLAY CREEK WILD AND SCENIC RIVER EXPANSION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3073 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5024. STUDIES OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3074 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5025. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES RELATED TO LAS VEGAS VALLEY PUBLIC LAND AND TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3092 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5026. REFINANCING OF PACIFIC COAST GROUND FISH FISHING CAPACITY REDUCTION LOAN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3095 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 5027. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3096 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4007. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ CRITERIA FOR OCO FUNDING REQUESTS.**(a) CERTIFICATION BY DIRECTOR OF OMB.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any request of the President for funds for overseas contingency operations to be carried out by the Armed Forces (including any request for supplemental funding for a fiscal year for such purpose) shall include, for each program, project, activity, or other item for which funds are so requested, a certification by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget whether

such program, project, activity, or item meets one or more of the criteria specified in paragraph (3).

(2) SCOPE OF CERTIFICATION.—Each certification under paragraph (1) for a program, project, activity, or item that meets more than one of the criteria specified in paragraph (3) shall specify each of the criteria which such program, project, activity, or item meets.

(3) CRITERIA.—The criteria specified in this paragraph are as follows:

(A) MAJOR EQUIPMENT.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for major equipment as follows:

(i) Replacement of losses that have occurred, other than—

(I) items already programmed for replacement in the future-years defense program; and

(II) accelerations of replacements.

(ii) Replacement or repair to original capability (to upgraded capability if currently available) of equipment returning from a theater operations—

(I) including replacement by a similar end item if the original item is no longer in production; but

(II) excluding incremental cost of non-war related upgrades.

(iii) Procurement of specialized, theater-specific equipment.

(B) GROUND EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for replacement of ground equipment as follows:

(i) Replacement of combat losses and returning equipment that is not economical to repair, including replacement of equipment to be given to coalition partners.

(ii) Replacement of in-theater stocks above customary equipping levels, if jointly determined by the Director and the Secretary of Defense to be consistent with the purposes of certification under paragraph (1).

(C) EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for operationally-required modifications to equipment used in a theater of operations or in direct support of combat operations, other than modifications already programmed in the future-years defense program.

(D) MUNITIONS.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for munitions as follows:

(i) Replenishment of munitions expended in combat operations in a theater of operations.

(ii) Procurement of training ammunition for training events unique to a theater of operations.

(iii) Anticipated procurement of munitions where existing stocks are insufficient to sustain combat operations in a theater of operations, if jointly determined by the Director and the Secretary to be consistent with the purposes of certification under paragraph (1).

(E) AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for replacement of aircraft as follows:

(i) Replacement of combat losses by accident that occur in a theater of operations.

(ii) Replacement of combat losses by enemy action that occur in a theater of operations.

(F) MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for military construction as follows:

(i) Construction of facilities and infrastructure in a theater of operations in direct support of combat operations.

(ii) Construction at non-enduring locations of facilities, and infrastructure for temporary use.

(iii) Construction at enduring locations of facilities and infrastructure for temporary use.

(iv) Construction at enduring locations for surge operations or major changes in operational requirements, if jointly determined by the Director and the Secretary to be consistent with the purposes of certification under paragraph (1).

(G) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for research and development for combat operations that can be delivered in 12 months.

(H) OPERATIONS.—That the item is for operations as follows:

(i) Direct war costs, including the following:

(I) Transport of personnel, equipment, and supplies to, from, and within a theater of operations.

(II) Deployment-specific training and preparation for units and personnel (whether military or civilian) to assume their directed missions as defined in the orders for deployment into a theater of operations.

(ii) Within a theater of operations, incremental costs for purposes as follows:

(I) To support commanders in the conduct of their directed missions (including Emergency Response Programs).

(II) To build and maintain temporary facilities.

(III) To provide food, fuel, supplies, contracted services and other support.

(IV) To cover the operational costs of coalition partners supporting military missions of the United States Armed Forces.

(iii) Indirect war costs incurred outside a theater of operations, if jointly determined by the Director and the Secretary to be consistent with the purposes of certification under paragraph (1).

(I) HEALTH CARE.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for health care as follows:

(i) Provision of short-term care directly related to combat.

(ii) Procurement of infrastructure that is only to be used during the current conflict.

(J) PERSONNEL.—That the item is for pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces as follows:

(i) Payment of incremental special pays and allowances for members of the Armed Forces and civilians deployed to a combat zone.

(ii) Payment of incremental pay, special pays, and allowances for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are mobilized to support war missions.

(K) SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for the United States Special Operations Command as follows:

(i) Operations certifiable under another subparagraph of this paragraph.

(ii) Equipment certifiable under another subparagraph of this paragraph.

(L) PREPOSITIONED SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for procurement of prepositioned supplies and equipment for resetting in-theater stocks of supplies and equipment to pre-conflict levels.

(M) SECURITY FORCES.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for training, equipping, and sustaining military and police forces of countries in a theater of operations.

(N) FUEL.—That the program, project, activity, or item is for fuel as follows:

(i) Procurement of fuel for logistical support for combat operations.

(ii) Maintenance of Defense Working Capital Funds to cover seven-day disbursements

for base fuel shortfalls attributable to fuel price increases.

(b) SENATE POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any appropriations legislation, including any amendment thereto, motion in relation thereto, or conference report thereon, that includes amounts designated for overseas contingency operations unless such amounts are for a program, project, activity, or other item that meets one or more of the criteria specified in subsection (a)(3).

(2) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(A) WAIVER.—In the Senate, paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under paragraph (1).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Notwithstanding section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), if, for any fiscal year, appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that the Congress designates for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, the adjustment to discretionary spending limits under such section 251(b)(2)(A) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism shall be the total of only such appropriations in discretionary accounts that are certified by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to be for a program, project, activity, or other item that meets one or more criteria specified in subsection (a)(3).

SA 4008. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INSTALLATION RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECT DATABASE.

(a) LIMITATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a searchable database to uniformly report information regarding installation renewable energy projects undertaken since 2010.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The database established under subsection (a) shall include, for each installation energy project—

- (1) the estimated project costs;
- (2) estimated power generation;
- (3) estimated total cost savings;
- (4) estimated payback period;
- (5) total project costs;
- (6) actual power generation;
- (7) actual cost savings to date;
- (8) current operational status; and
- (9) access to relevant business case documents, including the economic viability assessment.

(c) UPDATES.—The database established under subsection (a) shall be updated not less than quarterly.

SA 4009. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ENHANCED WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION FOR CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.

(a) PROHIBITION ON PREVENTION OF WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES.—

(1) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—Section 2409(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “may not be discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for disclosing” and inserting “may not be prohibited in any way from, or discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for, disclosing”.

(2) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—Section 4705(b) of title 41, United States Code, is amended by striking “may not be discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for disclosing” and inserting “may not be prohibited in any way from, or discharged, demoted, or otherwise discriminated against as a reprisal for, disclosing”.

(b) CONTRACT CLAUSE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to require that any contract entered into after such date by an executive agency, and any subcontract at any tier, include the following clause: “The contractor shall not enter into any agreement with an employee performing work under this contract that would prohibit that employee from disclosing information as described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 2409(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code or section 4705(b) of title 41, United States Code, to officials described in such sections.”.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY DEFINED.—The term “executive agency” has the meaning given the term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

SA 4010. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE ____ —AUDIT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEC. ____ 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Audit the Pentagon Act of 2014”.

SEC. ____ 02. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States requires all agencies of the Federal Government, including the Department of Defense, to publish “a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money”.

(2) Section 3515 of title 31, United States Code, requires the agencies of the Federal Government, including the Department of Defense, to present auditable financial statements beginning not later than March 1, 1997. The Department has not complied with this law.

(3) The Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996 (31 U.S.C. 3512 note) requires financial systems acquired by the Federal Government, including the Department of Defense, to be able to provide information to leaders to manage and control the cost of Government. The Department has not complied with this law.

(4) The financial management of the Department of Defense has been on the “High-Risk” list of the Government Accountability Office, which means that the Department is not consistently able to “control costs; ensure basic accountability; anticipate future costs and claims on the budget; measure performance; maintain funds control; [and] prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse”.

(5) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107) requires the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress annually on the reliability of the financial statements of the Department of Defense, to minimize resources spent on producing unreliable financial statements, and to use resources saved to improve financial management policies, procedures, and internal controls.

(6) In 2005, the Department of Defense created a Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Plan, overseen by a directorate within the office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), to improve Department business processes with the goal of producing timely, reliable, and accurate financial information that could generate an audit-ready annual financial statement. In December 2005, that directorate, known as the FIAR Directorate, issued the first of a series of semiannual reports on the status of the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan.

(7) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) requires regular status reports on the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan described in paragraph (6), and codified as a statutory requirement the goal of the Plan in ensuring that Department of Defense financial statements are validated as ready for audit not later than September 30, 2017. In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) requires that the statement of budgetary resources of the Department of Defense be validated as ready for audit by not later than September 30, 2014.

(8) At a September 2010 hearing of the Senate, the Government Accountability Office stated that past expenditures by the Department of Defense of \$5,800,000,000 to improve financial information, and billions of dollars more of anticipated expenditures on new information technology systems for that purpose, may not suffice to achieve full audit readiness of the financial statement of the Department. At that hearing, the Government Accountability Office could not predict when the Department would achieve full audit readiness of such statements.

(9) At a 2013 hearing of the Senate, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel affirmed his commitment to audit-ready budget statements for the Department of Defense by the end of 2014, and stated that he “will do everything he can to fulfill this commitment”. At that hearing, Secretary Hagel noted that

auditable financial statements were essential to the Department not only for improving the quality of its financial information, but also for reassuring the public and Congress that it is a good steward of public funds.

SEC. 03. CESSATION OF APPLICABILITY OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) CESSATION OF APPLICABILITY.—

(1) **MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.**—The financial statements of a military department shall cease to be covered by the reporting requirements specified in subsection (b) upon the issuance of an unqualified audit opinion on such financial statements.

(2) **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**—The reporting requirements specified in subsection (b) shall cease to be effective when an unqualified audit opinion is issued on the financial statements of the Department of Defense, including each of the military departments and the other reporting entities defined by the Office of Management and Budget.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—The reporting requirements specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) The requirement for annual reports in section 892(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383; 124 Stat. 4311; 10 U.S.C. 2306a note).

(2) The requirement for semi-annual reports in section 1003(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2440; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note).

(3) The requirement for annual reports in section 817(d) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (10 U.S.C. 2306a note).

(4) The requirement for annual reports in section 1008(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107; 115 Stat. 1204; 10 U.S.C. 113 note).

(5) The requirement for periodic reports in section 908(b) of the Defense Acquisition Improvement Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-500; 100 Stat. 1783-140; 10 U.S.C. 2326 note) and duplicate requirements as provided for in section 6 of the Defense Technical Corrections Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-26; 101 Stat. 274; 10 U.S.C. 2302 note).

SEC. 04. ENHANCED REPROGRAMMING AUTHORITY FOLLOWING ACHIEVEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND MILITARY DEPARTMENTS OF AUDIT WITH UNQUALIFIED OPINION OF STATEMENT OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES FOR FISCAL YEARS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2014.

(a) **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GENERALLY.**—Subject to section 06(1), if the Department of Defense obtains an audit with an unqualified opinion on its statement of budgetary resources for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2014, the limitation on the total amount of authorizations that the Secretary of Defense may transfer pursuant to general transfer authority available to the Secretary in the national interest in the succeeding fiscal year shall be \$8,000,000,000.

(b) **MILITARY DEPARTMENTS, DEFENSE AGENCIES, AND DEFENSE FIELD ACTIVITIES.**—Subject to section 07(a), if a military department, Defense Agency, or defense field activity obtains an audit with an unqualified opinion on its statement of budgetary resources for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2014, the thresholds for reprogramming of funds of such military department, Defense Agency, or defense field activity, as the case

may be, without prior notice to Congress for the succeeding fiscal year shall be deemed to be the thresholds as follows:

(1) In the case of an increase or decrease to the program base amount for a procurement program, \$60,000,000.

(2) In the case of an increase or decrease to the program base amount for a research program, \$30,000,000.

(3) In the case of an increase or decrease to the amount for a budget activity for operation and maintenance, \$45,000,000.

(4) In the case of an increase or decrease to the amount for a budget activity for military personnel, \$30,000,000.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or revise any requirement (other than a threshold amount) for notice to Congress on transfers covered by subsection (a) or reprogrammings covered by subsection (b) under any other provision of law.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “program base amount”, “procurement program”, “research program”, and “budget activity” have the meanings given such terms in chapter 6 of volume 3 of the Financial Management Regulation of the Department of Defense (DoD 7000.14R), dated March 2011, or any successor document.

SEC. 05. FAILURE TO OBTAIN AUDITS WITH UNQUALIFIED OPINION OF FISCAL YEAR 2015 GENERAL FUND STATEMENT OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Department of Defense fails to obtain an audit with an unqualified opinion on its general fund statement of budgetary resources for fiscal year 2015 by December 31, 2015, the following shall take effect on January 1, 2016:

(1) **ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES OF USD (COMPTROLLER).**—

(A) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Any individual nominated for appointment to the position of Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) under section 135 of title 10, United States Code, shall be an individual who has served—

(i) as the chief financial officer or equivalent position of a Federal or State agency that has received an audit with an unqualified opinion on such agency's financial statements during the time of such individual's service; or

(ii) as the chief financial officer or equivalent position of a public company that has received an audit with an unqualified opinion on such company's financial statements during the time of such individual's service.

(B) **DUTIES AND POWERS.**—The duties and powers of the individual serving as Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall include, in addition to the duties and powers specified in section 135(c) of title 10, United States Code, such duties and powers with respect to the financial management of the Department of Defense as the Deputy Secretary of Defense (acting in the capacity of Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense) or a successor official in the Department of Defense (acting in such capacity) may prescribe.

(2) **ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ASA FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.**—

(A) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Any individual nominated for appointment to the position of Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management under section 3016 of title 10, United States Code, shall be an individual who has served—

(i) as the chief financial officer or equivalent position of a Federal or State agency that has received an audit with an unqualified opinion on such agency's financial state-

ments during the time of such individual's service; or

(ii) as the chief financial officer or equivalent position of a public company that has received an audit with an unqualified opinion on such company's financial statements during the time of such individual's service.

(B) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The responsibilities of the individual serving as Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management shall include, in addition to the responsibilities specified in section 3016(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, such responsibilities as the Deputy Secretary of Defense (acting in the capacity of Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense) or a successor official in the Department of Defense (acting in such capacity) may prescribe.

(3) **ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ASN FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.**—

(A) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Any individual nominated for appointment to the position of Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management under section 5016 of title 10, United States Code, shall be an individual who has served—

(i) as the chief financial officer or equivalent position of a Federal or State agency that has received an audit with an unqualified opinion on such agency's financial statements during the time of such individual's service; or

(ii) as the chief financial officer or equivalent position of a public company that has received an audit with an unqualified opinion on such company's financial statements during the time of such individual's service.

(B) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The responsibilities of the individual serving as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management shall include, in addition to the responsibilities specified in section 5016(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, such responsibilities as the Deputy Secretary of Defense (acting in the capacity of Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense) or a successor official in the Department of Defense (acting in such capacity) may prescribe.

(4) **ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ASAF FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.**—

(A) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—Any individual nominated for appointment to the position of Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management under section 8016 of title 10, United States Code, shall be an individual who has served—

(i) as the chief financial officer or equivalent position of a Federal or State agency that has received an audit with an unqualified opinion on such agency's financial statements during the time of such individual's service; or

(ii) as the chief financial officer or equivalent position of a public company that has received an audit with an unqualified opinion on such company's financial statements during the time of such individual's service.

(B) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The responsibilities of the individual serving as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management shall include, in addition to the responsibilities specified in section 8016(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, such responsibilities as the Deputy Secretary of Defense (acting in the capacity of Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense) or a successor official in the Department of Defense (acting in such capacity) may prescribe.

(b) **PUBLIC COMPANY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “public company” has the

meaning given the term “issuer” in section 2(a)(7) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7201(a)(7)).

SEC. 06. FAILURE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO OBTAIN AUDITS WITH UNQUALIFIED OPINION OF FISCAL YEAR 2018 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

If the Department of Defense fails to obtain an audit with an unqualified opinion on its general fund statement of budgetary resources for fiscal year 2018 by December 31, 2018:

(1) **PERMANENT CESSATION OF ENHANCED GENERAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY.**—Effective as of January 1, 2019, the authority in section 44(a) shall cease to be available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018 and any fiscal year thereafter.

(2) **REORGANIZATION OF RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER.**—Effective as of April 1, 2019:

(A) **POSITION OF CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER.**—Section 132a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 132a. Chief Management Officer

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—(1) There is a Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

“(2) Any individual nominated for appointment as Chief Management Officer shall be an individual who has—

“(A) extensive executive level leadership and management experience in the public or private sector;

“(B) strong leadership skills;

“(C) a demonstrated ability to manage large and complex organizations; and

“(D) a proven record in achieving positive operational results.

“(b) **POWERS AND DUTIES.**—The Chief Management Officer shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe.

“(c) **SERVICE AS CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER.**—(1) The Chief Management Officer is the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

“(2) In serving as the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, the Chief Management Officer shall be responsible for the management and administration of the Department of Defense with respect to the following:

“(A) The expenditure of funds, accounting, and finance.

“(B) Procurement, including procurement of any enterprise resource planning (ERP) system and any information technology (IT) system that is a financial feeder system, human resources system, or logistics system.

“(C) Facilities, property, nonmilitary equipment, and other resources.

“(D) Strategic planning, annual performance planning, and identification and tracking of performance measures.

“(E) Internal audits and management analyses of the programs and activities of the Department, including the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

“(F) Such other areas or matters as the Secretary of Defense may designate.

“(3) The head of the Defense Contract Audit Agency shall be under the supervision of, and shall report directly to, the Chief Management Officer.

“(d) **PRECEDENCE.**—The Chief Management Officer takes precedence in the Department of Defense after the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense.”.

(B) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(i) Section 131(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(I) by striking paragraph (3);

(II) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(III) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) The Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.”.

(ii) Section 132 of such title is amended—

(I) by striking subsection (c); and

(II) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(iii) Section 133(e)(1) of such title is amended by striking “and the Deputy Secretary of Defense” and inserting “, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense”.

(iv) Such title is further amended by inserting “the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense,” after “the Deputy Secretary of Defense,” each place it appears in the provisions as follows:

(I) Section 133(e)(2).

(II) Section 134(c).

(v) Section 137a(d) of such title is amended by striking “the Secretaries of the military departments,” and all that follows and inserting “the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Under Secretaries of Defense.”.

(vi) Section 138(d) of such title is amended by striking “the Secretaries of the military departments,” and all that follows through the period and inserting “the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, the Under Secretaries of Defense, and the Director of Defense Research and Engineering.”.

(C) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 4 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 132a and inserting the following new item:

“132a. Chief Management Officer.”.

(D) **EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE.**—Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.”.

(E) **REFERENCE IN LAW.**—Any reference in any provision of law to the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense shall be deemed to refer to the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense under section 132a of title 10, United States Code (as amended by this paragraph).

(3) **JURISDICTION OF DFAS.**—Effective as of April 1, 2019:

(A) **TRANSFER TO DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.**—Jurisdiction of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) is transferred from the Department of Defense to the Department of the Treasury.

(B) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall administer the Defense Finance and Accounting Service following transfer under this paragraph through the Financial Management Service of the Department of the Treasury.

(C) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the transfer of jurisdiction of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service under this paragraph. The memorandum of understanding shall provide for the transfer of the personnel and other resources of the Service to the Department of the Treasury and for the assumption of responsibility for such personnel and resources by the Department of the Treasury.

(D) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as terminating, altering, or revising any responsibilities or authorities of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (other than responsibilities and authorities in connection with the exercise of jurisdiction of the Service following transfer under this paragraph).

SEC. 07. FAILURE OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS TO OBTAIN AUDITS WITH UNQUALIFIED OPINION OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) **PERMANENT CESSATION OF AUTHORITIES ON REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS.**—If a military department fails to obtain an audit with an unqualified opinion on its financial statements for fiscal year 2018 by December 31, 2018, effective as of January 1, 2019, the authorities in section 44(b) shall cease to be available to the military department for fiscal year 2018 and any fiscal year thereafter.

(b) **ANNUAL PROHIBITION ON EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN MDAPS PAST MILESTONE B IN CONNECTION WITH FAILURE.**—

(1) **PROHIBITION.**—Effective for fiscal years after fiscal year 2017, if a military department fails to obtain an audit with an unqualified opinion on its financial statements for any fiscal year, effective as of the date of the issuance of the opinion on such audit, amounts available to the military department for the following fiscal year may not be obligated by the military department for a weapon or weapon system or platform being acquired as a major defense acquisition program for any activity beyond Milestone B approval unless such program has already achieved Milestone B approval of the date of the issuance of the opinion on such audit.

(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) The term “major defense acquisition program” has the meaning given that term in section 2430 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) The term “Milestone B approval” has the meaning given that term in section 2366(e)(7) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 08. ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING.

The Secretary of Defense shall amend the acquisition guidance of the Department of Defense to provide for the following:

(1) The Defense Business System Management Committee may not approve procurement of any Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) business system that is independently estimated to take longer than three years to procure from initial obligation of funds to full deployment and sustainment.

(2) Any contract for the acquisition of an Enterprise Resource Planning business system shall include a provision authorizing termination of the contract at no cost to the Government if procurement of the system takes longer than three years from initial obligation of funds to full deployment and sustainment.

(3) Any implementation of an Enterprise Resource Planning system shall comply with each of the following:

(A) The current Business Enterprise Architecture established by the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

(B) The provisions of section 2222 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) The Deputy Secretary of Defense (acting in the capacity of Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense) or a successor official in the Department of Defense (acting in such capacity) shall have the authority to replace any program manager (whether in a military department or a Defense Agency) for the procurement of an Enterprise Resource Planning business system

if procurement of the system takes longer than three years from initial obligation of funds to full deployment and sustainment.

(5) Any integrator contract for the implementation of an Enterprise Resource Planning business system shall only be awarded to companies that have a history of successful implementation of other Enterprise Resource Planning business systems for the Federal Government (whether with the Department of Defense or another department or agency of the Federal Government), including meeting cost and schedule goals.

SA 4011. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON EMPLOYMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF INDIVIDUALS AND CONTRACTORS WITH SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBTS.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—An individual or contractor with a seriously delinquent tax debt may not be appointed to, or continue serving in, a position within or funded by the Department of Defense.

(b) **SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX DEBT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “seriously delinquent tax debt” means an outstanding debt under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for which a notice of lien has been filed in public records pursuant to section 6323 of such Code, except that such term does not include—

(1) a debt that is being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement under section 6159 or section 7122 of such Code; and

(2) a debt with respect to which a collection due process hearing under section 6330 of such Code, or relief under subsection (a), (b), or (f) of section 6015 of such Code, is requested or pending.

SA 4012. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CONSOLIDATION OF DUPLICATIVE AND OVERLAPPING AGENCIES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government—

(1) use available administrative authority to eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government agencies, programs, and activities with duplicative and overlapping missions as identified in Government Accountability Office reports on duplication and overlap in Government programs;

(2) identify and submit to Congress a report setting the legislative action required to further eliminate, consolidate, or streamline Government agencies, programs, and activities with duplicative and overlapping missions as identified in the reports referred to in paragraph (1); and

(3) determine the total cost savings that—
(A) will accrue to each department, agency, and office effected by an action under paragraph (1) as a result of the actions taken under that paragraph; and

(B) could accrue to each department, agency, and office effected by an action under paragraph (2) as a result of the actions proposed to be taken under that paragraph using the legislative authority set forth under that paragraph.

SA 4013. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TERMINATION OF US FAMILY HEALTH PLAN.

(a) **TERMINATION.**—The US Family Health Plan (USFHP) is hereby terminated.

(b) **WIND-UP OF ACTIVITIES.**—The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to wind up the activities of the US Family Health Plan as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4014. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DATABASE ON PATIENT SAFETY, QUALITY OF CARE, AND OUTCOME MEASURES REGARDING HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) **PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATABASE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall develop and make available to the public a comprehensive database containing all applicable patient safety, quality of care, and outcome measures for health care provided by the Department of Defense that are tracked by the Secretary.

(2) **UPDATES.**—The Secretary shall update the database required by paragraph (1) not less frequently than once every six months.

(3) **UNAVAILABLE MEASURES.**—For any measure that the Secretary would otherwise publish in the database required by paragraph (1) but has not done so because such measure is not available, the Secretary shall publish notice in the database of the reason for such unavailability and a timeline for making such measure available in the database.

(4) **ACCESSIBILITY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the database required by paragraph (1) is accessible to the public through the primary Internet website of the Department and through each primary Internet website of a Department medical center.

(b) **SHARING OF INFORMATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT MEDICAL CENTERS AND DEFENSE HEALTH AGENCY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to facilitate and enhance sharing between the medical centers of the Department of Defense and the Defense Health Agency on information on patient safety, quality of care, and outcomes for health care provided by such medical centers, including information obtained through the measures developed pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) **HOSPITAL COMPARE WEBSITE OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.**—

(1) **AGREEMENT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the provision by the Secretary of Defense of such information as the Secretary of Health and Human Services may require to report and make publicly available patient quality and outcome information concerning Department of Defense medical centers through the Hospital Compare Internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services or any successor Internet website.

(2) **INFORMATION PROVIDED.**—The information provided by the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Health and Human Services under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Measures of timely and effective health care.

(B) Measures of readmissions, complications of death, including with respect to 30-day mortality rates and 30-day readmission rates, surgical complication measures, and health care related infection measures.

(C) Survey data of patient experiences, including the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems or any similar successor survey developed by the Department of Health and Human Services.

(D) Any other measures required of or reported with respect to hospitals participating in the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.).

(3) **UNAVAILABLE INFORMATION.**—For any applicable metric collected by the Department of Defense or required to be provided under paragraph (2) and withheld from or unavailable in the Hospital Compare Internet website or successor Internet website, the Secretary of Defense shall publish a notice on such Internet website stating the reason why such metric was withheld from public disclosure and a timeline for making such metric available, if applicable.

(d) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF PUBLICLY AVAILABLE SAFETY AND QUALITY METRICS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of the safety and quality metrics made publicly available by the Secretary of Defense under this section to assess the degree to which the Secretary is complying with the provisions of this section.

SA 4015. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees

under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON GOVERNMENT AGENCY EXPENDITURES ON CONFERENCES.

(a) CONFERENCE LIMITATIONS.—

(1) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT EXPENDED ON A CONFERENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—No agency may expend more than \$500,000 to support a single conference, unless the head of the agency and the Chief Financial Officer of the agency submits to Congress before the conference a written certification that the conference is in the national interest, which shall include—

(i) an estimate of the total cost of the conference;

(ii) the dates of the conference;

(iii) an estimate of the number of full-time equivalent employees attending the conference;

(iv) any costs associated with planning for the conference; and

(v) an explanation of how the conference advances the mission of the agency.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude an agency from receiving financial support or other assistance from a foundation or other non-Federal source to pay or defray the costs of a conference.

(2) LIMITATION ON CONFERENCE POLICIES.—An agency may not establish or implement a policy that discourages or prohibits the selection of a location for travel, an event, a meeting, or a conference because the location is perceived to be a resort or vacation destination.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given that term under section 5701(1) of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term “conference” means a meeting, retreat, seminar, symposium, or event that involves attendee travel.

SA 4016. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON ARMY NATIONAL GUARD SPONSORSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL WRESTLING ENTERTAINMENT OR MOTOR SPORTS.

Section 503(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) Recruiting and advertising campaigns authorized by paragraphs (1) and (2) or by any other provision of law, including section 561(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106-398; 10 U.S.C. 503 note), for the purposes of branding or marketing of, or promoting enlistment in, the Army National Guard may not include payments for professional wrestling entertainment sponsorships or motor sports spon-

sorships. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit recruiters from making direct, personal contact with secondary school students and other prospective recruits.”.

SA 4017. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1212. INCREASED MILITARY ASSISTANCE FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to provide defense articles, defense services, and training to the Government of Ukraine for the purpose of countering offensive weapons and reestablishing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, including anti-tank and anti-armor weapons, crew weapons and ammunition, counter-artillery radars to identify and target artillery batteries, fire control, range finder, and optical and guidance and control equipment, tactical troop-operated surveillance drones, and secure command and communications equipment, pursuant to the provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), and other relevant provisions of law.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(1) a detailed description of the anticipated defense articles, defense services, and training to be provided pursuant to this section;

(2) a timeline for the provision of such defense articles, defense services, and training; and

(3) a list of defense articles, defense services, and training authorized to be provided by subsection (a) that have been requested by the Government of Ukraine but are not being provided and an explanation with respect to why such defense articles, defense services, and training are not being provided.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$350,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 to carry out activities under this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available for obligation and expenditure through the end of fiscal year 2017.

(d) AUTHORITY FOR THE USE OF FUNDS.—The funds made available pursuant to subsection (c) for provision of defense articles, defense services, and training may be used to procure such articles, services, and training from the United States Government or other appropriate sources.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) DEFENSE ARTICLE; DEFENSE SERVICE; TRAINING.—The terms “defense article”, “defense service”, and “training” have the meanings given those terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

SA 4018. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle F—Palestinian Authority Reform

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Palestinian and United Nations Anti-Terrorism Act of 2014”.

SEC. 1282. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On April 23, 2014, representatives of the Palestinian Liberation Organization and Hamas, a designated terrorist organization, signed an agreement to form a government of national consensus.

(2) On June 2, 2014, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas announced a unity government as a result of the April 23, 2014, agreement.

(3) United States law requires that any Palestinian government that “includes Hamas as a member”, or over which Hamas exercises “undue influence”, only receive United States assistance if certain certifications are made to Congress.

(4) The President has taken the position that the current Palestinian government does not include members of Hamas or is influenced by Hamas and has thus not made the certifications required under current law.

(5) The leadership of the Palestinian Authority has failed to completely denounce and distance itself from Hamas’ campaign of terrorism against Israel.

(6) President Abbas has refused to dissolve the power-sharing agreement with Hamas even as more than 2,300 rockets have targeted Israel since July 2, 2014.

(7) President Abbas and other Palestinian Authority officials have failed to condemn Hamas’ extensive use of the Palestinian people as human shields.

(8) The Israeli Defense Forces have gone to unprecedented lengths for a modern military to limit civilian casualties.

(9) On July 23, 2014, the United Nations Human Rights Council adopted a one-sided resolution criticizing Israel’s ongoing military operations in Gaza.

(10) The United Nations Human Rights Council has a long history of taking anti-Israel actions while ignoring the widespread and egregious human rights violations of many other countries, including some of its own members.

(11) On July 16, 2014, officials of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) discovered 20 rockets in one of the organization’s schools in Gaza, before returning the weapons to local Palestinian officials rather than dismantling them.

(12) On multiple occasions during the conflict in Gaza, Hamas has used the facilities and the areas surrounding UNRWA locations to store weapons, harbor their fighters, and conduct attacks.

SEC. 1283. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to deny United States assistance to any entity or international organization that harbors or collaborates with Hamas, a designated terrorist organization, until Hamas agrees to recognize Israel, renounces violence, disarms, and accepts prior Israeli-Palestinian agreements;

(2) to seek a negotiated settlement of this conflict only under the condition that Hamas and any United States-designated terrorist groups are required to entirely disarm; and

(3) to continue to provide security assistance to the Government of Israel to assist its efforts to defend its territory and people from rockets, missiles, and other threats.

SEC. 1284. RESTRICTIONS ON AID TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY.

For purposes of section 620K of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378b), any power-sharing government, including the current government, formed in connection with the agreement signed on April 23, 2014, between the Palestinian Liberation Organization and Hamas is considered a “Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority”.

SEC. 1285. REFORM OF UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Until the Secretary of State submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the requirements described in subsection (b) have been satisfied—

(1) the United States contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations shall be reduced by an amount equal to the percentage of such contribution that the Secretary determines would be allocated by the United Nations to support the United Nations Human Rights Council or any of its Special Procedures;

(2) the Secretary shall not make a voluntary contribution to the United Nations Human Rights Council; and

(3) the United States shall not run for a seat on the United Nations Human Rights Council.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The annual certification referred to in subsection (a) is a certification made by the Secretary of State to Congress that the United Nations Human Rights Council’s agenda does not include a permanent item related to the State of Israel or the Palestinian territories.

(c) REVERSION OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated and available for a United States contribution to the United Nations but withheld from obligation and expenditure pursuant to this section shall immediately revert to the United States Treasury and the United States Government shall not consider them arrears to be repaid to any United Nations entity.

SEC. 1286. UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (UNRWA).

Section 301(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2221(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) PALESTINE REFUGEES; CONSIDERATIONS AND CONDITIONS FOR FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No contributions by the United States to the United Nations Relief

and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) for programs in the West Bank and Gaza, a successor entity or any related entity, or to the regular budget of the United Nations for the support of UNRWA or a successor entity for programs in the West Bank and Gaza, may be provided until the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

“(A) no official, employee, consultant, contractor, subcontractor, representative, or affiliate of UNRWA—

“(i) is a member of Hamas or any United States-designated terrorist group; or

“(ii) has propagated, disseminated, or incited anti-Israel, or anti-Semitic rhetoric or propaganda;

“(B) no UNRWA school, hospital, clinic, other facility, or other infrastructure or resource is being used by Hamas or an affiliated group for operations, planning, training, recruitment, fundraising, indoctrination, communications, sanctuary, storage of weapons or other materials, or any other purposes;

“(C) UNRWA is subject to comprehensive financial audits by an internationally recognized third party independent auditing firm and has implemented an effective system of vetting and oversight to prevent the use, receipt, or diversion of any UNRWA resources by Hamas or any United States-designated terrorist group, or their members; and

“(D) no recipient of UNRWA funds or loans is a member of Hamas or any United States-designated terrorist group.

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 1287. ISRAELI SECURITY ASSISTANCE.

The equivalent amount of all United States contributions withheld from the Palestinian Authority, the United Nations Human Rights Council, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East under this subtitle is authorized to be provided to—

(1) the Government of Israel for the Iron Dome missile defense system and other missile defense programs; and

(2) underground warfare training and technology and assistance to identify and deter tunneling from Palestinian-controlled territories into Israel.

SA 4019. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title III, add the following:

SEC. 333. REPORT ON SUPPORT FOR LAUNCHES IN SUPPORT OF NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a

report on the requirements and investments needed to modernize Department of Defense space launch facilities and supporting infrastructure at Cape Canaveral Air Force Station and Vandenberg Air Force Base.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) The results of the investigation into the failure of the radar system supporting the Eastern range in March 2014, including the causes for the failure.

(2) An assessment of each current radar and other system as well as supporting infrastructure required to support the mission requirement of the range, including back-up systems.

(3) An estimate of the annual level of dedicated funding required to maintain and modernize the range infrastructure in adequate condition to meet national security requirements.

(4) A review of requirements to repair, upgrade, and modernize the radars and other mission support systems to current technologies.

(5) A prioritized list of projects, costs, and projected funding schedules needed to carry out the maintenance, repair, and modernization requirements.

SA 4020. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1080. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BENEFITS OF USING SIMULATORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The use of technologies such as virtual reality and modeling and simulation tools provides cutting-edge, cost-effective training and technology development for members of the Armed Forces.

(2) Leveraging such technologies is an especially relevant supplement to live training given the future of declining defense budgets.

(3) The implementation by the Air Force Agency for Modeling and Simulation of virtual reality centers is part of a coordinated effort to broaden the use of virtual training methods.

(4) Those centers use of a variety of training tools that give members of the Armed Forces and developers alike a realistic training experience that contributes to improved readiness and system effectiveness.

(5) Organizations like the United States Army Program Executive Office for Simulation, Training, and Instrumentation would benefit from increased utilization of virtual reality and modeling and simulations tools.

(6) Modeling and simulation tools can provide powerful planning and training capabilities to expose a member of the Armed Forces to the complexities and uncertainties of combat before ever leaving the member’s home station. For example, the Naval Air Warfare Center Training Systems Division integrates the science of learning with performance-based training focused on improving the performance of members of the Army and Marine Corps and measures the effectiveness of such training. The Naval Air

Warfare Center Training Systems Division continually engages members of the Army and Marine Corps to understand challenges, solve problems, create new capabilities, and provide essential support.

(7) The use of simulation training has yielded military units that are better trained, more capable, and more confident when compared to units that do not have access to modern simulation training devices.

(8) Simulation training can be a cost-effective means for units to improve combat readiness and tactical decisionmaking skills and ultimately to save lives.

(9) The Department of Defense could meet the training challenges of the future in a fiscally austere environment by leveraging simulation training that uses simulators owned and operated by the Federal Government combined with simulation training services provided by universities and industry.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the use of simulators offers cost savings and provides members of the Armed Forces exceptional preparation for combat; and

(2) existing synergies between the Department of Defense and entities in the private sector should be maintained and cultivated to provide members of the Armed Forces with the best simulation experience possible.

SA 4021. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 601 and insert the following:
SEC. 601. FISCAL YEAR 2015 INCREASE IN MILITARY BASIC PAY.

(a) WAIVER OF SECTION 1009 ADJUSTMENT.—The adjustment to become effective during fiscal year 2015 required by section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, in the rates of monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services shall not be made.

(b) INCREASE IN BASIC PAY.—Effective on January 1, 2015, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services are increased by 1.8 percent for enlisted member pay grades, warrant officer pay grades, and commissioned officer pay grades below pay grade O-7.

(c) APPLICATION OF EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE LEVEL II CEILING ON PAYABLE RATES FOR GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS.—Section 203(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, shall be applied for rates of basic pay payable for commissioned officers in pay grades O-7 through O-10 during calendar year 2015 by using the rate of pay for level II of the Executive Schedule in effect during 2014.

(d) INCREASE IN AMOUNT FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 by section 421 for military personnel is hereby increased by \$600,000,000.

SA 4022. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility re-

quirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 30. PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES REFORM.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO P.L.T.—

(1) DEFINITION OF ENTITLEMENT LAND.—Section 6901(1) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the National Park System or”; and

(B) in subparagraph (H), by inserting “, other than land that is a unit of the National Park System” before the period at the end.

(2) ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS.—Section 6904(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) the United States acquired for the National Forest Wilderness Areas; and”.

(3) REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK.—Section 6905 of title 31, United States Code, is repealed.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 501 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (16 U.S.C. 471j) is amended by striking subsection (f).

(B) The chapter analysis for chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 6905.

(b) DEFERRED MAINTENANCE BACKLOG.—Any amounts saved as a result of the amendments made by subsection (a) shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior, without further appropriation, to address the maintenance backlog on National Park System land.

SA 4023. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. ENSURING PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE SUMMIT OF RATTLESNAKE MOUNTAIN IN THE HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3081 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4024. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, CONVEYANCE OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3082 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4025. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. RELEASE OF PROPERTY INTERESTS IN BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF OREGON FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF HERMISTON AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3083 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4026. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION HYDRO-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3087 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4027. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. TOLEDO BEND HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3088 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4028. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. EAST BENCH IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONTRACT EXTENSION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3089 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4029. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. COMMEMORATION OF CENTENNIAL OF WORLD WAR I.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3091 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4030. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES RELATED TO LAS VEGAS VALLEY PUBLIC LAND AND TULE SPRINGS FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3092 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4031. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. NATIONAL DESERT STORM AND DESERT SHIELD MEMORIAL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3093 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4032. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. EXTENSION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMEMORATIVE WORK IN HONOR OF FORMER PRESIDENT JOHN ADAMS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3094 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4033. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. REFINANCING OF PACIFIC COAST GROUND FISH FISHING CAPACITY REDUCTION LOAN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3095 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4034. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3096 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4035. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. ILLABOT CREEK, WASHINGTON, WILD AND SCENIC RIVER.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3071 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4036. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. MISSISQUOI AND TROUT WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS, VERMONT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3072 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4037. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. WHITE CLAY CREEK WILD AND SCENIC RIVER EXPANSION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3073 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4038. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. STUDIES OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3074 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4039. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. LAND TAKEN INTO TRUST FOR BENEFIT OF THE NORTHERN CHEYENNE TRIBE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3077 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4040. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, BADGER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, BARABOO, WISCONSIN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3078 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4041. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5044. HERMOSA CREEK WATERSHED PROTECTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3062 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4042. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5045. NORTH FORK FEDERAL LANDS WITHDRAWAL AREA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3063 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4043. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. PINE FOREST RANGE WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3064 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4044. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. ROCKY MOUNTAIN FRONT CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT AREA AND WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3065 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4045. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure

that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. WOVOKA WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3066 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4046. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. WITHDRAWAL AREA RELATED TO WOVOKA WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3067 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4047. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. WITHDRAWAL AND RESERVATION OF ADDITIONAL PUBLIC LAND FOR NAVAL AIR WEAPONS STATION, CHINA LAKE, CALIFORNIA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3068 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4048. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5043. COLUMBINE-HONDO WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3061 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4049. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees

under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5037. NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE SUPPORT FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3053 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4050. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5038. NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM DONOR ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3054 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4051. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5039. COIN TO COMMEMORATE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3055 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4052. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5040. COMMISSION TO STUDY THE POTENTIAL CREATION OF A NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3056 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4053. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees

under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5041. CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3057 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4054. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5042. ALPINE LAKES WILDERNESS ADDITIONS AND PRATT AND MIDDLE FORK SNOQUALMIE RIVERS PROTECTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3060 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4055. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5031. SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3042 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4056. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5032. VALLES CALDERA NATIONAL PRESERVE, NEW MEXICO.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3043 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4057. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees

under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5033. VICKSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3044 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4058. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5034. REVOLUTIONARY WAR AND WAR OF 1812 AMERICAN BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3050 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4059. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5035. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3051 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4060. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5036. NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS AND CORRIDORS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3052 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4061. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient

Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5030. OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3041 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4062. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. INTERNET-BASED ONSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3022 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4063. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. GRAZING PERMITS AND LEASES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3023 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4064. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. CABIN USER AND TRANSFER FEES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3024 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4065. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. ADDITION OF ASHLAND HARBOR BREAKWATER LIGHT TO THE APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3030 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4066. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3031 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4067. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. COLTSTVILLE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3032 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4068. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. FIRST STATE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3033 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4069. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3034 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4070. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. HARRIET TUBMAN UNDERGROUND RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, MARYLAND.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3035 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4071. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. HARRIET TUBMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, AUBURN, NEW YORK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3036 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4072. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. HINCHLIFFE STADIUM ADDITION TO PATERSON GREAT FALLS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3037 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4073. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5027. LOWER EAST SIDE TENEMENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3038 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4074. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5028. MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3039 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4075. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 5029. NORTH CASCADES NATIONAL PARK AND STEPHEN MATHER WILDERNESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3040 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4076. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. LAND CONVEYANCE, WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3001 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4077. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. SEALASKA LAND ENTITLEMENT FINALIZATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3002 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4078. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3003 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4079. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. LAND EXCHANGE, CIBOLA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, ARIZONA, AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3004 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4080. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. SPECIAL RULES FOR INYO NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA, LAND EXCHANGE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3005 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4081. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. LAND EXCHANGE, TRINITY PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT, TRINITY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND THE FOREST SERVICE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3006 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4082. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. IDAHO COUNTY, IDAHO, SHOOTING RANGE LAND CONVEYANCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3007 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4083. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. SCHOOL DISTRICT 318, MINNESOTA, LAND EXCHANGE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3008 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4084. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. NORTHERN NEVADA LAND CONVEYANCES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3009 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4085. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. SAN JUAN COUNTY, NEW MEXICO, FEDERAL LAND CONVEYANCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3010 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4086. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. LAND CONVEYANCE, UINTA-WASATCH-CACHE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3011 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4087. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF FRUIT HEIGHTS, UTAH.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3012 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4088. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. LAND CONVEYANCE, HANFORD SITE, WASHINGTON.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3013 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4089. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PERMIT PROCESSING.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3021 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4090. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle J of title XXX of division B, add the following:

SEC. 3097. RANCH A WYOMING CONSOLIDATION AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 3014 shall have no force or effect.

SA 4091. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3979, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1209.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY**

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The Commodity Futures Trading Commission: Effective Enforcement and the Future of Derivatives Regulation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Cybersecurity: Enhancing Coordination To Protect the Financial Sector."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and

Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Passenger Rail: Investing in our Nation's Future."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 10, 2014, at 10:30 a.m., to hold a Subcommittee on African Affairs hearing entitled, "The Ebola Epidemic: The Keys to Success for the International Response."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on December 10, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Executive Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on December 10, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Keeping Families Together: The President's Executive Action On Immigration And The Need To Pass Comprehensive Reform."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Deepa Ghosh, a foreign affairs fellow in my office, and Kaveh Sadeghzadeh, a natural resources fellow, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following people from my office be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 113th Congress: Military Fellow, Chief

Master Sergeant Lavor Kirkpatrick; Interns Lee Kearns, Eleanor Murphy, Morgan Mena, and Joy Demmert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent that Jonathon Burpee, a National Park Service fellow on the staff of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the 113th Congress.

RECOGNIZING 20 YEARS SINCE THE GENOCIDE IN RWANDA

On Tuesday, December 9, 2014, the Senate adopted S. Res. 413, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, as follows:

S. RES. 413

Whereas in the aftermath of the Holocaust, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide declaring that genocide, whether committed in a time of peace or war, is a crime under international law;

Whereas the United States was the first country to sign the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and the Senate voted to ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide on February 11, 1986;

Whereas, for approximately 100 days between April 7, 1994, and July 1994, more than 800,000 civilians were killed in a genocide in Rwanda that targeted members of the Tutsi, moderate Hutu, and Twa populations, resulting in the horrific deaths of nearly 70 percent of the Tutsi population living in Rwanda;

Whereas the massacres of innocent Rwandan civilians were premeditated and systematic attempts to eliminate the Tutsi population by Hutu extremists, fueled by hatred and incitement propagated by newspapers and radio;

Whereas in addition to systematic targeting of an ethnic minority in Rwanda resulting in the mass slaughter of innocent civilians, rape was also used as a weapon of war;

Whereas, despite the deployment of the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) in October 1993 following the end of the Rwandan Civil War, its mandate was insufficient to ensure the protection of large swathes of the population, demonstrating the inability of the United Nations to effectively respond to the unfolding genocide and stop or mitigate its impact;

Whereas, on July 4, 1994, the Rwandan Patriotic Front, a trained military group consisting of formerly exiled Tutsis, began its takeover of the country, which resulted in an ending of the genocide, though not a complete end to the violence, including retribution;

Whereas, in October 1994, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) was established as the first international tribunal with the mandate to prosecute the crime of genocide and ultimately prosecuted 63 individuals for war crimes, including genocide and crimes against humanity as well as the first convictions for rape as a weapon of war;

Whereas the United States Government supports initiatives to ensure that victims of genocide and mass atrocities are not forgotten, and has committed to work with international partners to help prevent genocide

and mass atrocities and identify and support a range of actions to protect civilian populations at risk;

Whereas, in July 2004, the Senate adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 133 and the House of Representatives adopted House Concurrent Resolution 467, declaring that “the atrocities unfolding in Darfur, Sudan, are genocide”, and calling on the United States Government and the international community to take measures to address the situation immediately;

Whereas, in September 2004, the United States Government, in testimony by Secretary of State Colin Powell before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, declared the ongoing conflict in Darfur, Sudan, a “genocide” perpetrated by the government based in Khartoum against its own people and affecting over 2,400,000 people in Sudan, including an estimated 200,000 fatalities;

Whereas, in September 2005, the United States joined other members of the United Nations in adopting United Nations General Assembly Resolution 60/1, which affirmed that the international community has a responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity;

Whereas, in December 2011, the Senate unanimously passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, recognizing the United States national interest in helping to prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and other mass atrocities against civilians, and urging the development of a whole of government approach to prevent and mitigate such acts;

Whereas, in April 2012, President Barack Obama established the Atrocities Prevention Board within the United States inter-agency structure, chaired by National Security staff, to help identify and more effectively address atrocity threats, including genocide, as a core national security interest and core moral responsibility;

Whereas, in July 2013, the National Intelligence Council completed the first ever National Intelligence Estimate on the global risk for mass atrocities and genocide;

Whereas, in January 2014, the National Director of Intelligence testified before the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, stating that “the overall risk of mass atrocities worldwide will probably increase in 2014 and beyond. . . . Much of the world will almost certainly turn to the United States for leadership to prevent and respond to mass atrocities.”;

Whereas, despite measures taken by the United States Government and other governments since 1994, the international community still faces the challenges of responding to escalation of violence, atrocities, and religious-based conflict in many corners of the globe, including Syria and the Central African Republic, and a failure of the international community to appropriately respond to and address the rapidly deteriorating situation could result in further atrocities;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council was unable to pass a resolution condemning the Government of Bashar al Assad of Syria for the use of chemical weapons against civilians, killing more than 1,400 of his own people in August 2013; and

Whereas United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon recommended to the United Nations Security Council the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping mission in the Central African Republic with the pri-

mary mandate to protect civilians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the United Nations designation of April 7th as the International Day of Reflection on the Genocide in Rwanda;

(2) honors the memory of the more than 800,000 victims of the Rwandan genocide and expresses sympathy for those whose lives were forever changed by this horrific event;

(3) expresses support for the people of Rwanda as they remember the victims of genocide;

(4) affirms it is in the national interest of the United States to work in close coordination with international partners to prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and mass atrocities;

(5) condemns ongoing acts of violence and mass atrocities perpetrated against innocent civilians in Syria, the Central African Republic, South Sudan, Sudan and elsewhere;

(6) urges the President to confer with Congress on an ongoing basis regarding the priorities and objectives of the Atrocities Prevention Board;

(7) urges the President to work with Congress to strengthen the United States Government’s ability to identify and more rapidly respond to genocide and mass atrocities in order to prevent where possible and mitigate the impact of such events;

(8) clarifies that nothing in this resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war; and

(9) supports ongoing United States and international efforts to—

(A) strengthen multilateral peacekeeping capacities;

(B) build capacity for democratic rule of law, security sector reform, and other measures to improve civilian protection in areas of conflict;

(C) ensure measures of accountability for perpetrators of mass atrocities and crimes against humanity; and

(D) strengthen the work of United States and international institutions, such as the Holocaust Memorial Museum, which are working to document, identify, and prevent mass atrocities and inspire citizens and leaders worldwide to confront hatred and prevent genocide.

DEATH IN CUSTODY REPORTING ACT OF 2013

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 604, H.R. 1447.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1447) to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today Senators have finally come together to pass the Death in Custody Reporting Act, which will provide important transparency to law enforcement efforts and our prison system. At a time when our Nation is having an important conversation about police encounters that result in the loss of life, we

know that hundreds of police-related deaths are unaccounted for in Federal statistics. The Death in Custody Reporting Act will require that State and Federal law enforcement officials report deaths in their custody, including those that occur during arrest. The Justice Department will then have the opportunity to analyze the data and see what we can learn from it. The American people deserve as much.

Too many communities across our country are losing faith in our justice system. This bill provides a step toward accountability, and it is my hope that it may ultimately lead to restoring some measure of trust in these communities. If we are ever able to truly embody the words engraved in Vermont marble above the United States Supreme Court building, “Equal Justice Under the Law,” then more of course must be done. I look forward to continuing these efforts in the next Congress.

The prior authorization for the Death in Custody Reporting Act expired in 2006, and after too many years of inaction, I am glad that Democrats and Republicans have come together and sent this reauthorization bill to the President for signature. My appreciation goes to Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, who sponsored and has long championed this legislation, as well Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, who sponsored a Senate version.

This has been an important week for transparency. On Monday, the Senate came together to pass my bipartisan FOIA Improvement Act and I hope the House will soon take up this bill. On Tuesday, I spoke on the Senate floor in favor of the release of the executive summary of the Senate Intelligence Committee Study of the CIA’s Detention and Interrogation Program. Both of these actions did not come easily, but in both instances the interests of the American public and our values as a democracy prevailed. Today, we have again come together in the interest of transparency for the betterment of our Nation.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1447) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN SAVINGS PROMOTION ACT

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3374 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3374) to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3374) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SMART SAVINGS ACT

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4193, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4193) to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4193) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4926, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4926) to designate a segment of Interstate Route 35 in the State of Minnesota as the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4926) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROPANE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5705, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5705) to modify certain provisions relating to the Propane Education and Research Council.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5705) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DIGNIFIED INTERMENT OF OUR VETERANS ACT OF 2014

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans' Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2822 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2822) to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on matters relating to the burial of unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BENNET. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2822) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2822

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Dignified Interment of Our Veterans Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS STUDY ON MATTERS RELATING TO BURIAL OF UNCLAIMED REMAINS OF VETERANS IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) complete a study on matters relating to the interring of unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study required under paragraph (1).

(b) MATTERS STUDIED.—The matters studied under subsection (a)(1) shall include the following:

(1) Determining the scope of issues relating to unclaimed remains of veterans, including an estimate of the number of unclaimed remains of veterans.

(2) Assessing the effectiveness of the procedures of the Department of Veterans Affairs for working with persons or entities having custody of unclaimed remains to facilitate interment of unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration.

(3) Assessing State and local laws that affect the ability of the Secretary to inter unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration.

(4) Developing recommendations for such legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) METHODOLOGY.—

(1) NUMBER OF UNCLAIMED REMAINS.—In estimating the number of unclaimed remains of veterans under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary may review such subset of applicable entities as the Secretary considers appropriate, including a subset of funeral homes and coroner offices that possess unclaimed veterans remains.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL LAWS.—In assessing State and local laws under subsection (b)(3), the Secretary may assess such sample of applicable State and local laws as the Secretary considers appropriate in lieu of reviewing all applicable State and local laws.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF ABDUL-RAHMAN PETER KASSIG AND CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ACTS OF THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 598, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 598) expressing condolences to the family of Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig and condemning the terrorist acts of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made

and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 598) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE PLACED ON THE
CALENDAR—S. 2992

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I understand that S. 2992 is at the desk and due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2992) to amend title 10, United States Code, to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and for other purposes.

Mr. BENNET. I object to any further proceedings with respect to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ORDER FOR PRINTING OF SENATE
DOCUMENT

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the tributes to retiring Senators be printed as a Senate document and that Senators be permitted to submit tributes until December 23, 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—H.R.
5471

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5471, and the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
DECEMBER 11, 2014

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, December 11, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of pro-

ceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to accompany H.R. 3979, NDAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BENNET. For the information of all Senators, there will be a cloture vote on the motion to concur on the Defense authorization bill at 10:30 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. BENNET. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:55 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, December 11, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. STEVE SAULS

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Steve Sauls, and to congratulate him on his retirement. Mr. Sauls is an outstanding individual who has served as the Vice President for Governmental Relations at Florida International University.

Steve has spent over 20 years at FIU, helping build the university into one of the top research institutions in the country. At FIU, he was instrumental in establishing and funding both the law school and medical school, and the expansion of graduate programs. His assistance has also led to millions of dollars of research funds being made available for the International Hurricane Research Center, Wolfsonian-FIU, and countless construction projects at the university.

Steve's accomplishments include much more than just his work at FIU. He is the author of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, which was created to provide educational assistance to Mariel and Haitian refugees. In the 1980s he also provided staff support to Governor Bob Graham of Florida. He was instrumental in the resurrection of the Everglades Coalition as part of the Save the Everglades program, and the purchase of Fakahatchee Strand, which protected Florida's panther habitat.

Having known Steve for over 20 years, and been able to work with him since my time in the Florida state legislature, I can attest that he has consistently demonstrated the highest degree of integrity, character, and professionalism. He has been dedicated to his career and has worked tirelessly for the state of Florida and FIU. Beyond that, over the years I have had the privilege of getting to know Steve on a personal level, and am honored to now call him my friend. I wish nothing but the best for Steve in the future, and again congratulate him on his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Mr. Steve Sauls for his tremendous service to Florida, and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable individual.

CELEBRATING MARIN FRENCH
CHEESE 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Marin French Cheese on the occasion of the company's 150th Anniversary Celebration on January 10, 2015.

In 1865, as the Civil War was drawing to an end, Jefferson Thompson made deliciously fresh cheese using the milk from his dairy cows at his Marin dairy farm. He developed a renowned reputation for his European style cheeses, and founded a creamery that would eventually be known as Marin French Cheese. 150 years later, Marin French Cheese operates in the same location, making it the longest continually operating cheese company in America. The company still creates the same classic styles of Brie and Camembert, crafting cheese in small batches using traditional cultures, coaxing the distinctly coastal California character and flavor into every cheese.

An internationally respected cheese maker, Marin French Cheese products have been honored with numerous well-deserved national and international awards over the years. On this momentous anniversary, it is appropriate to pay tribute to Marin French Cheese. Please join me in expressing congratulations to Marin French Cheese on one hundred fifty years of success and best wishes for an equally bountiful future.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL
CELEBRATION OF THE VILLAGE
OF SURING

HON. REID J. RIBBLE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Village of Suring, located in Oconto County.

Suring applied to the Oconto Circuit Court for its incorporation as a Village in 1914. Residents voted in favor of incorporation in January 1915 and immediately elected W.J. Thielke as the first Village President.

Today, Suring is a wonderful destination to live, work and visit in the northern part of the 8th District. Outdoor enthusiasts and families looking for recreational opportunities can visit Suring to hike the Nicolet State Trail, relax for a weekend at the local campgrounds, enjoy a few rounds of golf, or go for a ride on the snowmobile trails during the winter months.

This is truly a time for the village residents to reflect on their shared history, but also share in the excitement of their future and what the next 100 years may bring. As Congressman, I am proud to represent the citizens of the Village of Suring and encourage everyone to join me in celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Village of Suring in 2015.

HONORING ANDREW LOWELL
CROUSE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew Lowell Crouse. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 412, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has become a member of the Order of the Arrow and earned the rank of Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Andrew has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Andrew remodeled the Smithville Middle School Family and Consumer Science Room by repairing, building, and painting shelving for sewing machines.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending Andrew Lowell Crouse for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING STEVE SAULS

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding accomplishments and extraordinary career of Steve Sauls, the outgoing Vice President for Government Relations at Florida International University.

There are many of us who just a few decades ago remember a much more nascent FIU. Today, serving over 50,000 students and helping to anchor a thriving South Florida, Florida International University has rapidly grown into the first-class research university and flagship public institution that this community has always deserved.

I am proud of today's FIU, and in short, much credit is deserved by Steve Sauls for helping make that a reality.

Our paths first crossed as young staffers in Tallahassee, where I encountered a thoughtful, personable, and whip-smart colleague. From there, Steve's drive and commitment to service propelled him onto a distinguished career. Fortunately, he took FIU on that rise with him.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

From the establishment of its medical and law schools, to building its federal research portfolio, to its mission of training the next generation of high-skilled STEM graduates, to its acquisition of the Wolfsonian Museum, Steve has had a hand in nearly every major expansion and success of the university.

On behalf of each of my constituents who have ever stepped into an FIU classroom, whose lives have been touched by one of their research innovations, or who have ever worn the blue and gold, I thank Mr. Sauls for his leadership and decades of public service.

As this chapter of his career draws to a close, I hope he enjoys a joyous and restful break in the company of good friends and family, and wish him the best of luck in all his future endeavors.

HONORING MS. SHEILA JORDAN

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career of Ms. Sheila Jordan on the occasion of her retirement. Ms. Jordan is retiring after serving for fifteen years as the Alameda County Superintendent of Schools.

A proud native of the Bronx, Ms. Jordan graduated from Rutgers University with a B.A. in English. She went on to get her M.A. in Special Education from San Francisco State University, and is the holder of a lifetime teaching credential, a credential for teaching the learning handicapped, an Administrative Credential from California State University East Bay, and a Certificate in Executive Management from the Graduate School of Public Policy at UC Berkeley.

Prior to her service as Superintendent of Schools, Ms. Jordan served on the Oakland City Council and the Oakland Unified School District Board of Education, and was a teacher for 20 years.

During her time as Superintendent of Schools for Alameda County, Ms. Jordan has overseen the implementation of numerous programs designed to promote civic engagement and service, environmental education, arts and technology integration, math, language arts, and science. Her leadership has clarified and solidified the role of county offices of education and influenced new statewide policies. Her efforts to create a regional model have deepened the ties and accountability between school districts and county offices and inspired student success. For instance, she helped to forge a closer alliance with Chabot Space & Science Center's education department in order to provide county and regional schools with training and support of STEM and STEAM opportunities.

Ms. Jordan has also served in numerous community service positions, including the Executive Committee of the Economic Development Alliance for Business; and the boards of the Chabot Space & Science Center, the Workforce Investment Board, United Way, and the Interagency Children's Policy Council. She is also a former member of the Board of Di-

rectors of the East Bay Leadership Foundation, a past co-chair of the Alameda County Superior Court Children's Waiting Room Project, and a former Fellow of the Bay Area Writing Project.

Among other honors, Ms. Jordan has received the Outstanding Educator of the Year Award from the Peralta Presidential Council of the Alpha Delta Kappa educational sorority, the Educator of Excellence Award from Hispanos Saludos, the Programs of Excellence Award from the Association of Contra Costa County Administrators, and has been named Alumnus of the Year by California State University Hayward.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, Ms. Sheila Jordan, I salute you. I thank you for a lifetime of service and congratulate you on your many achievements. I wish you and your loved ones the very best as you transition to this exciting new chapter of life.

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN'S GENEROUS DONATIONS TO COMBAT EBOLA

HON. STEVE STOCKMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the Ebola epidemic, our government must take decisive action to combat and prevent the spread of this disease. We should also build up a concerted international effort to stem this epidemic.

There still exist critical needs in containing Ebola's spread. We, and several other nations, have made available limited resources; but it's not enough. Taiwan, though not directly affected, once again has risen to the challenge of helping other people in need.

On December 4th, Taiwan's Representative to the United States, Ambassador Shen, officially announced the contribution of \$1,000,000 to the Global Distribution Fund of the Centers for Disease Control. This is in addition to 100,000 personal protection suits that Taiwan has donated to the medical authorities. This donation will help prevent deaths and alleviate some of the pain and suffering of victims, as well as offer hope where hope is scarce.

In crisis after crisis we have seen our old and reliable friend Taiwan respond. For example, over the past few years Taiwan immediately responded with aid to Japan's earthquake and tsunami in 2011, the Philippines Typhoon in 2013 and even donated over \$1,000,000 to the United States in the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy.

In times of crisis it is important to know on whom you can depend. Taiwan and its people remain dedicated to the same principles that guide our nation, and they can be counted upon in times of crisis. We are very grateful to Taiwan for this major contribution.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MICHAEL B. MCCALL

HON. THOMAS MASSIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my constituent, Dr. Michael B. McCall. Dr. McCall is the Founding President and Chief Executive Officer of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS). Since his appointment in 1998, Dr. McCall has honorably served as the head of a system made up of 16 colleges located on more than 70 campuses across the state, serving over 92,000 students. He recently announced his retirement, effective January 2015.

KCTCS is the largest provider of workforce training in Kentucky, serving more than 5,300 businesses and training more than 52,000 employees annually. Among his many achievements, Dr. McCall has led the KCTCS Board of Regents' ratification or approval of more than 700 credit program options that resulted in certificates, diplomas or associate degrees. Under Dr. McCall's leadership, KCTCS became the state's largest provider of online learning, offering more than 77 online credentials. Other KCTCS accomplishments spearheaded by Dr. McCall include the creation of the North American Racing Academy (first college-affiliated horseracing academy in the United States), the Kentucky Coal Academy, the Kentucky Fire Commission, and the Kentucky Board of Emergency Medical Services.

Dr. McCall has also personally received numerous awards and honors, including the Phi Theta Kappa's prestigious State Community College Director Award of Distinction and the 2005 National Council for Continuing Education and Training's National Leadership Award. In addition, the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development honored Dr. McCall with its 2005 International Leadership Award. Dr. McCall also received the prestigious honor of selection by the Kentucky Monthly Magazine as the 2004 Kentuckian of the Year, and on June 30, 2006, Dr. McCall completed his tenure as Board Chair of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). This marked the first time ever that a system-level president was elected chair of the AACC board.

A recent study by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems highlighted many KCTCS accomplishments achieved under Dr. McCall's leadership. For example, KCTCS ranks 5th among the nation's community and technical college systems in the category of "improvement over time in its outreach to younger working-aged adults without college degrees." In addition, from 2000 to 2012, KCTCS experienced a 63 percent increase in enrollment, while at the same time, the population of KY citizens aged 18 to 34 only increased by 2%. Finally, at least one of KCTCS's colleges has been awarded a "top-ten" finish in each of the three rounds of the Aspen Prize for Community College Excellence.

I salute Dr. McCall for his exemplary service to KCTCS, the state of Kentucky, and the nation.

H.R. 4926, DESIGNATING THE "JAMES L. OBERSTAR MEMORIAL HIGHWAY" AND THE "JAMES L. OBERSTAR NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAY"

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the unanimous passage today of H.R. 4926, which names a segment of Interstate 35 the "James L. Oberstar Memorial Highway."

Jim Oberstar was an infrastructure partisan, a transportation expert, and had more influence over the House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee—a committee he served as staffer, member, ranking member, and chairman—than anyone in the last 50 years. And he was like an uncle to me.

Jim was a man of remarkable memory and learning. He spoke a half-dozen languages. He never stopped fighting for what he believed in and what he knew was right for his district, his State, or for the American people. In his long career, he guided the passage of dozens of landmark laws and shaped the transportation policy of our country for the better, creating an infrastructure system that is more efficient, more sustainable, and safer than before Jim entered politics.

He was an incredible cyclist, a skilled and passionate legislator, and a good friend. I pleased that H.R. 4926 will literally cement his legacy.

HONORING JOHN C. MANKA

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize John C. Manka. John is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 412, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

John has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years John has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, John has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. John worked with the United States Army Corps of Engineers to provide five additional handicap-accessible deer blinds for organized hunts at Smithville Lake.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending John C. Manka for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF ALARM (THE AFRICAN LEADERSHIP AND RECONCILIATION MINISTRIES) ON THEIR 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the work of ALARM (the African Leadership and Reconciliation Ministries) on their 20th anniversary, and especially, the President and Founder of the organization, Dr. Celestin Musekura, an ordained Baptist minister who was born and raised in Rwanda.

It is important to note that ALARM works to strengthen the church in Africa to be an instrument of change in the community by focusing on three areas: developing servant leaders, reconciling relationships, and transforming communities. ALARM is made up of three charitable organizations: 1) ALARM-Africa, which has offices in eight countries; 2) ALARM-UK; and 3) ALARM-USA.

ALARM-Africa was founded after civil wars and political violence in Rwanda, Burundi, Congo, northern Uganda, and southern Sudan left a vacuum of leadership in Christian churches. These churches, once led primarily by western missionaries who were forced to flee due to the violence, needed leadership from within their own countries. These leaders needed to be trained in guiding, teaching, forgiving and reconciling, to bring healing and transformation to their communities.

In the aftermath of these crises, Dr. Musekura and his wife, Bernadette, felt called to help fill this void and to help train others in the ministry. They founded ALARM and continue to dedicate their lives to it.

Dr. Musekura received a Bachelor of Theology at Kenya Highlands Evangelical University in Kenya, a Master of Divinity at the Africa International University (AIU) in Kenya, a Master of Sacred Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary, a Master of Science in Justice Administration and Leadership at the University of Texas at Dallas, and a Ph.D. in theological studies at Dallas Theological Seminary in Dallas, Texas.

ALARM-Africa uses curriculum, most of which is internally developed, to equip untrained church and community leaders and reconcile hurting communities.

Since its founding in 1994, ALARM-Africa has expanded into eight countries across east and central Africa (Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda) with its head office in Nairobi, Kenya. All offices are staffed by well-trained, professional African men and women who act as local missionaries to their people.

I would like to congratulate ALARM and Dr. Celestin Musekura on the occasion of this anniversary and for their dedication to this important work.

HONORING THE TOWN OF ELIZABETH, MISSISSIPPI

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable town of Elizabeth, Mississippi.

The town of Elizabeth, Mississippi is located on U.S. Highway 61, approximately 1 mile north of Leland and 2 miles east of Stoneville. In March 1889, a deed was issued to Mr. Joshua Skinner for a railroad depot in the area. At the time, the place was named "Athol", but it was later changed to its current name "Elizabeth".

In 1889, Elizabeth was advertised as "a new town with an unparalleled future, located in the heart of the famous Yazoo Delta . . . the richest and most fertile section of the earth where king cotton reigns supreme." Elizabeth had the unique distinction of being located at the crossroads of the first two main railroads in the Delta: the Louisville, New Orleans, and Texas RR (which later became the Illinois Central RR) and the Georgia Pacific RR (which eventually became the Columbus and Greenville RR).

The town of Elizabeth was designed along the west and south sides of both railroads. Elizabeth emerged early on as a mercantile city, with numerous businesses started up due to the existence of the rail lines. The town can no longer boast a commercial center. Leland has taken that role. However, it does retain its identity as Elizabeth. It boasts a modest population of nearly 200 people and a beautiful roadside park. In 2013, DuPont Pioneer opened a new 30,000 square foot research center near Elizabeth that focuses on soybean breeding and product development as well as corn product testing and characterization for farmers in the Delta.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Town of Elizabeth for its dedication to serving others.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR CURT OWENS

HON. CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Major Curt Owens for his past two years of exemplary dedication to duty and service as an Army Congressional Fellow and Congressional Liaison for the Chief of Army Reserve. I am grateful that he will continue to serve the Army and Congress in his new assignment as a legislative liaison in the Programs Division of the Office of the Chief, Legislative Liaison. We wish him well in his new position.

A native of Tallahassee, Florida, Major Owens earned a Bachelor of Science degree in business at Florida State University and was commissioned an infantry officer in the Army Reserve. He has earned advanced degrees in management and legislative affairs.

Curt has served in a broad range of assignments during his 20 years of service as a citizen soldier. As a lieutenant, he served as a rifle platoon leader in the 100th Infantry Battalion during combat operations in Iraq. As a captain, he served as an operations officer in a combined joint special operations task force, commanded a basic combat training company, and served as platoon trainer at the basic officer leadership course, 11th Infantry Regiment, Fort Benning, Georgia.

In 2013, following assignments as a battalion operations officer and executive officer with 1st Brigade, 98th Division, Major Owens was selected as an Army Congressional Fellow and assigned as the Defense Fellow in my office. In this role, Curt served as policy advisor on all matters relating to defense and national security. He provided me with candid advice and became a trusted source of counsel and productivity to my office.

After this, he served as a legislative liaison in the Office of the Chief of Army Reserve. In this capacity, Curt represented the Chief of Army Reserve directly with the Senate and House Armed Services and Appropriations Committees to educate and inform Senators, Representatives, and staff on critical Army Reserve issues and programs.

Throughout his twenty year career, Major Curt Owens has made positive impacts on the careers and lives of his soldiers, peers, and superiors. I am grateful that he has chosen to continue to serve as an Army leader. I join my colleagues today in honoring his dedication to our Nation and invaluable service to the United States Congress as an Army congressional liaison.

Curt is accustomed to working long hours in his congressional relations work. So let me also acknowledge Curt's wife Allison, and their sons Grayson, Carter and Brady, thank them for their sacrifices and wish them all the best for continued success in the future.

THE HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN
KERRY BENTIVOLIO

HON. STEVE STOCKMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the 113th Congress comes to a close, I would like to recognize my good friend and colleague from Michigan's 11th District, Congressman KERRY BENTIVOLIO. We grew up in the same community and went to the same schools, only to meet years later in our nation's capital.

He is one of five sons of a factory worker who put himself through college, eventually earning a Master's Degree, worked as an automotive designer, home builder and an exceptional, highly qualified vocational and general education teacher in both private and public schools. Married for 37 years to his wife Karen he raised two wonderful children and has four grandchildren. He's an effective legislator, a staunch defender of conservative values, and he, and his team, have provided constituent services that would be considered beyond exceptional by even the tenacious critic.

KERRY's conservative colleagues aren't the only ones to recognize his work, many groups

outside of the halls of Congress have taken notice.

The National Taxpayer's Union honored KERRY with the Taxpayers' Friend Award and NFIB named him a "Guardian of Small Business". He earned recognition from the National Association of Manufacturing for his support of that industry. The Family Research Council gave him one of their highest awards.

He received high ratings from Heritage Action for America, Club for Growth, and FreedomWorks for his voting record. The American Conservative Union named Mr. BENTIVOLIO a "top conservative" for his defense of our limited-government values. And, his voting record has been recognized as the #1 in Transparency according to GovTrack.us.

As a freshman legislator, a House historian pointed out Congressman BENTIVOLIO was one of the most successful and effective first-term legislators in recent memory. He passed two bills as amendments, and his Safe and Secure Federal Websites Act unanimously passed the House with 100% bipartisan support. The Safe and Secure Federal Websites Act had 126 cosponsors—which is more cosponsors than any other freshman Republican bill secured during the 113th Congress.

KERRY's successes didn't begin nor end in the marble halls of Congress. While legislators clamor for attention and dream of their next major network television appearance, Congressman BENTIVOLIO and his team were working hard on behalf of their constituents. He and his staff received two awards for their constituent service—one from National Write Your Congressman for their superior constituent service and the Public Service Award from NASASP.

He's the same man who volunteered as Santa Claus year after year, to the delight of neighborhood children. He's the same man—and only member of Congress—who served with honor in the combat arms in both Vietnam and Iraq and received 28 military awards, including the Combat Infantryman Badge which he proudly wore on his lapel every day as a member of Congress.

The upstanding Congressman from Michigan's 11th Congressional District may not be returning to the 114th Congress, but Congressman BENTIVOLIO's legacy will continue to shine long after his time here as he carries the torch for conservative values and maintains his community stewardship.

HONORING KALEB WADE BARBER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kaleb Wade Barber. Kaleb is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 249, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Kaleb has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Kaleb has been involved with

scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Kaleb has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending Kaleb Wade Barber for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

FA'AFETAI

HON. ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, last October 2013, because of complications due to Agent Orange exposure during my service in Vietnam, I was airlifted from American Samoa to Hawaii where I was not expected to live. Thanks to the prayers offered and the assistance provided on my behalf at a time when I needed it most, I am here today. And so, for historical purposes, I rise to express my gratitude for all those involved in making my evacuation and recovery possible, and to say thank you to the people of American Samoa for giving me the opportunity to serve them in the U.S. House of Representatives from the time they first elected me in 1988 until 2014.

At about 2:30 p.m. Washington, DC time (7:30 a.m. in Pago Pago), on October 24, 2013, my staff in Washington, DC released an official statement informing the people of American Samoa that I had been hospitalized at the LBJ Tropical Medical Center (LBJ) on October 22, 2013. My Washington team learned of my hospitalization on October 23, 2013 through Fili Sagapolutele, a local reporter in American Samoa. Upon learning of my hospitalization, my staff in Washington, DC immediately sought a first-hand assessment of my condition and facilitated a conference call on October 23, 2013 between Dr. Rahim Remtulla of the Office of Attending Physician at the U.S. House of Representatives and medical officer (M.O.) Jerome Amoa who was supervising my care at LBJ. In American Samoa, medical officers are spoken of as doctors and, out of respect and appreciation for the care he provided me, I also use the local terminology when referring to Dr. Amoa, who recently passed away. Dr. Amoa was a true servant of our people and I am forever thankful for him. During his conference call with my staff, Dr. Amoa reported that LBJ did not have the equipment necessary to provide further evaluation of my condition and that a medical evacuation (medevac) was needed. He also reported that I was stable for travel and was not in a life-threatening situation. Because commercial flights from American Samoa only fly to and from Hawaii twice a week, Dr. Amoa stated that he had requested medevac services through the American Samoa Government (ASG) and the local Veterans Administration (VA) in the Territory but that no action had yet been taken due to some confusion about whether or not ASG should request the medevac or if the local VA should since I am a Vietnam veteran. Due to these delays, my

Washington staff contacted General Robert Lee, former Adjutant General of the State of Hawaii, who contacted Major General Darryll Wong, the Adjutant General for the State of Hawaii who oversees the Hawaii Air National Guard and who provides direct support to the Office of Veterans Affairs. Based on letters my office obtained from Dr. Amoa and the Office of Attending Physician, which stated that medevac services were essential, my Washington staff registered a request for medevac services through Colonel Ronald Han, Director of the State of Hawaii's Office of Veterans Services. Colonel Han, General Wong and Governor Neil Abercrombie of Hawaii acted with urgency and immediacy. Within 30 minutes of receiving the request, General Wong and his team put a crew into crew rest to prepare for the medevac flight. In less than 2 hours, General Wong informed my Washington staff that an aircraft would leave Honolulu (HNL) at approximately 8 a.m. on Thursday, October 24, 2013, with a doctor, nurse and aero-medical evacuation team in place. My Washington office then began the process of linking the Office of Attending Physician to the aero-medical evacuation team as well as to physicians at Tripler Army Medical Center (Tripler) so that I could be treated in the air and upon arrival at Tripler without delay. After taking these actions on October 23, 2013 and October 24, it was then that my office issued a press release on October 24, 2013 at about 2:30 p.m. Washington, DC time (7:30 a.m. in Pago Pago) announcing that a medevac team would depart from Hawaii at about 8 a.m. Honolulu time on Thursday, October 24, 2013, with scheduled landing in American Samoa the same day at about 1:00 p.m. Pago Pago time. On October 24, 2013, at approximately 5 p.m. DC time (10 a.m. in Pago Pago), while the medevac was already en route to American Samoa, my Washington staff learned in another conference call between Dr. Amoa and Dr. Remtulla that my condition had worsened and that my situation was now critical. When the medevac team reached me, they did not know if I would make it to Tripler alive, but I did and, on behalf of my family, I want to thank everyone involved in my rescue. I thank Governor Lolo Moliga and Lieutenant Governor Lemanu Peleti Mauga for the measures they instituted to provide me with the best chance for evacuation and recovery. I also thank the local police department in American Samoa for their fine work, and the late Dr. Amoa and his staff for the care they provided. I also express appreciation to the Office of Attending Physician, including Dr. Brian Monahan and Dr. Rahim Remtulla, who offered extraordinary assistance and support. I thank the Pacific Air Force's 613th Air Operations Center/Air Mobility Division and all its components and especially its Aero-medical Evacuation Team, Theatre Patient Movement Requirements Center, and Joint Patient Liaison Office, and the Hawaii Air National Guard maintenance and flight crew for their professionalism and expertise. These heroic men and women went for broke to rescue me. From the planning, execution, coordination down to the aircrew and maintenance personnel and everyone involved, they delivered me to Tripler in better condition than they found me. Upon my arrival at the HNL airport,

a true Joint Force team of Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel was on the tarmac ready to transfer me from the airport to Tripler. Even after I was offloaded, the aircraft maintenance men and women worked into the night to offload equipment and bed down the jet. Neither my office nor I expected or requested this kind of outpouring of support. But given the care and love shown for me by our military men and women, I salute the service of all involved. Although words can never express how grateful I am, I would like to honor those who assisted by including their names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: 613 Air Operations Center/Air Mobility Division Aero-Medical Evacuation Team: Lt Col Christine Thrasher, MSgt Gregory Moore, TSgt Christine Hill, TSgt Eric Hammerstrom, SSgt Jerry Marquez, SSgt Brittani McClure; 613 Air Operations Center/Air Mobility Division: Senior Director Lt Col Henry Fairtlough, Major John Lewis, Mr. Paul McDaniel, Major Patrick McClintock; Theater Patient Movement Requirements Center: Col Michael Martin, Maj Joseph Reno, Maj Cynthia Mandac-Clark, Maj Jacob Smith, Capt Amy Sivils, Lt Stephen Meyers, SSgt Maria Velasquez, Sgt Johnny Reynolds, Maj Ryan Gibbons, Maj Kirk Smith, Maj Jacob Smith; JPLO/Joint Patient Liaison Office (members that met the aircraft and transferred me into the ambulance and then to Tripler): HM2 Morgan Orton, Capt Michael Bringas, HM2 Isaac Kargbo, TSgt Delbert Smith; 613 Air Operations Center/Air Mobility Division Mission: Mangers MS. Mary Ann Chock, Mr. David Avigdor, Mr. Jeffrey Frye; 613 Air Operations Center/Air Mobility Division Airlift: Mr. Mark Salondaka, Mr. Matt Mustafaga; 613 Air Operations Center/Air Mobility Division Flight Managers: Mr. Myron Jones, Ms. Eileen Aina, Mr. Stephen Mather, Mr. Rick Dittmer; 613 Air Operations Center/Air Mobility Division Logistics: Mr. Paul Pang, Mr. Walter You, Mr. Ricky Davis; Hawaii Air National Guard: Major General Darryll Wong, Col Rob Hoffman (109th Air Operations Group Commander), Col Duke A. Pirak (154th Operations Group Commander), flight crew members: Capt Kellen Brede, Capt Liliukekulakamaile "Kula" Cummings, Capt William Kealaiki, MSgt Kevin Kalani, MSgt Denny Yoshikawa, TSgt Bronson Abellanida, TSgt Callen Cordeiro, TSgt Sterling Nakamura. I also thank Col Paul A. Friedrichs, Pacific Air Forces Command Surgeon and the medical personnel at Pacific Regional Medical Command and Tripler; including Dr. Osborn, Dr. Donald Helman, Dr. Jone Geimer-Flanders and the many other doctors, nurses and personnel who attended to my well-being. I pay special tribute to General Wong who coordinated every detail of my evacuation. I thank him for his leadership, kindness, expertise, for his calm in the eye of a storm, for his compassion, commitment, and faith. Through emails and phone calls, General Wong stayed in direct contact with my Washington staff every step of the way. He worked around the clock, and I publicly express my appreciation to him. I also publicly thank General Robert Lee, former Adjutant General for the State of Hawaii, whose quick action led to my rescue. Bob Lee is my brother and always will be. I also thank General Dennis Doyle, Commanding General of Tripler; Colonel Ronald Han; M. John Condello, Veterans Services

Coordinator for the State of Hawaii; and members of their staff. I also thank Hawaii VA Director Wayne L. Pfeffer for the quality service he provides our veterans in Hawaii and American Samoa. I also thank Protocol Officer Joel Jenkins who cared for my family and worked with my staff on my behalf. I thank Tracey A. Betts, Director of the Honolulu VA Regional Office, for her tireless efforts. I also thank Captain Findley and those involved in my medical evacuation from Tripler to Travis Air Force Base in California, including the flight crew, and the doctors and nurses and medical personnel at the VA Medical Center in Palo Alto who also aided in my recovery. I recognize Mr. Scott Skiles who served as Liaison for my Congressional office and family while I was at the VA Palo Alto. I pay special tribute to my dear friends, Chairman Li Ka Shing and Ms. Solina Chau, for their visionary philanthropy that includes the Li Ka Shing Center for Learning and Knowledge at the Stanford School of Medicine, which provides services for our veterans at the VA Palo Alto. I thank Chairman Li and Ms. Chau for caring about America's veterans and for the quiet service they offered on my behalf, which strengthened my family and me during difficult days. I also thank the Stanford Medical team that worked with me. I am also appreciative of the medical staff and personnel at Walter Reed.

I thank my colleagues—both Republicans and Democrats—in the House and Senate for their prayers. We have worked together in close cooperation for many years and I will always be grateful for their steadfast friendship as well as their constant support of the initiatives I put forward for the benefit of the people of American Samoa. I particularly thank Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI. We came to know each other through Congressman Phil Burton, who was like a father to me. Leader PELOSI and I have been family since our Burton days, and I am grateful that she has been a part of my life for all these years. I am also very proud that she became the first woman in U.S. history to serve as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. To my friends from around the world, including leaders and diplomats from Vietnam, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Malaysia, Cambodia, Laos, Taiwan, Korea, China, India, Hong Kong and elsewhere, I also express my gratitude for their support and well wishes. I thank the pastors, priests, parishioners, and also those of my own faith who offered prayers and fasted on my behalf, including Elder Paul Pieper and Elder Gerrit Gong of the First Quorum of the Seventy of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Above all, I thank God. I know God loves us. We are His children. From the place of His habitation, He looks down from heaven upon all the inhabitants of the earth (Psalms 33:14), and He hears and answers our prayers. He does so in His own way and in His own time, as the object of prayer "is not to change the will of God but to secure blessings for ourselves or others that God is already willing to grant but are made conditional on our asking for them." I know I am alive today because of prayer and because my appointed days are not yet (Job 14:5). But when my appointed time does come, I will return home to the God who made me with gratitude for the many blessings—especially my family, friends and

associates—that He so richly bestowed upon me in this life. I will go, knowing that if a man die he shall live again according to the promise of our Lord (Job 14:14). Whether I go soon or stay for a while, I hope, like Gandhi, my life will be my message. Having grown up in the small village of Vailoatai in American Samoa and having graduated from Kahuku High School in Hawaii, I will always be grateful to the people of American Samoa for the opportunity they gave me to serve them. I thank the late Paramount Chief A.U. Fuimaono, who served as American Samoa's first elected Representative to Washington, DC, for giving me the opportunity to serve as his Chief of Staff from 1973 to 1975. I will always be thankful for all that he taught me. I am also thankful for the late Congressman Phil Burton, former Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, who I served with from 1975 to 1981. During my service as his Staff Counsel, he tasked me with drafting legislation providing for an elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor in American Samoa. Congressman Burton introduced the legislation on June 10, 1976, which the U.S. House of Representatives passed by a landslide vote of 377 to 1. The historical proceedings and debates of the 94th Congress, Second Session related to this legislation were made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in Volume 122—Part 18, July 1, 1976 to July 21, 1976 (Pages 21785 to 23276). After the legislation passed the House, instead of sending the bill to the Senate for a vote, Chairman Burton consulted with Secretary of the Interior Rogers C.B. Morton and the two agreed that a Secretariat Order should be issued authorizing the American Samoa Government to pass enabling legislation to provide for an elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor. Secretariat Order No. 3009 was issued on September 13, 1977 in accordance with the will of the majority of voters in American Samoa who voted in favor of electing their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor in a plebiscite that was held on August 31, 1976. Chairman Burton also tasked me with drafting legislation providing for American Samoa to be represented in the U.S. Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives. Chairman Burton introduced this legislation, which later became Public Law 95–556, Oct. 31, 1978–92 Stat. 2078. The historical proceedings and debates of the 95th Congress, Second Session related to this legislation were made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in Volume 124—Part 25, October 3, 1978 to October 6, 1978 (Pages 33129 to 34486). I will always be thankful for the opportunity I had to participate in such an historic undertaking for and on behalf of the people of American Samoa.

After I completed my service with Congressman Phil Burton, the late Senate President Paramount Chief Letuli Toloa encouraged me to come home and “eat the dust and walk on the rocks” or, as he put it, *ai le pefu ma savali le ma'ama'a*, meaning come home and more fully feel the suffering and pain of our people so that I might serve them more completely. I followed his advice and served the people of American Samoa as Deputy Attorney General from 1981 to 1984, and as Lieutenant Governor from 1985 to 1988. As I look back over my life, had I not returned to American Samoa

to live and serve among our people, it would have been impossible for the people to have entrusted me to represent their interests for nearly four decades. Because of their faith in me, I became the first Asian Pacific American in U.S. history to serve as Chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives' Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. This was an unexpected honor and an honor that belongs only to the people of American Samoa, not to me. When I left for Vietnam in 1967, I was uncertain if I would return alive. By the grace of God, I did return and went on to serve in the Army Reserve as a Captain in the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Corps and as a proud member of the 100 Battalion 442 Infantry Reserve Unit, Honolulu, Hawaii. By God's grace, I returned to Vietnam in 2007, for the first time in nearly 40 years after having served in Nha Trang as a young soldier at the height of the Tet Offensive. I returned in my official capacity as Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment and, in returning, I found a people I love. This is why I have repeatedly called for the United States to clean up the mess it left behind and do right by the victims of Agent Orange. I was not aware of the many side effects caused by Agent Orange exposure but, now that I know, I urge anyone exposed to seek treatment. Agent Orange is a silent killer. From 1961 to 1971, the U.S. military sprayed more than 11 million gallons of Agent Orange in Vietnam, exposing millions of civilians and soldiers to dioxin, a toxic contaminant known to be one of the deadliest chemicals made by man. I was exposed during my service in Nha Trang. Like hundreds of thousands of veterans in the U.S. and Vietnam, I suffer from the side effects of Agent Orange, including heart and kidney disease. Sadly, many veterans and civilians have lost their lives because of Agent Orange exposure, and many more continue to suffer from its debilitating effects. Before it is too late, it is my sincere hope that the U.S. government will do its part to rectify this problem, and I hope that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will lead the way.

After serving in the U.S. House of Representatives for all these years, I now go forward with faith. In doing so, I again express my love for the people of American Samoa. I thank them for the opportunity they gave me to wear out my life in their service, and I hope I will be remembered for doing my best. As I begin a new chapter, I thank my staff in American Samoa, especially Faivae Alex Godinet, as well as my Washington, DC staff, including Dr. Lisa Williams, Vili Le'i, Tavita Richmond, Leilani Pimentel, Ta'afili Sagapolutele and Jennifer Elliott. I thank them for their loyalty and dedication to me, to this institution and to the people of American Samoa. I also thank other members of my staff who served with me in the past and present, and I also recognize Cari Schemm and Cathy Barnhardt whose work I have relied on and appreciated. At this time, I pay special tribute to my wife, Antonina Hinanui Cave Hunkin. I am forever grateful that Hina is my companion in this life and in the life to come. I thank her for standing by my side during my recovery and throughout my many years of service. I love and appreciate her, and I always will. Hina

and I express our profound love for our children and their spouses: Temanuata Jessie Tuilua'ai Hunkin and her husband Michael Laussen, Taualaitufanuaimaataamali'i O'rereao Hunkin and her husband Fredrick Kolotau Vaitu'ulala, Nifae Ra'imana David Hunkin and his wife Malia Ana Jacqueline Rivera, Vaimoana Kealoha Hunkin, Leonne Lia'ina Hunkin and her husband Taufui-e-valu Vakapuna. We also express our love for our grandchildren: Tutehau Jeremiah Torres Hunkin, Leonne Kilisitinakolokiholeva Leigoanaimanuifa'alava Vaitu'ulala, Tamatoa Eni Nakita Vaitu'ulala, Feletiliki Kolotau Sebastiani Vaitu'ulala, Kenzo Kiyozo Nagashima Banno Vaitu'ulala, Taimana Kenese Rivera Hunkin, Taiatea Hinanui Rivera Hunkin, Maiana Vei Hina Taimalietane Vakapuna, and those yet to come. We pay tribute to our late parents, Eni Fa'auaa Hunkin and Taualaitufanuaimaataamali'i Manu, and David Montague Cave and Georgina Popoua Bambridge. We also extend our love to my sisters, Dr. Salusalumalomamealeleimolea-tunu'u Hunkin-Finau, Masinaatoa Magalei, my brother Albert, as well as my siblings Tuilua'ai, Arlene, and Taulauniumaituitagata who have since passed away. We also express our love for my sister Diane, my late sister Suzie, my late brother Felise, and Hina's brothers—Victor Dwight Cave and the late Dexter Buton Cave—as well as our extended families on this side and the other side of the veil. Hina and I believe that the best is yet to come. Until we meet again, Fa'afetai ma ia Soifua.

HONORING MR. AUBREY O'NEAL
DENT JR., M.D.

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Dr. Aubrey O'Neal Dent. Dr. Dent was a beloved husband, father, brother, and friend. With his passing on October 29, we look to Dr. Dent's personal legacy of leadership, service, and the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Born on May 7, 1934 in Roanoke, Virginia, to Aubrey O'Neal and Lillian Gertrude Dent, Dr. Dent was the only boy and the oldest of four children. After graduating from Lucy Addison High School, he went on to Howard University, where he was a proud member of the Omega Psi Phi fraternity and received his Bachelor of Science degree.

In 1963, Dr. Dent married Carol Hayden Johnson at All Souls Unitarian Church in Washington, D.C., and that same year, he joined the Civil Rights Movement, proudly taking part in the March on Washington.

At that time, Dr. Dent served as a Major in the United States Army at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. His experience there drove him to enroll in College of Medicine at Howard University in 1964, where he would graduate four years later with a medical degree. After he graduated, he moved with his wife, Carol, and his daughter, Gina, to San Francisco. It was there, at the UCSF Medical Center at Mount Zion, that he completed his residency in psychiatry.

With his residency completed, Dr. Dent established a private practice specializing in general psychiatry that he maintained for 26 years. Working in the Presidio, he continued to serve his country as an active reservist in the United States Army Reserve. Later, he took a position at the California Medical Facility in Vacaville. Moreover, Dr. Dent served as Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at the School of Medicine at UCSF.

As a past president of both the Golden Gate Medical Association and the John Hale Medical Society, and his affiliation with the Black Psychiatrists of America and the National Medical Association, Dr. Dent was an active member of his professional community. Dr. Dent dedicated himself to mentoring young students and professionals through his active participation in the Beta Upsilon Boulé of the Sigma Pi Phi fraternity, and he enjoyed attending Howard University's Homecoming each year to be reunited with old pledge brothers and friends.

On a personal note, Aubrey was a dear friend and loyal supporter. I will always remember his kindness and his concern for people who deserved a second chance. I will always remember him as a kind, gentle, loving, and brilliant human being who gave so much to others.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes and honors an outstanding individual, Dr. Aubrey O'Neal Dent. His dedication and efforts have impacted so many lives throughout the state of California. I join all of Aubrey's loved ones in celebrating his incredible life. He will be deeply missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 9, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "NAY" on #552 and "YEA" on #553.

HONORING LATONYA DENISE COTTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a determined young lady, LaTonya Denise Cotton. Ms. Cotton has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to make a positive difference in her community.

LaTonya Denise Cotton, a resident of Anguilla, Mississippi, was born on January 29, 1976 to Diane Cotton and Tom Davis in Hollandale, Mississippi. She is a graduate of Anguilla High School.

LaTonya is the author of a historical novel called "A Small Peyton Place in a Town Called Anguilla". She has plans to make a

movie based on the novel. LaTonya has served as a volunteer through the AmeriCorps program as a career trainer in Sharkey County.

LaTonya has been a devout member of Union Chapel Baptist Church in Anguilla, MS for thirty one years. She is the proud parent of two girls, Dominique and Sumonia Cotton. She enjoys time with family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. LaTonya Denise Cotton for her dedication to serving her community.

HONORING THE KING INSTITUTE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, Leader NANCY PELOSI, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, Congressman MIKE HONDA, Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER and Congressman ERIC SWALWELL, to recognize the Martin Luther King Jr. Research and Education Institute (King Institute) located at Stanford University. Led by Stanford University historian Dr. Clayborne Carson, the King Institute is preserving and promoting the legacy and achievements of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

Before the King Institute was officially founded in 2005, Coretta Scott King approached Dr. Clayborne Carson in 1985 to become the director of the King Papers Project. This Project was established as a long term effort to publish Dr. King's sermons, speeches, correspondence, writings and other materials.

The King Institute is the largest online archive of Dr. King's writings that were previously inaccessible, including the Martin Luther King Jr. Encyclopedia, which was published in 2008.

The King Papers Project plans to release 14 volumes of The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr. by 2027. The first volume was published in 1992 and they have subsequently released six more. This Project is one of the few documentary archiving projects in the nation that focuses on the life of an African American leader.

Moreover, the King Institute prepares and provides educators with the Liberation Curriculum, a document-based set of lesson plans and online educational resources emphasizing the modern African American freedom struggle using nonviolence as the means to achieve positive social change and justice in the United States and other movements globally.

Additionally, the King Institute's Global Outreach program introduces Dr. King's work to a variety of countries, including China and India. By holding public events and by emphasizing the visionary ideas of Dr. King on a global scale, these programs increase awareness of Dr. King's thoughts and life's work.

We are proud that the King Institute resides in such a prestigious academic institution. The Institute is a vital part of our national discourse, inspiring future generations to build upon Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s legacy to achieve equality for all.

Therefore, on behalf of the residents of the Bay Area, we recognize the King Institute's work to preserve the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. We wish the King Institute and Dr. Clayborne Carson the best as they continue to promote Dr. King's beliefs of social justice and racial equality.

IN HONOR OF JOHN DAVID DUKE LANE, SR.

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen and valued peach farmer of Middle Georgia, Mr. John David Duke Lane, Sr., who sadly passed away on Thursday, December 4, 2014 at the age of 87.

Although he was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Mr. Lane had long since planted his roots firmly into Georgia soil. Following his graduation from Gordon Military College in Barnesville, Georgia, Mr. Lane studied at the University of Georgia, where he became a member of the Chi Phi fraternity. He married the former Caroline Martin, and the young couple decided to return to Middle Georgia and help Mr. Lane's grandfather, John David Duke, run the family business at Diamond D Farm, which Mr. Duke founded in 1908.

Mr. Lane, or "Big Duke" as he was known, took the reins and the farm thrived under his leadership for many years. Mr. Lane, alongside his father, Dave Lane, founded Lane Packing Company, which is now a state-of-the-art facility and one of the most modern and efficient packinghouses in the industry. It has the capacity to pack and ship up to one million 25-pound cartons of peaches per season.

Mr. Lane was an innovator and made a name for himself in the agricultural community of Middle Georgia, so much so that the Georgia Peach Council bestowed upon him the title of "Mr. Peach" in 2002. He was one of the first people in Georgia to see the potential of agricultural tourism. The packinghouse has covered walkways where visitors can stroll and watch as peaches are being packed. It also has a restaurant and a large gift shop, which draws more than 200,000 visitors a year. His children and grandchildren continue to operate the packinghouse and the farm, now known as Lane Southern Orchards, one of the largest peach-growing operations in Georgia.

An avid outdoorsman, Mr. Lane enjoyed hunting and fishing and spent 44 years salt water fishing in Homosassa, Florida. In addition, he was fascinated by Indian artifacts and maintained an impressive collection of authentic arrowheads. But his greatest joy was roaming the farm, overseeing the growth and harvesting of the crops.

George Washington Carver once said, "No individual has any right to come into the world and go out of it without leaving behind distinct and legitimate reasons for having passed through it." Mr. Lane has done just that, leaving behind a great legacy of leadership in the

peach-growing community of Middle Georgia. His great contributions to our state's reputation as the "Peach State" will live on as long as Americans and people from all over the world enjoy our delicious and succulent Georgia peaches.

Mr. Lane is preceded in death by his daughter, Anne Lane Tribble, and brother, David Lane. He is survived by his wife of 25 years, Rose Garrett Lane; his sons; Duke, Jr., Bobby, and Stevie Lane; stepchildren, Coleman and Lauren; and his beloved grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the Middle Georgia community in honoring the great John David Duke Lane, Sr. His leadership, wisdom, and keen business savvy helped make Middle Georgia's peach-growing industry the success that it is today. Mr. Lane was a remarkable man and a blessing to the state of Georgia and the nation as a whole. We extend our deepest sympathies to his family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time and we pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

GENERAL LEAVE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call votes 532–533. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on #532, yes on #533.

HONORING DEVIN TYLER McGUIRE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Devin Tyler McGuire. Devin is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 412, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Devin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Devin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Devin has become a Brotherhood Member of the Order of the Arrow and earned the rank of Fire-Builder in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Devin has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Devin built a backstop and painted a storage shed for the Smithville Baseball and Softball League.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending Devin Tyler McGuire for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONSTITUTIONALITY AND LEGALITY OF EXECUTIVE AMNESTY

HON. STEVE STOCKMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, America has a Constitutional crisis. The President is in clear and direct violation of both the Constitution and existing federal statutes in proclaiming by fiat 'executive amnesty.'

With regard to violation of the Constitution, Article I, Section 1 is clear and definitive in its intent when it states "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

The President's blatant attempt to override existing immigration law by executive action is a clear violation of this.

With regard to violation of existing federal statutes, 8 USC 1324 'Bringing in and harboring certain aliens' both prohibits and specifies criminal penalties for bringing to the United States or harboring illegal aliens.

In section (a), the law states "Any person who encourages or induces an alien to come to, enter, or reside in the United States, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such coming to, entry, or residence is or will be in violation of law;" and further describes the penalties as "A person who violates (these sections shall) be fined under title 18, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Further, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State are in additional violation of 8 USC 1324 for not educating the public about the penalties for bringing in and harboring aliens in violation of this law.

In section (e), the law states "The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, as appropriate, shall develop and implement an outreach program to educate the public in the United States and abroad about the penalties for bringing in and harboring aliens in violation of this section."

Therefore, the President must immediately cease and desist his actions to impose amnesty by executive action. He must also reverse existing actions that he and his administration have taken to circumvent existing federal statutes and the Constitution in this matter.

RECOGNIZING REV. JEFFREY C. CHAMBLESS ON THE OCCASION OF HIS INSTALLATION AS PASTOR OF MOUNT MORIAH MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rev. Jeffrey C. Chambliss on the occasion of his installation as pastor of Mount Moriah Missionary Baptist Church on December 12th in Buffalo, New York. Rev. Chambliss was born and baptized in Rockville

Centre, Long Island and became an active member of the Shiloh Baptist Church at the age of 10 under the leadership of the late Rev. Dr. Morgan M. Days, Jr. His early life of service included appointments as a junior trustee, deacon and usher board president. He later relocated to Buffalo and attended Canisius College, majoring in Pre-Law with a minor in Religious Studies. His educational pursuit also included a major in Police Services while attending Erie Community College.

Led by his family to Zion Missionary Baptist Church, this determined and dedicated man continued to embrace a life of service through his work on the Deacon Board, as Youth Pastor and then Interim Pastor. His impressive engagement with Church leadership and civic and community involvement includes membership with the Baptist Ministers Conference of Buffalo, NY and Vicinity, Delegate to the National Baptist Convention, Chaplain at Erie County Medical Center and Kaleida Health System, member of the Board of Directors for Teens In Progress (TIP) Youth Organization, Regional Committee for the New York State Department of Health AIDS/HIV Institute and Say Yes to Education Buffalo Clergy Task Force. Mount Moriah Missionary Baptist Church was founded in September 1960 by the late Rev. Anthony Benson, Sr. Their congregation has continued to grow for more than fifty years and through the guidance of several pastors. Under the spiritual leadership of Rev. Robert E. Baines Jr., valuable programs were started at the church including the Women's Ministry, the Senior Citizens Ministry and the Drug Abuse Program. Mount Moriah moved to its current location on Northampton Street in Buffalo in 1994 where fellowship flows to this day.

Since accepting this leadership position, Rev. Chambliss's ministry has added new members and appointed two deacons. His many gifts and ability to bring his practical experience to serve the needs of people in the Church as well as the community will continue to yield growth, goodwill and guidance to his congregation and the City of Buffalo.

Mr. Speaker, it is in that spirit of service, that I rise with great pride today to extend deepest congratulations and best wishes for success to Rev. Jeffrey C. Chambliss, his wife Clarisse and their daughter, Camille, and all who join with them on December 12th to witness his installation as Pastor of Mount Moriah Missionary Baptist Church.

HONORING MRS. MARY LEE TAYLOR

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a former educator and longtime community activist from Tallahatchie County, MS, Mrs. Mary Lee Taylor.

Mrs. Taylor is 101 years old. She was born January 17, 1913 in Paynes, MS. Her years have been long and her mind is full of many stories her eyes have seen. I am talking about trying times, historical eras, blue skies, and personal achievements.

Mrs. Taylor is a 1936 graduate of the Tallahatchie County Training School. She went on to continue her education at Rust College in Holly Springs, MS and at the Mississippi Vocational College (now referred to as Mississippi Valley State University) in Itta Bena, MS. There she received her Bachelor of Science Degree.

Her age has not had an effect on her memory which brings smiles to her face. One of her personal achievements is that Mrs. Taylor is the only person in her family who received an education, according to her son, Mervyn Leon Taylor.

Mrs. Taylor taught 1st grade and adult education classes. Another achievement of Mrs. Taylor is that she was one of the original pioneers who lead the effort to bring the Head Start program to Charleston and across Tallahatchie County. Her list of fighting for the citizens of Tallahatchie County and surrounding communities goes on to include road improvements in the Black community, and bringing electricity and telephone service to the Black communities.

Her son, Mervyn, said his mother wasn't just active locally but also overseas. She traveled to poverty stricken areas on mission trips. Mrs. Taylor was also an active member in her church, St. Paul Christian Methodist Episcopal (C.M.E.) Church. She served as president of the local missionary, president of the Northern District Episcopal faith domination, and missionary president of the northern and southern Mississippi C.M.E. conferences.

Mrs. Taylor is the widow of the late Mr. Jimmy M. Taylor. She now lives in the Blue Cane Community, right outside of Charleston.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Mary Lee Taylor a pioneer in her community who has helped to pave the way for others, like you and me, to come along.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE ASSOCIATION FOR TALENT DEVELOPMENT (ATD)

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the Association for Talent Development (ATD) as the largest association dedicated to the talent development profession and recognize them for their annual Employee Learning Week, held from December 1st through the 5th, 2014.

Members of ATD come from more than 100 countries and connect locally with 125 U.S. chapters, international strategic partners, and global networks. They work in thousands of organizations of all sizes, in government, as independent consultants, and as suppliers.

Established in 1943 as the American Society for Training Directors, ATD is now a global leader in the talent development field. As businesses seek competitive advantages and growth, talent development professionals make sure an organization's best asset, its employees, have the skills they need to help achieve business growth. ATD serves this im-

portant community of professionals with research and resources.

To further these goals, ATD has declared December 1st through December 5th, 2014, as "Employee Learning Week" and designated time for organizations to recognize the strategic value of employee learning. I applaud ATD and its members for their dedication to developing knowledgeable and skilled employees during Employee Learning Week.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting policies that commit to maintaining a highly skilled workforce.

HONORING LANDON MONTGOMERY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Landon Montgomery. Landon is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 714, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Landon has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Landon has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Landon contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending Landon Montgomery for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HONORABLE CALVIN SMYRE

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished public servant, principled business leader and dear friend to my wife, Vivian and me, Georgia State Representative Calvin Smyre. Representative Smyre will be retiring this month as Executive Vice President of Corporate External Affairs of Synovus, a financial services company based in Columbus, Georgia.

Representative Smyre earned a degree in Business Administration from Fort Valley State University in Fort Valley, Georgia. In 1974, he was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives as its youngest member at 27 years of age. I was honored to have served with Rep. Smyre during my own tenure in the Georgia General Assembly, and I feel blessed to have gained a dear friend.

A 40-year legislative veteran, Rep. Smyre has built a repertoire of legislative accomplishments. He currently serves on the Appropriations Committee and the Rules Committee

and is Chairman Emeritus of the House Democratic Caucus. In 1983, Rep. Smyre transcended racial barriers when Governor Joe Frank Harris appointed him as Administration Floor Leader, making Rep. Smyre the first African American in history to hold this position. In 1985, he was elected to the Democratic National Committee, becoming the first African-American elected official from Georgia to serve on the Committee. Then, in 2001, Rep. Smyre made history again when Governor Roy Barnes named him Chairman of the Democratic Party of Georgia, making Rep. Smyre the first African American to chair the state Democratic Party. Nationally, Rep. Smyre is President Emeritus of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators (NBCSL) and the immediate Past President of the NBCSL Foundation.

In addition to his legislative achievements, Rep. Smyre has also built a successful business career. In 1976, he joined Columbus Bank & Trust Company, the Columbus-based division of Synovus, as a Manager Trainee. Two years later, he was promoted to Assistant Vice President and Marketing Officer. He served as Assistant Vice President and Vice President of Corporate Administration for Synovus from 1984 to 1990 and as Vice President of Corporate Affairs from 1992 to 1994. In 1996, Rep. Smyre was named Senior Vice President and Assistant to the Chairman for Community Affairs. In 1999, he was promoted to Executive Vice President and has served in this position ever since. In addition, he has the role of Synovus representative on the Financial Services Roundtable, the leading advocacy organization for the financial industry headquartered in Washington, D.C.

As former Chairman and CEO of the Synovus Foundation, the organization that directs corporate and philanthropic gifts from Synovus, Rep. Smyre has been one of the driving forces in ensuring that the company creates goodwill in the communities that it serves. Synovus boasts approximately \$26 billion in assets and provides commercial and retail banking and investment services to consumers in the southeast United States. The company has been named one of Fortune magazine's "100 Best Companies to Work For" in America multiple times.

Although his business career and legislative duties have kept him busy, Rep. Smyre still finds the time to serve his community in various other capacities. He has held leadership and membership positions on numerous boards, foundations and organizations. He is a devoted Christian and has been a member of Greater Ward Chapel A.M.E. Church for over fifty years.

Nelson Mandela once said, "For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others." Rep. Smyre embodies this statement thoroughly, for in light of his great personal success, he continues to fight to ensure that every voice is respected and heard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the Columbus, Georgia community in honoring Georgia State Representative Calvin Smyre for his decades of leadership at Synovus. While he leaves behind a great legacy at Synovus, we have certainly not seen the last of Rep. Smyre. He will

continue to represent his constituents in the state legislature and he will continue to serve the Columbus community with integrity and distinction.

HONORING THE HEROIC SERVICE
AND SACRIFICE OF ABDUL-
RAHMAN PETER EDWARD
KASSIG

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the service and sacrifice of Abdul-Rahman Peter Edward Kassig. Tragically before his time, Kassig was taken from this earth by the hands of the terrorist group ISIL. He will forever be remembered as a selfless man who gave his life in service to those who needed it most. I also honor his loving and dedicated parents, Ed and Paula Kassig, who live in Indianapolis.

Although he was only 26 at the time of his death, Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig dedicated his entire adult life to serving others. Born and raised in Indianapolis, Kassig graduated from North Central High School in 2006. Upon his graduation, Kassig served as a soldier in the U.S. Army as a member of the 1st Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment. Deployed to the Middle East, he bravely served his country and returned to the United States with an Honorable Medical Discharge.

After his tenure in the Army, Kassig attended Hanover College and Butler University. During this time, he also trained as an Emergency Medical Technician. In 2012, after seeing the suffering of Syrian refugees in Lebanon, he left higher education to use his medical training by providing humanitarian aid to those affected by the ongoing conflict in Syria. He founded a non-profit, Special Emergency Response Assistance (SERA), to provide Syrian refugees with medical supplies, medical assistance, clothing and food. Kassig also taught trauma care skills to others and thus spread his knowledge and good works to countless people.

The compassion and selflessness that Kassig displayed is an inspiration to his fellow Hoosiers and everyone who dreams of a more peaceful world. The danger he faced did nothing to temper his resolve to help those who needed it most. Kassig and SERA were dedicated to providing acute logistical support and assistance in areas too difficult for other humanitarian organizations to effectively operate.

Abdul-Rahman Peter Edward Kassig will be remembered as a young man of tremendous courage and integrity by family and friends from Indiana and across the globe. I join people of all faiths in praying for the comfort of those who mourn his death and a more peaceful world for all to live in.

HONORING REVEREND THADDEUS
J. WILLIAMS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Thaddeus J. Williams, a native of Yazoo City, Mississippi.

Reverend Thaddeus J. Williams is married to the former Teresa L. Buckner and the father to four children: Sam, Dante, Philip, and Alexandria. He is a Licensed and Ordained Minister of the Gospel and currently serves as Minister of Membership Assimilation at Greater Fairview Baptist Church.

Reverend Williams is currently enrolled in Mississippi Baptist Seminary and Bible College pursuing a Master in Christian Education. He earned a B.S. degree in Business Administration from Mississippi Valley State University in 1987 and a Master of Public Administration from the University of Mississippi in 1991. He is a graduate of the Mississippi Certified Public Manager Program, the John C. Stennis Institute of Government, Leadership Yazoo City's Inaugural Class in 1992, and the 2008 Inaugural Class of FOCUS—DMH's Succession Planning/Accelerated Leadership Development Program.

Reverend Williams organized and has facilitated T and T (Thad and Teresa) Food/Outreach Ministry since 2000 where they have received both national and local recognition for their service to the community including the 2014 "WJTV Jefferson Award" and the 2013 Southern Christian Services "Hands of Providence Award."

Reverend Williams has served as Chaplain for the Mississippi Valley State University National Alumni Association, employed with the State of Mississippi since 1992 and currently with Mississippi Department of Mental Health's Central Office where he was voted by his peers as the 2012 Employee of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Reverend Thaddeus J. Williams.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JESUIT MARTYRS OF EL SALVADOR

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in mid-November I was privileged to participate in the 25th Anniversary observance of the Jesuit martyrs of El Salvador. On November 16, 1989, the Salvadoran military carried out a joint operation with the specific purpose to enter the campus of the Jesuit-administered University of Central America José Simeón Cañas (the UCA) and murder the university rector and several of its faculty. That evening, members of the Salvadoran Army shot and killed six Jesuit priests, including the rector, along with two women, a housekeeper and her teenage daughter, who were being sheltered at the university that evening.

This year I traveled to El Salvador as part of a delegation led by the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), which included many presidents and officials of U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities. It was a very moving experience, one that strengthened both my faith and my commitment to stand up for human rights everywhere, including in my own country.

I was invited to participate in one of the forums organized by the UCA as part of the 25th Anniversary events, The Legacy of the Jesuits on U.S. Foreign Policy toward El Salvador and Central America and on the Society of Jesus. Also appearing on the panel were Fr. Charlie Currie, SJ, with Georgetown University and executive president of Jesuit Commons; Fr. Michael Sheeran, SJ, president, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities/AJCU (in the USA); Fr. Andreu Oliva, SJ, rector, UCA; Geoff Thale, WOLA; and Fr. Tom Smolich, SJ, former president of US Conference of Jesuit Provincials.

I would like to submit the remarks I presented at the UCA on how the murders of the six Jesuits and two women affected me and how I see their legacy in El Salvador and the United States.

THE LEGACY OF THE JESUITS ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD EL SALVADOR AND CENTRAL AMERICA AND ON THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

Forum at the UCA: 25th Anniversary Observance of the Jesuit Martyrs

University of Central America José Simeón Cañas

Saturday, November 15, 2014

10:00 AM-12:00 PM

Background: Panel presentations by Rep. Jim McGovern, Fr. Charles Currie, Geoff Thale, Fr. Tom Smolich, and UCA Rector Fr. Andreu Oliva. Presentations will be in Spanish/English with simultaneous translation provided.

REMARKS BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES P. MCGOVERN

Thank you for that very kind introduction. I am here this morning because I am grateful to the Jesuits of El Salvador, and especially those who have served and those who continue to serve here at the UCA. You have been my friends, my mentors and my teachers. How I think, what I believe, how I view and evaluate what is going on in the world has been shaped by my relations with the Jesuits, before, during and after the war.

The UCA itself was founded in the spirit of liberation. It is named after a Salvadoran priest, Jose Simeón Cañas, who as a congressman in the Constitutional Assembly championed and achieved the abolition of slavery in Central America in 1824. Abraham Lincoln didn't sign the Emancipation Proclamation until forty years later, in 1863. So it's right that we in the United States look to and work with the UCA to advance human rights, human dignity, freedom and equality.

Many people look upon the deaths of Fathers Ignacio Ellacuría, "Nacho" Martín-Baró, Segundo Montes, Juan Ramón Moreno, Joaquín López y López, Amando López, and Elba and Celina Ramos as crimes that epitomize the harsh reality of the war and the brutality of the Salvadoran armed forces. I prefer to remember their lives. I remember how they lived, how they carried out their pastoral work, their intellectual work and research, and how they interacted with their students, friends, colleagues and the Salvadoran people. And if there is one lesson that they taught me, it was that faith is more

than ritual—it means action. “Feed the Hungry” means feed the hungry. “Treat Everyone with Dignity” means every person, and especially the poor, rightfully deserve a life with dignity.

One of the reasons U.S. policy changed towards El Salvador in the 1990s was because Jesuit university and college presidents from all around the United States—many who are here today—took up the challenge of the murdered Jesuits and ignited their alumni across the country to take action, not to remain silent. Those actions had tremendous power—the power of faith working to move history in support of human rights, truth, justice and peace.

We come to El Salvador this weekend to commemorate the lives and the loss of our Jesuit brothers. But we are also here to reflect on what has happened over the past 25 years. I believe that U.S. policy toward El Salvador has fallen far short in the aftermath of the war. In 1995, we all but abandoned El Salvador, significantly reducing our economic and development support just when it was most needed to consolidate the peace. When we have seen increases in our development aid, it has mainly been in response to natural disasters.

The U.S. should have helped lead a Marshall Plan for Peace in El Salvador over the past 20 years; instead, we did the opposite. We still don't have robust assistance ready to support a national development strategy for El Salvador—and we certainly aren't prioritizing projects focused on listening to, working with and helping lift up the poorest and most neglected Salvadorans, rather than economic projects that support elite interests. Even our Millennium Challenge Grants, which are targeted at strengthening Salvadoran agriculture and related infrastructure, and now at supporting development projects along the Pacific Coast, were held hostage to private sector interests for too long. But I'm glad that all conditions have now been resolved and I'm hopeful that development projects that take into account the interests of the communities on the coast might now move forward.

So, we Americans should not be surprised that we are now reaping what we have helped sow. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to understand that had we invested significantly over the past 20 years in jobs, education, health care, food security, youth, women and families, fewer Salvadorans would have felt forced to abandon their homes and seek a life elsewhere. Not only did U.S. policies export gang violence to Central America, we did precious little to invest in preventing violence from taking root.

With all these families and unaccompanied children arriving at the U.S. border—many with terrible stories to tell—it is time to develop a policy that is good for the people of El Salvador, Central America and the United States. Will we help our friends and neighbors create jobs and greater opportunities for young people and marginalized communities and towns? Will we help strengthen judicial institutions to investigate and prosecute those responsible for violence? Will we help those same institutions root out corruption and identify those among society who are in league with or benefit from criminal activity and violence? Will we invest in the kind of citizen security and infrastructure that benefits all Salvadorans, not just the wealthy few?

President Sanchez Cerén is in Washington right now, and he and the other Central American presidents met with U.S. Vice-President Joe Biden yesterday. I hope that

the Obama Administration and the U.S. Congress will decide to make long-term investments in youth, in development, and in citizen security. I hope they will embrace the positive lessons learned from USAID's recent programs on youth violence prevention. As they work on these proposals, I hope the U.S. and Salvadoran governments will make sure that programs are designed in partnership with civil society and affected communities—a real partnership.

We in the U.S. government need to be committed to reforming and strengthening institutions, and we have to make sure that our partners in Central America, most especially the regional governments, are also genuinely committed to using these investments for real institutional reform, and for development that benefits youth and marginal communities. We need to make sure that civil society and affected communities are wholly integrated into designing and evaluating these projects. And when I look around the region, I feel like the most potential for creating these types of sensitive and genuine partnerships is here in El Salvador.

Such long-term investments not only need to be made, they will need to be sustained. I am very concerned that the Administration, and especially the new U.S. Congress, will try to do everything “on the cheap.” And meanwhile, the questions remain whether we in the United States will respect our own laws, as well as international humanitarian law, and welcome those who come to our borders in need of protection? Or will we continue to spend money primarily on increasing border security, expanding detention facilities, denying immigrants legal counsel, streamlining deportation proceedings, and overwhelming, rather than strengthening, our immigration courts?

My country owes a great deal to the hundreds of thousands of Salvadorans who have made the United States their home. They are great assets to our local communities, working hard, opening small businesses, investing in their neighborhoods, and all the while continuing to invest in their families and former communities here in El Salvador. It reminds me a lot of my own Irish-Polish immigrant heritage.

I learned a great deal about El Salvador from refugees in 1983 who told my former boss, Congressman Joe Moakley, their stories. I believe that Salvadoran children and families telling similar stories about why they are trying to escape gang violence and criminal networks can make a difference today. Policymakers need to understand this reality. It also requires a commitment to invest in new policies, new ideas, new approaches—both here in El Salvador and in the United States.

When we deal with criminal and gang violence in the United States, we know we need to deal with education, social services and prevention programs, and with jobs and opportunities for young people. I don't know why anyone believes it's any different here.

The Government of El Salvador has made great progress. When I first traveled to El Salvador, the FMLN was in the mountains, settling differences through the barrel of a gun. Today, the Salvadoran people have just elected its second president from the FMLN political party. Peace has made a tremendous difference. The Salvadoran people's commitment to peace has made a tremendous difference. And today, political disputes are settled in the political and public arena.

I am grateful to be able to honor the lives of the Jesuit martyrs, and to know that their memory and their example continue to

influence so many people, even now, 25 years after their murders.

I am also proud that we will be presenting later today a gift from the Moakley Foundation in Massachusetts for the UCA. I still believe that one of the best investments we can make in El Salvador is to support this university. Future leaders of El Salvador are being educated here today—maybe one of you sitting in the audience will be president of El Salvador one day, or a financial leader, or a teacher whose students will change the world, or a social worker who will work with communities and design the model that lifts thousands of Salvadorans out of poverty and into a dignified life. It is all possible, here at the UCA.

Education is the great liberator. The history of the UCA—and the lives and work of the Jesuit community—have long stood for an engaged and educated society, able to transform itself for the good of all people. This is why universities throughout Central America and around the world have created partnerships with the UCA. The UCA is the place where new ideas, new visions, and new leadership come to be nurtured and to flourish. And the UCA has always been where the voices of the poor were amplified—not just during the war, but in the hard work of advancing and consolidating the peace.

We all know there is no quick fix to the problems facing El Salvador. But many of the solutions to those problems are ones that the Jesuits and the UCA have advocated for as long as I can remember. All people deserve to be treated with dignity. Investing in the poor means listening to those who live in marginal communities and letting them decide how best to address the many problems that affect their daily lives. Certainly, confronting violent gangs and criminal networks requires strong police and judicial systems. But it also requires that those institutions be free of corruption, transparent, respectful of basic human rights, able to carry out their duties at a decent living wage, and in harmony with the communities that rely on their protection.

The good news is that there are solutions, and we basically know what they are. I believe with the commitment to act and press policymakers to do the right thing for the majority of Salvadorans, especially the poor, we can all make a difference. And I rely on the UCA and the Jesuits in El Salvador and the United States to remain committed and engaged, and to help show us the way.

In 1982, in a speech at Santa Clara University, Father Ellacuria spoke eloquently about the role of the university. He began by saying:

“Our historical reality—the reality of El Salvador, the reality of the Third World, that is, the reality of the larger part of the world and the most universal—is characterized fundamentally by the dominance of falsehood over truth, of injustice over justice, of oppression over liberty, of scarcity over abundance, in short of evil over good . . .”

He then went on to describe the role of the university this way:

“We ask ourselves what to do with the University. And we answer, above all, from the ethical point of view: transform it, do what is possible so that good wins over evil, liberty over oppression, justice over injustice, truth over falsehood and love over hate. . .”

“A Christian university must take into account the gospel preference for the poor. This does not mean that only the poor study at the university; it does not mean that the university should abdicate its mission of

academic excellence—excellence needed to solve complex social problems. It does mean that the university should be present intellectually where it is needed: to provide science for those who have no science; to provide skills for the unskilled; to be a voice for those who have no voice; to give intellectual support for those who do not possess the academic qualifications to promote and legitimize their truth and their rights.

I do not mean to be presumptuous by quoting Fr. Ellacuria to all of you who work and study at the UCA, but for me, those words resonate as strongly today as they did three decades ago. How can we look at the agony and desperation of so many Salvadorans and Central Americans and not feel called upon to respond generously and in solidarity with them, their families and their communities? I strongly believe—and it is one of the most important legacies of the Jesuit martyrs—that we are here to help the least among us. For me, this is the most important mission—for governments, for churches, for universities, for all of us. As Professor Emeritus Dave O'Brien, at the College of the Holy Cross, a Jesuit college in my home town of Worcester, wrote earlier this week, the challenge for all of us is in “creating the next chapter.”

When I think of the lives and the deaths of those who we honor and who bring us together for this reflection, I believe that if they were still here with us, experiencing El Salvador's current reality, they would be calling us to the same commitment, built on the same ideals.

These eight individuals—six priests, two women—they died for a reason. What they stood for is very powerful. As long as I live I will be inspired by their words and by their example.

It is a powerful legacy. Let us build upon it together. Let us create the next chapter. Thank you.

HONORING JACKSON REXFORD

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jackson Rexford. Jackson is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 206, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jackson has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jackson has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jackson has led his troop as the Patrol Leader and also became a Brave in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and a Brotherhood Member of the Order of the Arrow. Jackson has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Jackson constructed four raised planters for Susquehanna Baptist Church in Independence, Missouri. All of the food produced in these planters will be provided to the church's food pantry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in commending Jackson Rexford for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for

his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HEAR WHAT I HEAR: THANKING THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES THIS CHRISTMAS

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor our Armed Forces and their families, on this Christmas and holiday season of giving. Their gifts to our Nation are of the greatest. Let's keep them in our prayers this Christmas and holiday season. I submit this poem penned in their honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

HEAR WHAT I HEAR

Pray for peace, people everywhere
Listen to what I say I say
The child, the child, sleeping in the night
he will bring us goodness and light
he will bring us goodness and light
Do you hear what I hear,
I hear
This Christmas our troops are coming home,
to their loved ones where they belong
To be near.
To be near
Do you hear what I hear
I hear
All those most poignant tears,
of all those who've lost their loved ones so
very dear

So dear
Who will be alone year after year
After year
Never again to be near
To be near
All of those little boys and girls,
who've lost all their best friends in the world
In the world
Do you see what I see
I see
All those amputees,
who gave all their strong arms and legs,
as for you and me what they gave
What they gave
And all those physical therapists who inspire
these
To dig in deep
Dig in deep
Do you see what I see
All those selfless ones,
whose eyesight is now gone,
all for the price of freedom they paid
They paid

Do you know what I know
I know
How inside them all so grows,
the scars of war upon them so
PTS something on that outside which
doesn't show
Do you know what I know
Our Armed Forces,
are our most brilliant of all souls
Whose hearts are made of gold,
and their families so
And their families so
Let us bring them silver and gold
Silver and gold
All in our hearts that we hold,
that we hold
Do you know what I know
All those doctors and nurses so,
who from death have so stole
So stole
Giving all those families hope

Giving them peace and such hope
As all across America in hospitals their dedication shows

Shows
Do you see what I see
I see
On this Christmas Eve,
how much we owe to all of these
How great they are so all indeed
With a voice as big as the sea
as big as the sea
Found in all their deeds
In this season,
of the birth of the Prince of Peace,
please please remember him and all of these
Because they too bring us goodness and
light,
they bring us goodness and light

By: Albert Caswell.

RECOGNIZING JOHN ALTON MILLER, JR., FACHE FOR A RECORD OF SERVICE

HON. JEFF DUNCAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and career of Mr. John A. Miller, Jr. for his 41 years of involvement with AnMed Health System and with the local community in South Carolina. John began his career with AnMed Health in 1973, eventually becoming its Chief Operating Officer (COO) in 1978 and serving as its Chief Executive Officer (CEO) from 1998 to the present. I have appreciated John's expert views on healthcare policy and economic development over the years.

Anchored by AnMed Health Medical Center in downtown Anderson, South Carolina, AnMed Health is one of the largest employers in South Carolina's Third Congressional District with over 500 physicians and nearly 4,000 employees. The 690-bed, not-for-profit health system is one of the state's largest not-for-profit independent health systems and serves South Carolina, Georgia, and North Carolina. AnMed Health also serves as a local hub of medical education, partnering with institutions such as Clemson University, Anderson University, The Medical University of South Carolina, and AnMed Health's own Family Medicine residency program in the training of future healthcare professionals, which has graduated over 300 family doctors since 1975.

John began his career with AnMed Health in 1973 after graduating from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, serving in the U.S. Navy and completing a Masters of Health Administration from Duke University. John has also received an Honorary Doctorate of Humanities from Anderson University. John's career in healthcare now spans nearly 41 years as does his involvement in the Anderson Community and across the region. He has served in numerous leadership capacities with a number of local, regional, state, and national organizations, including the Anderson Area Chamber of Commerce, the Anderson Area YMCA, the Anderson County United Way, Innovate Anderson, Hospice of the Upstate, Upstate South Carolina Alliance, Ten at the Top, Leadership South Carolina, and the SC Chamber of Commerce.

During John's tenure at AnMed Health, he has led AnMed Health from a community hospital to a comprehensive health system, encompassing five hospitals, a modern cancer center, a comprehensive home care division, a Level II trauma center, a cardiac and orthopedic center, three outpatient surgery centers, a family medicine residency program, two minor cares, two retail pharmacies, and a network of physician practices. John's knowledge and understanding of the changing healthcare landscape and his ongoing dedication to the organization and the community have ensured the continued realization of AnMed Health's founder Jennie Gilmer's vision to bring comprehensive and quality healthcare to the Anderson community. While at the helm of AnMed Health, he has continued to encourage the achievement of the gold standard for the health system by lending support to AnMed Health in its achievement of Magnet designation for nursing excellence by earning Top 100 recognitions by organizations such as Thomas Reuters and Becker's Hospital Review, U.S. News and World Reports Best Regional Hospital, and numerous accreditations from the Joint Commission and other national organizations.

John has contributed to the advancement of the healthcare industry on a local, regional, state, and national level over the past four decades by serving in a leadership capacity with such organizations as the American Hospital Association, the American College of Healthcare Executives, the South Carolina Hospital Association, and many others. While he is leaving his leadership post, he will still remain active with AnMed Health and various national and local organizations. I know that John will always be there to offer much needed counsel to those in need. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 3rd District of South Carolina, I wish to express our deepest thanks to Mr. John A. Miller, Jr. for his significant contributions to AnMed Health, the local and regional communities, and healthcare overall. We wish him and his family all the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HARRY
EMMETT MCKILLOP

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the life of Harry Emmet McKillop of McKinney who passed away November 7 at the age of 92. Harry was a passionate family man, global humanitarian, a dedicated patriot, and a dear friend of mine.

The child of Harry and Cecilia (née D'Ozeville) McKillop, Harry was born January 2, 1922 in New York, New York. Harry served his country as a naval officer aboard the USS *Phoenix* in the South Pacific during World War II. A graduate of St. John's University with a degree in law, Harry worked throughout the world in the airline industry working his way up to the executive level with United Airlines, after which he serviced as Vice President for Braniff International and Vice President with

Pan American Airways over a thirty year span. Hired in 1985 by Ross Perot, Harry headed the travel department for Electronic Data Systems before being appointed as President of Alliance International Airport—International Division by Ross Perot, Jr.

In addition to a lifelong career in the aviation industry, Harry dedicated more than 40 years of unselfish service to Americans in need around the world—most notably by continuing the search for and return of missing POWs and MIAs in many countries including Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Iran, and Iraq. His tireless work included managing logistics for Ross Perot's trip of the wives of American POWs to Vietnam to provide supplies and relief to the POWs. For his devotion to humanitarianism and patriotic service, in 2007 President George W. Bush awarded Mr. McKillop with the Secretary of Defense Medal for Exceptional Public Service, one of the most prestigious awards given to a civilian by the Department of Defense.

A man who loved history especially as it relates to his Irish roots, Ross Perot established The Harry McKillop Irish Spirit Award to honor the life of and work of his friend for his commitment to "Irish Spirit" in 2003. Among those to receive the award are Jean Kelly of Speedwell Trust, Rev. Bill Shaw of 174 Trust, and Richard Moore of Children in Crossfire. In honor of his work addressing the plight of POWs and MIAs from Vietnam and successive wars, as well as his support of Irish causes and business developments in Ireland, specifically Shannon Airport, The University of Limerick conferred an Honor Doctor of Economic Science on Mr. McKillop in early 2014.

Harry was a long-time member of the Knights of Columbus, a former Grand Knight of the New World Council 9903 in McKinney, and a member of the 4th Degree Assembly 2266 in Plano. Children in the Fourth Congressional District attend the Harry McKillop Elementary School in Melissa, Texas. He has also been honored by the McKinney Fire Department as an Honorary Battalion Chief.

Harry is survived by his wife of 27 years, Rebecca Sue, and their daughters, Mary (and husband Seth) and Tory, six children from his first marriage: Linda, Laurie, Jeff, Wayne (and wife Mary), Allison, and Tracey, as well as 22 grandchildren: Aaron, Andrew, Kittredge (and husband Jack), Kelly (and husband Ken), Finnian, Vivienne, Ryan, Tessa, Maxwell, Jane, Corey (and wife Samantha), Zachary, Lauren, Kerry, Elizabeth, Lara, Tara (and husband Shane), Nick, Ben, Daniel (and wife Samantha), Michael (and wife Hannah), and Emily, and 9 great-grandchildren: Denver, Isabella, Sage, Sean, Maddox, Canyon, Noble, Leighton, and Olive, along with 17 nieces and nephews, and his siblings, Carol and Donald. He is preceded in death by his parents, his sister, Lucille, and his brother, Tom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of Harry Emmett McKillop and the positive impact he had upon his community and communities around the world. He was a man of faith, family, generosity, and selflessness and I believe we can all learn from his example.

HONORING MR. JOHN RUMSEY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize John Rumsey for his lasting impact in the field of developmental disability advocacy and his exceptional service to those in need.

Early in his professional career, Mr. Rumsey turned his attention to helping those who were less fortunate than himself. In 1974, he joined the Contra Costa ARC, a non-profit, public benefit organization that is dedicated to helping adults with significant disabilities to realize their full potential and find meaningful employment.

In addition to his important work at Contra Costa ARC, Mr. Rumsey was an early active advocate for the accreditation of disability services agencies. As a statewide leader in the developmental disability field, John Rumsey held several key positions, such as President of California Disabilities Services Association. Today, the State of California requires the accreditation of such agencies to ensure quality service, due in large part to Mr. Rumsey's strong advocacy.

In 1984, Mr. Rumsey left Contra Costa ARC and devoted himself to assisting the developmentally disabled residents of Marin County. In 1990, Mr. Rumsey worked with other advocates to found Marin Ventures, where he served as the Executive Director for 21 years until his retirement in 2011.

Even in retirement, Mr. Rumsey continues to advocate for those in need and remains a strong voice for developmentally disabled adults. Please join me in expressing deep appreciation to John Rumsey for his long and singularly exceptional career, and for his outstanding record of service to the people of Marin County and beyond.

IN HONOR OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COLUMBUS (GA) CHAPTER OF THE LINKS, INCORPORATED

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the noble work of the Columbus (GA) Chapter of The Links, Incorporated on the eve of its 50th anniversary. The Columbus (GA) Chapter was chartered on December 19, 1964. Its members and supporters will be celebrating this milestone at a luncheon on Saturday, December 13, 2014.

The Links, Incorporated traces its origins back to 1946. Margaret Roselle Hawkins and Sarah Strickland Scott gathered seven friends in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to form a group to respond to the pressing needs of the African-American community after World War II. Today, an esteemed international women's service organization, The Links, Incorporated

aims to improve the lives of African Americans by providing them with essential resources and services which offer disadvantaged communities new hope for improved lives.

I would like to take this opportunity to specifically acknowledge the great work of the Columbus (GA) Chapter of The Links, Incorporated. The Columbus (GA) Chapter has implemented and sustained The Links, Incorporated's five programming categories: National Trends and Services, The Arts, Services to Youth, International Trends and Services, and Health and Human Services.

The National Trends and Services facet of the Columbus (GA) Chapter champions the idea of empowering both the individual and the community through events such as a week-long community celebration that illustrates the positive impacts of diversity and multiculturalism. Displayed everywhere from government centers to schools to churches, The Links, Incorporated promotes ethnic pluralism within the community.

In addition, The Links were the first to gather local black entrepreneurs and prospective customers together in order to explore shared interests and encourage the potential for reciprocal benefits. The organization also takes the time to honor the lifeblood of local communities: trash collectors, school bus operators, postal carriers, and cafeteria workers. It seeks to recognize every aspect of a community, understanding that everyone deserves respect and gratitude for the vital roles they play in keeping the community afloat.

The International Trends and Services arm of the Columbus (GA) Chapter brings resources to countries across Africa through well-building and providing clean birth kits to those in Uganda and survival kits to women in Haiti. The organization's dedication to domestic and international service showcases the depth of its commitment to community betterment through public service.

The Columbus (GA) Chapter has instituted numerous programs under its Services to Youth facet, including a mentor program for kids in kindergarten to young adults in college. Additionally, Services to Youth promotes the values of higher education by raising interest in STEM education and career paths by awarding scholarships, creating endowments, and supporting Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

In line with its mission to promote cultural awareness through The Arts program, the Columbus (GA) Chapter partners with a number of arts institutions, such as museums, art councils, symphonies, and educational institutes to reinforce the importance of a strong minority presence in the art community.

Last, but certainly not least, the Health and Human Services facet of the Columbus (GA) Chapter works to implement and maintain community services to address the disparities in health conditions negatively impacting minorities. In this regard, the Columbus (GA) Chapter has joined forces with Linkages to Life, Susan G. Komen for the Cure, Walk for Healthy Living, and the National Childhood Obesity Initiative.

Through the wisdom and strong leadership of its past fourteen presidents, the Columbus (GA) Chapter has given back so much to the African-American community and, in turn, the

community as a whole. Today, the Chapter is led by current president, Olive Gibson Vidal-Kendall and boasts 33 spirited and outstanding members who provide over 1,500 hours of service each year.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing 50 years of incredible and inspiring work by the Columbus (GA) Chapter of The Links, Incorporated. The services this organization has provided to the greater Columbus community are immeasurable and there is no doubt in my mind that The Links, Incorporated will continue its worthy mission of promoting hope and prosperity for years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I was traveling with President Obama and was unable to be present for Roll Call Vote numbers 552 and 553, the Motion to Recommit and Final Passage of H.R. 5781, The California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014.

Had I been present, I would have voted Yes on Roll Call 552 and No on Roll Call 553.

HONORING ATTORNEY WILL ELLIS PITTMAN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Attorney Will Ellis Pittman.

Attorney Pittman was born and raised in Tutwiler, MS. Mr. Pittman is 51 years old. He is the owner and managing member of Pittman & Associates, PLLC law firm in Clarksdale, Mississippi where he also serves as the first African-American County Prosecutor for Coahoma County. Attorney Pittman also serves as the board attorney for the Tunica County Board of Supervisors and is the first African-American to represent the Tunica County Board of Supervisors. Attorney Pittman is recognized amongst family, his community, and his colleagues as a man of wisdom, service, a generous spirit, and passion. He regularly attends and serves on the finance committee of the Galena Missionary Baptist Church in Tutwiler, Mississippi which he grew up in and joined at eight years of age.

Ellis attended and graduated from public high school in Tallahatchie County, Mississippi. After earning his high school diploma, he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps. While in the Marine Corps, Ellis married his high school sweet heart, and they had two (2) children. After being honorably discharged from the Marine Corps, Ellis returned to his home town in Tutwiler.

However, he was unable to find employment anywhere in the delta area. Ellis returned to work and earned a living on the plantation in

Tallahatchie County where he grew up. Ellis worked six (6) sometimes seven (7) days a week to provide food, shelter, and the bare necessities for his family. He always knew that if given the opportunity, he would provide them with a better way of life.

After working one full year and saving every penny that he could, Ellis departed for Dallas, Texas where he obtained a job with a janitorial service, cleaning grocery stores at night. Within two months Ellis saved enough funds for a deposit and first months' rent on an apartment. He then returned to Mississippi to get his wife and child and they returned to Dallas, Texas. Within six months, the store at which Ellis was employed took notice of his hard work and daily attendance and the store manager offered him a job as an apprentice baker that provided health insurance, dental, and vision benefits for both him and his family. With this break, Ellis used the extra earnings to provide a better place for his family to stay. Within six months, Ellis had worked his way from an apprentice baker to a journeyman baker and was able to provide his family with the kind of things that he had always dreamed of having.

Although he excelled in his employment, Ellis realized that in order to do more for his family he would have to obtain a college education. At the same time, Ellis desired to return home to be with his elderly father who became ill. So, he applied for and was hired with the Mississippi Department of Corrections as a correctional officer trainee.

He then made plans to attend Mississippi Valley State University to obtain a college degree. Prior to applying to Mississippi Valley State University, the Pittman's home caught on fire in which Ellis received second and third degree burns over a large portion of his body. His wife received severe burns as well. After a month, she passed away from the injuries she sustained from the fire. Ellis remained in the Greenville Burn Center for a month and half before he was released. After a short period of time, he returned to his place of employment at the Mississippi State Penitentiary. The home that he had purchased for his family had burned down, so the Department of Corrections provided him with a house on the ground for him and his two minor sons to live.

At this point, he made the decision not to attend Mississippi Valley State University due to the drive because he would have to commute. Being a single parent and still having to work, Ellis applied to Delta State University which was closer to where he was living at the penitentiary and he could make the daily commute. He commuted five days a week for three years until he graduated from Delta State University with a degree in criminal justice and political science.

Prior to graduation from Delta State University, Ellis applied to law school at Mississippi College, Thurgood Marshall School of Law, and the University Of Mississippi School Of Law. He was accepted for admission at all three law schools. However, he chose to attend the University of Mississippi—School of Law due to the financial aid available for African-American applicants. After obtaining his law degree and license to practice law, Ellis

returned to the Mississippi Delta from Memphis, Tennessee and opened Pittman Law Office in Clarksdale, Mississippi in 1996 where he continues to practice to this day.

Ellis has given countless young lawyers, that have recently graduated with no experience and unable to find a job, a position at his law office to give them a start. He realized that most people will do well if given the chance which he learned from personal experience when he needed someone to give him a chance. There has not been a time when a newly admitted lawyer came to Ellis looking for job and was turned down for employment.

Ellis' practice has included representing countless individuals in cases for excessive force, employment discrimination, criminal defense, family law, as well as personal injury and wrongful death.

Attorney Will Ellis Pittman's work ethic, passion, dedication, dependability, and service have made him synonymous with being one of the best, if not the best, attorney around. At the end of the day, Ellis is recognized for his service to God, his family, his country, his community, and the people that seek his help.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Attorney Will Ellis Pittman for his dedication to serving this great state and country.

HONORING SHARON MENDOZA DOUGHTY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Sharon Mendoza Doughty, who passed away on November 19, 2014 following a long battle with cancer. A pioneering rancher, conservationist, teacher, winemaker and a natural leader, Ms. Doughty was a positive force within the local community.

Sharon Doughty grew up on her parents' historic B Ranch on the Point Reyes Peninsula. After the passing of her second husband, Bill Bianchini Jr., in the early 1980s, she took over the daily operations of their 800-acre dairy. Transitioning from a career as an accountant and teacher, Sharon Doughty became a full-time rancher with the help of her close family and friends.

Through her comprehensive knowledge of the dairy trade, Ms. Doughty became a natural leader within the North Bay dairy community and leaves behind a long legacy of positive impacts. The depth of her commitment to Marin County agriculture united fellow ranchers and helped to propel their products into national markets. A dedicated advocate for the preservation of local agricultural lands, Ms. Doughty served two terms as the president of the Marin Agricultural Land Trust and one term as a member of the California Coastal Commission. She selflessly devoted her time and expertise to the Marconi Conference Center in Marshall and 4-H. Among her many honors, in 2007, Ms. Doughty was named the "Woman of the Year" for California's 6th Assembly District for her exceptional community leadership.

Mr. Speaker, Sharon Doughty's life teaches us that one woman can make a substantial difference. Her efforts will not soon be forgotten as much of her legacy lives on all around us in Marin County and beyond. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and express our deepest condolences to her husband Steve; daughters Kathleen von Raesfeld and Karen Taylor; brothers Joseph Mendoza Jr. and James Mendoza; grandchildren Audrey and Nina von Raesfeld, Camilla, William Joseph, and Eva Taylor; and nephew Will Clark.

RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE JAMES M. BATZER FOR 30 YEARS OF SERVICE AS A JUDGE FOR THE 19TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT OF MICHIGAN

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Honorable James M. Batzer and his commendable service to Benzie and Manistee counties as a Circuit Court Judge.

Judge Batzer served West Michigan as a circuit court judge for 30 years. His commitment to the people of West Michigan has been exemplified through his long and illustrious career.

After graduating from Wayne State University with his Juris Doctor, Judge Batzer chose to remain in Michigan to practice. Before his election to the 19th Circuit Court, Judge Batzer worked a number of different jobs helping Michigan's youth. From 1968–1975, he served as a Children's Protective Services Worker as well as a Juvenile Delinquency Case Worker. He then went on to become a Teaching Fellow at the Detroit College of Law, where he taught legal research and writing to first-year law students. In 1979, Judge Batzer served as an Assistant Attorney General for the state of Michigan as well. Judge Batzer was later elected to the 19th Judicial Circuit Court on January 1, 1985.

Judge Batzer has proven his dedication to the courts of Michigan throughout his career, and he has been a respected and prominent figure in the law community. From 1989–1995, he served as a Member of the State Bar Committee on Criminal Jury Instructions, and he served as Chair of the committee from 1993–1995. He has also been a member of the Northwest Michigan Community Corrections Advisory Board from 1989–2010. Judge Batzer was later named as one of the least reversed trial court judges in criminal cases in Michigan by the Detroit Free Press, and was also profiled by the college textbook, Criminal Justice in America.

Judge Batzer stands as a shining example of the Michigan Judicial System. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Judge James Batzer for his service to the state of Michigan.

IN HONOR OF STANLY COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S NURSING PROGRAM

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Stanly Community College's Annie Ruth Kelley Associate Degree Nursing Program for being ranked #1 in the United States by the National Council of State Boards of Nursing for schools of nursing that lead to entry-level Registered Nurse licensure.

Stanly Community College's Annie Ruth Kelley Associate Degree Nursing Program ranks first among 1,904 programs in the United States.

This innovative program utilizes unique education techniques such as instant messaging, flipped classroom opportunities, adaptive testing, and simulated clinical experiences in a simulation hospital. All of these techniques lead graduates of SCC's nursing program to be well-prepared to serve those in need across the region.

A strong education system is important to empowering our nation and Stanly Community College's Nursing Program is setting a standard of excellence that should be commended.

The impact that the Stanly Community College Nursing Program has on our local communities, and the state of North Carolina, is undeniable.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 2014, on Roll Call #532 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended H.R. 5629—Strengthening Domestic Nuclear Security Act of 2014, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 1, 2014, on Roll Call #533 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 3438—National Laboratories Mean National Security Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 2, 2014, on Roll Call #534 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 2040—Blackfoot River Land Exchange Act of 2014, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 2, 2014, on Roll Call #535 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 5050—May 31, 1918 Act Repeal Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 2, 2014, on Roll Call #536 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as

Amended H.R. 3572—To revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 2, 2014, on Roll Call #537 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 5739—No Social Security for Nazis Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 2, 2014, on Roll Call #538 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and H.R. 3240—Regulation D Study Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 2, 2014, on Roll Call #539 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended H.R. 2366—World War I American Veterans Centennial Commemorative Coin Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 3, 2014, on Roll Call #540 on H. Res. 766, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5771) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 647) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On December 3, 2014, on Roll Call #541 on the Motion to Suspend the Rules and H.R. 5769—"To authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.", I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 3, 2014, on Roll Call #543 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 5771, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 3, 2014, on Roll Call #544 on Passage of H.R. 5771—Tax Increase Prevention Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 3, 2014, on Roll Call #545 on Passage of H.R. 647—Achieving a Better Life Experience Act, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 4, 2014, on Roll Call #546 on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On December 4, 2014, on Roll Call #547 on H. Res. 770—Rule providing for consideration of the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment with an Amendment to H.R. 3979—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, H.R. 5759—"Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act," and H.R. 5781—California Emergency Drought Relief Act of 2014, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On December 4, 2014, on Roll Call #548 on H. Res. 758—Strongly condemning the actions of the Russian Federation, under Vladimir Putin, which has carried out a policy of aggression against neighboring countries aimed at political and economic domination, as amended, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 4, 2014, on Roll Call #549 on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 5759, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

On December 4, 2014, on Roll Call #550 on Passage of H.R. 5759, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY.

On December 4, 2014, on Roll Call #551 on the Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment with an Amendment to H.R. 3979, I am not recorded because I was absent for medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ORONO HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' SOCCER

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the members of the Orono High School girls' soccer team on winning the 2014 Minnesota State Soccer Championship recently.

After playing to a nil-nil draw through regulation and extra time in the finals, Orono displayed teamwork, grit, and nerves of steel as they came out on top in a 3-2 shootout. Goalkeeper Jessica Woessner played a major role in the Spartans' clean sheet and also came up big with the game winning stop in penalty kicks.

The ability of the Spartans to overcome adversity was especially noteworthy. Minnesota's Ms. Soccer, Sophie Babo, tragically suffered a leg injury in the second half of the finals. However, Orono rallied together in order to finish the game victorious. We all wish a speedy recovery for Sophie and best of luck as she plays for the University of Kentucky next year.

Soccer is called the "beautiful game" for its ability to combine skill, teamwork, endurance, and toughness. Few sports require such dedication both to one's physical shape and a commitment to technique.

It is a testament to the hard work and dedication of these young women that they are able to effectively balance the time needed to excel as a team while still maintaining their school, family, and social commitments.

As a member of the Congressional Soccer Caucus, I'm happy to congratulate the Orono High School girls' soccer team, their coaches, and fans on a great season!

VOICE OF AMERICAN UKRAINE

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the important work of the Ukrainian Service of the Voice of America.

VOA's Ukrainian Service has been a crucial source of news and information for the people of Ukraine for 65 years. Throughout Russia's campaign of aggression against Ukraine, VOA's Ukrainian Service has been an important source of news, information and discussion about the year-long crisis. Every week, VOA's Ukrainian Service reaches millions of people in Ukraine and through its daily reporting on U.S. politics, foreign policy, social issues, business, culture and the arts, VOA provides comprehensive, accurate and authoritative information that Ukrainians can employ in strengthening their nascent democracy, market economy and independent statehood.

I congratulate VOA Ukrainian for 65 years of service to the Ukrainian people and for all it is doing to strengthen ties between the U.S. and Ukraine.

HONORING ALEJANDRO BARLOCK

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my thanks to Alejandro Joshua Barlock of Unity Township, Pennsylvania for his service to the Greater Latrobe community by planning and installing a new veterans memorial at Barnes Place, a senior living community.

Alec is a student at Greater Latrobe High School and a member of Boy Scout Troop 327 in Youngstown, Pennsylvania. Alec had noticed that his grandfather Eugene Jones, 89, a World War II veteran who fought in the Battle of the Bulge, could no longer travel from Barnes Place to local Veterans Day ceremonies. Thus, Alec decided for an Eagle Scout project to build a memorial for his grandfather and all of the Barnes Place veteran residents.

He spent nearly nine months planning his project and approximately twenty hours constructing the memorial with the help of his family and fellow scouts. The memorial is now open for use of the entire community for special patriotic ceremonies.

By building this memorial to honor our veterans, Alec has answered the call of the Scout Oath to show "duty to country." Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate Alejandro Barlock on a job well done, and I ask that all Members join me in thanking him for an Eagle Scout project that remembers the sacrifice of America's service men and women.

CONGRATULATIONS TO EDINA
HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' TENNIS
CHAMPS!

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the Edina High School girls' tennis team on their 2014 Minnesota State Championship.

The Edina Hornets clinched the state tennis team title with a strong performance top to bottom in their 6-1 victory over Prior Lake. Senior Caitlyn Merzbacher and Freshman Sophia Reddy led the way in Singles play, but it took a complete team effort to take home the title.

Credit goes to Coach Steve Paulsen, who now can now count this as his 19th state title, including 18 in a row. With such a consecutive title streak on the line, it's easy to see these Edina athletes have no problem coping with pressure.

Tennis is a game with tremendous ups and downs that takes focus, mental toughness, and an ability to overcome mistakes. Edina's success is a testament to the time spent day after day honing those skills.

What makes it even more impressive is that these Hornet athletes are able to thrive at their sport while still meeting their academic, family, and social commitments. Family and friends should be tremendously proud of what these girls have accomplished.

It is my pleasure to honor and congratulate the Edina High School girls' tennis team on bringing home another state title!

IN HONOR OF SHIRLEY
MCDOWELL'S CAREER

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Shirley McDowell of Concord, North Carolina for her faithful work as Executive Director at Hospice and Palliative Care of Cabarrus County. Upon retiring she will have served 28 years building a team of caregivers that have served our community during times when families have confronted terminal illness.

Under Shirley's leadership, Cabarrus County's Hospice service has grown into a strong program that effectively helps those in need. She guided this program through all of the changes in healthcare over the years and directed Hospice through acquisition of land for a permanent building and the construction of the Tucker Hospice House in Kannapolis.

The impact that Shirley has had on our community is profound, and we are grateful for her commitment to help those in need. I am proud to represent Shirley McDowell and we are thankful for her years of service.

HONORING ISAAC PALMER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable person, Mr. Isaac Palmer.

Mr. Isaac Palmer was born on May 23, 1914 in Sharkey County, Mississippi, the oldest of nine children born to the late Reverend Littleton and Frances Nathaniel Palmer. Mr. Palmer was married to the late Vera Lee Bell Palmer for over 50 years. He has eight children: Betty, Geraldine, Odell, Isaac Lavelle, Nina, Patricia, David (deceased) and Fred (deceased).

Mr. Palmer wanted to attend school badly; but, he had to leave school when he was twelve years old, in the 6th grade, to work on the farm and help provide for his younger sisters and brothers. However, he didn't let this stop him. He learned to read, write and speak more fluently by studying the Holy Bible. Mr. Palmer was a "jack of all trades", doing things like driving tractors, farming, welding and being a mechanic, just to name a few.

At an early age, Mr. Palmer accepted Christ as his Savior. He was an active member of New Hope Baptist Church in Blanton, Mississippi, where he served as Senior Deacon and Superintendent of the Sunday school for many years. During this time, he led many children, friends and acquaintances to Christ. He has been and remains a laborer for Christ for more than 85 years.

Though Mr. Palmer only had a 6th grade education, he remains passionate about helping and encouraging his children and other young people to get as much education as possible. To help out, he would drive his own children to and from Alcorn and Jackson State Universities, as well as their friends who lived in the area (free of charge), after working all day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Isaac Palmer for his dedication to serving and giving back to his family and community.

HONORING JOE GERGELA

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Joe Gergela, who will retire at the end of this year from his position as the Long Island Farm Bureau's Executive Director, a position he has held for 26 years.

Joe's highly effective advocacy for Long Island agriculture was first cultivated early in his life, harvesting potatoes and other vegetables with his father and grandfather. He came to know the satisfaction of a hard day's work and the vital role family plays in a working farm, which form the backbone of the economy and tradition of Long Island's East End. In doing so, Joe celebrated the rich agricultural heritage that has been the pride of eastern Long

Island since the 1600s. But he also learned the struggles farming families face, which strengthened his resolve to fight for our farming communities as the leader and chief advocate of the Long Island Farm Bureau.

At the helm of the Farm Bureau, Joe has worked tirelessly for the over 600 farms covering nearly 36,000 acres of land in Suffolk County, in which my district lies, and the thousands of acres of farmland in adjacent Nassau County. During my tenure in Congress, Joe has been a trusted and valued counsel upon whom I have relied for expert knowledge of agricultural and environmental policy. I enjoyed my regular visits that Joe coordinated for me with board members of the Long Island Farm Bureau that became known as "coffee with the congressman," which I found to be invaluable forums. These annual coffee meetings gave me the opportunity to hear directly from East End farmers who imparted firsthand accounts of their success and challenges with issues relating to water quality, open space preservation, the Farm Bill, immigration reform and access to affordable labor, and how we could work together to maintain Long Island's robust agricultural footprint.

Joe has been an invaluable resource to my staff and me, providing real life knowledge about working farms but also helpful insight on public policy. He has helped my office build meaningful relationships with the agriculture community and has always been ready to assist when there were opportunities to work together. Most recently, Joe helped coordinate a visit to Long Island for the Under Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, to focus USDA's attention on our land, wineries, farm stands, related small businesses, and the hard-working Long Islanders behind these successful, growing ventures.

Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to call Joe a friend and colleague for many years now. I know there will be many farmers, small businesses, and Suffolk County residents who will miss his tenacious dedication to farming and farmers on Long Island. On behalf of New York's First Congressional District, I congratulate Joe on his years of outstanding service and his many accomplishments with the Long Island Farm Bureau, and I wish him well in retirement and his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE SIXTH ANNUAL
CHRISTMAS EXTRAVAGANZA

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 2014, Brevard County families, businesses and local community organizations will gather together to celebrate the Sixth Annual Christmas Extravaganza. This wonderful event, which will take place at the Max K. Rodes Park in West Melbourne, will provide an uplifting message of hope during this Christmas season as so many families are still facing difficult challenges.

The House at Palm Bay, Brevard County Parks & Recreation and their business partners have recognized the importance of providing a positive venue for residents and children to celebrate Christmas.

What makes the Christmas Extravaganza so special is that there is no cost to attend—everything is absolutely free to the public. From cotton candy and hot dogs, to live music performed by the Bay West Church Band, and fun activities for children, such as face painting, rock wall climbing, bounce houses, and a robotics demonstration, the sponsors of this annual event have committed to serving others during this Christmas season and giving back to their community in order to make a difference in someone's life.

This year, over sixty local businesses and organizations have made donations of food, gift certificates, equipment, cash and goodie bags. Toys for Tots will again make donations of toys for local children while the Sheriff, law enforcement officials and firemen have all volunteered their time. Florida Institute of Technology has partnered with The House at Palm Bay's Christmas Extravaganza team to provide free trolley rides for children and adults alike. Also, this year the Heritage High School Marching Band will be performing along with members of The House at Palm Bay's drama team which will provide their rendition of the Music Box, a Musical Drama for all ages.

Senior Pastor Ken Delgado of The House at Palm Bay said, "The essence of Christmas is about sacrificial giving. Parents do everything possible, to their own hurt, to bless their families. What an honor it is to see the business community sacrificially coming together to create a moment where families can find love, hope and joy—it's the example of the love, hope and joy that was expressed through the life of Jesus Christ 2000 years ago."

The Cities of Palm Bay and Melbourne have issued proclamations of support for this year's Christmas Extravaganza and the Brevard County Commission passed a resolution commending these efforts and encouraging families to attend.

I salute all those who have given so much to make the Annual Christmas Extravaganza possible, and applaud all the communities across our great nation who have seized upon this opportunity to spread the Christmas spirit through good deeds and charitable acts.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to recognize the 25th anniversary of a grant program that has benefitted thousands of individuals and families across the country—the Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLBank) system's Affordable Housing Program (AHP). The AHP is a flexible source of grants designed to help community-based lenders and their partners develop affordable housing solutions for very low- to moderate-income individuals and families.

The AHP receives its funding through annual contributions of 10 percent of the FHLBanks' net income. The Federal Home Loan Banks have awarded over \$5.1 billion in AHP funds since Congress created the program in 1990. These funds represent the larg-

est single source of private grant dollars available for housing and community development in the country.

By developing affordable housing—and creating stable communities in the process—AHP funds have a long-term, positive economic impact. Many projects are designed for seniors, the disabled, homeless families, first-time homeowners and others with limited resources. More than 845,157 housing units have been built using AHP funds. And I'm happy to say that the Federal Home Loan Bank system is the largest single funding provider to Habitat for Humanity, an organization that I have strongly supported during my 16 years in Congress.

Created by an act of Congress in 1932, the Federal Home Loan Banks are 12 regional cooperative banks that community-based financial institutions utilize to make home loans, small business loans and agriculture loans in every corner of America. Nearly 8,000 lenders are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank cooperative, representing approximately 80 percent of America's insured lending institutions. The FHLBanks and their members have been the largest and most reliable source of funding for community lending for over 80 years.

The FHLBanks have repeatedly demonstrated their ability to serve their members and to meet the affordable housing and community development needs of individuals, families and local communities through the Affordable Housing Program. As Congress contemplates the future of housing finance, I encourage members of Congress and the Administration to look to the Federal Home Loan Banks as an example of a system that works well.

AN IRANIAN OPPOSITION GROUP'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you may not know it, but there is a group that, like the United States, thinks the Supreme Leader of Iran needs to go. They are a group of Iranians called the MEK. They want their countrymen to be free from the oppressive regime that has ruled with an iron fist since 1979. But the MEK is locked up in a prison-like camp in Iraq. 112 of its members have been killed.

How we came to this point is a story worth telling. After the Iranian revolution, the MEK opposed the Supreme Leader. So the newly installed Islamic regime systematically arrested and executed members of the MEK. The MEK fled and found refuge in Iraq. They built a home in the middle of the desert in a place called Camp Ashraf. In August 2002, the MEK disclosed two previously unknown nuclear facilities in Iran.

The Natanz enrichment facility and Arak heavy water facility triggered the IAEA inspection of Iranian sites for the first time.

After the U.S. invaded Iraq in 2003, the MEK gave over all of its weapons to the U.S. Army 4th Infantry Division. In return, the U.S.

promised to protect the MEK, labeling them "protected persons" under the Fourth Geneva Convention.

On January 1, 2009, U.S. forces handed control over to the Iraqi Security Forces. Then Prime Minister Maliki was beholden to Tehran so when the Supreme Leader asked him to crack down on the MEK, he obeyed. Maliki either allowed or facilitated two deadly attacks on the defenseless residents living in Camp Ashraf. In July 2009, 11 residents were killed and 500 more injured. Two years later, in April 2011, the Camp was attacked again.

Videos would show Humvees running over residents and snipers shooting at residents as they ran for their lives. The attackers were not trying to talk. They were trying to kill. And they succeeded. 36 residents were killed and 345 injured.

I and other Members of Congress met with Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki in June 2011. The meeting that was supposed to last 20 minutes but went for 2 hours came to an abrupt halt when our delegation asked to see Camp Ashraf where the MEK members lived. Maliki's mood immediately changed and he said that there was no way we were going to see the Camp. Maliki did not allow us to go because he had something to hide.

After pressure from the Government of Iraq and the U.S. Government, the remaining residents agreed to be transferred to Camp Hurriya near Baghdad as the UN worked to resettle them in some other country besides Iraq or Iran. But a new camp would still not keep them safe—not while Maliki was under the thumb of an Iranian regime that wanted to decimate the MEK. On three more occasions in 2013, 65 more unarmed residents were killed and over 600 injured. The UN has now resettled 600 residents, but there are still 3,200 living in squalid conditions in Camp Hurriya. They are confined to the Camp, not allowed to leave.

Lawyers and family members cannot visit them. After a series of rocket attacks killed many of them, residents dug trenches and slept inside them because they had no other way to protect themselves. These conditions are worse than an American prison. This is no way to treat thousands of people who have risked their lives for three decades so that their countrymen may know the sweet taste of freedom. One day, I believe, we will not be talking about ensuring Iranian freedom fighters like the MEK have another country to live in. One day, the Supreme Leader will supremely fall.

Democracy and freedom will once again flourish in Iran. And the freedom fighters, who have now been fighting for decades, can finally return home to join their families and their countrymen in building a new, peaceful Iran.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF THE BIRTH OF MARY PARKS NATONSKI

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pepper and David Natonski on

the birth of their beautiful daughter. Mary Parks Natonski was born on her Thanksgiving Day due date at 7:02 a.m., November 27th, 2014; weighing 8 pounds and 8 ounces and measuring 21½ inches long.

She was born to Pepper Pennington Natonski and David Richard Natonski, my Chief of Staff and KEVIN YODER's (KS-03) Chief of Staff respectively. I must admit, she clearly has her mother's punctuality—and her father's size.

Mary Parks gets her name from her two remarkable great-grandmothers, Mary Allen and Mary Pennington, and her late great-aunt, Mary Natonski. Parks comes from her great-grandfather, Wayman Parks Allen.

She is the first grandchild for grandparents General and Mrs. Richard Natonski, and Cass and Cindy Pennington. Proud great-grandparents include Sadie Natonski, Mary Pennington, and Wayman and Mary Allen.

Mary Parks Natonski joins a wonderful family who are devoted to her well-being and will empower her for a bright future.

HONORING THE BOTHELL HIGH
SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. SUZAN K. DeIBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Ms. DeIBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2014 Bothell High School football team. On December 6, the Cougars won the 4A Washington State football championship, finishing their outstanding season with a perfect record of 14–0. I congratulate them on this exemplary achievement.

The resounding 24–14 victory over the defending champions, Chiawana High School, left no doubt that Bothell is the state's best team. This championship win is especially remarkable for the Cougars, as it is the football team's first state title in school history.

I would like to give special recognition to Caleb Meyer, Damani St. John-Watkins, and Ross Bowers, for their exceptional performances in Saturday's game. Meyer and St. John-Watkins both capped the season with over 100 yards rushing, but it was quarterback Ross Bower's score with 6 seconds remaining in the 3rd quarter that grabbed the headlines. On a scramble from 5 yards out, Bower landed a complete front flip over the Chiawana defenders on his way into the end zone. He also went 17–19, passing for over 200 yards and a touchdown.

The Cougars displayed a great deal of character and determination throughout this season led by Coach Tom Bainter. His constant encouragement and training helped guide the Cougars to this momentous victory.

Again, I congratulate the Bothell football team on all of their success. Their accomplishments on the field this season are hard-earned and well-deserved.

IN HONOR OF NEW MEXICO HOUSE
CHIEF CLERK STEPHEN ARIAS

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of New Mexico House Chief Clerk Stephen Arias, who is retiring at the end of the year.

Mr. Arias began his career with the New Mexico Legislature in 1966 and worked his way through the ranks of the House, starting as a clerk reading legislation, a payroll officer, and even a coat checker. In 1983 he was elected House Chief Clerk by the majority caucus and has served in that position for the past 31 years. In that time, Mr. Arias became the third-longest serving legislative clerk in the country. Originally elected Chief Clerk under Speaker of the House Raymond Sanchez, Mr. Arias went on to serve under four subsequent speakers as he was re-elected time and again by the members of the House—a testament to the tremendous job he did over three decades.

Although they may not receive a lot of attention, Chief Clerks are essential to the smooth functioning of the legislature. Chief Clerks are in charge of hiring seasonal staff, tracking and filing bills, maintaining and setting the House budget, keeping communication between the House and Senate chambers flowing smoothly, and helping incoming lawmakers and committees address constituent issues. Mr. Arias has done all these things and more during his tenure as Chief Clerk, and I applaud his tireless work ethic. I congratulate Stephen Arias on his remarkable career, and I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING MOUNT ZION
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mount Zion Missionary Baptist Church Canton, Mississippi.

The population of Madison County, Mississippi has been predominantly African-American since 1840. Prior to 1865, some members of the African-American population, most of whom had arrived in the county as slaves, were permitted to attend worship services, to be baptized and to be married in the area churches. They were also allowed to join established white congregations.

Early county records indicate that slaves were a part of the church communities. The Old Madison Presbyterian Church, the First Presbyterian, and the First Baptist listed a total membership of one hundred and thirty-four. One hundred were slaves and the other thirty-four were whites.

After the Civil War and freedom, African-Americans naturally desired to establish their own houses of worship. In 1865, the newly

freed members of the congregation of First Baptist, with encouragement and financial assistance from their white counterparts, organized Mount Zion Baptist Church. Rev. T. J. Drane, pastor of the white church, served as minister receiving for his services a monthly salary of one dollar.

In 1870, Drane and R. B. Johnson donated two acres of land on the northern boundary of the plantation to Mount Zion. The first church was erected on Freedman Hill, located at the corner of North Railroad and Bowman Streets, according to the 1898 George and Dunlap map of Canton. Rev. Drane called for a meeting with council along with Mr. Will Powell from the white Baptist Church to help establish the church.

In addition to serving as pastor, Rev. Drane ran a day school and was assisted by Lillian Highgate, a white female. Rev. Drane received an additional \$1.50 a month for his services. He also organized and maintained the first Sunday school class. All other organizations came into existence after Rev. Drane's resignation. Rev. Jordan Williams replaced him.

Newspapers frequently carried announcements concerning Mount Zion's activities. For example, "Several converts at the Colored Baptist Church were baptized at the railroad culvert," or "Rev. Williams, pastor of the Colored Baptist Church, immersed ten converts last Sunday night". The second church site was across the street where the TWL parking lot is now located.

The third and fourth pastors were Rev. erends Mass and Davis. The fifth pastor, Rev. R.T. Sims, served for eighteen years and Rev. W. L. Varnado for seven. The seventh through the tenth pastors were as follows: Rev. Bradley, Rev. Morris, Rev. Drew, and Rev. A. D. Purnell.

By the 1920's, the congregation had outgrown the church and Rev. Purnell, along with members, began raising money for a larger building. The new lot for our present church was purchased from Jack Warren. Rev. Purnell asked Mr. S. M. Reddick, Vice President of Madison County Bank, to serve as custodian over the church's building funds. He also asked if he would direct the building of the church and issue bonds to underwrite construction costs.

The bank issue \$14,000 in bonds. Raymond H. Spencer was the architect of the neoclassical brick structure. He also designed the First Methodist Church of which Reddick was a member. The building was erected in 1929 at the cost of \$35,000. The congregation moved into the new structure February 1930.

Rev. P. F. Parker, the eleventh pastor, with the help of God and members, burned the mortgage. Under his leadership the church grew. For example, the following organizations played an active role in missionary work: Senior Missionary Society, Junior Matrons, Young Woman's Auxiliary, Red Circle/Sunshine Band, Sunday school, Baptist Training Union, Senior Choir, Gospel Chorus, Junior/Beginner's Choir, New Membership Club, Pastor's Aide, Boys' Bible Club and Usher Board. Rev. Parker served until his death in 1970.

Mount Zion continued to serve the African-American community religiously and socially. During the summer of 1964, Mount Zion was the location of a pivotal moment in our state's

civil rights struggle. In her autobiography, *Coming of Age in Mississippi*, Ann Moody notes that Mount Zion was the biggest Negro church in Canton and the center of the local marches.

On Friday, May 29, 1964, on the church lawn, six hundred community and church members witnessed the near death beating of McKinley Hamilton, a young African-American man. As a result, eighty church members marched on the Madison County jail in one of the first protest marches in Canton. Mount Zion became known as the "Church of Refuge". In 1968, twelve hundred students from Rogers High School marched because they were outraged over the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. A group of parents led them to Mount Zion. Rev. Parker opened the doors of the church to them, thus saving them from injury by law enforcement officers waiting for them on Hickory Street in front of High's Funeral Home.

Dr. W. L. Johnson, our twelfth and present pastor, has served for twenty-nine years. His words have power through the Holy Spirit. Under Dr. Johnson's leadership, the church has continued its growth. For example, the church has been air-conditioned, carpeted throughout, a fellowship hall and recreation center built and equipped, four parking lots purchased and surfaced, restrooms were remodeled, a lounge installed, pews padded, a new intercom system purchased, speakers installed in the pulpit and choir loft, additional chairs purchased for the choir and seating areas in the wings, two new copiers, a computer, storage room, and a fifteen passenger van and twenty-seven passenger bus were also purchased. The stained glass windows were repaired, and the pastor study was moved upstairs.

We now have a summer recreation program. Our membership is approximately 500 and still growing. The church is one of the most monumental, intact, and historic resources associated with the Canton African-American Community. As a result of this, the church was recently placed on the registry of Historical Buildings.

Our aim is to give every God-seeking person an opportunity to receive salvation. The church clearly reflects the importance of the social and religious life of the African-American community from its birth in 1865 up to the present. Let us resolve to make service to Christ a priority in our lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mount Zion Missionary Baptist Church.

A TRIBUTE TO MARIE E. THOMPSON, AUDREY B. LESESNE, WILLIAM J. "BILLY" BARKER AND THE STAFF OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. MIKE MCINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Marie E. Thompson, Audrey B. Lesesne, and William J. "Billy" Barker, my

most senior staff, for their steadfast service, longevity of commitment and passionate performance in serving the constituents of the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina.

These individuals have served faithfully with me throughout my entire Congressional career, and their exemplary service has truly made a difference in the many lives which they have impacted by their professional, prompt, and persistent service.

Marie Thompson's work on constituent services is unparalleled and has inspired other Congressional Offices to emulate her distinguished service.

Audrey Lesesne's mastery of multiple responsibilities, sharp insight, and valuable institutional knowledge have been greatly admired.

Billy Barker's practical working knowledge and unfailing work ethic have been integral to the respect he has earned throughout our district by citizens everywhere.

These three individuals have proudly and graciously given their very best in the service of their country and our district, and I am grateful for their work and their friendship. Indeed, they—along with the many others who have served in our Congressional office over these past 18 years—have proven that teamwork and loyalty demonstrate the true dedication and determination they possess and the devotion to the people that they have given.

May God bless them and all of our staff, both past and present, for their strong, distinguished service to the people with purpose and passion—and for which our country, the people of our district, and I will forever be grateful.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF CONGRESSMAN HERMAN BADILLO

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with grief to honor the passing of Herman Badillo, a great New Yorker, a great friend and a man that worked honorably for this country. I fondly remember walking down 116th street, the borderline of Harlem and East Harlem, as we shared the great plans we had for our districts and this great nation. Herman and I were part of the 1970 Congressional freshman class. Herman was also the man who gave Percy Sutton, David Dinkins, Basil Paterson, and me the special label: the Gang of Four. He was always driven and persistent, called himself "the first Puerto Rican everything," and won the respect for being a fighter. Congressman Herman Badillo will be truly missed.

My friend, Herman Badillo, will always be remembered as America's first Puerto Rican-born Congressman and a fixture in New York City politics for four decades, championing civil rights, jobs, housing and educational reforms. Born in Caguas, P.R., on Aug. 21, 1929, Herman was the only child of Francisco and Carmen Rivera Badillo. Upon moving to the continental United States, he learned English and was an excellent student at Haaren High School in Manhattan. Being a

hard worker since a young age, he labored as a dishwasher, bowling pinsetter, and accountant and graduated with high honors from City College in 1951. Herman went on to graduate from Brooklyn Law School as valedictorian in 1954, then settled into law practice in New York. Badillo served his community as a public servant on many fronts. Besides his election to four terms in Congress, he was a city commissioner, the Bronx borough president, a deputy to Mayor Edward I. Koch, a counsel to Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, a candidate for state and city comptroller, and for many years a trustee and then board chairman of the City University of New York.

I was honored to serve with Herman during his seven years in Congress in the 1970s, when he pushed urban renewal, antipoverty programs, voting rights and bilingual education. Herman has been a treasure to the people of our community as well as a true testament to the American Dream. Herman Badillo will forever remain in our hearts.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE EDEN PRAIRIE HIGH SCHOOL FOOT- BALL TEAM

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the Eden Prairie High School Football Team on winning the Minnesota State Championship.

The Eagles capped off an undefeated 13-0 season with a hard-fought victory over Totino-Grace in which they trailed at halftime by 14 points. Senior running back Will Rains led the way with 230 yards rushing and 3 Touchdowns, but the victory by Mike Grant's unit was a complete team effort.

With their backs against the wall, the Eagles dug deep to claw their way back and win their fourth consecutive big school title.

Football is a unique sport in that every play requires 11 teammates working in unison to be successful. It takes perfect execution combined with skill and of course, a large amount of toughness to make a deep play-off run and win a title.

Eden Prairie's commitment to excelling on the gridiron is even more noteworthy when combined with the requirements of a student-athlete. Maintaining commitments in the classroom, with their families, and fitting in a social life is not easy for a group of teenagers—but these young men were able rise to the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to once again congratulate the Eden Prairie Eagles for bringing home the state title!

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$17,993,213,058,619.35. We've added \$7,366,336,009,706.27 to our debt in 5 years. This is over \$7.3 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING HEAVENLY ANGELS DAYCARE CENTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Heavenly Angels Daycare Center.

The Heavenly Angels Daycare Center opened on August 8, 2006 with Mrs. Emma Bell as owner and director, in Port Gibson, Claiborne County, Mississippi on Church St.

Mrs. Bell loves children and started Heavenly Angels Daycare Center with 8 enrolled from 6 months to 3 years old. She also had an After School Program with 6 children up to 12 years old.

Through the years, the Heavenly Angels Daycare Center has grown and in 2008 a Pre-K Center was included to better equip children who started in the center to be able to successfully start 1st grade.

Heavenly Angels Daycare Center has been progressing for 8 years with a current full capacity of 87 children, who are enjoying the process of learning and the After School Program has 27 children.

Mrs. Bell, because of her hard and diligent work at Heavenly Angels Daycare Center has received a trophy honoring her as Businesswoman of the Year.

Mrs. Bell has been married for 25 years to a husband that loves and supports her. They have 5 children: 4 boys and 1 daughter, Janice, who has worked with Heavenly Angels Daycare Center since its opening and graduated from Jackson State University with a Business Degree.

Heavenly Angels Daycare Center's slogan is: To look, listen and learn and every child succeeds. Mrs. Bell stated that "When they come through our doors, we make sure that they get the learning that they need. They all are smart children."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Heavenly Angels Daycare Center for caring and educating children.

HONORING DAVE CUELLAR

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dave Cuellar of Veterans Helping Veterans for his outstanding volunteer work with New Mexican veterans.

A Vietnam veteran himself, Mr. Cuellar had a distinguished career as a Gallup police officer after serving his country in the Army. Before retiring as a police lieutenant, he helped to protect and serve Gallup for over 22 years. In 2003, Mr. Cuellar was inspired to help start Veterans Helping Veterans, an organization dedicated to providing informational and social support for veterans in the Gallup area. The group provides critical help to veterans navigating the Veteran Administration's benefit and healthcare systems. More importantly, Mr. Cuellar has created an open and welcoming network run by veterans for veterans. His group is all inclusive, working with veterans young and old, from all backgrounds and all branches of the military to create a voice for all veterans.

Words alone cannot express our full appreciation and gratitude for the service of our veterans, and the deeds of volunteers like Mr. Cuellar help make a difference in the lives of our veterans who often face many challenges when they return home from active duty. Veterans Helping Veterans is a great example of a remarkable volunteer organization that is having a positive impact in the community. I thank Dave Cuellar for both his service and for his work with Veterans Helping Veterans.

HONORING CHAIRWOMAN FUDGE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE on her extraordinary leadership as the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

With conviction and passion, she defended the change we have all worked so diligently to achieve since the CBC was founded in 1971.

Throughout her career in Congress, MARCIA's passion for the advancement of the least among us, regardless of race, color or creed, has served her constituents in Cleveland well. This tireless advocacy made her an excellent choice for the CBC chair.

During her tenure, she was fearless in promoting the goals of the CBC and advancing our fight to confront critical issues that are confronted by the communities we represent.

Her staff certainly impressed us with their unparalleled work ethic, enthusiasm, responsibility and flexibility to meet the needs of so many Members. They demonstrated great aptitude in communicating urgent matters to us in a timely and effective manner.

The Chairwoman was unwavering in her strength as she gracefully tackled the harsh

political battles we were confronted during this Congress.

She has left a huge imprint in the CBC and will be missed by all of us who have come to respect and appreciate her very much as our leader.

I look forward to working with MARCIA and the rest of my Colleagues on the CBC in the 114th Congress as we continue our efforts to put America back to work, cut our deficit responsibly, tackle tax reform, and ensure that everyone has the opportunity to pursue the American Dream.

RECOGNIZING POTH HIGH SCHOOL WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL TEAM

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Poth High School Women's Volleyball Team for their ninth state championship win under the leadership of Coach Patti Zenner.

On Saturday, November 22nd, the Poth Pirettes emerged victorious over Brock High School during the UIL Class 3A State Final. This was a defining match for the Pirettes, marking their fourteenth appearance at the state tournament and ninth state championship win. With this recent victory, the Poth Pirettes are now tied for the second most championship wins in state history. Pirettes Volleyball Senior Alyssa Kruse was awarded Most Valuable Player of the championship.

Mr. Speaker, this is a momentous occasion for Poth High School and I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the Pirettes Women's Volleyball Team for its record-setting victory. I thank you for this time.

INTRODUCING THE AFRICAN DESCENT AFFAIRS ACT IN RECOGNITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL DECADE FOR PEOPLE OF AFRICAN DESCENT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill recognizing persons of African descent on the occasion of the December 10, 2014 launch of the International Decade for People of African Descent.

As our country fights to realize justice for Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, Aiyana Jones, John Warner, Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, and many others, we must not forget the names—Stephen Lawrence, Oury Jalloh, Mark Duggan, Zyed Benna, Bouna Traore, and many others—who are victims of similar injustices in Europe and elsewhere in the world.

The International Decade provides an opportunity to join efforts with countries around the globe to, over the next 10 years, develop

and implement national strategies honoring the vast contributions of people of African Descent and to combat continuing issues of prejudice and discrimination such as those currently gripping our nation.

To aid these efforts, I have introduced the African Descent Affairs Act. The Act seeks to improve the situation of people of African descent around the world by establishing within our State Department a Global Office of African Descent Affairs to establish global foreign policy and assistance strategies for people of African descent. Furthermore, it creates a "President Obama Fund" to support anti-discrimination and empowerment efforts by African descent-led civil society organizations, and requires annual State Department human rights reports to include a section on discrimination faced by people of African descent. U.S. foreign policy strategies such as these have improved the situation of vulnerable groups internationally and would greatly assist in responding to increasing levels of prejudice and discrimination faced by people of African descent around the globe.

The International Decade reaffirms the importance of inclusion and the full and equal participation of people of African descent around the world in all aspects of political, economic, social, and cultural life. I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing and celebrating the collective history and achievements made by people of African descent on the occasion of the launch of the Decade by supporting the African Descent Affairs Act.

supported. Rainbow's classrooms are arranged in an environment that presents maximum opportunities for cognitive development, discovery learning and an awareness of cultural diversity. They offer clean and spacious learning centers that offer a wide variety of daily activities to encourage and challenge each child.

Rainbow's learning environment will empower children and enhance self-esteem by creating an atmosphere where social, emotional, physical, and cognitive development can take place. By encouraging children to learn and develop at their own level, they will gain the confidence of self-importance. Rainbow offers children guidance and understanding, so they will have the opportunity to explore their world in a safe and controlled environment.

Rainbow provides nutritional meals and snacks. All meals meet the nutritional guidelines set by the USDA.

Each caregiver receives on-going training through staff meetings and during early childhood conferences and workshops that are held throughout the year. All Rainbow employees are trained in Pediatric CPR and First Aid. Rainbow accepts all children regardless of race, color, creed, and sex, religious or ethnic backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Rainbow Learning & Daycare Center for its dedication to serving others.

HONORING RAINBOW LEARNING & DAYCARE CENTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable Rainbow Learning & Daycare Center.

Rainbow, opened in June 2007, is operated by the owner/director, Mrs. Pernada Jackson. The hours of operation are Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Rainbow's mission is to provide child care services and a safe learning environment that focuses on the developmental needs of the children. The center serves families in Leland, Mississippi, and the surrounding towns.

Rainbow strives to provide a quality early childhood education program filled with love and compassion for children. They believe that children are the most important resource and that the early childhood experiences are crucial in the development of their future.

Rainbow's belief is that the family is the strongest influence in the child's growth and development. They extend the child's home experience and provide new and different experiences of value. Rainbow's program is based on the knowledge that children learn best through play and active hands-on activities. Using developmental appropriate materials to stimulate and explore their potential is their goal.

Growth occurs in developmental stages and each stage must be offered, encouraged and

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON BARBER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I missed two recorded votes on December 9. I would like to indicate at this point how I would have voted had I been present for those votes.

On Roll Call No. 552, on Motion to Recommit the California Emergency Drought Relief Act 2014, I would have voted "aye."

On Roll Call No. 553, passage of the California Emergency Drought Relief Act 2014, I would have voted "nay."

IN HONOR OF NEW MEXICO STATE TREASURER JAMES B. LEWIS

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize James B. Lewis, who is retiring after a career devoted to public service. Most recently, Mr. Lewis served as New Mexico State Treasurer, a position he held for the last 8 years.

Mr. Lewis' long and distinguished career includes serving our country in the Army and serving New Mexico in many notable positions, such as Chief of Staff to Governor

Bruce King, Chief Clerk and Chief Executive Officer of the New Mexico State Corporation Commission, Director and Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Energy, President of the National Association of State Treasurers, and immediate past President of the National Association of State Auditors, Controllers, and Treasurers. In 1986, Mr. Lewis became the first African American to be elected to a statewide office in New Mexico, and is also the first and only African American to be appointed and then elected to office three times.

His tenure in the Treasurer's office will be remembered for his efforts to increase transparency and raise public awareness and understanding of this important office and the role it plays in our great state. Treasurer Lewis automated the warrant and collateral compliance system, established the Remote Electronic Banking System, signed the first joint Powers Agreement enabling the Ramah Navajo Chapter to invest in the Local Government Investment Pool, and implemented the new state Linked Deposit program.

The State Treasury plays a vital role in protecting state monies deposited in New Mexico's financial institutions and promoting a stable state economy, and as Treasurer, Mr. Lewis led that effort with distinction. While Mr. Lewis' retirement is a loss for the state of New Mexico, I wish him all the best as he embarks on this next chapter, and I congratulate him on his distinguished career.

RECOGNIZING DR. MICHAEL B. MCCALL

HON. JOHN A. YARMUTH

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Michael B. McCall, the Founding President of the Kentucky Community and Technical College System (KCTCS). Since 1998, Dr. McCall has served as system President. His exemplary service has greatly benefited community colleges throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky, including Jefferson Community and Technical College, which is in my Congressional district.

Under Dr. McCall's leadership, KCTCS has become the largest provider of post-secondary education in Kentucky. This year, KCTCS enrolled more than 92,000 students and remains the largest provider of workforce training in the Commonwealth, serving more than 5,300 businesses and training more than 52,000 employees every year.

Recently, a study by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems reviewed many of the accomplishments achieved under Dr. McCall's stewardship and found that "Relative to most other public community and technical college systems in the U.S., KCTCS has improved dramatically on the key measures of student participation and completion. Enrollment in the system has nearly doubled since 2001 and its production of college credentials has increased by more than 400 percent."

Dr. McCall has spent the last fifteen years dedicated to improving Kentucky's workforce and economy by leading the transformation of KCTCS. I would like to thank Dr. McCall for his commitment to improving the lives of Kentucky families and for his service to the Commonwealth. I wish you the best in your retirement.

TRIBUTE TO SALVATORE FERRARA II: FORMER CEO OF FERRARA PAN CANDY CO.

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to the life of Mr. Salvatore Ferrara II, former CEO of Chicago's Ferrara Pan Candy Company; Mr. Ferrara II passed away on November 27, 2014.

Named after his grandfather, Salvatore Ferrara, Mr. Ferrara lived a life surrounded by all the sweetness that candy could ever provide. His grandfather started the family business in 1908 on Chicago's famous Taylor Street in the Little Italy neighborhood. It was not long before Mr. Ferrara's father, Nello Ferrara, joined the business and continued the hard work that had been started before him. Under Nello Ferrara's guidance the creation of the Atomic Fireball and Lemonheads candy became reality, one inspired from his service in World War II and the other on the birth of his son.

Salvatore Ferrara II, or "Sal" to his friends, attended high school in the Chicago area and attended Loyola University New Orleans. He followed the path of his father and grandfather and joined the family business in the 1970s; under his leadership, the company went into a growth phase that raised the number of annual earnings and hardworking employees. He would stay in the family business until March of this year but even after stepping down, Sal would continue to work until the end. Chicagoland has lost an outstanding citizen, businessman, father and husband; he will truly be missed. He will be missed not only by his family and friends, but also by all of us who have enjoyed his specialty candies distributed at parties, picnics, weddings, birthdays and special gatherings.

All of us say thanks to you Mr. Salvatore Ferrara II. Sweet dreams as you rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING ROBERTO GALVEZ JUNIOR

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Roberto Galvez Junior of Laredo, Texas.

Mr. Galvez was born in 1971 in Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas to parents Roberto Galvez Martinez and Gloria Irma Alcala de Galvez. As

the eldest of three brothers, Mr. Galvez studied in Mexico up until high school.

For decades, Mr. Galvez has been involved in broadcasting for both Mexico and the United States in radio and television. He began his career as a sports correspondent in 1990, and then became a sports broadcaster for KLDO Univision Laredo in 1998. From 2008 to 2010, Mr. Galvez became editorial director for the popular magazine "Mas Accion," where he emphasized the importance of athletics in Laredo and the surrounding region.

Since 2010, Mr. Galvez has worked as Sports Director and Anchor for Telemundo Laredo Channel 25. Motivated by a desire to give back to his community, he has collected toys for underprivileged children during the holidays for the past four years.

Mr. Roberto Galvez has been honored with the "Best Sports Anchor" national award from the Mexican Federation of Sports Newscasters for his important work in sports journalism. Additionally, he has been named the best sports reporter in the Mexican state of Tamaulipas by this organization and will receive the award in a ceremony in Torreón, Coahuila in February, 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Roberto Galvez Junior for his many accomplishments and great contributions to the Laredo area. I thank you for this time.

HONORING JUDGE IVORY E. BRITTON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Judge Ivory Britton, a Justice Court Judge of District 2, who is a native Jacksonian.

Judge Britton was reared on Tougaloo Street in the Virden Addition Community.

Judge Britton attended Brinkley Elementary School, which is now Walton Elementary School, and graduated from Brinkley High School. He attended: the University of Judicial Court, National Judicial College, Reno, NV, National Judges Association, American Judges Association, and National Center for State Courts.

As a Justice Court Judge Britton works hard to ensure fair and equal treatment for all litigants of his court. He has increased his knowledge of the judicial process to enable citizens to easily use the Justice Court System. Judge Britton will continue to be fair and accessible to all citizens and be knowledgeable and obedient to the laws of The State of Mississippi.

Judge Britton is married to Liza Britton and they have three children: Perry, Dexter and Tabathia. He is a member of Cade Chapel M. B. Church.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Judge Ivory E. Britton.

IN HONOR OF REGIS PECOS

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 2014

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Regis Pecos, who has dedicated his career to working on behalf of his community and the people of New Mexico.

I have had the honor of knowing Regis for many years as he served as Chief of Staff to my father, Ben Luján, Speaker of the New Mexico House of Representatives. Regis was more than just a trusted advisor, he was a friend to my father and to our whole family.

Regis has spent much of his career helping to advance the interests of the people of New Mexico, and has continually been a strong advocate for Native American communities in our state. Regis served his pueblo as both Governor and Lieutenant Governor and went on to work as Executive Director at the New Mexico Office of Indian Affairs for 16 years and under four different governors. While in this important position, he helped gain the support of the New Mexico State Legislature for the State Indian Child Welfare Act.

Regis' passion for Tribal public policy and community issues extends beyond his time in government. In 1997, he co-founded the Santa Fe Indian School Leadership Institute, an organization dedicated to creating systemic change within Tribal communities. The Leadership Institute helps create a dialogue on the important policy issues facing Indian Country and also gives youth community members important exposure and education on Native issues.

The knowledge and passion that Regis has brought to his endeavors on behalf of the people of New Mexico will be greatly missed as he leaves the Roundhouse. But I know that whatever the next chapter brings for Regis, he will always remember his deep roots and always work to build a brighter future for his community and his state. It is with great honor that I congratulate Regis on his many years of service and wish him continued success.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

December 10, 2014

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 160, Pt. 12

17655

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, December 11, 2014 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

DECEMBER 17

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone.

SD-406